Kirtikar does, with the mystic thinkers of the west—Plotinus, Eckhart, Tuler, Suso and Spinoza.\textsuperscript{60} A mystic interpretation, however, of Śaṅkara's philosophy, is possible.\textsuperscript{61} This paper is only an examination of the non-dualistic and non-positivistic attitude of Śaṅkara from the intellectualistic aspects as far as possible, without shutting out the possibility of a mystic interpretation of it.

A. K. SARKAR.

---

\textbf{Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa: Their Contemporaneity and Age}

I have read with profit Rev. A. P. Buddhadatta's article—\textit{The Great Author of Summaries—Contemporary of Buddhaghosa}—contributed to The University of Ceylon Review (Vol. III, No. 1). 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 Nīgamas to three of the manuals and the \textit{Mudgalarathasvātīsāni}, the latter being a commentary on the \textit{Buddhavamsa}. Now, in the above article he has reconsidered some of the points.

The first point is that he is inclined to accept \textit{Kalabhakulanandana} (also, \textit{vaddhana}) as the more correct of the two variants in the MSS., the other being \textit{Kalambakulanandana}. The second name, \textit{Kalamba}, of the royal family, if accepted, must have to be equated with \textit{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 Kanāra and Western Mysore,\textsuperscript{1} the Kalabhras would seem to have a greater claim on our attention as a ruling people whom the Pallava king Śimhaśānta defeated during his reign (A.D. 575-600). But the question remains open until the identification of the contemporary king \textit{Acyutavikraman} 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 (Uraliur near Trichinopoly) on the Kāveri and a citizen of the Cola country, especially when the Kadambas maintain the tradition of the Acyutārayas up till a late period\textsuperscript{2} 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 \textit{Bhūtamangala} with the present village of Pallivittakam, also known as Jayantī or Vaijayanti, in the Mannargudi 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.

---

\textsuperscript{1} By the way, the Kadamba capital Vanavāsa, also known as Jayantī or Vaijayanti, is not mentioned in the edicts of Asoka. If Vincent Smith has written so in his \textit{Oxford History of India}, p. 198, it is simply due to a slip of his pen.

\textsuperscript{2} There being an ancient land-route connecting the Lower Kēverī region with Kanāra, probably along the banks of the Kēverī, as proved by the joint testimony of the \textit{Great Epic}, the \textit{Khānḍakamana} and Hwen Thsang's \textit{Si-yu-Ki}, it is not impossible that the Kadambas founded a territory in Cola 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 Mannargudi Taluq. It is quite possible that even in Buddhadatta’s time there were localities more than one known by the name of Bhūtamangalam and that to distinguish his Bhūtamangalam from the rest he characterised it as Mangala-Bhūtama- 
galama. It is evident, moreover, from his descriptions that Mangala-Bhūtama- 
galama was just another name of Kāveriṣṭana, or, at any rate, that of a 
dvārakāna or suburb of the same. The point may be made clear thus:

1. In the Nigamana to his Vinaya-Vinīcchaya, Buddhadatta locates the great monastery erected by Visṇudāsa or Kṛṣṇadāsa in Mangala-Bhūtama
galama described as ‘prosperous and richly endowed in all respects’ (iddha saṁbanga-sampanne)—a description applied in Pali to a prosperous city or town. The same is placed in a central part of the Cola territory which looked like ‘an epitome of the whole world’ (saṁbassa pasu lokassa gāme saṁpratide viya). It was washed by the waters of the Kāveri.

2. In the Nigamana to the Buddhavamsa-commentary, he substitutes the name of Kāveriṣṭana for Mangala-Bhūtama-galama, and the same is the case with the epilogue to his Abhidhamma-kathārā.

3. We are yet to enquire if Mannar in the name of the Mannargudi 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 Sanghapala 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 Sanghapala is very close and striking indeed. The Thera Buddhadatta, as he himself tells us, wrote all his works while he was residing at Visṇudāsa’s monastery in Kāveriṣṭana alias Mangala-Bhūtama-galama. The request must have come from Sanghapala to write the Uttaravinicchaya when obviously the latter was staying with him in the same monastery, while Buddhaghosa in the epilogue to his Visuddhimagga refers to the Bhadanta Sanghapala when the latter was the head of the Mahāvihāra of Ceylon. Buddhaghosa wrote his Visuddhimagga and all other works but the Nāgadāya in Ceylon. Buddhadatta lived in Kāveriṣṭana in the centre of Cola, evidently the southern Cola 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 Buddhaghosupāpatti expressly says that the two great men met each other when one was returning from

