EARLY MONASTIC BUDDHISM

VOLUME II
PREFACE

The three Buddhist Councils are the three landmarks in the history and development of early monastic Buddhism. In the first volume of this work, an attempt has been made to present the history and doctrines of early Buddhism as far as can be gathered from the Nikāyas and the Vinaya. This volume has been brought to a close with the account of the first Buddhist Council, in which the direct disciples of Buddha met together to ascertain and compile the scattered discourses of the Founder. Though a discordant note is perceptible in the proceedings of the first Council, the Saṅgha was able to maintain its concord at least outwardly for about a century or a little less than a century. The disruptive forces were already at work within the Saṅgha and the Second Buddhist Council marked the complete cleavage of the Saṅgha into two groups, each of which again became divided into a few sub-groups. After the session of the second Council, the Saṅgha was no longer one but many, and each sub-Saṅgha considered itself independent and felt justified in giving its own interpretation to the teachings and disciplinary rules promulgated by the Teacher. Hence the history of Buddhism after the second Council is no longer the history of one group of thinkers but of the many groups of thinkers that came into being in the wake of the first cleavage. About a half of the present volume has therefore been devoted to the study and discussion of the materials available relating to the history, literature and doctrines of the many groups and sub-groups. This has been followed up by four chapters, the first dealing with the gradual change of relation of laity to the church, the second with the career of the religion during the regime of
the Mauryas particularly Asoka, the third with Asoka’s Dhamma and the fourth with the third Buddhist Council which marked the climax of sectarian differences and an effort of the Theravadins to propagate their point of view about Buddha’s teachings in the different parts of India. This volume has been brought to a close with an analysis of the popular features which the religion incorporated in the pre-Asokan and post-Asokan period, thus paving the way for the advent of Mahayanism.

For the convenience of the general reader not acquainted with the phraseology of the Buddhist texts, an exhaustive index of the Pali and Sanskrit words with their nearest English renderings has been added to this volume. There is also a general index of both the volumes. Owing to the difficulties due to the last world-war there has been some delay in printing the second volume. I must again thank Mr. P. Das, Manager, Indian Historical Quarterly, for seeing this volume through the Press and preparing the two indexes.
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CHAPTER I

FROM AJĀTASATTU TO NĀGADĀSAKA

In the history of Buddhism, the session of the First Buddhist Council coincides with the eighth year of king Ajātasattu’s reign. Ajātasattu extended his father’s dominion beyond Magadha and ruled over Aṅga, Kāśi and the states of the Vajjian confederacies. The Buddhist traditions are unanimous in stating that Ajātasattu in his early days was not very well-disposed towards Buddha and his religion, but later on he changed and became a patron of the religion, and whole-heartedly lent his support to the session of the First Council.

In the Mahāvamsa and the Mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa (henceforth abbreviated as Mmk.), Ajātasattu’s enthusiasm for rendering service to the new religion is referred to but there is no evidence to show that his interest for the propagation of the religion was anything notable.

UDĀYIBHADDA

According to the Buddhist and Jain traditions, though not according to the Purāṇas, Ajātasattu was succeeded by his son

2 In the Vamsatthappakāsini, (p. 145), it is pointed out that Ajātasattu repaired the 18 great monasteries of Rājagaha.
3 Mmk., p. 603:

4 Raychaudhuri, op. cit., p. 143.
Udāyibhadda. He ruled for 16 years. The Mmk. says that like his father he was not only enthusiastic about the religion but also had the sayings of Buddha collected. In the same text again, it is stated that the religion would decline after Buddha’s death, the kings would be fighting with one another, and the monks would busy themselves with various secular matters, find fault of one another, and lack in self-restraint. The monks and men would be demoralised, indulge in false disputations, and become jealous of one another. The non-Buddhists would gain the upper hand and the people would revert to Brāhmanism and take to animal killing and such other evil practices. If this self-contradictory statement of the Mmk. be considered along with the discreet silence of the Ceylonese chronicles about the activities of Udāyibhadda, it seems that the cause of Buddhism found little favour with the king. The text adds that there would be, however, some good men, gods and beings other than human, who would continue to worship the relics, and though the religion would be on the wane, there

1 20 years according to the Mmk., p. 604. Prof. Chattopadhyaya assigns to him a reigning period of 25 years.

Recently Prof. K. Chattopadhyaya has re-examined the question of succession of the kings of Magadha and arrived at the conclusion that Darśaka was an alternative name of Udāyi as Srenika was of Bimbisāra and Kunika of Ajātaśatru. (See Proc. of the Indian History Congress, Lahore, 1940, pp. 140-7). Prof. Bhandarkar identifies Darśaka with Nāgadāsaka. Cf. Divyāvadāna, p 369.

2 Mmk., p. 604:

तथापि सुलिया राजा उद्यायः प्रकृतिः ।
भविष्यति तदा विवा शासनाय च वच्यते ॥
तदेतत्त प्रकृति शास्ति विखिरापविषयति विचारम् ।
पुष्पोच सप्तोंऽस्माद विद्व समन्वयन नविष्यति ॥

3 Mmk., p. 597-8.
would be a least eight distinguished monks\(^1\) with Rāhula as the chief to protect the religion.

Buston\(^2\) writes that the guardianship of the religion was entrusted by the Teacher to (Mahā) Kāśyapa, who in turn entrusted it to Ananda. Both Kāśyapa and Ananda passed away during the life-time of Ajātasattu. Ananda charged his disciple Śānavāsika to protect the religion after his demise and to ordain, in course of time, Upagupta of Mathurā. He foretold that, according to the prophecy of the Teacher, Upagupta would become a Buddha but not with all the characteristics of a Sambuddha.

Just before his demise, Ananda also ordained 500 Brāhma- nical anchorites with Madhyāntika at their head, and entrusted him with the propagation of the religion in Kashmir. The episode of Madhyāntika and his activities in Kashmir do not find any mention in the Ceylonese chronicles.

**ANURUDDHA’S SON MUNDA**

Udāyibhadda, after a region of 16 years, was succeeded by his son Anuruddha whose period of reign along with that of his son Munda was very short, being only 8 years in all. In the *Divyāvadāna*\(^3\) king Munda is described as the son of Udāyibhadda, and no mention is made of Anuruddha. In the

---

1 The list of monks given elsewhere is as follows:—

_Mmk., p. 64:_ Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, Mahākāśyapa, Subhūti, Rāhula, Nanda, Bhadrika, Kaphinā.

_Ibid., p. 111:_ Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, Gavāṃpati, Pindola-Bharadvāja, Pīlundavatsa, Rāhula, Mahākāśyapa, Ananda.

2 Obermiller’s *Translation of Buston’s History of Buddhism* (henceforth abbreviated as Buston), II, p. 88.

3 *Divyāvadāna*, p. 369.
Anguttara Nikāya, king Munḍa is mentioned as approaching bhikkhu Nārada on the death of his queen Bhaddā. He listened to a discourse of bhikkhu Nārada delivered at Pāṭaliputta on the impermanence of worldly things. In the Jaina tradition preserved in the Parīṣṭaparvan (ch. vi), it is stated that a prince in the guise of a Jaina novice killed Udāyin. Prof. Chattopadhyaya surmises that this novice might be king Munḍa.

NAGADĀSAKA

King Munḍa was succeeded by his son Nāgadāsaka, who ruled for 24 years. With Nāgadāsaka ended the rule of the line of kings that commenced with Bimbisāra. In the Ceylonese chronicles, all the successors of Bimbisāra are described as patricidal (pitughātakavamsa); how far this statement is reliable remains yet to be examined, but it seems that the Buddhists were not in much favour of these kings, and evidently, as the Mmk. says, Buddhism was on the wane all along this period of about half a century. Madhyāntika’s departure to Kashmir and his attempt to propagate Buddhism far away from Magadha is also an indirect hint to the unpopularity of the religion in the province of its origin.

1. Anguttara, III. pp. 57f.
2. K. Chattopadhyaya, op. cit.
3. The Divyāvadāna (p. 369) says that Munḍa’s son was Kākavarni. In the Aṣokavadāna and Divyāvadāna the line of kings is given as follows:—

CHAPTER II

DISRUPTIVE FORCES IN THE BUDDHIST CHURCH

If the suttas in the Nikāyas and the rules in the Vinaya, the compilation of a greater portion of which may be placed during the reign of Ajātasattu and his successors, be scrutinised, it will be found that the disruptive forces were already at work within the Saṅgha even at the time of Ajātasattu, i.e., soon after Buddha's death. These forces were not totally absent during the life-time of Buddha as is evidenced by the story of Kauśāmbi and the episode of Devadatta. In the Nikāyas1 also appear a few apprehensive statements regarding the possibility of dissen-
sions in the Saṅgha and the condemnation of saṅghabheda as one of the five extreme offences like patricides, matricides and so forth. In the Vinaya, there are elaborate directions as to when a dissen
tion among the monks should be regarded as a regular or an irregular saṅghabheda. In the proceedings of the First Council also, is noticeable a rift in the lute in the refusal of Purāṇa of Dakkhināgiri to accept in toto the texts adopted by Mahākassapa and his followers as Buddhavacana. His insistence on the introduction of a few disciplinary rules clearly shows a lack of unanimity among the monks immediately after Buddha's death.2

1 Majjhima, III, p. 65; Mahāvagga, X. 3. 1; Kathāvattthu, XIII. 1
2 See my Early Monastic Buddhism (henceforth abbreviated as EMB.), I, p. 331-2.
The story of Kosambi

At Kosambi, there were two teachers, one a Dhammadhara and the other a Vinayadhara, both imparting instructions in their respective subjects to two different groups of students. One day the Dhammadhara teacher committed a very light offence through inadvertence and when pointed out he expressed regret for it, but this was talked about by the Vinayadhara teacher among his students and lay-devotees. The students and lay-admirers of the Dhammadhara teacher became offended at this provocative attitude of the Vinayadhara teacher and his followers, and there was a sharp cleavage not only between the two groups of students but also between their respective lay-devotees. Buddha intervened, and at first failed to make up the difference, and it was out of sheer disgust that he preferred to retire to the forest to be served by an elephant than by quarrelling people of the world. At this attitude of the Teacher, the quarrelling teachers, students and lay public came to their senses and settled their dispute. This episode cannot strictly be called a saṅghabheda, but it shows the possibility of dissensions in the Saṅgha.

The episode of Devadatta

The episode of Devadatta is almost a saṅghabheda though it is not recognised as such in the Vinaya. Devadatta was an advocate for more austere discipline and requested the Teacher to make the following five rules compulsory for all monks:

1 Mahāvagga, X; Majjhima, Kosambisutta; Dhammapadatthakathā, Kosambivattha. In the Gilgit ms. of the Mālasarvāstivāda Vinaya, the story remains substantially the same with slight variations in geographical details.
2 Cullavagga, vii. 3. 14; Itākasa, I, p. 34.
That the monks

(i) should live all their life in the forest;
(ii) subsist solely on doles collected out-doors;
(iii) dress themselves in rags picked out of dust-heaps;
(iv) dwell always under a tree and never under a roof;
(v) never eat fish or flesh.

Buddha could not agree with Devadatta. He believed more in person's own initiative than in obligatory rules, and so he left to the monks the option of observing the rules. This was too much for Devadatta, who departed to Gayāsīsa with a number of disciples who supported him. It is said that at the instance of Buddha, Sāriputta and Moggallāna later on won them over to Buddha's side.  

_Apprehensive statements in the Nikāyas_

Though Buddha did not admit that there was any dissen- sion in his Saṅgha, he was fully conscious of the possibility of such disensions. It is clear from his sayings here and there that he strongly apprehended disensions among his followers. He laid stress upon the importance of samaggā parisā (concord in the saṅgha) and pointed out in one of his last discourses that so long as his disciples would perform the ecclesiastical functions in concord, the welfare of the Saṅgha was assured. Once Cunda and Ānanda approached him with the news of the death of Niganṭha Nāṭaputta and informed him

---

1. Yuan Chwang writes that he saw three Buddhist monasteries at Karnasuvarna, where, in accordance with the teaching of Devadatta, milk-products were not taken as food. Watters, II, pp. 191, 192. I-tsing states that milk is an unlawful food. See Takakusu, I-tings, P. 43.
about the quarrels that immediately followed his death among his disciples. Buddha assured them that among his disciples there was no disagreement as far as his fundamental teaching, consisting of the 37 Bodhipakkiya dhammas, was concerned. There might be, after his death, he said, some differences of opinion relating to abhi-dhamma (atireka-dhamma = minor points of doctrine), ajjhāyva (minor rules of livelihood) and adhi-pātimokkha (minor rules of discipline) but these should be treated as negligible (apamattake), but should there be any differences relating to the fruits (magga), path (pati-padā) or the congregation (saṅgha), it would be a matter of regret and cause harm to the gods and the people. In differences of minor matters, as mentioned above, his instruction was that the erring monks should be politely pointed out that they were putting a different interpretation on a text or misreading a text, and that in the interest of the Saṅgha, they should give it up; for practical purposes, he suggested, that a sane and reasonable member among the erring monks should be selected for the purpose. In the Saṅghādisesa section of the Pātimokkha appear similar instructions (vide rules 10-11) with the addition that if the erring monk or monks do not change their views, he or they should be treated as guilty of the Saṅghādisesa offence. In the Āṅguttara there is a reference to Ānanda complaining

1 Viz., (i) four satipaṭṭhānas; (ii) four sammāpaddhānas; (iii) four iddhipādas; (iv) five indriyas; (v) five balas; (vi) seven bojjhāngas; (vii) eight-fold path. See Digha, xvi, 50; Majjhima, II, pp. 77, 103, 104; Lalitavistara (Bibl. Ind.), pp. 34-37: Saṅgīt-pāryāya in JPTS., 1904-5, pp. 71, 75.

2 Atthasālīni, p. 2.
5 Āṅguttara, II, p. 239.
to Buddha that Anuruddha's disciple Bāhiyo was in the habit of picking up quarrels among the monks and causing dissension in the Saṅgha while his teacher would not say a word to him. Buddha pacified Ānanda by saying that Anuruddha had never interfered in Saṅgha matters, and that all such disputes had so far been settled by himself or Sāriputta and Moggallāna.

Failing to make up differences by polite persuasion, Buddha's instruction was to take resort to the seven methods of adhi-karanasamathas, defined in the Majjhima and the Pātimokkha. Buddha attributed all quarrels to selfish motives of the monks or their possession of certain wicked qualities. He held out the prospect of a happy and glorious life like that of the god Brahmā to a monk in after-life as the result of any act of his that would serve to re-unite the groups of monks separated from one another, while he declared that the monk sowing dissension among his brethren is doomed to perdition for an aeon.

**Definition of Saṅghabheda**

Every quarrel or difference of opinions among the bhikkhus was not characterised by Buddha as a saṅghabheda. It is thus described in the Vinaya: "For not only is a formal putting forward and voting on the false doctrine essential to schism as distinct from mere disagreement, but the offending bhikkhus must also be quite aware that the doctrine so put forth is wrong, or at least doubtful, and also that the schism resulting from his action will be or will probably be disastrous to the Dhamma. In other words, the schism must be brought about deliberately by putting forward a doctrine known to be false, or at least doubtful, or with the express intention or object of thereby injuring the

---

1 See EMB., I, p. 307-8.
2 Aṅguttara, V, pp. 73, 75, 78; Cullavagga, vii. 5.
Dhamma.”

This definition obviously represents the opinion of the conservative school of the Theravādins who usually looked upon all those who differed from them with an eye of suspicion and ascribed an evil motive to their entertainment of the dissenting views. It is very likely that the dissenters held an honest belief that their views were devoid of any evil motive of injuring the Dhamma. It will, therefore, be apparent from a neutral standpoint that evil intention is not an essential factor of the saṅghabādha. The real essentials are:—

(1) belief in a dissentient religious view regarding either one or more points of faith or discipline; (2) entertainment of the dissenting view by eight, or more than eight, fully ordained monks; (3) the division taken among the aforesaid eight or more monks must show a majority on the side of the dissenters. When the disunion is confined to eight monks, it is called saṅgharaśī. This restriction as to number forming the essential of saṅgharaśī shows that it might at any moment develop into a saṅghabādha, by drawing an additional monk into the difference. Of course, bonafide belief and the full ordination of monks are necessary requisites.\(^2\)

Differences in the First Council Proceedings

In the proceedings of the First Council it will be observed that Mahākassapa was keen on securing the approval of all the senior monks, particularly, of Gavampati and Purāṇa, of the

---

1 Vinaya Texts (S. B. E.), pt. iii, p. 271 n.
2 Cullavagga, vii, 5, 1; Milindapañha, p. 108: “No layman can create a schism, nor a sister of the order, no one under preparatory instruction, nor a novice of either sex. It must be a bhikkhu under no disability, who is in full communion and co-resident” (S. B. E., vol. xxxv, p. 163).
texts settled by his Council as *Buddhavacana.* Gavampati remained neutral, i.e., he did not wholeheartedly accepted the proceedings of the Council as final while Purāṇa expressed his inability to accept the same as the words of the Teacher. He further insisted on the incorporation into the Vinaya of eight rules relating to food. The Mahiṣāsaka Vinaya not only upheld these eight rules as pointed out by Prof. Przyluski and also gave special recognition to Purāṇa as one of the foremost teachers of the time.

All these testimonies clearly indicate that the seeds of dissensions had already been sown in the Saṅgha during Buddha’s life-time and that these sprouted forth in full vigour in the second century after Buddha’s demise.

---

1 See *EMB.*, I, p. 331-2.
2 *Cullavagga*, xi, 1, 11.
3 The eight rules (as translated by Suzuki from Chinese) are:—
   (i) cooking food indoors; (ii) cooking indoors; (iii) cooking of one’s own accord; (iv) taking food of one’s own accord; (v) receiving food when rising early in the morning; (vi) carrying food home in compliance with the wish of the giver; (vii) having miscellaneous fruits; and (viii) eating things grown in a pond.
4 Przyluski, *Le Concile de Rājgrha.*
5 See *Infra*, Ch. VII.
CHAPTER III

PROBABLE CAUSES FOR DISSENSIONS IN THE SĀNGHA

In the preceding chapter, it has been shown that disruptive forces were already at work within the Sāṅgha during and immediately after Buddha's life-time. On scrutinizing these and the state of the Buddhist church as presented in the Nikāyas and the Vinaya, we may point out the following as the probable causes for dissensions in the Sāṅgha:

Absence of the supreme head of the church

Buddha thought that the prescription of heavy punishments for schisms in the church would check them effectively and that his Dhamma and Vinaya were comprehensive enough to keep intact the religion established by him, obviating thereby the appointment of the supreme religious head. He magnified the unaided strength of dhamma and vinaya, and directed that his teachings would be the Teacher after his death. Vassakāra asked Ānanda whether any bhikkhu had been specified by Buddha as would after his death become the leader of men under whom everybody would seek shelter. Ānanda answered in the negative. He asked again whether any bhikkhu had been selected by the Sāṅgha as would become their leader etc. To this also Ānanda answered in the negative. Vassakāra was curious to learn the cause of the concord prevail-

1 Majjhima, II, p. 105.
2 Dīgha, II, p. 154: Yo mayā dhamma ca vinaya ca desito paññatto, so vo mam' accayena Satthā.
ing in the church inspite of there being no leader (lit. refuge). Ananda replied "We are not without a refuge (appatīsaranā). dhamma is our refuge. There is a treatise called Pātimokkha which has been formulated by the omniscient Teacher and which all the monks living in the same parish (gāmakkhettā) have to recite in a monastery where they assemble on the uposatha days. Should there occur any difference or doubt in the recitation, the bhikkhus present explain them in accordance with the dhamma (hence they have their refuge as dhamma)."

In answer to another question put by Vassakāra, Ānanda explained that though there was no supreme head of the fraternity but there was in each parish a qualified head who was respected by the people under his charge and whose guidance was strong enough to keep the great many parishes connected together in religious concord. This conversation makes it clear that each parish was under the control of the seniormost and the best qualified monk that the parish could furnish.

In the Pātimokkha assemblies, the monks interpreted the terse expressions of the Teacher in different ways and intro-

1 Majjhima, III, pp. 7ff.
2 In the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta (Digha, II, p. 77) it is enjoined upon the bhikkhus that they should offer due respect to the Saṅgha-pitara or Saṅgha-parināyaka (the head of the parish) who should be bhikkhus of long standing and experience for the well-being of this Saṅgha. See also Aṅguttara, IV, p. 21; V, p. 353.

Childers in his Pāli-Dictionary (s. v. saṅgha) says that a Saṅghatthera is usually selected as the President of an assembly. He cites, for instance, Kassapa, the then Saṅghatthera was the President of the First Council. He also points out that a Saṅghatthera is not always the one who is the longest ordained for Sabbakāmin who was the longest upasampanna bhikkhu was not the President of the Second Council.
duced additional material in the interpretations, and passed them in the name of Buddha. This happened in most of the parishes scattered over the whole of northern India. There was none at that time in the whole of the Buddhist community who could dissolve the numberless divergences thus originated into one uniform whole and convert the threatening centrifugal forces then at work into centripetal, conducive to the well-being of the whole Saṅgha.

Mahākassapa made an attempt to remedy this defect of the Saṅgha as a whole by convening a Council, but he was also not fully successful as pointed out above (p. 10-11).

System of specialisation in different branches of Buddhist literature

The Pali literature is replete with terms like (i) Suttantikas or masters of Suttanta (or the Sutta-piṭaka); (ii) Vinayadhāras or repositories of the rules of discipline (Vinaya-piṭaka); (iii) Mātikādhāras or those versed in mātikā (= abhidhamma); (iv) Dhammakathikas or the preachers of the Buddhist doctrine.1 In the Atthakathās again, appear further terms like Dīghabhāṇaka and Majjhima-bhāṇaka (reciters of the Dīgha and Majjhima Nikāyas).2

In those days, when writing was hardly used for putting on record the sayings and discourses of Buddha, the means for preserving and handing them down to posterity was recitation and memorization. This was akin to the method that had been in vogue in India from the earliest Vedic period, which also gave rise to the different Vedic schools. A similar cause produced a

1 Dīgha, II, p. 125; Aṅguttara, I, p. 117.
2 Sum. Vil., I, p. 15; Pāpañcasūdani, p. 79.
similar result among the Buddhists and we find that the memorizing of different portions of the Piṭaka was entrusted to different sets of bodies hardened and separated from one another in course of time and bearing names descriptive of their functions. ¹

In the account of the first Council it will be observed that Ānanda was requested to recite the Suttas while Upāli the Vinaya. This would not have been the case if Ānanda or Upāli was not generally famed for proficiency in the particular branches of the Piṭaka. Elements of such specialisation can be noticed in the quarrel that took place between the dhammakathikas and the vinayadharas.² Commonness of duties gave rise to unity among the dhammakathikas on one side and the vinayadharas on the other in such a marked way that each group made the cause of one individual member its common cause and participated in the dispute.

It is an interesting reading how arrangements of beds and seats were made for the residence of the bhikkhus.⁵ Dabba Mallaputta, it is said, made such an arrangement that the bhikkhus, adopting the same mode of life (sabbāgā), resided in the same place in order that the Suttantikas could recite suttantas among themselves while the Vinayadharas could discuss the

¹ Vinaya, IV. 15. 4 (S. B. E. xiii, p. 339). “On the Pavāranā day the greater part of the night has passed away while the bhikkhus were in confusion: the bhikkhus were reciting the Dhamma, those versed in Suttantas were propounding the Suttantas, those versed in Vinaya were discussing the Vinaya, the Dhamma preachers were talking about the Dhamma”.

² In the Sum. Vil., I, p. 15, it is stated that the memorization of the Majjhima-nikāya, Samyutta-nikāya and Aṅguttara-nikāya was entrusted to Śāriputra, Mahākassapa and Anuruddha respectively and their respective disciples.

² See above, p. 6.

³ Vinaya, II, pp. 75–76.
rules of discipline with one another, and the Dhammakathikas talk about the matters of doctrine. Instances are not rare of a feeling of rivalry among these bodies, each member of which wished and was pleased to see the body to which he belonged take precedence over other bodies in having seat or food in assemblies or in thanksgiving after a meal.¹

These separate bodies, which existed for a particular function necessary for the whole Buddhist community, e.g., the preservation of a particular portion of the Pitaka by regular recitations, imbibed in course of time, doctrines, which could be looked upon as peculiar to the body holding them and in this way, the body developed into a separate religious school of Buddhism. Such instances are found in the Theravādins who had developed into such a school from the Vinayadharas, and the Sautrāntikas from the Suttantas.

The crystallization of bodies happened not only for the preservation of literature but also for the grouping of monks around a noted teacher. Buddha awarded prominence to some of his disciples by extolling them for their attainment of proficiency in certain branches of the Buddhist dhamma.² Of them the following may be mentioned:—(i) Sāriputta, the foremost of the highly wise (mahāpaññānam); (ii) Mahāmoggallāna, the foremost of the possessors of miraculous powers (iddhimantānam); (iii) Anuruddha, the foremost of the possessors of divine eyes (dibba-cakkhukānam); (iv) Mahākassapa, the foremost of the followers of dhūta precepts (dhūtavādānam); (v) Puṇṇa Mantānīputta, the foremost of the preachers of dhamma (dhammakathikānam); (vi) Mahākaccāyana, the foremost of the expositors

¹ Cullavagga, IV, 6, 2; Mahāvagga, IV, 15, 4
² Aṅguttara, I, p. 24
(saṅkhīttena bhāsitassā vitthārenā attham vibhajantānam);
(vii) Rāhula, the foremost of the students (sikkhākāmānām);
(viii) Revata Khadiravaniya, the foremost of the forest-recluses
(āraṇṇikānām); (ix) Ānanda, the foremost of the vastly learned
(babussutānām), and (x) Upāli, the foremost of the masters of
Vinaya (vinayadharānām).

Buddha indirectly pointed out to his new disciples the
preceptor most suited to each in view of his peculiar mental
leanings. This practice led to the grouping of students around
a teacher or his direct disciples, hence the remark dhātuso sattā
samsandanti samenti1 on the principle that like draws like. In
the Samyutta Nikāya,2 we read of ten chief theras, viz.
Sāriputra, Moggallāna, Mahākoṭṭhita, etc., each having ten to
forty disciples under their tuition. Buddha on a certain occasion
pointed out that the group of bhikkhus formed round each of
these theras was possessed of the same special qualifications that
characterised the therā himself. Thus the bhikkhus accompanying
Sāriputra were mahāpaññāvanta, those accompanying Mahā-
moggallāna were mahiddhikā, those accompanying Mahākassapa
were dhātavādā, those accompanying Devadatta were sinfully
inclined (pāpicchā).

Yuan Chwang noticed about a thousand years later that on
auspicious days the Abhidhammikas worshipped Sāriputra, the
Vinayists Upāli, the Śrāmaṇeras Rāhula, the Sūtraists Pūrṇa
Maitrāyaniputra, the Samādhists Mahāmoggalāna, the bhikkhu-
nīs Ānanda, the Mahāyānists Mañjuśrī and other Bodhisattvas.3

In the first four classes of bhikkhus, the aforesaid affinity
between them and their leaders is obvious. In the next three

1 Samyutta, II, p. 157. 2 Samyutta, II, pp. 155, 156.
3 Watters, Yuan Chwang, I, p. 302.
classes, the affinity existed all the same though it may not be apparent on the face of it. For the Samādhists followed Mahāmoggallāna because he was the master of iddhi par excellence which could be obtained only through samādhi, and the bhikkhumis followed Ānanda because to him the order of nuns owed its origin.

The principal points of resemblance between the followers and their preceptors were the ties that bound them together but these were the points which constituted the features by which the chief qualities of the preceptors were distinguished. These distinctions among them did not lie in any differences of doctrines which they professed but in the degrees of proficiency attained by each, in particular directions of Buddhistic sādhana. But the divisions though not proceeding from radical differences in doctrine grew stereotyped in course of time, and fusion between them later on became an impossibility due to the separatist frame of mind that their existence as separate bodies naturally developed. Thus the division which had commenced without any doctrinal differences gradually gave rise to the latter and grew into full-fledged schools.

*Latitude allowed in discipline*

It has been already mentioned in connection with the episode of Devadatta*¹* that Buddha allowed a certain amount of latitude to his disciples in the observance of Vinaya rules. He laid more emphasis on mental than on physical discipline. In his discussion with Upāli, a disciple of Nigantha Nātaputta, he pointed out that he considered *manodanda* as more important

---

¹ See above, p. 6-7.
than kāyadanda in spiritual culture. In the Mahāparinibbānasutta, his direction regarding the abrogation of minor disciplinary rules clearly revealed his viewpoint in regard to external discipline. In short, in his estimation, pāṇīṇa and citta practices were far more important than sīla observance. He realised the value of the latter for the new adepts but it was not the all and end all of his scheme of culture. From the history of the growth of the Vinaya code it will be observed how he made concessions after concessions for the physical comforts of his disciples. His code was not a hard and fast one. He made exceptions in favour of the bhikkhus who were placed at a disadvantage by reason of the locality in which they resided. In the border countries (paccantima janapada) such as Avanti, the converts were few and intractable, hence, Buddha at the request of Kaccāyana and Puṇṇa Mantāniputta made some exceptions in their favour in regard to the rules for the formation of an assembly for ordaining monks, and the use of leather-made shoes and other articles, prohibited to the bhikkhus dwelling in the Middle country.

Particularly noticeable is his reply to the Vajjiputtaka monk who expressed his difficulty in observing all the 250 rules of the Patimokkha. Buddha said that he would be satisfied if the bhikkhu would practise the three Sīkṣās, viz., adhisāla,

1 Majjhima, I, p. 372f. 2 Dīgīka, II, p. 154.
3 See EMB., I, ch. XII. 4 EMB., I, ch. XVI.
5 For boundaries, see B. C. Law, Geography of Early Buddhism: Vinaya, I, pp. 197-8; Divyāvadāna, p. 21.
6 Majjhima, II, pp. 8, 9. Cf. Dīkā., I, p. 334: ‘Sekho’ tī adhi-sīlasikkha adhicītta-adhipaṇṇāsikkha tī impā tisso sikkha sikkhanato sotāpattimaggaṭṭham ādīm katvā yāva arahattamaggaṭṭhā sattavidho sekho...
adbicittā and adbipaññā, by which he meant the minute observance of the discipline envisaged in the attbhāṅka-magga.

Austerities made optional

From his personal experiences Buddha recommended to his disciples the middle path which eschewed austerities as a means of attaining the goal. Buddha himself led a life of severe austerity and he was convinced that such austerities could never fulfil his mission.¹ For this reason one is expected that austere practices should not figure in his disciplinary code and this is actually a fact,² but there are ample evidences to show that Buddha praised those ascetics who took to the dhātu precepts.³ Buddha yielded to the strong tendency of those disciples who believed in the efficacy of austerities and could not be satisfied with a religion barren of such practices. Mahākassapa, one of his most favourite disciples, was an advocate of austerities, and it was difficult for the Teacher not to comply with the wishes of disciples like him. The system of living a forest-life, therefore, came into vogue in the early days of Buddhism and so there are in the Vinaya special rules for the āraññakas. The āraññakas were required to attend the fortnightly Pātimokkha assemblies, but they were exempted from many formalities.

(v) Faith instead of moral practices

It cannot be exactly determined when firm faith in Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha came to be recognised as a means to the attainment of Nirvāṇa. In the Vatthūpamāsutta, so much emphasis is laid on it, that a monk having firm faith in the

¹ Majjhima, I, p. 17. ² Vinaya, V, 131, 193. ³ Aṅguttara, III, p. 344f.
Triratna is exempted from observing even the rules of food. This sutta further shows that a monk taking to faith need not practise the śīlas as recommended for the generality of monks.¹

In view of what has been stated above, we may conclude that strict observance of the Vinaya rules was not in the Teacher’s mind though after his demise his disciples made the most of same. In fact, they became more and more ritualistic and failed in using common discretion. A slight deviation from the Vinaya laws made them sinners though it mattered very little in spiritual advancement. The protest raised by the Mahāsāṅghikas had nothing untoward in it and the Theravadins, we may say, magnified them. We do not mean to justify laxity in discipline but when discipline ends in literal and superficial observance of a set of rules, one has the right to examine them on merits.

¹ See my paper in IHQ., vol. XVI: Place of Faith in Early Buddhism.
CHAPTER IV

FROM KĀLĀSOKA TO NANDA

The Bimbisāra (or Haryāṇa) line of kings ended with the reign of king Nāgadāsaka. The throne was taken by his minister Susunāga, who according to the traditions preserved in the Uttaravihāra Aṭṭhakathā, was the son of a Licchavi prince of Vesāli by a courtesan. As he was adopted by a minister, he came to be known as a minister’s son. According to a late tradition preserved in the Mālālaṅkāravatthu, Susunāga had his royal residence at Vesāli, to which place he later on transferred the capital from Rajagaha. He ruled for 18 years and is said to have humbled the Pradyota dynasty of Avantī. As far as the testimony of the Buddhist texts is concerned, no incident of note happened during his reign in the history of Buddhism.

Susunāga was succeeded by his son Kālāsoka of the Ceylonese chronicles or Kākavarni of the Purāṇas. Most of the scholars are of opinion that the two names are of an identical person. The Aṣokāvadāna places Kākavarni after Muṇḍa and makes no mention of Kālāsoka while the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa speaks of Viśoka as the successor of Susunāga. Tāranātha has made a confusion of the Emperor Asoka with Kālāsoka and makes Viśoka a son of Aṣoka. In the Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā (p. 2) he is called simply Aṣoka. The outstanding event that

1 See above, p. 4.
2 Vamsatṭhappakāsini, I, p. 155.
4 See above, p. 3-4.
took place in the history of Buddhism during his reign is the
session of the Second Buddhist Council (see infra).

According to the Mahâbodhivamsa, Kâlásoka was succeeded
by his ten sons: Bhadrasena, Korâñçavarna, Maṅgura, Sab-
bañjaha, Jâlaka, Ubhaka, Sañjaya, Kôravya, Nandivardhana,
and Pañcamaka, who ruled simultaneously for 22 years. This
tradition, however, is not corroborated by other Buddhist sources,
according to which Kâlásoka or Viśoka was succeeded by his son
Sûrasena, who reigned for 17 years.¹

Sûrasena supported the bhikṣus of the four quarters for
three years, and offered a hundred kinds of requisites to all
caityas existing on the face of the earth.² Târanâtha makes
Arhat Sânavîsika and Arhat Yaśa contemporaries of Sûrasena
and refers to the appearance of Mahâdeva and his five propo-
sitions during his reign.

Sûrasena was succeeded by Nanda, who, according to
Târanâtha,³ was Sûrasena’s son. The Mmk.⁴ says that king
Nanda was very powerful, maintained a large army and made
Puspapura his capital. He, it is said, acquired wealth through
magical means. Jayaswal⁵ on the basis of the stanza in the
Mmk.:

¹ Also called Ugrasena in the Mahâbodhi-vamsa. Cf. Mmk., p. 611:

      तथागतमनरे राजा युरैः: प्रकाशः।

² Schiefler Târanâtha’s Geschichte des Buddhismus, p. 50-51.
The restoration from Tibetan may well be Sûrasena instead of Virasena.
Cf. Mmk. p. 611:

      तैनाथि कारिता शासनः: कारा सुमहति तदा।
      सूत्रेन्दृक्ता सर्वेः सवुद्रान्ना वसुमया॥

³ Schiefler, op. cit., p. 52. King Nanda came of the Licchavi
tribe, see p. 41.

⁴ Mmk., p. 611-612. ⁵ Imperial History of India, p. 14.
remarks that Nanda was at first a minister of the previous king
and that he belonged to a low family but was the leading man
of the community. By unexpected acquisition of wealth he
became the king of the country. He entertained the bhikṣus
in Kāśi for many years.¹ King Nanda was surrounded by
Brāhmaṇa ministers, on whom also he bestowed wealth. At
the instance of his spiritual teacher (kalyāṇamitra) he offered
several gifts to the caityas built on Buddha’s relics.² King
Nanda ruled for 20 years and died as a true Buddhist at the
age of sixty-six.³

During the reign of Nanda, the bhikṣu Nāga began to speak
highly of the five propositions of Mahādeva, which led to the
appearance of four schools.⁴ In this connection, we may refer
to the statement of Tāranātha that during the reign of Aśoka
(i.e. Kālasoka) appeared a brāhmaṇa Vatsa in Kashmir who was
learned but very wicked. He took pleasure in preaching the
Ātanka theory, travelled over all the countries and turned the
simple people into his own teaching and caused a dissension in
the Saṅgha.⁵ It is a well known fact that the Vātsiputiṣyas were
one of the four schools, and probably this school came into
existence at an earlier date but was recognised as a separate
school at the time of king Nanda.

Tāranātha as well as Bu-ston speak of the successor
of Nanda as his son Mahāpadma, who, they state, was devoted
to Buddhism and furnished the monks at Kusumapura with all
their necessaries of life.⁶ They further state that Vararuci and

¹ Schiefner, op. cit., p. 53.
² Mmk., p. 611-2.
³ Mmk., p. 612.
⁴ Schiefner, op. cit.
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Schiefner, op. cit., p. 55.
Pāṇini, who were his father’s ministers, continued to be his ministers, but Vararuci was hated and ultimately killed by him. As an atonement for the sin of killing a brāhmaṇa, 24 monasteries were erected by him. During his reign, Tāranātha states, Sthiramati, a disciple of Nāga,¹ caused further divisions in the Saṅgha by propagating his teacher’s propositions.

Prof. Raichaudhury and other scholars place king Nanda after the reign of the sons of Kālāsoka, Jayaswal, on the basis of the Mmk., places Śūrasena after Kālāsoka. It may be that Śūrasena was another name of Bhadrasena, the first son of Kālāsoka. In the history of Buddhism we know that, after the session of the second council during the reign of Kālāsoka, dissections arose in the Buddhist Saṅgha. Mahādeva’s five propositions were regarded by Vasumitra and others as one of the causes of the dissections. Mahādeva was followed by Nāga, who, in his turn, was followed by Sthiramati in the propagation of the five propositions. In view of this succession of teachers, it is quite probable that Kālāsoka was succeeded by Śūrasena, and Śūrasena by Nanda. Bustom writes that troubles arose in the Buddhist Saṅgha 137 years after Buddha’s pari-nibbāna.² This date coincides with the reign of Nanda and therefore his information as also of Tāranātha that Śūrasena intervened between Kālāsoka and Nanda appears to be historical. It is quite likely that the Tibetan historians mistook the name Mahāpadma Nanda as names of two personages. Nanda and Mahāpadma, and made the latter a son of the former. It may be that king Nanda took the appellation Mahāpadma some time after the commencement of his reign.

¹ See above, p. 24.
² Bustom, II, p. 76.
The Mmk. and the Tibetan historians furnish us with interesting information regarding the time and activities of the famous grammarians Pāṇini and Vararuci. Regarding Pāṇini the texts mention that he was born at Bhirukavāna in the west (probably north-west) and that though he was a brāhmaṇa, he was strongly inclined to the Buddhist faith, and that he attained proficiency in grammar (śabdaśāstra) through the grace of Avalokiteśvara. He composed the well-known Pāṇinivyākaraṇa and ultimately attained Śrāvakabodhi. The date of Pāṇini is placed by Weber, Maxmüller, Keith, and several other scholars between 350 and 300 B.C., and this is also the time of the reigning period of king Nanda, hence the contemporaneity of Nanda and Pāṇini as stated by the Buddhist writers seems to be true.

Regarding Vararuci our information is that he was an erudite scholar and started writing explanatory śāstras on Buddha’s words. Prof. Belvalkar has adduced ample evidences to show that Vararuci was another name of Kātyāyana of the Aindra School of grammarians, which school, Tāranātha says, was believed to be earlier than the Pāṇinian school. To this school also belongs Kaccāyana’s Pāli grammar. Vararuci’s interest in writing exegetical literature is also referred to by Belvalkar. In view of all these, it will not be wide of the mark if we hold that Vararuci was also a contemporary of king Nanda and Pāṇini and that he like his famous namesake Mahākaccāyana specialised in writing commentaries on Buddha’s enigmatic expressions. Tāranātha suggests that the writing of Vibhūṣa-śāstras was commenced by Vararuci. It may be that Kātyāyana or Vararuci

1 Systems of Sanskrit Grammar, pp. 11, 27, 85.
2 Ibid., p. 84.
was the originator of the Sarvāstivāda school of Buddhism, which later on came to be known as the Vaibhāṣīka school. From the above account, we may conclude that dissensions in the Buddhist Saṅgha commenced in the reign of Kālāsoka and multiplied during the reigns of Śūrasena and Mahāpadma Nanda.

**Principal centres of Buddhism**

The names of monks and the geographical information as furnished by the accounts of the Second Council throw interesting light on the extent of the area which came under the influence of the Buddhist church. The leading monks of the time were counted as eight, viz., Sabbakāmī, Sālha, Revata, Khujjasobhita, Yasa, Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī, Vāsabhagāmika and Sumanā. The first six were disciples of Ānanda, and the remaining two of Anuruddha. Ānanda died during the latter part of the reign of Ajātasattu, and so the age of his disciples at the time of the Second Council exceeded, in any case, 90 years. Sabbakāmī was then the Saṅghatthera but Revata was the recognised leader. In the Sanskrit tradition, Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī gets more prominence as he, according to this tradition, was selected by Ānanda as the monk to take charge of the religion after him. In the Chinese traditions, he is shown as taking the leading part in the deliberations of the Council. The Vesālians were monks of the eastern countries (pācīnakā) so also were Sabbakāmī, Sālha of Sahajāti, Khujjasobhita and Vāsabhā-

1 Bustom (II, p. 93) gives a slightly different list: Yaśas, Sādha, Dhanika, Kubjita, Ajita, Sambhūta, Revata.

FROM KĀLĀSOKA TO NANDA

gāmika.¹ In Buxton's account, Sabbakāmi is said to have been residing at Vesālī. Hiuen Tsang tells us that Khujjasobhita belonged to Pāṭaliputra while Sālha came from Vesālī. It will be observed that Sālha of Sahajāti or Vesālī was at first in an indecisive mood. King Kālāsoka also like Sālha was at first in favour of the Vesālians, but later on, at the intervention of his sister Bhikkhunī Nandā, he changed towards the Westerners. In the early history of Buddhism, Vesālī is described as a town seething with non-Buddhistic thinkers and as a centre of the followers of Nīgāṇṭha Nāṭaputta, hence it is quite in keeping with the traditions of the country that non-orthodox Buddhists should find a footing there.

Yasa, the most active figure in the account and the one who started the commotion, hailed, according to Hiuen Tsang, from Kosala. He left Vesālī for Kosambī, where he organised a party with sixty monks of Pāvā (Pāveyyakā)² and eighty monks of Avanti, all of the Western countries.³ He proceeded with them first to Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī of Mathurā and met him at Ahogaṅga.⁴ Accompanied by him they went to meet Revata, another Westerner, belonging to Kanauj and met him at

¹ Buxton (p. 93) gives the following geographical information:—
   i Sarvakāmin of Vaiśālī
   ii Yaśas of Dhanika
   iii Sādha of Soṇaka
   iv Dhanika of Saṃkāśya (in Magadha, see Przyłęski, Le Concile de Rājagaha, p. 286)
   v Kubjita of Pāṭaliputra
   vi Sambhūta of Mahiṣmati
   vii Revata of Sahajāti
   viii Ajita of Śrughna

² Pāthheyyaka is another reading.

³ Vamśatthappakāsini, p. 166: Pacchimikā yeva Pāveyyakā.

⁴ Ahogaṅga is a mountain near the sources of the Ganges. Moggaliputta Tissa resided there immediately before the Third Council see B. C. Law, Geog. of Early Buddhism, p. 40.
Soreyya. The fourth Western monk was Sumana. Thus we see that there was a clear geographical division among the monks. The opposition to the Vesālian practices was started by Yasa of Kosala,¹ and supported by Revata of Soreyya (Kanauj),² Sambhūta Saṅavāsī of Mathurā, and Sumana, whose native place is not mentioned anywhere. This testifies to the fact that the monks of the Western countries, viz. Kauśāmbī,³ Avantī Mathurā were more orthodox in their observance of the Vinaya rules as adopted by the Theravādins. In the deliberations of the Council, Sabbakāmī, though the Saṅghatthera, was not given the lead, and this also proves the lack of his whole-hearted support to the agitation started by Yasa. Saṅha’s attitude, as mentioned above, was at first indecisive and similar probably was also the view of Khujjasobhita of Pātaliputra.

Prof. Przyluski also has noted the geographical division of monks in his Concile de Rājagṛha (p. 308-9) and remarks that there were definitely three centres, viz., Vaiśāli,⁴ Kauśāmbī and Mathurā. Kauśāmbī and all south-western countries became later on the seat of the Theravādins while Mathurā and the north-western countries of the Sarvāstivādins. The Westerners of this Council were therefore the group of monks who came to be later on known as the Sthaviras and Sarvāstivādins while the Easterners, who made their seat at Vaiśāli, were the Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots. Whatever may have been the differences

---

¹ Dhanika, according to Buston (II, p. 91).
² Kauśāmbī is identified with the ruins at Kośam, 38 miles from Allahabad above the Yamunā. Watters, II, p. 75.
³ In the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya account of the Kauśāmbī dispute, one party is described as Vesālian and the other Kauśāmbīan.
⁴ Vaiśāli is identified with Besarh in the Muzaffarpur district of Behar.
between the Easterners and Westerners, it is apparent that Buddhism was prevalent at the time all over the central belt of India from Avanti to Vaiśāli and from Mathurā to Kauśāmbī. The chief centre of Buddhism, it seems, was shifted at that time from Rājagṛha to Pāṭaliputra which became then also the royal seat of the rulers. The Mahāsaṅghikas made Pāṭaliputra their chief centre.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Avanti in ancient times was divided into two parts, the northern part with its capital at Ujjeni is identified with Malwa.

\(^2\) See *Infra*
CHAPTER V
SECOND BUDDHIST COUNCIL

Sources (Earlier): (i) Our main sources of information for the history of the Second Council are the Cullavagga of the Vinaya Pitaka and the Vinayakṣudrakavastu, the Tibetan translation of the Mūla-sarvāstivāda Vinaya,\(^1\) which forms also the basis of Bustoṅ's and Tāranātha's accounts of the Council, as also of Rockhill. The Ceylonese chronicles and Pāli commentaries derive their information mainly from the Cullavagga and so have no independent value of their own. The account of Yuan Chwang is useful inasmuch as his information is derived from the Chinese versions of the Vinaya texts of the Mahāsaṅghika and other schools.

Sources (Later): (ii) Besides the above accounts derived from the Vinaya texts, there are three other texts written by Bhavya, Vasumitra and Vinitadeva on the history of the Buddhist schools. In introducing the history of the schools of thought, Vasumitra refers to the Council. He writes that it was held one hundred and odd years after Buddha's death while Aśoka was ruling at Kusumapura\(^2\) in Magadha kingdom. Evidently, by

---

1 Dul-va, xi, 323-330; Rockhill, Life of the Buddha, pp. 171-180. The account also appears in the Vinaya texts of the Mahāsiṅgas and the Dharmaguptas. Tāranātha, p. 41; Bu-ston, p. 91f.

2 See Masuda in Asia Major, I, p. 14. According to some authorities the name of the kings is given as Nanda and Mahāpādama and the time elapsed after Buddha's death is 137 years. See Bu-ston, II, p. 96.
Asoka, he meant Kālāśoka of the Pāli tradition. All these three writers have not a word to say about the ten un-Vinayic acts of the Mahāsaṅghikas. They attribute the division of the Saṅgha to the five propositions of Mahādeva.\(^1\) The works of these writers, therefore, are not of much value for the events that led to the session of the Second Council.

(iii) Apart from the two kinds of sources mentioned above, there are references to the session of the Council in the Mahāvastu, Saṃđhīrāja, Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa and other later texts, hence the session of the Council was taken generally as an accepted fact by the early writers on Buddhism.

**The Story**

Some of the Vajjian monks of Vesāli allowed as lawful ten rules which were not in strict conformity with the Pātimokkha. Yasa of Kosambi, while at Vesāli, happened to notice this and strongly protested against the same. The Vajjian monks resented this attitude of Yasa and expelled him (ukkhēpana) from the Saṅgha. Yasa made an appeal to the laity of Vesāli, and it is said, that he had to flee to his native land. From there he tried to form a party of monks who adhered to his views. He sent messengers to the monks at Pāṭheyya and Avantī, and he himself went to Ahogaṇga, the residence of Sambhūti Śaṇavāsi. There he was joined by sixty theras of Pāṭheyya and eighty theras of Avantī, and gradually by several others. They all decided to approach Revata of Soreyya, who was then the chief of the Saṅgha. Before they could reach Soreyya, Revata started for Vesāli, and the meeting of Revata with other monks took place at Sahajāti. The Vajjian monks, in order to forestall

\(^1\) *Infra*, p. 41.
Yasa's plans, approached Revata at Sahajāti with robes and such other presents but failed to win him over to their side. Sālha of Sahajāti was at first wavering between the two parties, but ultimately he sided with Yasa. The Vajjian monks, being unsuccessful in this attempt of theirs, approached king Kālāsoka at Pupphapura, and persuaded him to believe that the monks of the western countries were making a sinister move to get possession of the Teacher's Gandhakūṭi in the Mahāvanavihāra at Vesāli. The king at first took up their cause but later on changed his mind, it is said, at the intervention of his sister who was a bhikṣhunī. The session of the Council was held at Vesāli with 700 members but as there was great uproar during the deliberations of the Council, it was decided to refer the matters to a body of referees consisting of eight members, four from the orthodox party of the west and four from the unorthodox party of the east. The Council followed the Ubbāhiyā process as described in the Patimokkha.¹ The findings of the referees, which were all against the Vesālian monks, were placed before the larger body constituting the Council and were confirmed.

The Ceylonese chronicles continue the story and write that the findings were not accepted by all the Vesālian monks, some of whom held another Council and included in it all the monks whether arhats and non-arhats, and decided matters according to their own light. This assembly was called Mahāsāṅgha or Mahāsaṅgīti.

Time & site of the Council

All the traditions state that a Council was held about a century after Buddha's death to suppress certain un-Vinayic acts

¹ See Early Monastic Buddhism, vol. 1, p. 319.
practised by a group of monks of Vesāli. The Council was held at Vesāli, but the traditions differ about the name of the monastery where the scene of the session was laid. In Pāli the name of the monastery is given as Vālukārāma, and this is corroborated by the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya. According to Bustom, the name of the monastery was Kusumapura, but it is not corroborated by any other text. Bustom probably confused the capital of the province with that of the seat of the Council, or it may be that the Mahāsaṅghikas after their defeat in the Vesālian Council held another Council at the capital.

No President

A remarkable feature of the Council is that it did not elect any President. By the ubbāhika process a body of referees consisting of eight monks was formed to go into the questions of dispute, and each tradition gave prominence to its favoured monk. Thus, we see that though Sabbakāmī is recognised as the Saṅghathātera, the Pāli tradition accords to Revata, a Westerner, the leadership of the Council, while the Chinese version of the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya attributes to Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī the leading part in the Council. Bustom gives prominence to Sabbakāmī and Khujjāsobhita (Kubjita). In view of these differences regarding the leading monk, we have to conclude that there was no elected President and the business was carried on by a Committee.

The ten un-Vinayic acts

All the earlier sources agree in stating that the main business of the Council was to examine the validity of the ten un-

1 Watters, op. cit., II, p. 73. 2 Bustom, II, p. 96.
Vinayic acts performed by a section of the Vesālian monks, but there exists a wide divergence of opinion in their interpretations. It is difficult to decide which of the interpretations, accessible to us, should be accepted and so we should prefer that which appears more plausible.

The ten un-Vinayic acts with their interpretations, as given in the Pāli texts, are as follows:

(i) Siṅgiloṇa kappa—or the practice of carrying salt in a horn for use when needed, which contravened according to one view the rule against the storing of articles of food (cf. Pācittiya 38).

(ii) Dvaṅgula kappa—or the practice of taking food after midday, lit. when the shadow (on the dial) is two digits wide (vide Pāc. 37).

(iii) Gāmantara kappa—or the practice of going to a neighbouring village and taking a second meal there the same day, committing thereby the offence of over-eating (cf. Pāc. 35).

(iv) Ávāsa kappa—or the observance of uposathas in different places within the same parish (sīmā) (prohibited in the Mahāvaṇga, II, 8, 3).

(v) Ánumati kappa—or doing an act and obtaining its sanction afterwards (contrast Mahāvaṇga, IX, 3, 5).

(vi) Acinna kappa—or the use of precedents as authority.

(vii) Amathita kappa—or the drinking of milk-whey after meal (against Pāc. 35).

(viii) Jalagjspatam—or the drinking of fermenting palm-juice which is not yet toddy (against Pāc. 51). 1

---
1 Cf. Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya (Gilgit ms.), Givaravastu, p. 142.
(ix) _Adasakam nisidanam—or the use of a borderless sheet to sit on (contrary to _Pac. 89_).

(x) _Jataruparajatam—or the acceptance of gold and silver (prohibited in _Nissagg. 18_)._1

Buston, on the basis of the tradition preserved in the Mula-Sarvastivada Vinaya, enumerates the undermentioned ten acts.2 Prof. La Vallée Poussin translated the same Tibetan passage from the _Dulva_. We reproduce below both the translations of Obermiller and de La Vallée Poussin.

(i) _Using the sacred salt:_ (Obermiller) Mixing the salt that is to be kept for life-time with that which is used in general, to eat it and make it thus an object of use.3

(Poussin) Mixing salt consecrated for life-time with food appropriate at the moment.4

The Dharmaguptas and the Mahisasakas offer quite a different interpretation. According to them, the word _siṃgi_ is _siṃga_ ( _vera_ ) = ginger and _lona_ = salt. Their interpretation is to “mix the food with salt and ginger.”5

---

1 For a discussion on the interpretations of the terms, see Minayeff, _Recherches_, I, pp. 44-50.

The first three rules are relaxations of the more stringent rules, made by Buddha regarding the storage of food and eating to suit the conditions created by famine in Vesali. The people of Vesali continued to observe the relaxed rules though they were abrogated later on by the Theravadins in their _Vinaya_.

2 The order of enumeration has been changed for the convenience of comparison with the _Pali_ list.

3 Cf. Gilgit Ms. leaf 93b: चलि चादुचछां यज्ञारुपे लतश्रेय्य यात्राजीवमध्यभिन्नम:—

4 _Indian Antiquary_, 1908, pp. 91, 104.

5 _Ibid._, p. 91.
(ii) Taking food with two fingers: (Obermiller) The food that has not been left (from a previous meal) they eat, taking it with two fingers.

(L. V. P.) Eating food of both kinds, not being remainder, while using two fingers.¹

(iii) Eating on the way: (Obermiller) The monks, having gone a yojana or a half, assemble and eat on the pretext that they are travelling.

(L. V. P.) Having gone a yojana or a half-yojana, and having eaten food in troop, rendered the meal in troop legal by reason of the journey.²

(iv) Admission of a mixture: (Obermiller) The monks mix a droma measure of milk with as much sour milk and drink it at undue time.

(L. V. P.) After agitating a full measure (droma) of milk with a full measure of curd, and then eating the preparation out of time.³

(v) Taking intoxicating drink: (Obermiller) The monks take wine in the manner of a leech that sucks blood and having drunk, excuse it with illness.

(L. V. P.) Drinking fermented liquor with a sucking action like leeches, rendering it legal by reason of illness.⁴

¹ Dharmaguptas: “derogation from sobriety, as if, for example, a monk after an ample repast, forgetting the rule of good conduct, began to take with two fingers and to eat the food remaining.”

² The Mahiśāsakas say “to eat a second time after having risen before taking a sufficient meal.”

³ The Dharmaguptas and Mahiśāsakas say: “to drink, beyond the time allowed, a mixture of cream, butter, honey and sugar.

⁴ According to the Mahiśāsakas, it is a question of an intoxicating liquor which had become fermented.
(vi) **Making a new rug**: (Obermiller) Taking a new rug without stitching it by a patch of the so-called Sugata span taken from the old one.

(L. V. P.) Not having patched their new mats with a border, a Sugata’s cubit broad, from the old mat.¹

(vii) **Begging gold and silver**: (Obermiller) The monks anoint an alms-bowl with fragrant spices, put it on the head of a Śramaṇa, on a table or a seat, or in a narrow passage at the four cross-roads and proclaim: This is a sublime vessel, if you deposit your gifts in it and fill it, you are to reap great merit.

(L. V. P.) Taking alms-bowls such as were round, pure and suitable for ritual, anointing them with perfumes, fumigating them with incense, adorning them with various fragrant flowers, placed on the head of a monk over a cushion went about the highways, streets and cross-roads, crying as follows. “Here, ye people, who have come from various towns and countries, and ye wise people of Vaiśāli! This pātra is a lucky one, to give in it is to give much, or whoever shall fill it will obtain a great fruit, a great advantage, a great activity, a great development.”

[As far as the seven un-Vinayic acts, mentioned above, are concerned, all the Vinaya texts, including those of the Mahiśāsakas and the Dharmaguptas agree, though they have differed in interpretations, which have all been pointed out.]

(viii) **Digging ground**: (Obermiller) It is considered admissible for monks to live by agriculture. (L. V. P.) Turning up the soil with their own hands.²

¹ According to the Mahiśāsakas, to make for oneself a mat of undetermined dimensions; there is no question of fringe.

² According to the Dharmaguptas, the Vajjiputtakas think their conduct may be justified by alleging that “this has been done from time immemorial.”
On this un-Vinayic act, the comment of the Sarvāstivādins stands alone, and this seems to be due to careless Sanskritization of अचिन्न by अचिन्न, unconsciously changing the root (car to chied). Hence the interpretation offered by the Sarvāstivādins should be left out of account.

(ix) Approving: (Obermiller) They perform religious observances, and at the same time incite the monks in attendance to approve.1 (L.V.P.) The Venerable Ones (absent brothers) having approved, do ye count it as approved, caused the resolutions of the incomplete Saṅgha to be approved by the monks of the parish.2

Buston or Obermiller has no doubt been misled by the Tibetan rendering of the Sanskrit word anumodanā, which, though derived from the root mud, does not carry the meaning of “rejoice”. Anumodanā in Pāli means “acquiescence of an act done by the Saṅgha in one’s absence”. This is also an instance of anomaly of converting a Prakrit word into Sanskrit. We are not aware what was the original Prakrit word, but evidently the Pālists made it anumati. In any case, the interpretations offered by the different Vinaya texts are similar, i.e., getting an ecclesiastical act performed in an incomplete assembly approved by the absentee members.

The Mahiśāsakas and the Sarvāstivādins have both omitted āvāsakappa of the Pāli list. It seems that these schools included

According to the Mahiśāsakas: “To continue to occupy themselves with what they had been in the habit of doing before becoming ascetics; certain occupations were declared lawful, others were forbidden.”

1 “Rejoicing” of Obermiller is changed by me to “Approving.”

2 The Dharmaguptas support the Pāli interpretation while the Mahiśāsakas say “in the accomplishment of an ecclesiastical act to call others one by one afterwards to hear.”
all the irregularities committed by the Vajjian monks relating to the performance of ecclesiastical acts in a regular or irregular assembly within *anumodanā-kappa*, while the Theravādins (Pāli) and the Dharmaguptas have split it up into two: *anumati* and *āvāsa*. The Dharmaguptas, it will be noted, put a slightly different interpretation on *āvāsakappa*. They say that "in the *āvāsa*, besides the regular acts, the innovators accomplished others.

Perhaps in order to keep up the number of deviations as ten the Mahiśāsakas and the Sarvāstivādins borrowed one point from Mahādeva's five and made it the first of their list, viz., "Exclamation of *abo*".

(x) Exclamation of astonishment: (Obermiller) The monks of Vaiśāli perform religious observances and at the same time they admit such exclamations as *abo*.

(L. V. P.) The monks of Vaiśāli having rendered legal the exclamation *abo* performed an ecclesiastical act illegally in an incomplete or complete Saṅgha or legally in an incomplete Saṅgha.

The interpretation given in the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins is a laboured one and appears more or less a repetition of the previous un-Vinayic act of the Vajjiputtakas.

The exclamation of *abo* reminds us of the fifth point of Mahādeva, viz., the path is attained by an exclamation. This has been discussed in the *Kathāvatthu* (xi. 4) under the heading: 'Idam dukkhan ti' vācam bhāsato 'idam dukkhan ti' nānāṃ pavattati ti.¹

A comparison of the two lists (Pāli and Sanskrit) shows that both the traditions have worked on a common original list,

¹ See *Infra*, p. 41.
which was probably in a Prakrit, and definitely neither in Sanskrit nor in Pāli. This we state on the basis of the change noticed in the words: śīṅgilōṇa, āciṃṇa and anumati. The anomaly of āvāṣa can hardly be explained. As regards the remaining six items, the interpretations of both the schools are allowable and either exposition may be accepted.

_Five propositions of Mahādeva_

Vasumitra, followed by Bhavya and Viniṭadeva, writes that on account of the five propositions propounded by Mahādeva, the Saṅgha became divided into two schools: the Mahāsaṅghika and the Stavirāvāda. The five points are:—

The Arhats

1. are subject to temptation (cf. _Kvu._ II. 1: _Atthi arahato rāgo ti?_)
2. may have residue of ignorance (cf. _Kvu._ II. 2: _Atthi arahato aṇḍāṇan ti?_)
3. may have doubts regarding certain matters (cf. _Kvu._ II. 3: _Atthi arahato kaṅkhā ti?_)
4. gain knowledge through others’ help (cf. _Kvu._ II. 4: _Atthi arahato paravitāraṇā ti?_).
5. The Path is attained by an exclamation (as “_abo_”) (cf. _Kvu._ II. 3 & 4 & XI. 4).

Watters has collected some information regarding the life of Mahādeva from the _Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣa-luṇ_ (ch. 99). According to this work, Mahādeva was the son of a brāhmin merchant of Mathūrā. He had his ordination at Kukkuṭārāma in Pāṭaliputra. By his zeal and abilities, he soon became the head of the Buddhist establishment there. The ruling king was

---

1 Watters, _op. cit._, I, pp. 267-8.
a friend and patron of Mahādeva. With his help, he was able to oust the senior orthodox monks and establish his five dogmas, as enumerated above. Yuan Chwang writes that at the instance of the reigning king, an assembly of monks was summoned, in which the senior brethren, who were arhats, voted against the five dogmas, which however, were supported by a large majority of ordinary ordained members, i.e., non-arhats.

The Chinese pilgrim, it will be observed, mentioned both the five dogmas of Mahādeva (Watters, I, p. 267) and the few un-Vinayic acts of the Vesālian monks (Watters, II, p. 73) as the cause of the session of the Council and the cleavage in the Saṅgha. The writer of the Kathāvatthu was aware of the five dogmas. Buddhaghosa attributed them to the Mahāsaṅghikas, so there can be no doubt that the statement of Vasumitra and others is authentic. The Dipavamsa also states that the seceders introduced alterations in the doctrines as well.

### Conclusion

Now the questions that can be raised are: To which of the two causes is due the schism? Or is the schism due to both the causes? We prefer the second alternative and may account for the two traditions thus: The division of monks began with the differences of opinion regarding the interpretation of the ten Vinaya rules some time before the appearance of Mahādeva (or Nāga)\(^1\) i.e., during the reign of Kālāsoka. It was about half a century after this event that Mahādeva or Nāga propounded his five dogmas during the reign of king Nanda and his disciple Sthiramati propagated it further. As regards the fact that the

---

\(^1\) See above, p. 24, where Nāga is described as a disciple of Mahādeva, and Sthiramati as a disciple of Nāga.
tradition of the breach of ten Vinaya rules appears in the Vinaya texts and the Ceylonese chronicles while the tradition about Mahādeva's five dogmas appears in the Tibetan and Chinese versions of Vasumitra's and other writers' text on the doctrine of the schools, we may state that the Vinaya texts being concerned with the disciplinary aspect of the religion passed over the doctrinal differences while Vasumitra and other writers being more concerned with doctrinal differences than with disciplinary rules, considered it unnecessary to repeat the ten un-Vinayic acts of the Vesālian monks. The sources of information of the Ceylonese chronicles being the Vinaya texts, these also passed over the doctrinal differences, Yuan Chwang, being an annalists, was interested in both doctrines and disciplines and so he recorded the divergences in regard to both. It is quite probable that the schism began with disciplinary rules and in course of time, incorporated matters of doctrine.

It is apparent from the subject-matter of the ten un-Vinayic acts and the five points of Mahādeva, that the Vesālians wanted a certain amount of latitude and freedom in the interpretation and observance of the rules, and to carry into their organizations and general governance a democratic spirit which was gradually disappearing from the Buddhist Saṅgha. The exclusive powers and privileges which the arhats claimed for themselves were looked upon with disfavour by the Vesālians. The claim of the arhats to become members of important Councils and make their decisions binding on the non-arhats did not appeal

1 The Vesālian monks are called Vajjiputtakas in the Pali tradition. In the Anguttara (I, p. 230) we notice that a Vajjiputta monk approached Buddha saying that it would be difficult for him to observe the 250 rules of the Pātimokkha.
to the Vajjians—a clan imbued with a thorough democratic spirit. The five propositions of Mahādeva also indicated that the arhats were not ‘perfect’ men as was claimed by the orthodox and that the arhats also had a few limitations. The Vesālians refused to be bound down by the decision of the arhats, and instead they convened a Council of all arhats and non-arhats, calling it a Mahāsangīti and agreed to abide by the decisions of the enlarged Council. This new body believed sincerely that the decisions taken by them were in conformity with what they had learnt from Buddha.

Effect on the Church

Some of the Vesālian monks separated themselves from the Saṅgha of the Elders or the Orthodox, called the Therā or Sthaviravādins, and organised a new one of their own, calling it Mahā-saṅgha, from which they came to be known as the Mahāsaṅghikas. From now on, the cleavage in the Saṅgha began to widen and widen, ultimately giving rise to as many as eighteen to twenty-five sects. The Therā or Sthavira-vādins were split up into eleven sects but remained Hinayāna throughout their existence, while the Mahā-saṅghikas became divided into seven sects, gradually gave up their Hinayāna doctrines, and became the fore-runners of Mahāyānism. Once the disruptive forces were set in motion the Saṅgha could no longer remain a single whole. Sect after sect came into existence on slight differences of opinion concerning doctrines, disciplinary rules, and even cutting, colouring and wearing of robes.

In view of the general agreement of the different traditions, the session of the Second Council is taken as historical by the present-day writers. There can be no question about the fact that the Council marked the beginning of divisions in the Buddhist
church, and that the disruption hinged on the ten un-Vinayic rules. The different traditions agree about nine of the ten rules though they may have differed in their interpretations. The only point which requires further evidences is the date of the Council and the name of the king under whose auspices the Council was held. The Ceylonese chronicles gives Kālāsoka as the name of the king. Kālāsoka succeeded Susunāga and is identified now with Kākavarṇin of the Purāṇas (see above, p. 22). In view of the fact that Susunāga transferred his capital to Vesāli, it is not unlikely that his son should continue to make Vesāli his royal seat and take interest in the affairs of the monks who were residents of the capital. If Kālāsoka be accepted as the royal patron of the Council,¹ the date of its session will have to be put about a century after Buddha's death. Kern has questioned the statement of the Ceylonese chronicles about the age of the monks who took leading parts in the deliberations of the Council and pointed out that the names do not include any of the list of teachers given in the fifth chapter of the Mahāvamsa.² Kern's apprehensions are not baseless and so we should take the statement of the Mahāvamsa that some of the monks lived at the time of Buddha³ with a certain amount of caution. As far as the line of teachers is concerned, Kern overlooks the fact that it is a list of succession of the spiritual teachers of Moggaliputta Tissa and not a list of succession of the Saṅgha-ttheras. Kern's conclusion that the Second Council "preceded but had no connection with the schism of the Mahāsaṅghikas"

¹ Kern thinks that Kāla Asoka is none other than Dharma-Asoka in his early days.
³ Mahāvamsa, IV, 59.
seems to be his personal conviction and not based on any evidence and so is his remark that Kāla-Asoka was Dharma-Asoka in his early days. Vasumitra places the session of the Council during the reign of Mahāpadma Nanda. This statement is probably due to the confusion made by Vasumitra that Mahādeva's five propositions were the original causes of the schism.
CHAPTER VI

APPEARANCE OF THE BUDDHIST SCHOOLS OF THOUGHTS

It has been shown that within the period of Buddha's ministry which covered less than half a century, the various forces leading to dissensions were already at work. It was not therefore unusual that in the absence of the Teacher, the disruptive forces were still more active, and inspite of all precautions against Saṅghabheda, caused the origin of as many as eighteen or more schools within a century and a half.

We have two independent traditions about the secession of the Schools, one preserved in the Kathāvatthu-attbhakathā, the Ceylonese chronicles and the Sinhalese Nikāya-saṅgraha, and the other in the treatises of Vasumitra, Bhavya and Viniṭadeva. Though there are slight deviations in the order of secession of the schools, the two traditions, as shown in the annexed table, agree substantially. Vasumitra has assigned little later dates to the origin of some of the schools, but the dates are too vague to be of any consequence to us.

Viniṭadeva and the author of the Bhiṣṇuvārṣāgraprechā divided the eighteen sects in five groups thus:—

I. & II. Mahāsaṅghikas comprising Pūrvaśaila, Aparāśaila, Haimavata, Lokottaravāda and Prajñaptivāda.

III. Saṅvāstivādins comprising Mūlasaṅvāstivāda, Kāśyapīya, Mahīśāsaka, Dharmagupta, Bahuṣrutiyā, Tāmraśātiya and a section of the Vibhajyavāda.

IV. Saṃmitīyas comprising Kaurukullaka, Avan-taka and Vātsiputriya.
V. Sthaviras comprising Jetavaniya, Abhayagiritivāsin, and Mahāvihāravāsin.

