

Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa: Their Contemporaneity and Age

I have read with profit Rev. A. P. Buddhadatta's article—*The Great Author of Summaries—Contemporary of Buddhaghosa*—contributed to *The University of Ceylon Review* (Vol. III, No. I). His introductions to *Buddhadatta's Manuals* have been fruitful in that some of the Indian scholars have sought to clarify the historical and geographical references in the *Nigamanas* to three of the manuals and the *Madhuratthavilāsini*, the latter being a commentary on the *Buddhavamsa*. Now, in the above article he has reconsidered some of the points.

The first point is that he is inclined to accept *Kalabbhakulanandana* (also, *-vaḍḍhana*) as the more correct of the two variants in the MSS., the other being *Kalambakulanandana*. The second name, *Kalamba*, of the royal family, if accepted, must have to be equated with *Kadamba*. The fact, however, is that both the Kalabhras (Pali *Kalabbha*) and the Kadambas had founded kingdoms in South India. The Kadambas being connected rather with Kanārā and Western Mysore,¹ the Kalabhras would seem to have a greater claim on our attention as a ruling people whom the Pallava king Simhaviṣṇu defeated during his reign (A.D. 575-600). But the question remains open until the identification of the contemporary king Accuta Accuta-vikkanta (Acyutavikrānta) or Accuta-vikkama (Acyutavikrama), on the fixing of the date of whose reign depends greatly the date of Buddhadatta, the Pali manual-writer and commentator who was a native of Uragapura (Uraiyūr near Trichinopoly) on the Kāverī and a citizen of the Coḷa country, especially when the Kadambas maintain the tradition of the Acyutarāyas up till a late period² and the Kalabhras are still wanting in it.

The second point is that he draws our attention to Miss C. Minakshi's identification of Buddhadatta's Bhūtamangala with the present village of Pallivritta Bhūtamangalam on the Vennār, a branch of the Cauvery, in the Mannarguḍi Taluq centrally situated in the district of Tanjore (*Current Science*, No. 8, Vol. VI). This identification is to be preferred to Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar's Budalur in the Tanjore District.

1. By the way, the Kadamba capital Vanavāsī, also known as Jayanti or Vaijayanti, is not mentioned in the edicts of Asoka. If Vincent Smith has written so in his *Oxford History of India*, p. 198, it is simply due to a slip of his pen.

2. There being an ancient land-route connecting the Lower Kāverī region with Karṇāṭa, probably along the banks of the Kāverī, as proved by the joint testimony of the *Great Epic*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and Hwen Thsang's *Si-yu-Ki*, it is not impossible that the Kadambas founded a territory in Coḷa even before the Kalabhras.

Without meaning to challenge Minakshi's suggestion, I would like to state where exactly my difficulty is. Minakshi herself came to know of two villages of the same name, Bhūtamangalam, at close proximity in the Mannarguḍi Taluq. It is quite possible that even in Buddhadatta's time there were localities more than one known by the name of Bhūtamangala and that to distinguish his Bhūtamangala from the rest he characterised it as Mangala-Bhūtamangala. It is evident, moreover, from his descriptions that Mangala-Bhūtamangala was just another name of Kāveriṭpaṭṭana, or, at any rate, that of a *dvāragāma* or suburb of the same. The point may be made clear thus :

- (1) In the *Nigamana* to his *Vinaya-Vinicchaya*, Buddhadatta locates the great monastery erected by Viṣṇudāsa or Kṛṣṇadāsa in Mangala-Bhūtamangala described as 'prosperous and richly endowed in all respects' (*iddhe sabbanga-sampanne*)—a description applied in Pali to a prosperous city or town. The same is placed in a central part of the Coḷa territory which looked like 'an epitome of the whole world' (*sabbassa paṇa lokassa gāme sampiṇḍite viya*). It was washed by the waters of the Kāveri.
- (2) In the *Nigamana* to the *Buddhavaṃsa-commentary*, he substitutes the name of Kāveriṭpaṭṭana for Mangala-Bhūtamangala, and the same is the case with the epilogue to his *Abhidhammāvatāra*.
- (3) We are yet to enquire if Mannar in the name of the Mannarguḍi Taluq is not the modern equivalent of Buddhadatta's Mangala.

The third point is the contemporaneity of Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa sought to be established on a common reference to Thera Sanghapāla at whose instance one wrote the *Uttaravinicchaya* and the other, the *Visuddhimagga*.

Rev. Buddhadatta has made out a very good case. The similarity in the two descriptions of Sanghapāla is very close and striking indeed. The Thera Buddhadatta, as he himself tells us, wrote all his works while he was residing at Viṣṇudāsa's monastery in Kāveriṭpaṭṭana *alias* Mangala-Bhūtamangala. The request must have come from Sanghapāla to write the *Uttara-vinicchaya* when obviously the latter was staying with him in the same monastery, while Buddhaghosa in the epilogue to his *Visuddhimagga* refers to the Bhadanta Sanghapāla when the latter was the head of the Mahāvihāra of Ceylon. Buddhaghosa wrote his *Visuddhimagga* and all other works but the *Ñāṇodaya* in Ceylon. Buddhadatta lived in Kāveriṭpaṭṭana in the centre of Coḷa, evidently the southern Coḷa territory.³ Buddhadatta, who, too, was a celebrity of the Mahāvihāra, must have gone to Ceylon before he began to write his works in South India. The tradition in the *Buddhaghosuppatti* expressly says that the two great men met each other when one was returning from

3. It is difficult to say with Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar (*Aśoka*, Revised ed., p. 38) that "in *Aśoka's* time there were more than one Coḷa and one Pāṇḍya king."

and the other (*i.e.*, Buddhaghosa) was going across to Ceylon. The *Saddhamma-sangaha* tells us that Buddhaghosa arrived at Nāgapaṭṭana (Negāpaṭam at the mouth of one of the middle distributaries of the Kāveri) wherefrom he must have gone over to Ceylon. If so, they had not met each other either earlier in Ceylon or later on in South India, although Buddhaghosa before leaving the Indian shore, resided at Kāñcīpura (Conjeevaram on the lower course of the Lower Pennār below the Madras City) and other places⁴ including the Mayūrasuttapaṭṭana or Mayūrarūpapaṭṭana⁵ which may probably be identified with Mayaveram⁶ at the mouth of one of the upper distributaries of the Kāveri.⁷ If on the sameness of the 'supplicant,' namely, Thera Sanghapāla, we base the contemporaneity of the two Pali commentators, it follows that they wrote their works independently, almost at the same time, one in South India and the other in Ceylon, and there is no reason, therefore, that one should have mentioned the other. There is, nevertheless, a slight difference in the references made to Sanghapāla by the two writers. Buddhadatta's reference is evidently to a revered fellow elder by whom he was "courteously and lovingly requested" (*sakkacca sādaram yācito*). In the case of Buddhasiha, his own pupil, he simply uses the expression "respectfully requested by" (*sakkacca . . . āyācito*). Buddhaghosa's reference is to a most venerable teacher, Bhadanta-Sanghapāla, while in referring to the junior Buddhaghosa he applies the simple epithet of *Bhikkhu* or *Yati*.⁸ These facts go indeed to make Buddhadatta an elder contemporary of Buddhaghosa,—a view expressed by Rev. Buddhadatta in 1915⁹ in disregard of the tradition in the *Gandhavaṃsa* which places Buddhadatta next to Buddhaghosa in age.¹⁰

The matter assumes somewhat a different aspect once we presume that the author of the *Samanta-pāsādikā* is not the great or pioneer Buddhaghosa, the author of the *Visuddhimagga*. The Chinese translation of the *Samanta-pāsādikā* presupposes a Pali text extant before 489 A.D. The text, as we now have it, contains references not only to the *Visuddhimagga* but to the *Nikāya-*

4. *Nigamana* to *Manorathapūraṇi*: *āyācito sumatinā therena Bhadanta-Jotipālena Kañcīpuraḍisū mayā pubbe saddhim vasantena.*

5. *Nigamana* to *Papañca-sūdanī*: *āyācito sumatinā therena Bhadanta-Buddhamittena pubbe Mayūrasuttapaṭṭane saddhim vasantena.*

6. Apparently *Mayūra* was a Prakrit form of Mayapura (Sk. Mayapura or Māyāpura), cf. Palūra in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions = Palapura = Dantapura.