Vinātadeva’s information and classification evidently point to a posterior date. He includes some of the later schools into his enumeration and omits some of the older schools which were probably extinct by his time, e.g., the Ekavyavahārika, Gokulika, Dharmottariya, and Bhadrayānīka. Particularly noticeable is his inclusion of the Ceylonese sects like Jetavaniya¹ (i.e. Sāgaliya of the Mahāvamsa, v. 13), Abhayagiritivāsin² (i.e. Dhammarucika of the Mahāvamsa, v. 13) and the Mahāvihāravāsin. The Jetavaniya, it will be noted, came into existence as late as the reign of Mahāsenā (5th century A.D.).

Tāranātha in his 42nd chapter (Kurze Betrachtung des Sinnes der vier Schulen³) furnishes us with very important identifications of the different names of schools appearing in the lists of Bhavya, Vasumitra Vinātadeva and others. After reproducing the several lists, he gives the following identifications:

(i) Kāśyapīya = Suvarṣaka.
(ii) Saṃkrāntivādin = Uttariya = Tāmrasātiya.
(iii) Caityaka = Pūrvasāila = Schools of Mahādeva.
(iv) Lokottaravāda = Kaukkutika.
(v) Ekavyavahārika is a general name of the Mahāsaṅghikas.
(vi) Kaurukullaka, Vātsiputriya, Dharmottariya, Bhadrayānīya and Channagarika held almost similar views.⁴

¹ Vamsatttha, p. 175; Sāgalikā nāma Mahāsenarañño Jetavana-vāsino bhikkhu.
² Ibid. It was founded in Ceylon during the reign of Vattagāmāni.
³ Schiefsner, op. cit., pp. 270-274.
⁴ Tāranātha tells us further that during the reign of the Pāla king, seven schools only were known. These were
These identifications help us to trace the Uttarāpathakas of the Kathāvatthu. This school should be identified with the Uttarānyas of Bhavya and the Saṃkrāntivādins of Vasumitra or Saṃkrāntikas of the Pāli texts. The Saṃkrāntivādins were also known as the Tāmraśāṭiyas probably on account of their copper-coloured robes. Out of these Tāmraśāṭiyas or Uttarāpathakas or Saṃkrāntivādins or Dārśāntikas arose the Sautrāntikas, who are often mentioned in the Saṃkarabhāsya, Sarvadarsānasānagrabha and such other works of the Brāhmaṇic schools of philosophy.

A comparison of the different lists of Schools shows that the grouping of Schools fairly agrees with one another. The Mahāsaṅghika branches may be sub-divided into two groups one earlier and the other later.

The earlier (or the first) group comprised the original Mahāsaṅghikas, Ekavyavahārikas and Caityakas or Lokottaravādins. According to Tāranātha, Ekavyavahārikas and the Mahāsaṅghikas were almost identical. The chief centre of this group was at Pāṭaliputra.

The later (or the second) group of Schools came into existence long after the Mahāsaṅghikas. They became widely known as the Saila Schools or the Andhakas,¹ and made their chief centre at Amaravati and Nāgārjunikonda. With them

(i) Śāṃmitiya comprising Vātsiputriya and Kaurukullaka.
(ii) Mahāsaṅghika comprising Prajñāpivāda and Lokottaravāda.
(iii) Sarvāstivāda comprising Tāmraśāṭiya and Sarvāstivāda. The former became known as Dārśāntika, out of which developed the Sautrāntika School. This corroborates Masuda’s remark as against that of de la Vallee Poussin that the Dārśāntikas preceded the Sautrāntikas. See Asia Major, p. 67, fn.

¹ To the Andhakas should be added the Vetulyakas and the Hetuvādins of the Kathāvatthu.
may be classed the Bahuśrutiyas and Prajñāaptivādins, as the former had more agreement in doctrinal matters with the Sāila Schools than with the Mahāśaṅghikas while the latter had its origin as a protest against the doctrines of the Bahuśrutiyas.

The third group of Schools is formed by the earlier Mahiśāsakas, and Sarvāstivādins with the later Mahiśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas, Kāśyapīyas, Saṃkṛāntikas or Uttarāpathakas, or Tāmraśāṭiyas.

The fourth group comprised the Vajjiputākas or Vātiṣṭhitāryās with Dharmottarāryas, Bhadrayānikas, Channagarikas, and Sammittiyas, and also Kaurukullakas. In this group, practically all the schools merged in one, viz., the Vātiṣṭhitāryas, otherwise known as the Sāmmitiyas.

The last, the fifth group but the earliest in origin was the Theravāda which, as Vinitadeva says, formed a group with the Ceylonese sects, viz., Jetavanīya, Abhayagirivāsins and Mahāvihāravāsins.

1 Vasumitra gives Sautrāntika as an alternative name of Saṃkṛāntikas or Saṃkṛāntivāda. See Masuda, Asia Major, II, p. 67 fn. The Sautrāntikas are called Uttarāpathakas in the Kathāvatthu. See infra.
CHAPTER VII

SCHOOLS OF GROUPS I & II: THEIR HISTORY & LITERATURE

The first two groups in our scheme included the Mahāsaṅghikas with all their sub-sects. Scanning the various traditions about the appearance of the sub-sects, we notice that Vasumitra and Bhavya¹ agreed with the Kathāvatthu as far as the first three sub-divisions² were concerned, if Cetiya be taken as an alternative name of Lokottaravāda. In the Mahāvastu, which is an avowed text of the Lokottaravāda branch of the Mahāsaṅghikas, worship of caityas is given special prominence, hence it will not be out of the way to say that the Lokottaravādins, on account of their devotion to caityas, were also called Caityakas.

Sometime after the appearance of these three sub-sects, came into existence two further sub-sects, viz., Bahuśrutiyas and Prajñaptivādins. According to Vasumitra and Bhavya, they issued out of the Mahāsaṅghikas direct while in the Kathāvatthu and Ceylonese traditions, they are made sub-divisions of the Gokulikas though the Gokulikas do not appear to have become an important sect at any time. The doctrines of these two later schools are allied to those of the Mahāsaṅghikas or the Sarvāstivādins.

¹ Vinitadeva's list, being of a later date, may be left out of account. See Infra.
² Kaukkutika (Gokulika), Lokottaravāda (Cetiya) and Ekavyava-hārika (Ekabbhāra).
The importance and popularity of the Mahāsaṅghikas have been raised not so much by the sub-sects mentioned above but by the schools, which came into existence still later, we mean, the Sāila schools of Vasumitra and Bhavya and the Andhakas of the Pāli tradition. The former speak of three Sāila schools, Caitya, Apara and Uttara, while in Pāli appear four or five names: Hemavatika, Rājagirika, Siddhatthika, Pubbaseliya and Aparaseliya. Though the Pāli tradition is partially corroborated by Vinītadeva’s list, it has been fully borne out by the inscriptions recently unearthed at Nāgārjunikonda, where as also at Amarāvatī (Dhanakatāka) appear the following names:

(i) Hamghi (Burgess, p. 105)
Ayira-haghāna (El., XX, pp. 17, 20)
(ii) Caityika (Burgess, pp. 100, 102)
Cetivadaka (Ibid., p. 102)
(iii) Aparamahāvanaseliya (El., XX, p. 41)
Mahāvanaselyāna (Burgess, p. 105)
(iv) Puvasele (El., XX, p. 22)
(v) Rājagiri-nivāsika (Burgess, p. 53)
Rājaśaila (Ibid., p. 104)
(vi) Sidhatthikā (Ibid., p. 110)
(vii) Bahusutiya (El., XX, p. 24)
(viii) Mahīśāsaka (Ibid.)

Excepting the last, the rest are all sub-branches of the Mahāsaṅghika school.¹

Out of twelve names of the Pāli tradition, we come across seven in the above-mentioned inscriptions. This testimony indicates the authenticity of the Pāli tradition. Vinītadeva replaces Bahuṣrutiya of the inscriptions by Prajñaptivāda, otherwise he

¹ See IHQ., vol. VII, p. 646-7 for further details.
upheld the traditions preserved in Pāli and the inscriptions. The Śaila schools of later days placed the Mahāsaṅghikas in the shade. It seems that the earlier Mahāsaṅghikas were not concentrated in one centre as were the Śailas. The former remained scattered over N. W. India, Behar and Western India, while the latter were concentrated at Śrīparvata and Dhanakaṭaka (in mod. Guntur District). The inscriptions indicate that a magnificent caitya was erected here and its grandeur and sanctity attracted devotees from places all over India and Ceylon. According to the inscriptions, the date of erection of the caitya should be placed some time about the 3rd or 4th century A.D.

The first group of schools, comprising the Mahāsaṅghikas, Ekavyavahārikas and the Caityakas (or Lokottaravādins) had generally common doctrines with minor differences, which have not been carefully distinguished by Vasumitra. As regards the doctrines of the second group of schools, viz., the Śailas or the Andhakas, the Bahuṣrutīyas, and Prajñāptivādins, Vasumitra has equally been taciturn. It is in the Kathāvatthu that we find a large number of doctrines, specially attributed to this group, and scanning the doctrines, it appears that this group accepted some of the doctrines of the Sarvāstivādins. We propose to discuss the doctrines of the first and second groups separately, but as the materials for the history and literature of both these groups are scanty, we shall have to take up their treatment together.

Their origin and literature

In the account of the Second Council, we have already shown how and when the Mahāsaṅghikas appeared in the field; and what disciplinary rules and dogmas were upheld by them. In the history of Buddhism, they were the earliest seceders to come into the field.
In the Dipavamsa, it is stated that they did not stop at introducing only the ten new Vinaya rules but went further and propounded new doctrines contrary to the established ones. At the Mahasangiti held by them, in reciting the Sutras and the Vinaya, they made alterations in the texts, their arrangement and interpretations. They replaced portions of the text by others according to their liking, and even rejected certain parts of the canon though they had been accepted in Mahakassapa's council. They did not include in the Pitaka collection, Pariyāra, Abbhidhammapakarana, Paṭisambhidā, Niddesa, and the Jātakas. The importance and accuracy of the decision by which the Mahāsāṅghikas discriminated between the original portions and the later interpolations are found in the full support that the decision obtains from modern researches bearing out their discrimination in toto. The Parivāra (pāṭha), meant as a manual for the bhikkhus, is no doubt a composition of a date much later than that of the Canon. The Abbhidhamma literature also developed after the Council of Vesāli and obtained its final shape in Aśoka's Council. Lastly the three works, the Paṭisambhidā, the Niddesa and the Jātakas too have been added to the Canon without much discrimination and evidently long after its close. In view of the contents, it would have been proper if the Paṭisambhidā had been included in the Abbhidhamma collection, and the Niddesa, an old commentary on the Sutta Nipāta, along with the Jātakas which is a commentary on the canonical Jātaka book, had been altogether excluded from the Pitaka collection.

1 Dipavamsa, ch. iv.  
2 Dipavamsa, V, 32-38.  
3 Rhys Davids, Hibbert Lectures, p. 42; Oldenberg's Intro. to the Vinaya Pitaka, I, p. xxxiv.  
4 Oldenberg, op. cit., p. xxxiv.
From all these testimonies mentioned above, it is apparent that like the Theravādins and the Sarvāstivādins, the Mahāsaṅghikas also had a complete canon of their own in its three divisions. References to the canon of the Mahāsaṅghikas are found in the inscriptions discovered at Amarāvatī and Nāgarjunikonda. On the pillar of an outer railing of the Amarāvatī stūpa there are two inscriptions, one of which speaks of certain nuns as Vinayadharā and another of the monks of Mahāvanaseliya as Mahāvinayadharā. These distinctly imply the existence of a Vinaya-piṭaka in that region about the beginning of the Christian era.

There are similar references to the Sūtra-piṭaka also, but in more details. In an inscription on one of the slabs found near the Central stūpa of Amarāvatī there is a reference to a monk of Mahāvanasālā as Sāmyuta-bhānaka (not Sāmyutabbātuka, as read by Burgess). In the Nāgarjunikonda, appear the following inscriptions in the Ayaka pillars C₁ and C₂: Dīgha-Majhima-pāmcamātuka-osaka-vācakānam, Dīgha-Majhima-nikāya-dhārena, Dīgha-Majhima-paṃḍa-mātuka-desaka vācakānam and Dīgha-Ma-ṇigoya-dhārena. These leave no room for doubt about the existence of a Sutta-piṭaka in at least three Nikāyas: Dīgha, Majhima and Sāmyakta.

There also occurs the expression Pañca-mātuka which is a Prākrit form of Pañca-māṭkā or (Pālī) Pañca-mātikā. In Pālī, mātikā is the usual term for the Abhidhamma-piṭaka. Among the Vinaya texts in Chinese, catalogued by Nanjio, there are

1 Burgess, Buddhist Stūpas of Amarāvatī and Jaggayyapeta (Arch. Sur. of S. India), p. 37.
2 Ibid., p. 102.
3 Ibid., p. 91 (Plate xlvii, 35), see also p. 105.
four works with māṭykā as a part of their titles, though none of these belong to the Mahāsaṅghikas. Prof. Przyluski writes the Mahāsaṅghikas had a particular fancy for the number "five", specially in connection with the Vinaya rules. Māṭykā was used by the ancient writers to denote the Vinaya-piṭaka as much as the Abhidharma-piṭaka, hence the word 'Paṃca-māṭuka' of the inscriptions may well mean the Vinaya-piṭaka of the Mahāsaṅghikas whose text also had five divisions like the other schools.

Fa-hien (414 A.D.) took away, from Pāṭaliputra to China, a complete transcript of the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya and translated it into Chinese two years later. According to Yuan Chwang the Vinaya of the Mahāsaṅghikas was the same as the one reiterated in the First Council. In Nanjio's Catalogue are mentioned two Vinaya texts of this school, viz., Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya and Mahāsaṅgha-bhikṣuṇī Vinaya (No. 543). Fortunately, there is the original Mahāvastu, which is the first volume of the Vinaya Piṭaka of the Lokottaravādins, a branch of the Mahāsaṅghikas. It corresponds to that part of the Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka, which gives an account of Buddha's life and his formation of the first Saṅgha. By Buddha's life, the compiler meant not merely his present life but the events of his past lives as well, by recounting which he showed that a particular event in this life was only a repetition or result of the past. The account is divided into three sections like the Nidāna-kathā of the Jātakas, the first

2 Przyluski, Le Concile de Rāja-grha, p. 212.
3 Przyluski, op. cit., pp. 353, 357, 359.
dealing with his existences during the time of Dipaṅkara and other Buddhas, the second with his life in Tusita heaven, and the third with his present life, agreeing mostly with the contents of the Pāli Mahāvagga. Apart from a few rules relating to ordination, it has nothing to do with the disciplinary matters. It contains a few Prakrit versions of the sūtras of the Nikāyas, Sutta-nipāta, Dhammapada and a few other texts. It is more a collection of Jātakas than a text on Vinaya. Winternitz thinks that its date of composition should be placed between the 2nd century B.C. and the 4th century A.D.¹

Yuan Chwang states that the Mahāsaṅghikas accepted the canon as rehearsed in Kassapa’s Council but they included certain discourses which had been rejected in the first recitation as non-canonical. He further states that the canon of the Mahāsaṅghikas was divided into four parts: Sūtra, Vinaya, Abhidharma and Dhāraṇī.

Language of the Mahāsaṅghika-Piṭaka

Buston² tells us that the Mahāsaṅghikas claimed Mahākāśyapa as their founder, and that the language of their Piṭaka was Prakrit. The language of the Mahāvastu, specially of its poetry portion, is mixed Sanskrit and which may well be called a Prakrit.³

---

¹ See Winternitz, History of Buddhist Literature, II, p. 239; B. C. Law, A Study of the Mahāvastu, 1930.
² Besides their own language, Buston adds, their robes had 23 to 27 fringes, and their badge was a conch-shell. Buston, II, p. 100, Cf. Csoma Körösi, JASB., 1838, p. 134; Wassiliew, Der Buddhismus, p. 294-5; Eitel’s Handbook of Chinese Buddhism, p. 88.
³ See Keith, Foreword to B. C. Law’s Study of the Mahāvastu.
Principal seats of the schools

The different traditions about the Second Council indicate that a section of the Vajjiputtakas held another council, Mahāsaṅgīti, at Kusumapura, i.e., Pāṭaliputra, the capital of Kālāsoka. Yuan Chwang also remarks that “the majority of inferior brethren at Pāṭaliputra began the Mahāsaṅghika school.” Fa-hien, as stated above, found the Vinaya of this school at Pāṭaliputra, so, it may be safely concluded that the chief centre of this school was at Pāṭaliputra. I-tsing (671-695 A.D.) tells us that the Mahāsaṅghikas were found in his time mostly in Magadha (Central India) and a few in Lāṭa and Sindhu (Western India) and some in a few places in Northern, Southern and Eastern India. Before I-tsing, both Fa-hien and Yuan Chwang had come across in these localities the adherents of this school though not so frequently as those of the others. The earliest epigraphical notice of this school is found in the inscription on Mathurā Lion Capital (about 120 B.C.), mentioning that it had a very strong opponent in Buddhila, an adherent of the Sarvāstivāda school.

At Andarab in Afghanistan and its neighbouring places, there were also some followers of this school. During the reign of Huviska, one Kamagulya deposited some relics of Buddha in the Wardak vase and presented the same to the teachers of the Mahāsaṅghika school. The vault which contained the relic-vase was built by the father of Kamagulya. At Andarab which was three days journey from the country of the Wardaks, Yuan Chwang found the adherents of this school in three monasteries.

1 Watters, op. cit., I, p. 269. 2 Takakusu, op. cit., p. xxxiii.
3 Ep. Indica, IX, pp. 139, 141, 146.
5 Watters’ Yuan Chwang, II, pp. 267, 269.
There was another centre of the school at Karle, in the Bombay Presidency, famous in the history of Buddhist architecture for its possession of the largest and finest cave-temples,\(^1\) which are still standing as memorials of their past glory. That this cave was in the possession of the Mahāsaṅghikas is shown by two inscriptions at the cave-temples, one recording the gift of the village of Karajaka by Gautamiputra Šātakarnī to the monks of the Vāluraka caves for the support of the school of the Mahāsaṅghikas,\(^2\) and the other of the time of Vāsiṣṭhiputra Siripulumāyi recording the gift of a nine-celled hall to the same school by an inhabitant of Abulama.\(^3\) Though the Mahāsaṅghikas did not receive much attention from the Buddhist writers and donors, the Karle caves show that the school commanded a great popularity in that part of the Bombay Presidency where the caves exist; for, otherwise the cave-temples could not have been so richly decorated with such fine specimens of sculptural and architectural beauty. Its existence and richness prove that there was a series of donors through centuries anxious to express their religious devotion and zeal in the best way that their resources could command.

The above inscriptional evidences relate to the Mahāsaṅghikas alone, who as it appears from the evidences were scattered probably in small groups in a few localities of North-western, Western and Eastern India, and had their main centre at Pātaliputra or Kusumapura.

The career of the off-shoots of this school, however, took a different course. They were mainly located in one country, the

---

1 See for its description Fergusson's *Indian & Eastern Architecture*, pp. 117 ff.; Fergusson and Burgess, *Cave Temples of India*, pp. 232 ff.
3 Ibid., pp. 71 ff.
Andhra, for which they were given in the Ceylonese chronicles the collective name of the Andhakas. We have seen above (p. 52) that their names appear more than once in the Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions. Just as Bodhgaya grew up on the bank of the Neraṅjarā as a very early centre of Theravāda and a place of pilgrimage for the early Buddhists so also did Amarāvatī (extending to Jaggayapeta) and Nāgārjunikonda on the bank of the Kṛṣṇā (including its tributary Paler) grow as a flourishing centre of the off-shoots of the Mahāsaṅghikas in the first century B.C. or A.D. and became a place of pilgrimage for the Buddhists of the later days.

On the basis of the style of sculptures and the palæographic data, Burgess, agreeing with Fergusson, holds that the construction of the Amarāvatī Stūpa was commenced in the 2nd century B.C., and enlarged later and decorated with new sculptures, the latest of which was the great railing erected a little before 200 A.D.\(^1\) It was some time after the completion of this Amarāvatī stūpa, that the stūpas at Jaggayapeta and Nāgārjunikonda came into existence, their dates being, according to Burgess and Vogel respectively, the 3rd or 4th century A.D.\(^2\) This estimate of date is based on palæographic evidences and the mention of the king called Mādhhariputra Siri Virapurisadata (=Māṭhari-putra Śrī Virapurusadatta) of the Ikṣvāku dynasty.\(^3\) The inscriptions on the āyaka-pillars at Nāgārjunikonda contain not only the name of this king, but also that of his father Vāseṭhiputa Siri Cāṃṭamūla and his son and successor Vāseṭhiputa Siri

---

Ehuvuḷa Cāṃtamūla. It appears from the inscriptions that the principal donor of the subsidiary structures of the stūpa was Cāṃtasiri, the sister of the king Sīri Cāṃtamūla, and the paternal aunt (pittuchā), later on, probably mother-in-law, of the king Sīri Virapurisadata. Hence, the time of the inscriptions, mentioning the names of the kings Cāṃtasiri and Virapurisadata, is the 3rd or the 4th century A.D. It should be remembered that the period mentioned here relates to the subsidiary structures of the main stūpa, and not to the stūpa itself—the Mahācetiya, which must be assigned to an earlier period.

It is evident therefore that the off-shoots of the Mahāsāṅghikas, viz., the Caitya and Śaila schools migrated to the Guntur district from Pāṭaliputra through Orissa and made their settlement in that region in the 2nd century B.C. During the course of four or five centuries of their residence, they gradually extended their monasteries to the neighbouring hills, becoming one day a place of pilgrimage for all Buddhists.

The offshoots of this school, the Lokottaravādins and Caityakas, in other words, the Śaila schools, we know from the inscriptions of Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikonda, established themselves along the banks of the Kṛṣṇā with several monasteries located on the different hills all round. In the Kathāvatthu-attakathā and the Ceylonese chronicles they are given the appellation of Andhakas, indicating thereby that they mainly belonged to the Andhra country.

In short, the earlier schools (i.e. the First Group) were located at Pāṭaliputra with adherents scattered all over Northern and North-western India, while the later schools (i.e. the Second Group) were concentrated in the south, having their chief centre in the Guntur district on the banks of the Kṛṣṇā.

1 Ep. Ind., XX, p. 3. 2 Ibid.
CHAPTER VIII (A)

DOCTRINES OF GROUP 1 SCHOOLS

The Mahāsāṅghikas & Lokottaravādins

Our main sources of information for the doctrines of the Mahāsāṅghikas and the Lokottaravādins are the Mahāvastu, Kathāvatthu and works of Vasumitra, Bhāvyā and Viniṭadeva. In the Mahāvastu, the doctrines mentioned are essentially Hinayānic in character, e.g., the four truths,\(^1\) eightfold path,\(^2\) theory of pratiṣṭhasamutpāda,\(^3\) impermanence of skandhas,\(^4\) non-existence of ātman,\(^5\) theory of karma,\(^6\) the bodhipaksśiyadharmas, bodhyaṅgas and so forth. (The doctrines of dharma-śūnyatā, trikāya, the two āvaraṇas (kleśa and jñeya), the essentials of Mahāyānic doctrines receive little attention. The accounts of the four caryās,\(^7\) ten bhūmis,\(^8\) countless Buddhas and their kṣetras (spheres) appear more as interpolations than as integral parts of the original text.)

Re. Buddha and Bodhisattva. The only Mahāyānic feature of the text is the deification of Buddha and Bodhisattva. A Bodhisattva is described as self-born (upapāduka) and not born of parents; he sits cross-legged in the womb and preaches therefrom to the gods who act as his protectors; while in the womb he remains untouched by the phlegm and such other matters

1 Mahāvastu, III, pp. 331-3. \(2\) Ibid.
3 Ibid., p. 448-9. \(4\) Ibid., III, p. 345.
5 Ibid., pp. 335-7, 447; III, p. 66.
of the womb, and he issues out of the womb by the right side without piercing it. He cannot have kāma and so Rāhula was also self-born. But it will be observed that such conceptions about the Bodhisattva appear only in the introductory portion (p. 193) of the Mahāvastu, and very rarely in the remaining portion of the text. There are occasional references to Buddha as lokottara, but it seems that the lokottara conception had not yet taken firm hold of the people's minds. Buddha's acquisitions are said to be all supramundane and cannot be compared to anything worldly. His spiritual practices are supramundane and so are his merits, even his bodily movements such as walking, standing, sitting and lying are also supramundane. His eating, his putting on robes and such other acts are also supramundane. It is for following the ways of the world (lokānuvatana) that he shows his iryāpathas. His feet are clean, still he washes them. His mouth smells like the lotus, still he cleans his teeth. His body is not touched by the sun or wind or rain, still he puts on garment and lives under a roof. He cannot have any disease and still he takes medicine to cure himself. This lokottara conception also appears only in the introductory portion of the Mahāvastu; and so it is evident that the text was originally an out and out Hinayāna text, and that in course of time, the introductory chapters were added, and very probably the addition was made by one of its later offshoots, the Lokottaravādins.

1 Ibid., I, p. 148: परिपूर्वकः च दमाहि मांसेंद्रि सः बोधिसात्त्व: मातं कुली प्रमाणितत्र दक्षिणेष्व पाणिन न च ते पापं भिदायते।
2 Mahāvastu, I, p. 48.
3 Mahāvastu, I, p. 159: न हि विज्ञित समयसम्बन्धानां सोकेन समै। यथा खलु यथा मृत्युर्मयी थोकेत्यमः। तथादिः समयसम्बन्धानां समुदायमः; थोकिष्य थोकिष्यः।
4 For the beautiful inspiring account read the Mahāvastu, I, pp. 167-170.
In the *Abhidharmakośa* and its *Vyākhyā*, it is said that according to the Mahāsaṅghikas, Buddhas appear at the same time in more than one world, and that they are omniscient in the sense that they know all dharmas at the same time. The former statement appears also in the *Kathāvatthu* (xxi, 6), in which it is stated that according to the Mahāsaṅghikas, Buddhas exist in all corners of the world (*sabbā disā Buddhā tiṭṭhanti*). In the *Kathāvatthu* and the *Kośa*, no special doctrines about the Bodhisattva conception are attributed to the Mahāsaṅghikas.

Re. Arhat. There is a sharp difference of opinion among the various schools on the problem, viz., whether arhathood is identical with *mukti* or not? Those who adhere to the former view state that an arhat cannot recede from arhathood. This was the view of the Sāila schools and a section of the Mahāsaṅghikas. From Mahādeva’s five points, we have to infer that a section of the earlier Mahāsaṅghikas adhered to the opposite view, viz., that an arhat may fall from arhathood. In this respect the *Kathāvatthu* and the *Kośa* come to our aid. These texts state that, according to a section of the Mahāsaṅghikas, the arhats are not omniscient like Buddha (vide *Kvn.*, XXI, 3) and that they are subject to fall from arhathood. The *Kośa* (ii, p. 210) incidentally mentions that an adept who has attained the *nirdha-samāpatti* (meditation in which perception ceases almost completely), appertaining to the fourth *dhyāna*, cannot have a fall from that state. The Theravādins admit *pattaparibhāni*

1 *Kośa*, iii. 200; ix, 254.
2 Vide Masuda, p. 27; *Kośa* (Poussin’s transl.), vi, p. 255 fn.
3 *Kvn*. i. 2: Parihāyati arahā arahattā ti?
DOCTRINES OF GROUP 1 SCHOOLS

(loss of what is attained) of those adepts who have attained only lokiya-samāpatti (meditation limited to the worldly sphere) and not the higher fruits of sanctification (arhatādisāmaññaphala) while the opponents speak of retrogression of the latter also, but confine it only to those arhats who are samayavimuttas. The basis of this contention of the opponents is a passage of the Aṅguttara Nikāya (iii. 173), in which Buddha says that five ārāmatā (indulgences), viz., in kamma, (deed), bhassa (desultory talks), nidā (sleep) and saṅganikā (frequenting societies) lead to the fall of a samayavimutta-bbikkhu. Buddhaghosa infers from the discussion that the opponents assert that the arhats retrogress up to the Sotāpattipāla but no further and that the retrogression happens only in the sphere of Kāmaloka and not in the higher two spheres, Rūpa and Arūpa, and that also is confined only to the mudindriya or samayavimutta arhats.

The Kathāvatthu refers to another cause for the fall of an arhat, viz., (i) kammahetu arahā arahattā parihāyati (an opinion of the Pubbaseliyas and Sammitiyanas). It means that the fall of an arhat is sometimes due to the deeds of his previous lives, e.g. of having calumniated an arhat. It also warns the opponents particularly the Pubba- and Apara-seliyas and Uttarapathakas about impostors passing as an arhat and committing abhracarīya offences (vide Kūn., II. 1 & XXIII. 2).

Re. Anuśaya (Dormant passion):

(i) Anusayā anārammañā and citta-vippayuttā (IX. 4) (Dormant passions are not objects of thought and are dissociated from mind).

1 By Samayavimutta is meant those arhats whose faculties are not very strong; according to the Theravādins these arhats complete their meditational course but have not attained complete self control.
This opinion is the same as that of the Sāila schools, so it has been discussed along with their other views (see infra.) (cf. Kośa, transl., V, p. 4-5).

Re. Viññāna (Perception):

(i) Pañcaviññānasamaṅgissa atthi maggabhāvanā (X. 3) (Insipite of the perceptions through the organs of sense, a person may progress along the spiritual path). (ii) Pañcaviññāna kusala ti akusalā pi ti (X. 4) and (iii) Pañcaviññāna sābhoga (X. 5) (The five sense-perceptions may be good or bad and are "co-ideational" (sābhoga, lit., are associated with mental enjoyment).

The Mahāsāṅghikas on the basis of the statement of Bhagavā, "Idha bhikkhave bhikkhu cakkhusa rūpam disvā nimittaggābhi hoti...pe...na nimittaggābhi hoti...pe...sotena saddam sutvā etc..." contend that a person using the five sense-organs may practise maggabhāvanā, by not grasping the object seen or heard (nimittaggābhi) and directing his mind towards nibbāna. The Theravādins argue that if through pañcaviññāna one attains sotāpatti and other maggas, then the pañcaviññāna and magga should be of the same category, but the former is lokiya and the latter lokuttara, the former is savatthuka (have an object as basis) and the latter is avatthuka (without any basis). In this way the Theravādins argue that by the exercise of the five viññānas one does not attain nibbāna.

The opponents state that through the use of five viññānas a person may engender rāga (attachment) is self-evident though the Theravādins may not admit that the five perceptions are sābhoga (X. 5). In the discussion (VIII. 4) whether the five āyatanas are associated with desires (kāma), the Theravādins

1 Meditational practices which lead to the attainment of the four maggas, viz., sotāpatti, sakadāgāmi, anāgāmi and arahatta.
acknowledge that Buddha said that the five āyatanas may or may not be kāmagunas, and explained the same by saying that a person’s organs of sense or the objects of the senses are not by themselves kāmagunas (associated with desires) but one, who has saṅkapparāga (desireful intention) and does not disassociate his mind from the objects of sense, is not expected to attain detachment from worldly objects. The Mahāsāṅghikas, I think, hold the identical opinion though it is not so clearly expressed in Vasumitra, it is only the Sarvāstivādins who held the opinion that the vijñānas conduce to sarāga and not to virāga (Masuda, p. 48).

Re. Indriyas (Organs of sense):

_Cakkhunā rūpam passati ti_ (Kuṭ. xviii. 9). Sentient surface of the eyes see).  

In the Kathāvatthu (xviii, 9), the Mahāsāṅghikas are said to hold the opinion that the organs of sense perceive and not their perceptive faculty (vijñāna). This is also the view of the Vaibhāśikas (vide Kośa, transl. i. p. 81-2). The Sāla schools and the Theravādins hold the opposite view (see infra).

Re. Anupubbābhisamaya (Gradual realisation of the truths):

The Mahāsāṅghikas like the Theravādins hold that the realisation of the truths takes place all at once and not gradually (for the contrary opinion of the Sarvāstivādins, see infra).

---

2. The eyes see and not the caksu-vijñāna is also the opinion of the Vaibhāśikas (Kośa, i. 81-2). See Infra.
Re. Apratisamkhya-nirodha (Emancipation without knowledge):

The Buddhists admit two kinds of nirodha one attained by means of knowledge (pratisamkhya) and the other by complete removal of all impurities which cause rebirth, and not by knowledge (apratisamkhya). The Mahasanghikas hold that the latter is pascad abhava (subsequent absence) of dharmas in virtue of their spontaneous destruction, which are not reborn.

Re. Kleśa-bija (Germ of impurities):

The Mahasanghikas state that kleśa-bija is a dharma distinct from kleśa (Kośa, v. p. 7).

Re. Reals:

The Mahasanghikas maintain as against the Sarvastivadins that the present exists but not the past and future.

Re. Vijñapti (Signs of intimation):

The Mahasanghikas hold that vijñapti is also an act (Kośa, iv, p. 3). (Cf. p. 71).

Other opinions:

The following are some of the doctrines attributed to the Mahasanghikas in the Kathavatthu only:—

(i) Restraint (sāmvara) or unrestraint (asaṃvara) of the organs of sense should be treated as action (kamma). The Theravadins regard it as non-action, their contention being that an action should be defined as the actual functioning of the five organs of sense initiated by mind (cetanā). Kum. XII. 1.

(ii) All actions (sabbam kammaṃ) are accompanied by results (savipāka). The Theravadins contend that as cetanā is the

1 Kośa (transl.), ii, p. 280.  
source of all actions, and as there are avyākata (neither good nor bad) and avipāka (unaccompanied by any result) cittas, there must be also avyākata and avipāka kammatas, hence all actions are not necessarily accompanied by results.—Kvu. XII. 2.

(iii) Sound and other āyatanas (spheres of the organs of sense) are also results of actions (kammassā katattā uppannam). In short, all non-materials (arūpadhāma) are products of actions (kammamasamūṭṭhānā).—Kvu., XII. 3 & 4.

(iv) Acquisition of moral purity is not mental (sīlam acetassikan ti; sīlam na cittānuparivatthi ti). Ku. X. 7. 8.

The Mahāsāṅghikas imply by the above opinion of theirs that purity in speech (samma vācā), actions (samma kammanta) and means of livelihood (samma ājīva) is a corporeal property and as such is non-mental and requires no ārammaṇa (basis). The M. mean that the observance of sīlas transforms the bodily constituents of a being in such a way that it can no longer commit any wrong, i.e., cannot be dussīla.

(v) The collection of sīlas (merits) is not associated with mind. (cittavippayuttam silopacayam). Ku. X. 9.

Buddhaghosa explains this is due to misapprehension of the sense of the passage in the Samyutta Nikāya (I. p. 33): ārāmaropā vanaropā ye janā...tesam sadā puṇṇam pavaddhati (the merits of those who plant park and woods increase at all times).


1 Cetanāham kammam vadāmi—Atthas., p. 135.
2 See Dhammassaṅgani, pp. 87 ff. 3 Cf. Kośa, (trasl.), i, p. 69-70.
5 Transl. "That the physical frame of one who is practising the eightfold path is included in that path." Points of Controversy. p. 244.
6 Transl. "That one who is engaged in the path is practising a
A maggasamaṇī is an advanced adept who has reached one of the maggas, i.e., sotāpattimagga, etc., by following the eightfold path, and is engaged in maggabhāvanā (higher meditations). His mental states are transcendental (lokuttara). The question is whether the sila practices1 completed by him in the pre-sotāpanna stage and still possessed by him should be regarded as lokuttara or lokiya (belonging to the spheres of Kāma, Rūpa and Arūpa)? The M. contend that the rūpa of a maggasamaṇī (or maggaṭṭha) remains lokiya while his mental state (citta) becomes lokuttara, hence his silas, which belong to the category of rūpa as shown above, remain lokiya. Of the eight factors of the atthaṅgika-magga, three, viz., samma vācā, kammanta and ājīva of a sotāpanna are silas and as such they are lokiya but the remaining five which are mental (arūpa) may be lokuttara. A sotāpanna therefore is in possession of lokiya silas but if he practises sammāsati, sammāvāyama, etc. he may be said to have lokuttara-silas. The Th. do not make any such distinction, for all the eight silas, according to them, emanate from mind;2 so the silas of a sotāpanna, who has lokuttara-citta, are lokuttara.

(viii) Acts of intimation are virtues (aviññatti silan ti).

(ix) Acts not intimating a moral purpose is immoral3 (aviññatti dussilyan ti). Kvu. X. 10, 11.


1 See Dhammasaṅgani, p. 60.

2 Cf. Vism., p. 6: Kīṁ silan ti? Cetanā silam, cetasikam silam, samvarī silam, avitikkamo silan ti (quoted from Patisambhidāmagga, I. p. 44).

3 See Points of Controversy, p. 252. For definition of Viññatti, see Atthas., pp. 83 ff.
Sila, according to the M., must be positive action and not mere restraint (saṁvara), so any viññātī (intimation) by means of body or speech is sila. Salutation, rising to welcome, folding hands, etc., are silas. The M., in view of their opinion that there may be accumulation of demerits without the association of mind (cittavippayuttam apuññupacayam), contend “that acts not intimating a moral purpose are immoral.”

(x) Insight is dissociated from mind (ñānam cittavippayuttam). Kuṣ. XI. 3.

(xi) One should not be called ‘ñāni’ (possessed of insight) though his aññāna (spiritual ignorance) is gone but his thoughts are not conjoined with insight. (Aññāne vigate ñānavippayutte citte vattamāne na vattaṃbaṃ ‘ñāni’ ti). Kuṣ. XI. 2.

In this controversy ñāṇa means maggañāṇa (insight belonging to the adepts who are in one of the four maggas). The M. contend that at the moment when an adept has cakkhuviññāṇa, etc., he cannot have maggañāṇa. In other words they mean to say that it is only when an adept develops maggañāṇa and stops his sense perceptions (viññāṇas), he may be described as ‘ñāni’, hence ñāṇa is not associated with mind (citta = viññāṇa).

(xii) Akusalamūlam paṭisandahati kusalamūlan ti.1 Kuṣ. XIV. 1.

The M. contend that as the same object may be the cause of both rāga (attachment) and virāga (detachment) and as one may follow the other immediately, it may be stated that kusala is the anantarapaccaya (contiguous cause) of akusala and vice versa. The Th. point out that cultivation of kusalamūla must be made deliberately (yoniso manasikaroto) while that of akusalamūla does not require any such thinking (ayoniso manasikaroto),

1 “That a basis of bad thought is consecutive to a basis that is good, and conversely.” Points of Controversy, p. 282.
and also that nekkhammasañña (renunciating thought) does not always follow kāmasañña (worldly thought) and vice versa, and so kusalamūla cannot be regarded generally as the contiguous cause of akusalamūla and vice versa.¹

(xiii) Paccayatā uватб́хи́тā ti. (One phenomenon can be related to another in one way only). Kun. XV. 1.

The M. now enter into the problem of paccayās. There are twenty-four kinds of paccayās, viz., hetu, āramimana, adhipati, sahajāta, anantara, etc.² They raise the question whether one object can be placed under two or more kinds of paccayās of another object, or one can be related to another by one relation only. The Th. hold that one object may be two kinds of paccayās, e.g., viriya may be both adhipati and sahajāta; vimānsa may be both hetu and adhipati. The M. do not subscribe to this view.


This view of the M. is only a corollary to the previous one. The M. hold that avijjā is the hetu (cause) of samkhārā and as such there cannot be any other relation between the two. The Th., however, argue that avijjā and samkhārā are related to each other both as hetu and sahajāta (co-existent) or aṁnamanna (reciprocal), hence it may be stated that samkhārā are sahajātapaccayā of avijjā, and vice versa.⁴ In the Vibhaṅga (pp. 156 ff.)

¹ Cf. Tikapattṭhāna, pp. 168 ff.
² See Atthas., p. 9; Dukapattṭhāna, p. 3; Points of Controversy, App., pp. 390-2; Buddhist Psychology, pp. 194 ff.
³ “That whereas actions are conditioned by ignorance, we may not say that ignorance is conditioned by actions.” Points of Controversy, p. 204.
⁴ Cf. Majjhima Nikāya, I, p. 54-55: avijjā samudaya āsavā
the sampayutta (associated) and aññamañña (reciprocal) relations between any two consecutive links of the chain of causation are exhaustively dealt with, showing clearly the attitude of the Theravādins to the problem.

(xv) Lokuttarāṇam dharmāṇam jārāmarāṇam lokuttarāṇi (XV. 6) (decay and death of supramundane beings or objects are also supramundane).

(xvi) Paro parassa cittaṁ niggāṇbhāti (XVI. 1).

The Mahāsaṅghikas hold that the spiritually advanced monks develop the power of controlling others' thoughts.

(xvii) Iddhibalena samannāgato kappam tīṭhēyya (XI. 5).

On the basis of Buddha's statement that those who have mastered iḍḍhipāda (higher powers) may live for an aeon if he so wishes,¹ the Mahāsaṅghikas state that by means of higher attainments one can extend his life up to a kalpa.²

¹ See infra, p. 77, n. 4
² Cf. Mahāparinibbānasutta, p. 117.
CHAPTER VIII (B)

DOCTRINES OF GROUP II SCHOOLS

The Saîla Schools, Prajñâptivâdins, Bahuârûtiyas
and Vetûlyakas

In discussing the doctrines of the Saîla and other schools, Vasumitra has mixed them up with the Mahâsaîghikas, probably with that section of the Mahâsaîghikas who are distinguished in the Kathâvatsathu-âthbâkathâ as ekacce Mahâsaîghikâ. It is on the basis of the Kathâvatsathu that we have distinguished the doctrine of the later Mahâsaîghikas, whose opinion may be taken as identical with those of the Saîla and other schools and put them together in the following pages.

1. Is Buddha human?

In Vasumitra’s treatise the Buddhas are described as lokottara (supramundane), and as such he is made of anâsrava dharmas¹ (pure qualities, without sleep or dream which are concomitants of sâsrava dharmas). Buddhas have unlimited rûpakâyas (material bodies), powers (balas), length of life (âyu), etc.

¹ Masuda renders it as “no sâsrava dharmas.” The rendering, I would prefer, is “anâsrava dharmas,” i.e. Buddhas are embodiment of anâsrava dharmas, viz., silaskandha, samâdhîsk., prajñâsk., vimuktîsk. and vimuktijñânadarsânask. not of rûpa, vedanâ, saûnâ, saûkhârâ and viûnâna which are sâsrava dharmas. See my Aspects of Mahâyâna Buddhism and its Relation to Hinayâna (henceforth indicated as Aspects), p. 108.
In the Kathāvatthu (XVII. 1 & 2) the above doctrines are attributed to the Vetulyakas, according to whom the Buddha does not live in the world of men neither should he be located anywhere and it is his created form (abhinimmito jīno) that delivered the religious discourses. The Theravādins account for this heresy by saying that it is due to the literal but wrong interpretation of the passage: Bhagavā loke jāto loke sambuddho lokam abbhivyā vibarati anupalitto lokena ti (Buddha, born and enlightened in this world, overcame this world and remained untouched by the things of the world—Sam. Nik., iii. 140). This is supplemented by further discussions in the Kha., (XVIII. 1, 2 & XXI. 6) relating to the heresies also attributed to the Vetulyakas, viz., Na vattabbaṃ, "Buddho Bhagavā manussaloke attārī ti (It should not be said that Buddha lived in the world of men—XVIII. 1); Sabbā disā Buddhā tiṭṭhati ti1 (Buddhas exist in all corners of the world—XXI. 6) and Abbinimmitena desito ti (the discourses are delivered by created forms—XVIII. 2). These show that according to the opponents of the Theravādins the Buddha is omnipresent and as such is beyond the possibility of location in any particular direction or sphere and that all the preaching of Buddhism has been done by the apparitional images of Buddha.

Buddhaghosa with his usual naïvety understood the Vetulyakas as holding the opinion that Buddha remained always in the Tusita heaven, where he was before he came to this world. The discussions in the Kathāvatthu as also the terse statements of Vasumitra leave no room for doubt about the fact that the Mahāsaṅghikas (specially their offshoots,—the Vetulya-

1 This is the opinion of the Mahāsaṅghikas only according to the Kha.
kas and the Lokottaravadins) regarded Buddha as transcendent. Masuda suggests that the sambhogakāya of Buddha is referred to in the heresies, but the time of emergence of the conception of sambhogakāya is still a matter of controversy. From the discussion in the Kathāvatthu (XXI. 5) concerning "attbi Buddhānam Buddhhebi binātirekatā ti (whether Buddhas mutually differ?) it seems that the Andhakas (another offshoot of the Mahāsaṅghikas) were still concerned with the Sambhogakāya and had not yet arrived at the conception of the Dharma-kāya. Buddhaghosa says that the Andhakas hold that Buddhas differ from one another in some qualities other than attainments like satipatthāna, sammāppadāna, etc., the orthodox school holding that Buddhas may differ in respect of sarīra (body), āyu (length of life) and pabbāva (radiance) but not in regard to the attainments mentioned above. The discussion in the Kūn. (XVIII. 3) shows that the Uttarāpathakas held the views that Buddhas can have no karuna (compassion), and that Buddha's body is made of anāśrava dharmas. In the Mahāvastu (I. p. 167-8) the conception of lokottara Buddha appears thus:—Transcendental are the practices of Bhagavān, and so are his kuśalamūlas, his eating, drinking and such other daily actions. He follows the ways of the world just as much as he follows the transcendental ways. He makes a show of standing, walking and other iriyāpathas, but he never gets tired. He washes his feet or body though there is no dirt to wash; he cleanses his teeth.

1 Masuda's opinion, however, can be supported by the fact that in the Mahāvastu (I. p. 169) Buddha's kāya is equated to nisyandakāya rendered into Chinese by pao sheng which is also the rendering of sambhogakāya, see my Aspects, pp. 117, 120.

2 Mahāvastu, I. p. 168: लोकोत्तरत्वम् बुध्द शनुवत्तिव लीणिकिं\
भविःसनुवत्तिव यथा लोकोत्तरारम्भ ||
though his mouth smells like a lotus;¹ he eats though he has no hunger, and so forth. These are all due to his being an embodiment of the effects of good actions.² There is nothing in common between Him and the beings of the world. Everything of the great rṣi is transcendental including his advent into the world.³

If the transcendence of Buddha be admitted, then it follows as a matter of course that his length of life would be unlimited and that he could not be subject to sleep or dream, as he could have no fatigue, and one who is without sleep and ever awake has nothing to do with dream. It is worth noting here that even in the Pāli suttas like the Mahāparinibbānasutta⁴ there are hints to the effect that a Buddha, if he wishes, can extend his life-limit up to a Kalpa or the end of a Kalpa thus revealing that the transcendental conception has taken roots in the minds of the Buddhists at a very early date.

In the Kathāvatiṭṭha⁵ the discussion resting with the topic: Buddhassa Bhagavato vohāro lokuttaro ti reveals that the Andhakas, to whom the above opinion is ascribed, held that Buddha’s actions (vohāro) are lokuttara and that they are treated as lokiyā (mundane) and lokuttara (supramundane) according as the object of the action is lokiyā or lokuttara. Mr. Shwe Zan Aung prefers to confine the sense of the word “vohāro”⁶ to

¹ Cf. Kuv, XVIII. 4: Buddhassa Bhagavato uccārapassāvo ativiya aññe gandhajāte adhiganhātiti—opinion of some Andhakas and Uttarāpathakas.
⁴ Digha, II, p. 103: yassa kassaci cattāro iddhipāda bhāvita—so ākankhamāno kappam vā tittheyya kappavasesam vā.
⁵ Kuv, II, 10.
⁶ Sans. Vyavahāra.
"speech", and we think there is good reason for it. In Vasumitra's treatise an opinion of this nature is attributed to the Mahāsaṅghikas in contrast to the Sarvāstivādins, viz., the sūtras (or discourses) preached by the Buddha are all perfect in themselves (nītārtha). Buddhhas speak of nothing but dharma (doctrines), as such their teaching is concerned only with paramārtha-satya (paramatthasacca), i.e., not with samyuktisatya (sammuti-sacca). The paramārtha-satya cannot be normally expressed by words. It can be explained only by silence or at the most by an exclamation—which idea, I think, is expressed in Vasumitra's treatise thus: "The Buddha can expound all the doctrines with a single utterance and that there is nothing which is not in conformity with the truth in what has been preached by the World-honoured one." In the Upāyakausalyaparivarta of the Saddharma-pundarika it has been shown that for training up deluded beings in his doctrines, Buddha did take recourse to various expedients which were false, i.e., unreal (samurти or sammuti), and that through such teachings he led the deluded beings to the truth—paramārtha. So it follows that all his teachings collected in the Pitakas are merely samurти or sammuti (unreal) and hence they are not his real teachings.

According to the Mahāsaṅghikas, Vasumitra says, Buddhhas have both kṣayajñāna and anutpādaññāna always present in their

---

1 Cf. M.Vr., p. 494. व्यवहारसमाधिः परमार्थोऽन दैवतेऽ।
2 Paramārtha-satya means the highest truth while samurti-satya means the so-called truths as used in every day usage by the people in general. For detailed treatment see my Aspects, pp. 216 ff.
3 *Asia Major*, II, p. 19.
4 Aspects, p. 198.
5 Masuda, pp. 21, 42.
(a) Kṣayajñāna means cognizance of the fact that all the āsavas are destroyed;
mind, the Sarvāstivāda holding that all Arhats may have kṣaṇa-
āṇā but a few only have anupādañāṇā: the Theravādins,
however, do not make such a distinction.

Among the other attributes of this lokottara Buddha, Vasumitra’s treatise speaks of his powers (balas)\(^1\) as unlimited while the Mahāvastu of his five eyes (cakkus)\(^2\) as uncommon

(b) Anupādañāṇā means cognizance of the fact that one will not be reborn again. Cf. Kośa, VI, 67; Atthasālīni, p. 54. Cf. Aspects, p. 106 fn. 1.

---

1 The ten balas are,—
(Mahāvastu, pp. 159-160).

(Kathavattu and Majjhima Nikāya).

1. Thānāthānāṃ jñāti...
2. Sabbatthagamiṃnipatipadam jñāti.
3. Anekadhātum nānadbhātum lokām jñāti.
4. Sattānāṃ nānadbimuttikatam jñāti.
5. Parasattānam parapuggalānaṃ indriya-paropariyattam yathā-
   bhūtam pājanāti.
6. Atitānāgatāpaccuppannānam betuṣo vipākaṃ jñāti.
7. Jbāniamokkhasamādhisamā-
   ṭattināṃ sāṅkileśam vodānam
   voṭṭhānāṃ yathābhūtam pājanāti.
8. anekahībham puṭṭhānuṣṭāṇaṃ
   anussaratī.
9. dibbena cakkhaṃ satte passati
cavamaṇe upāsajamāme etc.
10. āsavānam kheyy ānasavāṃ ceto-
    vimuttim pañño阇utim diṭṭhe
    va dharme sayam abhiñānā sacchi-
kavā upasampajjā vibhāreti.

2 By eyes, the text means all the five, viz., māṃsakāra, dīyuṣa, praṇāc., dharmac., and buddhac.
(asadhabaraṇa) and excelling those of Pratyekabuddhas, Arhats and others. This particular topic—tathāgata balam savakasadbāraṇam ti has been taken up for discussion in the Kathāvatsa (III. 1), but strangely enough the position taken by the compiler of the Kathāvatsa is not that of a Theravādin but of a Lokottaravādin Mahāsaighika as against the Andhakas, i.e., the Śaila schools. In Vasumitra’s treatise this topic appears in a slightly different form.

The Theravādins do not regard Buddha as lokottara but attribute to him almost all the powers and qualities of a lokottara Buddha and this discussion reveals one of such instances. The ten special balas (powers) of a Tathāgata appear not only in the Mahāvastu (i, pp. 159-160) but also in old Pāli works like the Majjhima Nikāya (i, pp. 69 ff.). The contention of the Andhakas is that there is a certain degree of difference between the Buddhas and the Arhats regarding the acquisition of the ten balas, and as such, Buddhas and Arahats are not on the same level (asadhabaraṇam). In the Mahāvastu and the Pāli works this view is accepted with this reservation that Buddhas are sarvākāraṇa, i.e., they possess a complete and detailed knowledge of everything, while an Arhat can at the utmost have sectional knowledge.¹ The Pāli school, i.e., the Theravādins hold that as far as vimutti is concerned there is no difference between a Buddha and an Arhat, and that Buddhas are superior to the Arhats only on account of the fact that the

former are promulgators of a new law while the Arhats are only followers of the same.  

II. *Are Bodhisattvas average beings?*

If, according to the Mahāsāṅghikas, Buddhas are *lokottara*, and if the Buddhas, we *puthujjanas* know of, are only created forms of the real Buddha, the Bodhisattvas also cannot be average human beings—they must also be supramundane. In Vasumitra’s treatise the following account of the Bodhisattvas is given: The Bodhisattvas do not pass through the embryonic stages. They assume the form of white elephants when they enter their mothers’ wombs and come out of the same by the right side. The above opinion is the natural outcome of the legendary belief that came to be woven around the person of the great man about a century after his actual existence. In the *Lalitavistara,* the Bodhisattva is placed not only in a crystal casket put within the womb but while in that state he is said to be preaching his *dharma* to the heavenly beings that flocked around him. The stories of the white elephant seen by Māyā in a dream at the time of her conception and the birth of the Bodhisattva by bursting through the right side of the mother’s womb are too well-known to need any comment. The incorporation of these legends in the doctrines of the Mahāsāṅghikas shows that the Bodhisattva conception of the Mahāyānists was yet in the course of development.

The only doctrine that can be described as Mahāyānic is that Bodhisattvas take birth out of their own free will in any form of existence for imparting Buddhist dharmas to the sentient

1 This argument is adduced in the *Kvu.* See also *Sam. Nik.*, III, p. 66.
beings of that particular form of existence an idea well illustrated in the Jātakas, and developed in the later Mahāyāna works like the Śikṣāsamuccaya and the Bodhicaryāvatāra. This topic has been taken up for discussion in the Kathāvatthu (XXIII. 3): Bodhisatto issariyakāmakārikahetu vinipātam gacchanti ti—but the arguments put forward completely ignore the standpoint of the Mahāsaṅghikas and attempt to show the untenability of the opponent’s proposition by treating the Bodhisattva as nothing but an average human adepte toiling along the path towards the attainment of bodhi.

In the nīyāmokkantikathā (Kvn., IV. 8, XII. 5, 6 XIII. 4) the same attitude is taken by the Theravādins. By nīyāma, the Theravādins understand sammataniyāma and micchattaniyāma, the former being the practice of brahmacariya (purity in conduct) and ariyamagga (path of sanctification) including, for the Bodhisattvas, the fulfilment of pāramis, leading to nibbāna (i.e. samyakto or sammatta), and the latter the commission of heinous crimes (anantarīyakamma) leading to hell (i.e., mithyātva or micchatta), all other practices being looked upon as aniyata (un-predestined). In the sense as expressed above any Śrāvaka can be a sammataniyāma and he need not be a bodhisattva. The Theravādins do not recognise the bodhisattvas as superior in attainments to the Śrāvakas, and in the matter of brahmacariya and practice of ariyamagga they do not want to make any distinction between a Śrāvaka and a Bodhisattva.

In the Lankāvatāra and Asaṅga’s Sūtrālaṅkāra and such other Mahāyāna works however it is repeatedly stated that a

1 Masuda, p. 21.
2 Stepping into the path destined to reach Nibbāna.
3 Kvn., pp. 78, 143: Ime due nīyāme thapetvā añño nīyāmo nāma nattbi.
person by the development of bodhicitta becomes a niyata Bodhisattva, i.e., through the fulfilment of pāramis and practice of the various forms of asceticism he is to become ultimately a Buddha. Siddhārtha Gautama, in one of his previous births as Jotipāla-māṇava, did, as a matter of fact, develop bodhicitta at the time of Kassapa Buddha and then through several births, he fulfilled the pāramis and took recourse to all possible sādhana, whether Buddhistic or non-Buddhistic and ultimately attained perfection. He even became disciples of Āḷāra Kālāma and Rudraka Rāmaputta whose doctrines are treated as heresies in the Brahmagāla and other suttas. In the Mahāyāna texts emphasis is laid more on bodhicitta than on brahmacarīya and ariyamagga. In the Kathāvatthu discussion, the Mahāyānic sense of niyata is ignored and the Theravāda sense of sammattaniyāma is kept in view. In the Kathāvatthu (XIII. 4) it is argued that to speak of a niyata śrāvaka or bodhisattva to have become a sammatta is illogical. The difference of opinion really rests on the interpretation given to the word niyata in Mahāyāna texts as against that given by the Kathāvatthu writer and commentator. Despite of the above interpretation of niyāma and attitude of the Theravādins they contend that Gautama Buddha in his bodhisattva existence did not become a disciple (śrāvaka) of Kassapa Buddha. In support of their contention they cited the passage: na me ācariyo atthi, sadiso me na vijjati etc. The Andhakas, strangely enough, took the opposite view and asserted that he did become a śrāvaka of Kassapa Buddha and cited the passage from the Majjhima Nikāya (ii, p. 54): Kassāpo, abham ānanda bhagavati brahmacariyāṁ acarīṁ sambodhāyā ti etc.²

² Kov., p. 288.
According to the Theravādins, the Bodhisattvas as a class of beings as envisaged in the Sūtrakārā and Lankāvatāra do not exist. The individual, who happens to become the Buddha, is called a bodhisattva in his previous existence just to distinguish him as a being superior to an average one; by calling him a bodhisattva the Theravādins do not attribute to him any special virtues unattainable by a śrāvaka. The Mahāsaṅghikas or the Andhakas do not subscribe to the above view. According to them an individual from the moment he develops bodhicitta becomes a bodhisatta and is destined (niyata) to become a Buddha and follows a career which is quite different from that of a śrāvaka. The career of the former is marked more by love and compassion for the suffering beings than by path-culture while that of the latter has more of path-culture and sādhanā than exercise of mettā and karunā.

III. Are Arhats fully emancipated?

According to Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinitādeva, the secession of the Mahāsaṅghikas from the Theravādins happened on account of the five points of Mahādeva. Four of these points relate to the qualities attainable by an Arhat. According to the Theravādins only one who is fully emancipated is called an Arhat,—he is anupatto sadattho viṭarāgo viṭadoso viṭamobhokhināsavo obittabbhāro katakaranīyo nāparam itthattāyā ti (in possession of the excellent goal, free from attachment, hatred and delusion, in short, all impurities, relieved of burden of khandhas, accomplished in all that is to be done and—devoid of any further existence). He has further acquired the clear vision about the origin and destruction of things, got rid of all doubts (kañkhā) about the Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha, non-existence of soul and the theory of causation, seen things for himself without the
help of others (na paravitāraṇā)\(^1\) and attained bodhi which however is catumagganāṇa\(^2\) and not sabbaṃṇutaṇāna—the bodhi of the Buddhas.\(^3\) The Theravādins do not admit the failings\(^4\) which are attributed to the Arhats by the Bahuṣrutiya, the Śāla schools and the Haimavatas. The failings are thus enumerated in Vasumitra’s treatise:

1. Arhats can be tempted by others;
2. They have still ignorance;
3. They have still doubt;
4. They gain knowledge through others’ help.\(^5\)

In the Kathāvatthu (II, 1-5) all the above statements are taken up for discussion and appear thus:

(i) Atthi arahato ṛāgo? (II. 1).\(^6\)
(ii) Atthi arahato aṇāṇanā ti? (II. 2).
(iii) Atthi arahato kaṅkhā ti? (II. 3).
(iv) Atthi arahato paravitāraṇā ti? (II. 4).

The Theravādins emphatically deny that an Arhat who is free from attachment (vītarāga) can be subject to temptation. The

---

\(^1\) See infra, p. 87.
\(^2\) The catumaggas are sotāpatti, sakadāgāmi, anāgāmi and arhatta.
\(^3\) See Kuv., A., p. 76.
\(^4\) For the discussion “Parihāyati arahā arahattā ti” see infra, p. 90.
\(^5\) Masuda, pp. 24, 36, 38, 53; cf. IRAS., 1910, pp. 413-423. For the 5th point see infra, p. 87.
\(^6\) In the text the wording is “atthi arahato asucisukkavisaṭṭhi?”

It perhaps refers to an instance of the Māra gods having removed asucisukka of an arhat. The commentator remarks that the impostors passing as arhats may have asucisukkavisaṭṭhi and upon that the contention of the Śāla schools is based. The Theravādins take their stand upon the fact an arhat cannot have rāga and hence they cannot commit asucisukkavisaṭṭhi.

\(^7\) Aṇāṇanā is not the same as avijjā.
opponents, as shown in the Kusu., draw a subtle distinction between a Sa-(=Sansk. Svā-)dhammakusala-arhat and a Para-
dhammakusala-arhat, the former, according to the commentator, is a Paññāvimutta and the latter an Ubbatobhāgāvimutta, that is, the knowledge of the former is confined to his own personal attainments while that of the latter is extended to other’s attainments besides his own. In the Pāli texts the Ubbatobhāgāvimutta is not regarded as superior to the Paññāvimutta the only distinction made between the two is that the former has samathābhi-
ivesa¹ and realisation of eight vimokkhas² while the latter has vipassanābhi-
ivesa³ and realisation of only four jhānas,⁴ but as far as the question of rāgā or āsavas is concerned both the classes of Arhats must be regarded as completely free from them, hence the subtle distinction drawn by the opponents is of no avail according to the Theravādins.

The next two points, that an arhat may have ignorance (i.e. aṅkāna and not avijjā) and doubt (kaṅkhā or vīmattī) are also vehemently opposed by the Theravādins on the ground that one cannot be an arhat unless he gets rid of avijjā and vicikicchā and develops perfect vision free from impurities (virajam vītamalam dhammacakkhum) after having dispersed all his doubts (kaṅkhā vāpayanti sabbā).

The opponents, as presented in the Kusu., in this case also draw a distinction between a Sadhammakusala-arhat and a Para-

¹ Samatha leads to concentration of thoughts and eradication of attachment (rāgā). Cf. Aṅguttara, I, p. 61: rāgavirāgā cetovimuttī.
² For the eight Vimokkhas, see Appendix.
dhamma-kusala-arhat, saying that both the classes of arhats may not have avijjā in regard to the truths, the theory of causation, etc. or vicikicchā about Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha or absence of soul, but the former may have aññāna and kañkhā, say, as regards the name and family of an unknown man or woman or of a tree. It should be noted here the opponents do not mean sabbaññutaññāna (omniscience) but just paradhammaññāna—an intellectual power attained by the Ubhatobhāgavimutta-arhats, by which they can know many things outside himself. Arguing in this way the opponents maintain that a section of the arhats, i.e., the Paññāvimuttas or Sa-dhammakusala-arhats have ignorance (aññāna) relating to things or qualities other than those belonging to himself.

The same arguments and counter-arguments are applied in the next discussion relating to attbi arahato paravitārāṇā? The word paravitārāṇā perplexed our translator Mr. Shwe Zan Aung.¹ The discussion in the Kuu. reveals that the word means that an arhat develops faith in the Triratna or acquires knowledge of the truths, etc. not by himself but through the instruction of his preceptor¹ in whom he had firm faith. The Theravādins oppose the contention of the opponents, saying that an arhat is vītamoha and is possessed of dhammacakkhu and so he does not require paravitārāṇā. The opponents as before contend that a sa-dhammakusala-arhat requires paravitārāṇā, while a para-dhammakusala-arhat does not.

Another statement of Vasumitra relating to the Arhats,


Cf. Masuda, p. 24: "gain spiritual perception by the help of others (lit. enlightenment through others)."
namely, "one who is kṛtāryah (=Pāli: kathamakaraṇīyo) does not take any dharma to himself i.e. has no attachment for worldly things" is echoed, I think, in the Kuṭ. (XVII, 1 & XXII, 2) in these terms: atthi arabato puññopacayo ti? and arabā kusalacitto parinibbāyatī ti. The Theravādins agreeing with the Mahāsaṅghikas contend that the citta of Arhats goes beyond pāpa and punya, kusala and akusala, kriyā and vipāka, hence, to speak of them as acquiring merits or demerits is absurd. The opponents, the Andhakas, however, contend that the Arhats perform many good deeds, e.g., making gifts, worshipping caityas and so forth, and remain always self-possessed (sato sampajāno) even at the time of his parinibbāna, and so he does collect merits and passes away with kusalacitta.

Neither the above discussions in the Kathāvattthu nor the terse statements of Vasumitra help us much in finding out the real difference between the Andhakas and the Theravādins about the position of an Arhat. The Mahāyāna works point out the distinction thus: Arhats, who are perfect Śrāvakas, get rid of only kleśāvarana, i.e., the veil of impurities consisting of rāga, dōsa, moha, silabbataparamāsa, and vicikicchā but not of jñeyāvarana, i.e., the veil which conceals the truth—the veil which can only be removed by realising the Dharma-sūnyatā or Tatthaṭā. It is the Buddha alone who is perfectly emancipated having both kleśāvarana and jñeyāvarana removed. That the Mahāsaṅghikas appear to be groping to get at this clear distinction will be evident from two other topics discussed in the Kuṭ. but not referred to in Vasumitra’s treatise. The topics are,—atthi kiṃci saññojanaṃ appahāya parinibbānan ti? (XXII, 1) or arabattappattīti? (XXI, 3). To these the Mahāsaṅghikas replied

1 For details, see Aspects, pp. 35 ff.
in the affirmative, saying that an arhat is nikkileso (free from impurities) and does attain parinibbāna or arhatta but as he is not cognizant of all that is Buddhavisaya (domain of Buddha’s knowledge), it must be admitted that some saññojanas are left in him. This opinion may be taken as a hint that the arhats do not remove the jñeyāvarana.²

2 There are a few subsidiary discussions in the Kathāvatthu relating to Arhats. These are given here briefly:

IV. 1. Householders cannot become Arhats—Theravādins.
   But householders like Yasa, Uittiya, Setu became Arhats—
   Uttarāpabhas.

IV. 2. No one is born as Arhats—Therav.
   But there are Upahacca-(uppajja)-parinibbāyi Arhats—
   Uttarāp.

IV. 3. All dharmas of Arhats are not anāsava, e.g. their physical body etc.—Therav.
   But Arhats are anāsavā (free from āsavas)—Uttarāp.

IV. 4. In the Arhat stage, only arhattaphala is acquired—Therav.
   But all the phalas are possessed by the Arhats—Uttarāp.

IV. 5. An Arhat is chalupekkho (see App.)—Therav.
   Rather Araha chahi upekkhāhi samannāgato—Uttarāp.

IV. 10. All saññojanas are gradually destroyed and not by
   Arhatramagga alone—Therav.
   But by the destruction of all saññojanas one becomes an
   Arhat—Andhakas.

XVII. 2. Arhats may have untimely death as arahatghātaka is
   mentioned in the Buddhavacanas—Therav.
   But as one cannot become an Arhat before the karmic
effects are exhausted, an Arhat cannot have untimely
death—Rājagirikas and Siddhatthikas.

XVII. 3. Arhats do not die when in imperturbable meditation and
   devoid of kriyācitta—Therav.
   But did not Gautama Buddha pass away immediately
   after arising from the 4th jhāna—Uttarāp.
IV. *Can there be retrogression of Arhats, Srotāpañnas and other Phalasthas?*

The following views regarding the possibility of retrogression of Arhats, Srotāpañnas and other phalasthas are attributed in Vasumitra’s treatise\(^1\) to a section of the Mahāsaṅghikas and some of their sub-sects:

(i) From the gotrabhūmidharma there is in all stages the possibility of retrogression.

(ii) A Srotāpañna has a chance of retrogression while an Arhat has not.

The above two views are discussed in the *Kathāvatthu* under the topic: *Parihāyatī arahā arahattā ti?* (I. 2).

It will be observed that the *Kūn.* does not attribute to the Mahāsaṅghikas the above views about the retrogression of Arhats and Srotāpañnas. According to the Mahāsaṅghikas, the *Kūn.* says, an Arhat has retrogression while a Srotāpañna has not, while Vasumitra takes a contrary view, as above (ii). Vasumitra says that the former opinion is held by the Sarvāstivādins and other schools. Buddhaghosa points out that this opinion is held by one section of the Mahāsaṅghikas and not all, and so Vasumitra may have in view the views “of that section, according to whom the Arhats may retrogress but the Srotāpañnas do not.”\(^2\)

All the schools advocating the view that arhats retrogress hold, as stated in the *Kūn.*, that the Sotāpañnas have no retrogression. This, however, contradicts the statement of Vasumitra.\(^3\) All these schools accept that a sotāpanno is *niyato*

---

\(^1\) Masuda, p. 22.

\(^2\) *Kūn.* A., p. 35: Sammutiyā Vajjiputtiyā Sabbatthivādino ekacce ca Mahāsaṅghikā arahato pariñāṇīm icchatī.

\(^3\) See Masuda, II, p. 27.
sambodhiparāyana and hence is not subject to retrogression, but a sakadāgāmi or an anāgāmi may retrogress but not further than the sotāpanna stage, for some of the adepts in these stages may have anusaya which may develop into pariyutthāna and thus bring about the fall—an argument which will be discussed next in connection with the Atthamakas. In regard to these two stages the Kvin. corroborates Vasumitra’s statement (no. ii).

Regarding the srotaāpannas, Vasumitra further states that:

1 they are capable of knowing their own nature (svabhāva) through their citta and caitasika dharmas;
2 they can also attain the dhyāna;
3 they are liable to commit all sorts of offences except the five anantarūyas (i.e. matricide, patricide etc.)

In the Kvin. we do not come across any controversy relating to the first two topics. This silence may be interpreted as that the Theravādins accepted the two views. As regards the third topic, we may take into consideration the controversy: Diṭṭhisampanno puggalo saṅcicca pānam jawītā voropeyyā ti? (see infra). A sotāpanna is a person with right view (diṭṭhisampanno), hence, according to the Theravādins, he cannot commit killing (paññātipāta) or such other offences, not to speak of the five extreme offences like matricide or patricide. Vasumitra perhaps speaks of the opinion of that section of the Mahāsāṅghikas i.e., the Andhakas, who contemplate the retrogression of the Sotāpannas while the Kvin. very likely speaks of the other section, according to whom the Sotāpannas do not retrogress.