7. This is to modify my previous views in *Ceylon Lectures* p. 90.

8. *Ceylon Lectures*, p. 90.

9. *Buddhadatta's Manuals* (1915), p. xiii f.

10. J.P.T.S. 1886, p. 59; B.C.Law. *The Life and Work of Buddhaghosa*, p. 98. It should be noted that Buddhadatta who is described in the *Buddhaghosuppatti* as the author of the *Jinālankāra*, the *Dantadhātuvāṃsa* (*i.e.*, *Dāthāvāṃsa*) and *Bodhivāṃsa* (*i.e.*, *Mahābodhivāṃsa*) has nothing in common with Buddhadatta, the author of the *Vinaya-vinicchaya* and the rest.

commentaries as well, including even the *Paramatthajotikā*. Takakusu and Nagai point out that the concluding eleven verses of the Pali prologue, from the sixth to the 16th, are missed in the Chinese translation which contains in their place six verses that are altogether of a different purport. The important matters that are missed comprise (1) the eulogy of the teachers and tradition of the Mahāvihāra, (2) the purpose of presenting the Sinhalese commentaries in a Pali garb, (3) the behest of Thera Buddhāsiri behind the undertaking, and (4) the name of the three earlier Sinhalese commentaries.

If the main contents of the extant Pali text and those of the Chinese translation are the same, and the earlier Sinhalese commentaries are quoted and discussed alike in the body of both, the absence of the verses concerned from the Chinese translation is immaterial. The absence of the verses praising the Mahāvihāra tradition and Vinaya teachers is easily explicable if the fact be that the copy of the Pali original taken to China was procured from the rival school of Abhayagiri. I have strong reasons to believe that the commentary in its original form and Mahāvihāra recension was written during the reign of Kittī-Siri-Meghavanna (A.D. 334-62).¹¹ So far the only means of determining the earlier form is the full knowledge of the text before the Chinese translator. Pending that, I may draw here the attention of the scholar to an interesting point.

Buddhaghosa in the epilogue to his *Papañcasūdanī*, says that he began to write the work in compliance with a request made to him by the Most Venerable Buddhāmitta when they were previously staying together at the Mayūrasuttapaṭṭana. The author of the *Jātakatthakathā*,—probably Culla-Buddhaghosa, says in the prologue to the work that Buddhāmitta was one of the three Theras at whose instance he undertook the work. The author of the *Samantapāsādikā*, on the other hand, states in the epilogue to his work that he had read the *Vinaya Commentaries* with the Most Venerable Buddhāmitta. If Buddhāmitta be a common personal factor like Sanghapāla in the cause of Buddhādatta and Buddhaghosa, the problem of the personal identity and distinctness of the great Buddhaghosa and the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* is apt to become more complicated. But there is no certainty as yet as to the identity of Buddhāmitta of the Mayūrasuttapaṭṭana and that of the Mahāvihāra.

One thing is certain, that both the *Samantapāsādikā* and some of the commentaries of the pioneer Buddhaghosa clearly presuppose the *Dīpavaṃsa* quoted in places by name, and nowhere the *Mahāvāṃsa*. And yet the prose legend of Asoka as narrated in the *Samantapāsādikā* agrees entirely with a

tradition similar to that in the *Mahāvāṃsa*,¹² and it differs here and there from that in the *Dīpavaṃsa*. Two glaring instances of disparity are cited below :

- (i) As to the mission to Suvannabhūmi, the verse quoted from the *Dīpavaṃsa* in the *Samantapāsādikā* speaks of the place as a country dominated by the Pisācas (in plural number) and does not connect it with the sea, while the prose account connects it with the sea and describes it as a country in the grip of a terrible Rakkhasī, precisely as in the *Mahāvāṃsa* story :

*Saddhim Uttarattherena Soṇatthero mahiddhiko
Suvannabhūmim āgamma tasmim tu samaye pana
jāte jāte rājagehe dārake ruddarakkhasī
samuddato nikkhamitvā bhakkhayitvāna gacchati.*
(Mv. xii 44-45).

“tena ca samayena tatha ekā rakkhasī samuddato
nikkhamitvā rājakule jāte jāte dārake khādati.”¹³
(Sp., i., p.).

The verse quoted from the *Dīpavaṃsa* reads :

*Suvannabhūmim gantvāna Soṇuttarā mahiddhikā¹⁴
Pisāce niddhamitvāna Brahmajālaṃ adesayum.*

- (ii) The prose account in the *Samantapāsādikā* agrees with that in the *Mahāvāṃsa* and differs from the *Dīpavaṃsa* tradition in so far as it represents Nigrodha as a posthumous son of Asoka's elder step-brother Sumana and does not speak of Asoka's two coronations.¹⁵ Buddhaghosa in his *Sumangala-vilāsinī*, (ii, p. 613), records a prophecy according to which prince Piyadāsa (Priyadarśana) was to have assumed the title of Asoka at the time of his coronation¹⁶—the first coronation according to the *Dīpavaṃsa*.

Similarly the *Nidānakathā* of the *Kathāvatthu Commentary* cites the account of the rise of the eighteen Buddhist sects from the *Dīpavaṃsa* which makes no mention of the six later sects that arose in India, while the prose account mentions them¹⁷ on the strength of a tradition similar to that in the *Mahāvāṃsa*.

12. The fact may be explained, no doubt, if we agree with Geiger in thinking that there was an earlier *Aṭṭhakathā Mahāvāṃsa*.

13. Dr. Bapat kindly informs me that this statement occurs also in the Chinese translation.

14. *Samantapāsādikā*, i.e., p. 69. The Siamese ed. reads: *niddhamitvāna* and *adesisum*. *Dīpavaṃsa*. viii. 11. Oldenberg's ed. reads the second line as—*Niddhametvā Pisācagane mocesi bandhanā bahum*.

15. *Dīpavaṃsa*, vi. 22, 24. Barua, *Asoka and His Inscriptions*, Part I, p. 16. ff.

16. *Piyadāso nāma kumāro chattam ussāpetvā Asoko nāma Dhammarājā hutvā*.

17. *Aparāpavam pana Hemavatikā Rājagirikā Siddhatthikā Pubbaseliyā Aparaseliyā Vājiriyā ti aññe cha ācariyavādā uppannā* cf. *Mahāvāṃsa*, V. 12-13.

I would not say with Rev. Buddhadatta that the Ācariya Buddhadatta was 'a great poet,' there being nothing of poetry in his composition. He was obviously a successful versifier, and at the most, a maker of the *Vinaya* and *Abhidhamma* manuals in elegant and easy prose and verse.

The existence of Buddhadatta's commentary on the *Buddhavamsa* may be presumed as the reason why Dhammapāla left the *Buddhavamsa* out of his account when he wrote his commentaries on the two companion works, the *Cariyāpīṭaka* and *Apadāna*. Having not the *Apadāna Commentary* before me, I am not in a position to say what Dhammapāla has done there, but on looking through his *Cariyāpīṭaka Commentary* I find that, strangely enough, he has wholly ignored Buddhadatta's Madhuratthavilāsini.¹⁸

Dhammakitti's *Mahāvamsa Supplement* refers the Ceylon career of the great Buddhaghosa to the reign of Mahānāma (A.D. 409-431). This Buddhaghosa mentions the name of no contemporary ruler, either of India or of Ceylon. The author of the *Samantapāsādikā*,¹⁹ on the other hand, definitely says in the epilogue that he began to write the work in the 20th and completed it just at the commencement of the 21st year of the reign of a king of Ceylon deserving the epithets of *Siri-kudda*, *Siri-pāla* and *Siri-nivāsa*. The author of the *Dhammapada Commentary* belonging to the serial commentary called *Paramatthajotikā*, probably Culla-Buddhaghosa, a younger contemporary of the author of the *Visuddhimagga* and *Abhidhamma Commentaries*, associates similarly his literary activity with the reign of a king of Ceylon deserving the epithet of *Siri-kūta*. Buddhadatta on the Indian side connects his literary career with the reign of the Accuta king Accuta-Vikkanta of the Kalabha or Kalamba family and his residence with the monastery erected at Kāverīpaṭṭana by Viṣṇudāsa or Kṛṣṇadāsa, evidently a Vaiṣṇava name. It may be noted here that the *Skanda Purāṇa* preserves the tradition of an unnamed ancient and powerful king of Coḷa who had the seat of his government at Kāñcīpura and during whose reign Viṣṇudāsa, a pious Vaiṣṇava saint, flourished and succeeded with much difficulty in persuading the contemporary Coḷa king to give up the performance of the pompous and cruel Brahmanical sacrifices. From Buddhaghosa's expression, *Kāñcīpurādāsu*, it is clear that Kāñcīpura was the chief town of Coḷa in his time. All the same, neither the great Buddhaghosa nor the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* can be placed later than the reign of Mahāsena, if it cannot be shown that the text of the *Dīpavamsa* present before them was then closed once for all. This remark applies with greater force to the author of the *Visuddhimagga*, particularly in the absence of references to a contemporary king. The earlier Pali Chronicle of Ceylon may be easily supposed to