1 Anusaya means that which lies in the mind in a latent state with the possibility of its coming into appearance if it receives an effective impulse, while pariyutthāna means its actual appearance in the mind without however a corresponding response in the outer world. For further details, see p. 94f.
There are in Vasumitra’s treatise two other statements, which also relate to the Srotāpañnas. They are,—

(i) When one enters into the samyakatvā-nyāma, one may be said to destroy all samyojanas.
(ii) None of the dharmaśāyatanas can be known or understood: they can be attained (only by those Aryan pūdagalas above the darśanamārga).

The Kṣuṇa contributes no discussion on the above two points. The Theravādins also cannot but subscribe to these views.

V (a). Do the Āṭṭhamakas have anusaya and pariyutthāna?

Relating to the Āṭṭhamakas, Vasumitra says that according to the Mahāsaṅghikas—

(i) In the eighth stage (astamaka-bhūmi) one can remain for a long time.

In the Kṣuṇa, (III. 5) the identical problem is discussed in these words:

(i) Āṭṭhamakassa puggalassa ditthipariyutthānam pābīnata ti?

Masuda’s comment on the first view seems to be wide of the mark, though he quotes ‘Shu-chi as his authority. The discussion in the Kathāvatthu clears up the view thus:

---

1. See above, p. 82.
2. The three samyojanas are silabbataparāmāsa, vicikicchā, micchādiṭṭhi.
3. The Dharmāyatanas are vedanā, saṁjñā, and saṁskāra. Cf. Abhi, Kośa, p. 46.
4. The āṭṭhamakas are those who have just stepped into the Sotāpañna-hood, which is the eighth or the lowest stage in the fruits of sanctification.
5. For the meaning of the term and its distinction from pariyutthāna, see p. 91, fn. 1.
According to the Andhakas, an adept who is in the eighth stage i.e., sotāpatti-maggaṭṭha and not yet sotāpanna gets rid of diṭṭhipariyuṭṭhāna, silabbata-p. and vicikicchā-p. but not diṭṭhi-anusaya, silabbata-a., and vicikicchā-a., i.e., the anusayas may become active (uppajjissati) if they receive an impulse. The Andhakas by drawing this distinction between pariyuṭṭhāna and anusaya hold that an Atṭhamaka may not get rid of the three anusayas and consequently remain away from the sotāpanna stage for a long time.¹

The Kathāvatthu also discusses the following two allied views attributed to the Pubbaseliyas and the Uttarāpathakas:

(i) Diṭṭhisampanno puggalo saṅcicca pāṇām ṣivitā voropeyyā ti? XII. 7 (Pubbaseliyas)
(ii) Diṭṭhisampannassa puggalassa pābinā duggatī ti? XII. 8 (Uttarāpathakas).

By the first view the Pubbaseliyas mean that a person by having sammādiṭṭhi does not get rid of dosa (hatred), hence he can commit the sin of killing—a view wholly rejected by the Theravādins. By the second view the Uttarāpathakas assert that a person with sammādiṭṭhi cannot be reborn in a lower form of existence; the Theravādins point out that it may be so, but he may have tanhā (desire) for objects and beings belonging to the lower forms of existences.

V (b). Are anusaya and paryavasthāna associated with mind or not?

There are in Vasumitra two statements relating to anusaya and paryavasthāna, which will clear up the above problem further.—

¹ Atṭhamaka puggalas have saddhā but not saddhindriya—Andhaka.
(i) Anusayās (dormant passions or latent bias) are neither citta nor caitasika dharmas: and again they never become the object of thought (anālambana).

(ii) Anusaya is different from paryavasthāna (pervading passion) and paryavasthāna is different from anusaya. It must be said that the anusaya does not combine (samprayuj) with the citta whereas the paryavasthāna does.

Relating to the above topics, the Kus. has,

(i) Anusayā anārammanā ti? (IX. 4) and cittavippayuttā
(ii) Anusayā avyākata ti (XI. 1)
(iii) Añño kāmarāgānusayo aññami kāmarāgapariyutthānani
    ti? (XIV. 5)
(iv) Pariyutthānam cittavippayutta ti? (XIV. 6)

Masuda offers the following interpretation from the 'Shu-chi: The anusayas are really bijas (germs inborn in the mind) of rāga and other passions. They remain dormant unless excited by the corresponding impulse. They remain always in the mind, even in kusalacitta, so they are dissociated from the mind and do not require any object (ālambana) for support. When the anusaya is excited by a suitable impulse, it becomes paryavasthāna (pariyutthāna) and as such becomes a mental function (caitasika), and then only it becomes an impurity and clogs the way to spiritual progress. The interpretation given above is corroborated by the Kus. A.¹ The Theravādins however do not distinguish between kāmarāgānusaya and kāmarāgapari
yutthāna and maintain that as the anusayas are included in the Saṃkhārakkhandha, they are all sārammanā. But according to

¹ Kus. A., p. 117: Tattha yesām anusayā nāma cittavippayuttā ahetu avyākata te' eva anārammanā 'ti laddhi seyyathā pi Andhakānañi 'e' eva ekaccānañi ca Uttarāpathakānañ.
the Andhakas some saṃkhāras are sārammaṇa (with basis) and some are anārammaṇa (without basis),¹ but not so are the remaining four khandhas. The Andhakas further maintain that as a puthujjana having kusalāvāyākata-citta is sometimes described as "sānusayo ti" when their anusayas are without any ārammaṇa, it must be admitted that anusayas may be anārammaṇa.

From the above discussion it is apparent that the anusayas, according to the Andhakas, are avyākata² i.e. neither good nor bad, and consequently they are citta-vippayutta, and also causeless (ahetuka). The Andhakas in the third discussion assert that anusayas are different from pariyuttānas, but in the fourth the Kṣa. makes the Andhakas contend that pariyuttānas are also cittavippayuttas, which, however, appear to be contradictory. Vasumitra says that the pariyuttānas according to these schools are cittasampayuttas, so we must dismiss the statement of the Kṣa. as unwarranted.

"The world in its variety originates out of actions (karma) which accumulate on account of anusayas. In the absence of anusayas, karma is not capable of producing a new existence (punarbhava). Consequently the root of bhava or rebirth is karma, in other words, anusaya." With these words Vasubandhu opens the fifth book of Kośa. (See Kośa, V, p. 1).

The Sarvāstivādins like the Theravādins regard anusaya, paryavasthāna and klesa as same, the only distinction being that anusaya is the subtle, while paryavasthāna the manifest, state of rāga, dosa, moha, etc.

¹ Kṣa., p. 407: Saṃkhārakkhandho ekadeso sārammaṇo, ekadeso anārammaṇo.

² The Andhakas; it seems, looked upon the anusayas as vipāka-citta and treated the same as avyākata. Cf. Dhammasaṅgāni.
The Kośa too deals with the problem under discussion, viz., whether or not anuśaya (e.g. kāmarāgaṇusaya) is a dharma by itself dissociated from mind, the prāpti of kāmarāga, etc.? The answer of the Sarvāstivādins is in the negative as that of the Theravādins. The former quote as their authority the Jñānaprabhāna-sūtra, in which anuśaya is shown to be associated with mind (cittasamprayuktā). They assert that anuśayas are kleśas, and hence they cannot but be citta-samprayuktas.

In this connection the Kośa refers to the opinion of the Sautrāntikas, who hold that anuśaya is different from kleśa inasmuch as it is neither associated with, nor dissociated from, mind because it is not a dravya apart; it is a sakti left in certain individuals by the previously existing kleśas and has the power of reproducing further kleśas. According to the Sautrāntikas, kleśa when non-manifest is anuśaya and when manifest, an act, it is paryavasthāna (Kośa, V, p. 7).

VI. Can the Atthamakas have Saddhindriya?

Vasumitra does not mention this view among the doctrines of the Mahāsaṅghikas but it is stated in the Kuṭu. that according to the Andhakas, atthamakassa puggalassa nāththi saddhindriyan ti (III. 6), i.e., the atthamakas may develop saddhā, viriya, etc. but do not acquire saddhindriya, viriyindriya etc., a distinction which the Theravādins are not prepared to admit. The Andhakas mean that saddhindriya or viriyindriya, etc. is a faculty forming a part of the mind while saddhā or viriya etc. is only a passing phase of the mind.

1. For exhaustive treatment of Anuśayas, see La Vallée Poussin's Abhidhammakosa, V.
VII. Are there worldly samyagdrṣṭi and samyak-śraddhendriya?

Along with the above we may discuss the allied topic worded thus in Vasumitra’s treatise,—

(i) There is neither laukikasamyagdrṣṭi (worldly right view) nor laukikāśraddhendriya (worldly faculty of faith).

The corresponding passages of the Kusu. are,—

(i) Nattbi putthujjanaśa nānaṇ ti? (XX. 2);¹ and
(ii) Nattbi lokiyam saddhindriya ti? (XIX. 8).²

The argument of the Theravādins is that a layman may have paññā and saddhā of a kind which may be different from those of an adept, but paññā and saddhā that he possesses do develop into paññindriya and saddhindriya. It may be that the layman’s paññā or nāṇam is confined to dāna, sila, cāga, etc., i.e. lokiya affairs and does not extend to the comprehension of lokuttara subjects like truths, maggas and phalas, hence according to the Theravādins there may be lokiya paññindriya and saddhindriya.

VIII. Is utterance of dukkha possible in meditation; and Does it help perception of the truths?

The two statements of Vasumitra (i) “The path is realized by utterances” and (ii) “Even in the state of samāhita one can utter words” to which corresponds “samāpannāsa attbi vacibbedo ti” of the Kathāvatthu are explained by Buddhaghosa thus: According to the Sāla schools an adept while in the first jhāna (meditation) and on the point of attainment of the Sotāpattimagga in some cases gives out an exclamation like “aho

¹ Attributed to the Hetuvādas only.
² Attributed in the Cy. to the Hetuvādas and Mahīśāsakas and they mean all the five indriyas, saddhā, viriya, sati, samādhi and paññā.
dukkhan ti. 1 This, the adherents of the Sāila schools account for by saying that in the first jhāna, there is *vitakkavicāra*, and because of *vitakkavicāra* there is *vacīsamkhāra* 2 i.e., discursive and discriminating thoughts cause vocal activity, hence there is the possibility of a meditator in the first jhāna uttering the word 'dukkha'. The Theravādins contend that as all physical activities of a meditator are set at complete rest, his giving out of an exclamation is an impossibility. 3

Along with the above we should take into consideration the other three doctrines of the Mahāsaṅghikas presented thus in Vasumitra's treatise,—

(i) The words of suffering can help (the process of realization of the path);

(ii) Suffering leads a man to the path;

(iii) Suffering also is (a kind of) food (āhāra); and

(iv) Through *prajñā* suffering is destroyed and final beatitude is obtained.

The corresponding expressions in the Kathāvatthu are as follows:—

(i) “*Idāṁ dukkhan ti*” vācaṁ bhāsato “*idāṁ dukkhan ti*” ānāṁ pavattati ti? (XI. 4).


3 Cf. Kūn., XVIII, 8: Samāpanno saddaṁ suñāti ti. As it has been said by Buddha that sound is a hindrance to the first jhāna and that one rises from the first jhāna by an external sound, the Pubbaseliyas inferred therefrom that one in meditation hears sound.
(ii) \textit{Dukhbhābāro maggaṅgam maggapariyāpannān ti?}

(II. 6).

Both these statements repeat in a slightly different form what has been stated by Vasumitra. The Andhakas and the Sailas hold that when a meditator realises within his innermost heart that the world is full of suffering and is not worth living, an exclamation like "aho vata dukkham" spurs out of his mouth and then and there his insight (ñāṇa) penetrates into the first truth "idam dikkhan ti" and as a result, he attains (\textit{pariyāpunāti}) the Sotāpattimagga. So "dukkha" may be called an "āhāra" in respect of the realisation of the path as also an "āṅgā" (limb) of the Sotāpattimagga.

The fourth doctrine mentioned above is, as Masuda explains, that \textit{dukkha} can be removed not by means of the observance of moral precepts (śīlas) and practice of meditation (samādhi) but by the knowledge of the truth, causal law, and \textit{anatta} of the things of the world. It is the basic teaching of Theravāda, hence no reference is made to it in the \textit{Kvn}.

IX. \textit{How Vijñānas function?}

The following opinions are attributed by Vasumitra to the Mahāsaṅghikas:

(i) Beings of the Rūpa and Arūpadhātu possess all the six sense-perceptions (ṣaḍvijñānas)\footnote{See fn. 1 above.}

(ii) The five vijñānas conduce both to attachment (\textit{sarāga}) and freedom from attachment (virāga); and

(iii) The rūpendriyās (organs of sense) are nothing but lumps of flesh: the eyes do not see colours, the ears do not hear sounds, the nose does not smell odours, 

\footnote{Or ṣaḍvijñānakāya or the group of six sense-perceptions.}
the tongue does not taste flavour, and the body does not feel touch.

The *Kṣuṇ.* deals with these topics thus:

(i) *Sālayataniko aṭṭabbaśo rūpadhātuyā ti?* (VIII. 7) and
(ii) *Paṇc' evāyatanā kāmā ti?* (VIII. 4).
(iii) *Cakkhunā rūpaṃ passati ti? ...pe...kayena phoṭṭhabbham phusati ti?* (XVIII. 9).

In the discussion relating to the six āyatanas (spheres of the organs of sense), the *Kṣuṇ.* shows that the Andhakas took literally the expression: *rūpī manomayo sabbāṅgapaccaṅgī abhinindriyo ti* and assert that there are in the rūpadhātu all the six indriyas and āyatanas with this difference from the Kāmadhātu, that out of the six āyatanas three, viz., ghāna, rasa and phoṭṭhabba do not exist but their nimittas, i.e., the subtler forms exist.\(^1\)

In the Abhidhamma texts it is stated that the denizens of the Rūpadhātu have five khandhas and six (and not twelve) āyatanas while those in the Arūpadhātu have four khandhas and two āyatanas (manāyatana and dhammāyatana only).\(^2\)

Relating to the third point the *Kṣuṇ.* contradicts Vasumitra and says that it is the Mahāsaṅghikas who held the opposite view, viz., the eyes see colours, ears hear sounds etc. by conceiving a pasādacakkhu, a subtle eye, which has not got the power of āvajjana (reflection) like cakkhuvinīṇāna but possesses just the power of knowing (paṭijñāti) objects. In this case also, shall we account for the contradictions by saying that the opinion of ‘ekacce mahāsaṅghikā’ is represented by Vasumitra while the opinion of the ‘aṇṇe mahāsaṅghikā’ is noticed in the Kathā-

---

1 *Vibhaṅga*, p. 405: In Kāmadhātu there are cakkhāyatana and rūpāyatana, sotāyatana and saddāyatana, etc., in all, twelve āyatanas.

2 *Vibhaṅga*, pp. 405-7.
vattu.\footnote{1} The Theravādins and a section of the Mahāsaṅghikas hold that the eyes, ears etc. are mere material conveyers of perception, the cakkhuviññāna, sotaviññāna, etc. being the actual percipients, in other words, eyes, ears etc. belong to the rūpakhandha which is material, while cakkhuviññāna, etc. belong to the viññāna-khandha, which makes a being aware of the things around him.

X. How many avyākatas are there?  
The opinion of the Andhakas that "there is nothing which is indeterminate" (avyākṛta) has been explained by Masuda as that the Andhakas admitted only two natures of things, good or bad and not a third, neither good nor bad. This interpretation does not appear to be sound as in the Buddhist texts the three natures of things are accepted generally. The avyākatas also refer to those problems which Buddha left unanswered as any answer to them whether in the affirmative or in the negative would mislead the enquirer, or treated the question as absurd and unanswerable. These avyākata problems are always mentioned in a stereotyped form in all Buddhist texts whether Hinayāna or Mahāyāna.\footnote{2} Nāgārjuna has utilised these problems in his Mādhyamika-kārikā to establish the Mahāyānic conception of Śūnyatā. If we accept Vasumitra’s statement as correct, we shall have to say that the Śūnyatā conception was known to the Mahāsaṅghikas, and so to them the so-called avyākata problems were not avyākata (inexplicable), but this

\footnote{1} See infra.

\footnote{2} Sassato loko, asassato loko; antavā loko, anantavā loko; tam jivaṁ tam sariraṁ, aňñaṁ jivaṁ aňñaṁ sariraṁ; hoti Tathāgato param maraññ, na hoti Tathāgato param maraññ; hoti ca na hoti ca Tathāgato param maraññ, n’eva hoti na na hoti Tathāgato param maraññ.
way of looking at the statement of Vasumitra seems to me to be too far-fetched and so, I think, Vasumitra's statement is not complete. Perhaps it refers to the problem discussed in the *Kuṭ.: diṭṭhiḥ kātāṃ avyākataḥ ti?* (XIV. 8),—whether a person holding one of the unanswered views can be regarded as avyākata i.e. neither good nor bad. The answer of the Theravādins is that the holder of any one of the views is wrong, hence akuśala and cannot be avyākata as supposed by the Andhakas and Uttarāpathakas.

XI. How many Asaṃskṛtadharmas are there?

In the Pāli texts, as also in the *Abhidharmakośa* (of the Sarvāstivādins) the three asaṃskṛtas are, (i) Pratisaṃkhya-nirodha, (ii) Apratisaṃkhya-nirodha and (iii) Ākāśa. The Andhakas increase them to nine by adding the four āruppas\(^1\) and āryamārgāṅgikatva.\(^2\) Excepting the nirodha of two kinds, all other asaṃskṛtas of the Mahāsaṅghikas are not recognised as such by the Theravādins, whose argument is whether each of these asaṃskṛtas is of the same nature as Nibbāna, if not, they are asaṃskṛtas. Strangely enough the *Kuṭ.* goes so far as to say that ākāśa is not asaṃkhata. The attitude taken in the *Kuṭ.* (VI. 2, 4, 6; XIX. 3, 4) is that Nibbāna is tānaṃ lenam accutām amatāṃ, (escape, refuge, infallible and immortal) so each of the seven of asaṃkhatas, even every member of the formulæ of the Pāṭiccasamuppāda, each of the four phalas must be tānaṃ.

---

\(^1\) The four āruppas are—
(i) Akāśanāntāyatana.
(ii) Viṣṇūnāntāyatana;
(iii) Ākāścanyāyatana; and
(iv) Naivaśāmijñā-nāśanijaññāyatana.

\(^2\) Cf. *Kośa*, iii, p. 77.
lenam accutaṁ amataṁ, otherwise they are saṁkhatas (constituted). The Mahāsaṅghikas interpret, as presented in the *Kṣuṇ.,* that the asaṁkhata is that which is unchangeable (anēñja) but not tānāṁ lenam, etc. In regard to the causal law, they rely on Buddha’s statement: *avijjā paccayā bhikkhave saṁkharā, uppāda va Tathāgatānaṁ anuppāda va Tathāgatānaṁ thīīa va sa dhammaṁ thīīaṁ dhammaṁ thīīaṁ thīīaṁ idappaccayataṁ etc.,* and point out that by asaṁkhata they do not mean the links separately but the unchangeable law (a) of the origin a thing through a cause, and (b) of the unchangeable nature of dharmas, undisturbed by appearance (uppāda) or non-appearance (anuppāda) or continuity (thīīi). As for the āryamārgaṅgikatva, the *Kṣuṇ.* explains that Pubbaseliyas regard as asaṁkhata the fact of attainment (*patti*) of a magga or phala by the removal of certain mental impurities (kilesapahānam) and not the maggas or phalas by themselves. This, Vasumitra corroborates by using the term *mārgaṅgikatva* i.e. prāpti of a mārga and not simply mārga.¹

In the *Kṣuṇ.* there are a few other discussions relating to the asaṁkhatas to which we shall revert when dealing with the Mahīśāsakas.

XII. Other doctrines

The remaining three opinions of this group of schools, viz.,

(i) There is no intermediate state of existence (*antarābhava*),

(ii) Phenomena exist neither in the past nor in the future, and

(iii) The nature of mind is pure in its origin: it becomes impure when it is stained by āgantukarajas and *upakleśas.*

¹ In the *Majjhima Nikāya,* (I, p. 301) it is distinctly stated that *atthāṅgiko maggo is saṁkhato.*
are in accord with those of the Theravādins. Both these schools do not admit that between death and rebirth there is any intervening period in which the subtle khandhas wait for the selection of the parents or the states of existences. The *Kvet.,* says that the opinion of the opponents is formed through the mis-comprehension of the meaning of the word 'antarāparinibbāyī.' We shall revert to this topic while dealing with the Sammitiyyas, with whom, the commentator says, the Pubbaseliyas agreed.

As regards the opinion that the past and future exist—the cardinal doctrine of the Sarvāstivādins, to be dealt with next, both the Theravādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas are emphatic in their protest against it.

The third point raises an important problem that is to say whether the mind at the beginning was pure or not. The Theravādins are decidedly of opinion that *pubbakoṭi* (beginning) and *aparakoṭi* (end) of beings are unknowable, and as such they have not gone into the question whether the mind is pure at any time before the attainment of *vimutti.* This doctrine of the Mahāsaṅghikas obtained its full development in the idealistic philosophy of Yogācāra in which the *ālayavijñāna* is pointed out as the storehouse of pure consciousness which gets contaminated with worldly objects through the *indriyavijñānas* and mentally creates a world around it. It is by the removal of this mental creation that a person regains the *ālayavijñāna* in its pure original form and becomes an emancipated being—a Buddha.

**XIII. Doctrines of the Sāila Schools only**

Vasumitra has attributed the following doctrines specially to the three Sāila schools:

(i) Bodhisattvas are average beings and are liable to be born in the lower states of existence.¹

(ii) Offerings made to a caitya are not necessarily of great merit.²

The above doctrines are in direct contrast to those of a section of the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Pūrvaśailas or Caityakas (see above, pp. 49, 51, 81-2). Vasumitra evidently, had in mind only the later Śaila schools, viz., Aparāśaila, Caityāśaila and Uttaraśaila and not the Pūrvaśaila.

Regarding the origin of Caityāśaila and Uttaraśaila schools, Paramārtha³ writes that two hundred years after Buddha’s pari-nirvāṇa, a second Mahādeva appeared with heretical views. He slipped into the church stealthily (i.e. became a steyasamvāsika) by ordaining himself. This event gave occasion for fresh controversies among all the branches of the Sthavira and Mahāsaṅghika schools, particularly on the question of the validity of ordination given by an ācārya, who is himself not regularly ordained. In this matter the Mahāsaṅghikas were in agreement with the Sthaviras and excommunicated Mahādeva. At this, Mahādeva got enraged and retired to another mountain and started the Caityāśaila and Uttaraśaila schools.

The Caityāśailas therefore should be distinguished from the Caityakas, who were identical with the Lokottaravādins or the Pūrvaśailas and were of earlier origin. The Caityakas and

---

¹ See above p. 81.
² In the Mahāvastu and the Nāgārjunikonda inscr., erection, decoration and worship of caityas find prominent place, for which I think the name Caityakas has been applied to the Pūrvaśaila school. Cf. Kośa, iv. 121.
Pūrvaśailas are referred to in the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions, and not the later Śaila schools mentioned above.

XIV. Nirvāṇa in Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions

In the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions, there are a few incidental remarks relating to Buddha and Nirvāṇa. These probably apply to the conceptions held by the Pūrvaśailas or Caityakas. Buddha is described here as jīta-rāga-dosa-moha (one who has conquered attachment, ill-will and delusion) and dhūtuvaraparigabita (possessed of the excellent dhātu), and the donor expects as a result of his or her gifts merits which he or she can transfer (parināmetum) to his or her relatives and friends—an article of faith not recognised in the Pāli works where attadīpa attasaraṇa is the maxim. The fruits expected are (i) religious merits, for himself, his relatives and friends resulting in their happiness in this world and the next (ubhaya-loka hita-sukhāvahananāya)—a merit which reminds us of the Aśokan inscriptions: esa bādha dekhiye iyam me bidatikāye iyam mana me pālatikāye ti and (ii) Nirvāṇa-sampati (nirvāṇadom) for himself or herself.¹

The recording of the view that gifts may bring happiness to all, but nirvāṇa only to oneself, deserves our careful consideration. The distinction drawn in this way is rather uncommon and is not made even in the inscription recording the gifts of the Queen of Vanavāsi to the Mahiśāsakas² or in the long inscription of the Sinhalese donor.³

Then the expressions, dhūtuvara-parigabita or nirvāṇa-sampati-sampādaka raise the presumption that the Andhaka-conception of Nirvāṇa was different from that of the Theravādins or their sub-sect the Mahiśāsakas. In the Kathāvatthu, there are

1 Ep. Ind., XX, pp. 16, 18, 19, 20, 21: "atano" or "apano."
3 Ibid., p. 22.
two controversies (ix, 2; xix, 6), relating to the conception of Nirvāṇa as prevailing among the Andhakas. The one attributed to the Pubbaseliyas is that the Amatapada (=Nirvāṇa), is "an object of thought of a person not yet free from bondage"; and the other attributed to the Andhakas is that "the Nibbāna-dhātu is kusala (good)" in the sense in which mental states are spoken as kusala (good) and it is a faultless state. Both these statements bear the implication that the Pubbaseliyas or the Andhakas conceived of Nirvāṇa as a 'positive faultless state'—a conception which can hardly be accepted by the Theravādins, who speak of realizing the Nibbāna within one's own self (paccattaṁ veditabbo viññūhi) and not of grasping the same as some object producing pure happiness.

XV. Doctrines of the Bahuśrutīyas only

Regarding the special doctrines of the Bahuśrutīyas, the Kathāvatthu is silent. Though this school belonged to the Mahāsaṅghika group, it accepted, according to Vasumitra, many views of the Sarvāstivādins. Vasumitra adds that it held that Buddha's teachings relating to anityatā, duḥkha, śunya, anatman and Nirvāṇa (transitoriness, suffering, non-existence of objects, absence of soul, and the ultimate goal) are lokottara (supramundane) while his teachings on topics other than those mentioned above are laukika (mundane).

In Pāli texts the teachings and exercises connected with maggas and phalas are usually regarded as lokottara and the rest laukika.

1 Mrs. Rhys Davids, Points of the Controversy, pp. 231-3.
2 Ibid., p. 339.
3 See Majjhima Nikāya, I, p. 1 f.: Mūlapariyāyasutta.
4 Masuda, pp. 35-36.
This school according to Paramārtha, attempted a syncretism of Hinayāna and Mahāyāna and attributed two meanings, probably nītārtha¹ (profound) and neyārtha² (superficial) to the teachings of Buddha. It adopted the Satyasiddhiśāstra of Hari- varman as their main text. In the Nāgarjunikonda inscription, this school is mentioned.

XVI. Doctrines of the Prajñāptivādins only

Regarding the special doctrines of the Prajñāptivādins, Vasumitra remarks that they agreed mainly with the Mahāsaṅghikas (i.e. later Mahāsaṅghikas). They held in addition the following opinions:

(i) Skandhas and duḥkha are not concomitant;
(ii) The twelve ayatanas are not real;
(iii) Either attainment of ārya-mārga or death is dependent on karma.

The Prajñāptivādins, as Paramārtha tells us, appeared some time after the Bahuṣrutāyas, and distinguished themselves as Bahuṣrutiyavibhajyavādins. The main difference between the Prajñāptivādins and Bahuṣrutāyas is that the former partly like the Mahāyānists held the view that Buddha’s teachings as embodied in the Pitaka should be distinguished as nominal

---

1 Cf. Samādhivijaya-rūtra, p. 78:

2 Cf. M. Vf., p. 43: वह  भावधन्वजिविहारः । कन्ये भवति वयस्कः । कन्योऽन्तु नावत भवति ।

3 This school came into existence 200 years after the Mahāsaṅghikas (Koka, v, p. 24).

---

1 See Prof. Vidhusekhar Sastri’s Sandhībhāṣā in IHQ, IV, p. 295.
(prajñāpī), real (paramārtha), conventional (sāmyrti) and causal (hetuphala). This school, as against the Bauhinivāyas, agreed more with the views of the Mahāsaṅghikas than with those of the Sarvāstivādins.¹

XVII. Doctrines of the Rajagirikas and the Siddhāttvikas

In the Kathāvatthu, but not in Vasumitra’s treatise certain special doctrines have been attributed to the Rajagirikas, and Siddhāttvikas. To the former are attributed the following:

(i) Nattī keci dharmā kebicicī dharmmehi saṃgahita or sampayutta (VII. 1 & 2)

There is no such thing as a quality attached to or adhering in another e.g. oil in mustard seeds, feeling in perception, and so forth.²

(ii) Nattī cetasiko dharmo (VII. 3)

This is a corollary to the previous opinion. It says that citta (mind) functions and there are no mental states associated with it,

(iii) Cetasiko dharmo dānan ti (VII. 4)

(iv) Īto dinnena tattba yaṃpenti (VII. 6)

By the former it means that gift is not material; the mind for making a gift is really giving. By the latter it holds that merits are accumulated, and that a person enjoys its fruits in after-life on account of such accumulation.

(v) Paribhogaṃayam puññanvaddhati (VII. 5)

The accumulating merits can go on increasing (by renewal of gifts of robes and other articles to monks, and so forth).

(vi) Nattī arahato akālamaccu (XVII. 2)

Arhats cannot die untimely, i.e. their death is also subject to the influence of karma.³

1 See Demiéville, op. cit., p. 49-50.
2 Cf. The topics of the Dhātu-kathā, (P.T.S.).
3 Based on the statement: kammunā vattati loko.
(vii) Sappatth idam kammato (XVII. 3)
   Everything is subject to deeds.
(viii) Kappattho kappam tittheva (XIII. 1)
   A being destined to live for an aeon lives for an aeon, as one consigned to purgatory for committing Sanghabheda.

XVIII. Doctrines of the Vetulyakas only

In the Kathavatthu, the following doctrines are specially attributed to the Vetulyakas:

"(i) Na vattabbam 'Buddho Bhagava manussaloke attthasi"
   This point has been discussed above (p. 75).
(ii) Na vattabbam Buddhassa dinnam mahapphalam boti (XVII. 10).

As Buddha as a person does not exist, it is meaningless to say that gifts to Buddha produce great merit.

(iii) Na vattabbam "samgho dakkhinam patiganhati"
(iv) Na vattabbam "samgho dakkhinam visodheti"
(v) Na vattabbam "samgho bhunjati pivati kbadati sayati"
(vi) Na vattabbam "samghassa dinnam mahapphalam boti" (XVII. 6-9).

All the four opinions are of the same import. The question raised here whether Saṅgha is a body of individuals who have attained magga and phala (fruits of sanctification) or Saṅgha is identical with maggaphala. This school holds that Saṅgha does not exist apart from maggaphala and so it is not proper to say that Saṅgha receives gifts, or purifies it, or enjoys it, or a gift made to a Saṅgha is productive of great merits.¹

¹ Cf. Milinda pañha, p. 95 f.; Kośa, iv. 32; also see L. de La Vallée Poussin’s paper on La doctrine des refuges in the Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, vol. 1, p. 64 f.
CHAPTER IX

DOCTRINES OF GROUP III SCHOOLS

The Mahiśasakas, Sarvāstivādins, Dharmaguptakas, and other Schools

The third group of schools, according to the Pāli tradition, comprised the Mahiṃsāsakas and their offshoots, viz., Dhammaguttikas, Sabbatthivādins, Kassapikas, Saṅkāntikas, and Sutta-vāḍi. According to this tradition the Mahiṃsāsakas were the earliest to secede from the Theravāda among its sub-sects. Out of the Mahiṃsāsakas, developed the Sabbatthivādins and gradually the other schools.

Vasumitra puts the appearance of sub-sects of this group a little differently. According to him Sarvāstivāda first branched off from the Sthaviravāda, and from the former appeared the Mahiśasakas, Kāsyapīya and Saṅkrāntivādins one after another at the intervals of a century. Out of the Mahiśasakas developed only the Dharmaguptakas.

Comparing the two traditions, it will be observed that the two lists agree excepting the first appearance of the Mahiṃsāsaka as stated in the Pāli texts. This anomaly can be easily explained thus: A reference to the doctrines of this school reveals that there were two Mahiśasaka schools, one earlier and the other later. Vasumitra missed the earlier Mahiśasakas while enumerating the sub-sects.1 He, however, points out that the earlier Mahiśasakas agreed more with the Theravādins while the later with the Sarvāstivādins. It may be that the Pāli tradition was aware of

1 See infra, p. 117.
the earlier division only of the Mahiśāsakas, and so naturally placed their origin before the Sarvāstivādins.

THE EARLIER MAHIŚĀSAKAS

The antiquity of the Mahiśāsakas goes back to the time of the first Buddhist Council, hence its origin is anterior to that of the Mahāsāṅghikas. The Vinaya texts of the Theravādins (in Pāli), of the Mahiśāsakas and of the Dharmaguptakas record the differences of opinion—relating to seven rules according to the Mahiśāsakas, and eight rules according to the Dharmaguptakas—between Mahākassapa and Purāṇa of Dakkhiniṇāgiri (near Rājagrha). The Mahiśāsaka Vinaya attached special importance to the person of Purāṇa, his insistence on a second rehearsal which, according to this school, was complied with by Mahākassapa, as also the incorporation in the Vinaya of the seven rules relating to food. ¹ This shows clearly that Purāṇa and his admirers and followers formed a group by themselves, though probably not yet known by the designation, Mahiśāsaka. Prof. Przyluski has discussed this in his work Le Concile de Rājagrha (pp. 319 ff.) on the basis of the Mahiśāsaka and Dharmagupta Vinaya texts in Chinese.

He writes that the episode of Purāṇa of Dakkhiniṇāgiri² in the account of the first council marks the difference between the Theravādins and the Mahiśāsakas. In course of time, that group of monks who held Purāṇa in high esteem formed the Mahiśāsaka school by including his seven rules not accepted by Mahākassapa in his Vinaya code. In the Mahiśāsaka Vinaya, the

¹ See Indian Antiquary, 1908, pp. 5-6.
² "Purāṇa demeure dans le sud." Here by "sud," he means Dakkhiniṇāgiri, which is not really in the south.
second place of seniority is awarded to Purāṇa, the first being given to Kauṇḍinya. The Mahišāsakas assert that after the deliberations of the first council were finished, the texts were once more recited for the approval of Purāṇa, who accepted the same after adding his seven rules.

Regarding the geographical expansion of the school, Prof. Przyluski points out that (i) Purāṇa refers to the people of Mahišaka; (ii) that the alternative name of this school is Mahā- vantaka;¹ and (iii) that the Vinaya text of this school was found by Fa-hien in Ceylon.

On the basis of these facts he states that the line of expansion of this school was the same as that of the Theravāda, i.e. along the Kauśāmbi-Bharukaccha axis and that it gradually extended up to the sea-borne countries, and that it became particularly popular in Mahiśamaṇḍala and Avanti, and ultimately reached Ceylon.

Prof. Przyluski's suggestions are supported by the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions, in which it is stated that the queen of Vanavāsi erected a pillar and a monastery at Nāgārjunikonda for the benefit of the ācāryas of the Mahiśasaka sect. Vanavāsi corresponds to North Kanara. There is also a village called Vanavāsi in the Shimoga District of the Mysore State and lies on the border of Mysore territory and North Kanara.² Vanavāsi is also one of the countries which was visited by the mission of Asoka's reign, and it was from this country that a mahāthera called Candagutta went to Ceylon at the invitation of Duṭṭha-

¹ Tārānātha in his Geschichte (pp. 175-273) speaks of the Avantakas as an offshoot of the Sāṁmitiyas.
² El., XX, p. 36; cf. El., vol. III, p. 117; Vikramāṅkadevacarita, V. 23; Mahāvamsa, XII, 31; XXIX, 42; B. C. Law, Geography of Early Buddhism, p. 66.
gāmanī to take part in the celebrations for erecting the maha-
thupa. Hence, it may be concluded that the Mahiśāsakas
became popular in Vanavāśi, i.e. in North Kanara and Mysore,
and probably had some followers in Ceylon, as their school
agreed with the Theravādins in fundamental doctrines and
disciplinary rules. In short, this school had its sphere of
influence in south-western India and Ceylon.¹

The Kathāvatthu has not a word to say about the doctrines
of this school. This silence, though a negative evidence,
confirms our supposition that the Theravādins had little or no
difference with the Mahiśāsakas as far as their doctrines were
concerned. Vasumitra furnishes us with the following informa-
tion regarding the doctrines of this school.

Doctrines of the earlier Mahiśāsakas

The Mahiśāsakas rejected the "Sabbam atthi" thesis of the
Sarvāstivādins² and held that the present only exists. They made
it more emphatic by stating that all samskāras perish at every
moment and that entrance into the womb is the beginning, and
death is the end, of human life. The material constituents of
the sense-organs as also citta and caitāsikas are subject to change.
In other words, there are no real elements.

They do not enter into the question of Buddha's attributes
and probably like the Theravādins held Buddha as an average
human being.

Regarding Arhats, they state (i) a srotāpanna has a chance
of retrogression while an arhat has not and that (ii) arhats do
not perform meritorious deeds. Both of these opinions are

¹ Cf. Przyluski, op. cit., pp. 325, 327—Mahiśamandala, Avanti
and other sea-borne countries on the west.
² For Sarvāstivāda views, see infra.
directly opposed to those of the Sarvāstivādins and are partly in agreement with those of the Theravādins.

Re. Samyakatvanyāma, the Mahiśāsakas have nothing to say. They state against the opinion of the Sarvāstivādins that there is no deva who leads a holy life.

Re. Anupubbābhīsamaya, the Mahiśāsakas held views contrary to those of the Sarvāstivādins. They state that the four truths are to be meditated upon at one and the same time. As against the opinion of the Theravādins, they held that transition from one jhāna to another is immediate (Kυ., XVIII. 6).

Re. Puthujjana, etc., the Mahiśāsakas held the following views in agreement with the Sarvāstivādins excepting the last:

(i) An average man is able to destroy rāga and pratigha in the Kāmadhātu.

(ii) There is laukikasamyagdrṣṭi (right view relating to worldly matter).

(iii) There is no laukikāsraddhendriya (faculty of faith obtained by a worldly man). This is discussed in the Kυ., XIX. 8 (see above, p. 97).

Re. Anuṣaya and Paryavasthāna, the opinions of the Mahiśāsakas are directly opposed to those of the Sarvāstivādins and the Theravādins and are in agreement with those of the Mahāsaṅghikas:

(i) Anuṣaya (dormant passion) is neither citta (mind) nor caitasika (mental).

(ii) Anuṣaya is different from pervading passion (paryavasthāna).

(iii) Anuṣaya is never an object of thought (anālambana).

(iv) Anuṣaya is dissociated from mind (citta-visamprayuktā).

(v) Paryavasthāna is associated with mind (citta-sampa- yuktā).
All these have been discussed in the Kathāvatthu in connection with the doctrines of the schools of Group II (see above, pp. 65; 93 f.).

Re. Meditation & Smṛtyupasthāna, the only difference between the Mahiśāsakas and the Sarvāstivādins is that the former do not recognise any lokottaradhyāna. They agree with the Sarvāstivādins in holding that all dharma (mārgaṅgas) are included in the four smṛtyupasthānas (introspective practices).

Re. Viṣṇāna, the Sarvāstivādins state that the five viṣṇānas (perception derived by the organs of sense) engender rāga (attachment) but not viṟāga (detachment). The Mahiśāsakas consider this unreasonable and hold that these conduct both to sarāga and viṟāga. Both the schools agree in holding that the six viṣṇānas combine with vīṭaka and viciṇa (see above, p. 66-67).

Re. Asaṃskṛta & Antarābhava, the views of the Mahiśāsakas are all opposed to those of the Sarvāstivādins: —

(i) There are nine unconstituted (asaṃskṛta) dharmas, but this list is different from that of the Mahāsaṅghikas.
(ii) There is no intermediate state of existence (antarābhava).
(iii) There is nothing which can transmigrate from one world to another.

There are a few other opinions which are also contrary to those of the Sarvāstivādins, viz.,

(i) No heretic can gain the five supernatural powers.
(ii) Good karmā cannot become the cause of existence.

In addition to the above the Mahiśāsakas held the following two views: —

(i) Though Buddha is included in the Saṅgha, a gift made to Buddha is more meritorious than that to the Saṅgha.
(ii) Buddhāyāna and Śrāvakayāna have the same emancipation (vimukti).
THE LATER MAHĪŚĀSAKAS

We have already pointed out that there were two schools of Mahīśāsakas, one earlier and the other later. The views stated above were held by the earlier. The later Mahīśāsakas accepted the cardinal doctrine of the Sarvāstivādins that past and future exist, and asserted that śkandhās, dhātus and āyatana in their subtlest form are always present, so also are the anuśayas. They added that the earth lasts for aeons. They agree with the Sarvāstivādins in holding that there is antarābhava. The later Mahīśāsakas, therefore, were as much in agreement with the Sarvāstivādins as the earlier Mahīśāsakas were with the Theravādins.

THE SARVĀSTIVĀDA

At the outset, it should be pointed out that the wide popularity of the Sarvāstivāda has put into shade all other schools, and that, particularly, for its propagation all over Northern India and in countries outside India, like Central Asia and China. Its origin should be placed some time after the Mahīśāsakas and the Mahāsaṅghikas. There is no doubt that it branched off from the Mahīśāsakas and not from the Theravādins directly as stated by Vasumitra and other writers of later days. These Sarvāstivādins should be distinguished from the Mūlasarvāstivādins,¹ who probably modified certain doctrines of the Sarvāstivādins, as also from the Vaibhāṣikas, in which name this school was latterly known from the time of Kaṇiṣṭha.²

¹ I-tsing speaks of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. See Takakusu, pp. xxiii-iv, 7-14, 20.
² In Kashmir there were both Vaibhāṣikas and Sautrāntikas (ye vinayavidādayaḥ Sautrāntikā bhadantādayaḥ). The latter are described
Vasubandhu, in his *Abhidharmakosa*, has the Kashmir Vaibhāṣikas more in view than the early Sarvāstivādins. This is due to the fact that the Vaibhāṣikas became more popular since the days of Kaniska and became predominant in Kashmir and Gandhāra.¹ The popularity of the early Sarvāstivādins was confined to Northern India around Mathurā, where it had its origin.

Prof. Przyluski² rightly traces the origin of the Sarvāstivāda school in the grouping of monks, shown in the account of the Second Council. He says that the monks collected by Yasa hailed mainly from two centres, of which one was Kausambi-Avanti and the other Mathurā. The former developed into the Theravāda and Mahiśasaka schools while the latter into Sarvāstivāda, and both were opposed to the Mahāsaṅghikas whose centre was at Pāṭaliputra and Vesāli.

**Succession of Teachers**

If we turn to the succession of teachers (*ācariyaparamparā*) as given in almost all Sanskrit traditions, preserved in Tibetan, it will be observed that after Sambhūta Saṅnavāsi, the succession is recorded differently from that in Pāli. Bustom and Taranātha,³ in the *Kośa-Vyākhyā* (VIII. 32) as Vinaya-vid. There were also Vaibhāṣikas who lived outside Kashmir referred to in the *Kośa* as "bahir-desakā Vaibhāṣikā."

¹ Prof. Takakusu writes (IPTS., 1904-5, p. 119) that the Sarvāstivādins were also distinguished in the *Vibhāṣā* as Kashmirian and Gandharian, but after compilation of the *Mahāvibhāṣā* the former eclipsed the latter and became known as Kāśmira-vaibhāṣikas, or simply Vaibhāṣikas.

² Przyluski, op. cit., p. 308.

³ See Bustom, II, p. 108. He derived his information from the *Vinayakṣudraka* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins.
tell us that Mahākassapa entrusted the guardianship of the Saṅgha to Ānanda, who in turn entrusted the same to Sambhūta Śānavāsi. The latter gave over the guardianship to Upagupta of Mathurā. It is well-known that in the Sanskrit Avadānas, Upagupta is made the spiritual adviser of Aśoka as against Moggaliputta Tissa of the Pāli texts. This also lends support to the view that Mathurā became the first seat of the Sarvāstivādins soon after the Second Council, and that it was from Mathurā that the influence of the Sarvāstivādins radiated all over Northern India, particularly over Gandhāra and Kashmir.

The propagation of Buddhism in Gandhāra and Kashmir has an independent history of its own. Both the Pāli and Sanskrit traditions state that Madhyāntika (Majjhantika) was responsible for the propagation of the religion in these two countries. Madhyāntika was a disciple of Ānanda and so he was a contemporary of Sambhūta Śānavāsi and senior to Upagupta. Madhyāntika is recognised as a teacher by the Sarvāstivādins. That Madhyāntika preached there Sarvāstivāda Buddhism in Kashmir is corroborated by the testimony of Hiuen Tsang who tells us that Aśoka not only sent Buddhist monks to Kashmir but also built monasteries at that place. He writes that during Aśoka's reign there was in Magadha "a subtle investigator of name and reality, and who put his extraordinary thoughts in a treatise which taught heresy." An attempt was made to drown into the Ganges these monks who however saved themselves by flying through the air to Kashmir where they settled on the hills and the valleys. On hearing this, Aśoka felt remorse and requested them to return, and on their refusal, built for them 500

1 Upagupta was followed by Dhitika.
2 Watters, I, p. 269.
monasteries and "gave up all Kashmir for the benefit of the Buddhist church." The fact underlying this story is that the "investigators of name and reality" were none other than the Sarvāstivādins, whose principal tenet is that nāma and rūpa are real and are divisible into 64 elements which exist for ever (sarvam asti), and it is for this they had the appellation of Sarvāstivāda. Then the statement that they resorted to the hills and valleys of Kashmir corroborates the flight of the Sarvāstivādin monks to the north in Kashmir.

Yuan Chwang must have fallen into confusion in regard to the name Mahādeva. There were very probably two persons of this name "one an influential abbot of Pāṭaliputra" who preached the Devadatta-sūtra, and the other a monk who introduced the tenets relating to the imperfections of an Arhat. Mahādeva the investigator of name and reality must have been a Sarvāstivādin while the other Mahādeva, who attributed imperfections to an Arhat, was a Mahāsaṅghika. Yuan Chwang further confused the Theravādins with the Mahāsaṅghikas when he wrote that Aśoka supported the Mahāsaṅghikas against the Theravādins, and that 500 Arhats left Pāṭaliputra and propagated the Sthavira School in Kashmir, while the majority of the inferior brethren at Pāṭaliputra began the Mahāsaṅghika school. The Mahāsaṅghikas, as we know, lived originally at Vesali and later on passed on to the south, making their principal centre in the Andhra country at Dhanakataka (present Guntur District).

The statement that Aśoka became later on repentant and wanted the monks who fled to Kashmir to return to Magadha

1 Watters, I, p. 267. 2 See Infra.
3 Watters, I, p. 269. 4 Majjhima, III, 179.
5 Watters, I, p. 268. See above, pp. 64, 84-8.
6 Watters, I, p. 269.
may be an indirect reference to the fact recorded in the *Divyāvadāna* and *Aśokāvadāna* that Aśoka made an attempt towards the end of his life to reconcile the monks of the different schools of Buddhist thought by convening a council to which he particularly invited the monks living at Tamasāvana in Kashmir. The Ceylonese chronicles maintain a discreet silence over this incident, and this is not unusual in view of the sectarian spirit permeating the chronicles.

The Sarvāstivādins also claim Aśoka as their patron. They ignore the name of Moggaliputta Tissa and put in its stead the name of Upagupta as the spiritual adviser of Aśoka. The Ava- dāna literature of the Sarvāstivādins is full of episodes dealing with the life and munificence of Aśoka. Tāranātha also speaks of his lavish gifts to the Sarvāstivāda monks of Aparantaka, Kashmir and Tukhāra. Kalhanna writes that Aśoka not only built Śrīnagari but also covered Suskaletra and Vīrastrā with numerous stūpas, one of which was so high that its pinnacle could not be seen. Yuan Chwang noticed four Aśoka topes, each of which contained relics of Buddha’s body. The Ava- dānas record that Aśoka’s liberality to the Buddhist monks was carried to such an excess towards the end of his life that his grandson Sampati who was in charge of his treasury refused to carry out

---

1 *Divyā*, p. 399 वसवदत्त कालाधि पुरर सुख विषयो च धर्म साहि नामसाहिन्नः; *I.A.*, 1895, pp. 241 ff.

2 Prof. Przybulski writes in his *Légende de l’Empereur Aśoka*, pp. 101, 117 that a council of 30,000 monks was held by Aśoka, his sources of information being the *Aśokāvadāna* and Tāranātha (Schiefner, p. 38) but we do not find any such reference in Tāranātha.

3 Schiefner, p. 38.

4 Stein, I, p. 19.

5 *Divyā*, p. 430. Tib. त्रियाग० विषयो च. It has been restored by Schiefner as Vāsavadatta, but it may also be Dhanadā or Sampati.
his commands and even reduced his food to a myrobalan, half of which was the last gift made by him to the Buddhist Sangha.

Through the activities of the Sarvāstivādins, Kashmir became a centre of Buddhist philosophical studies and was, according to Tārānātha, also the scene of the activities of Vatsa, the propounder of the Ātmaka theory (pudgalavāda) and the founder of the Vatsiputriya or Sammitīya school.

Geographical Expansion

At the time of Asoka, therefore, we may hold that there were two centres of the Sarvāstivādins, one at Mathurā with Upagupta as the head of the Sangha and the other in Kashmir with Madhyāntika as its founder. It may be that the latter centre became in course of time the seat of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and the Vaibhāṣikas. On account of the popularity of this school in the north, there is no reference to it in the early inscriptions of Central India. Among the donnees mentioned in the Barhut and Sānchi inscriptions, the name of this sect does not appear. Its name appears in the inscriptions of later dates, like Kāmasī inscription, Set Mahet Image inscription of the time of Kaniska or Huviska and inscriptions on the Mathurā Lion Capital. In the Sarnath inscription it is incidentally stated that the Sarvāstivādins ousted the Theravādins there and they in turn were overthrown by the Sammitiyas in 300 A.D. There is no reference to the Sarvāstivādins in the Nāgārjunikonda and the Amaravati inscriptions.

Very likely its progressive career had a set-back for some time during the reign of Pusyamitra as is evidenced by

1 See Gilgit Ms., vol. I, Intro. 2 Schiefner, p. 44. See Infra.
3 See JRAS., 1892, p. 597. 4 El., II, p. 212.
5 El., VIII, p. 111; IX, p. 29. 6 El., IX, p. 135.
7 See Infra.
the *Divyavadāna* a text of this school but the several donations made during this period by the devotees prove that it was professed by a large section of the people. Its revival came with the invasions of the Græco-Bactrians, Sakas, Pahlavas, Parthians and Yavanas. The *Milindapañha*, the original of which was in Sanskrit, very likely belonged to this school.\(^1\) The existence of this text shows that the Græco-Bactrian kings like Menander were interested in this religion. Its complete revival took place during the reign of the Sakas, and the popularity of this sect reached its climax in the reign of Kaniska.

Fahien (319-414 A.D.) noticed the existence of this school at Paṭaliputra while Yuan Chwang (629-645 A.D.) found it “chiefly in Kashgar, Udyana, and several other places in the Northern Frontier, in Matipur, Kanauj, and a place near Rajagṛha and also in Persia.”\(^2\) I-tsing came across the adherents of this school in Lāṭa, Sindhū, Southern and Eastern India, Sumatra, Java, China, Central Asia and Cochin China.\(^3\) From the above evidences it is apparent how widely popular was this school all over Northern India and outside India, but little known in Southern and Western India.

**Buston’s information about the School**

According to Buston, the founder of this school was Rāhulabhādra of the Kṣatriya caste “renowned for his devotion to discipline.” The mantle worn by the members of this school had 25 to 29 fringes, and their badge had an *utpala* (a lotus), a jewel, and the leaf of a tree.\(^4\)

He further writes "Just as the high classes establish the mundane laws and customs of a country or race, in a similar manner the Sarvāstivādins as they spoke in Sanskrit, the language of the higher classes, represent the foundation of the other sect."

It cannot be definitely stated whether Bustom had the Sarvāstivādins or the Mūla-Sarvāstivādins in mind. ²

Language and Literature

The Tibetan traditions corroborated by the recent finds of manuscripts in Eastern Turkestan leave no room for doubt about the fact that the Sarvāstivādins adopted grammatical Sanskrit (and not mixed Sanskrit) as the medium of their literature and that they possessed a complete canon of their own in three divisions Sūtra, Vinaya and Abhidharma. The sub-divisions of these three pīṭakas were also substantially the same as those in Pāli.

Our main source of information regarding the literature of this school is the Chinese and occasionally Tibetan versions of the Tripiṭaka, supplemented by the find of manuscripts in Central Asia, Eastern Turkestan, Gilgit and Nepal, and by quotations found in works like the Lalitavistara, Mahāvastu, Madhyamaka-vṛtti, Sūtrālaṅkāra of Asaṅga, Divyāvadāna, Abhidharma-kosā with its Bhāṣya and Vyākhyā. It may be questioned whether the informations available about the literature of this school are of the Sarvāstivādins or of the Mūla-Sarvāstivādins. For the present it is not possible to distinguish between the two.

1 Bustom, II, pp. 99-100.
2 Huen Tsang states that the Sarvāstivādins had a peculiar mode of wearing and colouring their robes not approved by the followers of several schools (Watters, I, pp. 150 ff. Takakusu, I-tsing).
but it seems that the Āgamas were common to both, so also were the Abhidharma texts. It is only in regard to Vinaya and a few Avadāna texts there might have some differences.

Sūtras: The Sūtra-Piṭaka of the Sarvāstivādins was divided into Āgamas corresponding to Nikāyas of the Pāli school. There were four Āgamas called Dirgha, Madhyama, Saṃyuktā and Ekottara. In the Kośa there are references to the Kṣudraka implying thereby the existence of a Kṣudrakāgama too. Prof. Akanuma has compared the Āgamas in Chinese with the Pāli Nikāyas¹ in detail and has come to the following conclusions: The Dirghāgama contains 30 Sūtras as against 34 of the Dīgha Nikāya. Of the 13 suttas in the first volume of the Pāli Dīgha Nikāya, 3 only are omitted in the Dirghāgama viz., Mahāti (no. 6), Jāliya (no. 7) and Subba (no. 10). All the suttas of the other two volumes are contained in this Āgama with a few in the Madhyamāgama. The order of arrangement of the sūtras in the Āgamas and Nikāyas differs widely, e.g., Mahāpadāna is the first sutta in the Āgama in place of Brahmajāla of the Nikāya. In the Āgama the order of sūtras is as follows: Mahāpadāna, Mahāparinibbāna, Mahāgovinda, Janavasabba, Aggañña, Cakkavatti, Sīvanāda, Pāyāsī, Udumbarika-Sīvanāda, Saṅgīti, Darśitā, Mahānīda, Saṅkha-panha, Pāṭika, Sināgolāvāda, Pāsādika, Sambhāsadāniya, Mahāsambhā, Ambattā, Brahmajāla, Sonandā, Kūṭadanta, Kevatta, Kassapa-sīvanāda, Tevijja, Sāmanānāphala, Poṭṭhāpāda, Lobicca. The Āgama contains two other suttas.

Of these suttas, fragments of the Āsatīya and Saṅgiti have been discovered in Eastern Turkestan[a] and quotations from the Brahmajāla and Saṅgiti appear in the Abhidharma kośa.

² Hocnle, Manuscript Remains of Buddhist literature found in Eastern Turkestan.
The relation of the sūtras of the Madhyamāgama to those of the Majjhima Nikāya is similar to the Digha. Of the 152 suttas in the three volumes of the Majjhima, only 19 suttas are omitted in the Āgama, viz., Cūlasāropama (no. 30), Mahāsaccaka (no. 36), Sāleyyaka (no. 41), Verānjaka (no. 42), Kandaraka (no. 51), Jivaka (no. 55), Kukkuravatika (no. 57), Abbayarājakumāra (no. 58), Apanṇaka (no. 60), Teviṭṭa-Vacchagotta (no. 71), Ghotamukha (no. 94), Caṅki (no. 95), Vāsetṭha (no. 98), Saṅgārava (no. 100), Pañcattaya (no. 102), Kinti (no. 103), Sunakkhatta (no. 105), Anupada (no. 111) and Bhaddekaratā (no. 131). In the Madhyamāgama, there are in all 222 sūtras, 82 of which correspond to the suttas in the Aṅguttara, 10 to suttas in the Saṃyutta, 9 to those in the Dīgha and rest to suttas in the Majjhima. There are a few of these suttas in Pāli not found in the Āgama, while a few stray suttas correspond to passages in the Suttanipāta, Thera-theri-gāthā and Vinaya (Mahāvagga). In view of the mixture of the suttas from two or three Nikāyas in this Āgama we can hardly expect much agreement in the order of the arrangement of the sūtras.

Fragments of two sūtras of the Madhyamāgama, viz., Upāli and Sāka, have been discovered in Eastern Turkestan.¹

The agreement between the Samyuktāgama and Saṃyutta Nikāya is similar to that of the Madhyamāgama and Majjhima Nikāya. The Sagāthavagga (Sec. I) of the two piṭakas has much in common but not the Nidānavagga (Sec. II); the 8th and 9th chapters of Nidāna, viz., Samana-brāhmaṇa and Antara- peyyāda are wanting in the Āgama, while the 1st and 5th chapters (Buddha and Gabapati) show marked differences. In the same section, Abhisamaya, Dhātu and other samyuttas are almost

¹ Hoernle, op. cit.
passed over in the Āgama, but there is much commonness in the following five Samyuttas: Anamatagga, Kassapa, Lakkhana, Opanna and Bikkhu. In the Khandha-vagga (Section III) of the Āgama, the following samyuttas are wanting: Okkantika, Uppāda, Kilesa, Sārīputta, Nāga, Gandhābbakāya, Valāha, Vacchagotta and Ikhāna. In the Saḷāyatanavagga (Section IV), the following are absent: Mātugāma, Moggallāna, Asaṅkhaya, Sammappadhāna, Bāla and Iddhipāda, while major portions of the Magga, Indriya and Sacca omitted.

The Samyukta Āgama, as it exists in Chinese, is divided into 50 sections and incorporates a large number of suttas of the Āṅguttara Nikāya and a few of the other texts. There are also a few sūtras which have no parallels in Pāli.

A fragment of the Sroṇasūtra of this Āgama has been discovered in Eastern Turkestan while Prof. Sylvain Lèvi traced a few quotations from this Āgama in the Sūtrālāmākāra of Asaṅga,¹ and identified the following fragments from the collection of Grünwedel: Kokanada-sūtra (=Āṅguttara, V, pp. 196-198); Anāthapiṇḍada-sūtra (=Āṅguttara, V, pp. 185-189); Dīrghanakha sūtra (=Majjhima, I, pp. 497-501); Sārabbha-sūtra (=Āṅguttara, I, pp. 185-188); Pravṛṣaka Sthavirasūtra and Brāhmaṇasatyāṇi sūtra (=Āṅguttara, II, p. 185) — all included in the Chinese translation of the Samyukta Āgama.²

The Ekottara Āgama and the Āṅguttara Nikāya have very little in common. This is partly due to the fact that a large number of the suttas of the Āṅguttara is included in the Madhyama and Samyukta Āgamas. The Pāli text is much more extensive than the Sanskrit and it seems that the growth of this part of the Piṭaka took place independently of each other. From Akanuma’s comparative studies, the following may be pointed

¹ See Winternitz, p. 234 fn.
² Toung Pao, V, p. 299.
out as being more or less common in the two pitakas: Samacitta (I, pp. 61-9), Devadīta (I, pp. 132-150), Brāhmaṇa to Lōnaphala (I, pp. 155-258), Cakka (II, pp. 32-44), Mūndarāja (III, pp. 45-62), Nīvarana (III, pp. 63-79), Āghāta (III, pp. 185-202), Devatā to Mahā (III, pp. 329-420), Avoṣaṅgata to Mahā (IV, pp. 67-139), Ghaṇapati (IV, pp. 208-235), Saṅcitta (V, pp. 92-112), Upāsaka (V, pp. 176-210), Jānuṣsoni (V, pp. 249-273), and Anussati (V, pp. 328-358). This is not an exhaustive list, for there are stray agreements in other sections.

A fifth Āgama was not recognised by the schools other than the Theravāda. In the Divyāvadāna (pp. 17, 331, 333) and elsewhere the Āgamas are referred to as Āgamicatustayām. In the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions also, four Nikāyas are spoken of and not five. The Pāli Khuddaka Nikāya is really a collection not of discourses, short or long, but of a number of independent works which could not be included in one of the four Nikāyas. By Khuddaka, the Pālists probably meant "other works" or "miscellaneous works." Though the Sarvāstivādins did not have a fifth Nikāya, they had a few texts like the Udānavarga, Suttanipāta (Āṭṭhaka and Parāyana vaggas), Sthavira-gāthā, Dhammapada, Vimānavastru, and Buddhavaṃsa, which came later on to be collectively called Kṣudrakāgama (see above, p. 125).

VINAYA: Our information about the Vinaya texts of the Sarvāstivādins is derived solely from the catalogues of Chinese canonical literature. In Nanjio’s Catalogue, we came across the following titles:—

(i) Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-mātrkā, translated by Saṅgha-varman (445 A.D.): Ta’isho, xxii, 1441; Nanjio 1132.

(iii) Sarvāṣṭivāda-vinaya-saṅgraha, compiled by the venerable Jinamitra, translated by I-tsing (700 A.D.): Nanjio 1127.

(iv) Daśāḍhyaśya-vinaya-nidāna, translated by Vimalākṣa (being the preface to the Daśāḍhyaśya-vinaya), Nanjio 1144.

(v) Daśāḍhyaśya-vinaya-bhikṣu-prātimokṣa, translated by Kumārajiśa (404 A.D.): Taisho xxiii, 1436; Nanjio 1160.

(vi) Daśāḍhyaśya-vinaya-bhikṣunī-prātimokṣa, compiled by Fa-yin (420-479 A.D.): Taisho xxiii, 1437; Nanjio 1161.

(vii) Daśāḍhyaśya-vinaya or the Sarvāṣṭivāda Vinaya, translated by Puṇyatara together with Kumārajiśa (404 A.D.): Taisho xxiii, 1435; Nanjio 1115.

The principal text of the Sarvāṣṭivāda was the Daśāḍhyaśya-vinaya. Fa-hien writes that he came across a Sarvāṣṭivāda-vinaya in verses, but the Chinese translation of the Daśāḍhyaśya-vinaya attributed to the Sarvāṣṭivāda is in prose. The Daśāḍhyaśya (Taisho ed., xxiii, 1435) is divided into 14 sections. It opens with the eight sections of the Prātimokṣa-sūtra. The ninth section deals with “seven dharmas” viz., śīksāpada, poṣadha, pāpa-deśanā, varṣāvāsa, carmaṇavastu, bhaṣaṇayavastu and ēvara (precepts, fortnightly ceremonies, confession, dwelling in the rainy season, use of leather-shoes, use of medicines, and robes of monks). The tenth section contains “eight dharmas”, viz., Kathina, Kaustubhi, Campā, Pāṇḍulobitaka, Saṅghāvaśeṣaparivāsā, Paṭicchādana, Sayanāsana and Āsamanācārīka-dharma (rules re. making of Kathina-robies, dispute at Kaustumbhi, events at Campā, deeds of Pāṇḍulobitaka-robies, atonement for Saṅghāvaśeṣa-offences, concealment of irreligious acts, rules regarding bed and seat, and rules
regarding proper conduct of monks). The eleventh section entitled "samyutta", i.e., miscellaneous rules, deals with the dhūta and other extra-ordinary precepts observed by monks. The twelfth section is devoted to Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa containing, as it does, 8 Pārajikā, 17 Saṅghāvaśeṣa, 30 Naibṣargikā, 78 Paṇantikā, 8 Prātideśaniyā and Aṣṭa-dharmā. The thirteenth section re-arranges the preceding rules in the Ekottara style, from one to eleven dharmas. The concluding section, the fourteenth, contains the Upāli-paripṛcchā, a well-known text on disciplinary rules.

This text contains almost all the chapters of the vinaya of the Theravādins and the Mūlasarvāstivādins, and appears to be a much shorter version of the text of the latter. From the title, one expects ten chapters, but actually there are fourteen, and so we have to assume that four of the fourteen chapters were later additions or were originally treated as supplements. The 11th, 13th and 14th chapters are no doubt later additions, but it is difficult to ascertain the fourth additional chapter. A close study of the Chinese translation along with the Sanskrit text of the Mūlasarvāstivādins will reveal the actual position.

ABHIDHARMA: The Abhidharma literature of the Sarvāstivādins is fairly extensive. Apart from the well-known seven texts belonging to this school and the famous Vibhāṣa-śastras of the Vaibhāṣikas, this school had to its credit a few other philosophi-

1 The titles of vastus (chapters) in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya are as follows: Praṇavatā, Posadha, Praṇārtha, Varṇa, Carma, Bhāṣajya, Cūvara, Kāthina, Kośāmbaka, Karma, Pāṇḍulobitaka, Pudgala, Pārvāsika, Posadbhasthāpāna and Saṃghabheda.

2 See Bodhisattva-prātimokṣa-sūtra, Intro., p. 3 (IHQ., VII. 2).

3 For further details, see introduction to the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya, Gilgit Manuscripts, vol. III, pt. ii.
cal works written by Vasubandhu, Saṃghabhadra, Dharmatrāta and Dharmottara. None of these valuable works are available in original Sanskrit except the Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā of Yāsomintra. The Vyākhyā is no doubt a mine of information and contains most of the philosophical topics discussed in the Abhidharma literature of the Sarvāstivādins. It may also be regarded as a quintessence of the seven Abhidharma texts. For a general idea of the several texts at the present moment, we shall have to depend on the valuable analysis of the Chinese translations of the texts made by Prof. Takakusu in the J.P.T.S., 1904-5 and the notes left by Prof. Louis de la Vallée Poussin in his introduction to the French translation of the Abhidharmakośa. With the publication of the Vyākhyā it has become possible to comprehend the terms and nomenclatures suggested by Takakusu on the basis of the Chinese renderings and form a better idea of the contents of the texts. The seven texts claimed by the Sarvāstivādins as constituting their original Abhidharmapiṭaka are as follows:

(i) Jñānapratibhānasūtra of Ārya Kātyāyani-putra with its six supplements, (sat pādāh), viz.,
(ii) Prakaraṇapāda of Sthavira Vasumitra
(iii) Viśñunakāya of Sthavira Devasharmā
(iv) Dharmaskandha of Ārya Śāriputra
(v) Prajñaptiśāstra of Ārya Maudgalyāyana
(vi) Dhātuṣṭhāya of Pūrṇa and
(vii) Saṅgīt-paryāya of Mahākauṭūḥila.

(i) The Jñānapratibhāna-sūtra is attributed to Ārya Kātyāyaniputra. In the Kośa it is stated that the actual author of the work is Buddha but the arrangements of chapters and topics had been made by Kātyāyaniputra and so its authorship is attributed.

1 Kośa, I, 9 & 11.
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to him. It was twice translated into Chinese, by Gotama Samghadeva of Kashmir and Chu Fo-nien, in the 4th century A.D. and by Hiuen-tsang in the 7th century. It is divided into eight sections. The first section contains exposition of laukikā-gradharmas, jñāna, pudgala, śraddhā, abhirakā, rūpa and its lakṣaṇa, anartha (?), and caītasikās (= supramundane topics, knowledge, individuality, faith and reverence, lack of modesty, material constituents of the body and their characteristics, anartha (?) and mental states). The second section details the samyojanas or defilements which hinder the spiritual progress of an adept, and the causes of defilements. The third section is devoted to the acquisition of the knowledge (jñāna) (a) of doctrinal matters by which a sekha becomes an asekha, (b) of right and wrong views, (c) of the means of attaining six abbijñās, (d) of the four truths and of the acquisitions to be made in the four stages of sanctification. The fourth section details the evil words and acts with their consequences as also explains the viññaptis and avijñapti². The fifth section gives an exposition of rūpakandha, i.e., the four great elements and of things originating out of them, both internal and external. The sixth section analyses the 22 indriyas (predominant faculties) and the three spheres of existence viz., kāma, rūpa and arūpa, and explains in detail the spariṣendriya, mūla-citta, etc. The seventh section is devoted to the mental states developed by an adept while he is in samādhi, and gradually advances from Sakadāgāmi to Anāgāmi stage. The last, the eighth section explains the four smṛtyupasthānas, the various wrong views, and such other matters.

2 Kośa, I, 11.
Dr. Barua suggests that this work may be paralleled with the Pāli text *Paṭisambhidāmagga.* There may be a verbal resemblance between the two texts, but the *Jñānaprajñāpāda* is written more on the lines of Buddhaghosa’s *Visuddhimagga* than on the *Paṭisambhidāmagga.* The title also suggests that the work is expected to contain topics leading to the highest knowledge, which, in other words, is purity or emancipation.

The second book is entitled *Prakaraṇapāda.* Its authorship is attributed to Sthavira Vasumitra, who, according to the Chinese tradition, composed it in a monastery at Puṣkaravati. It was translated into Chinese by Guṇabhadra and Bodhiyasas of Central India (A.D. 435-443) and also by Hiuen-tsang (A.D. 659). The work is divided into eight chapters. The first defines rūpa, citta, caitasikas, cittaviprayuktas and asamskṛtasya (material constituents, mind, mental states, non-mental states, and the unconstituted). The second deals with the same topics as those discussed in the last two chapters of the third section of the *Jñānaprajñāpānasūtra.* The third explains the sense-organs and their spheres of action while the fourth defines several terms, such as dhātu, āyatana, skandha, mahābhūmikās (cf. Kośa, II, 23, III, 32), etc. The fifth chapter analyses the anuśayas (dormant passions), while the sixth touches the *vijñeya, anumeyā* and *anāsrava dharmas* (things to be known and inferred, and pure dharmas). The concluding chapter, the seventh, appears to be an index, containing all the technical terms with their meanings in short.