have been completed previous to the reign of Dhātusena (A.D. 460-78) who caused it to be widely known to the people.²⁰

The kings of India and Ceylon who find incidental mention in Buddhaghosa's works belong all to a period earlier than the fourth century A.D. Other cogent reasons to consider in this connection are as follows :

- (i) That the tradition claiming him to be the first Indian Buddhist scholar who showed the way of presenting the Sinhalese commentaries in a Pali garb is amply corroborated by the fact that the *Vinaya* and *Nikāya Aṭṭhakathās* mentioned in his *Visuddhimagga* are all earlier Sinhalese commentaries. If Buddhadatta on the Indian side wrote his works independently, he, too, must have based them on such authorities.
- (ii) That his *Kathāvatthu Commentary* goes to show that not only the earlier eighteen but such later Indian Buddhist sects and schools of thought as the Andhaka (Andhra), Pubbaseliya (Pūrvaśāila), Aparaseliya (Aparaśāila), Rājagiriya, Siddhatthika, Uttarāpathaka, Hemavatika (Haimavata) and Vetullaka were all existing in his time,—the sects and schools of thought that do not find mention in any hitherto known Indian inscriptions that are later than those of the Kuṣāṇa, Sātavāhana and Ikṣvāku rulers which are all pre-Gupta. The statements—"just as now (*seyyathā pi etarahi*) the Sammitiyas and others", "just as now the Andhakas and the like" are significant as to contemporaneity. With regard to the Andhakas, he is careful to record that they consisted of the four later Indian sects called Pubbaseliya, Aparaseliya, Rājagiriya and Siddhatthika.²¹ Buddhaghosa characterises the doctrine of the Vetullakas as *mahāsuññatāvāda* or the Mahāyāna Doctrine of the Great Void. In all probability the reference is to the Doctrine of the Void as developed in the *Prajñāpāramitā* and such other *Vaipulya Śāstras*. He was aware of the difference and distinction between the two kinds of *nirodha*, *paṭisaṅkhā* and *appaṭisaṅkhā*, discussed by Vasubandhu in his *Abhidharmakośa* and other later writers.²²
- (iii) That if the great Buddhaghosa had flourished after king Kittī-Siri-Meghavanna's time, it is unexpected that he should not have to say anything about the Tooth-relic in Ceylon, and that at least in connection with the name of Dantapura, the ancient capital of Kalinga.

18. cf. *Cariyāpīṭakathā*, pp. 1, 15, 16.

19. Here the *Nigamana* to the *Kankhāvitaraṇī*, too, is taken into consideration.

20. *Culavamsa*, XXXVIII 58; Malalasekera, *A Dict. of Pali Proper Names*, i, p. 1088.

21. *K.A.*, I, 9; B.C.Law., *The Debates Commentary*, pp. vi, 62.

22. *Ibid.*, ii, 9; *Ceylon Lectures*, p. 199.

(iv) That assigning the great Buddhaghosa to a pre-Gupta age, it becomes easy to connect the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* with the reign of Kitti-Siri-Meghavanna who was a contemporary of Samudragupta.