The third book, *Vijñāna-kāya* is attributed to Devasarmā, who, according to Hiuen-tsang, compiled it at Viśoka near Śrāvastī, about a century after Buddha’s death. It was translated into Chinese by Hiuen-tsang (649 A.D.). It is divided into six

---

chapters. It contains an exposition of pudgala, indriya, citta, kleśa, vijñāna, etc. as given by Maudgalyāyana, enumerates the different classes of beings, persons, etc., defines the function of mental states as hetu (cause) and ālambana (basis) of spiritual progress and also of mental states of a perfect and an imperfect adept. Prof. La Vallée Poussin remarks in his Etudes Asiatiques 1925 (i. 343-376) that the first two chapters contain the controversies relating to the existence of past and future, and of pudgala (soul).

The fourth book is entitled Dhammakandha. Its authorship is attributed to Śāriputra. It was translated into Chinese by Huen-tsang (659 A.D.). In the colophon of the Chinese translation this text is described as "the most important of the Abhidharma works, and the fountain-head of the Sarvāstivāda system". This book it seems appealed to the Chinese not for its subtleness and depth of philosophical discussions but for its comprehensiveness as outlining the general course of spiritual training prescribed for a Buddhist monk. This work also can be paralleled to the Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosa. Its 21 sections are as follows: Sikṣāpadas or Šilas: attainments leading to Srotāpatti; development of faith in the Triratna; the fruits of four stages of sanctification, four āriya-pudgalas; samyak-samkalpa of the eight-fold path; attainment of ādhipādas; practice of smṛtyupasthānas; exposition of the āryasatyas; four dhyānas; four apramāṇas; four higher samāpattis (ārūpyas), practice of bhāvanā; exposition of bodhyaṅgas, and then an exposition of indriyas, āyatanas, skandhas and dhammas. Its concluding chapter explains the twelve terms of the formula of causation (pratītyasamutpāda).

1 Kolla, ii, 61-62.  
2 Kolla, vii. 12.  
3 Cf. Infra, p. 137 f.
The fifth book, *Dhātukāya*, is attributed to Pūrṇa in the Sanskrit and Tibetan tradition, and to Vasumitra by the Chinese writers. Prof. Takakusu remarks that the original Sanskrit had probably more than one recension. It was translated into Chinese by Hiuen-tsang (663 A.D.). The object of the treatise is to enumerate the dharmas, considered as ‘reals’ by the Sarvāstivādins. The dharmas are classified under the heads: 10 mabhābhūmikas, 10 kleśa-mabhābhūmikas, 10 parittakleśas, 5 kleśas, 5 drṣṭis, 5 dharmas, etc. This classification differs slightly from that found in Pāli texts or the *Abhidharmakośa*.\(^1\) Prof. La Vallée Poussin thinks that this must be a very old text, which may be regarded as the source of the Pāli *Dhātukathā* also, as it discusses the sampayutta and vippayutta relations of the dharmas as has been done in the *Dhātukathā*.

The sixth book *Prajñāptisūtra* is attributed to Maudgalyāyana. It was translated into Chinese at a very late date (1004-1055 A.D.) by Fa-nu (=Dharmapāla) of Magadha. The Chinese text is incomplete. In Tibetan version this treatise is divided into three parts, viz., lokaprajñāpti, kāraṇaprajñāpti and karmaprajñāpti. The lokaprajñāpti appears in a well-digested form in the *Abhidharmakośa* (III). Prof. La Vallée Poussin has analysed the first two prajñāptis in the *Cosmologie bouddhique* (pp. 275-350).\(^2\) In the lokaprajñāpti the cosmological ideas of the Buddhists are given, in the kāraṇaprajñāpti the characteristics that make a Bodhisattva are discussed while in the karmaprajñāpti there is an enumeration and classification of different kinds of deeds.

The seventh book *Sāṅgīṭiparyāya* is attributed to Mahākausṭhila by Yaśomitra and Buston, and to Śāriputra by the

---

Chinese writers. It was translated into Chinese by Hiuen-tsang (660-663 A.D.). This text was compiled, according to the introductory remarks, immediately after Buddha’s death to avert disputes among the disciples regarding the Buddhist teachings and disciplinary rules. The scene of this text is laid at Pāvā, where the dissensions among the Nigantha Nāṭaputtas started after the death of their teacher. It arranges the dharma both doctrinal and disciplinary, numerically in the Ekottara style, i.e., gradually increasing the number of dhammas from one to ten. The contents of this text agree to a large extent with those of the Saṅgīti and Dasuttara suttantas\(^1\) of the Dīghanikāya.

Besides these seven recognised texts of the Sarvāstivādin Abhidhammapiṭaka, there were a few other digests and commentaries dealing with the topics of the Abhidharma. The exhaustive commentary on the Jñānapraśṭhāna-sūtra was, of course, the Mahāvibbāṇa, compiled according to Paramārtha, by the Kātyāyana-putra himself with the assistance of Aśvaghoṣa of Śāketa. Among the digests, the most important work is Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośa, which has got a bāṣya written by Vasubandhu himself and a vyākhyā written by Yaśomitra. Then there are two other texts viz., Abhidharma-nīyāyānusāra and Abhidharma-samaya-pradīpikā, attributed to Saṅghabhadra an opponent of Vasubandhu. Saṅghabhadra wrote these works to refute some of the theses of Vasubandhu, specially those which were in support of Saundrāntika views.

There was an earlier digest called the Abhidharmasāra written by Dharmacārī. It contained eight chapters, viz., dhātu, saṃskāra, anusaya, ārya, jūna, samādhi, miscellaneous, śāstra-varga or vāda-varga\(^2\).

---

2 For details see La Vallée Poussin’s Intro. to the Kośa, p. bxii.
Among other works of note belonging to this school we may mention Sārīputrābbidharma, Abhidhmāmyāṇtaśāstra of Ghoṣa, Abhidharmabhṛdaya of Dharmottara and Lokaprajñāpti-abhidharmaśāstra of an unknown author.

Doctrines

In the history of the secession of schools, it has been shown that the Sarvāstivādins belonged to the orthodox group, hence there are many points of agreement between the Theravāda and Sarvāstivāda doctrines.

1. Sabbaṃ atti

The principal point of difference between the two schools is that the Sarvāstivādins maintain the existence of 5 dharmas in their subtler forms at all times, whether in the past, present or future, while the Theravādins deny any such existence. The former accept the fundamental creeds of Buddhism, viz., anatta and anicca of all worldly things, and their contention is that the things constituted out of the dharmas at a particular time are subject to disintegration but not the dharmas themselves, which always exist in their subtler state. Vedanā, for instance, may be kusala, akusala or avyākṛta at a particular time and place but it exists at all times.¹

The Kathāvattbu (I. 6) presents the arguments and counterarguments of the Sarvāstivādins and the Theravādins thus: The Sarvāstivādins maintain that all dharmas exist but not always and everywhere and in the same form. In reply to the question whether khandhas which are all different by nature exist uncombined (ayogam), they answer in the negative. This, however, gives an opportunity to the Theravādins to show the fallacy

¹ See Points of Controversy, Appendix, pp. 375-7.
that if all exist then both micchādiṭṭhi and sammādiṭṭhi exist together. Then again by equating past and future to present, the Theravādins show that if past and future exist then their existence should be predicated in the same way as of the present,¹ which the S. deny, saying that past and future exist but not exactly in the same way as one would speak of the present.

The Th. take recourse to the second argument saying that let the 'present material aggregate' (paccuppanna-rūpa) be treated as one inseparable object; now, after some time has elapsed, this material aggregate becomes past, i.e., gives up its presentness (paccuppannaabhāva) to which the S. agree; then in the same way can it be said that the material aggregate also gives up its materiality (rūpa-bhāva)? The S. deny the latter inference, reasoning thus,—let a piece of white cloth, be regarded as one inseparable object; now, when this cloth is coloured, it gives up its whiteness (like 'paccuppannaabhāva' in the former case), but does it give up its clothness (like 'rūpabhāva' in the former case)? This disarms the opponents. The Th. however follow up this argument of the S. by suddhikanaya (pure logic) saying that if the material aggregate (rūpa) does not give up its materiality (rūpabhāva),² then rūpa becomes permanent, eternally existing like nibbāna—a conclusion not accepted by the S., as according to the latter rūpabhāva is different from nibbānabhāva.

The next question put by the Th. is whether past (atīta) gives up its pastness (atītabhāva)? The S. answer in the negative, but take care to note that when they say that atītabhāva exists they mean that anāgatabhāva (futurity) and paccuppanna-bhāva (presentness) do not exist like the atītabhāva, and similarly when they predicate existence of anāgatabhāva, they mean atīta-

¹ This is repeated with each of the khandhas.
² Cy. rūpakkhandhena saṅghahitattā.
bhāva and paccuppannahāva do not exist like anāgatabhāva. This general statement is then applied to each of the khandhas. The Th. round up the discussion by their usual suddhikanaya saying that atīta or atītabhāva then would be the same as nibbāna or nibbanabhāva a conclusion rejected by the S. The Th. then take to vacanasodhana (clearing up of verbal errors) saying that (i) if the existence of past (atīta) and non-past (nvāsīta) as also future (anāgata) and non-future (nvānāgata) is denied then the S. should not say that past and future exist; so also (ii) if they do not accept the identity of atīta, paccuppanna and anāgata,¹ they cannot say that atīta and anāgata exist.

The next argument of the Th. is that if the S. admit that paccuppannañāna (present cognition) exists and it has the function of knowing things (paccupannam nānam atthi, tena nānena nānakaraniyam karoti) and then why not the atītāñāna and anāgatañāna, the existence of which is affirmed by the S., should not have the function of knowing things in analogy to that of paccuppannañāna?² This the Th. consider as illogical and reject the contention of the S. that ‘atītam nānam atthi’.

The Th. now take up the cases of the Arhats, Anāgāmis, etc., and show that according to the S. who state atīta rāga exists in an Arhat, that atīta byāpāda exists in an Anāgāmi and so forth, an Arhat should be sarāgo, an Anāgāmi should be byāpannacitto and so on, but this inference is not accepted by the S.

¹ By taking recourse to the discussion whether butvā hoti butvā hoti and na butvā na hoti, na butvā na hoti, the Th. show logically the untenability of the assertion of the S.

² In the text, this argument is elaborated by the application of this general statement to each of the sense-organs, (paras 23-28) as also to bhatta, pāda, pabbha, kāya, āpo, tejo and vāyu (paras 47-49).
The last argument resorted to by the Th. is that if the existence of \textit{atīta, paccuppanna and anāgata khandhas, dhātus, ayatanas} be admitted, then the S. should say that there are \((3 \times 5\) or) 15 khandhas, \((3 \times 18\) or) 54 dhātus, \((3 \times 12\) or) 36 ayatanas which the S. reject saying that they may accept the position that \textit{atīta or anāgata} exists from one standpoint and does not exist from another standpoint (\textit{atthi siyā atītam or siyā nu āsitam or nu anāgatan ti}). The Th. then bring in their \textit{suddhikānaya} by citing the instance of \textit{nibbāna} and establishes the futility of the assertion of the S. that past and future exist. Both the Th. and S. then quote passages from the Sutta Pitaka in support of their own contentsions, one however remaining unconvinced by the other. From the controversies dealt with above the following may be taken as the opinion of the S.:

1. The past and future, as usually understood, do not exist, though they are perceptible in the present.\(^1\) In the same sense, the non-past and non-future should also be taken as non-existing.

2. It is the \textit{bhāva} of each of the five khandhas and not the khandhas persist in the past, present and future.

3. An object (\textit{vastu}) may lose its pastness, presentness, or futurity but not its objectness (\textit{vastu\textit{vā}}) but that objectness is not identical with \textit{nibbāna} or \textit{nibbānabhāva}.

4. An Arhat e.g., for instance, has \textit{atīta rāga} but he is not therefore to be regarded as ‘\textit{sara\textit{go}}’.\(^2\)

The S. admit impermanency (\textit{anityatā}) of the constituted things but they contend that the “\textit{dhammas}” (or \textit{bhāvas}) of the

\(^{1}\) E.g. \textit{anāgatam bhūtā paccuppannaṃ bottī but anāgata is not identical with paccuppanna in the ordinary sense, though in paccuppanna there is (the dharma of) anāgata so in that sense paccuppanna is anāgata.

\(^{2}\) Cf. the views of Śāla schools re. \textit{anussaya}, pp. 92-94.
past are transmitted into the present and likewise the “dharmas” of the future are latent in the present. This we may illustrate, by citing the example of a sweet mango—the past mango seed transmits into the present “mangoeness” if not the “sweetness” and similarly the “future mango” receives its “mangoeness” from the present: the mango seed can never produce any other fruit though there may be a change in the quality and shape and colour of the mango. The S. speak of a being in the same way. According to them a being is composed of five dharmas (not five khandhas), viz., (1) citta (mind), (ii) caitasika (mental states), (iii) rūpa (matter), (iv) visamprayuktasamskāra (states independent of the mind),¹ and (v) asamskṛtas (the unconstituted).² The five dharmas (not elements as usually understood) persist in a

¹ In Vasumitra this appears also as a separate opinion of the S.: The phenomena jāti, jāra, sthiti, anityata are cītta-visamprayuktas but included in samskāraskandha. One of these four items, viz., jāra is discussed in the Kuṇ., (VII. 8) in the topic “jāramaranaṁ vipāko ti?” an opinion of the Andhakas, the Kuṇ., supporting the opposite view that “jāramaranaṁ” is not vipāka.

² These five are sub-divided into seventy-five thus:

I. Rūpa (11): (a) visaya (5) (b) indriya (5) (c) avijñānti (1)
   (i) rūpa
   (ii) śabda
   (iii) gandha
   (iv) rasa
   (v) sparśa

II. Citta (1)

III. Caitasikas (46):
   (a) Mahābhūmika (10)
   (i) vedanā
   (ii) samjñā
   (iii) cetanā
   (iv) sparśa
   (v) chanda
   (vi) mati or prajñā
   (vii) smṛti
   (viii) manaskāra
   (ix) adhimokṣa
   (x) samādhi
being, the present being the resultant of the past, and potential of the future. An adept after becoming a sotāpanna remains so

(b) Kuśalamahābhūmiṇika (10)

(i) śraddhā (vi) alobha
(ii) virya (vii) advesā
(iii) upekṣā (viii) ahiṃsā
(iv) hri (ix) praśrabdhi
(v) apatrāpya (x) apramāda

(c) Kleśa-mahābhūmiṇika (6) (d) Akūśala-mahābhūmiṇika (2)

(i) mohā (i) ahrīkatā
(ii) pramāda (ii) anapatrāpya
(iii) kauśidyā
(iv) asrāddhīya
(v) styāna
(vi) audelhatya

(e) Upakleśa-bhūmiṇika (10) (f) Aniyata-bhūmiṇika (8)

(i) krodha (i) kaukṛtya
(ii) mrakṣa (ii) middha
(iii) mātsarya (iii) vitarka
(iv) īrṣyā (āv) vicāra
(v) pradāsā (v) rāga
(vi) viśumnā (vi) pratīgha
(vii) upānāha (vii) māna
(viii) māyā (viii) vicikitsā
(ix) śāthya
(x) mada

IV. Citta-viprayukta (14):

(i) prāpti (viii) jāri
(ii) aprāpti (ix) sthiti
(iii) sabhāgata (x) jarā
(iv) asamjñiṇika (xii) ānityatā
(v) asamjñi-samāpatti (xii) nāmakāya
(vi) nirodha-samāpatti (xiii) padakāya
(vii) jīvita (xiv) vyanjana-kāya

V. Asamskrta (3):

(i) ākāśa
(ii) pratisamkhya-nirodha
(iii) apratisamkhya-nirodha

See Rosenberg, Die probleme der buddhistischen philosophie, pp. 128-9. Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, Abhidharma-kosa, Table III.
in his following existence proving thereby that his past dharma continues and the three samyojanas remain ineffective. It may be argued by the Th. that the three samyojanas have altogether disappeared; then the Sarvāstivādins may cite the instance of the Sakadāgamin as a better illustration. A Sakadāgamin reduces rāga, dosa and moha to the minimum, and in his following births that state continues, proving thereby the continuity of past “dharmas”. Now we may pass on to the case of Arhats. The Arhats, it will be seen, become completely free from rāga, dosa and moha; according to the Th. they are destroyed for ever but according to the S., these rāga, dosa and moha persist though in an ineffective form and these may reappear and cause an Arhat fall from the Arhathood—a topic discussed in the Kus. (I. 2) and attributed by Buddhaghosa to the S., viz., Paribhāyati arahā arahattā ti?

In Kārikas 25-27 of the fifth Kośasthāna of the Abhidharma-kośa, there is a detailed exposition of the main thesis of the Sarvāstivādins, viz., Sarvam asti: The contention of the S. that the dharmas exist in the past, present and future rests on certain statements found in the Agamas, one of which is as follows:—

रूपमित्वामतित्वात्मानानमम | कः पुनवाचः प्रत्योगश्रोत्र | एवंदेशी श्रुतवान्
आर्थोकोट्स्ताते हृदेन्यावेलेऽभवति | अनामगतं हेऽ नामिनन्द्वति |
प्रत्युलस्वयं हस्त्य निर्विदेन्विरागाय निरोधाय वितिप्पो भवति |

1 Viz., sakkāyaditthi, silabbataparamāsa, vicikicchā.
2 For its exposition, see ante, p. 84f.
3 See Stcherbatsky, Central Conception of Buddhism, Appendix, pp. 76-91; La Vallée Poussin's Fr. transl. of Kośa, V. 25-27; Rāhula Sāṅkrityāyana, Abhidhammakosā.

The exposition given in the Kathāvatthu speaks of “bhāvāny-athātva” of Dharmatrāta, see p. 145.
[Rūpa (material constituents of a being) whether past or future is impermanent, not to speak of the present. A learned Śrāvaka, who realises this, remains unconcerned of past rūpa, does not rejoice at his future rūpa and exerts to rid his mind of the present rūpa].

On the authority of this statement taken literally (kaṇṭhabah) the S. contend that if past rūpa do not exist, there is no necessity of instructing an adept to remain unconcerned of the same. In the same way it may be said of the future and the present.

The same statement when interpreted (arthaḥ) yields a further argument, viz., every viññāna (perception, cognition) requires the combination of two things, the sense-organ and its object. Now, one speaks of mano-viññāna (mental perception, cognition) of past acts or things. This also implies the existence of past acts or objects, otherwise how could there be mano-viññāna of the same. The same argument is applicable to future acts or objects.

Then again if there be no past, how can one speak of an effect due to past good or bad deeds. At the moment

1 See M. Vr., p. 444; cf. Bhaddekaratta-sutta in Majjhima, iii, p. 187:
Atitam nāṅvāgameyya, nappatiśikhe anāgataḥ.
Yad atitam pahinam tām, appattaṁ ca anāgataṁ,
Paccuppetṭham ca yo dhamme tathā tathā vipassati
Asamhīranti asamkuppan ca tīvā manubhūhayate.

2 Kośa-vyākhyā (Jap. ed.), p. 468: चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः
यथानामर्गार्थको चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं पूर्वविभागः
यथानामर्गार्थको चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः
चतुर्दशीवर्गः सयं नामविभागः सयं पूर्वविभागः

3 Ibid., p. 469: न द्वस्त मनोविभागः सत्ता। वनम्रविभागसत्तात्वमस्तिन्विषयः।
तत्त्वं विख्यातं सत्त्वं चालसन्मात्वमतिं विशिष्टः।
when the effect is produced there is the vipākaḥhetu, which is past.¹

For the reasons stated above, the S. affirm the existence of past and future dravyas only and not of bhāva, laksana, or avasthā.

Among the Sarvāśtvādins again, there are four different opinions, which are as follows:

(i) bhāvanyathātva: Bhadanta Dharmatrāta maintains that the past, present and future are differentiated on account of the non-identity of bhāva and not of dravya e.g. when a vase of gold is broken and transformed into a figure of gold, colour remaining the same or when milk is transformed into whey, changing the taste, strength and digestibility but not its colour. In the same way when future dharma is changed to present, the anāgata-bhāva only is abandoned and the vartamana-bhāva is acquired, dravya remaining identical; in the same way the change of the present into past may be explained, i.e., when the present bhāva is abandoned and the past bhāva is acquired, the dravya remains identical.

(ii) laksananyathātva: Bhadanta Ghoṣaka and others maintain that the dharmas in their transition from past to present, and present to future, undergo changes in characteristics (laksānas) only. A dharma, when it is past, is associated (yukta) with the laksānas of the past, but it is not dissociated (avijynta) from the laksānas of the present and future, so also a future dharma is associated (yukta) with the laksānas of the future but not dissociated from the laksānas of the present and past; in the same way one can speak of the present. By way of illustration, it may

¹ Kośa-vyākhyā, (Jap. ed.), p. 469: विद्यानन्दकथितन निपन्नित्तिकाल उपयुक्तमानसत्संलिखत। वर्षमाण धर्मविदितः।
be said that when a man is attached (rakta) to a woman, he is not detached (avirakta) from other women.¹

(iii) avasthānyathātva: Bhadanta Vasumitra and others maintain that past, present and future of a dharma is indicated by its difference in condition (avasthā). If in a certain state (avasthā) a dharma is not active (kāritram na karoti), it is future (anāgata), if the dharma is active it is present (vartamāna) and if the dharma has ceased after being active (kṛtvā niruddhabh), it is past. In short, there is change of states (avasthāntara) but not change of objects (draavyāntara). A dharma is described as past, present and future, in accordance with the state attained by it at a particular moment, and not on account of the differences in characteristics.

Changes in dharma occur also on account of changed conditions (avasthāntara) due to change in places (stibāntara), but actually there is no change (nasvabhūvānyathātva), e.g., when a cipher is put in the place of ten or hundred or thousand, it carries different values, but it actually remains the same, hence there is avasthāntara and not svabhāvāntara.

(iv) anonyathātva: Bhadanta Buddhadeva and others maintain that the past, present and future are spoken of relatively² i.e., a dharma is described as past, present or future with reference to that which precedes and that which follows. Future is established relatively (apekṣya) to past and present; the

¹ Kosā-uyākhyā (Jap. ed.), p. 470: नथय पुष्प एकलो लीलो रः श्रीपास्फाल्क ध्रुवतिः। एकलो लीलो पो रामायणवसान्त बतस्ती। श्रीपस्फाल्क पस्फातिस्तत्वालिः। न ममसवान ध्रुवतिः।

² This, according to Fa-pao, is the opinion of Samghabhadra. According to P’ou-koung this opinion is also expressed in the Vibbhaṣā. Cf. Kosā-uyākhyā, p. 470: पुष्पकरं वायुखात्यातानामत्तथे भ्रमणम् उपयोगम्। पूर्विविन्योत्ते वर्धन्यानानान ध्रुवतिः। पूर्वां वायुनासपर वायुवायुविश्व सत्यानान ध्रुवतिः। परिब्रह्म वस्तूनामनानान्त वायुवायुत्ततेः। पूर्वांपरिप्रेशीणायायत्वक्षण अविकर्ष;
past relatively to present and future and the present relatively to past and future. The same woman, e.g., is called a daughter and mother, when she is referred to in relation to her mother and daughter respectively. Hence there is actually no change in a dharma (na dravyāntarabh); past, present and future of a dharma indicate only its relation to other dharmas.

Vasubandhu regards the first opinion (bhāvanayathātvā) as similar to that of the Śāṅkhyan thinkers and takes it as upholding the theory of transformation (parināmavāda). The second opinion he criticises as marked by confusion of time (adheva-samkara) because the characteristics (lakṣāṇas) of past, present and future are always present. According to the fourth opinion, he says, all the three past, present and future exist at the same time, so it is wrong. He therefore accepts Vasumitra's opinion (avasthānyathātvā) and rejects the other three.

II. Maitri (love) and Karuṇā (compassion)

The S. in consonance with the Th. regard Buddha as a human being but they attribute to him divine, sometimes superdivine, powers. They look upon the Bodhisattvas as puthujjanas, who must destroy the worldly ties like an average adept in order to step into the samyakatvaniyāma or sotāpannahood.

According to the S. "sentient beings are not objects of maitri and karuṇā and so forth on the part of the Buddha," and further "if anyone adheres to the view that there are sentient beings he cannot realize emancipation."

The former opinion is opposed in the Kau. (XVIII. 32: Natthi Buddhasa Bhagavato karuṇā ti) on the ground that the

1 See Kośa-vyākhyā (Iap. ed.), p. 470-1.
2 Sāntarakṣita in his Tattva-saṅgraha has criticised the opinions of all the teachers mentioned above, including that of Vasubandhu.
Buddha is described in the texts as 'kāruniko' and that he sometimes enters into mahākarunāsamāpatti and so he has karunā for sentient beings. In the Pāli texts, the practice of four brahmavihāras: maitri, karunā, muditā and uppekkhā form an essential part of the Theravāda code of spiritual practice. It is by means of brahmavihāras that an adept is able to look upon all beings as one and the same, in other words, develops samatājñāna.

As regards the second opinion we may state that the doctrine of anattā teaches that there are actually no individual beings, and that it is avijjā which makes one think of the existence of beings. The S. are only stating the axiomatic truth that in Buddha's eye, no individual beings exist and as such they cannot be the object of his maitri and karunā.

There are three other views relating to Buddha's teachings, which are opposed to those of the Mahāsaṅghikas and are in consonance with the human conception of Buddha. They are,

(i) The Buddhas cannot expound all doctrines with a single utterance.
(ii) The world-honoured One utters words which are not always in conformity with the truth.
(iii) The sūtras delivered by Buddha have nītārthas and there are even some anītārtha-sūtras.

III. Arhats

According to the Sarvāstivādins, Vasumitra says,—

(i) A srotāpanna has no chance of retrogression while an arhat has.

1 All these views have been discussed before, see ante, pp. 74 f.
2 The word nītārtha means expressions which do not convey the real sense directly as the neyyārtha would do. Nītārtha corresponds to sammuti or samvrti-satya.
(ii) All arhats do not gain anutpāda-jñāna.

(iii) An arhat is governed by the pratityasamutpādāṅga (members of the causal law).

(iv) Certain arhats perform meritorious deeds.

(v) Arhats are not free from the influence of past karma.

(vi) Arhats gain naivasaṭṭikṣa-naśaṅkaśajñāna.

(vii) Arhats gain the four fundamental dhyānas: they cannot realise the fruits of dhyāna.

The first opinion that arhats may have retrogression is the same as that of the Mahāsaṅghikas and others (discussed above, pp. 64, 85). The S., like the M. postulate the existence of two classes of arhats with different degrees of attainments. According to the S., all arhats are not completely perfect—an opinion not accepted by the Theravādins though the latter have no objection to distinguish arhats as Sa(=sva)-dhammakusala and Para-dhammakusala. It is interesting to find this opinion discussed also in the Milindapañha, where it is said that there are arhats who may not be aware of the name and gotra of any and every person, the various roads and so forth, but there may be some conversant with the vimuttis.

1 See Kośa, vi. 64: The Ubbhayatobhāgavimutta-arhats realise nirodhasamāpatti and remove both kleśāvaraṇa (obstacle of passions) and vīmoksāvaraṇa (obstacle to the knowledge of akarmayatā of nāma and rūpa) while the Prajñāvimukta-arhats are those who remove only kleśāvaraṇa by means of prajñā; see also ante, p. 86. For the six kinds of arhats, see Kośa, vi. 56ff.


3 The five vimuttis are—(1) tadaṅgavimutti or vippassanañāna attained by removing the misconceptions of nicca, nimitta etc.,
The second opinion reiterates the first in another form. The S. hold that some and not all arhats gain the anutpādaññāna (lit. knowledge of the cessation of rebirth) but all may have ksayaññāna (lit. knowledge of the extinction of all impurities in oneself). The M. assert that only Buddhas and not arhats can have both ksayaññāna and anutpādaññāna.

Regarding the third opinion, Mr. Masuda on the basis of 'Shu-chi says that of the twelve members of the causal law, four, viz., nāmarūpa, ādāyatana, phassa and vedanā—(or, according to another interpretation, only vedanā) remain active in the case of arhats, the other members, i.e., avijjā, samkhāra, tanhā, upādāna, bhava, jāti, and jarā-marana becoming ineffective. The Chinese interpretation can be accepted, only if "vedanā" is limited to "adukkha-asukha-vedanā" for an arhat is chalupekkho (endowed with indifference in respect of the six indriyas) i.e. the organs of sense come into contact with the respective objects but produce neither good nor bad feeling.

The fourth opinion speaks of the puñnopacaya of an Arhat. The Th. and Mahiśasakas reject it; so also do the Mahāsanghikas. The Arhats are said to have done all that is to be done (katakaraṇīya) and are beyond merit and demerit, good or bad; hence to speak of some of them as collecting merits shows that the S. like the Andhakas do not look upon all arhats as completely perfect.

The fifth opinion that arhats are subject to the influence of past karma is perhaps based upon some instances found in the

(a) vikkhambhānāvimutti or paccavekkhāhañāna, (3) samucchedāvimutti or maggañāna, (4) patipassaddhivimutti or phalañāna, and (5) nissarañāvimutti.

1 See above, p. 78-79.
2 See Digha, iii, p. 245. Majjhima, i, p. 219.
3 See ante, p. 88.
Piṭākan stories that Arhats like Aṅgulimāla and Mahāmoggallāna suffered pain on account of their past karma. In the sixth opinion, the word naiśaikaśa-nīśaikaśa as translated by Mr. Masuda appears to be ambiguous, and preference should be given to the meaning "nirvāṇa" as assigned to it by the Mahāyutpatti. The sense would then be that according to the S., some and not all arhats attain Nirvāṇa (full emancipation).

The seventh opinion has not been taken up for discussion in the Kvin. The Kośa (viii. 6) tells us that there are eight fundamental ḍhyānas (maulasamāpattidrayāni), i.e., four ḍhyānas and four ārūpyas (higher ḍhyānas). The contention of the S. is that all arhats complete the four ḍhyānas but all do not necessarily attain the fruits of the four ḍhyānas, which are detailed in the Kośa (viii. 27-28), thus: by the first ḍhyāna, one obtains dṛṣṭa-dharma-sukhavibhāra, by the second jñāna-darsāna, (or divya-caṅsūrabhijñā), by the third prajñā-prabhedā, and by the fourth anāśravatā.

1 See Milinda-paṇha, p. 134: Na hi mahārāja sabbantam vedayitaṃ kammamūlakam. See also Kvin., viii. kammahetu arahā arahattā parihāyatiti?
2 "For arhants there are things which are no longer to be learnt and things which are still to be learnt." Asia Major, p. 49.
3 Dīgha iii. 222, Aṅg., ii. 4: Atth' āvuso samādhībhāvanā bhāvi ṭa bahulikatā dīṭṭhadhammasukhavihārāya samvattati nāṇadassana-patilabbhāya satisampajjāṇāya āsavānam khayāya samvattati.
4 lit. enjoyment of happiness in the present body (Pāli: dīṭṭhadhammasukhavihāra).
5 lit. insight into the real state of things i.e. free from any vikalpa. (=Pāli: nāṇadassana).
6 lit. special or detailed knowledge of the things of the world—the corresponding Pāli expression is satisampajjāṇā.
7 lit. purity (Pāli: āsavānam khaya).
IV. *Samyakatvanīyāma* (destined to attain nirvāṇa)

Vasumitra attributes the following opinions to the Sarvāstivādins:

(i) A person can acquire the *samyakatvanīyāma* through the meditation of *sūnyatā* and *apraṇāhita-tā*; a person in the *samyakatvanīyāma* is called *pratipannaka* up to the fifteenth (or the last) moment of the *darśana-mārga*. In the sixteenth moment he is called *phalastha* when he is in *bhāvanāmārga*.

(ii) A person can acquire the *samyakatvanīyāma* and can also gain arhatship independently of the four dhyānas.

(iii) A being (in Rūpa or Arūpa-dhātu) can gain arhatship but not *samyakatvanīyāma*. It is only when he is in Kāmadhātu that he can have *samyakatvanīyāma* as also arhathood.

Allied to the above three, there are two other views attributed to the S., viz.:

(iv) There are also certain devas who lead a holy life.

(v) There is no one who is free from passion in the Uttarakuru. No saint is born there or in the *Asaṅgisattvā-loka*.

The first three views raise the question of *samyakatvanīyāma*, i.e., of persons who are destined to attain Nirvāṇa, and have no chance of being diverted from the Aryan path and going to lower states or joining heretical sects. An adept in *samyakatvanīyāma* is the same as *sotāpati-maggapati-panna*, i.e., one after destroying the three *samyojanas* (impurities), viz., *sakkāyadīṭthi* (belief in a self), *sīlabbatāparāmāsa* (belief in the efficacy of rituals) and *vicikicchā* (lack of faith in the Triratna) is on the way

---

1 For references see *Koha*, vi, p. 181 f.n.
to sotāpatti phala. According to the scheme of the S., an adept remains sotāpatti phala-pratipannaka for the first fifteen moments, i.e., up to the development of mārge anvayaśāna-ksānti, when he completes the darśanamārga; from the 16th moment he is in bhāvanāmārga and is a srotaāpatti phala astha or srotaāpanna.

The first opinion raises the question whether one can become a srotaāpatti phala pratipannaka by the meditation of śūnyatā (i.e. anattata) and apraniḥsitata i.e. dukkhatā and anityatā and not of animmittā; the answer given by the S. is in the affirmative.

The second deals with the problem whether samyakatvanyāma followed by arhathood can be attained without the practice of the four dhyānas, the S. asserting that it is possible to attain arhathood by means of certain practices other than the usual four dhyānas, e.g. by means of satipaṭṭhāna or brahmavihāra and so forth.

The third is concerned with the problem whether gods in the Rūpa or Arūpadhātu can gain samyakatvanyāma as also arhathood. The S. hold that they can attain the latter but not the former which can only be attained by a being while in the Kāmadhātu. This problem is discussed in the Ksv. (I. 3): N'atthī devessu brahma ca riyāvāsā ti—an opinion held by the Sammiṭiyas. The opinion of the S. is upheld by the Th. In the Ksv. it is contended that "brahma ca riyāvāsā" does not mean merely "pabbajjā" (ordination), "muniḍiyam" (shaven-

---

1 See infra, p. 151.
3 Mr. Masuda on the basis of Fa-jen states that Dharmagupta held that one cannot attain samyakatvanyāma without animittasamādhi, Asia Major, p. 40, n. 9.
headedness) and so forth as held by the Sammitiya, but includes "maggabhavana." The Th. and the S. hold that the Anagamis do not come to the Kammadhatus but they remain in Rupa or Arupadhatus and by maggabhavana there, they become Arhats, without becoming a samyakatvanyama.

The fourth opinion of the S. is that the gods except the Asaññisattas can have maggabhavana, though not pabbajja, mundiyam, etc.

The fifth opinion is based on a passage of the Ang. Nik. (iv. 396) and cited in the Kuv. (I. 3. p. 99) in which it is said that the inhabitants of Jambudipa surpass those of Uttarakuru and Tavatimsa heaven in courage, mindfulness and in religious life (brahmacariyavasa); from this it has been inferred that there cannot be any saint in Uttarakuru. It has been mentioned above that the S. as well as the Th. exclude the Asaññisattas from the gods who follow a religious life, and so, among the Asaññisattas also there cannot be any saint.

V. Anupubbabhisamaya (gradual realisation of the truth)

Vasumitra attributes the following views to the Sarvastivadinah:

(i) The four truths are to be meditated upon gradually.
(ii) The catur-sramanyaphala are not necessarily attained gradually.

1 Points of Controversy, p. 73.
2 The S. are making an anomaly in drawing the inferences. If Uttarakuru cannot have any saint how the Tavatimsa can have any?
3 Mr. Matuda points out (in the f.n. Asia Major, p. 46) that Uttarakuru is regarded as a land of pure happiness and the Asaññisattas as the highest devaloka with long life and happiness; hence the beings of these two abodes need not take to religious life.
(iii) If one is in samyakatuanyāma, he can attain (at once) the fruits of sakṛdāgāmi and anāgāmi on account of (the completion of) the laukikamārga.

An adept, according to the S., develop insight into the four truths in a gradual order\(^1\) in 15 moments thus:

**Dariṇa-mārga:**

(i) Duḥkhhe (or five skhandhas, i.e. nāma-rūpe) dharmajñāna-kṣānti\(^2\) \{confined to Kāmadhātu.\}

(ii) Duḥkhe dharmajñāna

(iii) duḥkhe anvayajñāna-kṣānti\(^3\) \{extended to Rūpa and Arūpadhātu.\}

(iv) Duḥkhe anvayajñāna

**Srotāśpatti-pratipannaka-dariṇamārga:**

(v) Samudaye (sāsravadharmānām hetu i.e., karmakleša) dharmajñāna-kṣānti \{confined to Kāmadhātu.\}

(vi) Samudaye dharmajñāna

(vii) anvayajñāna-kṣānti \{extended to Rūpa and Arūpadhātu.\}

(viii) anvayajñāna

(ix) Nirodhe (pratīṣāmākhyā-nirodha or karmakleśa-kṣaye) dharmajñāna-kṣānti \{confined to Kāmadhātu.\}

(x) Nirodhe dharmajñāna

---

1 Cf. Kośa, vi. 2:

मध्यमान्विन चतुरी दुःखानुमार्गः

निरोधी मागे, पतेषो व्यासिसत्यमय कमः ॥

2 Kṣānti means "faith (kṣamate=rocate, Kośa, vi. 18). An adept at the first moment thinks that he has realised (though actually he has not realised) the fact that the things of the Kāmadhātu i.e. the skandhas are undesirable. It is in the second moment that he realises that the skandhas are undesirable. He acquires now dharmajñāna.

3 After the realisation of the actual state of skandhas of the Kāmadhātu, the adept extends his inner vision to the skandhas of Rūpa and Arūpa-dhātu to realise in the next two moments that skandhas of the higher worlds are also undesirable and hence existence in any of the worlds is to be avoided. In the same way, the other three truths are to be understood.
From the above table it is evident how the S. mark the gradual stages of the development of insight into the four truths. In the Kūṭa, the controversies: Anupubbabhīsamayo ti? (II. 9) and Odhisodhiso kilese jahāti? (I. 4) and also Vimuttam vimuceamānān ti? (III. 4), support the view of the S. about the gradual realisation of the truths. The problem discussed is whether an adept realises the four sāmaṇānaphalas including vimutti gradually or not? The Th. contend that there is no bar to the realisation of all the phalas at one and the same time. The S. subscribe to this view as will be apparent from the second opinion of the S. quoted above, except that they do not include the fourth phala, viz., arhathood or vimutti.¹ Buddhaghosa should have pointed out this discrepancy as far as the S. are concerned. According to him, the opinion that the realisation of the phalas happens gradually is held by the Sammitiyas.

In the third point, it is stated that according to the S., those adepts only who have completed the laukikamārga² attain the second and third phalas at one and the same time. The Th. hold

² There may be ascetics who obtain the four fruits gradually (anupūrvena catuhphalapratīpti). Kośa, vi, 45.
³ Kośa, vi, 45: The bhāvanā-mārga is of two kinds: laukika or sāsrava and lokottara or anāsrava.
that bhāvanāmārga which commences from the srotāpattīphala stage is lokottara and cannot be laukika; the S., however, contend that it may be either laukika or lokottara. A topic allied to this is discussed in the Kṣū. (I. 5), which will be dealt with hereafter.

VI. Puthujjana, Laukikamārga or Laukikāgradharmā

The S., as pointed out by Vasumitra, hold:

(i) An average man is able to destroy rāga and pratigha in the Kāmadhātu.

(ii) A puthujjana can die in a good state of mind.

(iii) There is laukikasamyagdrṣṭi and laukikāśuddhendriya.

(iv) The laukikāgradharmā is a stage lasting but one moment (akāṣanikacittā).

In the Buddhist texts a puthujjana (an average man), whether a householder or a recluse, who has not yet destroyed the three samyojanas viz. sakkāyadiṭṭhi, vicikicchā and sīlabhata-parāmāsa' in order to become a sotāpanna, can hardly be expected to destroy rāga, dosa, moha which impurities are normally removed when an adept reaches the anāgāmi stage. The S. hold that a puthujjana is able to remove from his mind rāga and pratigha which is the same as dosa or vyāpāda. The Th. discuss this view in the Kṣū. in these words: Jḥati puthujjano kāman-rāgabyāpāda tī? (I. 5) concluding that a puthujjana cannot completely eradicate from his mind rāga (attachment) and vyāpāda (hatred), gross and subtle. In course of this discussion, the Th. raise the other question: Puthujjano kāmesu vītarāgo saba dhammābbisamayā anāgāmiphe saṃbhāti tī? (Kṣū. I. 5, p. 112), i.e. whether an average man who is free from kāma attains with

1 See above, p. 152.
the realization of the truth the anāgāmi stage or not? The S., as we have seen above, answer the question in the affirmative, but they do not think that such a pathujjana can attain arhat hood, but he can attain all the other three phalas at one and the same time. In other words, the contention of the S. is that a pathujjana’s attainments through laukikamārga may be of so high an order that the moment the truth flashes in his mind he becomes an anāgāmi, when he completes all the necessary conditions for anāgāmihood, including those of the lower two phalas.\(^1\)

The second opinion that an average man dies with a kusala-citta is based on many instances of upāsakas dying with a good mental state. The Th. also subscribe to this view, and hence there is no discussion in the Kυυ.

The third opinion is the same as that of the Th. and is opposed to that of the Śaiva Schools (see ante, p. 97).

The fourth opinion is not touched in the Kυυ. but has been dealt with fully in the Kośa (VI. 19) thus:—

कामाक्षुः:कविष्णुविशेषितमाला एक्षण्या तु सा। तथायाः: etc.

If the conviction (kṣānti) concerning duḥkha (= skandhas) of the Kāmadhātu be the strongest, it lasts only for a moment; so also are the agradharmas, i.e., laukikāgradharmas,\(^2\) which though sāsrava (impure) are the highest of the worldly dharmas and lead one to the darśana-mārga (way to the realisation of truths).

The point is that a pathujjana, according to the S., may attain spiritual progress up to the anāgāmi stage by taking to satippattāna and such other practices which are laukika so long as they are practised by one who is not yet in one of the maggas and phalas.

---

1 See Kυυ., pp. 113-4.
VII. Anusāya and Paryavasthāna

The S. are of opinion that:

(i) All the anusayas are caitasika; they are cittasamprayauktā and are also objects of thought (ālambana).

(ii) All the anusayas can be included in the paryavasthānas but all paryavasthānas are not anusayas.

The above two opinions are diametrically opposed to those of the Mahāsaṅghikas, and in full agreement with those of the Th. The topics are dealt with in the Kṣu. fully (see ante, p. 94f.), in which it is shown that anusayas are not without ārammana; they are not avyākata (neither good nor bad); they are the same as the paryavasthānas (= pariyutthānas) which again are not cittavippayautta. The S. distinguish the anusayas from paryavasthānas, saying all paryavasthānas are not anusayas while the vice versa is true.

VIII. Meditation

The Sarvāstivādins hold that

(i) In the state of samāhita one can utter words.

(ii) No man ever dies in the state of samāhita.

(iii) It may be said that four smṛtyupasthānas can include all the dharmas.

(iv) All the dhyānas are included in the smṛtyupasthānas.

(v) There are four lokottara-dhyānas.

(vi) The bodhyāngas are acquired in seven samāpattis and not in others.

The first opinion is in agreement with that of Śāila schools, and as such has been refuted by the Th. in the Kṣu. (see ante, pp. 97-98).

The second is opposed by the Rājagirikas and the Th. and as such is discussed in the Kṣu. (XV. 9): Saññāvedayita-
niruddham samāpanno kālam kareyyā ti? The Th. contend that
a meditator while in the saññāvedayitanirodhasamāpatti cannot
have any death-like (maraññiko) contact, feeling, perception,
etc. or is not affected by poison, weapon-stroke or fire; hence to
speak of him as dying while in meditation is wrong. The oppo-
tents contend that there is no such law (miyāma) that a meditator
while in saññāvedayitanirodha will not die.

The third topic is discussed in the Kuśa. (I. 9): sabbe
dhammā satipatthānan ti?—an opinion attributed by Buddha-
ghosa to the Andhakas. The interpretation of Buddhaghosa is
that the opponents meant by satipatthāna the objects which form
the basis of sati (satiyā paṭṭhāna, satigocara, satiyā paṭṭhāna).¹
In this sense the second opinion may be explained as that the
satipatthānas include all forms of meditation, i.e., an adept
practising satipatthāna needs not have recourse to other medita-
tional practices. The S. may well point to the well-known state-
ment found in many places of the Nikāyas (vide Majjhima, I,
pp. 55-6), that there is only one way to the attainment of purity
and that is the practice of satipatthāna (ekāyano ayaṁ maggo
sattānāṁ viśuddhiyā..................yadidam cattāro satipatthāna).²

The fourth opinion needs hardly any comment. It refers
to the first four dhyānas when they are practised by adepts who
are in one of the maggas and phalas. The dhyāna of a magga-
ṭṭha or phalaṭṭha is regarded as lokottara (supramundane).

The fifth opinion evidently refers to the contention discussed
in the Kośa (VIII. 6) that of the eight dhyānas or samāpttis, the

¹ Kośa, vi. 14: Le smṛtyupasthāna est triple: smṛtyupasthāna en
soi (svabhāva), par connexion (samsārga), en qualité d’objet
(ālambanasmṛtyupasthāna).

² Cf. Kośa, vi. p. 158, n. 1: एकायनोक्ष्ये चिन्त्यांगे च सत्यं यथा विभावं
वाति। केवलोक्ष्ये कमलार्थां यथासम्म चक्षृरि स्थलपस्थानानि।
first seven are capable of elevating the mind of the adept to the purest state but not the eighth in which saṃjñā is in the feeblest form and as such the meditation of naivasaṃjñā-nāsaṃjñāyatana is ineffective. Consequently the attainment of the bodhyāṅgas takes place while the adept rises from one dhyāna to the next up till the seventh leaving nothing for the eighth.

IX. Vijnāna

The S. assert, as stated by Vasumitra, that

(i) The five sense-perceptions (pañca-vijnānakāyas) conduct to attachment (saṅgāga) and not to detachment (vīraṅga), because these only perceive the characteristics (lakṣaṇas) of objects and have no independent thinking faculty of their own.

If the reason adduced by the S. that the vijnānakāyas by themselves cannot produce vīraṅga, how can they induce saṅgāga? Hence, the reasoning of the Sarvāstivādins is not quite clear, and it would be better to accept what the Kāvyā says on the point (see ante, p. 99-100).

X. Aavyākṛta, Aśamskṛta, and Antarābhava

The following opinions are attributed to the Sarvāstivādins:—

(i) There are indeterminable problems (avayākṛtadharman).  
(ii) The law of causality (pratītyasamutpādāṅgikatva) is undoubtedly constituted (aṃskṛta).

(iii) The aṃskṛtavastus are of three kinds; the aṃskṛtavastus are also of three kinds.

(iv) Only in Kāma- and Rūpa-dhātu there is an intermediate state of existence (antarābhava).

The first two opinions are opposed to those of the Mahāsāṅghikas and agree with those of the Th. (discussed above, pp. 101-2).
The third also is not accepted by the Mahāsaṅghikas and agreed to by the Th. (see ante, pp. 101-2). The difference between the Th. and the S. lies in the fact that the latter makes the modification in accordance with their doctrine "sabbam atthi" discussed before (pp. 137 f.), according to which, the constituted things (saṃskṛtavastu) should be classified as three, viz., those of the past, those of the present and those of the future (see Masuda, p. 40, n. 2).

The fourth opinion of the S. that there is antarābhava in the Kāmadhūta and Rūpadhūta is neither accepted by the Mahāsaṅghikas nor by the Th. (see ante, p. 102). It has some agreement with the opinion of the Sammitīyas.

XI. Other opinions

There are a few other opinions held by the S. These are,—

(i) All the dharmāyatanas (i.e. vedanā, saṃjñā, saṃskāra) can be understood and attained.

(ii) Even heretics can gain five supernatural powers (see above, p. 116; Wassilijew, Der Buddhismus, p. 272, n. 3).

(iii) Good (karma) can also become the cause of existence—an opinion objected to by the Mahīśāsakas.1

THE DHARMAGUPTAS

The third in importance among the schools of this group is the Dharmaguptas. It has been shown in the account of the First Council that certain supporters of Purāṇa and Gavampati did not accept in toto the Vinaya rules as adopted by Mahākassapa.2 In the Abhidharmakōśa (iv. 39) there is a reference to the Dharmaguptas mentioning that they would not accept the Prātimokṣa rules of the Sarvāstivādins as authoritative on the ground that the original teachings of Buddha were lost.

1 See above, p. 116.
2 EMB., I, p. 333.
About the literature of this school, the only information we have is that it had a Vinaya text of its own (Nanjio, 1117) and that the *Abhiniskramana-sutra* belongs to this school. This sutra was translated into Chinese between 280 and 312 A.D. Prof. Przyluski furnishes us with the information that the canon of this school had the following divisions:

Vinaya-piṭaka

- Bhikṣu-prātimokṣa
- Bhikṣuni-prātimokṣa
- Khandhaka
- Ekottara

Sūtra-piṭaka

- Dirgha-āgama
- Madhyama-āgama
- Ekottara-āgama
- Samyukta-āgama
- Kṣudraka-āgama

Abhidharma-piṭaka

- Difficult (texts)
- Not difficult (texts)
- Samgraha
- Samyuktā

Prof. Przyluski, on the basis of the commentary of K'ouei-ki on Vasumitra's treatise, remarks that this school was noted for its popularity in Central Asia and China. De Groot remarks in his *Code du Mahāyāna en chine* (p. 3) that the Prātimokṣa of the Dharmaguptas was actually in use as the disciplinary rules in all the convents of China. The first formula translated into Chinese in 152 A.D. by K'aung-seng-kai who was a Sogdian, belonged to this school, so also was the other text (*Kie-mo*) translated in 254 A.D. by T'an-tai, who was a Parthian. Hence, it is inferred that this school was established in the Iranian countries in the third century A.D. Buddhayaśas, a native of Kipin (mod. Kashmir), introduced the Vinaya of this school into China and from this Prof. Przyluski concludes that this school had its centre in the north-west. He also identifies Dharmagupta with Yonaka

1 Translated into English by Beal under the title "The Romantic Legend of Sākya Buddha."

Dhammarakkhita, mentioned in the Ceylonese chronicles as the apostle sent to Aparāntaka. The reason adduced by him for this identification is that the region between the North-West and Avanti was traversed by the Yavanas, Sakas and Pallavas about the beginning of the Christian era, and the preacher is described as a Yonaka and then again Dhammarakkhita and Dharmagupta are identical in meaning (i.e. rakkhita = gupta).

**Doctrines**

About the doctrines of this school. Vasumitra writes that these were mainly the same as those of the Mahāsaṅghikas, though it was a branch of the Sarvāstivādins. The doctrines specially attributed to them are as follows:—

(i) Gifts made to the Saṅgha are more meritorious than those to the Buddha, though Buddha is included in the Saṅgha. This is a view contrary to that of the Mahiśasakas and also to that expressed in the Dakkhināvibhaṅgasutta in spite of the fact that Buddha asked Mahāpajāpati Gotami to offer the robe meant for him to the Saṅgha.

(ii) Gifts made to a stūpa are meritorious. This opinion is opposed to that of the Śaila schools (see above, p. 105).

(iii) Vimukti (emancipation) of the Śrāvakayāna and Buddhayāna is the same, though there may be difference in the paths leading to emancipation. This opinion is in agreement with that of the Sarvāstivādins.

(iv) Heretics cannot gain the five supernatural powers.

(v) The body of an arhat is pure (ānāsrava).

---

1 See above, p. 116, also Kośa (Fr. Transl.), iv. 117.
2 Majjhima, iii, p. 253.
3 See above, p. 116.
4 See above, pp. 116, 161; for opinions of other schools on this point see Masuda, p. 42 n.
5 See above, p. 89 n., also infra, p. 169.
(vi) Realisation of the truths (abhisamaya) takes place not gradually but all at once. This is contrary to the opinion of the Sarvāstivādins (discussed above, p. 154-5) but is in agreement with that of the Theravādins.¹

THE KĀŚYAPIYAS

The Kāśyapiya school was known by three other names, Sthāviriya, Saddharmavarsaka, or Suvarsaka. It issued out of the Sarvāstivādins on account of certain opinions which were more in agreement with those of the Sthaviravādins or Vibhajyavādins than with those of the Sarvāstivādins. This seems to be the cause of their being called a Sthāviriya. Its third name, Suvarsaka, appears in the works of Tāranātha and Ch'en-lun, while Saddharmavarsaka in Bhavya’s treatise.²

About the literature of the Kāśyapiyas Prof. Przyluski writes that it had a canon similar to that of the Dharmaguptas, and had the following divisions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vinaya-piṭaka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhikṣu-prātimokṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhikṣuni-prātimokṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mātrkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekottara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sūtra-piṭaka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dirgha-āgama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhyama-āgama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekottara-āgama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samyukta-āgama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṣudraka-āgama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhidharma-piṭaka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supraśnaka-vibhaṅga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apraśnaka-vibhaṅga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samgraha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparative tables

¹ This doctrine is not mentioned by Vasumitra. It is found in the Kośa, vi. 27, see Vāyākyā (Jap. ed.), p. 54a.
² Prof. Przyluski identifies the Kāśyapiyas with the Haimavatas (see infra, p. 170).
Doctrines

To the Kāśyapiyas Vasumitra attributes the following doctrines:

(i) Arhats have both kṣayajñāna and anutpādajñāna, and are not subject to passions.

(ii) Samskāras perish every moment.

(iii) The past which has not produced its fruit exists, the present exists, and some of the future exists. This opinion is discussed in the Kathāvatthu (I. 8) and is the only doctrine attributed in this text to the Kassapikas.¹

THE SAṀKANTAṄIKAS OR SAUṬRĀṬANTIḴAS

In the Pāli tradition the Saṃkantikas are described as an offshoot of the Kassapikas, and from the Saṃkantikas branched off the Suttavādis. Vasumitra writes² that at the beginning of the 4th century (i.e. after Buddha's death), one school named the Saurāntika, otherwise called the Saṃkrāntivāda, issued again from the Sarvāstivāda; (the founder of this school) declares himself: "I take Ānanda as my preceptor." From these two traditions, it seems that the Suttavādis are identical with the Saurāntikas, having branched off from the earlier school the Saṃkantikas, who may also be equated to the Dāṛṣṭāntikas of Vasubandhu.³

Doctrines

Vasumitra characterises the Saurāntikas as the school which admits the transference of skandhamātrās from one existence to another as distinguished from the Sammitīyas who maintain the transference of pudgala. Both of these views are wholly opposed to the cardinal doctrine of the early Buddhists, viz.,

¹ Kṣa. I. 8: Avipakkavipākaṁ atthi, vipakkavipākaṁ nattithi anāgatam atthiti ādīsu ekaccam atthiti uppādinadhhamme sandhāya vadatitī.
² Masuda, p. 17.
³ See Kośa, Index.
ksāṇika (momentary) existence of skandhas (constituents of a being), i.e., the skandhas disintegrate every moment to give rise to another. The Sautrāntikas, in deference to this old ksāṇika theory, add that the skandhas in their gross form do not pass from one existence to another; the mūlāntika (original or the subtlest form of) skandhas all the five of which are of one nature (ekarasa), in other words, which are in reality one substance and not five different substances pass from one existence to another. Bhāvaviveka in his Tarkajvāla (see Obermiller, Analysis of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra, pt. iii, p. 380) states that the school admitted the reality of the individual which is something inexpressible but neither identical nor different from the skandhas.

The second doctrine attributed by Vasumitra to this school is "apart from the aryan paths there is no eternal destruction of the skandhas." This shows that according to the Sautrāntikas, the skandhas, gross or subtle end in nirvāṇa. This view is also allied to the doctrine of the Sammitiyaśas that the pudgala ceases in nirvāṇa. So we may state that according to the Sautrāntikas, the subtle skandhas like the pudgala of the Sammiśiyaśas may continue through several existences but totally cease to exist in Nirvāṇa.

For this doctrine of transference of skandhamātras through several existences, the Sautrāntikas are also called Saṃkṛantivādins or Saṃkṛantikas.

Kośa on the Sautrāntika doctrines

Though Vasubandhu belonged to the Sarvāstivāda school, in his writings occasionally he gave preference to the Sautrāntika views. For this, he was severely criticised by Saṁghabhadra, who was a staunch Sarvāstivādin. In the Kośa, Vasubandhu has referred to the Sautrāntika doctrines on several occasions and pointed out the differences between the Sarvāstivāda and Sautrānti-
tika views. Prof. La Vallée Poussin has summed up these references in his introduction to the French translation of the Kośa. As these throw welcome light on the Sautrāntika doctrines a gist of the same is given here:—

(i) The Sautrāntikas do not accept the Abhidharmapiṭaka of the Sarvāstivādins as authoritative (Kośa, i. 3). On this point Vasubandhu supports the Sautrāntikas.¹

(ii) The asamskritas have no real existence. There is a long controversy in the Kośa (ii. 55) between the Sarvāstivādins and the Sautrāntikas as to whether the asamskritas have any cause or fruits.

(iii) The Sautrāntikas deny the citta-viprayuktas (i.e. samskāras not associated with mind, e.g. prāpti, sabbāgata, āvīten-driya, etc.) as real as contended by the Sarvāstivādins (Kośa, ii. 35-36).

(iv) The Sautrāntikas like all other schools reject the Sarvāstivāda view that past and future exist (Kośa, v. 25).

(v) By admitting the existence of the past and of prāpti, the Sarvāstivādins explained the function of causality. The Sautrāntikas denied both of these and asserted instead the existence of the subtle citta or bija or vāsanā and explained thereby the working of the formulae of causation (Kośa, ii. 36, 50).

(vi) The Sautrāntikas carry the kṣanikavāda doctrine to the extreme point, asserting that it almost verges on zero, and as such, objects can have, in fact, no duration (sthitī). It further asserts that as destruction of objects takes place almost immediately, there is no necessity of any effective cause.²

¹ Acc. to the Sautrāntikas, buddhavacana is vāg-vijñāpti, see Kośa, i. 25; iv. 2.
² See Kośa, iv. 2-3. The Saddarśanasūtramācyaya cites this passage from a sūtra of the Sautrāntikas: पञ्चसामन्नविन्ध: संशयामां प्रश्नित्वामां संज्ञित- माल: अवज्ञाताः। कर्मयोगः शरातीत्या शरमुकुट्वि दिनाय: पाकायः
(vii) The Sautrāntikas deny the existence of avijñapti (non-communicating corporeal and vocal acts) as a real (dravya). They hold in agreement with the Theravādins that an avijñapti act is mental (cetanā), a kāyasamcetanā.

(viii) According to the commentary of the Vijñaptimātratāśāstra, the Sautrāntikas are divided in their opinion relating to the conception of citta (mind) and caittas (mental states). According to the Dārśāntika-Sautrāntikas, citta only exists but not the caittas, but according to other Sautrāntikas caittas also exist and their number according to some is three, viz., vedanā, saṃjñā and cetanā, while according to others it is four, ten or fourteen. Some Sautrāntikas admit the existence of all the caittas of the Sarvāstivādins (for details, see Kośa, transl., ii. 23, fn.).

(ix) The Sautrāntikas hold that the body of an atthat is pure, as it is produced by knowledge.²

(x) There may be many Buddhas simultaneously.³

THE HAIMAVATAS

Bhavya and Vinitadeva enlist the Haimavatas as a branch of the Mahāsaṅghikas (Group I Schools) while Vasumitra remarks that the principal doctrines of this School were the same as those of the Sarvāstivādins.⁴ He adds that the original (mūla) Śthaviravāda changed its name to Haimavata.⁵ In the Ceylonese chronicles, however, the Hemavatikas are counted as one of the later sects, which came into existence some time after the appearance of the first eighteen schools. In view of these con-

Footnotes:
1 Cf. Vedāntasūtra, ii. 2, 23; Nyāyavāntikatātparyāttikā (Viz. S.S.), 383. See also Kośa, ii. 46; Madhīnīkavi, pp. 29, n. 5: 173, n. 8; 222, 413.
2 See above, p. 89 n. 164.
3 See above, p. 75.
4 Masuda, p. 53.
5 Masuda, p. 16; Points of Controversy, p. xxxvii.
flicting statements, and the acceptance of some doctrines of the Mahāsaṅghikas, it seems that this school might have branched out of the Sarvāstivādins or Sthaviravādins but doctrinally was inclined more towards the Mahāsaṅghikas than towards the Sarvāstivādins.

Prof. Przyluski, however, identify the Haimavatas with the Kāśyapiyas on the following grounds:

(i) In the Ceylonese chronicles, the apostles sent to Himavanta are Majjhima and Dundubhissara of the Kassapagotta.

(ii) On the relic caskets discovered in the stūpa of Sonari and Sanci are inscribed (a) sapurisasa Kāsapagotasa savahemavatācariyasa and (b) sapurisasa kotiputasa Kāsapagotasa savahemavatācariyasa.

(iii) There are other inscriptions which mention Majjhima and Dundubhissara.

He adds that there can be no doubt about the fact that the monks of Kassapa-gotta were responsible for the propagation of Buddhism in the Himavanta. This school also claims Kassapa as its founder, so the same school was known by two names, one local as Haimavata and the other after its founder Kassapa as Kassapiya (=Kāśyapiya). The former name fell into disuse, and so the Chinese pilgrims refer to it by the other name only, the Kāśyapiyas.¹

The conclusion drawn by Prof. Przyluski from the inscriptions does not appear to be logical. In the inscriptions it is stated that some monks of the Kassapagotta propagated Buddhism in Himavanta but there is nothing to show that the Kassapagotta monks necessarily belonged to the Kāśyapiya school. Hence the identification of Kāśyapiyas with the Haimavatas is not tenable.

¹ Le Concile de Rājagrha, p. 317-18.
Doctrines

Vasumitra treats the Kāśyapīyas and the Haimavatas as separate schools upholding different doctrines. He attributes to the Haimavatas a few doctrines which are in close agreement with those of the Sarvāstivādins, e.g.,

(i) The Bodhisattvas are average beings (prthajānas);
(ii) Bodhisattvas have neither rāga nor kāma when they enter their mothers' womb;
(iii) Heretics cannot gain the five supernatural powers;
(iv) There is no brahmacariyāvāsa among the gods; and
(v) Arhats have ignorance and doubt; they are subject to temptation; they gain spiritual perception with the help of others; and the path is attained by an exclamation.¹

THE UTTARĀPATHAKAS

From the geographical evidences collected by Dr. B. C. Law² about the Uttarāpatha, it appears it might have originally indicated the high road running north from Magadha to the northwest but later on it denoted the area west of Prthudaka (Pehoa, about 14 miles west of Thaneswar) and "comprised the Punjab people including Kashmir and the adjoining hill states with the whole of eastern Afghanistan beyond the Indus, and the present Cis-Sutlej States to the west of the Saraswati. "

The name "Uttarāpathakas" appears only in the Kathāvatthu-atthakathā and not in any other text, not even in the Ceylonese chronicles. Evidently Buddhaghosa had in mind some monks who could not be classed as adherents of the doctrines of a particular school or probably he meant, like the Andhakas, a

¹ The last two opinions are in agreement with those of the Mahāsaṅghikas. See above, p. 85.
² Geogr. of Early Buddhism, p. 48-9.
³ Cunningham's Ancient Geogr. of India, p. 13.
group of schools popular in the north. From the several doctrines attributed by Buddhaghosa to the Uttarāpathakas, it appears it was an eclectic school having doctrines taken from both the Mahāsaṅghika and Theravāda groups and really mark an intermediate stage between Hinayāna and Mahāyāna. The following are some of such doctrines:—

_Re. Buddha._ It is the attainment of bodhi or knowledge of the maggas and omniscience alone that make a Buddha (iv. 6) and that Buddhas are above maitrī and karunā¹ (xviii. 3, 4).

_Re. Bodhisattvas._ On the basis of the stories of the previous births of Gautama Buddha the U. remark that the Buddhas are always endowed with the mahāpurusa laksanās (iv. 7).

_Re. Arhats._ All dhammās (not his body, dress, etc.) possessed by an arhat are pure (anāsava) (K. iv. 3). The arhats are able to end their lives in the same way as Buddha did, (xxii. 3), as described in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta. They admit there may be persons claiming arhathood falsely (xxiii. 2). Taking the instance of Yaśa’s attainment of arhathood they held that a householder (gibi) can attain Arhathood without giving up the householder’s life. The Th. point out that Yaśa may have the gibis signs externally but his mind was free from the ties of a householder (iv. 1). Then on the basis of the existence of Upābacc(Uppajja)-parinibbāyis, the Uttarāpathakas hold that a being, usually a god, at the very moment of his birth, can attain arhathood. They also hold that beings while in the womb or beings just born may attain arhathood on account of their acquisition of sotāpannahood in their previous lives.²

_Re. Samyakavantvāyāma:_ The putthujanas, who are aniyata (not destined to attain Nibbāna) or who are doers of evil acts, may ultimately become niyata and realise the truth. This

¹ See above, p. 43. ² See above, p. 89 n.
they state on the basis of some statements of Buddha who foretold to certain putthujjanas that they would realise the truth ultimately, e.g., in the case of Aṅgulimāla (v. 4; xix. 7).

Allied to the above views, there are two other views of the Uttarāpathakas: one is that the persons who have to take seven more births to attain Nibbāna (sattakkhattuparama) can reach the goal after seven births and not earlier or later. The Th. are not prepared to accept this view on the ground that such persons may quicken their space by greater exertion or retard their progress by performing evil deeds (xii. 5). The second is that an adept may attain the four fruits of sanctification by one magga. The Th. contend that an adept can attain the phalas of the corresponding maggas only, i.e., a sotāpanna gets rid of sakkāyadiṭṭhi, etc. and he cannot attain the phalas of the sakadāgami or anāgami magga, i.e., elimination of rāga, dosa and moha. The Uttarāpathakas do not subscribe to the latter view (xviii. 5).

Re. Anusāyas. According to the U. anusāyas are anārammana and cittavippayutta (see above, p. 94) (ix. 4); past dharmas may be ārammana (ix. 6).

Re. Asamkhataḥ:

(i) nirodhasamāpatti is unconstitution (vi. 5)
(ii) space of all kinds, is unconstitution (vi. 6).

Re. Immutability (niyata): All dharmas like rūpa and vedanā do not change their nature (xxi. 7); karmaic effects also are unalterable (xxi. 8).

Re. Gatis (spheres of existence): The U. count the asūragati as one additional to the usual five, totalling in all six gatis.

Re. Buddhavacana. The U. assert that the religious teachings were revised thrice in the three Councils (xxi. 1).
CHAPTER X

DOCTRINES OF GROUP IV SCHOOLS

The Vātsiputriya-Sāṃmitiyas, Dharmottariyas
and other Schools

This group of schools comprised mainly the Vajjiputtakas or Vātsiputriyas, Dhammuttariyas, Bhadrayānikas, Channagarikas and Sammatiyas. Of these the Vātsiputriyas, later on known as Vātsiputriya-Sāṃmitiyas,¹ became the most prominent school of this group. The monks adhering to these schools were probably those Vajjiputtakas who submitted to the decisions of the Second Council and gave up their heresies as distinguished from those who preferred to remain apart and form a distinct Saṅgha of their own.² We do not hear much about this school in the early history of Buddhism excepting a few criticisms of its radical doctrine of the temporary existence of a self (prajñāpī-sat-pudgala) apart from the five skandhas. This school became popular and most widespread during the reign of Harsavardhana (606-647 A.D.) and it is said that the king’s sister Rājyāśrī joined the school as a bhikṣunī. The Chinese travellers also testify to its wide popularity in India. The earliest evidence to the existence of this school is furnished by a Gupta inscription discovered at Sarnāth,³ which states that this school ousted the Sarvāstivādins about 300 A.D., who had established themselves there after supplanting the

² See Infra.
Theravādins. This inscription is interesting from more than one point of view. It shows that Sarnāth was a centre of the Theravāda group, the earliest popular school,\(^1\) which gradually yielded its place to the next popular school, Sarvāstivāda. Though Sarvāstivāda retained its popularity and influence all over Northern India it had, at least at Sarnāth, given place to the Sāṃmitīyas.

The Sāṃmitīyas ascribed the origin of their school to Mahākaccāyana, the famous monk of Avantī. This established their close connection not only with the Pāli school but also with Avantī, for which their alternative name is given in some sources as Avantaka.\(^2\) Their robes had 21 to 25 fringes and their badge was Soriča flower like those of the Theravādins.\(^3\)

Yuan Chwang writes that he carried to China 15 treatises of this school\(^4\) while I-tsing speaks of its separate Vinaya text.\(^5\) The latter tells us further that this Vinaya had rules regulating the use of undergarment, girdle, medicines, and beds for the members of the sect in a way peculiar to itself. The only treatise that is expressly mentioned as belonging to this school in Nanjio’s Catalogue and extant in Chinese translation is the Sāṃmitīyaśāstra or Sāṃmitīyanikāyāśāstra containing the tenets of this sect. Most of the passages cited in the Kathāvatthu as giving the views of the Sāṃmitīya school are traced in the Pāli Piṭaka. It is very likely that the Sutta-piṭaka of the Sāṃmitīyas was substantially the same as that in Pāli.

1 See Infra.
2 According to Vinitadeva, the Sāṃmitīyas were sub-divided into three sects, Kuru-Kullakas, Avantakas and Vatsiputriyas. See Busston, II, p. 99.
3 Busston, II, p. 100.
4 Watters’ Yuan Chwang, I, pp. 20, 21.
5 Takakusu, I-tsing, pp. 7, 66, 140.
Kapila and Uluka believe in the existence of a permanent soul, which according to them, is different from the constituents of a being and is not a term indicating the flux of elements (skandhasanatana). The soul, the Buddhists assert, can neither be established by direct perception (pratyaksa) nor by inference (anumana).

Vasubandhu (henceforth abbreviated as V.) first defines the contention of the Vatsiputra (henceforth abbreviated as Va) thus: Is the pudgala of the Va real (dravya) or nominal (prajnapati)? By real (dravya) existence he means existence like that of rupa and such other elements and by nominal (prajnapati) he means existence like that of milk, house or army, which has no separate existence of its own apart from its constituents.

If the soul of the Va, be of the former category (dravya), it would be different from the skandhas as vedana is from rupa, and is not also all the skandhas taken together. Now, in that case it should be either samskrta (constituted), or asamskrta (unconstituted). It cannot be the latter, for it would make the Va. hold the Saisvata view, which is heretical.

If the soul of the Va, be of the latter category (prajnapati), its existence is dependent on the skandhas and so cannot have any independent existence of its own, i.e. it does not exist (pudgala iti prajnapatir asat-pudgalah prapnoti).

The Va. contend that their Soul is real (dravya) but it is neither identical with, nor different from, the skandhas as fire is to fuel. Fire exists as long as the fuel lasts, so also soul

1 Vyakhyä (Jap. ed.), p. 697 quotes this stotra:

साधारः मनसि न श्रेयं वाति ज्ञात्ममत्वोऽत्मम
(pudgala) exists as long as there are skandhas otherwise pudgala would be either asaṃskṛta (unconstituted), sāśvata (eternal) or samaskṛta (constituted), aṣāśvata (uccheda—annihilating). Fire is different from fuel inasmuch as it has the power of burning an object to ashes or producing light, which the fuel does not possess.

Vasubandhu argues that fuel and fire appear at different times (bhinnakaḷa) like seed and sprout. Hence fire is impermanent, and the difference between fuel and fire is one of time and characteristics (lakṣaṇa), and again one is the cause of the other.

He then states that according to the Vā., fuel is constituted of three mahābhūtas while fire is of the fourth (tejas) only, then it follows that fire is different from fuel.

The Vā. reply that fire and fuel are co-existent and the latter is a support of the former (upādāya; āśīrya), and that one is not wholly different from the other, for fuel is not totally devoid of the fiery element; in the same way pudgala should be distinguished from skandhas. Vasubandhu challenges the Vā. by citing the instance of a burning log of wood and saying that it represents both fuel and fire and hence they are identical (ananya).

According to the Vā., pudgala is neither to be described as anitya, which is sub-divided into past, present and future nor nitya, eternal. It is avaktavya, indeterminable, inexplicable. It is not included in the list of constituents of a being but is perceived when only all the constituents are present.²

---

1 Cf. the quotation in the Kvn. p. 34:
Khandhesu bhijjamāneṣu so ce bhijjati peggalo
Ucchedā bhavati ditthi yā Buddhena vivajjita
Khandhesu bhijjamāneṣu no ce bhijjati peggalo
Peggalo sassato hoti nibbānena samasamo.

2 Ibid., p. 700: समसं: समस्मयः प्रतिष्ठाने पादीपुलोधः
The question next raised is, can the pudgala of the Vā. be cognized by any sense-organ (indriya), if so, by which? The Vā. reply that it is perceived by all the six sense-organs. They contend that eyes do not care to see rūpa (object) or recognise it unless mind (mana indriya) is there. Eyes act as the dominating factor when the visual action takes place, hence it is not correct to say that eyes alone see rūpa, or for the matter of that, each of of the five sense-organs cannot function in their respective spheres independent of the mind.¹ For cognition of pudgala, the Vā. state that all the sense-organs point out to the mind indirectly that there is a pudgala; eyes, e.g., discern the rūpa (colour-figure) of a body and thereby induces the mind to cognize the presence of an individual (pudgala), but that pudgala is neither identical with, nor different from, rūpa.² V. argues that if rūpa be the cause of cognition of pudgala (रूपाणां कारणत्वमधिकरते) one should not say that rūpa and pudgala are different (anyams),³ again, if cognition of rūpa leads at once to the cognition of pudgala (रूपाणुपादाय पुद्रलोपतिधिति) one should also say that rūpa and pudgala are identical (ananyas)⁴ in other words, one is only a modification of the other (रूपांतरबन्ध). The Vā., however, would neither identify rūpa (colour-figure) with pudgala nor treat them

¹ See above, p. 101; also Masuda, p. 23 n.
² चाहु विभेद्यानि रूपाणि प्रतीयं युहयं प्रतिनिधित्वतीयुपलब्धिति तद्युपादानलाभ। नौ तु वशस्यो रूपाणि वा नौ वेयतवशस्यो भवायथायात्। See Kośa (Fr. transl.) ix, p. 238 fn.
³ Just as light, eyes and mind which cause a visualisation of an object are not different from the object गहि तातुपाणि पुद्रलोपलः: कारणं भवति न च तैत्तिकस्य वशस्य:। एवं तथै: तु रूपम्यालोकान्तेषु सर्वनिःकार्योऽभ्यमनं न वज्ञानम्। Ibid., p. 238 n. See Vyākhyā, p. 701.
⁴ चाहु रूपास्युपलब्धमानः पुद्रलोपलभते सि तैत्तिकम्यालोपलभते आस्तिकिर्मिन्द्रिय।। गहि ततैवं रूपास्युपलब्धमानः पुद्रः प्राप्तोति रूप एव वा तद्युपादाय।। एवं रूपस्यां पुद्रः कस्मिन्देति परिन्कृतः। Ibid., p. 239 n. See Vyākhyā, pp. 701-2.
as different; in the same way they would neither regard the perception of rūpa (colour-figure) as identical with the perception of pudgala nor look upon them as different.

V. asserts that if pudgala be an entity, it should be either material (rūpa) or non-material (nāma), but Buddha says rūpa or vedanā or samjñā or saṃsārā or viññāna is not self—all dharmas are without self—there is no pudgala. He further states that sattva, jiva, or pudgala is a prajñāpti (designation) applied to the false notion of a self cherished by the unenlightened.

The Vā. in reply state that they were not prepared to accept the statements attributed to Buddha as authentic as these were not to be found in their Piṭaka. They referred to statements, in which Buddha spoke of a person’s past existence or recognised pubbenivāsañāna as one of the higher acquisitions of an adept, and asked, who is it that remembers? Is it pudgala or the skandhas? They further argue that if Buddha be regarded as omniscient, i.e. he knows everything past or present, of every place, of every being etc. it also implies a continuity of something, in other words, it implies the existence of a pudgala. The Vā. further state that unless there were some form of pudgala why the disciples should be instructed to avoid thinking of rūpavān abham babhūvatīte 'dhuani (in the past I possessed a body) and so forth.3

V. refutes this contention by saying that pudgala here refers only to skandha-santāna (continuity of skandhas) and not to anything else. The Vā. then cite the Bhārāhārasūtra, and assert

1 Cf. Vyākhyā, सूत्रसूत्रभाष्य भास्त्र 
2 Cf. Majjhima, I. p. 22: so evam samāhīte citte parisuddhe pariyyodāte anāngane...pubbenivāsañussaratīnānaya cittam abhinimmāmeti. 
3 Cf. Majjhima, I. p. 3: ahośin nu kho aham atitam addhānāṃ, ......kim butvā kim ahośin nu kho atitam addhānāṃ, etc. etc.
that by bhāra is meant the constituents (skandhas) of a being and by bhārabhāra the individual (pudgala) who is known by a name, gotra etc.¹ If bhāra (= skandhas) included bhāra hāra (= pudgala), there was no need of distinguishing the two and so pudgala exists apart from skandhas, it is neither identical with nor different from skandhas.

The Vā. admit the existence of aupapādika beings and antarābhava,² and prove thereby the existence of pudgala. They also cite the passage "ekapuggalo bhikkhave loke uppaṭajamāno uppaṭati bahujanabhātāya (Aṅguttara, 1. 22) and lay stress on the word "puggala", saying this "puggala" is born (uppaṭati) and hence there is besides the skandhas something, which may be designated as "puggala". V. refutes all these by appropriate quotations and arguments.

The Vā. further state that if the pudgala is only a word meant to designate the five skandhas, then why Bhagavā did not identify iva with ṛṣīra. V. cites the discussion on the topic from the Milindapañha. The Vā. further argue that why pudgala has been declared by Buddha as indeterminable (avyākta), well, if it does not exist, then why Bhagavā did not declare that iva does not exist absolutely. V. in reply comments on the Vatsagotra sūtra and other sūtras dealing with the indeterminable problems.

The Vā. point out that the statement ātmā does not exist in reality (satyataḥ sthitah)³ is a wrong view, it indirectly implies the admission of the existence of pudgala.

¹ Cf. Vyākhyā (Jap. ed.), p. 706, bhāraḥ katamāḥ, pañcopādānaspandhāḥ. ......bhārabhāraḥ katamāḥ, pudgala iti syād vacaniyaḥ yo ‘śav āyuśman evaṃnāma evamāgya evangotra etc.
² Cf. Kāla, ii. 10, 12, 18-19, quoting सरस्वती वस्मिनिषु।
³ Cf. Majjhima, i. p. 8: Ātthi me attā ti vā ‘ssa saccato thetato
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The Vā. next raise the question, if pudgala does not exist, who it is that transmigrates from one existence to another. If the elements only exist, how do you explain when Buddha says "I was at that time the master Sunetro and in that statement why 'I' of the past is identified with 'I' of the present; does it indicate that the elements of the past are the elements of the present?" V. refuted it by saying that just as fire passes from one wood to another, the fire never remaining the same, so the elements pass from one existence to another, nothing remaining identical. If, according to the Vā., Buddhas admit the existence of pudgala they would be subject to the wrong belief of satkāyadrsti.

The Vā. now ask, how can memory be explained without the conception of 'pudgala'. Who is it that remembers; V. answers that it is samjñā that remembers—samjñā with attention directed to the object, an idea etc. similar to, or connected with it, provided there is no corporeal pain to impair its capacity.9

The Vā. are of opinion that there must be an agent, a doer, a proprietor of the memory. There must be a cognizing agent, an action must have a doer. 'Devadatta walks' implies the exis-

ditthi uppajjati, natthi me attā ti vā 'ssa saccato thetato ditthi uppa-
jjati, etc.

1 Sunetro nāma lāste ti. Saptasūryodayasūtre yam eva Bhagavān
ṛṣiḥ Sunetra nāma babhūveri. See Kośa (transl.), V, p. 271: Kośa-
vāyākhya, p. 710.

2 Kośavyākhya, p. 710: यथा तू पञ्चकोटिप्रितिति विकारे। स ईशानारी-
विनियोगं संवर्तनीयमि

3 Ibid., p. 710: तत्भवसमहसंभन्ति-संभविन्यासोऽविनंबिनियमि:
"भारत"

ध्वनि पञ्चकोटिप्रितिति भारतसन्तर्क लघुविशेषस्य च नै कर्तवमहिमारिनियमि
स्मिन विशेषस्य च नै कर्तव लघुविशेषस्य च नै कर्तवमहिमारिनियमि:

| 1 Sunetro nāma lāste ti. Saptasūryodayasūtre yam eva Bhagavān ṛṣiḥ Sunetra nāma babhūveri. See Kośa (transl.), V, p. 271: Kośavyākhya, p. 710. |
| 2 Kośavyākhya, p. 710: यथा तू पञ्चकोटिप्रितिति विकारे। स ईशानारीविनियोगं संवर्तनीयमि
| 3 Ibid., p. 710: तत्भवसमहसंभन्ति-संभविन्यासोऽविनंबिनियमि:
"भारत"

ध्वनि पञ्चकोटिप्रितिति भारतसन्तर्क लघुविशेषस्य च नै कर्तवमहिमारिनियमि
स्मिन विशेषस्य च नै कर्तव लघुविशेषस्य च नै कर्तवमहिमारिनियमि: |
tence of an individuality. V. replies that it is not so. He states that just as when a fire traverses from one forest to another, no question of individuality arises, similarly Devadatta is a praṇāpti (like fire) applied to a conglomeration of elements passing from one existence to another and has no individuality.

Now, we shall pass on to the arguments of the Vā. and the counter-arguments of the Theravādins as presented in the Kathāvatthu, which being of a much earlier date than that of the Koṣa, follows a form of controversy, quite different from that of the medieval and modern dialecticians.

The first question put by the Theravādins to the Vāciputriyas, known in the Pāli texts as Sammiṭiyas, is as follows: Can the puggala be known in the same way as that which is real and ultimate, e.g. Nibbāna (or Rūpa) is known? (para 1). In other words, the Theravādins want to ascertain whether the Sammiṭiyas (henceforth abbreviated as Sam.) admit the existence of the puggala either as the unchangeable, ever-existing reality like Nibbāna, or as a constituted (sappaccaya-saṃkhata) object like rūpa, or regard it as false as a mirage (māyāmaricē viya), or look upon it simply as a hearsay. The Sam. deny practically all the four possibilities though they assert that the puggala is known as a real and ultimate fact (saccikaṭṭhaparamatthena).

The Sam. now assail the Th. with the counter-question whether the latter would admit that the puggala is not known in the same way as that which is real and ultimate. The Th. answered in the affirmative as according to them puggala is not even an object like rūpa; it is a mere paññatti (conventional term), a sammutisacca (so-called truth).

1 “Para” refers to the paragraphs marked in the P.T.S. edition of the Kathāvatthu.
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But when the same question is repeated by the Sam. (as in paras 2 and 6), the Th. reply in the negative by saying "na h' evam", because the answer is to be given to a question which included both sammutisacca (conventional truth) and paramattha-sacca (the highest truth). The questions and answers which follow next have mixture of both sammuti and paramattha truths, and so they appear contradictory to a superficial reader.

Now the Th. give up the logical tricks and put the question straight (para 11) thus: whether puggala is a paramattha-sacca, or not, i.e. whether or not the puggala is known in the same way as the real and ultimate everywhere (sabbattha) in and outside rūpa (material parts of the body), always (sabbadā) in this and the following existences, and in everything (sabbesu) i.e., in all khandhas, āyatana, dhātus etc. The answer of the Sam. is also definitely in the negative, i.e., they do not consider "puggala" as real in the highest sense, and as existing everywhere, always and in everything as pointed out by the Th.

The next attempt of the Th. is to find out whether the Sam. regard puggala as something existing like any of the 57 elements, rūpa, vedanā, saññā, etc. The Sam. deny it saying they do not admit puggala as an element apart from the 57 elements, and in support of their contention they quote from the Nikāyas (Digbha, iii, 232; Majjhima, i. 341; Āṅguttara, ii. 95) the passage "atthi puggalo attahitāya patipanno", which indicates that puggala

1 The remaining paras 3-5 and 7-10 are mere logical rounding up of the questions and answers put in paras 1 & 2.
2 The question is,—Yo saccikattho paramattho tato so puggalo n'upalabbhāti saccikattha-parametthanāti ti?
3 Perhaps like the jñātman of the Vedānta School of Philosophy.
4 Samayasuttavirodham divsā patikkhepo paravādissa, Āsthakathā, p. 16.
exists but not apart from the elements. The Th. also do not clearly state that puggala (as a paññatti) is different from the elements, the reason assigned by Buddhaghosa being that the questions of the opponents have a mixture of sammadhi and paramaññatta truths and as such the Th. have no other alternative but to leave them unanswered (ṭhapanīya).

The next attempt of the Th. is to show that the Sam. should advocate either Ucchedavāda or Sissatavāda. With this end in view the Th. put the questions whether puggala is identical with rūpa, or different from rūpa, or puggala is in rūpa (like the container and the contained) or rūpa is in puggala. The Sam. reject all the four propositions as otherwise they would become either an Ucchedavadin or a Sissatavadin. Though, according to the Sam., puggala is of the same nature (ekadhammo) as rūpa and other elements, they would not treat it as an element separate from, and independent of, the 57 elements.

The Th. now assail their opponents by questioning on lakkhaṇas of the puggala, and ask whether the puggala is sappaccaya (caused) and samkhata (constituted) like rūpa, or is appaccaya (uncased) and asamkhata (unconstituted) like Nibbāna. The Sam. deny both and ask how the Th. would explain the 'puggala' in the statement of Buddha: ‘Atthi puggalo attahitāyā paṭipanno ti.’ Is the puggala referred to in this passage sappaccaya, samkhata or appaccaya, asamkhata? The Th. deny both, as in their opinion the term puggala is only a sammadhi-sacca, and as such it is non-existing.

1 See his Aṭṭhakathā, p. 16.
2 Paras 130-137 dilate on the above question, comparing it with each of the 57 elements.
3 Aṭṭhakathā, p. 18.
The next argument put forward by the Th. is whether the statement "puggala perceives" is the same as the statement, "that which perceives is puggala" i.e. whether the two statements are identical as citta is with mano or different as rūpa is from vedanā. Buddhaghosa interprets the position of the opponents thus: the Sam. hold that puggala perceives but not everything that perceives is puggala, e.g., rūpa, vedanā, etc. are not puggala but that puggala perceives and that which perceives referred only to the percepient (puggala), and not to rūpādi. The opponents, however, rely on the statement "atthi puggalo attahitāya patipanno ti" which, again is counteracted by the Th. by saying that the Sam. should equally rely on the statement "suññato lokaṃ avekkhassu, etc." and admit that there is no puggala.

The Th. now proceed to examine the paññatti (description) of puggala. In answer to the question whether the puggala of the Rūpadhātu is rūpi and likewise of the Kāmadhātu is kāmi and of the Arūpadhātu, arūpi, the Sam. affirm the first and the third but not the second. The Sam. argue that puggala = satta = āva and kāya = sarīna. Though they do not admit either the identity of, or difference between, āva and sarīna, they hold, though not logically tenable, that kāya must be different from

1 Puggalo upalabhāti (yo yo) upalabhāti (so so) puggalo ti? Kved., p. 24.

Puggala as there are such statements as 'so kāye kāyānupassi viharati and so forth', in which so cannot but refer to puggala.

The next discussion relating to upādāpannatti (rebirth) of puggala raises the question of transmigration. The Sam. affirm that puggala passes from this world to the next but it is neither the self-same puggala nor a different puggala—a statement similar to what the Th. would say about the passing of the khandhas—avoiding the two heretical opinions of sassatavāda and ucceda-vāda as also the ekaccasassatikavāda and amarāvikkhepadittī. In support of their contention the Sam. quoted the passages in which a "puggala" is said to pass from one world to another (sandhāvati samsaratī).

Accepting the opinion of the opponents that the self-same, or a different, puggala does not pass from one existence to another, the Th. point out that they admit that some form of puggala referred to in the above-mentioned passages does pass from one existence to another. This puggala can then have no death, it once becomes a man and then a god and so forth, which is absurd. In reply the Sam. point out that a sotāpanna-manussa is known to take rebirth as a sotāpanna-deva and question how can this sotāpanna-hood pass from one existence to another unless there exists some form of puggala to carry the qualities. In order to show the unsoundness of the statement, the Th. ask whether the passing puggala remains identical in every respect and does not lose any of its qualities. The opponents first negative it on the ground that a man does not continue to be a man in the devaloka. But on second thought they affirm it in view of the fact that the carrier of certain qualities from one

1 See my Early Monastic Buddhism, I, pp. 51 ff.
2 Anāñño = sabbākārata ekasadiso.
3 Āvigato = ekena pi ākāreraṇa āvigato.
existence to another is a puggala, an antarābhāvapuggala. The Sam. take care to keep clear of the two extreme views: tam ēvaṁ tam sarīram and aNNām ēvaṁ aNNām sarīram. They affirm that the transformed khandhas and puggala and not the identical khandhas and puggala pass from one existence to another. The khandhas are, however, impermanent and constituted while the puggala is not so but it is not also permanent and unconstituted. Without khandha, āyatana, dhātu, indriya and citta, puggala cannot remain alone but for that reason, the colour and other qualities of the khandha, āyatana, etc. do not affect the puggala. Again the puggala is not a shadow (cāyā) of the khandhas.

In reply to the question whether puggala is perceivable in every momentary thought, the Sam. answer in the affirmative but they would not accept the inference drawn by the Th. that the puggala in that case would have momentary existence (khaṇika-bhāvam) i.e. would die and be reborn every moment like citta (thoughts).

The Sam. now ask the Th. whether they would admit that one (yo) who sees something (yam) by means of an organ of sense (yena) is the puggala or not. The Th. after assenting to it as a conventional truth (sammutisucca), put the same question in the negative form thus: One (yo) who2 does not see anything (yam) by means of an organ of sense (yena) is not a puggala. The Sam., however, without arguing further quote a few passages in which Buddha said: I (i.e. the puggala) see by means of my divine eyes (dibbena cakkhana) beings appearing and disappearing and so forth, and infer therefrom that the seer is the puggala.

1 The self which exists between death and rebirth. See above p. 103-4.
2 E.g., a blind man, an asaṅñasatta.
Their next discussions related to purusākāra. The Th. do not admit any doer, so they asked the Sam. whether the latter would subscribe to the same opinion. On their denial, the Th. asked whether the Sam. would admit the existence of the doer, and a creator of the doer, which is negated by the Sam. on account of the heretical doctrine of issaranimmāna (god the creator of the world) but on second thought affirmed it in view of the fact that the parents, teachers etc. are also in a sense the makers (kattākāretā) of a person. The Th., without going into the implied sense of the replies, say that such a state of things, i.e., a doer having a doer and a deed implies not just a deed but also a doer, would lead to the conclusion that so long there is deed (kamma), there is its doer (kārako puggalo) and hence there can be no end to puggalaparamparā and that would falsify the fact that by the stoppage of the wheel of actions, dukkha can be brought to an end. Then again nibbāna, mahāpāthavi, etc. must also have a doer. All the inferences drawn by the Th. are rejected by the Sam. In conclusion the Sam. deny that the deed and the doer can be distinct, just to avoid admitting that the puggala has mental properties.

In the above, the doer of a deed is enquired into, while in the following discussion identity of the doer of a deed with the enjoyer of its fruit is enquired into.

The Th. deny the existence of a feeler or enjoyer apart from vipākapavatti, (that which is realised, the fructification of an effect). The Sam. hold that pâtissamveditabba is vipāka (result) but the puggala is not vipāka.¹ They further state that Nibbāna or Mahāpāthavi, etc. is not vipāka like divine happiness (dibba-

¹ But it may happen that puggala who is in the enjoyment of his fruits, say, merits, may be again an object of enjoyment of another puggala, e.g. a son enjoying the fruits of his actions may be the object
sukha) or human happiness (manussasukha) so none of them is an object of enjoyment of the puggala but again the Sam. do not admit that sukha is distinct from the sukha-enjoyer. The Th. logically wanted to make their opponents admit that there must be not only an enjoyer of a fruit but also an enjoyer of the enjoyer of the fruit and so on an endless chain, in other words, according to them, as shown above dukkha can have no end.

The Th. now put the crucial question thus: whether the doer of a deed is identical with, or different from, the enjoyer of its fruit. The opponents first deny both to avoid contradiction of Buddha’s saying: sayam katam param katam sukhadukkham, etc. but on second thought in view of their theory that there is a common element keeping the link between the present and the future life, they admit it. In short, the Sam. affirm that there is a kāraka (doer) and vedaka (feeler or enjoyer) of a deed, but the two are neither identical nor different, neither both identical and different, nor not both identical and different.

The Sam. next apply the test of abhiññā (supernormal powers), nāti (relatives) and phala (attainments) and put the propositions thus:

(i) How can a person perform certain miracles keeping his organs of sense etc. inert and inactive, unless there is something else as puggala.

(ii) How can one recognise the existence of parents, castes, etc. without positing that there is a puggala, and

(iii) How can a phalastha continue to be the same in his more than one birth, unless the existence of a puggala is admitted.

of affection of his mother and so forth. This explanation of Buddha-ghosa should be compared with the above like the kāretā of kattā.
The Th. avoid the issues by putting the counter-arguments that one who cannot perform miracles is not a puggala, and in this way they refute the other two propositions.

The next question of the Th. is whether puggala is constituted (samkhata) or unconstituted or neither constituted nor unconstituted (n'eva samkhato nāsamkhato). The Sam. affirm the last alternative but would not treat puggala as something apart (aṇīno) from the samkhata-khandhas. They state that the puggala has certain aspects of samkhata, e.g., it is subject to sukha, dukkha, and so forth; again it has certain aspects of asamkhata, e.g., it is not subject to birth, old age and death (jāti, jāra, and maraṇa).

In reply to the Th.'s question whether a parinibbuto puggalo exists in Nibbāna or not, the Sam. negative both as the affirmation of either would make them either a Sassaṭavādin or an Ucchedavādin.

Now the Sam. put the counter question: does not a person say that he is feeling happy or unhappy and so forth, how can a person say so unless he is a puggala and not a mere conglomeration of separate khandhas. In refuting this contention, the Th. put the same question in a negative form thus: well, if a person does not feel happiness or unhappiness, then there is no puggala. The Th. further ask whether Sam. would treat sukha and puggala as something separate and distinct. The Sam. evade a direct answer and ask, well, when a puggala (koci or so) is said to be kāye kāyānupassit viharati, does it not affirm the existence of a puggala?

The controversy is then closed by citations of passages from the Nikāyas, the Th. quoting only those which clearly express anattā of all things while the Sam. quote those in which the word puggalo or attābitta or so appeared.
Through these controversies it is apparent that the Sam. are seeking to establish that the five khandhas which are distinct from one another cannot give rise to the consciousness of I-ness, a unity. The facts that a person acts or thinks as one and not as five separate things, and that in many passages Buddha does actually use the words so, attā and puggala, and that a person's attainments like sotāpannahood continue to be the same in different births, that one speaks of his past births and so forth, do lead to the conclusion that besides the five khandhas there exists some mental property which forms the basis of I-ness, and maintains the continuity of karma from one existence to another. That mental property, however, is changing with the changing khandhas but in view of the fact that one can think of his past, even of the events of his past births, the changing khandhas alone cannot be made responsible for the memory. The Sam. therefore affirm the existence of a sixth mental property and call it puggala which can remain only along with khandhas and so must disappear when the khandhas disappear in Nibbāna. As this mental property or puggala is not kṣañika like the khandhas, it has not all the properties of a samkhata (constituted object) and again it is not also unchanging and ever existing like Nibbāna so it is not asamkhata. Therefore the puggala must be said as neither samkhata nor asamkhata.¹

¹ Cf. Obermiller's Analysis of the Abhisamayālāṃkāra, III. p. 380, referring to Tarkājoāla and Schayer, Kamalaśīla's Kritik der Pudgala- Vāda. Obermiller writes 'the Vātsiputriyas, Bhadrayānikas, Śāṃmītyīs, Dharmaguptas and Samkrāntivādins are those that admit the reality of the 'individual.' They say that the 'individual' is something inexpressible, being neither identical with the five groups of elements nor differing from them. It is to be cognised by the six forms of vijñānas and is subject to samsāra (phenomenal existence).
Vasumitra summarises the doctrine of the Sammitiyas or the Vātsiputriyas thus:

1. The *pudgala* is neither the same as the *skandhas* nor different from the *skandhas*. The name *pudgala* is provisionally given to an aggregate of *skandhas*, *āyatanaṇas* and *dbātus*.

2. Dharmas cannot transmigrate from one world to another apart from the *pudgala*. These can be said to transmigrate along with the *pudgala*.

**Other doctrines**

Vasumitra attributes to the Vātsiputriyas a few other views which have already been discussed. These are,—

(i) The five *vijñāṇas* conduct neither to *sarāga* (desire) nor to *virāga* (removal of desires);¹

(ii) To become free from desire (*virāga*) one must relinquish the *samyojanas* which can be destroyed by an adept when he reaches *bhāvanāmārga* and not while he remains in *darianamārga*;

(iii) When one has entered the *samyaktvanyāma* he is called *pratipannaka* in the first twelve moments of the *darianamārga* and when he is in the thirteenth he is called *phalastha*.²

(iv) There is *antarēbhava*.³ The Sammitiyas like the Sarvāstivādins hold that every being be he destined for Kāmaloka or Rūpaloka by his *karma*, remains for some time in an intermediate state of existence. At that time the body takes no material form not even the *skandhas*. It is not an independent state.

¹ See ante, pp. 99-101.
² Cf. Masuda’s notes in the *Asia Major*, II. p. 56. In short, the Sammitiyas count in all fourteen moments instead of Sarvāstivādin’s sixteen; so the 13th moment of the Sammitiyas corresponds to the 15th of the Sarvāstivādins; see p. 155-6.
³ See ante, pp. 103-4, 162.
of existence but just a waiting stage preliminary to his existence in one of the two lokas. The Sammitiyas add that those beings who are destined for hells, or Asaññī sphere or Arūpaloka have no antarābhava.

(v) Paribhāyati arabhā arabhattā ti (Kvn. I. 2).
(vi) N'atthi devesu brahmācariyavāso ti (Kvn. I. 3).
(vii) Odhisodhiso kilese jabatiti (Kvn. I. 4).
(viii) Jabati puthuṣaṇo kāmarūga-byāpādan ti? (Kvn. I. 5).

DHAMMUTTARIYA, BHADRAYĀNIYA AND CHAN-NAGARIKA

Vasumitra skips over the special doctrines of these three schools,§ mentioning in verse only that they differed regarding the attainments of an arhat, and the consequent chances of fall from arhatthood. It seems that in other matters, these three schools agreed with the views of the Sammitiyas.

VIBHAJYAVĀDA

This is one of the schools enlisted by Bhavya and Vinitadeva, but not by Vasumitra. It does not also appear in the list of schools of the Ceylonese chronicles. Bhavya and Vinitadeva treat it as an offshoot of the Sarvāstivāda school. Prof. La Vallée Poussin has traced in the Chinese commentary of the Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi a passage in which Vibhajyavādins are identified with the Prajñaptivādins.§ This apparently refers to the Bahuṣrutiyavibhajyavādins,§ by which name the Prajñaptivādins distinguished themselves from the Bahuṣrutiyas. Prof. Poussin has shown that the position of the Vibhajyavādins cannot be clearly made out as their doctrines have much in com-

1 See ante, pp. 85 f., 149 f.
2 See ante, p. 152.
3 See ante, p. 156.
4 See ante, p. 157.
5 See ante, pp. 48-9.
6 Kośa, Intro., p. lv.
7 See above, p. 108.
mon with the doctrines of the Sarvāstivādins, Mahāsāṅghikas, Sammitīyaś and others. To add to this confusion, we have the Ceylonese traditions, in which the Pāli School, i.e. the Theravaṇḍins preferred to call themselves, Vibhajyavādins.¹ This anomalous position of the Vibhajyavādins, it seems, may be explained by regarding them not as an independent school, but as a term to denote those who did not accept the doctrines of a particular school in toto.² To wit, it may be shown that those Sarvāstivādins who did not accept the *sarbam asti* thesis in toto and held instead the opinion that the past which has not yet produced its fruits and the future does not exist were known as Vibhajyavādins, i.e. Sarvāstivaṇḍa-vibhajyavādin just as we have Bahuṣrutīya-vibhajyavādin. On this analogy we may explain that among the Theravādins perhaps, there were some dissenting groups who were distinguished as Theravāda-vibhajyavādins. The Ceylonese monks of Mahāvihāra probably preferred to call themselves Vibhajyavādin as we find it clearly expressed in the versified table of contents of chapter III of the Cullavaggī³ and in the colophon of the commentary on the *Tīka-pattabhāna*,⁴ as also in the *Dīpavamsa*, (xviii. 41, 44). In the

¹ *Mahāvamsa*, p. 54.
³ See *Vinaya*, CV, pp. 72, 312: ‘ācariyānaṃ Vibhajjāvādānaṁ Tambapaṇṇidipapasādakānaṁ Mahāvihāravāśināṃ vācaṃ saddhamma-ṭṭhitiya ti.
⁴ *Tīka-pattabhāna* (Cy), p. 366: ‘ācariyānaṃ vādam avihāya
account of the Third Council, as given in the Ceylonese chronicles\(^1\) as also in Buddhaghosa's commentaries,\(^2\) the Vibhajjavādins were declared as orthodox monks.\(^3\)

As Vasumitra does not count the Vibhajjavādins as one of the sects, he has not mentioned any special doctrines of theirs. It is only in the Abhidharmakośa that we come across certain doctrines attributed to this sect. Evidently Vasubandhu had in his mind the Sarvāstivāda-vibhajjavādins. The doctrines as summarised by Prof. La Vallée Poussin are in short as follows:

1. Sound is an effect (saddo vipāko, Kum. xii. 3; Kośa, i. 37)
2. The faculties of faith, memory etc. (Sraddhendriya, Smṛtindriya etc.) are pure (anāsrava). (Kośa, ii. 9).
3. There is no intermediate state of existence (antarābhava) (Kośa, iii. 10).
4. The pratyāyatamūtpāda is unconstituted (asamskṛta) (Kośa, ii. 28).
5. Abhidhyā, vyāpāda, mithyādṛṣṭi are physical acts (kāyika).

Vibhajjavādissānaṃ etc.; p. 367: theravāmsappadipānaṃ therānaṃ Mahāvihāravāsināṃ vamsallakārabhūteṣa vipula-visuddhabuddhīnā Buddhaghosai ti . . . . therena katā.

1 Mahāvamsa, V. 271.
2 Kathāvatthu-attakhathā, p. 6.
3 Before Vibhajjavāda came to refer to a sect, it simply meant one who dealt with the metaphysical problems analytically, from a particular standpoint as opposed to one who solved the problems straightforwardly (ekasmavādīn) by a direct answer. See Majjhima, II, pp. 99, 107; cf. EMB., I, p. 124: Vibhajjavākaṇāniya and Ekamśavākaṇāniya. In the Majjhima, I, p. 163; Paññāsaṅgīti, II, p. 171, Buddha declared that he knew theravāda, which, according to Buddhaghosa, meant thirabbāvavāda (mental steadiness). Though these two terms Vibhajjavāda and Theravāda were used in the Nikāyas, they did not denote any sect, but we may take them as the source, from which the sectarian name issued later on.
vi Bhagavān is always in meditation (Kośa. Fr. transl. iv, p. 40 n) and has no muddha (Ibid).

vii Vibhavatṛṣṇā is abandoned by bhāvanā (Kośa, iv. 10-11).

viii Arhats have no fall (Kośa. vi. 58).

ix There are 41 Bodhipaksīka-dharmas (Kośa. vi. p. 281n: the four additional dharmas are the four ārya-vamsas. See Mahāvyutpatti).

x There is rūpa (matter) in the Ārūpya-dhātu (Kośa. viii. 3. See Fr. transl, p. 135 n.).

Some schools like the Andhakas, Mahāsaṅghikas, Mahiśāsakas point out that rūpa exists in ārūpyadhātu but in a very subtle state. The contention of the Vibhajyavādins is possibly the same as that of the Tāmraparṇīyas (Kośa. i. 39) who state that mano-dhātu is a material organ, which they call badayavattu (see Visuddhimagga, p. 447). This basis of the mano-dhātu, which is material, exists in the Ārūpyadhātu.

xi The Ārya of the 4th Ārūpya (i.e. nevasamjñānāsamjñāyatana) obtains arhathood without the aid of the magga. This is a doctrine of the Mahiśāsakas.

xii There are twelve viparyāsas, (see Vyākhyā, p. 454) of which eight are removed by darśanamārga and four by bhāvanāmārga (Kośa. v. p. 23 n.).

xiii jñāna is the same as dharmas which are good by nature (svabhāvutah), while vijñāna means those dharmas which are good by association (samprayogatah), i.e., associated with jñāna (Kośa. iv. p. 33 n. ix, p. 248 n).

xiv Realisation of the four truths takes place all at once and not gradually (Kośa, vi, pp. 185, 123).

1 Vyākhyā, p. 39: तत्तथपौयायार्थः प्रदःकन्यतनासम्प्रदायीस्तथर्यं जल्लादिः।

तत्तत्त्वभवामि विद्याय किं विनाशात्मानि। बाह्यविधानमिः कि तेऽः विषयमिस्त मेनि।

2 See above, pp. 154-6.
CHAPTER XI

DOCTRINES OF GROUP V SCHOOLS

Sthaviravāda or Theravāda

(including Mahāvihāravāsins and Abhayagirivāsins)

According to both Pāli and Sanskrit traditions, the original school, which the Ceylonese chronicles would not count as a schismatic, was called Theravāda or Sthaviravāda.

An alternative name of the Sthaviravādins is given as Vibhajjavyādins. It is doubtful whether any independent school went by the name of Vibhajjavyāda. It has been shown above that Vibhajjavyāda was sometimes affixed to the name of a school to show that certain adherents of a school differed in minor points from the principal doctrines of a particular school and preferred to distinguish themselves as Vibhajjavyādin of that particular school. In this way we may explain the Vibhajjavyāda of the Ceylonese tradition, that is to say, the Ceylonese did not accept in toto the doctrine of Theravāda and preferred to distinguish themselves as Sthavira-vibhajjavyādi or simply Vibhajjavyādi. In the Kathāvatthu the term Sakavāda is used instead of Sthaviravāda or Vibhajjavyāda.

Huen Tsang speaks of a group of monks as Mahāyānists of the Sthavira school. From his records, it seems that he divided the monks of Ceylon into two groups, calling the Mahāvihāra-

1 Dipavamsa, V. 51: Sattarasa bhinnavādā eko vādo abhinnako. See Watters, I, p. 164.
2 See above, p. 196. 3 Points of Controversy, p. xli.
4 Watters, II, p. 234.
vāsins as Hīnayāna-Sthaviras and the Abhayagirivāsins as Mahāyāna-Sthaviras. He came across such Mahāyānist Sthaviras in the Mahābodhi-saṅghārāma, built in Gaya by a king of Ceylon,¹ in Kāliṅga² and Surat.³ In the monasteries of Samatāta,⁴ Drāvīḍa,⁵ he says, the monks belonged to the Sthavira school without any mention of Mahāyāna. He was aware of the split of the Buddhist church into two schools, Sthaviras and Mahāsaṅghikas,⁶ and quite deliberately used the expression Mahāyānist Sthaviras. His remarks about the division of monks in Ceylon remind us about the Ceylonese tradition that the Abhayagiri monastery became for some time a centre of the Vetulyakas, the immediate forerunners, we may say, of the Mahāyānists,⁷ and very probably the Chinese pilgrim referred to the Vetulyakas or the monks generally living in the Abhayagiri monastery as Sthaviras of the Mahāyāna school. By Mahāyānist Sthaviras Huien Tsang probably meant those monks who followed Vinaya rules of the Sthaviravādins but held views of the Mahāyānists like Suññatāvāda of the Vetulyakas.

In the Abhidharmakośa and its bhāṣya,⁸ certain erudite monks are referred to as Sthaviras e.g. Sthavira Samghabhadra, Sthavira Vasubandhu, Sthavira Śrīlāta while the Chinese commentators on the texts point out that by “nikāyāntara,” the text referred to the Sthavira school. In the Kośavyākhyā (p. 705), there is a reference to the Tāmrapaṇṭiyanikāya. These references, however, are too inadequate for drawing any conclusion.

Leaving aside for the present the Haimavatas, or the Mahāyānist Sthaviras let us turn to the original Sthavira school which

3 Ibid., II, p. 248. 4 Ibid., II,p. 188.
7 See above, p. 110. 8 See Koṣa, Index, s.v. Sthavira.
claimed the Pāli scriptures as its own, or to be more precise, to the Sthaviravādins of the Mahāvihāra of Ceylon. Vasumitra has passed over the doctrines of this school while the Kathāvatthu refers to them by the word sakavāda. For the purpose of finding out the distinctive doctrines of this school, we shall elicit from the Kathāvatthu the views of the Sakavādins as against those of other schools on any particular doctrine.

Centres of popularity

The Tibetan traditions ascribe the foundation of this school to Mahākaccāyana¹ who was a native of Ujjeni, son of the priest of king Caṇḍa Pajjota of Avanti. The Pāli traditions, however, give prominence to Upāli, and speak of the succession of his disciples, the chief of whom was Dāsaka. The latter's disciples were Siggava and Caṇḍavajji who were young at the time of the Second Council.²

The events of the Second Council, in which the Theravādins became separated from the main body, indicate that the monks of the west, specially of Kauśāmbī and Avanti, formed the nucleus of this sect. The biography of Mahinda, who is mainly responsible for the propagation of this school of Buddhism in Ceylon, also shows that this school was more popular in the west than in the east. Taking into consideration all these facts, it may be stated that the Theravādins had one centre at Pātaliputra along with other schools but were chiefly concentrated in and

¹ See also Mahākarmavibhanga, p. 61-2.
² Atthasālīni (p. 32) however gives prominence to the disciples of Sāriputta, the chief of the Ābhidhammikas thus: Sāriputta-Bhaddaji-Sobhita-Piyājāli-Piyāpāla-Piyadassi-Kosiya-putta-Siggava-Sandeva-Moggali-putta, etc. Moggali-putta Tissa was a disciple of Siggava and Caṇḍavajji. See Samantapāśādikā, 1, p. 40.
around Ujjeni, which became its second but more important centre.

In the Sarnāth inscription, there is a reference to the existence of the Theravādins at that place in the early days, while in the Nāgarjunikōṇḍa inscriptions, mention is made of the activities of this sect in the propagation of Buddhism. In the Maṇimekhalai, we find that it had its popularity in countries around Kāṇci, which became one of their principal centres in the post-Christian eras. The fact that Buddhaghosa and Dharmapāla had their training at Kāṇci goes to show that Kāṇci became later on the educational seat of the Theravādins. After Mahinda’s demise the school obtained a firm footing in Ceylon and made the Mahāvihāra its chief academic centre. Hiuen Tsang saw one hundred monasteries of the Sthavira school in Drāviḍa, and also in Samatāta. He says that Dharmapāla was born in the Drāviḍa country. From this survey, it may be stated that the school originated at Pātaliputra, became popular in the western countries, making Ujjeni its second centre and then it gradually made headway towards the south, settling in and around Kāṇci, and was ultimately established in Ceylon.

Language

According to the Tibetan traditions, this school had its Piṭaka in the Pāśāci dialect. There is much value in this tradition. Grierson holds that Pāśāci had its home in the North-West (Kekaya and Gandhāra i.e. near Taxila) and that it gradu-

2 Watters, II, p. 226.
ally made its way to the western countries upto the Konkan coast.\(^1\) Guṇāḍhya, who belonged to Ujjeni, it is said, wrote *Bṛhatkathā* in Paiśāci.\(^2\) On philological ground Sten Konow localises Paiśāci around the Vindhya hills. He holds that Pāli is the literary form of Paiśāci. The traditions preserved in the Ceylonese chronicles also indicate that Pāli had its home somewhere in Avanti. So it is quite possible that the Tibetan tradition refers to Pāli as literary Paiśāci.

**Literature**

The whole of the Pāli literature belongs to this school and as such it hardly needs any further comment. The only information that we should add is that Hiuen Tsang records that he carried to China fourteen volumes of the Sthavira Sūtras, Śāstras and Vinaya. No Sinologist has so far dealt with this literature and we are still in the dark about the Sthaviras whom the Chinese pilgrim had in view.

**Doctrines**

The Theravāda doctrines are fairly well known and have been given in detail in the first volume of this work (chs. xii-xv). Our object here will be to mention the differences which this school had with the other schools, as pointed out by Vasu- mitra and Buddhaghosa. These differences are discussed in detail in connection with the doctrines of each school and so these are not repeated here. It should be noted that the doctrines of the Sarvāstivādins, Sammitīyas, Mahiśāsakas, Sautrāntikas and the Mahāsaṅghikas have been mainly kept in view.

\(^1\) *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*, pp. 119-120; see also *JRAS.*, 1921, pp. 244-5; 424-8.

The views of the Theravādins as against the opinions of the above-mentioned schools are as follows:

Re. Buddhas:

(i) Buddhas possess rūpakāya and worldly attributes and are subject to all the physical frailties of a human being; it is the attainment of bodhi that makes a being a Buddha.
(ii) Buddhas are above maitrī and karunā, but they do show maitrī and karunā to beings.
(iii) Buddhas cannot expound all the doctrines by a single utterance.

Re. Bodhisattvas:

(i) Bodhisattvas are average beings, and are subject to kleśas.
(ii) They are not self-born (upapāduka).

Re. Reals:

Past and future dharmas do not exist, not even their dharmatva. To say that Arhat has asita rāga though it is ineffective is wrong.

Re. Arhats:

(i) Arhats are perfect beings, hence they cannot have a fall from arhathood. They possess both kṣayajñāna (i.e. the knowledge that they have no more kleśas) and anutpādajñāna (i.e. the knowledge that they will have no more rebirths). There are, however, two grades of Arhats, viz., svadhmakuśala and paradharmakuśala (see above, p. 86-7).
(ii) Arhats, having reached the stage which is beyond merit and demerit, cannot accumulate merits, or be subject to influence of the past karmas.
(iii) All Arhats practise the four dhyānas and enjoy their fruits.
(iv) All Arhats attain Nirvāṇa.

Re. Puthujjana:

An average being does not fully eradicate from his mind attachment (rāga) and hatred (doṣa) but he may die with a good state of mind.

Re. Meditation:

(i) In the state of samābita, one cannot utter words.
(ii) An Arhat cannot die while in the highest samādhi (saññāvedayitanirodha).

Re. Antarābhava:

There is no intermediate state of existence (antarābhava) in the Kāma and Rūpa dhātus.

Re. Pudgala:

(i) Pudgala does not exist in the highest sense.
(ii) There is nothing which can transmigrate from one world to another.

Re. Anuṣayas and Paryavasthānas:

Anuṣayas (dormant passions) and Paryavasthānas (pariyutthāna in Pali = pervading passions) are caitasika (mental states), citta-samprayukta (associated with mind), and become objects of thought (na anārammaṇa).

Re. Vijnānas:

The five vijnānas conduce to attachment to the things of the world as also to detachment from the same.
Re. Asamksṛtas:

There are three asamksṛtas (unconstituted, viz., pratisamkhyā-nirodha, apratisamkhyā-nirodha and ākāśa) and not nine (see above).

Re. Brahmacarya of gods:

The gods except the Ṛṣaṇisattas may practise magga-bbāvanā though they may not have ordination according to the Vinaya rules.

Re. Anuppabhābbisamaya:

(i) The adepts realise the truths gradually.
(ii) They get rid of klesas (impurities) also gradually.
(iii) They may, only in exceptional cases, realise the four sāmaññaphalas including vimutti all at once.

Re. Laukika and Lokottara:

All the practices and fruits after ārothāpattiphalas are supramundane (lokottara) and not worldly (laukika).
CHAPTER XII

PLACE OF LAITY IN EARLY BUDDHISM

The principles of early Buddhism did not make any special provision for the laity. 1 Its mission was to persuade householders to embrace the life of a recluse, 2 and Buddha was so successful in his mission in Magadha that people of the country raised a hue and cry over it, saying that Samaṇa Gotama was bent upon making the families sonless, women widowed and line of succession discontinued. 3 Many householders retired from the worldly life because of the teaching that the life of a householder was impure and an obstruction to spiritual progress while that of a recluse was pure, open and free, and besides it was not easy for a person living a householder’s life to follow the teachings propounded by the teacher and to lead the thoroughly pure life of a brahmacārī. 4 Thus, it is evident that

1 See “Early Buddhism and Laity” in Studies in Indian History and Culture by Dr. N. N. Law. See above pp. 89, 97 for stray references to the laity.
2 Vinaya, i. p. 37: caratha brahmacariyaṁ samma dukkhassa antakiriyāya ti.
3 Vinaya, i. p. 37: aputtakīya paṭipanno sāmaṇo Gotamo, vedhavāya paṭipanno sāmaṇo Gotamo, kulāpacchedāya paṭipanno sāmaṇo Gotamo.
4 Cf. Majjhima, i. p. 344: Sambādho gharavas̐o rajāpatho abbbhokāso pabbajjā, nayidaṁ sukaram agāram aṭṭhavasatā ekantapariṇaṁ ekaṁ parisuddham saṅkhalikhitam brahmacariyaṁ caritum, Cf. Majjhima, ü, p. 55: Yathā yathā khvāhā Bhagavatā dharmam desitaṁ ajñātani nayidaṁ sukaraṁ gharan aṭṭhavasatā etc. as above.
the new religion was primarily meant for those who would retire from the household life. For householders generally some rites or ceremonies are provided, or some form of worship is recommended, by the founder of a religion but there was nothing of the kind in Buddhism. On the other hand the householders were asked to eschew rites and ceremonies (śīla-bāta)\(^1\) and this was made one of the primary conditions for becoming a devotee of Buddha.

At the same time, it has to be admitted that the Buddhist Saṅgha must have a lay-community for its very existence, some supporting families from which the members could have the bare necessities of their life. In ancient India, however, the formation of a lay-community need not be a condition precedent to the formation and growth of a body of recluses. Without any distinction of caste and creed, the householders welcomed every ascetic approaching them for food and dress, and hence the Buddhist monks at first did not experience any difficulty to get their requirements from the existing families. As time went on, they picked up some householders who showed them more veneration and who were more prompt in making offerings to them than others. These householders were designated upāsakas or upāśikās and received special attention of the Buddhist monks. In the early days of Buddhism, these householders looked after the needs of the monks during the rainy-season retreats (vassa-vāsa) and got opportunities to come into frequent contact with them and to listen to their discourses. Such closer contacts led to the institution of certain rites and ceremonies which Buddhism wanted so much to avoid

\(^1\) Sans. Sila and Vrata.
at its inception. The rites and ceremonies observed by these householders were as follows:

(i) To utter the formula of Trisaraṇa,
(ii) To listen to religious discourses on uposatha days,
(iii) To observe eight silas occasionally, and
(iv) To offer robes to the monks on certain occasions, specially at the end of the rainy season retreat.

Later on, the faithful persons were advised,

(v) to visit the four places of pilgrimage, and,
(vi) to worship the stūpas, particularly those containing the relics of Buddha.

The six rites mentioned above, it should be noted, came into vogue gradually. We are told that Tapussa and Bhallika were the first to become upāsakas (duvācikā) while Yasa’s father became the third upāsaka with Trisaraṇa (tevācika).

Henceforward several Khattiyas, Brāhmaṇas and Gahapatis became upāsakas by uttering these words:

“Abhikkantāḥ bho Gotama, abhikkantāḥ bho Gotama, Seyyathā pi bho Gotama nikujjitaṃ vā ukkujjeyya, paticchantāṃ vā vivareyya, mūlhassa vā maggam ācikkheyya, andhakāre vā telapajjotāṃ dhareyya: cakkhumanto rūpāni dakkhinīti; evam evam bhoto Gotamena anekapariyāyena dhammo pakāsito. Ete mayam bhavantam Gotamaṃ saranam gacchāma dhammaṃ ca bhikkhusaṅghaṃ ca upāsake no bhavam Gotamo dhāretu ajjatagge pāṇupete saranagate ti.”

1 Mahāparinibbānasutta, p. 141.
2 Ibid., p. 142.
3 Vinaya, i. p. 4. i.e. they took refuge in Buddha and Dhamma only, as the Saṅgha had not yet been formed.
4 Ibid., p. 17.
5 See infra, pp. 210-213.
(Excellent O Gotama, excellent. Just as one who turns the upturned, opens the covered ones, shows the path to the deluded, holds a lighted lamp in darkness, you have preached the doctrine in such a way that those who possess eyes (of knowledge) can see the actual objects. We seek refuge in you, O Gotama, in your Dhamma and in your Saṅgha. Accept us as your life-long lay-devotees).

The extract cited above appears verbatim at the end of almost every discourse addressed to a householder or a group of householders. It should not however be taken as indicative of a person's actually changing his creed and becoming an upāsaka. Several brāhmaṇas and gahapatis expressed their appreciation of the discourses by these set words, and did not care to follow up the declaration by observing the moral precepts and performing the duties specially prescribed for the Upāsakas and Upāsikās.

The Three Parisās

This class of devout listeners to Buddha's discourses is referred to in the Nikāyas as Khattiya parisā, Brāhmaṇa-parisā and Gahapati-parisā. There are occasional references to the four castes as well but the more common way of referring to this class of people was by the above-mentioned three parisās (assemblies). In some passages the word 'parisā' is replaced by

1 Mājjhima, i, p. 72: Abhijānāmi kho panāhaṃ Sāriputta, anekasatāṃ khattiya-parisāṃ upasaṅkamitā, tatra pi mayā sannissinna-pubbañ c'eva sallapita-pubbañ ca sākacchā ca samapajjita-pubba.

2 Aṅguttara, iv, p. 259: Sabbe khattiya arthaṅgasamannāgataṃ uposatham upavaseyyum sabbe pi brāhmaṇā...sabbe pi vessā...sabbe pi suddā arthaṅgasamannāgataṃ uposatham upavaseyyum.

3 The other parisās are Samaṇa-parisā, Cātummaḥarājika-parisā,
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‘mahāsāla’ (nobles or rich men): Not unoften is the word ‘paṇḍita’ (wise men) used instead of ‘parisa’.

The juxtaposition of the word ‘gahapati’ to ‘khattiya’ and ‘brāhmaṇa’ suggests that it meant usually the seṭṭhis (bankers) or businessmen or men who have taken to some vocations, such as agriculture, carpentry, smithy and so forth.

In the Aṅguttara-nikāya the distinctive features of the three parisaś are pointed out thus: All the three classes of men seek worldly enjoyment (bhogādhīpaya) and try to acquire knowledge (pāññupavicara). The Khattiyas rely on their prowess (balādhītthānā), is bent upon acquiring lands (pāthavibhinivesā) and aim at dominance (issariyapariyosanā), the Brāhmaṇas depend on hymns and chants (mantādhītthānā), is attached to sacrifices (yaṅnābhinivesā) and aim at reaching Brahmalaoka, while the Gahapatis depend on arts and crafts (sippādhītthānā), remains engaged with their works (kammantābhinivesā) and aim at fruition of their works (niṭṭhita kammantapariyosanā).

Aims and objects of Gahapatis

Of these three parisaś, the largest number of devotees of Buddha came from the Gahapati parisaś, few from Brāhmaṇa and


1 Samyutta, i. p. 71: Khattiya-mahāsāla and Brāhmaṇa-mahāsāla have ample gold and silver and other treasures. Aṅguttara, iv, pp. 104, 130, 239; Digha, iii p. 146

2 Khattiya-paṇḍita etc. Samyutta, iii, p. 6; Majjhima, i, p. 176; Aṅguttara, iv, pp. 104, 130, 239.

3 Cf. Kassakagahapati in Aṅguttara, i, p. 229.

4 Aṅguttara, iii, p. 363.
a very few from the Khattiya. About the characteristics of the Gahapatis, the Nikāyas say that they were keen about accumulation of gold, crops, buildings, lands, wife, male and female servants. Their happiness consisted in possessing worldly objects, in enjoyment of the same, and in remaining free from debts and faults. In short, the Gahapatis enjoyed all worldly pleasures derivable through the five organs of sense. Dīghajānu Koliyaputta said that the householders sought worldly objects, sons and wife, unguents, garlands and other articles of luxury, gold and silver; he wanted instructions from the Teacher as to the ways and means by which the householders could be happy in this life and the next. The reply was that the householders should be energetic in his vocation (uṭṭhānasam-padā), take good care of the wealth earned righteously by the sweat of his brow (ārakkhasam-padā), associate with men having faith, good morals, charitable disposition and wisdom (kalyāna-mittatā), and try to acquire their good qualities and be like them (samaśīvatā). Tapussa gahapati was frank enough to admit that the gahapatis were afraid of retirement, and given to worldly pleasures because they had not realised the evil consequences of attachment to worldly objects. Potaliya gahapati thought that as he had retired from his works (kammanta) and business (vohāra), leaving his possessions to his sons, and as he had been living on bare requirements of food and dress, he

1 Majjhima, i, p. 452.
2 Aṅguttara, ii, p. 69: atthisukha, bhogasukha, anaṇasukha and anavajja-sukha.
3 Majjhima, i, p. 505.
4 Aṅguttara, i, p. 281-2; iii, p. 45.
5 Aṅguttara, iv, p. 438.
6 Majjhima, ii, p. 359.
should not be called a *gahapati*, but Buddha would not listen to him as he had not yet fulfilled the elementary conditions of a retired life. Though the householders remained engrossed in their worldly possessions, some of them were religious minded and approached different religious teachers for instructions. The Brāhmaṇas and Gahapatis of the village Sālā\(^1\) said that they had listened to the teachings of different teachers and had not yet made up their mind to accept any of them as their spiritual guide. They approached Buddha and his disciples and listened to their instructions now and then, and some of them avowed themselves as upāsakas of Buddha, but not necessarily complying with all the conditions to be fulfilled by an upāsaka.

**Discourses to Gahapatis**

In every Nikāya, excepting the *Dīgha*, there is a *Gahapatīvaṅga*,\(^2\) in which Buddha administered instructions to a particular *gahapati* or delivered discourses for the benefit of *gahapatis* in general. There are also discourses dealing incidentally with the general rules of morality, effects of *karma*, ideals of a householder and his wife, and the fundamental principles of Buddhism. The Gahapatīvaṅgas are found to contain discussions on all aspects of Buddhist ethics and philosophy. There were also many learned Brāhmaṇas, Khattiyas and Gahapatis who took part in abstruse discussions with Buddha and his disciples. In the *Gahapatīvaṅga* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*,\(^3\) there are ten suttas. In the Kandarakasutta, Pessa

---

Hatthārohaputta spoke in appreciation of the four *satipatthānas* and said that he and other householders occasionally tried these four practices. He was then told about the various ascetic practices prevalent in the country, and the superiority of the practices and acquisitions of Buddhist monks. To Dasama Gahapati was explained how a monk attained the *anāgāmi* and *arabatta* stages, and practised the four *brahmavīharas* and *arūpasamāpattis*. The Sakkas of Kapilavatthu, specially Mahānāma, listened to a discourse on what made a *sekha* (i.e. a monk progressing towards Nibbāna). Potaliya gahapati felt offended at being called a *gahapati* in his so-called retired life and he was made to understand how one ceased to be a householder according to Buddha’s law (*ariyassa vinaye*). Jivaka could not believe that Buddha was taking meat specially prepared for him and on enquiry he was told how could the Buddha, perfect in the four *brahmavīharas*, do so. In the Upālisutta, one of the longest discourses, the teachings of Niganṭha Nāṭaputta were discussed, and Upāli gahapati, a distinguished disciple of Niganṭha Nāṭaputta, was convinced of the superiority of Buddhist teachings, and was won over to the Buddhist faith. Puṇṇa Koliyaputta and Acela Seniya listened to a discourse on the effects of *kamma*, gave up their austerities and joined the Buddhist order. Abbhayarājakumāra, a lay disciple of Niganṭha Nāṭaputta, wanted to cross words with Buddha at the instigation of his teacher but ultimately succumbed to Buddha’s arguments. Paṇcakaṅga thapati would not recognise the *adukkhamasukha-

1 *Majjhima*, p. 340: Mayam pi hi bhante gihi odāravasanā kālena kālaṃ ēmesu catusu satipatthānesu supatiṭṭhitacittā viharāma.
vedanā as the third vedanā, the two other being sukha and dukkha. Buddha explained that sukha was a relative term and then gave an exposition of the stages of sukha through which a monk passed in order to reach the highest state of mental concentration. In the last sutta of this Gahapativagga is given an exposition of the views of a few heretical teachers as well as the wrong views held about Arūpa-brahmaloka and Nibbāna; at the end of this discourse all the Brāhmaṇas and Gahapatis of the village Sālā expressed their desire to become devotees of Buddha.¹

There are two Gahapativaggas in the Samyutta-nikāya.² In the first, the Gahapatis were admonished to observe the five moral precepts, develop faith in the Triratna, and comprehend the law of causation including the four truths. Incidentally the question of the identity and difference of soul and khandhas is discussed. In the second Gahapativagga, there are discourses on hindrances (samyojanas) which kept one away from Nibbāna, on watchfulness over body (kāya satipaṭṭhāna) and its movements, on restraint in act, speech and thought, and on feelings of pain and pleasure derived through the organs of sense. There is a reference to the fall of Brāhmaṇas from their ancient ideal which was similar to the Buddhist ideal of self-restraint.

As regards the duties of a gahapati it is stated in this Nikāya that a gahapati should (i) maintain his parents; (ii) revere elders of the family, (iii) use gentle words; (iv) avoid malicious talks; (v) discard miserliness; (vi) be open-handed; (vii) be truthful and (viii) never be angry.

¹ Majjhima, i, p. 413.
In the Gahapativagga of the Aṅguttara Nikāya, the duties of a gahapati are dealt with more than the general principles of Buddhism. The eight special virtues of a gahapati are given as follows:—(i) firm faith in Buddha; (ii) appreciation of the Dhamma; (iii) regard for the Saṅgha; (iv) charitableness even to the extent of giving away one’s wife, (v) open-handedness in distributing property among the saints; (vi) keenness to listen to religious discourses, (vii) lack of pride due to spiritual success; and (viii) removal of the five impurities (orambahāgiyas). The gahapatis are expected to possess seven other virtues, viz., faith (saddhā), moral restraint (āśīla), modesty (bīri), shame (ottappa), learning (buddhi), charitable disposition (cāga) and knowledge (paññā). Some of the gahapatis practised the four samgaha-vattthu viz., gift, sweet words, beneficial acts and treatment of others as his equals, and thereby obtained a large circle of friends. Hatthaka of Alavi was the chief of those who practised the samgaha-vattthu.

Though there is no Gahapativagga in the Dīgha Nikāya, there are two suttas (Lakkhana and Sigālovāda) which deal with the duties of a gahapati. In the Lakkhana-sutta, the virtues or duties of a gahapati are mentioned though not in a systematic form, e.g., a good man should perform good deeds, restrain himself in body, speech and thought, be charitable, observe uposathas, take care of parents, Samanas and Brāhmaṇas, practise the four samgahavattthu, exert for others’ good, both moral

1 Aṅguttara, iv, pp. 208-235. 2 Cf. Samyutta, ii, p. 197. 3 Dāna, peyyavāca, athacariyā and samānattatā. 4 The last four discourses in this Vagga have nothing to do with the duties of Gahapati and so they are passed over here. 5 Aṅguttara, i, p. 26. 6 Dīgha, iii, p. 145. 7 Ibid., p. 152.
and secular,\(^1\) approach Samanās and Brāhmaṇas for instructions,\(^2\) never harbour any anger or hatred,\(^3\) try to bring about concord among quarrelsome persons\(^4\) and help others in increasing their faith, moral virtues, knowledge, charity, religiosity, wisdom, and secular possessions, look upon others with friendly eyes, never utter an untrue, malicious, harsh or useless word, or never cheat others, and so forth.

In the *Sigālovādasutta*, the following duties are prescribed for a gahapati:—(i) abstinence from killing, speaking falsehood, stealing and adultery; (ii) avoiding commission of offences through strong will (*cbanda*), hatred (*dosa*), delusion (*moha*) and fear (*bhaya*); (iii) refraining from drinking and merry-making, evening shows, dramatic performances, dice-plays, evil friends and idleness; (iv) avoidance of enemies posing as friends and obtaining sincere friends; (v) looking after parents, teachers, sons and wife, friends and advisers, servants and workers, Samanās and Brāhmaṇas.\(^5\)

**Gahapatāni**

There are not many discourses specially devoted to the duties of the female members of a household. In the *Samyutta-nikāya*\(^6\) a woman is enjoined to earn merits by good deeds, so that she may be reborn in a good family, be married in a good family, have no co-wife, be blessed with sons, and possess influence over her husband. Her strength, it is said, consisted in her appearance (*rūpa*), wealth (*bhoga*), relatives (*nāti*), sons (*putta*) and moral virtues (*sīla*).\(^7\) Like the gahapatis, they should also develop faith

---

(saddhā), observe moral precepts (sīla), listen to religious discourses (sutta), be charitable (cāga) and acquire knowledge (pañña). They should be quiet, gentle and obedient.

Women generally are more miserly (macehariyā), envious (issukī), more strongly attached to worldly objects than men, their knowledge also is less than that of men. They must drive away from their minds anger, hatred and disrespect for others, and be chaste, diligent, modest and bashful. They must not be greedy, wish others’ evil, indulge in malicious, harsh or useless talks, and discard wrong views.

There are certain special directions given to women, which are as follows:

They should (i) be well-wisher of their husbands, cater to their comforts and be sweet and attractive to them, (ii) respect the parents of the husband, and rever the Samanas and Brāhmaṇas revered by the husband’s family, (iii) be efficient in household work, e.g., in spinning, (iv) look after the needs of the servants and workers of the household and feed them properly, (v) protect paddy, gold and other articles brought by her husband, (vi) become an upāsikā by taking Trisaraṇa, (vii) observe the five precepts, and (viii) be charitable and (ix) acquire knowledge. The first five bring her success in this life and the succeeding four (i.e. saddhā, sīla, sutta and pañña) make her happy in the next.

1 Samyutta, iv, p. 250; Aṅguttara, iv, p. 270.
2 Majjhima, i, p. 125.
3 Samyutta, iv, p. 240.
4 Samyutta, iv, p. 240. It is said that for these deficiencies they were not allowed to sit in the assemblies.
5 Aṅguttara, vi, p. 203: Kopa, dosa and appaceaya. See also Samyutta, iv, p. 240 f.
6 Aṅguttara, v, p. 286.
7 Samyutta, iv, p. 246.
8 Aṅguttara, iv, p. 265-266; iii, p. 37.
The conversation that Nakulamātā gahapatānī had with her husband in deathbed shows how spiritually advanced sometimes the gahapatānis were. Nakulamātā said to her husband that (i) death with anxiety is disapproved by Buddha and so he should not die with any anxiety (sāpekho) for her as to how she would meet both ends and rear her sons; she knew spinning and shaving hair (venim olikhitum) and by plying that trade,¹ she would be able to tide over her difficulties. (ii) He need not apprehend that she would go to another family, for both of them knew that they had been living as brāhmaścārīs for the last 16 years. (iii) He must not think that she would not care to approach Bhagavān or his monks after his death; on the other hand, she would be more eager to approach them, or (iv) that she would not observe the moral precepts; on the contrary she would be no less energetic than the best of the householder-disciples of Buddha. (v) He must not have any doubt that she would not attain mental tranquillity (ceto-samatha); on the contrary she would be the best of those upāsikās who practised ceto-samatha. (vi) He must rest assured that she was deeply interested in this doctrine and was not wanting in deep faith in Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha.²

There were other upāsikās also like Sujātā, Visākhā, Khujjuttarā, Sāmāvati, Uttarā Nandamātā, Suppavāsā Koliyadhītā, Suppiyā Kātiyānī, and Kāli of Kuraraghara, who were extolled by Buddha as leading female devotees for having some extraordinary virtues.³ In spiritual attainments, the female lay-devotees vied equally well with the male-devotees.⁴

¹ It seems that Nakulapitā was a barber by profession.
² Aṅguttara, ii, pp. 295.
⁴ See Infra, 233 f.
Upāsakas and Upāsikās

The Gahapatis mentioned above were more or less devout listeners to the moral or religious discourses delivered by the monks. They offered food, clothing and other necessaries of life to the monks. Occasionally at the end of a discourse, they signified their appreciation by saying that they would take Trisaraṇa and become upāsakas till the end of their lives. A number of Brāhmaṇas, Gahapatis, Gāmanis, Paribbajakas, nobles and princes1 are found to say that they would become upāsakas, but there is nothing to show that they actually followed the moral code and performed the duties prescribed for the Upāsakas. These may be taken as lay-supporters of the Buddhist Saṅgha. The fact that there was a large number of such supporters is evidenced by the remark in the Mahāparinibbānasutta that Buddha should choose for his parinibbāna one of the towns like Campā, Rājagaha, Sāvatthi, Sāketa, Kosambi, and Vārānasī where are many Khattiya, Brāhmaṇa and Gahapati mahāsālas to worship his relics.

Out of this body of lay-supporters appeared a group of persons who were more earnest in their devotion to Buddhism, and naturally tried to follow the principles of Buddhism as far as compatible with their life as a householder. In order to distinguish this body, Mahānāma the Sākyan raised the question as

1 E. g. Caṅki brāhmaṇa (M. ii. 177); Ghoṭamukha-br. (M. ii. 163); Assalāyana-br. (M. ii. 157); Brahmāyu-br. (M. ii. 145); Cittagahapati (S. iv. 301); (for other Gahapatis, see above); Vekhanassa paribbājaka (M. ii.); Susima-paribbājaka (S. ii. 120); Madhuro Avanti-putta (M. ii. 90); Bodhirajakumāra (M. ii. 97). For Gāmanis, see Gāmanī-Samyutta in Samyutta-Nikāya, iv.
to what should be the marks of an upāsaka.\footnote{Anguttara, iv, p. 220; Samyutta, v, p. 395: Kittavatā nu kho bhante upāsako ti ti?} Buddha’s answer, however, was not very helpful for he simply said that anyone taking the Trisaraṇa was an upāsaka. In another context, however, it is stated that an upāsaka must have not only faith in the Triratna, observe moral precepts, and do good to people in return but also not resort to auspicious rites, and offer gifts to persons outside the Buddhist Saṅgha.\footnote{Digha, ii, p. 132-3.} There are instances to show that some householders eschewed their old teacher and became an upāsaka of Buddha. Pukkusa Mallaputta, a disciple of Ālāra Kālāma,\footnote{Anguttara, i, p. 219.} Upāli Gahapati and Abhaya Rājakumāra, a rich upāsaka of Nigāṁtha Nāṭaputta,\footnote{Cf. Anguttara, iv, p. 59: Campeyyakā upāsakā approached Sāriputta for requesting Buddha to deliver a discourse to them.} a gahapati-devotee of an Ājivaka\footnote{Majjhima, ii, p. 23.} changed their teachers and became upāsakas of Buddha. There are evidences to show that a number of householders was distinguished as devout upāsakas, and that their number was large in certain localities.\footnote{Cf. Majjhima, i, p. 379.} The stereo-typed remark found in the Nikāyas that Buddhist upāsakas do not like noisy discussions shows that some householders were distinguished as Buddhist upāsakas. Then passages like “yavatā kho pana samanassa Gotamassa sāvakā gibhi odātavasanā Sāvatthiyam paṭivasanti, ayaṁ tesam aññataro Pañcakaṅgo thapati” (Pañcakaṅgo the architect is one of the distinguished white-dressed householder disciples of Gotama residing at Sāvatthi)\footnote{Ibid.} leave no room for doubt that some persons were marked out as Buddhist upāsakas.
The members of these families received the special attention of the Buddhist monks, who, prescribed for them certain moral duties, which were classified under five heads, viz., Saddhā (faith), Sila (observance of moral precepts), Cāga (charity), Suta (listening to religious discourses) and Paññā (comprehending the higher truths).  