The pioneer Buddhaghosa and the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* have discussed in different contexts the scriptural and doctrinal position of certain texts associated with the early Vaitulyaka or Mahāyāna tradition of Ceylon. In the *Samantapāsādikā* (iv. p. 742), these are presented in two different lists. The texts of the second list alone find mention in Buddhaghosa's *Sāratthappakāsinī* (ii, pp. 201-2), while the first text of the first group is considered in the *Atthasālinī* (pp. 91-2).²³ Some of the typical texts of the second or common list are considered in another connexion in the *Samantapāsādikā*.²⁴ Everywhere the common finding against them is that they were unauthentic and unauthoritative for the reason that they had not passed through the first three Buddhist Councils (*tisso sangātiyo anārahama*). In discarding the texts of the common list as *a-Buddhavacana*, Buddhaghosa adduces this additional reason, that their subject-matters fall outside the scope of the five recognized topics of Buddhism, *viz.*, *dhātu* (elements), *ārammaṇa* (objects), *asubha* (loathsomeness), *nāṇavatthu* (foundations of knowledge) and *Vijjākadambaka* or *Vijjākaraṇḍaka* (body of acquisitions).²⁵ The author of the *Vinaya Commentary*, on the other hand, opines that there might be no objection to composing poems and verses (to present and popularise the doctrines) in various languages if they were based on the idea of the unworldly way (*vivattūpanissite*). There was objection, nevertheless, to accepting the texts of the first list as authoritative, while those of the common list were definitely not the Words of the Buddha (*a-Buddhavacāni*).²⁶

The first list in the *Vinaya Commentary* consists of the five *Suttas* called *Kuḷumba* (*Kuḷumba*), *Rājovāda* (*Rājāvavāda*), *Tikkhindriya* (*Tikṣṇendriya*), *Caturparivatta* (*Caturparivarta*), and *Nandopananda*.

Professor Malalasekera rightly refers us to the *Atthasālinī* (p. 91) where the *vidaddhavadin* (sophistic opponent, *i.e.*, *Vetullavādin*) is said to have cited the authority of the unauthentic *Kuḷumbasutta* in support of his opinion that an unwholesome physical reaction may follow from a purely mental act at the 'mind-door.' Evidently the reference is to a Mahāyāna text which is not traced as yet.

For the second text Professor Malalasekera refers us to the introductory episode of the *Sumanāgala Jātaka* where we have mention of the Buddha's

23. The references are given by G.P. Malalasekera in his *Dict. of Pali Proper Names*.

24. *Sp.*, i, p. 232.

25. *S.A.*, ii, p. 201.

26. *Sp.* iv, p. 742.

Discourse, *Rājovādasutta*, addressed to the Kosala king Pasenadi.²⁷ The suggestion is welcome in so far as it concerns the *Rājāvavādasūtra* in Nanjio's *Catalogue* No. 988, which, though a work of Hinayāna, bears in Tibetan the full Sanskrit title of *Āryarājāvavādaka-nāma-Mahāyāna-Sūtra*. But Nanjio's *Catalogue*, Nos. 248-50, presupposes a Mahāyāna Sūtra, translated into Chinese in A.D. 420-79, 649 and 705. Śāntideva in his *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, cites passages from different *Rājāvavādasūtras*, one bearing the stamp of Mahāyāna²⁸ and the other that of Hinayāna.²⁹ The text in the *Samantapāsādikā* first list must be identified with the Mahāyāna Sūtra.

The fourth *Sutta* called *Caturparivatta* can in all probability be identified with the *Caturdharmika Sūtra* of Mahāyāna quoted by name in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*³⁰ or the *Caturvargaśikṣādharma* in Nanjio's No. 1417, translated in A.D. 435-43. The third and fifth *Suttas* as Mahāyāna works are not as yet traced.

The common list consists of such alien texts as the *Vanna-pitaka*, *Angulimāla-pitaka*, *Ratthapālagajjita*, *Ālavakagajjita*, *Gūḷha* or *Guyha Vinaya*, *Gūḷha-Vessantara*, *Vedalla*, *Vedaḷha* or *Vetulla Pitaka*. The *Sāratthappakāsinī* (Siamese ed.) includes also the name of the *Gūḷhamagga* and *Gūḷha-Mahosadha*. These texts are mentioned in two slightly different orders in the two works. In another context the *Vinaya Commentary* names only the *Gūḷha-Vinaya*, *Gūḷha-Vessantara* and *Vedalla* as three typical texts to be treated as extraneous (*bāhirakasuttaṃ*) and discarded as unworthy of study (*gārayhasuttaṃ*).³¹ Here four works are of the *Gūḷha* (Secret) or *Guhya* (Esoteric) class, and the rest belong to the *Paritta* or *Dhāraṇī* type. The works bearing the title of *Pitaka* cannot but remind us of the *Dhāraṇī* or *Vidyādhara Pitaka* and the *Bodhisattvapitaka* quoted by name in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* of Śāntideva and probably also in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* of Nāgārjuna who was a predecessor of Śāntideva.