(i) By Saddhā is meant that an upāsaka must have firm faith in the Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha. There is a set formulae to express that faith, which is, in short, as follows:—Bhagavā the perfectly enlightened endowed with knowledge and good conduct is the highest, the knower of the world, the leader of men and gods. His Dharma is well-preached, produces fruit in this life, knows no limitation of time and is realisable within one's ownself. The Saṅgha of his disciples, who are in one of the eight stages of sanctification, is well-established in good conduct, is bent upon acquiring knowledge, is worthy of gifts, praise and reverence and is a fit recipient of gifts.  

(ii) By Sila is meant that an upāsaka must abstain from killing, stealing, adultery, speaking falsehood and indulging in drinks and merrymakings. He must discard all mental impurities like excessive greed (abbihijjā), hatred (vyāpāda), slothfulness (bhīnamiddha), flurry, (uddhaccakukkuucca), and doubt (vicikicchā).  

(iii) By Cāga is meant that an upāsaka should be charitable, provide the monks with food, robes, beds and medicinal re-

1 Majjhima, i, p. 467; iii, p. 99; Samyutta, iv, p. 250; Aṅguttara, i, p. 210; iv, p. 270.  
2 Aṅguttara, iv, p. 220.
quisites. He should be open-handed, prone to giving gifts to the needy.

(iv) By Suta is meant that an upāsaka should reverentially listen to religious discourses and moral teachings imparted by the monks.

(v) By Pañña is meant that an upāsaka should try to comprehend the origin and decay of worldly objects, in other words, realise the four truths and the law of causation.

The above mentioned five practices are fully described in the Gahapatiwagga and elsewhere. Ugga Gahapati said that his saddhā was of such an order that the moment he saw Buddha even from a distance, his mind obtained satisfaction (pasidi). He observed the five sikkhāpadas, and thereby completed the practice of silas. He approached bhikkhus and listened to their discourses with due respect (sakkaccam eva suñāmi no asakkha-ccam). For the sake of sacrifice (cāga) he would give away his young wives and divide his property among the religious people, and while giving gifts to the monks he would not discriminate between one monk and another on account of their spiritual attainments. He would listen to the higher teachings of Buddhism and thereby become paññaavā.

To Brāhmaṇa gahapatis of Veludvāra, Buddha delivered a

1 Cf. Aṅguttara, ii, 65.
2 Aṅguttara, ii, p. 65; Muttacāgā payatapāni vossaggaratā yācayogā dānasamvibhāgaratā.
3 Aṅguttara, iv, p. 271: Udayatthagāminiyā paññāya samannāgato ariyāya nibbedhikāya sammādukkhakkhayagāminiyā.
4 Aṅguttara, v, p. 184; Samyutta, v, p. 61; Aṅguttara, ii, p. 67. For Nivaranas, see Samyutta, v, pp. 60; 146.
5 Aṅguttara, iv, pp. 209ff.
discourse dilating on the five precepts referred to above. He said that an upāsaka in order to become a sotāpanna should bear in mind the following dhammas:

(i) Realising how painful is one's own death, a person should not cause other's death.

(ii) Remembering how a thief is hated by one whose possessions are stolen, a person must not steal other's property.

(iii) Knowing how much a person is hated by the man with whose wife he commits adultery, one must not commit adultery.

(iv) As a liar is disliked by everybody so one must not speak a lie.

(v) As a man who by malicious words brings about dissen-
sion is abhorred by everybody, so one should not utter malicious words.

(vi) As a person is disliked for harsh words, so one must avoid uttering the same.

(vii) As a person is looked down for his frivolous talks, one must not indulge in the same.\(^1\)

A person should not only practise the seven dhammas mentioned above for his own benefit but also persuade others to do the same.\(^2\)

An upāsaka is further prohibited from trading in (i) weapons; (ii) livestock; (iii) meat; (iv) wine and (v) poison.\(^3\)

In the *Milindapañha*\(^4\) there are a few additional instructions given to the upāsakas. These are as follows:

An upāsaka should (i) feel happy or sad at the joy or

---

grief of the Saṅgha; (ii) make the dhamma the leading factor of his life; (iii) share his gain with others as far as possible; (iv) exert his best for the growth of the religion of the teacher whenever its decline is noticed; (v) hold the right view; (vi) avoid performing any auspicious rite or venerating another teacher even for the sake of his life; (vii) observe restraint in acts and words; (viii) be keen in maintaining concord; (ix) discard jealousy and (x) avoid hypocrisy in following the religion.

In the Vinaya¹ are enumerated the gains obtained by a householder by observing the silas, viz., (i) wealth and property; (ii) fame; (iii) boldness in any social congregation; (iv) death with consciousness up to the last moment; and lastly (v) heavenly existence.

**Lay-devotees and Monks**

Apart from the moral precepts to be observed by the upāsakas and upāsikās, they were enjoined to supply the members of the Saṅgha with robe, food, bed and medicinal requisites.² As a result of such gifts they were given the hope that in the next world they would have long life, good appearance, happiness and strength.³ In making these gifts, however, they must not have any selfish end in view (sāpekha).⁴ Some of the upāsakas and upāsikās visited the several ārāmas to find out if any one was sick and needed medicines which they procured to the best of their abilities.⁵ The monks on the other hand were warned that with complete self-restraint they should approach householders for food and robe, or for any other purpose. They

¹ Vinaya, i, p. 227-228.  
² Aṅguttara, ii, p. 66.  
³ Ibid., ii, p. 64.  
⁴ Ibid., ii, p. 59.  
⁵ Vinaya, i, p. 216.
were not to associate themselves with the joys and griefs of householders,\textsuperscript{1} for there were instances of monks having got entangled with women\textsuperscript{2} by such association. They were also advised not to accept alms from those householders who had at any time attempted to bring about evil plight to the monks, or injure them in any way, or oust them from their residence (āvāsa), or have abused them or tried to cause dissension between one monk and another, or have spoken ill of Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha.\textsuperscript{3} The monks were further instructed to avoid those householders who would not welcome them with gentle words, or show respects to them, or offer them seats kindly, or conceal their possessions, give little and bad things though they have ample and good things, offer gifts irreverentially, not approach monks for listening to discourses, and dislike instructions.\textsuperscript{4} At the end of the rainy season the Saṅgha held a ceremony called Pavāraṇā and Kathina at every āvāsa. On these occasions, the upāsakas were advised to offer robes and were told that gifts on such occasions carried special merits.

\textit{Uposatha of the Upāsakas}

On the uposatha days, the more devout upāsakas were advised to observe eight precepts instead of five. They sometimes spent a few days in a monastery in company of the monks. The eight precepts\textsuperscript{5} were,—

\begin{itemize}
\item[1] \textit{Samyutta}, iii, p. 11.
\item[2] \textit{Aṅguttara}, iii, p. 259; iv, p. 54
\item[3] Ibid., iv, p. 344.
\item[4] Ibid., v, p. 387.
\item[5] \textit{Aṅguttara}, iv, p. 254:
\begin{quote}
Pānām na haṁic na cādinnam ādiye
musa na bhāse na ca mājapo siyā
\end{quote}
\end{itemize}
(i) complete abstention from killing by laying aside all weapons, and developing a kindly and friendly feeling towards all beings;

(ii) complete abstention from stealing, and remaining pure and satisfied with what is given;

(iii) total abstention from sexual enjoyments, and living the life of a true *brahmacāri*;

(iv) total avoidance of untruth; and remaining always anxious to be truthful;

(v) refraining from all kinds of drinks and merrymakings;

(vi) taking only one meal a day, and refraining from afternoon meals;

(vii) keeping away from all places of amusement having dance and music, also non-use of scents, unguents and garlands and lastly;

(viii) sleeping on low beds or grass mats and discarding high beds.

Some of the advanced upāsakas were able to attain concentration of mind. This concentration was induced in them by their deep faith in Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha. This faith engendered in their minds deep satisfaction that they had achieved something good. Through this satisfaction, their mind

*abrahmacāriyā virameyya methunā rattim na bhuñjeyya vikālabhojanāṁ mālaṁ na dhāraye na ca gandham ācare mañce chamāyāṁ vasayetha santhate etam hi āṭṭhaṅgikam āh’ uposatham Buddhena dukkhantagunā pakāsitam.*
became serene and concentrated.\(^1\) They practised the \textit{jhānas} one after another and perfected themselves in all the four \textit{jhānas}. Cittagahapati\(^2\) and Uttarā Nandamātā\(^3\) became highly proficient in the \textit{jhānas}. Some of the upāsakas practised the four \textit{brabmavibāras} and four \textit{satipaṭṭhānas}.\(^4\) Sirivaddha and Mānadinna were advised to practise \textit{satipaṭṭhānas} in order to overcome acute pain due to disease.\(^5\) Sāmāvati upāsikā\(^6\) was the chief of those female lay-devotees, who practised \textit{mettā}. Khujjuttarā upāsikā acquired \textit{patisambhūtā} and abilities in learning Buddha’s words.\(^7\) Nandamātā upāsikā was so spiritually advanced that her mind was not moved when she saw her husband reborn as an ogre. Her chastity was unimpeachable and there was no occasion for her to confess (\textit{paṭidesitā}) any transgression of the moral laws. Nandamātā mastered the four \textit{jhānas} and removed all the five \textit{orambhāgiya} impurities.

\textit{Teaching imparted to lay-devotees}

In delivering discourses to the householders, Buddha and his disciples uniformly observed an order (\textit{anupubbikathām}). They first expatiated on the merits of giving gifts (\textit{dānakathām}), and of observing moral precepts (\textit{silakathām}), and of the reward

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Aṅguttara}, v, p. 330.
\item \textit{Sahajagaha}, iv, p. 281 f.
\item \textit{Aṅguttara}, i, p. 26; iv, p. 66.
\item See above, p. 214.
\item \textit{Sahajagaha}, v, p. 176.
\item \textit{Aṅguttara}, i, p. 26.
\item \textit{Visuddhimagga}, p. 442.
\item It is said that she could recite the \textit{Itivuttaka} heard by her from the teacher.
\end{itemize}
obtained thereby, viz., a heavenly existence (saggakathāṁ). Then they dilated on the evils of enjoying worldly pleasures (kāmānāṁ ādīnavam) and the merit of retirement from the world (nekkhāmme ānisamsām). When they found that the teaching had made a good impression on the mind of a householder, they passed on to the next higher teaching, the exposition of the four truths, dukkha, samudaya, nirodha and magga, and made them realise that whatever has origin must have decay (yaṁ kiñci samudayadhammaṁ sabban taṁ nirodhadham- 
man ti).¹

There is a rule in the Pātimokkha (Pācittiya no. 4) that to an uninitiated the dhamma is not to be preached syllable by syllable. The upāsakas were advised to avoid reading Suttantas.² It is however clear that the householders were as far as possible kept away from the deeper teachings, lest they should be frightened away from taking interest in the religion. But again, we find Nandamātā upāsikā reciting the Pārāyanā at dawn³ and Sāriputta explaining to Hāliddikāni gahapati the verses of the Aṭṭhakavagga.⁴

There were however lay-devotees, who took interest in the deepest problems of Buddhist philosophy. Cittagahapati was complimented for being able to understand the subtleties of Buddhist philosophy⁵ while Anāthapiṇḍika was told that topics

¹ The first discourse was delivered by Buddha to the Brāhmaṇa gahapatis of Magadha. See Vinaya, i, p. 37. Cf. Majjhima, i, p. 379; ii, p. 145.
² Samyutta, v, p. 407.
³ Anguttara, iv, p. 63.
⁴ Sutta Nipāta, p. 165.
⁵ Samyutta, iv, pp. 282 f.: Suladdhaṁ te gahapati yassa te gambhīre buddhavacane paññācakkhu kamati ti.
not to be explained to a householder were being laid before him for his edification.\footnote{1}

When Anāthapiṇḍika was in his deathbed, Sāriputta delivered to him a discourse on Buddhist philosophy so that he might overcome the extreme pain.\footnote{2} In the discourse he pointed out that a person must not cling to the six organs of sense, or to the perceptions and feelings derived through the organs of sense, or to the \textit{dhātus} like earth, water, fire, air, space (\textit{ākāsa}) and consciousness (\textit{viññāna}), or to the five constituents of a being, or to the four Arūpadhātus, or to this world or the next, or to things seen, heard, thought or known. Buddha explained to Nakulapitā how the unenlightened persons identified soul with one or all of the \textit{khandhas} and thus suffered from the misconception of the existence of a self. Mahākaccāna explained to Hāliddikāni the following stanza of the \textit{Atthakavagga}:

\begin{quote}
"Okāṁ pahāya aniketasārī
gāme akubbaṁ muni santhavānī
kāmeli ritto apurekkharāno
kathāṁ na viggayha janena kaiyā."
\end{quote}

[A monk should give up clinging to the five constituents, remain unattached to the characteristics of the perceived objects (\textit{aniketasārī}). He must not associate himself with the weal and woe of householders, discard love, desire, attachment and despair, not speculate about his future existence (\textit{apurekkharāno}) and never quarrel with other monks regarding correctness and incorrectness of a \textit{dhamma} or a rule of discipline.]

In all the discourses delivered to Citta, Nakulapitā and

\begin{footnotes}
1 \textit{Majjhima}, iii, p. 261: Na kho gahapati gihinam odātavasanānam evarūpi dhammakathā paṭībhati.
\end{footnotes}
Hāliddikāṇī, the main topic dealt with was that a person must not take pleasure in the origin of khandhas, which were subject to decay; that an unwise person misconceived one or all of the khandhas as soul, and developed a notion of I-ness. A true disciple of Buddha should not care for his past khandhas, nor think of his future khandhas and must not have any attachment to his present khandhas.¹ Ugga gahapati and others were taught that those who were engrossed with the sense-objects would not attain Nibbāna.² Soṇa gahapati³ was taught that the khandhas were impermanent and impermanence was grief, and that none of the khandhas or all the khandhas taken together was soul. In the Citta-samyutta,⁴ we have practically all the abstruse discussions on Buddhist philosophy. These are as follows:—

(i) Neither the organs of sense nor their objects are worldly ties—the tie is thirst that arises out of the contact of the two.

(ii) The distinction that lies between the organ of sense, its object, and the perception caused by the contact of the two.

(iii) The sixty-two non-Buddhistic doctrines are nothing but the outcome of the misapprehension of one or all of the khandhas as soul.

(iv) The exact implications of saṅkhārā in Kāya- Vacī and Citta-saṅkhārā.

(v) The method by which a meditator induces and discontinues the meditation in which perception and consciousness become inactive (saṅñāvedayitanirodha).

¹ Samyutta, iii, pp. 1 f.  
² Ibid., iv, p. 109.  
³ Ibid., iii, p. 48.  
⁴ Ibid., iv, pp. 281 f.
and the distinction between death and saññāvedayitanirodha.

(vi) The meaning of mental emancipation (ceto-vimuttī) through realisation of the absence of desire (akīna-cañña), of substancelessness (suññatā), and characteristiclessness (animittatā) of worldly objects.

(vii) Exposition of the four brahmavihāras viz., love, compassion, joy at other’s success, and equanimity.

(viii) Elucidation of the four meditations: savitakka-savicāra, avitakka-avicāra, etc.

From the above, it will be observed that the advanced house holders tried to comprehend the deepest problems of Buddhist philosophy, and on occasions even entered into discussions with the teachers of other sects\(^1\). Though still in white robes they were as spiritually advanced as a monk.

**Upāsaka’s Spiritual Attainments**

The goal that was held before the householders was rebirth in one of the heavens\(^1\) or as Sakka, the king of gods. This conception was already existing in the pre-Buddhist days, and all religions which accepted the theory of karma endorsed it. A householder should be first instructed to make gifts and to observe the precepts, and he is to be convinced that as fruit of this he would be reborn in the heavens (sagga). The Nikāyas are full of instances of good householders, who by leading a virtuous life were reborn as gods, and then there is the whole of

---

\(^{1}\) Citta gahapati crossed words with Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta. See *Samyutta*, iv, p. 298f.

\(^{2}\) *Majjhima*, i, p. 505: Householders enjoying worldly pleasures by good conduct goes to *sagga*. 
the Vimānavatthu to illustrate this theory of karma. Aśoka also upheld this view, and did not like to go beyond. But the principles of Buddhism could not support it fully. Immediately after saggakhatbam, the householders were to be instructed in looking upon worldly pleasures as evil and retirement as the best course of life (nekhamme ānisamsam). Hence it is evident that the ideal held by Buddhism even before the householders was not rebirth in one of the heavens but retirement from the worldly life. In the Mahāparinibbānasutta, Buddha is heard to say about the fruits attained by some of his departed upāsakas. He said that Sudatta (=Anāthapiṇḍika) and ninety others had become Sakadāgāmi, while Sujātā and 500 others Sotāpanna. Kakudha upāsaka reached the Anāgāmi stage, so also did Kālūṅga, Nikāṭa, Katissabho, Tuṭṭha, Bhadda, Subhadda and several others.¹

The next lower fruits attained by the upāsakas are detailed in the Janavasabba Sutta² where it is stated that those who take the trisaraṇa and observe the āsīlas are reborn as Paranimitavasavatti, Nimmānarati. Tusita, Yama, Tāvatimsa and Cātumahārājika³ gods, and that the lowest state in which an upāsaka is reborn is that of Gandhabba. The merit of observing the uposatha with eight precepts is immense happiness surpassing even that of the kingship of all the sixteen provinces of India. He is reborn as one of the gods of the heavens mentioned above. A man or a woman who has observed the uposatha and earned the least merit will be reborn as a god.⁴

¹ Digha, ii, pp. 92-93, 200-1. ² Ibid., ii, p. 212. ³ Cf. Aṅguttara, iv, pp. 252 f. ⁴ Ibid., iv, p. 255.

Tasmā hi nāri ca naro ca silāvā atthaṅgupetam upavassūposaṭham puṇṇāni katvāna sukhdudrayāni anindita saggam upenti thānan ti.
It is evident therefore that the fruits earned by an upāsaka ranged from the Anāgāmi stage to rebirth as a Gandhabba. An advanced upāsaka naturally did not wish to have re-existence however happy it might be. Citta Gahapati when in deathbed was tempted by the gods to wish to have a future existence as a Cakkavatti, but he convinced them that the life of a Cakkavatti was impermanent and hence it was also not a desirable state.¹

The upāsakas and upāsikās, though retaining their white dress, aspired for the fruits obtained by the monks and nuns, viz., Sotāpatti, Sakadāgāmi and Anāgāmi. Like the monks they had not the opportunity of following a particular way of life, but still they were held out the hope that by fulfilling the duties prescribed for them they could attain three of the four fruits attained by a monk or nun.

The first fruit attained by a monk is Sotāpatti. It could also be attained by an upāsaka or upāsikā by practising saddhā, sila, suta, cāga and paññā explained above.² The condition precedent to the attainment of this fruit is the removal of three hindrances, viz., belief in the existence of a self (sakkāyadiṭṭhi),³ belief in the efficacy of rituals (sīlabbataparamāsas) and lack of

¹ Samyutta, iv, pp. 301-4.
² Pp. 222-3; for details, see Samyutta, ii, p. 681 also Samyutta, v p. 411. In addition to the above five-fold practices the lay-devotees were recommended to cultivate the following four habits: association with wise men, listening to religious discourses, proper mental exertion (yoniso manasikara) and observance of all major and minor rules of morality.
³ That the self is identical with one or all of the khandhas. See Samyutta, iv, p. 287.
faith in the Triratna (vicikicchā). There are instances of several upāsakas and upāsikās who attained sotāpatti.

It is rather interesting to read of an instance of a lay-devotee addicted to drinking attaining the fruit of Sotāpatti. The reason shown is that he had so much faith in the Triratna that he could not be reborn in any of the lower planes of existence and was destined to sambodhi.¹

The second fruit attained by a monk is Sakadāgāmi. The conditions precedent to the attainment of this stage was the reduction of attachment (rāga), hatred (dosa) and delusion (moha) to the minimum (tanuttta). A large number of lay-devotees complied with this condition and attained the Sakadāgāmi stage, i.e., they would come once more to this world, and then attain Nibbāna.

The third fruit attained by a monk is Anāgāmi. To attain this stage one must completely remove rāga, dosa and moha. The usual condition laid down for a lay-devotee is that he is to remove the five impurities of the lower category (orambhāgiyas) to attain this fruit. The five impurities are the three samyojanas, mentioned above viz., sakkāyaditthi, silabbataparāmāsa and vicikicchā, the other two being kāmarāga and byāpāda in other words, rāga and dosa. By reaching the Anāgāmi stage, the lay-devotee does not return to the world but is reborn only once in one of the heavens to attain Nibbāna (tattheparinibbāyi).

The fourth fruit arhatta is not attained by any householder, hence it is beyond the range of achievements of a lay-devotee.²

In view of the several statements in the Nikāyas about the afterlife of an upāsaka, it is clear that no upāsaka attained arhathood.

¹ Samyutta, v. p. 375. ² See, Infra.
i.e., Nibbāna. In the *Aggivacchagottasutta* it is explicitly stated that no householder without giving up the householder’s life can end his suffering at the time of his death. In other words, he can be only at the most an Anāgāmi, i.e., he must be born once more as a god to attain Nibbāna.

There was a controversy between the Theravādins and the Uttarāpathakas, and recently between Prof. de la Vallée Poussin and Dr. B. C. Law on the point whether a householder could become an arhat (*Gibi ‘ssa arahā ti?’*). The Uttarāpathakas and Dr. B. C. Law relied on certain passages of the Nikāyas, in which a few householders are mentioned as having become arhats. The Uttarāpathakas cited the instances of Yasa Kulaṇḍutta, Uittiya gahapatī and Setu Māṇava, while Dr. B. C. Law drew his support from the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* (iii, p. 451), in which it is said that Sudatta gahapatī (= Anāthapiṇḍika), Citta gahapatī, Uggo gahapatī and a few other householders realised the immortal (amataddaso), i.e. Nibbāna. The remark in the *Majjhima Nikāya* that a householder could realise the excellent truth is discussed in the *Milindapañha* (p. 243), in which Milinda raised the question that if a householder or a recluse could attain the truth by following the right course, there was no necessity for a person to become a monk. Again he questioned if countless householders visualised the truth, what was the good of taking recourse to the ascetic practices (*dhutasangas*). Nāgasena gave an

1 *Majjhima*, i, p. 483: Narthi koci gihi gihisamyojanam appahāya kāyassa bheda dukkhass’ antakaro ‘ti.
3 *Kathāvatthu*, iv, 1.
6 *Milindapañha*, p. 350.
evasive answer and dilated on the merits of renunciation and observance of dhutanga precepts, and avoided the issue by stating that those householders who realised the truth had practised the dhutangas in their previous lives.

The passage relied on by Dr. B. C. Law no doubt speaks of the gahapatis having been amataddaso, but in the same Nikaya and elsewhere Buddha declared at Nadika that none of the Upasakas mentioned there became arhats. Nakulapitā and Jivaka became a Sotapanna, Sudatta a Sakadāgāmi,1 Ugga and Citta became Anāgāmis.2 The Theravādins3 contended that a householder in the enjoyment of worldly pleasures could not normally be expected to become arhats. In the similar strain Nāgasena stated that on the very day that a householder attained arhathood, he must either die or take the yellow robe.4 Prof. de la Vallée Poussin also held the opinion that a layman, however faithful or virtuous he might be, could not attain Nibbāna.5 Buddhaghosa explained the anomaly by saying that Yasa, Uttiya and Setu were mere householders in name, in external dress but not spiritually; they were free from all worldly ties though they had not yet discarded the white dress of a householder.6 The conclusion that should be drawn from the conflicting statements in the Nikayas

1 See above, p. 233.
3 Kathavatthu, iv. 1.
4 Milindapañha, p. 265.
5 The Way to Nirvāṇa, p. 150-151.
6 Cf. Papañcasūdani, iii, p. 156: Santati the minister, Uggasena the banker's son, Vitasoka the young boy attained arhathood while in householder's dress, but the householder's dress (gibilīngam) cannot uphold the merit of an arhat and so they must either die or retire on the very day arhathood is attained by them.
about the attainments of an upāsaka and the controversies in the Kathāvattthu and the Milinda-panha, is that normally a householder could not become an arhat, but there were exceptional cases of householders who became so spiritually advanced that they deserved arhathood but the convention was that no householder unless he gave up his household life would be recognised as an arhat. Upāsakas like Citta and Hatthaka, and Upāsikās like Khujjuttarā and Nandamātā were more spiritually advanced than many monks and nuns, but still they were sekhas and not asekhas (= arhats).¹ They are said to have destroyed the orambhāgiya impurities² but not the five uddhambhāgiyas: viz., rūparāga, arūparāga, māna, uddhacca, and avijjā, and hence, they could not attain arhathood.³


² Cf. Majjhima, i, pp. 467. 490-1.

³ In the Anguttara, (iv, p. 456), it is stated that one cannot be an arhat without removing rāga, dosa, moha, kodha, upanāha, makkha, palāsa, issā, and maccchariya.
CHAPTER XIII

THE MAURYAS AND BUDDHISM

Mahāpadma Nanda, according to the testimony of the Buddhist historians, patronised Buddhism and died as a true Buddhist (see above, p. 24). That he was not well disposed towards the Brāhmmins is evidenced by the episode of Cāṇakya, whose claim as the leading Brāhmaṇa of the time in Pūpphapura on account of his extraordinary proficiency in the Brāhmaṇical lore was rejected by Mahāpadma Nanda. It is also not improbable that for his Buddhist leanings he lost his throne through the machinations of his Brahmin ministers. His reign was however marked in the Buddhist ecclesiastical history by several controversies and appearance of un-orthodox views within the Saṅgha. These controversies went on unabated and gave rise to several new sects, a survey of which is given in the previous chapters.

Candragupta

The story of the accession of Candragupta to the Magadhan throne with the help of Brāhmaṇa minister Cāṇakya is too well-known to be repeated here.² Dr. Ray Chaudhuri identifies the

1 Vamsattavapakāsini, pp. 182 ff.
2 In the Vamsattavapakāsini, p. 181, the story of the meeting of Cāṇakya with Candragupta is given as follows:—Cāṇakya went to Pūppapura for entering into disputation with the learned brāhmaṇas of the place, and by defeating them wanted to become the chief brāhmaṇa (Saṅghabrāhmaṇa). King Nanda, however, was displeased with his uncouth appearance and turned him out of the assembly of brāhmaṇas. Cāṇakya thereupon fled and took shelter at the palace of the
Moriyas of the Mahāvasa tradition with the Moriyas of Pippahalivana mentioned in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta as one of the claimants to the relics of Buddha and holds that Candra-gupta belonged to the Moriya clan of Pippalivana, who were Kṣatriyas.\(^1\) Candragupta carried on a long struggle to wrest the throne from the Nandas as also to extend his dominion from the Panjab to as far south as the northern border of Mysore, and from Magadha to Surāstra in Western India.\(^2\)

It is apparent that Candragupta's reign was a reign of conquests and that he had hardly any peaceful respite. Though he was surrounded by Brāhmaṇa ministers, it seems that his faith was not wholly Brāhmanic. It is said that he sought the air of a Jaṭila ascetic to quell certain disorders in his dominion and that towards the end of his life, he preferred to live the life of a Jaina ascetic and retired to a lonely place in the southern border of his empire.\(^3\)

Candragupta, as the tradition goes, abdicated the throne in favour of his son, Simhasena. It was however not Simhasena but Bindusāra who succeeded to his throne. It may be that Candragupta, for his non-brāhmanic leanings in the latter part of his life, lost the confidence of Brāhmin ministers, who, in defiance of his wishes, placed another son of his on the throne—a son who

\(^1\) Political History of Ancient India, 3rd ed., p. 181.

\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 182-4.

\(^3\) Shah, Jainism in North India, p. 131; Mookerji, Candragupta Maurya and his times, p. 23.
was more sympathetic towards Brāhmaṇanism and perhaps promised support to the Brahmin ministers.

In the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (p. 612), Candragupta is given the credit of making the kingdom free from enemies. He is described as a righteous and meditative person and a seeker of the truth, but on coming into contact with evil friends, he killed many living beings and ultimately died, putting Bindusāra on the throne surrounded by evil ministers.

The chief evil minister whom the author of the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* had in mind was of course Cāṇakya the arch enemy of the Buddhists. He writes that Cāṇakya perfected himself in the *Yamāntaka-siddhi* and was the personification of anger. He lived long and acted as the minister not only of Candragupta but also of his son and grandson.¹

**Bindusāra**

Bindusāra, influenced and surrounded as he was by the Brāhmaṇa ministers, the chief of whom was Cāṇakya, lent his support to Brāhmaṇanism. In the *Samantapāsādikā*,² as also in the *Mahāvamsa*,³ it is stated that Bindusāra fed 60,000 brāhmaṇas and members of the brāhmaṇical religious orders. The Buddhist historians have mostly passed over the name of Bindusāra, proving thereby the king’s lukewarmness if not antipathy towards Buddhism. Inspite of Bindusāra’s lack of interest, the progress of the religion did not suffer any serious set-back.⁴ The

---

¹ Cf. Buiton II, p. 118: "King Nanda’s reign will endure 56 years and his friend will be the Brahmin Panini. Then there will appear the king Candragupta, and after him his son Bindusāra who will rule for 70 years. The minister of these kings, Cāṇakya, will depart to hell."

² *Samantapāsādikā*, I, p. 44.

³ *Mahāvamsa*, V, 34.

⁴ Tāranātha (German transl., p. 89) states that Bindusāra with the
chief centre of Buddhism remained in Magadha, although the
new sects, which came into existence a few decades ago, preferred
to move away from this ancient centre to find a home for them-
selves in different parts of India. We may say that during the
reign of Bindusāra, the Theravādins shifted their centre to
Avantī, the Sarvāstivādins to Mathurā, the Mahīśāsakas to
Mysore, and the Mahāsaṅghikas to the Andhra country, but all
of them had their adherents living in the monasteries of
Magadha.

Asoka

The two outstanding Maurya rulers, Candragupta and
Asoka, put into shade the glories of the other rulers of this
dynasty. Candragupta again was surpassed by his grandson
Asoka, who not only extended his dominion but also conso-
lidated his vast empire and brought peace and happiness to his
innumerable subjects. He had the rare courage and intelligence
to see through the aims and activities of his ministers and never
allowed himself to be ruled by them. Untramelled by the age-
long traditional beliefs and customs, he freely exercised his
power of judgment in order to distinguish the right from the
wrong; be it a secular or a religious matter. No reliable his-
tory of this great ruler, to our regret, has come down to us but

help of Cāṇakya extended his dominion from the eastern to the western
ocean......During the reign of this king a monastery called Kusumā-
laṅkāra was built at Kusumapura. In this monastery lived Ācārya
Mātrceta, who spread both Hinayāna and Mahāyāna. About this time
Bindusāra's brother's son king Śrīcandra erected a temple of Avalokiteś-
vāra and maintained 2000 monks of the Mahāyāna school. Tārānātha,
it seems, had made some confusion of the name of Bindusāra with that
of a later king.
many distinguished scholars have reconstructed the history of this great man from the several inscriptions left by him, and the traditions preserved in the Buddhist-Sanskrit and Pāli texts. These traditions¹ have not been so exhaustively studied as the inscriptions and so we have thought it fit to give them here in bare outlines to enable the readers to find out from the mass of legends the common nuclei which might be taken as authentic.

_Buddhist-Sanskrit Traditions_

Succession: Bindusāra married a brahmin girl and had by her two sons Aśoka and Vitasoka.² One day he enquired of Piṅgalavatśa, an Ājivaka monk, as to which of his sons would ascend the throne after him, and found out from Piṅgalavatśa's hint that Aśoka would succeed him. Piṅgalavatśa, after making this prophecy, left the place for a border country for safety. About this time, there was a revolt at Taksāsilā. To quell the revolt Bindusāra deputed Aśoka, who carried out the mission successfully. Meanwhile, Bindusāra's ministers became displeased with the manners of Susīma, the eldest son of Bindusāra, and wanted to place Aśoka on the throne, though it was not the will of the old king. A fight ensued between Aśoka and Susīma, and the latter was ultimately killed and Aśoka seized the throne. Susīma's valiant soldiers, who were left alive, entered the Buddhist Saṅgha as monks, and in course of time, became _arhats._

¹ There are four Aśokan stories in the _Divyāvadāna_ (pp. 369-434), viz., _Pamsupradāna, Kunāla, Vitasoka_ and _Aśoka_.
Conversion: After accession to the throne, Aśoka put the old ministers, excepting Rādhagupta, to death. He made Rādhagupta his chief minister. At his advice he appointed a hangman called Candañgirika, who by nature was cruel and ferocious. Aśoka built for him a house, into which, it was ordained, whoever should enter would be put to death by Candañgirika. The house was similar in conception to the hell described in the Buddhist text called Bālapandita Sūtra. One day, a bhikṣu called Samudra unknowingly entered into the house and was placed on fire, but he could not be burnt to death. On the other hand, he showed some miracles and reiterated the prophecy of the Teacher that one hundred years after his pari-nirvāṇa, Aśoka would become the monarch with his capital at Pātaliputra, and that he would propagate the religion widely by erecting stūpas over the relics of the Teacher. On hearing this episode of Samudra, Aśoka became repentant, confessed his sins, and asked for pardon. He ultimately took refuge in the saint, in the Buddha and in his Dharma. After developing faith in the Triratna he used to salute the monks everywhere, whether alone or in the midst of many, much to the chagrin of his minister Yaśas, who, although a devotee of Buddha, wanted the king to discriminate among the monks by their original castes but Aśoka resented the idea and explained to him how mistaken was his notion.

Erection of Stūpas: At this time, Bhikṣu Yaśas was the Saṅghatthera at Pātaliputra, where was situated the monastery.

1. In one of their previous lives, it is said that Rādhagupta approved the gift made by Aśoka when as a child he gave some mud as rice-gruel to Buddha who accepted the gift and foretold that Aśoka would be reborn as a king of Pātaliputra and disseminate his religion. See Divyā, p. 402. 2 Divyā, p. 380. 3 Divyā, p. 382.
Kurkuṭārāma. Aśoka approached him and expressed his desire to erect stūpas over the relics. He had the relics deposited in the stūpas erected by Ajātaśatru and others opened up, dividing them into several portions for constructing stūpas over them at different places. All these stūpas were completed on the same day and hour, and from that day onwards Aśoka came to be known as Dharmaśoka instead of Cāndāśoka.

About this time he heard the name of Upagupta, the renowned monk of Mathurā, and probably the Saṅghatthera of the place, and became anxious to make his acquaintance. Upagupta also, on coming to know of Aśoka's change of heart and desire to propagate the religion, came down to Pātaliputra and was royally received by the king. Aśoka laid bare his heart before him and declared that he was prepared to sacrifice his self, son, house, wife, treasury and kingdom for the sake of the religion and that he wanted his help to propagate the religion further by marking the spots sanctified by the Teacher by his presence on different occasions during his life-time. A detailed geographical account of the peregrinations of Buddha was then given by Upagupta, and Aśoka marked every spot sanctified by Buddha's presence by a stūpa.

The spots sanctified by the demise of Sāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, Mahākāśyapa, Vakkula and Ānanda were also pointed out by Upagupta and marked by Aśoka with stūpas.

1 Divyā., p. 388:

शास्त्रानन्द दर्शनान्द शोभन्वी कोषमेव न
न किंविदिपरिवयाम धर्मराजम शास्त्रं II. Cf. also, pp. 493, 429.

2 He was first taken to Lumbinivana, then to the different sites of Kapilavastu, then the meeting places of Gautama with Bimbisāra, Ārāda, Rudraka, Nandabālā. Then he was shown Bodhimūla, the way to Vārāṇasi, Rṣipatana and Kuśinagara. Cf. Watters, II, p. 91.
Quinquennial ceremonies of gifts: Asoka then instituted the quinquennial assemblies of Buddhist monks\(^1\) for offering gifts to monks of all quarters which included Tamasāvana (in Kashmir), Revataka (in Mahāvana), Sairiṣaka (in Anavataptahada), and Gandhamādana mountains. After taking bath he used to put on new clothes with wide borders,\(^2\) observe the eight śilas prescribed for the lay-devotees, and then make his offerings to the monks of all quarters.

In the quinquennial assembly, he came across two Ubbhayatobhāgavimuktau arhats,\(^3\) and out of deep veneration for them, he started offering robes to the monks in addition to food.

Bathing Bodhi-tree: Besides his offerings to the monks, he worshipped the Bodhi-tree and spent large sums on its worship. His devotion to the Bodhi-tree rose to such a pitch that it even roused the jealousy of his queen Tisyarakṣitā, who once contrived to have the Bodhi-tree destroyed. At the instance of Pindola Bharadvāja he instituted the ceremony of bathing the Bodhi-tree, before offering gifts to the monks.

Buddha's Image: While holding the quinquennial ceremony of gifts, he found out that the oldest monk living at the time was Pindola Bharadvāja, who was then residing at a place on the north of Sararājya in the Gandhamādana mountains, and that he had seen Buddha many times. He listened to his description of Buddha's figure, which was endowed with all the major and minor signs. He was highly pleased with the account

---

1 Divyā, p. 398: चालक्षेपकाः व भविष्यमणियो वष्णुवार्षिकम्।

2 Divyā, p. 398: खलाक्षेपानिनि वातावि नवा तीव्रेदेशादि प्राङ्क्षादाशः

3 Divyā, p. 404. For the two classes of Arhats, see Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism, p. 276.
but there is no mention of Aśoka’s attempt to make an image.

Conversion of Vītaśoka: When Aśoka had become an ardent devotee of Buddha, erected several stūpas, instituted the quinquennial offerings to the Saṅgha and gave alms daily to countless monks, his brother continued to be an adherent of a non-Buddhist sect, condemning the Sākyaputriya Śramaṇas as unfit for attaining emancipation on account of their easy going life.¹ In order to convince Vītaśoka of the excellence of the Buddhist way of life, Aśoka put his brother on the throne with all the royal paraphernalia for one week on the condition that he would be put to death after that time. Vītaśoka could not enjoy his royalty due to fear of death and became emaciated. Then Aśoka pointed out to him that how the Buddhist monks, who constantly cogitated on the end of their lives, could enjoy food and other articles of use. Vītaśoka realised the value of Aśoka’s instruction and became a convert to Buddhism. He was ordained by Yaśas, the Saṅghasthavira of Kurkuṭārāma. He, however, being a member of the royal family, received too much attention from the people of Pātaliputra, and so seeking solitude he went to a monastery in Videha to complete his spiritual exercises. After attaining arhathood, Vītaśoka paid a visit to Aśoka, and delivered to him and Rādhagupta a discourse.

Beheading of Ascetics: Vītaśoka went to a border country Pundravardhana where he fell ill, but was cured by the medicine sent by Aśoka. During his illness, his hairs, nails etc. grew, and his look and dress appeared like that of an Ājīvaka ascetic. At this time, certain Nirgrantha (Ājīvaka) devotees of Pundra-

¹ Divyā., p. 419: नानि शाक्यपुत्रीराणि भोच देवत। Cf. Watters, II, pp. 93 ff.
vadhanas showed disrespect to a Buddha-image. This enraged Aśoka, who ordered the death of all Ājivakas, and even fixed the price of one dinara for every head of a Nirgrantha. Vītāśoka was mistaken as a Nirgrantha ascetic and was beheaded. This gave a very rude shock to Aśoka.

Last days of Aśoka: Aśoka began to multiply his gifts to the Saṅgha, and this drained the treasury so much that his gifts had to be forcibly stopped by the Crown-prince Sampadi, son of Kuṇāla. Evidently Aśoka was now in his dotage and could no longer exercise his royal power freely, and had to remain satisfied by giving to the Saṅgha whatever he could lay hold of. Rādhagupta continued to be his minister up to his last days.

Pāli Traditions

The following traditions are preserved in the Ceylonese chronicles in Pāli.

Succession: The family priest Janāsana ājivaka foretold that Aśoka would succeed Bindusāra to the throne. This Ājivaka monk was later ordained by Assagutta at Vattaniya hermitage.

According to the Jaina tradition, Aśoka was followed by Kuṇāla and Saṃpratī. The latter, as Smith observes, promoted the cause of Jainism as Aśoka did of Buddhism. See K. T. Shah, Jainism in North India, pp. 138, 144-5. The inscriptions on Nāgārjuna Hill too indicate that Daśaratha's leanings were towards the Ājivakas, an offshoot of the Jains. See Infra, p. 254.

According to Divyā., p. 432, the successors of Aśoka were Saṃapati-Bṛhaspati-Vṛṣasena-Pusyadharma-Pusyamitra, the last of whom announced 100 dināras for every head of a Buddhist monk.

According to the Vāyu Purāṇa, Kuṇāla reigned for eight years. He was followed by his son Bandhupālita. His successors were Indrapālita-Devavarman-Satadhanus-Bṛhadratha. See Infra, p. 254.

1 According to the Jaina tradition, Aśoka was followed by Kuṇāla and Saṃpratī. The latter, as Smith observes, promoted the cause of Jainism as Aśoka did of Buddhism. See K. T. Shah, Jainism in North India, pp. 138, 144-5. The inscriptions on Nāgārjuna Hill too indicate that Daśaratha’s leanings were towards the Ājivakas, an offshoot of the Jains. See Infra, p. 254.

and became the preceptor of Aśoka in his early days. Aśoka was at Ujjeni when his father was in the death-bed. He hurried back to the capital and, after killing 99 step-brothers, seized the throne of Magadha. The eldest son of Bindusāra was Sumana. It took him four years to consolidate his powers. He formally crowned himself as the king of Magadha and made his uterine brother Tissa the Crown-prince.

Conversion: He was continuing the family tradition of feeding several brāhmaṇas, but he became dissatisfied with the unseemly manner of the brāhmaṇas. At this time, he met Nigrodha Sāmanera, who was a posthumous son of Sumana, the eldest son of Bindusāra. He listened to his discourse on Appamāda (diligence) and was very much impressed by Nigrodha’s demeanour and arranged daily food for him and his fellow brethren, in place of the non-Buddhists whom he had been feeding so long.

Erection of Stūpas: Learning from Moggaliputta Tissa, that there were 84,000 dharmas, he decided to build one monastery for each dharma. He made lavish gifts to the Triratna. All these monasteries were completed on the same day and hour. He built caityas on the spots sanctified by Buddha’s presence. He ordered that all men observing uposatha

1. Vamsatthapakāsini, I, p. 192-3: This incident is recorded in the Sihalatthakathā in the commentary on Cūlasihanādasutta of the Majjhimaṇṇaṅgītī. This however is not found in Buddhaghosa’s commentary.

2. This information is derived from Vinayatthakathā and not Mahāvamsatthakathā. See Vamsatthappakāsini, I, p. 207.

3. Cf. Divyā, p. 419: यदा राजासीविन भगवधानमेऽ सहा प्रतिष्ठा तेन पुरुषोत्तिमससंज्ञिकात्मस् प्रतिष्ठापितं पञ्चशौचिकं च कलम् etc. see also p. 429.

4. Mahāvaṃsa, V. 175.
should congregate for worship. From that day onwards, he became known as Dharmāśoka instead of Candāśoka.

Buddha's image: He had an image of Buddha endowed with all the major and minor signs made by Mahākāla Nāga. Then he instituted the ceremony of the worship of Buddha's image.

Conversion of Tissa, the Crown-prince: Tissa doubted the efficacy of the Buddhist way of life. In order to convince him of its excellence, Asoka put him on the throne for seven days on the condition that he would be put to death after that time. Tissa became pale and emaciated and could not enjoy his royalty. The king then pointed out to him how the monks, who constantly thought of death, could enjoy worldly pleasures. Tissa was converted and was ordained by Mahādhammarakkhita the Yonaka. After Tissa, Aggibrahmā, the nephew and son-in-law of Asoka, as also Aggibrahmā's son, Sumana, took ordination. Then followed the ordination of Mahinda and Samghamittā. Moggaliputta Tissa became the upajjhāya of Mahinda, Mahādeva the ācariya, and Majjhantika gave the kammavāca.

Medicines: On hearing that a bhikkhu called Tissa died for want of medicine, Asoka made arrangements for giving medicines to the monks.

Beheading of unorthodox monks: Asoka ordered that all monks should observe the fortnightly uposatha. On the refusal of the orthodox monks to carry out the order of the king, his minister began to behead them, when the king's brother Tissa intervened by offering his head. When this was brought to the notice of the king, he was shocked and sought advice for exoneration from such a hineous act. This led to the arrival of

1 Mahāvaṃsa, V. 182.  
2 Ibid., V. 189.
Moggaliputta Tissa, who had retired to the forest, at Pāṭaliputra.

The two traditions compared

The above two traditions preserved in Sanskrit and Pāli, evidently have a common basis, which may be briefly stated thus:

(i) Aśoka's mother had Ājīvaka leanings though Bindusāra followed the brāhmanical religion.

(ii) Aśoka secured the throne of Magadha after a fratricidal war, in which all of his step-brothers were killed, leaving a posthumous son of his eldest brother, and his uterine brother called Vītāsoka in the Sanskrit, Tissa in the Pāli tradition.

(iii) Aśoka was converted to Buddhism by Samudra or Nigrodha. The former probably belonged to the entourage of the eldest son of Bindusāra, as it is said in the Sanskrit tradition that the valiant soldiers of Susīma (in Pāli Sumana) became arhats. Nigrodha also is described as the posthumous son of Sumana. Hence the conversion was made by somebody connected with Susīma or Sumana.

(iv) Aśoka erected several monasteries, and stūpas over the spots sanctified by Buddha's presence.

(v) In the Sanskrit tradition, emphasis is laid on the worship of Bodhi-tree while in Pāli on the worship of Buddha's image.

(vi) The story of the conversion of Aśoka's brother Vītāsoka or Tissa is almost identical.

(vii) In Sanskrit, the story of the quinquennial assembly of monks is given in detail and seems to have a historical basis as it is echoed in the Aśokan inscriptions.¹ The Ceylonese

¹ See Rock Edict III.
chronicles very probably utilised this tradition of quinquennial assembly for their story of the Third Council and edification of the Theravāda sect.¹

(viii) The story of the beheading of ascetics including Viṭa-śoka is echoed in the Ceylonese tradition of the beheading of the unorthodox monks, but the former story appears to be more plausible. In any case, the underlying fact is that Aśoka did commit the blunder of ordering death of some ascetics.

(ix) In both the traditions, there is no mention of Aśoka having taken ordination and joined the Saṅgha. All that we have is that on ceremonial occasions Aśoka observed the eight śīlas like a good upāsaka.

(x) Aśoka’s gifts to the Saṅgha were endless. In Ceylonese tradition, however, the enormity of gifts is not so much emphasised upon as his consent to the ordination of his son and daughter, who were responsible for propagating Buddhism in Ceylon. It may be that the Sanskrit writers were not interested in this propagation and so passed over the incident as unimportant.

(xi) The Saṅghatthera of Pātaliputra is called in the Sanskrit texts as Yaśas while in Pāli, it is Yonaka Dhammarakkhitā. Prominence is given to Upagupta of Mathurā in the Sanskrit traditions and Moggaliputta Tissa in Pāli. This is evidently a result of the sectarian bias. Upagupta was a Sarvāstivādin and so he is mentioned in the Sanskrit texts belonging to the Sarvāstivādins. He is ignored in the Theravāda tradition preserved in Pāli, which puts up the name of Moggaliputta Tissa in stead. Both Upagupta and Moggaliputta Tissa might be historical persons, but their position as a religious adviser of Aśoka should be discounted.

¹ See Infra.
(xii) In conclusion, it may be remarked that Aśoka might not have been as tolerant as he posed to be in his Edicts, at least in his early days. It may be that in his old age he realised his mistake of supporting one sect as against another and felt repentant, and in order to atone for his misguided deeds, he began to preach toleration.

Aśoka's successors (232-185 B.C.)

There is yet a great deal of uncertainty about the successors of Aśoka. From the Seventh Pillar Edict it is evident that Aśoka had many queens and sons. This is corroborated by the Buddhist legends about Aśoka as also by Tāranātha, who writes that Aśoka had eleven sons.¹ Names of four sons have come down to us. These are:

(i) Tivara, son of Queen Kāruvāki of the Aśokan inscriptions; he was the viceroy of Takṣāśilā, Ujjayini, Suvarṇagiri and Tosali.²

(ii) Kuṇāla (also known as Dharmavivaradhana and Suyaśas), son of Queen Padmāvati; he was deputed to Takṣāśilā for suppressing the rising of the Frontier Tribes, and was rendered blind through the machinations of his step-mother Tisyarakṣitā.³

(iii) Mahinda, son of the Vidisa lady married by Aśoka when he was the viceroy at Ujjayini; he was the famous apostle to Ceylon;⁴ and

---

1 Schiefner, Geschichte des Buddhismus etc., p. 48.
2 Raychaudhury, op. cit., p. 237.
3 Raychaudhury, op. cit., p. 238; Watters, I, p. 246; Przyluski, La légende de l'empereur Aśoka, p. 109; Schiefner, op. cit., p. 48.
4 See Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, p. 610; Schiefner, op. cit., pp. 40, 48; Bu-ston, II, p. 118; Divyāvadāna, p. 430; Watters, II, p. 100; Raychaudhury, op. cit., p. 238; Przyluski, op. cit., p. 240.
(iv) Jaluka of the Kashmirian tradition.

Of the grandsons of Aśoka, the names of only two have come down to us:—

(i) Sampadi or Viśoka\(^1\) (restored by Schiefner from Tibet-an as Vićāśoka or Vigatāśoka), son of Kuṇāla; he acted as Aśoka's treasurer and stopped the emperor's unending largess to the Buddhist Saṅgha, and later succeeded him; and

(ii) Daśaratha of the Purānic tradition and Aśokan inscriptions; he was a patron of the Ājīvakas.

There is very little information about the succeeding rulers of the Mauryan line,\(^2\) the last of which is said to be Brāhadratha, whose assassinator is wrongly recorded in the Divyāvalāna (p. 433) as the Maurya king.\(^3\)

The lavish gifts made by the Emperor on the various religious organisations and specially on the Buddhist Saṅgha met with a natural reaction in the hands of his successors. They disavowed the religion patronised by Aśoka and indicated their antipathy by supporting Jainsim, Ājīvakism and Sivaism to the exclusion of Buddhism.

---

1 Schiefner restores Vigatāśoka from Tibetan  YYSF  which may be restored as Viśoka as given in the Mañjuśrīmalalakalpa, p. 610.

Nanda (Rmr) is described as the grandson of Viśoka and son of Śūrasena (not Vīrasena). See Mmk., p. 613; Watters, II, p. 97; Schiefner, p. 53.

2 According to Tāranātha, Aśoka was succeeded by his grandson Viśoka followed by Viśoka's son Śūrasena—his son Nanda, who was a contemporary of Pāṇini—then Mahāpadma (see Schiefner, p. 52) whose contemporaries were Šehiramati, Bhadra and Vararuci.

There is another tradition (Schiefner, op. cit., p. 287): Sampadi-Brhaspati-Vṛṣasena-Puṣyavarman-Puṣyamitra.

3 See Raychaudhury, op. cit., p. 240.
Jalauka

The story of Jalauka, as given in the Rājaratanaṅgiṇī, reveals that he supported the Nāga and Śiva cults of Kashmir and persecuted the Buddhists. In the legend of Kṛtyā he is referred to as one who persecuted the Buddhists and destroyed the vihāras. His heart, however, was softened by the Bodhisattva ideal—the new aspect of Buddhism that had just then emerged. The Hinayāna Buddhists are painted in black and they are described as bent on taking revenge for his cruel acts. He built the Kṛtyāśrama vihāra and dedicated it not to Buddha but to the sorceress Kṛtyā. He directed his energies and munificence to the erection of Śiva temples and, possibly, it was an attempt to resuscitate Śivaism, which had waned in Kashmir owing to the popularity of Buddhism under Aśoka’s patronage.

Daśaratha

The anti-Buddhistic spirit of Daśaratha may be inferred from his gifts to the Ājīvakas and the silence of the Buddhist texts about his reign.

Sampadi

The anti-Buddhistic spirit of Samapadi is apparent from his disapproval of Aśoka’s gifts to the Buddhist Saṅgha as also from the Jaina accounts of his activities for the propagation of Jaina faith and the establishment of vihāras for śramaṇas in the non-Aryan countries. Tāranātha’s discreet silence over the events of his rule indicate also his unfavourable attitude towards the Buddhists.

1 Rāja. I, pp. 136, 140-4; see Kṣemendra, Samaya Mātṛkā, v. 61.
2 Roychaudhury, op. cit., p. 239; see also I.H.Q., 1930, p. 343.
Pusyamitra

The climax of anti-Buddhist feelings of Asoka's successors is narrated in the Divyāvadāna and Aśokāvadāna, in which Pusyamitra is described as wishing to surpass his renowned predecessor Asoka by undoing the works done by him. He razed the stūpas and vihāras to the ground and put the price of 100 dinaras on the head of every Buddhist śramaṇa. Mr. Havell, however, offers a valuable suggestion in explanation of this violent attitude of Pusyamitra towards the Buddhists. He writes that Pusyamitra's animus was not against "Buddhism as a religion but against the Saṅgha as a political power. If there is any truth in the Buddhist tradition, it is likely that some members of the Saṅgha were concerned in conspiracies against the Suṅga dynasty", and it was they who kindled the fire of wrath of the new sovereign. There is much reason in this view of Mr. Havell, for Buddhism as a religion did not suffer a very serious set back during or after Pusyamitra's reign. The Buddhist monuments of the pre-Christian era that have so far been discovered, the composition of the Buddhist works like the Milinda pañha, Lalitavistara and Mahāvastu about the 2nd or 1st century B.C., the development of the Abhidhamma literatures of the different schools of thought, and the multiplication of Jātaka and Avadāna stories a little before or after the beginning of the Christian era prove beyond doubt that the strength of the religion, which it had already acquired by sending its roots deep down and wide into the several regions of the land of its birth continued unabated notwithstanding the lack of sympathy.

1 Przyluski, op. cit., p. 301-2; Divyā., p. 434; Schiefner, op. cit., p. 81.
2 Havell, History of Aryan Rule in India, p. 123.
of Asoka's successors. The story of the persecution of Puṣya-
mitra can be taken as suggesting that the religion, which
almost monopolised the patronage of Asoka, was disowned by
the state during Puṣyamitra's reign, for many reasons, one of
which, as apprehended by Mr. Havell, was the probable politi-
cal moves of the Buddhist monks against the advent of the new
line of kings, not in favour of the Buddhists.
CHAPTER XIV

AŚOKA’S DHAMMA

There is nothing in the Edicts nor in the Buddhist traditions to prove that Aśoka took up the cause of Buddhism as against Brāhmanism, though there are ample evidences to show that Aśoka had a great, if not the highest, regard for Buddha and his teachings. During the first few years of his reign, he maintained the family tradition of feeding the brāhmaṇas¹ which even now is regarded as a meritorious act. This institution came into vogue for supporting a spiritually minded cultured class, who were unmindful about earning their livelihood. In course of time, it became a ritualistic affair, the original object of which was lost sight of. It did not however take Aśoka long to find out that the essential object of feeding the brāhmaṇas was more overlooked than observed. With his discriminating vision he took the right course of replacing the undeserving brāhmaṇas by deserving monks or ascetics, brāhmanical or non-brāhmanical. He no doubt deviated from the traditional convention, and it behoved a man of his courage and conviction to do so. That Aśoka was an out and out radicalist and a rationalist is clearly revealed in his Edicts. He cared neither for the brāhmanical rituals and traditions nor for the Jaina or Buddhist forms of ceremonies and observances. He was neither fond of a brāhmanical guru nor of a Buddhist theranor of a Jaina sādhu. He had his own ideals of religion—an

¹ Cf. Mahāvamsa, V, 34:
Pitā saṭṭhisahassāni brāhmaṇe brahmapakkhike bhojesi, so pi te yeva tiṇi vassāni bhojayi.
R.E. VIII, says “Aśoka gave gifts to brāhmaṇas and ascetics.”
ideal which would not bear a sectarian name. In forming the conception of his ideal, he was undoubtedly influenced by the Buddhist and Jaina teachings, but he was not enamoured of the Buddhist or Jaina ideal of retirement from worldly life. He stood against the brahmanical practice of killing animals for religious purposes, and dissuaded his subjects from performing brahmanical rituals, which to him were meaningless. From a study of his inscriptions we may outline his religion (Dhamma) thus:

(i) **Heavenly life hereafter:** Aśoka repeatedly stressed upon the desirability of a happy life hereafter, and for that he advised his subjects to be virtuous, to make gifts and to earn merits, as these would bring about happiness in this as also in the next world. There is no pessimistic vein in his teachings nor does he speak of the impermanence of worldly objects. Nowhere do we find in the Edicts any reference to the attainment of Nirvāṇa or the Absolute as the sumnum bonum of life. This shows that Aśoka espoused the religion of the laity and not that of the recluses, to whom heavenly existence was as much undesirable as worldly existence.

(ii) **Ethical teaching (elementary):** The ethical teachings imparted by Aśoka were the usual day to day rules and customs followed by an average householder. These were,—hearkening to parents, reverence to teachers, liberality

---

1 R.E. VI: That they may gain heaven in the next world.
R.E. IX: With this, it is possible to attain heaven (G.D. & J. Texts); it begets endless merit in the next world (K.S. & M. Texts).
R.E. XIII: That which concerns the next world, the Beloved of the gods esteems as alone bearing great fruit. — That (the conquest through Dhamma) is for here and hereafter (p. 332). See Bhandarkar’s Aśoka (3rd ed.), pp. 331-2, 340, 341, 342.
and seemly behaviour towards friends, acquaintances and relatives, and towards Brähmaṇa and Śramaṇa ascetics, and also towards slaves and servants. This teaching, as pointed out by Profs. Bhandarkar, Barua and others is an echo of the instructions given by Buddha to Sigāla the householder, and may be traced in the Dhammapada, Suttanipāta, Aṅguttara Nikāya and other works, in passages which were addressed to some house-holders and had nothing to do with the precepts prescribed for the Buddhist monks and laymen. It will be observed that Aśoka imparted this teaching only in the earlier years of his reign, the Edicts being dated mostly in the 12th year.

(iii) Ethical teaching (higher): Aśoka wanted that some of his subjects should reach a level higher than that of an average householder and it was from these he expected sādhave (much good), apāsinava (freedom from evils) such as strong desire (chamdiya), cruelty, anger, conceit, and envy (P. E. III), dayā (mercy), dāne (liberality), sace (truthfulness), socaye (purity), and mādave (gentleness). (Bhandarkar, p. 104). In this list of duties and virtues there is nothing particularly Buddhist, and if, as Prof. Bhandarkar suggests, that Aśoka utilised the Lakkhaṇasutta, it should be observed that he omitted the words śīla and uposatha, occurring in the verse referred to, indicating that his dhamma was different from that of the lay-Buddhists.

(iv) Ethical teaching (highest): There

1 Bhandarkar, op. cit., p. 124.
2 Dīgha, III, p. 147:
   Sačce ca dhamme ca dame ca saṃyame
   Soceyya-silālay-uposathesu ca
   Dāne ahimsāya asāhase rato
daḷham samādāya samattam acari.
were in Aśoka's dhamma some teachings which were meant, it seems, for the recluses living within his domain. He wished them to live a saintly life by practising self-restraint, purity of mind,\(^1\) gratefulness (katamñātā),\(^2\) by cultivating regard for all sects and by keeping themselves engaged in the preaching of dharma. For them self-restraint (samyama) was more important than gifts and worship,\(^3\) and their gifts should be the gifts of religious instructions (dhammadāna).\(^4\)

(v) Rejection of rites and ceremonies as also of Samājas: Aśoka discouraged rites and ceremonies, specially those performed by women on auspicious occasions, or for averting evils. He condemned Samājas (festive assemblies), which indirectly gave occasion for "drunkenness, revelry and infatuation" (See Batua, Inscriptions, ii, p. 226). It is very likely that Aśoka's dislike of rites and ceremonies was derived from the Buddhist teaching of the avoidance of śīlavṛata-parāmarśa (contagion of rules and rituals) and that of Samājas from the admonitions found in the Sīgālovāda-Sutta (Dīgha, iv, p. 163; Cf. Sīvālakasūtra in the Mahākarmavibhaṅga, p. 56).

1 By bhāvasuddhi Aśoka perhaps had in mind cittasuddhi (mental purification), a discipline which Buddhism and all other religions insist immediately after brahmacārya (physical purity) which is attained by kāyika and vācasika samyama. Bhikkhus attain cittasuddhi by means of meditation whereas the laity have it by love (mettā) and toleration.


3 Bhandarkar, op. cit., p. 320.

4 Cf. Dhammapada: Dhammadānam saddhānaṁ jināti.
(vi) **Aśoka's toleration:** There can be no doubt that though Aśoka was favourably inclined towards the Buddhists, he was not therefore unmindful of the interests of the other religionists. In the Edicts, he harped on the virtue of toleration, which even the Buddhists lacked inspite of Buddha's prohibition of *attukkamsanā* (self-praise) and *parapamsanā* (other's denunciation). He appointed officers (*dhammamahāmātrās*) to look after the interest of the members of all sects (R.E.V.). Their main duty was the promotion of *dharma* among the different sects as also to make money-grants to them. He himself paid visits and made gifts to the brāhmanical and non-brāhmanical ascetics (*samanas*) (R.E. VII). But he wanted that all religious men, irrespective of their creed, should freely dwell at all places (R.E. VII) provided they exercised self-restraint, possessed purity of mind and knew what is right. In R.E. XII, he is more explicit regarding toleration. He says that he honoured members of all sects, ascetics, and even non-ascetics (lay-devotees) and he expected that there should be not only absence of sectarian squibbles but also they should meet and try to acquaint themselves with, and if possible appreciate, one another's views. There must be mutual appreciation, and he enjoined his Dharma-mahāmātras to promote it as far as possible. He did not insist that the several sects should agree regarding their ultimate views but they must all be pure in speech, thought and action. (See also P.E. VI). In the seventh Pillar Edict, he specifically mentioned the Ājīvikas, Nirgranthas and the Buddhists (*Saṅgha*), for whose welfare he appointed the Dharma-mahāmātras. It is remarkable that he would not distinguish between ascetics and householders, if the latter be religious. In his opinion all religious men, whether ascetics or not, were good and as such should be looked after for their spiritual development, which he believed,
consisted mainly in the purity of speech, thought and action, and in avoiding self-praise and other’s denunciation,¹ in other words, mutual appreciation of one another.

(vii) **Asoka’s practical measures**: Asoka did not merely express pious wishes for the moral and spiritual uplift of all religious men. He introduced several practical measures to see that his wishes might be effectively carried out. Some of these measures were, (a) Mandatory orders prohibiting slaughter of animals for sacrifice; (b) Appointment of Dharma-mahāmātras to look after the moral uplift of the people and to give relief to the people in distress; (c) Directing officers like the Yuktas, Rajjukas and Prādesikas to undertake special tours of inspection every five years for propagating his Dhamma,² and (d) An empire wide organisation to see that the people of his empire as well as those living in border countries might be righteous and become godlike.

(viii) **Asoka’s attitude towards Buddhism**: Asoka as the emperor showed toleration to all religions, although he had a personal fancy for Buddhism, and very probably he became a Buddhist upāsaka. In R.E. VIII issued in the roth year of his reign, Asoka says that he paid a visit to the Sambodhi, by which he probably meant Gayā, the place where Buddha attained Sambodhi. In the 14th year of his reign he enlarged the stūpa of Kanakamuni, and in the 20th year he worshipped the stūpa of Kanakamuni as also the birthplace of Buddha (Vide Nigliva Inscr. and Minor Pillar Edict). In the Bhabru edict, he expressed his admiration for Buddha’s teachings and recommended certain texts for special study of the


monks while in the Sarnath and Sanchi inscriptions, he revealed his solicitude for the well-being and concord of the Saṅgha. In the Allahabad Pillar inscription he directed his officers to avert any schism in the church. Lastly, towards the end of his reign when 256 years had elapsed after the death of Buddha, he admitted that out of the two and a half years that he formally became an Upāsaka, he observed the śīlas (i.e., eight śīlas) for only one and a half-year,—the period he lived in a monastery with the monks. There is nothing in the inscriptions to show that Aśoka became an ordained monk nor is there any reference in the Buddhist traditions to such a possibility. He remained a lay-devotee, and very likely he resided in a monastery as such for a certain period of time.
CHAPTER XV

THIRD BUDDHIST COUNCIL

It is only in the Atthakathās¹ and the Ceylonese chronicles that we get an account of the third Buddhist Council held during the reign of Aśoka. The omission of this Council in the Chinese and Tibetan accounts, in other words, in the texts of the non-Theravāda sects, signifies that it was a sectarian affair, for which it was ignored by all sects except the Theravādins, to be more precise, Theravāda-Vibhajjavāda sect of Ceylon.² It is rather remarkable that Hiuen Tsiang or Itsing also has not referred to it though both have mentioned the names of different sects and the spheres of their influence.³ V. A. Smith (Early History of India, 3rd ed., p. 161) dismisses the account of the Ceylonese chronicles as fictitious on account of the fact that it is not mentioned in the Aśokan Pillar edicts. Prof. Kern has doubts about the actual session of the Council, and he thinks that if the Council was at all held, it was only a party meeting. Mrs. Rhys Davids regards the traditional

¹ Samantapāsādikā, I, p. 53 f.; Kathāvatthu-atthakathā, p. 5-6. In the Cullavagga, there is no reference to this council. It may be argued by some that the Cullavagga was composed before the third council.


³ Dr. R. C. Mazumdar thinks that Hiuen Tsiang’s account of the rivalry between the heretics and the Buddhists in connection with the Institution of the Gong-Call Tope may have some connection with this Council. See B. C. Law, Buddhistic Studies, p. 68-69.
account of the Council as something quite different from what actually took place. In her opinion the Pitaka was revised by eight monks and not by a thousand, and the expulsion of monks was carried out after the session of the Council. Dr. Thomas is also inclined to take the account of the Council as an invention of the Ceylonese writers. The traditional account of the Council may not be pure history but the circumstances which led to the Council appear to have a historical basis. The breach between the Theravādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas took place in the Second Buddhist Council, and it grew wider and wider till it became almost impossible for the two sects to live together in the same āvāsa. The controversies recorded in the Kathāvatthu have been corroborated by Vasumitra, Bhavya and others, hence their authenticity cannot be denied. The main business of the Council was the refutation of the doctrines of the more important non-Theravāda schools from the standpoint of the Theravādins. In the Second Buddhist Council the disciplinary rules only were taken exception by the orthodox party, and in this Council interpretation of the doctrines was challenged. From the Nikāya-saṅgraha we learn that the Mahāsaṅghikas did not pay heed to the refutations and that they met together at Kosambi to confirm their own views. The refusal of the orthodox monks to hold Uposatha with the unorthodox monks appears to be authentic and was very likely the main cause for the session of the Council. After expelling the unorthodox monks, the Theravādins met together to establish the contentions of the Theravādins, and the result was the compilation of the Kathavaṭṭthu, which might have been slightly smaller in extent than the present text.

1 E. J. Thomas, History of Buddhist Thought, p. 35.
2 See above, Ch. V.
3 See above, Chs. VIII-XI.
The Traditional Account

The story of the Council as given in the Chronicles runs as follows: About 200 years after Buddha’s death, a large number of non-Buddhists joined the order for the sake of gain. They held unorthodox views in matters of both doctrine and discipline. The orthodox monks refused to perform in their company, the uposatha ceremony, one of the primary conditions of which was that the members present must declare at the outset of the assembly that they were pure, and had not committed any breach of the disciplinary rules, or if they had, confessed the same and taken formal absolution. For full seven years, as the Pāli tradition goes, no uposatha could be held at Pātaliputra. Aśoka deputed one of his ministers to persuade the monks at Aśokārāma to hold the uposatha. On the monks’ refusal to comply with the king’s wishes, the minister had them seated in a row and began to behead them one after another. At this, Aśoka’s brother Tissa, who was also a monk, residing in the same monastery, intervened by taking a seat in the row. The minister got puzzled, and approached the king for direction. Aśoka was stunned at the news, for he never thought that his orders would be carried out in the manner his minister did. He approached the monks to ascertain whether he or his minister or both were guilty for the heinous act of his minister. He did not get satisfaction at the different answers given by the monks, and so at their advice he decided to invite the oldest and the most learned of the monks of the time, Moggaliputta Tissa, who was then staying in a forest, to the Aśokārāma in order to get his doubts solved by him. Moggaliputta Tissa arrived in due course of time and convinced him of his innocence on the ground of the absence of his intention to have the monks beheaded. At his advice, Aśoka decided
to weed out the unorthodox monks from the Saṅgha. He and Tissa called the monks one by one and asked each of them whether Buddha was a Vibhajjavādin or not? Those who answered in the affirmative were allowed to remain within the Saṅgha while the rest were compelled to give up their yellow robes. After thus purging the Saṅgha of unorthodox elements, a Council was held by the orthodox monks, and in that Council the three Piṭakas were recited as was done in the 1st and 2nd Councils. On this occasion Moggaliputta Tissa composed the Kathāvatthu, one of the seven texts of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka, with a view to refute the various doctrinal views held by the non-Theravādins. 1

In the Nikāya-saṅgraha, a late Sinhalese work, there is the additional information that the monks who were compelled to leave the Saṅgha of the Theriya Nikāya (= Theravādins) became members of the non-Theravāda sects, particularly the Mahāsaṅghikas. In course of time they became subdivided into nine sub-sects, viz., Hemavata, Rājagiriya, Siddhatthaka (see above, p. 109), Purvaśaila, Aparāśaila (see above, p. 74 f.), Vājirīya, Vettulaka, Andhaka and Anya-Mahāsaṅghika. In the Mahāvamsa the first six sects are mentioned as some of the later schools which came into being after the first eighteen. The Sālaka schools on account of their location in the Andhra country were also known as the Andhakas (see above, p. 49). The Vettulakas or the Vaitulyas (see above, p. 110) and the Anya-Mahāsaṅghikas referred to in the Kathāvatthu as ekacce Mahāsaṅghikā (see above, p. 74) were also later offshoots of the Mahāsaṅghikas with stronger pro-Mahāyānic views.