In connection with the *Gūḷha* or *Guhya* texts belonging to the *Guhya* cult of Mahāyāna, mention may be made of the *Guhyagarbharāja*, *Śrī-Guhya-samāja-tantrarāja*, *Guhya-paramarahasya* and *Guhyasamayagarbharāja* in Nanjio's Nos. 1026-29. The *Tathāgataguhya Sūtra* is quoted by name in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.

The *Vaidulyarāja Sūtra* in Nanjio's No. 671, translated in A. D. 265-326, seems to answer well to the *Vedulla* or *Vetulla Pitaka*.

27. *Jātaka*, iii, p. 439; Malalasekera, *Dictionary*, ii, p. 729.

28. Ch: i; Bendall and Rouse's Transl., p. 10.

29. *Ibid.*, Transl., p. 142.

30. Ch. vii; Bendall and Rouse's Transl., p. 158.

31. *Sp.*, i, p.

The *Ratthapālagajjita* is no other than the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā* in Nanjio's No. 23 (18), translated in A.D. 589-618 and quoted by name in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.³² Here *Rāṣṭrapāla* is the name of a *Yakṣa*.

The *Ālavakagajjita*, too, belongs to the Mahāyāna *Parīṣcchā* class, and it may be compared with the *Ugrapariṣcchā* and *Pūrṇapariṣcchā* in Nanjio's Nos. 23 (19) and 23 (17), translated in A.D. 220-65 and A.D. 384-417, here *Ālavaka*, *Ugra* and *Pūrṇa* being all *Yakṣas*.

The *Āṅgulimālapitaka* corresponds with the Mahāyāna *Āṅgulimāliya Sūtra* in Nanjio's Nos. 621 and 434, translated in A.D. 265-316 and A.D. 420-39 and quoted by name in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.³³ The Pali counterpart seems to be the *Āṅgulimālaparitta* (*Milinda*, p. 151).

The *Vaṇṇapitaka* may be provisionally identified with the *Kanakavarṇapūrvayoga* in Nanjio's No. 390, translated in A.D. 534-54.

The *Mahāvīyutpatti* list includes the name of *Rājāvavādakam* (wrongly *Rājupavādakam*), *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā*, *Sarvavaidalyasaṅgraha* and *Āṅgulimāliyam*.³⁴

The Pali *Parittas* which are claimed to be *Buddhabhāsitas* in the *Milinda* (p. 150ff.) were literary developments similar to the *Dhāraṇīs*, and deserve as such to be relegated to the *Vidyādharapitaka* quoted by name in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*³⁵ or to the *Dhāraṇīsaṅgraha Sūtra* in Nanjio's No. 795. The Theravāda of Ceylon itself came subsequently to have a *Parittasaṅgaha* of its own.

The *Mahāvamsa* is very definite in stating that the Vetullavāda or Mahāyāna form of Buddhism got a footing at Abhayagiri even before the reign of Vohāratissa and that the Vaitulyakas became a menace to the Theravāda to the great annoyance of the partisans of the Mahāvihāra.

It was at the instance of the Mahāvihāra monks that sixty Vaitulyakas were banished from the island by king Goṭhābhaya *alias* Meghavaṇṇa, father and predecessor of Jeṭṭhatissa and Mahāsena. In consequence thereof the Vetullavāda became aggressive and vindictive, and it worked to play havoc to the Mahāvihāra through the influence of the Colian monk Saṅghamitta with king Mahāsena during the greater part of the latter's reign. This powerful man of wicked design and terrible action was an adept in exorcism and the like (*bhūlavijjādi-kovido*). He is said to have come across during the latter part of Goṭhābhaya's reign as the avenger of the cause of the Vaitulyakas.

32. Bendall and Rouse's Transl., pp. 55, 152, 190, 197, 285.

33. Ch. vi; Bendall and Rouse's Transl., p. 131.

34. *Sanskrit-Tibetan-English Vocabulary*, in *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* Vol. III, Pt. I, p. 81 ff.