1 Mahāvamsa, Ch. V.
By scrutinising the above two traditions, we may draw the following conclusions:—

(i) The heretics (titthiyas) are none other than those Buddhists who were Ācariyavādins, i.e., the Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots.

(ii) The Ācariyavādins differed from the Theravādins not only in disciplinary rules but also in doctrinal principles.

(iii) Monks holding different views about the Pātimokkha rules could not reasonably agree to perform the Uposatha in one Āvāsa. According to the Pātimokkha code of every sect all the members present and the absentees by proxy must declare that they had not, during the preceding fortnight, committed any breach of the rules embodied in the Vinaya Code accepted by them. If this condition be strictly enforced, a Theravādin would be impure according to the Mahāsaṅghika Code and vice versa. Hence no two sects could hold the Uposatha at the same sitting.

(iv) Asoka not conversant with the Vinaya rules wanted to see that the uposathas were held in his Ārāma. He also did not approve of the existence of different sects and probably wanted that they should make up their differences which were in many cases of a minor character.

(v) The main cause of the Council was the disagreement between the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Theravādins about the Vinaya rules. The members of the Mahāsaṅghika sect were considered impure by the members of the Theravāda sect, and so the latter wanted to expel the former from the Saṅgha.

(vi) The Mahāsaṅghikas were already a powerful body with a large following. They probably left Magadha to make their seat in the Andhra country.
(vii) Aśoka’s anxiety for averting schism in the Buddhist church was very probably created by the differences that existed between the Theravādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas.

(viii) It is unlikely that Aśoka sided with the Theravādins as against the Mahāsaṅghikas. Hence Aśoka’s part in the Council as recorded in the Ceylonese traditions may be dismissed as imaginary.

(ix) The Kāthavattthu was definitely the outcome of the deliberations of the Council.

(x) Moggaliputta Tissa was the Saṅghatthera of the Theravāda-vibhajjavāda sect at the time while Upagupta was the Saṅghatthera of the Sarvāstivādins.

(xi) The Theravāda-vibhajjavādins only, to the exclusion of the adherents of other sects, met together and reaffirmed their acceptance of the Theravāda-Pitakkan collection.

Propagation of the religion

The second part of the Ceylonese tradition about the third council deals with the propagation of Buddhism in different countries. It is said that Moggaliputta Tissa after the termination of the Council despatched nine missionaries to nine different places for the propagation of the religion. The names of the

1 On the basis of the inscription Sapurisasa Mogaliputasa in a relic casket found in the Tope no. 2 of the Sanchi group, Dr. Geiger concludes that the tradition about Moggaliputta Tissa is authentic. See his Translation of the Mahāvamsa, p. xx.

2 It is rather remarkable that in the Papanasasudani (II, p. 139) Majjhantikatthera is described as the Saṅghatthera on the day on which the festivity on the completion of Aśoka’s monasteries took place.

3 See above, p. 199.

4 Mahāvamsa, Ch. XII.
monks and the countries to which they were deputed are given as follows:

(i) Majjhantika
(=Madhyāndina) to Kāśmīra-Gandhāra (=Mod. Peshwar and Rawalpindi Districts).¹

(ii) Mahādeva to Mahiṣamandala (=Mahiṣmati, a district south of the Vindhyas).

(iii) Rakkhita to Vanavāsi (=North Canara).

(iv) Dhammarakkhita (a Yonaka) to Aparānta (Western Countries like Alor, Broach, and Sopara).

(v) Mahādhammarakkhita to Mahāṛattha (=Mod. Mahāraṣṭra).

(vi) Mahārakkhita to Yona countries (=the foreign settlements of the N.-W. Frontier Province).

(vii) Majjhima to Himavanta.

(viii) Soṇa with Uttara to Suvaṃabhūmi.²

(ix) Mahinda to Tambapanni (=Ceylon).

In the Mahākarmavibhaṅga (p. 61-62) there is a similar tradition about the conversion of different countries. It is as follows:

(i) Mahākātyāyana Avanti (with capital Ujjayini) and other Western countries.

(ii) Madhyāndina Kāśmīra.

(iii) Gavāṃpati Suvaṃabhūmi.²

¹ For identification, see B. C. Law, Geographical Essays, p. 69.

² The identification of Suvaṃabhūmi (mentioned in the two traditions) with Burma cannot be accepted. We must identify it with a country within India. The association of the name of Gavāṃpati with Suvaṃabhūmi indicates that the place is not far from Magadha. In the Milindapañha, p. 359, Suvarṇabhūmi is mentioned after Kolapattana as a seaport.
(iv) Pindola Bharadvaja Pūrva Videha.
(v) Mahendra Simhala.
(vi) Pūrṇa Maitrāyaniṇiputra Surpāraka (=Mod. Sopara).

The author of the Mahākarmavibhaṅga has evidently mixed up the earlier tradition with the later. To the earlier tradition belong Mahākātyāyana (Avanti), Gavāmpati (Suvarna-bhūmi) and Pūrṇa Maitrāyaniṇiputra (Surpāraka) while to the later belong Madhyāndina (Kāsmira) and Mahendra (Simhala). Though the date of composition of the Mahākarmavibhaṅga is a matter of uncertainty, the tradition preserved by it is authentic.

The question is how far the Ceylonese tradition about the despatch of missionaries to different countries can be relied on. The find of the relic-urn, on the inner and outer lid of which appear the following two inscriptions respectively: Sāpurisa [sa] Majhimasa and Sāpurisa [sa] Kāsapagotasa Hemavatācariyasa is a definite proof of the fact that Majjhima with Kassapagotta Thera propagated the religion in the Himalayan countries. In view of the fact that Mahāvihāra became the repository of the Pāli Pitaka and a centure of the Theravāda sect, we may accept the traditional accounts about the missionary activities of Mahinda in Ceylon as fairly authentic. That the members of the Theravāda sect or the Theriya Nikāya as they are called in the Nikāya Saṅgraha (see above, p. 268) were imbued with a missionary spirit is amply corroborated by one of the Nāgarjuni-kōnda inscriptions (3rd or 4th century A.D.); It runs as follows:—

THIRD BUDDHIST COUNCIL

Translation: "Success. Adoration to the Lord Buddha. In the 14th year of King Mātharaṇa. For the benefit of the masters and of the fraternities (of monks), of Tambapāṇa (Ceylon) who have converted Kashmir, Gandhāra, Cīna, Cilāta (=Skt. Kirāta), Tosali, Avarāṇa (=Skt. Apārāṇa), Vaṅga, Vanavāsī, Yavana (?), Damila (?), Palura (?) and the Isle of Tambapāṇī (Ceylon). At Siripavata (=Śriparvata) on the east side of Vijayapuri at the Convent on the Lesser Dharmagiri a Cāitya hall with a flooring of slabs, with a Cāitya and provided with all the necessaries, was caused to be made by the female lay-member Bodhisiri (=Skt. Bodhiśīrī) .........." (Dr. Hirananda Sastri in Epigraphia Indica, XX, pp. 22, 23). This inscription not only corroborates the Ceylonese tradition that the members of the Thēriya Nikāya or the Thera-vāda sect, who later settled in Ceylon, propagated Buddhism in many countries but also proves that their missionary activity went on unabated and they were able to introduce Buddhism into a few other places like Cīna(?), Tosali (in Kaliṅga), Vaṅga (Bengal), Palura (Dantapura?) and the Tamil countries. In the other inscriptions discovered at Nāgarjunikonda the names of a few other Buddhist sects are mentioned but they are not given the credit of taking up actively the task of propagation of the religion. In view of the above quoted inscription of Nāgarjunikonda and the inscriptions on the lid of the reli-urns, we think the Ceylonese tradition about the despatch of missionaries has a historical basis.

Apart from the propagation made by the Thēriya Nikāya we know that several sects which came into being after the
Second Buddhist Council migrated to different countries from Magadha and each sect selected a centre for itself. The Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots, for instance, migrated southwards and came to be known as the Andhakas, which fact indicates that they propagated Buddhism in the Andhra countries. The Mahīśāsakas and the Theravādins moved together for some time till the former settled in Mahīśamandala and Vanavāsi, and the latter in Avanti, and ultimately in Ceylon. The Sammitiyas or the Vātsiputriyas bore the local name of the Avantakas, and so it seems that this sect selected the northern part of Avanti and Vatsa country as their field of activities. The Sarvāstivādins proceeded northwards to Mathurā and thence to Gandhāra. Those of the Sarvāstivādins, who proceeded further north to Kāśmīra, were probably the Haimavatas or the Mūlasarvāstivādins, who had the other local name, the Uttarāpathakas.

Thus we see that by the time of Aśoka, Buddhism had spread eastwards and southwards up to the Andhra countries, North Canara and Mahīśmati, westwards up to Broach and Sopara, and northwards to the N.-W. Frontier Provinces and Kāśmīra. It was on account of the peaceful state brought about by Aśoka's rule that it was possible for Buddhism to reach all the parts of India and to become a dominant force in the history of religions in India.
CHAPTER XVI

POPULAR BUDDHISM

Aśoka as a ruler gave preference to the popular religious ideal, producing good citizens, and not to the spiritual, making the people unsocial. It cannot be ascertained how far Aśoka had a hand in the matter of making Buddhism popular but the history of the religion shows that after the days of Aśoka, it developed new aspects which became so very popular that the reoriented religion spread all over India, marking every notable spot with magnificent structures of rare artistic value, and ultimately reaching countries beyond the borders of India. Early Buddhism of the pre-Aśokan days, though propagated in different provincial dialects, was not appreciated by the common-folk.1 The insistence on retirement from worldly life was a great handicap in the way of its popularity; so during the first century of its existence, it remained confined to the recluses and monasteries, and hardly reached the home and the hearth. It was perhaps about a century after Buddha's death that the religion became dynamic, assimilating some of the ideas and thoughts current around and stepped down from its high pedestal of exclusiveness and abstruse ideals to appeal to the more intellectual and faithful among the common-folk. This move towards popularity too did not proceed far as we find that it just allowed a little scope for rituals of a sober character, a little of faith and

1 Cf. Grünwedel, Buddhist Art in India, p. 67: "Originally, Buddhism was only a philosophy, no religion: but therein consisted the weakness of the Buddha doctrines, which speedily became unpopular on that account."
worship, and a slight relaxation from the stringency of disciplinary rules. There are, in fact, two stages in the course of its attainment of popularity, one of the pre-Aśokan days and other of the post-Aśokan.

1. Pre-Aśokan Period

The pre-Aśokan form of the religion provided no scope for emotion, nor for devotion or worship, not to speak of rituals. Its dry-as-dust ethical principles and doctrinal teachings based on so-called reason hardly attracted the attention of the common-folk. Among the householders it was only the cultured few like Anāthapiṇḍika and Visākhā, Jivaka and Āmrapāli, Citta and Nakulapitā who took interest in the religion and worked for its success. Among the recluses and intellectuals also there were not very many who could dive deep into the truths of the religion, and it was probably this lack of appreciation of his teachings that made Buddha hesitate to preach the religion to one and all.

Ecclesiastical Rituals

In course of time, however, there was some accretion of rituals in the form of (i) trisaraṇa, (ii) lower and higher ordinations, (iii) observance of uposatha, (iv) vassāvāsa, pavāranā, and kathina. These rituals attracted some converts of a mediocre type and appreciably helped the enlargement of the body hitherto known as Śākyaputtiya Saṃānas. Around this body grew up a number of house-holders, who impressed by the saintly character of some of the monks as also by the simple ethical teachings of the religion, and the rituals of Trisaraṇa, and other ecclesiastical functions like Pavāranā requiring the services of laymen, avowed themselves as upāsakas and upāsikās. It is rather remarkable
that the religion did not yield to the wishes of the mass any further, by providing objects of worship or by allowing the laymen to take any part in the ecclesiastical functions.

(i) Trisarana. There was no form of prayer except an expression of faith in the Triratna. The three articles of faith, compulsory for every monk and nun or layman and lay-woman was the thrice utterance of the formula,—

(i) Buddhām saraṇaṁ gacchāmi
(ii) Dhammām saraṇaṁ gacchāmi
and (iii) Samghām saraṇaṁ gacchāmi.

There has been a good deal of discussion among the Buddhist scholiasts about the meaning of saraṇa and Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha. The best and the earliest interpretation is found in a few couples preserved in the canonical texts. These are.—

हह: शरणां यान्ति पयांतः भनानि च ।
शरणां श्रीमान्यज्ञां सनुष्ठा भयतंतव्यतां: \[ II \]
न ह्यात्मार्गेषु श्रेष्ठ नैतिक्षरमातमम्।
नैतिक्षरसामाम्य सवैः-सात् प्रमुख्यते पि।
बसु वुद्ध च धर्मं संघं च शरणं गत:।
शरणांमार्गी चतवारि पश्चिम्य प्रहया सदा। \[ II \]
हुःहुः समस्मृतां हुःस्वते धर्मातिकमम्॥
शरणां नास्तां वैध श्रेष्ठेषु निर्यातिकमिनम्॥
एतदि शरणां श्रेष्ठेषु एतिक्षरसामाम्यम्।
एतिक्षरसामाम्य सर्वहुः-सत् प्रमुख्यते॥

1 See Vol. I, chap. xii.
2 Dhammapada, pp. 188-192; Udānavarga, xxvii, 28-30; Divyāvadāna, p. 164; Abhidhamakośa, iv, 80, etc. See L. de la Vallée Poussin, Doctrine des Réfuges, in Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, i, (1931-32), p. 75.
In these couplets, *saranām* means 'seeking protection' from evils. In the formulae of *Triratna*, the protection that one seeks is not from the worldly evils but from the suffering to which a human being is destined. Such protection can be secured by developing faith in Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, and by realising the four truths and the eightfold path, and not by leading solitary meditative life in the hills or forests nor by visiting temples and shrines (*caityas*).

The faith in the *Triratna* is usually expressed in these terms:

(i) *Iti pi so Bhagavā araham sammāsambuddho vijjā-caraṇasampanno sugato lokavidu anuttaro purisadammasārathi satthā devamanussānam.*

(Bhagavā, the enlightened, is endowed with knowledge and good conduct, he is the knower of the world, the guide in disciplining men, the incomparable, the teacher of men and gods).

(ii) *Svakkhāto Bhagavatā dhammo sanditthiko akāliko ehipassiko opanayiko pacckettam veditabbo viññūbi.*

(The Dhamma preached by Bhagavā produces fruit in his life, invites everybody; has no limitation of time, leads one to the goal and is realisable only by the wise within one's ownself).

(iii) *Supaṭipanno Bhagavato sāvakasaṅgho yad idam cattāri purisayugāni attṭhapurisapuggalā, esa Bhagavato sāvakasaṅgho ābuneyyo pābuneyyo dakkhineyyo aṇjalikaraṇīyo anuttaram puṇṇikhettam lokassa.*

---

(The Saṅgha consists of monks, who are in one of the four stages of sanctification, are righteous, exerting for knowledge, observing good conduct, who are worthy of gifts, praise and respects, and who are fit recipients of gifts from laymen).

The Buddhist scholiasts who were imbued with the principles of early Buddhism, were at a loss to justify the avowal of these three articles of faith. Some of them, who looked upon Buddha’s mortal body as impure, said that ‘Buddha’ in the formulae implied a collection of dharmas and not Buddha the individual; Dharma implied the last two truths only viz., duhkha-nirodha and the aṣṭāṅgikamārga, which are pure, and not the other two which are impure dharmas. Saṅgha in the formulae implied śīlas or the mortal duties which make a person an arhat, and not merely a member of the order. It is doubtful how far this interpretation of the scholiasts appealed to the common-folk. We know that the utterance of the Tri-sarana formulae was made compulsory for both monks and laity, and that this utterance alone transformed a non-Buddhist to a

1 See L. de la Vallée Poussin, Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques. (1931-32). In the Jñānapratibhāna sūtra, we find the following exposition:

(i) The real dharmas, which have for name or appellation or designation the expression ‘Buddha’—those who take refuge in the Aṣṭāṅkṣadharman, which make the Buddha, are said to take refuge in Buddha.

(ii) The real dharmas, which have for their name, appellation or designation the word ‘Dharma’—those who take refuge in the removal of thirst, i.e., destruction, detachment, Nirvāṇa, are said to have taken refuge in Dharma.

(iii) The real dharmas, which have for their name, appellation or designation the word ‘Saṅgha’—those who take refuge in both the Śākṣa and Aṣṭāṅkṣa-dharmas, are said to have taken refuge in the Saṅgha.
Buddhist. Hence, we may safely state that these three articles of faith served as a means of popularising the religion, and these were also looked upon as spells (paritta) for protection from evils or evil destiny.

The utterance of the Trisaraṇa is usually followed nowadays by taking the vow of observing the first five ṣīlas and then by chanting the Maṅgala Sutta. In the canonical texts, however, there is no indication of this procedure.

(ii) Uposatha. It is admitted in the Vinaya that the idea of holding fortnightly meeting was suggested to Buddha by Bimbiśāra whose object was that the monks should deliver religious discourses to the people at large on certain days of the month. These assemblies however soon turned into ritualistic institutions, requiring monks to be present at the meetings and confess their sins, if any committed during the preceding fortnight, after the formal recital of the Pātimokkha rule. This ceremony undoubtedly gave satisfaction to a class of monks who viewed the observance of Pātimokkha rules as more important than the inner spiritual development and attracted some men of the mediocre type.

(iii) Pabbajjā and Upasampadā. The ceremony of ordination was originally a very simple affair. It was done by Buddha by the mere utterance of ehi bhikkhu. Gradually it turned into a fairly long ceremony with two ordinations, one lower (pabbajjā) and the other higher (upasampadā). This ceremony, which required shaving of head, donning of yellow robes and living in a monastery, attracted some men who could not fully

1 See ante., ch. XII. 2 Vinaya, i, p. 617.
comprehend the philosophical teachings. In the Sāmaññaphala Sutta there are also some hints about the gains and honour received by an ordained person, e.g. it is said that the immediate gain of a person, whatever his status might be before his ordination, is that he is respected by kings and nobles, and obtains robes, food, bed, medicine and other requisites.\(^1\)

(iv) Vassaṅga, Pavaṅga and Kathina.\(^2\) The other ceremonial functions which gradually crept into the religion were the formal observance of the rainy season retreat. The monks were required to stay during the three months of the rainy season at a fixed abode. At the close of the retreat, the monks performed the Pavaṅga ceremony, which is similar to the Uposatha, but on account of the occasion on which it is performed, special importance was attached to it, and householders were told that gifts made on this particular occasion were more meritorious than at other times. With this Pavaṅga ceremony was associated another ceremony called Kathina in which the making of robes formed the chief object. These two ceremonies Pavaṅga and Kathina served to popularise the religion not only among those who wanted to join the order but also among the householders, who patiently waited for these days for making their gifts, particularly robes, and thereby assured their happiness in this existence and rebirth in the heavens.

The ceremonies mentioned above were no doubt useful for the spiritual development of a person, but strictly speaking, were not in consonance with the principles laid down for the attainment of spiritual perfection. It has got to be admitted that these ceremonies were introduced in imitation of, or com-

---

\(^1\) Digha, i. p. 61-62.  \(^2\) For details, see Vol. i, p. 292-3.
petition with, other contemporary religious systems in order to secure more converts, and it is not improbable that by these ceremonies, the religion attracted more men than it would otherwise have done.

Worship of Cetiya and Stūpa

Neither in the Vinaya nor in the Sutta-piṭaka, except the Mahāparinibbānasutta there is any direction for making and worshiping Cetiyas and Stūpas. In the Vinaya there is mention of two Cetiyas\(^1\) where Buddha stopped, while in the Pāṭika-suttanta\(^2\) as also in the Mahāparinibbānasutta,\(^3\) there are references to the Cetiyas situated around Vesāli, viz., Gotamaka-cetiya on the south, Sattamba-cetiya on the west, Bahuputta-cetiya on the north. The other Cetiyas mentioned in the Mahāparinibbānasutta are Udena, Sarandada, Čāpāla,\(^4\) Ānanda,\(^5\) (in Bhoganagara), and Makuṭabandhana\(^6\) of the Mallas.

From the list of cetiyas given above, it is apparent that long before Buddhism made its appearance, there was the prevalence of worship of cetiyas, which might be a tree, a stone and a spot believed to be sanctified or haunted by a good or evil spirit.\(^7\) The existence of Cetiyas is taken as an admitted fact by Buddha himself.

Apart from the Cetiyas, there was also the ancient custom

---

\(^1\) Vinaya, i, p. 35: Supatirttha cetiya near Rajagaha; ii, p. 172: Aggālavacetiya at Ālavi.
\(^2\) Digha, iii, p. 9-10. 
\(^3\) Ibid., ii, pp. 102-3, 118.
\(^4\) Ibid.
\(^5\) Ibid., pp. 123, 126.
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 160-1.
of erecting mounds (stūpas) on the relics of saintly persons or distinguished kings, princes and nobles as also over the sites sanctified by a saint's presence. It was this ancient custom which we find re-iterated in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta. Buddha is made to say that stūpas should be erected on the relics of (i) a Tathāgata, (ii) a Paccekabuddha, (iii) a Tathāgatasāvaka and (iv) a monarch (cakkavattī) evidently with a view to make the Buddhists refrain from erecting and worshipping any mound sanctified by a spirit or a non-Buddhist saint. The most suitable site recommended for the erection of stūpa, is the crossing of four highways. Worship of such four kinds of stūpas by garlands, scents, or coloured powders was regarded as meritorious, as it gave an expression to one's deep faith in the religion. Along with these directions, there is the description of the manner in which the earthly remains of a Tathāgata should be cremated. The erection of stūpas over Buddha's relics has created history, and even today the sight of the relics deposited in some of the monasteries is a matter of awe and inspiration to the devotees.

The whole account of the erection and worship of stūpas, particularly over Buddha's relics and the merit accruing therefrom was undoubtedly incorporated into the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta after Buddha's demise and had nothing to do with the great Teacher, who evidently could not have thought of what would become of his relics and who would be their claimants. This idea of erection and worship of stūpas was undoubtedly a post-Buddha development. The interpolator, who put in the directions for worshipping cetiyas and held out the hope that by such worship one would be reborn in the heavens, realised the inconsistency with the principles of the religion, and immediately corrected himself by adding the remark that
the advanced monks were not to occupy themselves with such worship of *stūpas*, and that they must exert to attain the goal while the worship of *stūpas* should be left to the laity alone, the wise brāhmaṇas, khattiyas and gahapatis.¹ The traditions about Asoka’s zeal to collect the relics and erect *stūpas* over them also prove that the stūpa-worship became widely prevalent. It is very likely that by Asoka’s time, the stūpa-worship became a regular feature of the religion.²

*Four Places of Pilgrimage*

Like the worship of *cetiyas* and *stūpas*, it must be sometime after Buddha’s *parinirvāṇa* that the idea of pilgrimage came into the minds of some Buddhist monks, at whose instance, some imaginary discourses attributed to Buddha were incorporated into the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*. A religious teacher like Buddha, who was all along averse to any form of worship³ and taught *attadipo attasaraṇo anañña-saraṇo dhammadipo dhhammasaraṇo anañña-saraṇo*⁴ (depend on your own self as the light, as the refuge and not on anything else; depend on the *dhamma* as the light, as the refuge and not on anything else) could not have admonished his disciples to earn merit by visiting the four places sanctified by his (i) birth, (ii) attainment of bodhi, (iii) promulgation of *dhamma-cakka* and (iv) *parinirvāṇa*. The inconsistency is at once

¹ *Digba*, ii, p. 141.
² See the account in the *Dīvya-vudāna*, pp. 389 ff.
³ *Digba*, ii, p. 138: *Na kho Ananda ettavata Tathāgato sakkato va boti garukato va mānito va pūjito va apacito va etc.*
⁴ Cf. *Mahāvastu*, X, p. 334. Also compare

*काव्या हि चाकानो मायां की न माय: परो भवेत्।*  
*चाकाना हि सुदान्तेन भवे प्रातीति परिषत:।*

quoted in the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, p. 483.
apparent in the fact that one of the places recommended for
visit is the site of his demise. Hence, there can be no doubt
that the idea of pilgrimage was not that of Buddha but was
of his disciples and of a time when Buddha had passed away.
The idea, however, caught the imagination of the peo-
ple, particularly, of the lay-disciples. The most remarkable an
instance is that of Asoka who paid a visit to the birth-
place of Buddha, evidently with the hope of earning some
merit. Throughout the history of Buddhism since the days
of Asoka, the idea of pilgrimage appealed strongly to the
Buddhists, both monks and laymen, and even today the Bud-
dhist devotees from far off countries like Burma and Ceylon,
China and Japan regard this pilgrimage as an act of great merit.

_Nirvāṇa through Faith_

In the earliest form of monastic Buddhism the only means
recommended for the attainment of emancipation was perfec-
tion in the _śīlacitta-paññā_ practices.¹ Occasionally perfection
in the _satipaṭṭhāna_ practices was recognised as another means
for reaching the goal,² but nowhere _saddhā_ and practice of
_brahmacārī_ were recognised as such. It is therefore striking
that we should find in the _Majjhima Nikāya_ a discourse³ in
which _saddhā_ is made the basic, and perfection in the _brahma-
cārī_ as the ultimate, factors for the attainment of _Nirvāṇa_.
This new path, which attached less importance to the obser-
vance of the _Pāṭimokkha_ rules, was definitely a step towards
making the religion popular among a certain section of the
people, who were not able to lead the life of a bhikkhu.

² _Majjhima_, i, p. 55: Ekāyano ayam bhikkhave maggo sattā-
nam āyuddhiyā yad idam cattāro satipaṭṭhānā.
³ Vatthupamassutta, _Majjhima_, i, p. 36 f.
Saddhā (faith), as expressed in the formulae Trisaraṇa, is mentioned as an essential element for spiritual progress, but that saddhā was looked upon only as an antidote to inclination to non-Buddhist religious faith. It was an antidote to vicikicchā or doubt about the greatness of Buddha, excellence of his teaching and uprightness of his disciples. In the Vattbhupamasutta, the process of attainment of Nibbāna through saddhā is detailed thus:

(i) An adept should first get rid of the mental impurities, such as abbijjhā (undue desire for gain), maccariya (miserliness), makkha (hypocrisy), māyā (deceitfulness) sātheyya (double-dealing), thambho-sārambho (pride and haughtiness), mano-atimāno (conceit and over-conceit), mada (pride or excitement caused by attachment to one's own acquisitions), and pamāda (carelessness).

(ii) After the removal of the above-mentioned impurities, the adept is required to develop unflinching faith (saddhā) in the Triratna.

(iii) The more the mental impurities are removed the stronger becomes his faith (saddhā) in Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha. Such faith produces in his mind the satisfaction that he has achieved something good. Such satisfaction in turn produces joy and deep pleasure (pīṭṭ) which makes the body calm and the mind serene, and ultimately leads to mental concentration.

1 For an exhaustive exposition of Saddhā, see B. M. Barua, 'Faith in Buddhism' in Buddhistic Studies, p. 329.
Cf. Saddhāya tarati ogham appamādena anānavan
viriyena dukkham acceti paññāya parisuṣijhati.
Suttanipāta, v. 184.
2 See above, p. 278.
3 Majjhima, i, p. 36f.
(iv) After developing perfect concentration of mind, the adept is required to practise the four brahmavibāras, in other words, he must practise mettā (love), karunā (compassion), muditā (feeling of joy at others' success) and upekkhā (equanimity) towards all beings of all corners of the world.¹

(v) After attaining perfection in the four brahmavibāras, the adept realises the four truths, removes the three impurities (āsavas) viz., kāma (desire), bhava (desire for rebirth) and avijjā (ignorance of the truth). He then feels convinced that he has completed his task, and will have no more rebirth, i.e., he attains Nirvāṇa. Thus we see that by saddhā and brahmavibāra one could achieve Nibbāna and this path could be taken by the householders as there was no question of renunciation or observance of Pātimokkha rules. This new process was really a move to make the religion popular among the householders and a product of a time in between Buddha and Aśoka.

It may be argued that saddhā is not devotion (bhakti)² and hence it has no fitting place in the popular form of the religion. There is some force in this argument, but what is needed to be pointed out is that saddhā eliminates the long process of observance of śīlas, i.e., the pātimokkha rules, and the process dealt with above eliminates many of the arduous tasks imposed upon a monk to attain perfection in the four jhānas, and to comprehend the anattā and anicca theories. It brings a new element, the brahmavibāras, which so far had no place in early Buddhism. In short, it is a new and shorter process suited to a person who is not necessarily a monk or nun, and that it was meant so is clear from the remarks in the above mentioned

¹ See infra and Vol. I, p. 228 f.
² Contrast Har Dayal's remarks in his Bodhisattva Doctrine, p. 32.
sutta that a person taking recourse to this new process may take luxurious food as that of a householder and that it would not stand in his way of attaining the goal. This is significant of the fact that the process was intended more for the laity than for the recluses, and actually we find this particular course recommended to the householder, Mahānāma,¹ who was addressed by Buddha in these words: "O Mahānāma, when you bear in mind that you have unflinching faith in the Tri-ratna, when you realise that you have observed the precepts fully, when you are convinced that you are great in charity and when you feel assured that you possess sādabhā, sīla, suta, cāga and pāññā as that of the gods, you would surely be reborn as a god. Again, when your mind becomes free from attachment (rāga), hatred (dosa) and delusion (moha) and you will feel that you have achieved something good, you will have joy and serene pleasure, which in turn will make your body calm and at ease and your mind will get concentrated." In another discourse² the same Mahānāma was told that an upāsaka by firm faith could become quick-witted (bāsapāññā javanapaññā) and attain emancipation by the realisation of akiñcaññā (desirelessness whether for heavenly life or Nibbāna), suññatā (essencelessness of worldly objects) and animittatā (characteristiclessness of worldly objects). In the Majjima Nikāya,³ however, it is pointed out that some monks by sādabhā attain the Anāgāmi stage only, because they regard Bhagavā as omniscient and that his teaching excellent and they exert strenuously so that their bodies become dried up into skin, bones and sinews. It seems, therefore, that sādabhā gradually rose in the estimation of the

1 Aṅguttara, v. pp. 320-332.
3 Majjima, i, p. 480-481.
Buddhist monks and came to be recognised as a means to the goal. The importance of saddhā in the life of laymen has already been dealt with; it assured them rebirth in one of the heavens, and it was only a step further that saddhā combined with the perfection in brahmavīhāras brought them full emancipation.

The early Buddhists were aware of the practice of brahmavīhāras, which they classed as appamaññas (immeasurables). By this practice one developed a sublime mental state,—in which, he could look upon all beings of the world with the same feeling of love and compassion as one would have towards his son;—in which, he felt happy at the spiritual or material success of every person, be he a friend or foe; and —in which, he remained unmoved by weal or woe. The brahmavīhāras, however, were not included in the list of thirty-seven bodhipakkhiya and other dhammas which Buddha declared as his own teaching.\(^1\) In the Visuddhimagga, their place is given after the four jhānas (meditations) and before the four samāpattis (higher trances),\(^2\) but in any case, their practice was not regarded as compulsory for the attainment of Nibbāna. The trend of the remarks in the Pāli texts\(^3\) is that their practice led to rebirth in one of the Brahmālokas only, i.e., the highest form of existence in the constituted sphere, in other words, it did not conduce to Nibbāna. These remarks point to the fact that practice of brahmavīhāras did not form a part of original Buddhism.

Mrs. Rhys Davids, it seems, was justified in writing that it was taught by the "unknown co-founder of Buddhism."\(^4\)

1 Majjhima, ii p. 11 f. 2 See Vol. I, p. 228 f.
3 Majjhima, ii, p. 76; Dīgha i, p. 251; Aṅguttara, ii, p. 129.
The fact that these practices appear also in the Yogasūtra of Patañjali leads us to infer that these originated among the non-Buddhist or pre-Buddhist thinkers. The nature of mental practices envisaged in the brahmavibhāras also suggests that these were meant more for the householders than for the recluses. In the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka¹ the practice of brahmavibhāras is given a place next to the pāramitās. While in the Mahāvastu² it is stated that a monk can attain nirvāṇa by practising the four brahmavibhāras. In the Daśabhūmikasūtra, the practice of brahmavibhāras is placed next to the four dhyānas in the exercises prescribed for the attainment of the third bhūmi.³ A bodhisattva is expected to continue this practice of four brahmavibhāras up to the seventh bhūmi,⁴ in which he realises the tathatā, and goes beyond the training stage.

Relaxation of Disciplinary Rules

There is a hint, in the path of saddhā and brahmavibhāra, that for the attainment of Nirvāṇa, one need not always be a strict observer of the monastic rules of discipline (see above). Buddha no doubt laid more emphasis on the control of the mind than on the control of body and speech,⁵ though it was far from his intention that his followers should show laxity in observing monastic rules. A century after Buddha’s death, appeared the Mahāsāṅghikas who put a new interpretation on Buddha’s directions, and set on foot a movement against the rigid orthodoxy of the earlier disciples, whose over-zealousness for the

¹ p. 142.  
² iii, p. 421.  
³ Aspects of Mahāyāna, etc. p. 267.  
⁴ Ibid., Ch. IV.  
⁵ Majjhima, i, p. 372: Imesaṃ tiṇṇam kammapañ evam pāṭivibhattānāṃ manokammaṃ mahāsāvājatarāmī paññāpemi.
observance of monastic rules led to the sacrifice of essentials. It is an indication that a group of thinkers attached more value to the purification of body and mind and the study of logic than to the punctillious observance of Vinaya rules. We have on the authority of Paramārtha, the following statement attributed to the Kaukulikas an off-shoot of the Mahāsaṅghikas that "a bhikṣu may or may not have three robes for covering his body; may or may not reside in a monastery; and may or may not take his meal within the time limit. The Vinaya rules about residence and food were abrogated by Buddha; it is clear that the real teaching of Buddha was not Vinaya but the study of the logical principles (nyāya), i.e., Abhidharma." According to the Dharmaguptas, the Prātimokṣa rules were lost when the saddharma disappeared hence there are no more rules, sīmābandha and karmāṇa.\footnote{See Paul Demieville, *L'origine des sects bouddhiques* in *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, vol. I, (1931-32), pp. 19, 46.} 

It is not improbable that this new viewpoint attracted a large number of recruits and helped to increase its followers. The relaxation in the monastic rules, of course, had nothing to do with the laity, and so whatever appeal, it could have, was confined to the monks and nuns.

We may now sum up the factors that made Buddhism popular in the pre-Aśokan period thus:—

(i) *Trisarana* came to be regarded as the three articles of faith.

(ii) The ecclesiastical ceremonies gave satisfaction to the less philosophically minded disciples.

(iii) Worship of *Caityas* and *Stūpas* allowed some scope for the expression of devotion (*bhakti*).\footnote{Abhidharmakośa, iv. 39.}
(iv) Visits to the four places of pilgrimage were looked upon as attractive means of earning merit.

(v) Saddhā and brahmavibhāra practices were regarded by some persons as the simpler and shorter means for the attainment of Nibbāna. And lastly,

(vi) Relaxation in the stringency of the Vinaya rules appealed to a class of persons who did not approve the rigid orthodoxy of the earlier schools of disciples.

II. Post-Asokan Period

The few deviations from the earliest principles of Buddhism dealt with above were hardly enough to make the religion popular. The persons who took to saddhā and brahmavibhāra path for emancipation were few and far between; the emphasis was still on the monastic life. The cult of cetiya- and stūpa-worship made very little progress and the householders with their Trisarana and other rituals still remained outside the Buddhist fold as mere suppliers of material needs of the monks and nuns and as faithful listeners to the moral discourses delivered to them by the monks on certain occasions. The Aśokan edicts reveal no change in this austere attitude of the early Buddhists—the only relieving feature being that Aśoka favoured the view that the people should not care very much for recluse-life and should perform good deeds (kusālakarma-patbas) to ensure them an after-life in the heavens. Hence we may say that the real move to make the religion popular among the common-folk was taken after Aśoka. This movement consisted mainly in the following five directions:

(i) Deification of Buddha.
(ii)Compilation of Jātaka-literature.
(iii)Sanction of Image-worship.
(iv) Introduction of Pāramitā-cult. And
(v) Promulgation of Bodhisattva Doctrine.

Deification of Buddha

In the pre-Aśokan days, Buddha had already come to be looked upon as the highest god superior to Brahmā, Viṣṇu or Siva. This deification should be attributed first to the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Andhakas, and then to the Sarvāstivādins. It has been shown1 while discussing the doctrines of the Mahāsaṅghikas and their off-shoots that Buddha had been given all the attributes of the highest god, whose apparitional body occasionally appeared in this world. This body took birth as Siddhārtha Gautama, went through all the ways of a householder and ultimately renounced the world to become a saint just in order to follow the ways of the world (lokānuvartana).2 Buddha was supramundane (lokottara) and was made of pure dharmas. Everything of the great rṣi was transcendental including his advent into the world. In the Mahāvastu, he is described thus:—

lokottara bhagavato cha lokaṅkaraṃ kṣatramūlaṃ. 1
mahān śīrṣaṁ nīpatañ ādhipa lokaṅkaraṁ suñāmino. 2
yat tad guṇatātaraṁ bhave bhavasya bhūtavakṣyakṛtām. 3
lokaṅkaraṁ tadapi bhūtāvān na sānyasayā kalayātmakam
bhūvaprāparaṁ suñāmino lokaṅkaraṁ vratā sānyasam nāśita
bhūtāṅkaraḥ sānyasāyaṃ lokaṅkaraṁśtvam guṇatsva.
deśana gapekyānaṁ śāvēśaṅkaraṁ gata
śāṅkaraṁ ṛṣayaśāyam bhāhaśāyaṁ yaduścitrāma. 4
deshāṅkalaṁ ṛṣayaḥ pāparakam c karman. 5
sarvam va prabhāvitarīṃ bhūtā yeśvēśaṅkitaṁ nayakatā. 6

1 See ante, pp. 63; 75f.  2 Mahāvastu, I, p. 167-8.
The above and other passages in the Mahāvastu leave no room for doubt that about the time of its composition (i.e., and century B.C.), Buddha had already become the highest god, at least, to a large section of the Buddhists.

The account of Buddha’s life in the Lalitavistara, the accredited text of the Sarvāstivādins, does not extol Buddha so much as has been done in the Mahāvastu. It is more realistic though it attributes divine and super-divine qualities to the Teacher. It says that Buddha while staying in the womb of his mother was enclosed in a casket and from there he delivered discourses to the gods who paid him visits. After his birth, he appeared to dwell at the same moment in all the houses built for him by the faithful. He paid the customary visit to the temples but the gods therein bowed down to him. In his boyhood, he was so learned that the teacher staggered in his presence. In his youth, he possessed already all the kingly powers and skill and surpassed everybody in strength. In this text, he is eulogized thus:—

1 Winternitz, History of Indian Literature. II, p. 247.
2 Cf. also Mahāvastu, I, p. 214.
Though this text maintains a more sober outlook than the Mahāvastu, there is no doubt that Buddha was regarded by the Sarvāstivādins as a divine being though not the highest god. Though he was proficient in everything, he followed the ways of the world to educate the people. The time of composition of this work, according to Winternitz, spread over a long period commencing from the early Christian eras. 1 It may

1 See Winternitz, op. cit., p. 255-6: “It is therefore only correct to say that the Lalitavistara offers us very old traditions concerning the Buddha legend, as well as some which are centuries later”.........“It is, however, most informative as regards the development of the Buddha legend from its earliest beginnings when only the chief events in the life of the great founder of the religion are adorned with miracles, down to that boundless deification of the Master, in which, from the beginning to the end of his career he appears mainly as a god above all gods.”
therefore be safely stated that in the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C., a certain section of the Buddhists regarded Buddha as the highest god while another section as a great divine being, endowed with all possible virtues and knowledge.

We need not discuss the conception of the Staviravādins, who tried to maintain even at this day that Buddha was after all a human saint but with attributes surpassing those of the gods and that in purity and knowledge he was the highest of all constituted beings.¹ This school of thought maintained the realistic conception throughout its long history but it did not gain the same amount of popularity as the Mahāśaṅghikas and the Sarvāstivādins did in the southern and northern parts of India respectively. However realistic the Theravādins might have been, they had to yield to the popular demand of Buddha-worship, and in course of time they allowed the placing of images of Buddha in their temples, and in one of their late texts the Mahāvamsa, there is also an elaborate description as to how the first image of Buddha was made and how grand were the ceremonies and festivals for putting up the image.

**Image-Worship**

In the Mahāvastu and the Lalitavistara Buddha is deified but there are no directions for making images of Buddha. The earliest literary evidence relating to image-making is yielded by the Divyāvadāna, in which Aśoka is found to be consulting Piṇḍola Bharadvāja regarding the features (mahāpuruṣa-

¹ *Majjhima*, i, p. 171:—
Sabbābhūthu sabbavidu’ham asmi
sabbesu dharmas tu anupalitta
sabbanjaho tanhakkhayye vimutto
laṅkāṇa) of the image. ¹ In the Mahāvamsa² too is recorded a similar attempt of Aśoka who consulted the Nāga king for an account of the image. One need not be so credulous as to take these traditions as authentic, but the fact is that the practice of image-worship was taken up by the Buddhists sometime before the 4th century A.D. about which time the Divyāvadāna and the Mahāvamsa were composed. We may now pass on to the monumental evidences. In the Sanchi and Barhut sculptures there are no images of Buddha. The most significant fact is that the seats of Buddha are shown as vacant. The earlier methods of indicating Buddha’s place in a scene were by depicting his Vajrāsana, Bodhi tree or pāduka (wooden slippers) or stūpa. If the date of Sanchi and Barhut sculptures be placed in the 2nd and 1st century B.C. we have to admit that image-worship did not prevail at that period. The practice of image-worship therefore came into vogue about the 1st or 2nd century A.D. at the earliest. The Amarāvati sculptures, belonging to the Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots, are studded with numeorous Buddha-images but the dates of these sculptures are placed by the archaeologists in the 2nd century A.D.³

(Though the image of Buddha is wanting in the earlier sculptures there are ample evidences to show the wide prevalence of symbol worship.) The artists probably did not make an image of the omniscient resplendent Buddha with all the signs of great men (mahāpuruṣa), but the feeling of adoration to Buddha was there, and this they expressed by concourse of men and gods and even animals, bowing down reverentially to

¹ Divyāvadāna, p. 400. ² Mahāvamsa, p. 37. ³ Buddhist Remains in Andhra, etc. by K. R. Subramanian, 1932, p. 15.
the stūpas, Bodhi-tree or the Vajrāsana, or offering flowers and garlands. In the post-Christian eras, however, the Buddha images not only came into vogue, but practically the Buddhist centres were flooded with such images, some of the most exquisite Gandharan art while others of indigenous local developments. Merit accrued to both the artiste and the donor of an image, and so it was quite natural there should be such an exuberance of Buddha-images in the post-Christian eras. Both the Hiṇayānists and the Mahāyānists started making images and temples and decorated the stūpas with countless images.

Jātakas and Avadānas

In the Mahāvastu and the Abhinīṣkramanāsūtra we have not only a biography of Buddha but also a number of stories dealing with Buddha’s supposed previous existences as also other traditions. The underlying object of the stories of Buddha’s previous births is to show that each event in this life was the result of a past deed of his. These stories served not only to establish the law of karma which Buddhism had borrowed from the pre-Buddhistic thoughts but also to convince the common-folk that any act of theirs would similarly be fruitful, and it may be that some of them might sow the seeds of merit like Siddhārtha Gautama and ultimately attain Buddhahood. In the latter case, they would be Bodhisattvas as was Siddhārtha Gautama in his previous lives. The Lalitavistara refers to the meritorious deeds performed by him in his previous existences.  

1 Lalitavistara (R. L. Mitra), p. 192:—

पूर्व तुम सुपुन्य सचिन्तन वदमृत्यो तत्र जयस्वत भव सम मर्याद इति। 
भिगि सचिन्तन विष्णु मणिक नृतिये सम्य किं तत्त न च हित यथासम्य। 
श्रेष्ठ तुम्हारे जयस्वत तत्र घराणिते सचिन्तन भिगि नवहम तत्त न च। 
मुनितत्व सम्य यद्यत्त रक्षिता सचिन्तन तत्त तव भिगितव सम्य।
does not give the stories in detail which were to be found partly in the Vinaya pitaka of the Sarvāstivādins, and partly in the Avadāna collections. The biographies, and particularly the Jātakas, made a strong appeal to the mass, kindled their devotion and gave them an opportunity to express the same by depicting the stories indelibly on stone. These made them feel within their innermost heart that Buddhahood for them was not an impossibility as had so long been preached by the early Buddhists. The task, of course, was arduous and the path long covering several existences and entailing extreme self-sacrifices. This literature therefore gave a new and forceful impetus to the mass, and paved the way for the glorious days which Buddhism had for a long time in the early Christian eras. Observing the effect of the Jātaka stories on the mass, the Sarvāstivādins began to multiply them and produced large collections of these, calling them Avadānas. They incorporated in it stories dealing with the previous birth not only of Buddha but also of his noted disciples. The puritanic Theravādins could not help following them and started making a collection of stories without intermingling them with the biography of Buddha. They however supplied the events of the present life by way of introduction (paccuppannavatthu) and ended the stories by identifying the characters with Buddha and other persons. The object of all these collections was identical, viz., the edification of the mass and popularisation of the religion.

Strangely enough all these Jātakas and Avadānas are non-Buddhist in character. This have nothing to do with the fundamental teachings of Buddhism—there is not a word about soul, component elements of a being, law of causation, ātman, skandhas, paṭiccasamuppada or nirvāṇa. These stories deal in a general way with moral virtue but not with the ṣīlas, as de-
tailed in the Pitakas. These speak highly of a retired life but do not discountenance the life of a householder. On the contrary, the stories are concerned mainly with the social life of the householders and not with the unsocial life of a recluse. These do not breathe a word about monks or their life in monasteries. If not for the use of the term 'Bodhisattva' in every story, the collections could not have been recognised as forming a part of the Buddhist literature. It is really a universal literature dealing with universal moral principles, and a large number of the stories belongs to the common heritage of the Indians of the pre-Aśokan period. These stories teach more altruistic moral principles than negative ethical ideals (beramanis) as was the practice with the Buddhists. The stories well-known to the common folk of the then age were found to be a convenient medium for propagating the Bodhisattva conception and along with it the greatness of the Teacher.

Pāramitā-cult

The Jātaka-stories, according to the late Buddhist traditions, had in view Bodhisattva's attainment of perfection in six or ten virtues, viz., (i) liberality (dāna) (ii) righteousness (śīla) (iii) forbearance or endurance (ksānti) (iv) mental strength (vīrya) (v) mental concentration (dhyāna) and (vi) realisation of the truth (prajñā). The number was latterly raised to ten by the addition of (i) skilfulness in expedients (upāyakausalya) (ii) vow or resolution (pranidhāna) (iii) attainment of certain powers (bala) and (iv) knowledge (jñāna). The above list is to be

1 Pāramitā, as suggested by Har Dayal should be derived from 'para' (highest, excellent, extreme). A Bodhisattva makes most extreme exertion or sacrifice for acquiring the virtues of gift, etc.

2 Dr. Har Dayal rightly describes these four as supplementary
found in Buddhist-Sanskrit works while the list in the Pāli texts is slightly different. It agrees with five of the above, viz., dāna, sila, khandi, viriya and pañña. The remaining five are (i) renunciation (nekkhamma), (ii) truthfulness (sacca), (iii) resolution (adhitthana), (iv) love (mettā) and (v) equanimity (upekkhā). Of these five, adhitthana may be taken as a synonym of prajñādhiṇā of the supplementary list. The agreement of the two lists in five of the ten pāramitās indicates their comparative antiquity. It seems that the list was not a pre-mediated one. The stories were originally written just to illustrate that the episodes of Buddha’s life were not untoward events but the outcome of the deeds of his previous existences. In course of time these stories were multiplied without any definite plan.

The earliest mention of the six pāramitās is found in the Mahāvastu (iii, p. 226), Lalitavistara (p. 342), and Asaṅgabhūṣikā Prajñāpāramitā (p. 194) while that of ten in the Mahāyāna Sūtraṇaṅkara, Daśabhūmikasūtra, Bodhisattvabhūmi, and Saṃbhārājasūtra. In the Mahāvastu again, mention of the six pāramitās is few and far between while the word pāramitā has been used in the ordinary sense (viz. perfection) in compounds like garbha-vakrāntipāramitā (the last entrance of the Bodhisattva into the womb), sarvaka-saladbharvāsibhāvapāramitā (perfect attainment of domain over all good actions) and prajñāpāramitā, (i.e. perfection in Śrāvaka’s knowledge). This shows that pāramitās. See his Bodhisattva Doctrine etc. pp. 167, 168. See also his remarks re. five pāramitās.

1 See Har Dayal, op. cit., p. 167.
2 Mahāvastu, i, p. 214; ii, p. 266; iii, p. 226.
3 Mahāvastu, ii, p. 17.
5 Ibid., iii, p. 67.
the word ‘pāramitā’ did not carry the meaning attributed to it in the later texts. Like pāramiṁ gato in Pāli, there are several uses of the phrase ‘pāramiprāpta’\(^1\) and ‘paramiṁ gato,’\(^2\) in the Mahāvastu. In speaking of Bodhisattva’s several attainments, perfection in the six pāramitās\(^3\) as a condition precedent to a Bodhisattva’s progress from a lower to a higher bhūmi, is not insisted upon,\(^4\) as has been done in the Daśabhūmikasūtra.\(^5\) At the time of composition (2nd century B.C.) of the Mahāvastu,\(^6\) the doctrine of pāramitā, it seems, was not well developed. Unlike the Mahāvastu, we have in the Lalitavistara, not only frequent references to the six pāramitās, but also eulogistic accounts of the deeds of Bodhisattva for attaining perfection in the six pāramitās.\(^7\) These gāthās imply wide currency of the Jātaka-stories as also a great popularity of the pāramitā-doctrine.\(^8\) In the Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā, the six pāramitās are systematically mentioned in the enumeration of Bodhisattva’s attainments, with the rider that these perfections are not to be taken as reals\(^9\) (paramārtha). Thus, we may say that the doctrine of pāramitā was fully developed before the time of composition of the Lalitavistara and the Aṣṭasāhasrikā, i.e. about 1st century A.D. and after the date of the Mahāvastu, i.e., 2nd century B.C.

\(^1\) Mahāvastu, i, p. 152.
\(^2\) Ibid., i, p. 74, etc.
\(^3\) Ibid., i, p. 133-4.
\(^4\) Ibid., i, pp. 89 ff.
\(^5\) Cf. Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism etc. (henceforth abbreviated as AMB.), pp. 267, 270 f.
\(^7\) Cf. e.g. Lalitavistara (R. L. Mittra’s ed.) pp. 38, 60, 185, 188, 199, 212, etc.
\(^8\) Cf. e.g. Ibid., p. 60.
\(^9\) See e.g. Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, p. 194.
The practice of pāramitās occupies an important place in the Mahāyānic code of discipline. In the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, one of the early Mahāyāna texts, it is repeatedly stated that the teaching for the Śrāvakas consisted of the four truths, law of causation, which put an end to suffering and led to Nirvāṇa, while the teaching for the Bodhisattvas consisted of the practice of pāramitās, leading to the highest knowledge or omniscience. In the Daśabhūmika-Sūtra, the practice of a particular pāramitā is enjoined for the attainment of a particular bhūmi. Thus we see that the pāramitās formed one of the fundamentals of the Mahāyānic code of discipline and spiritual progress.

The doctrine of pāramitā is not mentioned in the early Pāli texts, and was very likely unknown to the early Buddhists. The words 'pāramiṃ gato or pāramippatto' (attained perfection) occur in the Nikāyas but nowhere in the Pāli Tripiṭaka, barring the Khuddakanikāya, the pāramitās are mentioned. The number of pāramis, listed in the later Pāli texts, is ten and not six. Dhammapāla, in his commentary on the Cariyāpiṭaka, contributes on the ten pāramis a long dissertation, in which he tells us that there were various ways of classifying the pāramis. There was also the system of enumerating the pāramis as six viz., dāna-sīla-khanti-viriya-jhāna-paññā, which is exactly the list as given in the Buddhist-Sanskrit texts. He writes that

2. See AMB., ch. iv: dāna in 1st bhūmi (p. 259), sīla in the 2nd (p. 262), ksānti in the 3rd (p. 267), viriya in the 4th (p. 270), dhyāna in the 5th (p. 27) and prajñā in the sixth (p. 275).
4. Suttanipāta, vv. 1018, 1020; Majjhima, iii, p. 28.
according to this enumeration, 'sīla' includes nekkhāma (renunciation) as also saccā (truthfulness), the latter being only an aspect (ekadeso) of sīla; pañña includes ānā while jhāna and pañña together include upekkhā; adhiṭṭhāna he says, is associated with all the six pāramīs. Though Dhammapāla was aware of this sixfold classification of pāramīs, the Pāli texts usually mention ten and it seems that this list was made out by the Theravādins some time after the currency of the six pāramītas among the sects other than Theravāda. The supplementary four pāramītas of the later Buddhist Sanskrit texts and the Pāli list of ten pāramītas were very likely the products of the same period.

This doctrine of pāramīta is evidently a later accretion to the fundamental principles of Buddhism, and this took place about the 1st century B.C. Of the several sects that appeared after the Second Council, the Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots, the Andhakas, were the first to deify Buddha and introduce the conception of Bodhisattvas. The object of this group of sects was not only the deification of Buddha but also to find a place for the laity within the religion, to create an interest among the householders in Buddhism. This doctrine of pāramīta was meant primarily for householders; three of the pāramītas were already included in the duties prescribed for the laity, viz., sīla, cāga (=dāna) and pañña.¹ The remaining three pāramītas are kṣānti, vīrya and dhyāna. These, it will be observed, are included in the subsidiary practices prescribed for the laity. The distinction between the pāramīta-practices which made a Bodhisattva and the practices prescribed for the laity is that the former practices had to be carried to the extreme that

¹ The other two are saddhā and suta. See above, p. 222-3.
one can conceive of, while the latter was meant only as a general moral training. The doctrine of pāramitā illustrated by the Jātaka stories made a strong appeal to the common-folk, and became instrumental in propagating the religion among the mass. The success of the Mahāsaṅghikas and their offshoots in increasing their followers led other schools like the Sarvāstivādins and Dharmaguptas, and later the most orthodox of the schools the Theravādins to incorporate this new doctrine into their code, though it was not consistent with their teachings and ideals. The Sarvāstivādins, however, changed their outlook in the altered circumstances of the day, and produced an extensive literature in the shape of Avadānas to popularise this new cult.

**Bodhisattva-doctrine**

As has already been mentioned, the Mahāsaṅghikas were the first to usher in the conception of Bodhisattva, viz., that a being in any form of existence can have or develop the determination to attain bodhi (bodhicittotpāda) at sometime or other, however long and arduous the process may be, no matter even if it entails self-immolation, not once but several times in different existences. This conception is not quite clearly expressed in the Mahāvastu, where we find the first attempt to detail the career of a Bodhisattva, which is as follows:—

(i) *Prakṛti-caryā* (duties while a common man)

(ii) *Prāṇidhāna-caryā*¹ (duties when taking the vow for attaining Buddhahood)

(iii) *Anulomacaryā* (duties for spiritual progress to Buddhahood)

¹ After bodhicittotpāda and prāṇidhāna, there must be also vyākaranā (prophesy) by a Buddha that such and such a being will become the Buddha.
(iv) Anivartana-caryā (duties for remaining firm in a particular stage of spiritual progress).

These four caryās\(^1\) are explained in detail thus:—

(i) Prakṛti-caryā\(^2\) has no corresponding practice in the full-fledged Mahāyānism. A Bodhisattva is a common man (puthujjana) while he is in prakṛti-caryā. This caryā requires a Bodhisattva to be a good, if not an ideal, householder, fulfilling the duties towards his parents, recluses and Brāhmaṇas, respecting the elders of the family, observing the ten moral rules,\(^3\) admonishing others to be charitable and virtuous, worshipping Buddha and Śrāvakas, but not developing the mental state to attain bodhi.\(^4\) Gautama Buddha was in his prakṛticaryā during the time of Aparājitaadhvaja Buddha.\(^5\)

---

1 In the Bodhisattvaabhūmi, the four caryās are given differently thus, Bodhipakṣya caryā, Abhiṣīcaryā, Pāramitā-caryā, Sattvaparipāka-caryā. Dr. Har Dayal has followed this scheme of Caryās in his Bodhisattva Doctrine, p. 76. See also Thomas, History of Buddhist Thought, p. 201; AMB., pp. 286-289.

2 Mahāvastu, i, pp. 46-47, 81 cf. Carīyāpīṭaka Cy., p. 162.

3 See Mahāvastu, i, p. 107, ii, pp. 14-16. The daśa kuśala-karma-pathas are:—Refraining from (i) prānātipāta (killing), (ii) adattādana (stealing), (iii) kāmamithyācāra (misconduct), (iv) anytavacana (speaking falsehood), (v) pīṣunavacana (malignant speech), (vi) parusavacana (harsh speech), (vii) sambhinnapralāpa (frivolous talk), (viii) abhidhyā (avariesiousness), (ix) vyāpunnacitta (malevolence) and (x) mithyādṛṣṭi (wrong view).

4 Mahāvastu, pp. 47, 81:

\[ \text{नैव ताब जनविति मानसं जयवित्वमलं नरिर्ममा।} \]

\[ \text{नैव ताब जनविति मानसं स्वाबविविद्वयत्व प्रिष्ठतः।} \]

\[ \text{नैव ताब जनविति मानसं जनसंगतियत्व नावनाः।} \]

5 Mahāvastu, i, p. 1; but see p. 60 where it is said that he
(ii) Pranidhāna-caryā corresponds to bodhicittotpāda of the developed Mahāyānism. While in this caryā, a Bodhisattva takes the vow that by the merits that have so far accrued to him, he may become omniscient, that his zeal in keeping his vow may not flag, that he may end his past evil acts by suffering pains, and that he may wander over this world like the Buddha untouched by the worldly objects as the incomparable teacher, revered by men and gods, and ultimately he may roll the wheel of law, preach the truth, and train up beings like the Buddha the lamp of this world.

Gautama Buddha first took this vow during the time of a past Sākyamuni Buddha after offering him a drink of gruel. He took the vow for the second time during the time of Sāmi-tāvi Buddha, and later as the monk Abhiya during the time of Sarvābhībhu Buddha. In this way he took this vow five times.

(iii) Anuloma-caryā corresponds to Bodhi-prasthāna-citta of the Bodhicaryāvatāra (p. 23). A Bodhisattva immediately after taking the vow, mentioned above, commences performing the duties prescribed for his spiritual progress. The duties to be performed and the virtues to be acquired by a Bodhisattva are offered valuable robes to Aparājitadhvaja Buddha and prayed for attainment of sambodhi.

1 Mahāvastu, i, p. 50:—

एवमर्ग शोकमिमं चरितं ध्याय चच्छयं चरति चसंभवामहि।
चन्द्रभ्यं चन्द्रभाषधि भवेनसर्वां देहसन्निवृत्तिः॥

2 Ibid., p. 54:—

चच्छयं चरितं श्रीकां देहसन्निवृत्तां देशाय भवे।
एवं विनेत दश्यां चच्छयं ब्रोकप्रयति॥
endless. In some texts\(^1\) an attempt has been made to arrange the duties and virtues in a gradual order in ten stages (bhūmis). The keynote of the Bodhisattva practices is self-sacrifice for the good of others with a firm resolution for the attainment of bodhi. The practices mentioned in the Mahāvastu are not only much less elaborate than those found in the later texts, but also are not in a progressive order. Briefly, these are as follows:

In the 1st bhūmi (Dūrāroha)\(^2\) the Bodhisattva cultivates charity (tyāga), compassion (karunā), unweariness, (aparikhedā), conceit-lessness (amāna), love for study (sarvaśāstrādhyāyitā), valour (vikrama), knowledge of the worldly ways (lokānujñā) and patience (dhrutī).

In the 2nd bhūmi (Baddhamāna) the Bodhisattva develops twenty kinds of strong inclinations (adhyāsaya) viz., excellent (kalyāna), quiet (snigdha), sweet (madhura), etc. Each of these inclinations is explained in verse.\(^3\)

In the 3rd bhūmi (Puṣpamaṇḍitā) the Bodhisattva exerts for making all beings happy without seeking happiness for his own self, and sacrifices everything even his life for listening to wise sayings.

In the 4th bhūmi (Rucirā) the Bodhisattva refrains from commission of any of the extreme offences, viz., patricide, matricide and athanticide, and dissension in the Saṅgha, and stūpa-desecration; he avoids heretic views, performs the ten good deeds\(^4\) (kusālakārmapatha); does not use any magical spell for

---

1. Daśabhūmikasūtra; Bodhisattvabhūmi; Sūtrālāṅkāra of Asaṅga.
2. See Mahāvastu, i, pp. 85-89.
3. A bodhisattva while in the first bhūmi remains a prthaghjana (common man), but deserving gifts. See Mahāvastu, i, p. 78.
4. See above, p. 306 n. 3.
injuring others, does not get depressed in danger nor becomes elated in success, remains pure in physical, mental and vocal acts, as also in his inclinations (adhyāśaya).

In the 5th bhūmi (Citrawistarā) the Bodhisattva realises the fact that worldly existences are ablaze with attachment (rāga), hatred (doṣa), and delusion (moha).

In the 6th bhūmi (Rūpavatī) the Bodhisattva comprehends that existence in the world is unhappy and painful.

In the 7th bhūmi (Durjayā) the Bodhisattva attains complete self-control and wishes for the good of all beings.

In the 8th bhūmi (Janmanirdeśa) the Bodhisattva sacrifices everything including the dearest things which are very difficult to part with. From this bhūmi onwards the Bodhisattva should be looked upon as the Samyaksambuddha as he has mastered the higher meditational practices, acquired full knowledge and delivered wise discourses.

In the 9th and 10th bhūmis (Yavvarājya and Abhiṣeka) therefore the Bodhisattva has nothing more to attain. Now he can take rebirth in whatever form he likes; he can also become a universal monarch. These two bhūmis, evidently, were reached by Gautama Buddha in his last two existences in the Tūṣita heaven and in the mortal world. He decided to take rebirth as a human being for imparting instructions to men and gods, leading them to arhathood or other attainments. In the later Mahāyānic texts, the Bodhisattva in the eighth bhūmi becomes a Buddha in esse, a member of the Buddha family with Buddha gotra, and guarded henceforward by the gods and Vajrapāni. In the 9th bhūmi, according to these texts, the Bodhisattva

1 Mahāvastu, i, pp. 105-6.
2 Thomas, History of Buddhist Thought, p. 203.
3 AMB., p. 282.
becomes a dharma preacher, a guide to other beings. In the 10th bhumi he obtains the resplendent body and omniscience while in meditation; he is now consecrated as the Samyaksambuddha and so this bhumi is called Abhiṣeka.

(iv) Anivartana-caryā of the Mahāvastu is equated by Dr. E. J. Thomas to the Avaivartya-caryā of the later Mahāyānic texts. In the Mahāvastu, however, it carries a different sense. In this text some lapses are pointed out as causes for retrogression of a Bodhisattva from a higher to a lower bhumi, and so a Bodhisattva is warned about these lapses in connection with every bhumi that may be reached by him. The word avaivartya is used as an adjective of the Bodhisattva in every bhumi, implying that the resolution of the Bodhisattva for attaining bodhi remains unflinching all along. Incidentally the text mentions that the Bodhisattva while in one of the first seven bhūmis may, for any serious lapse, be reborn in one of the lower forms of existence. In the later Mahāyānic texts, the 8th bhumi is called Avaivartya or Acalā, from which the Bodhisattva can never have any retrogression; he is destined to attain bodhi and become a samyaksambuddha, and so it is quite different from the anivartana-caryā of the Mahāvastu.

The Bodhisattva conception apparently was not fully developed in the Mahāvastu. The conception presented in the text is half-way between Hinayāna and Mahāyāna. The Bodhisattva, it has in view, is the previous existences of Gautama

1 AMB., p. 283. 2 History of Buddhist Thought, p. 201. 3 Mahāvastu, i, p. 82: ये पुनर् निद्रवरच चाविषि प्रवविषि द्वरम निद्रमुन्नादवसि etc.; p. 83: ये ग्यि मी निद्रमु जाविषि का चाविषि चवविषि द्वरमकानि ते प्रवर्ताय मृतमि विविुति दुर्दशानि हर्तानिनि etc. 4 Mahāvastu, i, pp. 102-4.
Buddha. It makes no reference to the acquisition of pāramitās i.e., the inconceivable and immeasurable virtues acquired by Bodhisattvas in the several bhūmis, as detailed in the Daśabhūmikasūtra or the Bodhisattvabhūmi. There can be no doubt therefore that in the Mahāvastu, we have not only the earliest speculations about the life and career of a Bodhisattva, but also the earliest Jātaka stories. It is in the Saddharmapundarika that we find a fairly developed conception of the Bodhisattva. The Śrāvakas in this work are not disparaged as is done in the later Mahāyāna texts, and a hope is held out to them, that by taking recourse to certain Bodhisattva practices they could still achieve Buddhahood. The new ideals preached in this text electrified the mass, made Buddhism an all-India religion, and we may say that the popular form of Buddhism reached its climax about the time of composition of this work, i.e., about the 2nd century A.D.

Gṛhi Bodhisattvas: In the early Mahāyāna texts, there is no express mention of householder-bodhisattvas. In the Saddharmapundarika (p. 20), a Bodhisattva is said to have 800 disciples (antevāsins), but it is not known whether they were householders or recluses. In the Daśabhūmikasūtra, it is stated that in the fourth bhūmi, the Bodhisattva takes ordination, which

1 Cf. Thomas, History of Buddhist Thought, p. 201: "The conception of the career in the Mahāvastu also shows more primitive features. It is described not as a career for any bodhisattva, but as having been the career of Śākyamuni and previous Buddhas."

2 See AMB, ch. IV.
3 Bodhisattvabhūmi (ed. Wogihara), Tokyo.
4 Saddharmapundarika, p. 221.
5 Cf. Bodhisattvabhūmi (ed. Wogihara), p. 138:—तत्ति कर्षण बङ्ग-सङ्कल्प संयोजितम्। समासती बोधिसङ्कल्प गूढ़तपेत्ते प्रविज्ञत्तर्पणं ते ब्रह्म-श्रवणसिद्धस्ते।
implies that he could remain a householder up to the fourth bhūmi, or the practice of virya-pāramitā. The dhyāna and prajñā pāramitās are to be accomplished after a bodhisattva becomes a monk. In the later Mahāyāna texts like Ugradattapari-precha and Sikṣāsamuccaya, a special code has been framed for the conduct of the householder-bodhisattvas.¹ The pāramitās, it seems, were meant more for the householders than for the recluse. In actual practice, as is found in the Jātaka stories, the pāramitās were being accomplished by laymen, gods and animals, and rarely by ascetics. In the Mahāvastu and other early Mahāyāna texts, the duties of Gṛhī-bodhisattvas are not distinctly prescribed, but in course of time this desideratum of a code was removed and the career of a householder-bodhisattva was clearly chalked out.²

Conclusion: In the pre-Aśokan days Buddhism hardly became a popular movement. It was confined to recluse, the number of which increased to a certain extent owing to the slight deviations made from the austere principles of the earliest form of Buddhism. In his edicts Aśoka did not fully approve of the emphasis laid by early Buddhism on retirement from household life. This attitude of Aśoka might have some effect on the religion. During Aśoka’s reign, the caitya and stūpa worship of Buddha’s images got currency. About two centuries had elapsed since Buddha’s demise, and during this long period, Buddha came to be deified inspite of all the textual injunctions to the contrary. The laymen expressed their devotion by erecting stūpas and decorated them with images of Buddha. The laity, however, still remained outside the Buddhist

¹ AMB., pp. 295-301.
² For further details, see AMB., pp. 295 ff.; and Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa Sūtra.
fold, and earned merits only by making gifts to the monks and offering worship to the Buddhist stūpas. They were held out the hope of rebirth in one of the heavens, but not emancipation. At this stage, about the 2nd century B.C. appeared the Jātakas and Avadānas depicting the previous lives of Buddha and his disciples. These stories caught the imagination of the generality of the people who now hoped that they could become Bodhisattvas and earn necessary merits to become a Buddha in the long run. Their hopes were further strengthened by the doctrine of pāramitās, and special texts were composed to show that the perfection in the pāramitās assured one Buddhahood and that the practice of pāramitās was open to all, recluses or householders. The laymen now felt that they could become actual followers of the religion and derive the benefits. The self-sacrifice preached in the pāramitā doctrine had a wide appeal and made Buddhism an all-India religion. It was through the propagation of this pāramitā cult that the religion reached the pinnacle of its glory.
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<td>Arhat, 64, 114; attainments of, 88; classes of, 87; failings of, 85 ff.; full emancipation of, 84 ff.; house-holder may become, 82 n., 172; imperfections of, 120; Mahā-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sanghika view about, ii 64-5; retrogression of, ii 90; Sarvastivāda view about, ii 148-151; Theravāda view about, ii 204
Aryans, settlements of, i 2 f.; outlook of, i 7 f.
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Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā, pāramitās in, ii 302
Ātman (soul), skandhas distinguished from, i 84 f., 87 f.; Nāgārjuna's view about, i 92; non-existence of, i 85 f.; I-ness the basis of, i 91; upādāna distinguished from, i 56
Ātmaka theory of Vatsa, ii 24
Avadāna literature, Buddhism popularised by, ii 299; non-Buddhist character of, ii 299
Avanti, i 193, ii 19, 113, 175, 271, 274
Bāhiya, a monk, ii 9
Bahuṣrutiya, doctrines of, ii 107 f.
Bahuṣrutiya-vāṣṭha, i 108, 195 f.
Bālapaṇḍitasūtra, ii 244
Bārhaspatyas, views of, i 66, 74 f.
Bāvari, route of, i 5; disciples of, i 162, 165
Bhaddā, queen, ii 4
Bhaddā Kapilānī, i 197
Bhadrayānīka, sect, ii 174, 195
Bhaggas, clan, i 114, 181
Bhallika, disciple, i 99
Bhāṇaka (reciters), ii 14 f.
Bhārahārasūtra, ii 181
Bhāvaviveka, writer, ii 176
Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha, i 305-310
See Pātimokkha
Bhikkhus, disciplinary measures for, i 302 f.; dress of, i 286-8; punishments of, i 299 f.; residence of, i 284 f.
Bhikkhuni, order of, i 294-7; restrictions imposed on, i 295 f.
Bhikkhuni-Pātimokkha, i 310-2
See Pātimokkha
Bhiksu-Sūtra, i 275
Bimbisāra, i 95, 111; successors of, ii 4
Bindusāra, ii 241-2, 243, 248
Bodhirājakumāra, conversion of, i 181
Bodhisattva, i 19, 118, ii 63; conception of, ii 81 f.; four carīyas of, ii 305-8; ten bhūmis of, ii 308-310
Bodhisattva-buddhi, ii 311
Bodhisattva-doctrine, ii 305-12
Bodhisattva-householders, ii 311-2
Bodhi-tree, bathing of, ii 246
Brahma, conception of, i 15
Brahmaloka, i 14 f.
Brähmana, asceticism practised by, i 17; Aśoka’s attitude towards, ii 258; dharmas observed by, i 10; schools of, i 10; Suttanipāta account of, i 8 f.; paraśa of, ii 210; animal sacrifice disliked by a section of, i 12 f.
Brähmanical ascetics, Aśoka’s gifts to, ii 262
Brähmanism, among the Licchavis, i 175; among the Mallas, i 185; in Aṅga, i 185 f.; in Kośala, i 160 f.; in Magadha, i 140-1
Buddha, ascetic practices in vogue before, i 31, 97; attributes of, ii 147-8; austerities made optional by, i 20; Bhaddavaggiyas converted by, i 148; birthplace of, i 93; Brähmanas converted by, i 162 f.; 193; deification of, ii 293; disputations disapproved by, i 127 f.; dissensions apprehended by, ii 7 f.; first discourse of, i 101; first lay-disciples of, i 99; kings converted by, i 112, 165; nobles and bankers converted by, i 113; paribbājikas converted by, i 144 f.; proselytizing activities of, i 116 f.; image of, ii 246, 250, 296-8; Lalitavistara account of, ii 294-5; Mahāvastu account of, ii 293; Mahāsaṅghika conception of, ii 62, 64; method of training of, i 126 f., 134; medium of instruction of, i 130 f.; method of disputation adopted by, i 130; places visited by, i 3, 95 f.; 191 f.; occult powers of, i 121-3; order of nuns sanctioned by, i 179; quarrel between the Śākyas and Koliyas settled by, i 182; relics of, i 4; training imparted by, i 131-4; ways of exposition of, i 124 f.; rules framed by, i 276 f., 125 f.; self-culture stressed by, i 106; scenes of activity of, i 147 f.; supporters of, ii 113 f.; Theravāda conception of, ii 80, 204, 296; transcendental conception of, ii 74 f.;
Buddhadeva (a Sarvāstivādin), opinion of, ii 146
Buddhism, Aśoka’s attitude towards, ii 263; Bodhisattva-doctrine popularised, ii 311; catholicity in, i 121; causes for the popularisation of, ii 312-3; causes for the spread of, i 104-123; decline of, ii 2; ecclesiastical rituals in, ii 276-
82; pāramitā for popularisation of, ii 305; place of laity in, ii 206-38; jātakas popularised, ii 299; formation of schools of, ii 16 f.; fundamental principles of, i 248 f.; principal centres of, ii 27; propagation of, ii 270-4; proselytising in, i 116 f.; Puṣyamitra's animus against, ii 256; time of advent of, i 104-6

Buddhist church, absence of supreme head in, ii 12-4; disruptive forces in, ii 5 f.

Buddhist Council (first), i 324-40; causes of, i 327-30; dissentients in, i 331; authenticity of, i 336 f.

Buddhist Council (second), ii 31-46; causes of, ii 42; business of, ii 34 f.; Mahādeva's propositions in, ii 41; authenticity of, ii 45; ubblebikā process followed in, ii 33 f.

Buddhist Council (third), ii 265-270; authenticity of, ii 265 f.; cause of, ii 269; sectarian differences in, ii 268; Ašoka's part in, ii 269-70

Buddhist literature, specialisation in branches of, ii 14-18

Buddhist schools, ii 31, 47 f.

Buddhological speculations, ii 75 f.

Bu-ston, on Sarvāstivādins, ii 123

Caitiya. See Cetiya

Caityikas (sect), ii 61

Campā, i 185-6

Cānaka, ii 239 f.

Candagirika, ii 244

Candāsoka, ii 245, 250

Candragupta, ii 239-41

Carakas (wanderers), i 31

Cariyāpiṭaka commentary, pāramitās in, ii 303-4

Cātuddisa-saṅgha, i 317

Cedi, i 190

Central Asia, i 119

Cetiya (Caitya), ii 24, 291 f.; worship of, ii 282; list of, ii 282

Ceylon, ii 113

Chan-nagarika, (sect) ii 174, 195

Cīna, ii 273

Citta gahapati, ii 228 f.

Council. See Buddhist Council

Cows, sacrifice of, i 12

Cunda Kammāraputta, i 183

Dabba Mallaputta, i 152, 183; beds for monks arranged by, ii 15 f.

Damila, ii 273

Dārśāntikas, ii 166, 169

Daśabhūmikasūtra, ii 311

Daśādhyaśayavimāna (in Chinese), ii 129-30

Daśatartha, grandson of Ašoka, ii 254 f.

Devadaha, i 172, 174

Devadatta, episode of, ii 5 f.; stringent rules for monks in-
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sisted by, i 208 f., ii 6 f.; training of, i 134
Devadūtasūtra, ii 120
Devasarmā, author, ii 133
Devayānists, i 30
Dhammacakkapavattanasutta, i 101 f., 137, 198
Dhammakathikas, ii 14 f.
Dhammarakkhita, preacher, ii 164, 271
Dharmas (acc. to Sarvāstivādins), ii 137 f., 141 n.
Dharmagupta (sect), ii 36, 40, 47, 305; doctrines of, ii 164-5; literature of, ii 163-4; seat of, ii 163
Dharma-mahāmātras, ii 262
Dharmapāla, ii 202
Dharmaskandha (text), contents of, ii 134
Dhammasūtras, date of, i 275
Dhammatrāta, a Sarvāstivādin, opinion of, ii 145
Dharmottariya (sect), ii 174, 195
Dhārūkāya (text), contents of, ii 135
Dīghanakha, i 145
Dīghajānu Koliyaputta, ii 212
Dīghatapassi, i 129
Dirghāgama, Dīghanikāya compared with, ii 125
Disciples, succession of, ii 3; leading, ii 16-17
Disputation, Buddha’s attitude towards, i 127-130; conversion by, i 128; rules of, i 129
Divyāvadāna, Buddha’s image in, ii 297
Dundubhissara, monk, ii 170
Ekanāla (village), i 141, 154 f.
Ecclesiastical acts and punishments, i 298-304
Ekottarāgama, ii 127
Exposition, four ways of, i 124
Gahapatānī, instructions meant for, ii 217
Gahapati, aims and objects of, ii 211-3; discourses suited to, ii 213-7
Gahapati-parisā, ii 210
Gahapativaggas, ii 213 f.
Ganas, i 33
Gandhabba, ii 235
Gandhamādana, ii 246
Gandhāra, ii 271, 274
Gautama Buddha, ii 309. See Buddha
Gavāmpati (monk), i 331 f.; ii 10, 271
Gayā, Buddha in, i 148 f.
Gayaśīra Hill, i 96
Ghosaka, a Sarvāstivādin, opinion of, ii 145
Ghoṭamukha’s gift, i 139
Gifts, Asoka’s quinquennial, ii 246; Dharmaguptas’ view about, ii 164
Gosirigasālavatana, i 178
Gījñhakūṭa-pabbata, i 159
Graeco-Bactrians, ii 123
Grhi-Bodhisattvas, ii 311-2
Guntur District, Buddhist inscr. in, ii 61
Haimavata (sect), ii 169-71, 200; doctrines of, ii 171
Heavens, names of, ii 233
Himavanta, ii 271
Householders, ii 276; duties of, ii 288; rites and ceremonies of, ii 208; discourses to, i 125
Huviška, ii 58
Iksväku, sacrifices performed by, i 9
Inscriptions, Sarvāstivādins mentioned in, i 122
Iśipattana. See Rśipattana
Jaggayapeta inscription, ii 60
Jainas, monastic system of, i 276; Syādvāda of, i 40
Jalauka, king, ii 254, 255
Jārakas, Buddhism popularised by, ii 299; non-Buddhist character of, ii 299; object of, ii 298-300
Jatilas i 148, ii 240
Jetavanavihāra, i 167
Jivaka, conversion of, i 156
Jñānaprasthānasūtra, contents of, ii 131-2; commentary on, ii 136
Kajangala (village), i 185, 188
Kākavanri, king, ii 22, 45
Kālaśīla, i 143
Kālāsoka, king, ii 22 f., 33, 42, 45; sons of, ii 23
Kallavālamuttagāma, i 155
Kammassadhamma, village, i 195
Kanakmuni Buddha, ii 263
Kānci a centre of the Theravādins, ii 202
Kaniṃka, i 119; ii 123
Kapila, ii 178
Kapilavastu, i 93, 135, 173
Karle (cave), ii 59
Karma (deeds), ii 65; arhats not subject to, i 23; carrier of, i 24f.; law of, ii 298; skandha-satāna subject to, i 22
Kashmir ii 118 f.; ii 271, 274
Kāśi, conversions at, i 136 f.
Kassapagotta, ii 170
Kāśyapīyas, ii 166, 170, 171; literature of, ii 165; doctrines of, ii 166; Haimavatas identified with, ii 170
Kathāvatthu (text), ii 270
Kathina (ceremony), i 293-4, ii 281
Kāśyāyaniputra (author), ii 131
Kauśāmbi, ii 29; disruptive forces at, ii 5 f.; hermitages in, i 188 f.
Kesaputta, Kāḷāmas of, i 170
Khānumata, village, i 141
Khattiya-parisā, ii 210
Khemā, conversion of, i 197
Khemiyambavana, i 139
Khīṭīdāpadosikā (gods) i 53
Kimbila, training of, i 132
Kīṭāgiri, i 139
Koliyas, i 114, 182
Kosala, Brāhmaṇas of, i 160; lay-
devotees of, i 165; non-brahmanical teachers in, i 158 f.; paribbajakas of, i 163 f.; Buddhism in, i 157-67
Kotiśāma, i 154
Kudrakāgama, ii 128
Kunāla, ii 253
Kuru country, Buddha in, i 195 f.
Kuśināra, i 113, 183 f.
Lakkhanaśutta, ii 216, 260
Lalitavistara, Buddha’s life in, i 95 f., ii 298; Buddha described in, ii 264-5; paramīs in, ii 302 Lay-devotees, relation of monks to, ii 225-6. See Householders
Licchavi country i 113, 175; Brahmanism and Jainism in, i 175 f.; Buddhism in, i 179 f.
Lokāyatas, i 174 f.; doctrine of, i 66
Lokottaravādins, ii 61, 63 f., 76
Madda country, Buddhism in, i 197
Madhyamāgama, Majjhima Nikāya compared with, ii 125
Madhyāndina, ii 271
Madhyāntika, ii 119; Kashmir converted by, ii 4
Magadha, Brāhmaṇas of, i 140-1; lay-devotees of, i 146 f.; non-brāhmaṇical sects of, i 141-4; paribbajakas of, i 144-6 Buddha in, i 147 f.
Māgandiya (paribbajaka), i 190, 196
Mahācetiya, ii 61
Mahādeva, ii 271; five propositions of, ii 24, 41 f., 32; two monks of the name of, ii 120
Mahādhammarakkhita, ii 250, 271
Mahākaccāyana, i 108, ii 175, 201, 271; conversion of, i 193
Mahākapphita, i 197
Mahākassapa, i 108, ii 3, 10 f.
Mahākauṣṭhila, author, ii 135
Mahāpi, Buddha invited to Vessali by, i 177
Mahāpadma Nanda, ii 24 f., 239
Mahānāma, lay disciple, ii 288
Mahāraṭṭha, ii 271
Mahāśāla Brāhmaṇas, i 28 f.
Mahāsāṅgīti, ii 33, 54, 58
Mahāsāṅghikas, ii 21, 29, 44, 47, 51 f., 198, 266, 290, 293, 304; centres of, ii 53, 242, 58-61; doctrines of, ii 62 f.; ekacce, ii 268; Mahāyānic features in, ii 63 f.; Kathavattu attributes opinions to, ii 68-73; origin of, ii 53; literature of, ii 54-6; Vinaya of, ii 56; see Śaila schools
Mahāvastu, Buddha’s life in, i 95 f., ii 54, 58, 63, 298; Buddha described in, ii 76-7, 293; bhūmis in, ii 308-9; paramīs in, ii 301-2
Mahāvamsa, Buddha’s image described in, ii 296-7
Mahāvihāravāsin (sect), ii 199, 201
Mahāvibhūṣa, ii 136
Mahāyāṇa, i 118-9, 265, ii 63 f.
Mahinda, ii 253, 273
Mahīśāsaka (sect), ii 11, 36, 40, 106, 198; centre of, ii 242; earlier, ii 112; offshoots of, ii 111; seven rules of, ii 112; Vinaya of, ii 112; later, ii 117; doctrines of, ii 114 f.; line of expansion of, ii 113
Mahīśāmanḍala, ii 113, 271
Mahissati, i 193
Majjhantika, ii 271. See Madhyāntika.
Majjhima (monk), ii 170-271
Majjhima-desa, boundary of, i 3, 185, 188 190-1 n.
Makkhali Gosāla, ii 24; doctrines of, i 36
Mallas, i 113, 183 f.
Malla Roja, conversion of, i 110
Mallikā (queen), i 165
Māndhata, i 56
Mānimekhalai, ii 202
Manopadokā (gods), i 53
Manu, the first sacrificer, i 11
Mathurā, ii 29
Mātikādhara, ii 14 f.
Maudgalyāyana, author, ii 135
Meditation, i 212-247; subjects of, i 217-8; spiritual preceptor in, i 233; mental states of a candidate for, i 235-8; successive steps in, i 239-47 Sarvāstivāda views about, ii 159-160, 286

Mental impurities, ii 286 f.
Metempsychosis, i 24-5, viññāna in, i 24 f.
Middle Path, i 198 f.
Milindapañha, Upāśaka’s duties in, ii 224
Mithilā, i 180
Moggallāna, i 107 f., 133
Moggaliputta Tissa, i 109, 117; ii 119, 121, 249 f., 267 f.
Monasteries, office-bearers in, i 321 f.; no ownership of, i 320 f.
Monks, beheading of, ii 250, geographical division among, ii 27 f.
Moriyas, i 114
Mucilinda Nāga, i 99
Mūlasarvāstivāda, ii 117, 122. See Sarvāstivāda
Munḍa, king, ii 3-4, 22
Nādīka, i 154
Nāga, bhikṣu, ii 24, 42
Nāgādāsaka, son of Munḍa, ii 4
Nāgārjuna, śāvyatādinas and others refuted by, i 57 f.
Nāgārjunikāyopapāda inscriptions, ii 60, 122, 272-3, Mahīśāsakas mentioned in, ii 113; Nirvāṇa in, ii 160-7; Theravadins mentioned in, ii 202
Nakulamātā, ii 219
Nālaka, i 193
Nālandā, i 153
Nanda, training of, i 132
Nanda, king, ii 23 f.
Nibbanadhatus, whether kusala, ii 107
Nigantha Nataputta, i 142 f., ii 22; teachings of, i 40 f.
Nigrodha, i 144, ii 249, 251
Nigrodha-paribbajaka, i 32
Nikayasangraha, (text), ii 266, 268
Nikayas, ascetic practices as mentioned in, i 18 f.
Nirgranthas, ii 262
Nirvana, i 74, 118; ii 259, 289; not attainable by laity, ii 236-8; faith leading to attainment of, ii 285-9; Nagarjunikonda inscriptions mention, ii 106
Okkaka (Iksvaku), i 9, 11
O.gans of sense. See Indriya
Pahlavas, ii 123
Paisaci, ii 203
Pajota, king, ii 112
Pakatnavadin, i 265
Pakudha Kaccayana, doctrines of, i 39
Pali text, paramita in, ii 303-4
Pali traditions re. Asoka, ii 248-51
Painin, ii 25 f.; date of, ii 26
Paramartha, author, ii 108, 291
Paramitas, earliest mention of, ii 301; six and ten, ii 300-1; cult of, ii 300-5; Bodhisattva and laymen practice, ii 304-5
Paribbajakas, i 119, 144, 149
Paribbajikka, i 33
Parisi, three, ii 210-1
Pasisuddhi, declaration of, ii 291
Parivrjaka, i 31-3, 275 see Paribbajaka
Parthiana, ii 123
Pasenadi, king, i 111, 164-5
Patalliputra, ii 29 f., 58, 153 f.
Pattecasamuppada, i 264-273
Patimokkha, i 204, 291 f., ii 19 f., 229
Pava, i 183 f.
Pavaran, i 293, ii 281
Payasi, i 38
Perception, see Viñana
Pilgrimage, four places of, ii 284-285
Pindola Bharadvaja i 117, 190; ii 246, 272, 296
Pingalavatsa, an Ajivaka, ii 243
Pphalivana, Moriyas of, i 114, ii 240
Potalliputta, i 145
Pulura, country, ii 273
Prajapati, the supreme god, ii 15 f.
Prajapatisstra, contents of, ii 135
Prajapativadins, ii 195; doctrines of, ii 108
Prakaranapada, contents of, ii 133
Pubbarama, i 167
Pubbaseliyas (sect), ii 93
Pudgalavada, ii 177
Punabbasu, i 139
Pundravardhana, ii 248
Punn Mantaniputta, i 108, 117, ii 272
Pūrāṇa, i 331 f., ii 10; a teacher of the Mahiśāsakas, ii 112
Pūrāṇa Kassapa, i 24; doctrines of, i 35 f.
Pūrṇa, author, ii 135
Pūrva Videha, ii 272
Pusyamitra, ii 256; Havell on persecution of, ii 256
Puthujjana, Sarvāstivāda views about, ii 157-8; Mahiśāsaka views about, ii 115
Quinquennial assembly of Aśoka, ii 251
Quorum in a Saṅgha, i 317-8
Rādhagupta, minister of Aśoka, ii 244
Rāhula, i 94; training of, i 131-2
Rājagaha, i 135, 149 f., hermitages around, i 150 f.
Rājagirikas (sect), doctrines of, ii, 109
Rakkhita (monk), ii 271
Rāmagāma, Koliyas of, i 182
Rattthapāla, conversion of, i 196
Reality according to Buddhism, i 21
Revata (monk), i 109
Revataka, country, ii 246
Rgveda, Brāhmaṇas of the time of, 11; conception of not-being in, i 16; conception of unity in i 16
Rites and ceremonies, Aśoka's views about, ii 258, 261
Rṣis (ancient), names of, i 10
Rṣipattana, i 136 f.
Rudraka Rāmaputra, i 96
Sabbakāmi bhikkhu, i 316
Sacrifice (yajña), i 12 f.
Sadānirā (river), i 2, 180
Saddhā (faith), ii 286, 289 f.
Saddhārmapuṇḍarika, Bodhisattva conception in, ii 311; pāramitās in, ii 303
Saddharmavarṣaka (=Kāśyapīya), ii 165
Sāgala, i 197
Sahajāti (country), i 190
Saṅgha schools, ii 61, 74; doctrines of, ii 105; arhats as conceived by, ii 85 f.
Sakadāgāmi, attained by laity, ii 235; retrogression of, ii 91
Sakuludāyi, i 145
Sāketa, monasteries at, i 168 f.
Sākyas, monasteries of, i 174; converts made among, i 171, 113; Nigantha Nāṭaputta among, i 172
Sāmagāma, i 174
Sāmāvati queen, i 112, 115, 189
Sambhūta Sānāvāsi, i 109 ii 3, 27, 118 f.
Sambodhi, Aśoka visited, ii 263
Samkantika (=Sautrāntika), ii 166-9; doctrines of, ii 166 f.
Sāmkhya, i 265; Sasattavāda differed from, i 50 f.
Samkrāntivāda, ii 166, 176
Sāmmitiyas, ii 47 f., 166, 174 f.; origin and history of, ii 174-
| 5: literature of | i 175. See Vātsiputriyas. | i: 130-6; āgamas of, | ii 125 f.; controversy of Theravāda with, | ii 137 f.; doctrines of, ii 137 f.; origin of, ii 118; succession of teachers of, ii 118 f.; Vinaya of | i 184, ii 128 f.; controversy of Vātsiputriyas with, ii 177 f.; four different opinions of, ii 145-7; expansion of, ii 122-3; language of, ii 124; seat of, ii 242; two centres of, ii 122; revival of, ii 123 |
| Sampadi, grandson of Asoka, | ii 254 f., 248 | Sarvástivāda-Vibhajyavādins, ii 196 |
| Samudra, bhikṣu, | ii 251, miracle of, ii 244 | Sassatavāda, i 50 f., ii 186, 192 |
| Śaṅyuktāgama, Śaṅyutta Nikāya compared with, ii 126-7. | | Satyasiddhiśāstra, ii 108 |
| Śaṅgha, ii 262; admission into, i 281 f.; beginning of, i 278; constitution of, i 313-23; early dissensions in, ii 5-8; causes of dissensions in, ii 12 f.; no quorum in, i 317 f.; office-bearers in, i 321; selection of head of, i 315-7; voting in, i 319 f. | | Sautrāntika; see Saṃkāntika |
| Śaṅghabheda, ii 15; definition of, ii 9 f.; Saṅgharājī distinguished from, ii 10 | | Savatthi, i 135, 167-8 |
| Saṅgharājī, ii 10 | | Schools, authors of the history of, ii 47 f. |
| Saṅghārāma, i 314 f. | | Sects, Buddhist, ii 47 f. |
| Śaṅghathera, i 316, ii 252 | | Setu, a householder who became an arhat, ii 89 n. |
| Saṅkha Likhita, authors, i 275 | | Siddhatthakas, sect, doctrines of, 109 |
| Saṅgītripāryāya, contents of, ii 135-6 | | Siggava bhikkhu, i 108 |
| Saṅjaya Belaṭṭhiputta, i 40, 120, 142 | | Sigala the householder, ii 260 |
| Sarana, meaning of, ii 279 | | Sigalovādasutta, ii 216, 261 |
| Śāriputra, author, ii 134 | | Siha, conversion of, i 176 f. |
| Śāriputta, i 107, 117; Rāhula ordained by, i 279 f.; training of, i 132 | | Sūtra-pitaka of the Sarvāstivādins, ii 125-8 |
| Saṅsāka, country, ii 246 | | Silānka, Jaina commentator, i 35 |
| Sarvāstivāda, ii 27, 36, 40, 47, 104, 111, 117 f., 203, 295 f., 305; Abhidhamma literature of, | | Silas, kinds of, i 203; non-mental acc. to Mahāsaṅghikas, ii 69 f. |
| Simhala, ii 272 |
Simhasena, son of Candragupta, ii 240
Skandhas, ii 174, i 24; attā distinguished from, i 89 f.; Nāgarjuna's comment on, i 88 f.; pudgala exists apart from, i 83; Tathāgata distinguished from, i 78 f., 81; two classes of i 24, 78
Skandhamātra, existence of, ii 166-7
Skandhasantāna, i 22, 62, ii 181
Sonā, (monk) ii 271
Sonadanda, i 185
Sonā Kolivisa, i 186
Sotāpatti, attained by laity, ii 234
Soul, skandhas distinguished from, ii 230
Saddhā, ii 222
Sripavata, ii 273
Sotapanna, retrogression from, ii 90
Sthavira, ii 29; Mahāyānist, ii 199 f.; see Thera
Sthaviravāda, ii 199-206
Sthāviriya (=Kāśyapiya), ii 165
Sthiramati, ii 25
Stūpa, ii 291 f., worship of, ii 209, 283; erection of, ii 244-5, 249; relics for, ii 245
Suddhodana, i 172 f.
Sujātā, i 97
Sumana bhikṣu, ii 250
Sunāparānta, i 195
Sunakkhatta, i 178
Sūrasena, ii 23 f.
Susīma, son of Bindusāra, ii 243
Susunāga dynasty, ii 22 f.
Sutta Nipāta, i 194; ancient Brāhmaṇas depicted in, i 8 f.
Suttantika, ii 14 f.
Suttavādi, i 166
Suvannabhūmi, ii 271
Suvarṣaka (=Kāśyapiya), ii 165
Takṣasīla, ii 243
Tamasāvana, i 121, 246
Tambapanni, ii 271, 273
Tāmraparṇīyas, ii 198, 200
Tapassa gahapati, ii 212
Tarkajvāla of Bhāvaviveka, ii 167, 176
Tathāgata, i 21; skandhas distinguished from, i 79 f.
Tathāgatagarbha, i 98
Theravāda. See Sthaviravāda
Theravāda, controversy of Sarvāstivāda with, 137 f.; literature of, ii 203
Theravāda-Vibhajjavāda, ii 265, 270
Theravādins, ii 44, 48, 269, 305; centre of, ii 242, 201; doctrines of, ii 203-6; controversy of Vātsiputriyas with, ii 184 f.
Theriya Nikāya, ii 272, 268
Thullakottīhita, i 195
Tissa the Crown prince, ii 250 f., 267
Tiṣyarakṣitā, ii 246
Tivara, prince, ii 253
Tosali, ii 273
Trances, stages in, i 242-7
Tripitaka of the Sarvāstivādins, ii 124 f.
Trīsaraṇa, ii 209, 277-80, 291.
See Sarana.
Truths, realisation of, i 67-8
Ubbhāhika system, i 318, ii 33
Uccchedavāda, i 71 f., ii 186, 192
Udāyibhadda, king, ii 1 f.
Udena, i 109, 112, 189 f.
Ujjeni, ii 201 f. 249
Ukkaḷā, i 136 f.
Ukkatthā, i 169-70
Upagupta, ii 3, 119, 245
Upāli, i 143, 201
Upaniṣads, i 20 f., 26 f., 30 f.
Upāsaka, ii 208 f.; deeper problems of Buddhist philosophy explained to, ii 230-2; spiritual attainments of, ii 232-6; Nirvāṇa unattainable by, ii 236-8; Gahapati distinguished from, ii 220; duties prescribed for, ii 222 f.; uposatha of, ii 22 f.; teaching imparted to, ii 228 f.
Upāsikās, names of distinguished, ii 219; defined, ii 221; special attainments of, ii 219, 228
Upasampadā (higher ordination), ii 280
Uposatha, ii 209, 266 f., 280; assemblies for, ii 289 f., Upāsakas', ii 226 f.
Uruvela, i 96, 148 f., 137
Uluka, non-Buddhist teacher, ii 178
Uttara (monk) ii 271
Uttarā Nandamātā, ii 228 f.
Uttarāpathakas, ii 76, 93, 171-3; doctrines of, ii 172-3
Utthiya, ii 89 n.
Vaibhāśika, ii 27, 118, 122
Vaiśāli, see Vesāli
Vaitulyas, ii 268. See Vetulyakas
Vaikhāṇasa, i 275
Vajjian monks, ii 32-3
Vajjiputtaka, ii 174
Vajrāsana, ii 298
Vānavāsi, ii 113, 271, 273; queen of, ii 106
Vānaprastha, i 29, 275
Vāṇga, ii 273
Vararuci, ii 25 f.
Vāsabhakkhattuva, i 111
Vasuladatti, i 190
Vāsītiputra Siripulumāyi, ii 59
Vassakāra, minister, ii 13
Vasubandhu, ii 167-8, 178
Vasumitra's views accepted by, ii 147
Vasumitra, author, ii 133; views of, ii 146
Vatsa, atmaka theory of, ii 24
Vātsiputriya, ii 24, 194-5; controversy of Theravādins with, ii 184 f.; see Sāmmitiya.
Vedas, i 6 f.; śākhās of, i 10, 12.
See Rgveda.
Vekhanassa, i 275
Veludvāra, Brāhmaṇa gahapatis of, ii 223
Veranīja, location of, i 191
Vesāli, i 135 ii 29, 38; conversions at, i 177-9; order of nuns sanctioned at, i 179
Vetulyakas, ii 200; conception of Buddha according to, ii 75; doctrines of, ii 110
Vibhajavāda, ii 195, 268; Bahusūrutiya, Sarvāstivāda and Theravāda, ii 196; doctrines of, ii 197
Vibhāṣa-sāstra, ii 130
Videgha Māthava, i 2
Videha, Buddhism in, i 180
Vijñānakāya, contents of, ii 133-4
Vijñaptimātratāsāstra, ii 169, 195
Vinayadhara, ii 14 f.
Vinaya Piṭaka of the Sarvāstivādins, ii 128-130
Vinaya rules, leniency in, ii 35 f., 291
Viśākhā, i 114, 166
Viśoka, ii 23, 254
Vitaśoka, ii 243, 251, conversion of, ii 247
Voting in a Saṅgha, i 319-320
Yamāntakasiddhi of Cānakya, ii 241
Yānas (two), vimukti of, ii 164
Yasa, householder, i. 109, ii 89, 172
Yaśa of the second Council, ii 28, 32
Yaśa the Samgharthera, ii 244, 247
Yavanas, ii 123
Yona countries, ii 271
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akiriya-vāda (theory of non-action i.e. soul is not affected by actions), ii 35 f., 39 f.
akusalamūla (demerit-roots, viz., rāga, dosa and moha), ii 71 f.
acetasika (non-mental), ii 69
ajñānavāda (agnosticism), i 39
ajñāna (ignorance of an arhat), ii 41, 71, 85 f.
ajñāma jivaṁ ajñāma satirām (soul is different from body), i 46 f., 88; ii 189
āṭṭhakathā (commentaries on the Pāli texts), ii 265
āṭṭhāngika-maṅgga (the eightfold path leading to Nibbāna), i 102, 139, 198-202
āṭṭhamakā (one who is in the lowest one of the eight stages of spiritual progress, same as sotāpanna), ii 91 f., 96
addhavāja (pinnacled house), i 284
attavāda (belief in the existence of soul), i 272
attā, see ātman.
attharana (carpet, rug), i 286
adaskaṁ nisidanaṁ (borderless seat), one of the ten rules discussed in the 2nd Council, ii 36, 38
adukkhamasukha (neither painful nor happy), i 18, ii 214-5
addhariyā (a Vedic Śākha), i 10.
adhipaññā, ii 20
adhisīla, ii 19
anātrā (=anātman, absence of soul), i 17, 20, 92, 150, ii 99, 107, 137, 148, 176
Anattasutta, i 103
anantavā loko (theory that the world is infinite), i 46 f.
anantarapaccaya, ii 71. See pac- caya (cause)
anantarīya (the five extreme heinous crimes, viz., patricide, matricide, arahanticide, dissen- sion within the saṅgha, and
spilling blood of the Buddha), ii 82, 91
anāgāmi (the third stage of sanctification), ii 91, 214, 234
anārocanā (an ecclesiastical restriction), i 303
anāsrava (free from impurities), i 77, ii 74 f., 151, 164, 172
anicca (=anitya, impermanent), i 8, 150 ii 107, 140
anîmittatā (characteristics-lessness), ii 153, 232, 288
anivartanacaryā (certain practices for which Bodhisattvas do not recede from a stage of advancement), ii 310
anîyata (a kind of ecclesiastical offence) i 306
anurādajñâna (the knowledge acquired by an arhat that he has no more rebirth), ii 79, 149, 166, 204
anupubbâbhisamaya (realisation of the truth gradually), views of different schools about, ii 67, 115, 154, 165, 206
anupubbâkathā (gradual courses meant for new recruits or householders), i 125, ii 228
anumati-kappa, one of the ten rules discussed in the 2nd Council, ii 35, 39-40
anussaya (dormant passion), views of different schools about, ii 65, 91 f., 94 f., 115, 159, 173, 205, see pariyûṭhāna
anumodanā-kappa, one of the ten rules discussed in the 2nd Council, ii 40
anurūpavihāra (suitable places for meditation), 234 f.
anulomacaryā (duties to be performed by Bodhisattvas for spiritual progress), ii 307-8
anusāsani, one of the three occult powers, i 123
anusatti (cogitation of the merits of Buddha, Dhamma, Saṅgha, Sila, Cāga and Devatā), i 223-7
antarābhava (intermediate existence between death and rebirth), views of different schools about, ii 103, 116 f., 161, 176, 182, 189, 194 f., 197, 205
antaravā loko (the theory that the world is finite), i 46 f.
antanantikā, i 59 f.
antevāsika (disciple), i 284
aparâkoti (end of being or existence), ii 104
appanā (fixing attention by a meditator on a subject), i 240-2
apranihittatā (desire-less-ness), ii 152 f.
apratisamkhyā-nirodha (emancipation without knowledge), ii 68, 102
abbhāna (readmission into the Saṅgha), i 298, 303
abrahmacaryāvāsa (leading impure lives), i 37, see brahmacariyāvāsa
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abhijñā (=abhidhyā, undue desire for gain), ii 197, 286
abhīṣīnā (=abhīṣīnā, higher knowledge), i 43, 49, 54, 331, ii 132, 191
Abhidharmakośa (text), ii 136, 162
Abhidharmayānusāra (text), ii 136
Abhidharmasamayapradipikā (text), ii 136
Abhidharmasāra (text), ii 136
Abhidharmahṛdaya (text), ii 137
Abhidharmāṁrtaśāstra (text), ii 137
Abhinīkramanāsūtra, ii 163
amata (=nibbāna, immortal), ii 107, 235 ff.
amathita-kappa, one of the ten rules discussed in the 2nd Council, ii 35, 37
amārāvikkhepi (eel-wobblers—those who do not give a definite answer to a question), i 40, 63 ff., ii 188
avatthuka (having no basis for origin), ii 66
avicāra, ii 232, see jhāna.
avijjā (=avidyā), non-realisation of the truth, i 102, 267 ff., ii 72, 148, 238
aviññatti (=avijñapti, non-intimation), ii 70, 132, 169
avitakka, see jhāna
avipāka (unaccompanied by any result), i 254 ff., ii 69
Aviruddhaka, a sect, i 33
avaivartya-cāryā. See anivartana-cāryā
avyākata (=avyākṛta, indeterminable), i 39, 44 ff., 83, 100; ii 69, 94 ff., 101, 159, 161
ariyamagga (path of sanctification), ii 82 ff.
ariyasaṅcàca (=āryasaṁyāga), the four truths, i 139, 261 ff.
arūpa (non-material), i 68, 70, 96; ii 65, 69, 99 ff.
arūpa-samāpatti (the four higher meditations), i 230-2, ii 214
arhant (=arahat), the fourth stage of sanctification, different views relating to, ii 41, 64, 85 ff., 89 ff., 90 ff., 109, 114, 148 ff., 164, 171 ff., 195, 204, 243; different types of, ii 86
āsāsvata, see asassata
Aśvamedha (sacrifice), i 9
aśṭāṅgika-mārga, see atthaṅgikamagga
asamānīsattā (=asamānī-sattvā, beings with inactive perception), ii 152, 206
asassato loka (a view that the world is impermanent), i 45 ff.
asubha (unpleasant objects of meditation), i 222-3
asekha (one who has nothing to learn=an arhat), ii 238
ākāsa (space), i 37, ii 102, 230
ākāsānaññāyatana (sphere of unbounded space), the fifth meditation, i 72, 86, 95, 230 f.
ākinnāññāyatana (sphere of desire-less-ness or nothingness), the seventh meditation, i 231, ii 232, 288
ācariya (spiritual preceptor), i 281, ii 250
ācariyaparamparā (succession of teachers), ii 118
ācinnakappa, one of the ten rules discussed in the 2nd Council, ii 35, 38-9
ājivapārisuddhisila (rules for purity in taking food), i 205
ātman (soul, individuality), i 17, 20, 56, 102, ii 63, 122; discussions re., i 84 f.
Ādittapariyāya (sutta), i 148
ādesa, one of the three occult powers, i 123
ānapañnasati (observation of inhalation and exhalation), i 134
āpatti (ecclesiastical offence), i 209
āraññaka (forest-dweller), one of the dhutanga, i 210, ii 20
ārammana (=ālambana, basis), ii 65, 159
ārāma (hermitage), i 163, 321
āruppa (=ārūpya), higher meditations, i 218, 230-2, ii 102, 151, 198
āsava (=āśrava, impurity), four kinds, viz., kāma (desire), bhava (desire for rebirth), avidyā (ignorance of the truth), and dṛṣṭi (wrong views), i 97; ii 287
āsrama (hermitage), i 170 f.
āyatana (sphere, region), i 102, 259-260, ii 100, 108, 117, 133, 140, 194
āyu (length of life), i 86, 97 n., ii 74
āhāra (food), i 25, ii 98 f.
āryamārga, ii 102 f., 108, see ariyamagga
āryasatya, i 97, 102, see ariyasacca
ālayavijñāna (store-consciousness, the substratum of samsāra), ii 104
āvajjana (reflection), ii 100
āvāsa (parish), i 290 f., 321, ii 35, 39, 226, 266, 269
idappaccayatā (this-conditioned, all worldly objects are caused and conditioned), i 265, ii 103
iddhi (miraculous power, =rddhi), i 24, ii 18, 73
iddhipāda (four psychic powers), ii 73
indriya (faculty, organ of sense), i 37, 72, 260-1; ii 67, 96, 100, 132, 180
indriyasamvarasila (precepts for controlling the organs of sense), i 205
indriyavijñāna (perception through the organs of sense), ii 104
īryāpatha (=īryāpatha, four
INDEX OF PĀLI AND SANSKRIT WORDS

ways of deportment, viz., walking, standing, sitting and
lying down), ii 63, 76
issaranimmāna (the theory that
the world is a creation of the
God), ii 190
ukkhepaniyakamma, an ecclesiastical
punishment, i 302 f.
ucchedavāda (the view that there
is no future existence), i 38 f.,
ii 186 f.
uddesabhātta (specified food), i 322
uddosita (outhouse of a monas-
tery), i 296
uddhambhāgiya (the second five
samyojanas, fetters, viz., rūpā-
raga, arūparāga, māna, uddhacca and avijjā) ii 238, see
orambhāgiya
uddhacca (=auddhatya, haughti-
ness), ii 238
upakkilesa (=upakleśa, minor
impurities), i 189, ii 103
upacāra (the first attempt at
concentration of thoughts), i 239-40
upajjhāya (=upādhyāya, teacher),
i 281
upaṭṭhānasālā (assembly room or
chapel), i 109
upanissaya (qualificatory condi-
tion), i 273
upapāduka (self-born), ii 62, 204
upasampadā (higher ordination),
i 281, ii 280
upassaya (=upāśraya, hermit-
tage), i 296
upahaccaparinibbāyi (=upapadya-
parinirvāyin, one who attains
emancipation, immediately af-
ter rebirth), ii 172
upādāna (substratum or cons-
stituents), i 56, 63, 79 f., 90,
272
upāsaka (lay-devotee), i 111, ii
208 f.
upāsikā (female lay-devotee), i
112, ii 208 f.
upekkhā (equanimity), i 74) ii 287
uposatha (sabbath), i 290-1, ii
13, 209, 226 f., 250, 266 f.,
276, 280
ubbhāhikā (selection of a body of
referees), i 319, ii 33-4
ubhatobhāgavimutta, a class of
arhats, ii 86 f., 149 n., 246
uṣmā (heat of the body), i 86
ṛṣi (hymn-composer), names of,
10
ckaccasassati (partial eterna-
lists), i 46, 51 f., ii 188
ckakṣanikacitta, (momentary
thought), ii 157
ckarasa (same taste or nature), ii
167
ogha (flood of passions, =āsava),
i 176
olārika (gross), i 85
orambhāgiya (the first five
samyojanas, fetters, viz., sak-
kāyadiṭṭhi, vicikicchā, silab-
bataparamāsa, kāmacchanda and vyāpāda), ii 216, 228, 238, see uddhambhāgiya
osāraṇā, an ecclesiastical punishment, i 302
auapāduka, ii 182, see upa-pāduka
kañkāha (doubt), ii 41, 85 f.
kathina, an ecclesiastical ceremony, i 293-4, ii 281
kappa (=kalpa, aeon), ii 73, 77
kappiyakāraka (monk-officer in charge of provisions etc.), i 289
kappiyakūṭi (a house outside the compound of a monastery for storing articles for monks' use), i 285
kappiyabhūmi (the compound for kappiyakūṭi, q.v.), i 289
kamma (deed), i 24 f., 36, 145 f., ii 68 f.
kammattāhāna (subject of meditation), i 133 f., 232 f., 217-8, 237-9
kammavācā (the text containing directions for ecclesiastical acts), i 296, ii 250
kammavāda, i 121, 144
kammavipāka (fruition of action), i 23
karma, (actions which regulate future life) i 18, 22 f., 41, 84, ii 62, 108 f., 116, 150, 162, 193, 232
karmakāṇḍa (religious rites), i 105
karunā (compassion), ii 84, 147, 172, 204, 287
kaśāya (five evils), i 96 n.
kasina (object of meditation), i 65, 218-222
kalyāṇamitta (spiritual guide), i 233
kalyāṇavākkaraṇa (pleasant speech or conversation), i 28
kāma (desire), i 96, ii 67, 72
kāmarāga (strong desire, lust), ii 94 f., 235
kāmaloka (the lowest strata of worldly beings), ii 65
kāyakamma (physical acts), i 143
kāyadāna (control of physical acts), i 41, 143, ii 18
kāya-satiṇīṭhāna (minute observation of physical and physical movements), ii 192, 215
kiriyaṇāvāda (theory of karma), i 36, 41
kilesa (=kleśa, impurities), ii 195
kutihala-sālā (place for discussions), i 26, 32, 128
kuśalāmūla (merit-roots, viz., alobha, adosa, amoha), i 98
kuśalakarmapatha (the ten abstentions from evil acts), ii 292, 306 n.
kusalaśīvayakacittā (indetermin-
able thought but producing good effect), i 254, ii 95
kṣaṇīka (momentary existence of constituents), i 24, ii 167 f.,
189, 193
kṣayajñāna (the knowledge of an arhat that he will have no more rebirth), ii 78, 150, 166,
204, see anutpāda jñāna
kleśa (impurity), ii 206
kleśa-bīja (seed of impurity) ii 68
kleśāvaraṇa (the veil of impurity), ii 88
khajjaka-bhājaka (monk in charge of the distribution of eatables),
i 322
khandha (=skandha, constituents of a being), i 24, 61 f.,
77 f., 83, 86 f., 89 f., 102, 150,
249 f., ii 100, 108, 117, 132 f.,
167 f., 174, 176, 179, 181 f.,
194, 215, 230 f.
gāna (a religious body), i 34
gati (sphere of existence), ii 173
gahapati (householder), ii 211 f.
gahapatāni (female householder),
ii 217
gāmakhetta (parish), ii 13
gāmaṇi (head of a village), i 147,
ii 220
gāmantara-kappa, one of the ten rules discussed in the 2nd
Council, ii 35
gihi (householder), ii 172, 236
guru (spiritual preceptor), ii 258
guhā (cave-dwelling), i 284
gotrabhūmidharma (the stage in which one becomes a member of the Buddha family, i.e. a
sotāpanna), ii 90
cāṅkamasālā (place for walking while meditating), i 285
cakkavāla (world), i 59
cakkhu-viśnāna (visual perception), ii 100-1
caṭuṭkotika (four-fold extreme positions), i 60
caraka (wanderer), i 31, see pari-bbajaka
caryā (four ways of life of a Bodhisattva), ii 62
cāga (gift), ii 222 f., 234
cātuyāmasāṃvara (four kinds of restraint observed by the Jainas), i 41, 145
cātuddisa-sāṅgha (monks of the four corners of the world), i
317, 320
citta (=mano=vīśnāna, mind, thought, mental state), i 54,
200 f., ii 19, 73, 91, 114 f., 133,
168 f.
citta-vippayutta (or viprayukta or visamprayukta), (dissociated from mind or thought), ii 65,
69, 71, 94 f., 115, 133, 141-2,
168, 173
citta-vimutti or ceto-vimutti (mental emancipation), i 19,
132, ii 232
citta-samprayukta (associated with
mind or thought), ii 96, 115, 159, 205
civara (monk’s robe), i 155
civara-nidāhaka (keeper of robes), i 287
civara-pāṭīgāhaka (receiver of robes), i 287
civara-bhājaka (distributor of robes), i 287, 322
cetasika (caitasika mental), ii 91, 109, 114 f., 132 f., 159, 169
cetiya (caitya, memorial mound), i 113, 178, ii 24, 51, 105, 249
ceto-samatha (tranquility of mind), ii 219
chandā (strong desire), i 95
chandā (consent), i 317
Chandokā, a Vedic śākha, i 10, 12
cchalabhijātī (six grades of beings), i 37
chalupēkkha (indifferent in respect of the six organs of sense), ii 150
Jātīla, a sect, i 33
jalogimpātum, one of the ten rules discussed in the 2nd Council, ii 35, 37
jātarūparajatāni (gold and silver), ii 36, 38
jāti (birth), i 273
jātibhūmi (birthplace of Buddha), i 173
jīva (soul), i 68, 85 f., ii 181
jāntāghara (bathroom), i 285
jñāna (knowledge), ii 198, 132
jñānadasana (knowledge and insight), ii 151
Jñānaprasthāna-sūtra, ii 133
jñeyāvarana (veil covering the truth), ii 88
jhāna (=dhyāna, meditation), ii 65, 74, 86, 137, 156, 228
ñatti (=jñāpti, announcement), i 299
ñāna (=jñāna, q.v.), ii 71, 98
ñāti (=jñāti, relative), ii 191
tam jivam tam sariram (soul is identical with the body), i 38, 46 f., 73, 88 ii 189
tajjaniyakamma (censure), i 299-300
tanha (=trṣṇā), ii 25, 271 f., ii 93
tattva (identity), i 87
tathāparinibbāyi (an Anāgāmi who attains nibbāna in the heaven in which he is reborn), ii 235
tathatā (thatness, the reality), ii 88
tathāgata (=Buddha), i 46 f., ii 80
tathāgatagarbha (the source of all tathāgatas), ii 98
tapasyā (religious austerities), i 18, 30, 41
tassapāpiyāsikā (an ecclesiastical method of settling dispute), i 309
tinavatthāraka, (an ecclesiastical
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method of settling dispute), i 309
Tittiriya, a Vedic sākhā, i 10, 12
tithiya (heretic, non-Buddhist),
i 145, 159, 189
Tedandaika, a sect, i 33
trikāya (three bodies of Buddha),
viz., nirmāṇa or rūpa (apparit-
tional), sambhoga (celestial),
dharma or svabhāva (real), ii 62
tridhātu (the three spheres of
existence), i 42
triratna (Buddha, Dhamma and
Saṅgha), ii 21, 215, 235 f.,
244, 249
trisaraṇa (the three refuges in
the triratna), ii 209, 233, 277-
280
trisāhasra-mahāsāhasra lokadhātu
(innumerable worlds), i 99
thambha (pride), ii 286
thullaccaya (serious fault), i 290
thca (=sthavira, a fully ordained
monk), ii 17, 258
Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅgasutta, ii 164
darśana-mārga (the sixteen mo-
ments of the comprehension of
the truth leading to bhāvanā-
mārga) ii 92, 152, 155, 158,
198
dāna (gift), ii 109 f.
dīṭṭhadhammanibbānavādins (the
view that nibbāna is attained
in the present life), i 74 f.
dīṭṭhi (=dṛṣṭi, religious or philo-
sophical views), i 140, 272, ii
93
dibba-cakkhu (superhuman vi-
sion), ii 16
dukkha (unhappiness), i 18,
262-3, ii 40, 97 f., 107 f., 229,
dukkata (fault), i 290
duṣkara-cāryā (austere practices),
i 97
dṛṣṭadharmasukha-vihāra (enjoy-
ment of happiness in the pre-
sent body), ii 151
Devadhammika, a sect, i 33
devayānist (forest-dweller seeking
heavenly existence), i 30
dosa (=dveṣa, hatred), ill-feeling,
i 23, 148, ii 93, 95, 235, 288
dravya (substance), ii 96, 145,
169, 178
dvāngula-kappa, one of the ten
rules discussed in the 2nd
Council, ii 35, 37
dhamma (=dhamma, religion,
things of the world, practices,
truth or reality, elements), i
9 f., 108, 117, 192, ii 109,
137 f., 141 n., 172, 224, 229
dhammatthitāta (sameness of ob-
jects), ii 103
dhammāyatana (anything that
comes within the sphere of
mind), ii 92, 100, 162
dharma, ii 68, 78, 81, 173, 204,
five, ii 137, 141
dharma-mārga, ii 116
dharmakāya (the real body of
Buddha, the truth, the reality, ii 76
dharmacakra (the wheel of law), i 101, 103
dharmatathata (sameness of objects), i 98
dharmadhatu (the reality), i 98
dharmasunyatā (absence of characteristics of objects, non-existence of the phenomenal objects), i 48, ii 62, 88
Dharmaskandha, a text, ii 134
dhatu (component elements of a being, also world), i 102, 132, 258-9, ii 17, 117, 133, 140, 194, 230
Dhautakāya, a text, ii 135
dhutaṅgas, the thirteen austere practices, i 206-11, 236 f., ii 20
dhutavāda (a follower of the 13 ascetic practices), i 195, ii 16 f.
dhyāna, ii 64, 91, 151, 160, 205, see jhāna
navakammika (supervisor of erection work in a monastery), i 296, 322
navatattva (nine substances in Jaina doctrines), i 40
nāmarūpa (mind and matter), i 24, 249, 269, ii 120
nibbāna (=nirvāna), ii 102, 107, 138 f., 140
nimitta (characteristics of an object), i 68, 239, ii 66, 100
niyata (destined), ii 83 f., 173
niyatisaṅgatībhāva (doctrine of fatalism), i 36
niyāma (law, order), ii 82, 160
restraint
niruddha-samāpatti (meditation in which perception ceases), ii 64, 173
niruddha=nirodha, i 263, ii 229
nirvāna, i 62, 98, ii 106, 205
nissaggiya-pācittiya, a section of the Pātimokkha, ii 306, 311
nissaya (resources, requisites), i 281 f., 296, 300
nissāraṇa, an ecclesiastical punishment, i 392
nitārtha (deeper meaning), ii 78, 108, 148
nekkhamma (=naikramya, renunciation), ii 72
nevasaṅgānaṁsaṅgāyatana (the sphere in which perceptive faculty remains inactive, i.e. there is neither perception nor non-perception), i 72, 86, 96, ii 161, 198
neyārtha (superficial meaning), ii 108
naivaśaikṣa-naśaikṣaṁjña (knowledge which is neither that of a perfect nor that of a non-perfect), ii 149, 151
paccaya (cause or condition), ii 71-2, 73
pāññatti, see prajñapti
pāñña (=prajñā, knowledge), i 78,
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201-2, 218, 222 f., 234, ii 19, 98, 151
patikassana (restrictions to begin over and over again), i 304
patikkosana (reproving), i 302
patigha (repugnance, anger), i 72, ii 115, 157
paticcasamuppāda (theory of origin through cause and condition), i 25, 264-73, ii 62, 102, 161, 197
paticchanna (a concealed offence), i 303
patiṇṇa (formal confession of a wrong), i 308
patisambhidā (4), (analytical knowledge), attha, dhamma, nirutti and patibhāna, i 331, ii 228
Patisambhidāmagga (a text), ii 133
patisārāniyakamma (act of making one ask for pardon), i 301
patthā, a kind of measure, i 192
pabbajjā (ordination), ii 280
pabbājanīyakamma (temporary removal from the monastery), i 301
paradhhammakuṣala (knowledge of others' attainments), i 86, ii 149, 204
paramattha (=paramārtha, the real meaning, the highest, absolute) ii 78, 199, 185
paravīraṇā (acquisition of knowledge through others' help), ii 41, 85 f.
parikamma (preparation for meditation), i 239
parinibbāna (=parinirvāṇa), ii 105, 220, 244
paribbājaka (wanderer), i 31 f., ii 220
paribbājākārāma (hermitage of wanderers), i 26, 32, 128
paribbājikā (female wanderer), i 33
pariyutthāna (=paryavasthāna, appearance of the passion so long dormant), ii 91 n., 92 f., 96, 115, 159, 205
parivāsa (probationary period, an ecclesiastical punishment), i 300, 303
parivena (large monastery), i 322
pariṣā (assembly), ii 7, 210
palibodha (hindrance to meditation), i 216-7
pavāraṇā (a religious ceremony after the rains), i 293, 298, ii 281
pācittiya, a section of the Pātimokkha, i 306, 311
pacinakā (monks of the west), ii 27
pāṭidēsaniya, a section of the Pātimokkha, i 306, 312
pāṭihāriya (marvels), i 123
Pātimokkha (the monastic code), i 155, 305-312
pātimokkha-samvara-sīla, i 204
pāramitā (six or ten virtues ac-
quired by a Bodhisattva), ii 83, 300 f.
pārajīkā, a section of the Pātimokkha, i 305, 310, 333 f.
Pārāsāriya, a sect, i 33
Pārāyaṇa, a text, ii 229
pārisuddhi (declaration of purity in a Pātimokkha assembly), i 290 f., 340
pītyāna (path of sacrifices), i 30
pindīyālopabhojanam, i 288-9
puggala (=pudgala, soul) i 25, 83, 102; ii 92, 132, 166, 168, 176, 179 f., 182, 184, 189, 191 f.
puñña (=punya, merit), ii 88, 109, 150
puthujjana (=pūthagjana, one has not yet reached the sotāpatti stage), ii 81, 95, 115, 147, 157, 171, 195, 205
pudgala, see puggala
pudgala-nairātmya (absence of soul), i 84
pudgala-sūnya (non-existence of soul), i 48, 103
pubbenivāsa-nāṇa (knowledge of former births), i 49, 54, ii 181
puruṣākāra (human effort), ii 190
puruṣamedha, a sacrifice, i 9
purohita (priest), i 13
pūrīmukhabhēṣajam (cattle-urine used as medicine), i 288
Prakaraṇapāda, a text, ii 133
prakṛti (the original source of the material world), i 35, 50, 91
prakṛti-caryā (the primary practices of a Bodhisattva), ii 306
prajñāpāti (=paññattti, concept, nominal existence), ii 109, 174, 178, 181, 184, 187 f.
Prajñāvipāda, a text, ii 195
Prajñāpātisāstra, a text, ii 135
pratidhāna-caryā (the practices of a Bodhisattva), ii 307
pratīsāmkhyā-nirodha (emancipation through knowledge), ii 68, 102
pratyekebuddha, ii 80
prityāhāravyūha-samādhi (meditation in which the bliss of emancipation is enjoyed), i 99
phala (fruits of sanctification), i 90 f., 102 f., 107, 152, 160, 173, 191
phala-bhājaka (monk in charge of distribution of fruits), i 322
phassa (=sparśa, contact), i 271
bala (power), ii 74, 79 f.
Bāvharīja (=Bāvṛca), a Vedic śākhā, i 10, 12
bāhussuta (vastly learned), i 133, ii 17
Bāharpatya, i 66
biya (root, seed), ii 94, 168
Buddhayāna (=Mahāyāna), ii 116, 164
bodhicitta (the vow to attain the highest knowledge) ii 83, 305, 397
bodhiśāna, i 98
bodhipraṣṭhānacittta (the mental state of a Bodhisattva, who
has already commenced the practices), ii 307
bodhipakkhiya dhhamma (the thirty-seven practices recommended for the attainment of full knowledge), ii 8 n., 62, 198
bodhyyānga (=bojjhaṅga), the seven acquisitions which qualify a person to attain full knowledge), viz., smṛti, dhammapravicaya, virya, priti, prasrabdhī, samādhī, upāksa, ii 62, 159, 161
brahmacariyavāsa (pure religious life), ii 153, 171, 195
brahmacāri (those who live a holy life), i 12, 65, ii 82, 207, 219, 227
brahmadeyya (offer made to a Brahmin teacher), i 169
brahmāvaccasi (cf. brahmaavanaṇṇi, one having complexion like that of Mahābrahmā), i 28
brahmāvihāra, (four practices leading to concentration of mind which enables one to reach Brahma-loka, viz., mettā, karuṇā muditā andupekkhā), i 15, 228-230, ii 148, 153, 214, 228, 232, 285, 287, 290-292
brahmāloka (the sphere of Brahma gods), i 30
Brahma-sahavyata (union with Brahmā), i 10, 14
byāpāda (malevolence, angry thought), ii 235
bhakti (devotion), ii 287, see śraddhā
bhāṇḍāgārika (store-keeper in a monastery), i 287, 322
bhattacharjesaka (distributor of meals), i 322
bhava (desire for existence), i 272 f.
bhāvanā (meditation), i 228, ii 198
bhāvanāmārga (the moment or stage following the darsana-mārga q.v.), ii 152, 157, 198
bhūtakoti (the limit of existence), i 98
bhūmi (ten stages of sanctification), ii 62, 308-310
macchariya (miserliness), ii 286
makkha (hypocrisy), ii 286
magga (path, stages of sanctification), i 199, 263, ii 69, 99, 103, 107, 110, 160, 173, 198, 229
magga-bhāvanā (higher meditational practices), ii 66, 70, 153, 206
Majjhima-desa (middle country of the Buddhists), i 3
majjhima patipada (middle path), i 137, see arthāṅgika-magga mada (pride), ii 286
manāyatana (sphere or scope of mind), ii 100
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manokamma (mental actions), i 143
manodanda (control of mind), i 41, ii 18
manodhātu (mind), ii 198
manomaya (mental), i 72, 85, ii 20
manovijñāna (mental perception), ii 144
mahākarunāsamāpatti (meditation induced through great compassion), ii 148
mahājanapada (=province), i 4
Mahāthūpa, ii 114
mahāpuruśalakṣaṇa (physical signs of a great man), i 43, 180
mahābhūta (the great elements), i 37
mahābhūmika (broad divisions of mental states), ten, ii 141 n.
Mahāvibhāṣa (commentarial literature), ii 136
mahāśāla (rich), i 28, 220
mahiddhika (possessed of miraculous power), ii 17
Māgāndikā, a sect i 33
mattā (=mātikā, synopsis), ii 55
māna (pride), ii 238, 286
mānatta (suspension for an ecclesiastical offence), i 300
mārge anuyajñāna (gradual realisation of the truth), ii 153
māyā (deceit), ii 286
micchatta (=mithyātva, false), i 98 ii 82
micchādittī (=mithyādṛṣṭi wrong view, i.e. all non-Buddhistic views), i 48, ii 138
middha (sluggishness, drowsiness), ii 198
muttācāra (an ascetic practice, lit. free from conventions), i 18
muni (hermit), i 30
muditā (joy through appreciation), ii 287. See brahmavihāra
mudindriya (mṛdu + indriya, monk of weak faculty), ii 65
mūlāntika (original or the subtlest form of skandhas), ii 167
mūläya paṭikassana (renewal of probationary period), i 300, 303
mettā (=maitri, feeling of amity, love, affection, etc.), i 110, 228, ii 84, 147, 172, 204, 228, 287. See brahmavihāra
mokṣa (emancipation), i 140, ii 177
moha (delusion), i 23, 148, ii 95
288
yāgubhājaka (monk in charge of distribution of gruel), i 322
yati (ascetic), i 105
yebhuyyasikā (settlement of disputes by votes) i 308
yoga-śāstras (texts on meditation), i 196
yoniso manasikāra (concentrated attention) ii 71
rāga (desire, attachment), i 23, 148, ii 41, 66, 85 f., 95, 115 f., 157, 194, 235, 238
rūpa (matter, form), i 24, 74, 85 f., 249 f.; ii 67, 133, 138 f., 144, 180, 184 f., 198
rūpakāya (=nirmāṇa-kāya, apparitional body of Buddha), ii 74, 204
rūpa-dhātu (sphere of form, material sphere), ii 99 f.
rūpa-lōka, ii 65
rūpaskandha (material constituents of the body), ii 132
rūpendriya (material organs of sense), ii 99
lokadharma (the eight factors which govern a worldly man’s life, viz., labha, alābhā, yasa, ayasa, pāsamaṇa, nindā, sukha and dukkha), i 98
Lokaprajñapti-abhidharma sāstra, ii 137
Lokāyatika, i 66
lokiya (=laukika, worldly), ii 65, 70, 97, 107, 206
lokuttara (=lokottara, transcendental), i 96, ii 63, 70, 73 f., 81, 107, 206
lokottaradhyāna (meditation of the supramundane sphere), ii 116, 159
laukika-mārga, (practices of a common man for reaching the goal), ii 156 f.
laukika-samyagdṛṣṭi, (right view of a common man) ii 157
laukika-sraddhendriya (the faculty of faith of a common man), ii 157
laukikāgradharma (subtle worldly mental states), ii 132, 157-8
vacibheda (vocal activity), ii 97
vacisankhāra (=vacibheda), ii 98
vaccakutī (privacy), i 285
vassā (rainy retreats) spent by Buddha, i 164, 167, 169
vassāvāsa (rainy retreats of monks), i 110, 292-3, ii 208, 281
vājapeyya, a sacrifice, i 9
vānaprastha (renunciation), i 105
vāsanā (subtle mental state), ii 168
vikālabhojana (afternoon meal), i 139
vicāra (mental examination), i 74
vīcikicchā (doubt about the excellence of the triratna), ii 235 f.
vījnāpti (=vīññatti, intimation, communication), ii 68, 70 f., 132
vīññānānañcāyatana (infinitude of mind or consciousness), i 72
vijñānavāda (=yogācāra, the theory that the conscious principle is real), i 20, 60
vijñāna, see vijñāna
vijñānaśāthiti (classes of beings), i 42, 73
vitakka (reflection), i 74, 98, 116
viparyāsa (reverse views), i 198
vipassanā (introspection), i 86.
vipāka (fruit, maturity), i 88, 145, 190
vippavāsa (living alone in a monastery), i 303
vibhavatṛṣṇā (desire for annihilation), i 198
Vibhāṣā-śāstra (commentarial literature), i 26
vimutti (=vimukti, emancipation), i 17, 36, 78, 98, ii 80, 104, 116, 149, 164, 206
vimokkha (=vimokṣa, the eight stages of emancipation), i 196, ii 86
virāga (detachment), ii 67, 71, 116
vīrya (=vīrya, energy, exertion), i 36, 95, ii 96
vividādhikarana (ecclesiastical disputes), i 319
vihāra (monastery), i 152, 321
Vekhanassa, a sect, i 33
vedanā (feeling, sensitivity), i 85 f., 145, 251, 271, ii 137
vohāra (action, speech), ii 77-8
vyākaraṇiya (ways of exposition), i 124
vyāpāda (ill-will), ii 197
śakti (latent power, energy), ii 96
śabdaśāstra (grammar), ii 26
Śāriputrabhidharma, a text, i 137
śāsvata (eternal), i 199 f., ii 178
śrīṣā (training in the fundamental principles), ii 19
śūnyatā (non-existence of phenomenal objects), i 48, 60, 132
ii 152 f., 200, 232, 288
śraddhā (faith), i 30, 98, 139, ii 132, 218, 222, 234, 285-7
śraddhendriya (faculty of faith), ii 96, 115, 197
śrāmanyaphala, see sāmaññaphala
śrāvaka (a disciple, a Hinayānist), ii 26, 84
Śrāvakayāna (=Hinayāna), ii 116, 164
śaṅkapparāga (desireful intention), ii 67
śaṅkaramaka (transmigrator), i 102
śaṅkhata (=saṃskṛta, constituted), i 249 f., ii 103, 162, 178, 192
śaṅkhāra (=saṃskāra, impressions, aggregate of the conditions or essential properties for a given process or result), i 58, 85 f., 257 f., 268 f., ii 72, 94, 166, 231
Śaṅgītiparīyāya, a text, ii 135
Śaṅgītisuttanta, i 184, ii 136
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sammâ (perception, awareness), i 65 f., 85 f., 218, 257, i 183
samǧanuvr̥tti (continuity of characteristics), i 57
samvara (restraint), ii 68
samvr̥ti (conventional), ii 78, 109, 184 f., 189
samsâra (transmigration), 58
saṃyojana (=saññojana, fetter), ii 88 f., 92, 143, 152, 157, 215
samskrtâ, see saṃkhâta
saṅghahavatthu (four means of gaining popularity, viz., dâna, peyyavâca, atthacariyâ, samâ-nattattâ), ii 216
saṅghatthera (head of a congregation of monks, the senior-most monk of a particular parish), i 316 f., ii 24, 244 f., 252
saṅghaparinâyaka, see saṅghatthera
saṅghapitara, see saṅghatthera
saṅghabhâtta (food offered to a congregation of monks), i 321
saṅghabhâda (dissension in the monastic organisation), i 292, 332, ii 5, 9
saṅgharâji (a dissension but not recognised as saṅghabhâda), ii 10
saṅghâdisesa (=saṅghâvaicca, an ecclesiastical offence), i 303, 305, 310, 333 f.
saṅghârâma (residence of monks), i 313 f.
sakadâgâmi (the third stage of sanctification), ii 91, 234
sakavâda (=Theravâda or Vihârayavâda), ii 199, 201
sakkâyadâthi (=saṅkâyadâthi, belief in the existence of a self), i 48, 84, ii 177 f., 234 f.
sagga (=svarga, heaven), i 17, ii 232 f.
saggakathâ (talk re. heavenly life), i 126; ii 229
sañña, see saṃjñâ
saññâvedayitanirdha (meditation in which perception and sensitivity cease), i 160, 205, 231
sati (=smṛti, memory, awareness), i 74, 95
satipaṭṭhāna (smṛtyupasthâna, a meditational practice for keeping the mind alert), i 186, 195, ii 76, 116, 132, 153, 158 f., 160, 214, 228, 285
sativinaya (an ecclesiastical way of settling dispute), i 308
sattakkhattuparama (one who will not be reborn more than seven times), ii 173
saddhâ, see śraddhâ
saddhindriya (faculty of faith), ii 97
santhâgâra (meeting place), i 175
sabhâga (those who lead the same mode of life), ii 15
samaṇa (=śramaṇa, novice), i 187
samataññâna (knowledge of sameness or equality), ii 148
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samathābhinvivesa (inclination to quietude), i 86
samayavimutta (finally emancipated), ii 65
samādhi (meditation), i 23, 78, 95, ii 99, 205
samāpatti (higher meditational attainments), i 95, 230-2; ii 64 f., 159
samāhita (concentrated), ii 97, 159
samudaya (origin), i 263, ii 229
samodhāna (a combined, inclusive probation), i 303
sammattā (=samyakatva, right), ii 82
sammādātthi (right view), ii 93, 138
sammappadhāna (right exertion), ii 76
sammukhavinaya (a method of settling ecclesiastical dispute), i 308
sammuti, see samvrti
sammutisacca (conventional truth), ii 185
sambhogakāya (fulgent or celestial body of Buddha), ii 76
samyakatvaniyata (destined to proceed along the right path) i 98, 101
samyakatvayāma (leading to the right goal), ii 82, 92, 115, 147, 152 f., 172, 194
samyāprāsa, a sacrifice, i 9
sambodhi (full enlightenment), ii 91, 235
sambujaśhana, see bodhyāga sarāga (with attachment), ii 67, 71
sarvam asti (all exist), ii 196
sarvajñatā (omniscience), i 98, 100
sarvākāraṇajñatā (full knowledge in detail), ii 80
salākā (stick for voting or distribution of food), i 289, 317, 319, 322
salayatana (spheres of the six organs of sense), i 270 f., ii 100
savitakka (with reflection), ii 232
savicāra (with mental examination), ii 232
sasatavāda, i 45 f., ii 186, 188
sātheyya (double-dealing), ii 286
sādhanā (practice of religious duties), ii 18, 83 f.
sābhoga (associated with mental enjoyment), ii 66
sāmaṇṇaphala (fruits of the life of a recluse), ii 65, 154, 156
sārambha (haughtiness), ii 286
sārammama (with basis), ii 95
sāsrava (impure), i 77, ii 74
sikkhāpada (precept), i 295, 330, 335, 339, ii 223
sirigilonakappa, (one of the ten rules discussed in the 2nd Council), ii 35 f.
simā (limit of a parish), i 290
sila (precept), i 19, 78, 199 f.,
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204 f., ii 70, 99, 209, 218, 222 f., 234, 264
silacittapañña (= the eightfold path), i 199, ii 285
silabbata (= śilavrata, rituals), i 106, 272
sihanādikā (monks described as lion-roarers), i 117, 190
suññatā, see śūnyatā.
suddhantaparivāsa (a probation for complete purification), i 303
suta (= sruta, learning), ii 223
sekha (one who is still learning, i.e. not yet an arhat), i 169, ii 238
sekhiya, a section of the Pātimokkha, i 306, 312
senāsanagāhāpaka (receiver of bed and seat), i 322
senāsanapaññāpaka (regulator of bed and seat), i 286, 322

sotāpatti (= srota-āpatti, the first stage of sanctification), ii 97, 99, 153, 193, 206, 224, 234
skandha, see khandha
skandha-santāna (continuity of the subtle constituents of a being), i 22, ii 166, 178, 181
stūpa (relic-mound), ii 164, 209, 244 f.

steyasamvāsaka (one who lives clandestinely with the monks), ii 105
smṛti, see sati.

smṛtyupasthāna, see satipatthāna
srota-āpanna, see sotāpatti
hadāyavatthu (heart as the seat of feeling), ii 198

hammiya (a large building), i 284
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