35. Ch. vi; Bendall and Rouse's English Transl., p. 140.

It is said that he audaciously entered the place when there was at the Thūpārāma a conference of the monks, evidently from the Mahāvihāra and won the favour of king Goṭhābhaya-Meghavaṇṇa by defeating in argument the Thera Goṭhābhaya of Saṅghapāla's Pariveṇa who happened to be the king's namesake and maternal uncle.³⁶

The *Mahāvamsa* account is historically most significant. It goes to show that the conference of the Mahāvihāra monks was called by the king himself and that he was present there when it met at Thūpārāma to try certain doctrinal issues with Saṅghamitta, the Mahayanist monk and Colian vindicator of the Vetullavāda who came in as a powerful disputant.³⁷ Some of the important issues of the controversy which then took place are the very points on which we have findings from the pioneer Buddhaghosa and the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*. Referring as if to an issue raised there, Buddhaghosa in his *Atthasālinī* (p. 91), observes: *Vidaḍḍhavādī (Vitaṇḍavādī) paṇḍha: "Akusalam kāyakammaṃ manodvāre pi samutthāhi" ti. So "tayo saṅgahe ārūṭham suttaṃ āharāhi" ti vutto, idaṃ Kuḷumbasuttam nāma āhari.*

In the *Sāratthapakkāsinī* (ii, pp. 201-2), he mentions the criterion by which any new text offered for acceptance as authoritative or unauthoritative is to be judged, namely, to see whether its subject-matter falls within the scope of the recognized topics.

We have in the *Samantapāsādikā* not such a rough-shod but an elaborate and more thorough-going and rational judgement on the point at issue.³⁸ Here he does not refrain even from expressing his forcible judgement on the extra-Canonical authorities cited by the Thera Nāgasena in the *Milinda*.

As for the pithy account of the controversy at the Thūpārāma conference (*sannipāta*), the *Mahāvamsa* seeks to heighten its importance by introducing the Thera Goṭhābhaya, the spokesman of the Mahāvihāra monks and able defender of the pure doctrine of Theravāda, as a person who was the namesake and maternal uncle of the reigning monarch and no less as a Thera from the most important Pariveṇa of Saṅghapāla. There is nothing to prevent me thinking that, like the Mayūra and other Pariveṇas, the Pariveṇa (an *angana* according to the commentary) of Saṅghapāla was just one of the important buildings of the Mahāvihāra and, for the matter of that, the Thera Saṅghapāla was the leading personality of the institution. If this Saṅghapāla be no other than the renowned Saṅghapāla who was the personal link between Buddhaghosa and Buddhadatta, their age cannot be earlier than the reign of Goṭhābhaya-Meghavaṇṇa (A.D. 302-15) and later than that of his immediate suc-

36. *Mahāvamsa*, XXXVI. 111-13.

37. For the king's part and procedure followed in settling disputes on the points of doctrine and discipline, see *Sp.* ii, p. 307, iii, p. 583 and *Malalasekera, op. cit.*, p. 371.

38. *Sp.*, i, p. 230 ff.; iv, p. 742.

UNIVERSITY OF CEYLON REVIEW

cessor Jetṭhatissa (A.D. 323-33), while that of the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* must have been somewhat later, and it was most probably the reign of Mahāsenā's great son and successor and Samudragupta's Ceylon contemporary, king Kittī-Siri-Meghavāṇṇa.³⁹ If this suggestion be sound, the literary career of Culla-Buddhaghosa (Buddhaghosa II), who was probably a younger contemporary of the great Buddhaghosa, may also be connected with the earlier part of the reign of Kittī-Siri-Meghavāṇṇa—a ruler well deserving the epithet of *Siri-kūṭa*.⁴⁰ The cross references in the *Nikāya Commentaries* to the *Samantapāsādikā* are later additions, while the treatment of the *Sutta* topics in the *Samantapāsādikā* clearly presupposes the first four *Nikāya Commentaries* as well as the *Paramatthajōtikā*. If any salient point may be established when the contents of the Chinese translation of the *Vinaya Commentary* are fully made known to us, it is precisely this, and nothing else.

B. M. BARUA.

39. *Ceylon Lectures*, p. 91 ff.

40. Variants: Siri-Kuḍḍa, Siri-gutta.