4. Nigamana to Manorathapūrani: āyicito sumatiṁ theraṇa Bhadanta-Jotipālana 
Kāṇeṣvaraṇa mayā pube suddhiṁ vasaṇāta.
5. Nigamana to Panaṇca-sūdāna: āyicito sumatiṁ theraṇa Bhadanta-Buddha- 
mittena pube Mayurasaṣṭapattane suddhiṁ vasaṇāta.
6. Apparently Mayūra was a Prakrit form of Mayapura (Sk. Mayapura or Māyapura), cf. Palitra in the Nāgarjuna-kāṇḍa inscriptions =Palapura = Dantapura.
7. This is to modify my previous views in Ceylon Lectures p. 90.
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 Buddhaghosupāpatti as the author of the Pinnacle, the Dantadharmānta (i.e., Dāthamānta) and Bodhisamtha (i.e., Mahābodhisamtha) has nothing in common with Buddhadatta, the author of the Vinaya-vinīcchaya and the rest.

and the other (i.e., Buddhaghosa) was going across to Ceylon. The Saddhuramu-
sangalāṇa tells us that Buddhaghosa arrived at Nāgāpāṭṭana (Nāgāpatnam at 
the mouth of one of the middle distributaries of the Kāverī) 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 Kāṇeṣvaraṇa (Genjevaram on the lower 
course of the Lower Pennār below the Madras City) and other places including 
the Mayūrasattapattana or Mayūrāpattana which may probably be identified with Mayaveram6 at the mouth of one of the upper distributaries of the Kāverī.7 If on the sameness of the ‘supplicant,’ namely, Thera Sanghapala, 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 Sanghapala by the two writers. Buddhadatta’s reference is evidently to a revered fellow elder by whom he was “courteously and lovingly requested” (sakkacca sādaram yācitā). In the case of Buddhhasāha, his own pupil, he simply uses the expression ‘respectfully requested by’ (sakkacca ... āyicito). Buddhaghosa’s reference is to a most venerable teacher, Bhadanta-Sanghapala, while in referring to the junior Buddhaghosa he applies the simple epithet of Bhadanta or āyicito. These facts go indeed to make Buddhadatta an elder contemporary of Buddhaghosa,—a view expressed by Rev. Buddhadatta in 1915 in disregard of the tradition in the Gandhāravamsa which places Buddhadhautta next to Buddhaghosa in age.10

The matter assumes somewhat a different aspect once we presume that the author of the Samantapāśadikā is not the great or pioneer Buddhaghosa, the author of the Visuddhimagga. The Chinese translation of the Samantapāśadikā 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-

3. It is difficult to say with Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar (Aloha, Revised ed., p. 38) that “in Aloha’s time there were more than one Cola and one Pandyia king.”
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 Mahavihāra recension was written during the reign of Kitti-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 translation. Pending that, I may draw here the attention of the scholar to the eulogy of the teachers and tradition similar to that in the Mahāvamsa, precisely as in the Mahāvamsa story:

Saddhim Utpatiratkerena Soṇatihero mahiddhihiko Sauṇaḥabhūminī śaguna tamāmin tu samaye pana jāte jāte rājaṣe ḍhārabe ruddaṁ nakkhasi
samuddato nikhāminī kaḥkhyayitavā gacchati.

(Mv. xii 44-45).

The verse quoted from the Dipavamsa reads:

Suvaṇṇabhūminim gantuṇāna Suvaṇṇatattvāmahiddhihiko Pīṭhā nighāhitavān Brahmajālān adasaṇyān.

(ii) The prose account in the Samanta-pāddhikā agrees with that in the Mahāvamsa and differs from the Dipavamsa tradition in so far as it represents Nigrodha as a posthumous son of Asoka's elder stepbrother Sumana and does not speak of Asoka's two coronations.15 Buddhaghosa in his Sunanga-vilasini, (ii, p. 613), records a prophecy according to which prince Piyadāsa (Piyaśadāsa) was to have assumed the title of Asoka at the time of his coronation—the first coronation according to the Dipavamsa. Similarly the Nīdānabāhikā of the Kathavatthu Commentary cites the account of the rise of the eighteen Buddhist sects from the Dipavamsa 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 Mahāvamsa.

12. The fact may be explained, no doubt, if we agree with Geiger in thinking that there was an earlier Athakathā Mahāvamsa.
13. Dr. Bapat kindly informs me that this statement occurs also in the Chinese translation.
16. Piyadāsa nāma humāro chatavam ussāpetā Asoka nāma Dhammarāja kutaḥ.
I would not say with Rev. Buddhadatta that the Aciariya 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 Vinya 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 Dhammapala left the Buddhavamsa out of his account when he wrote his commentaries on the two companion works, the Cariyaptaka and Apadana. Having not the Apadana Commentary before me, I am not in a position to say what Dhammapala has done there, but on looking through his Cariyaptaka Commentary I find that, strangely enough, he has wholly ignored Buddhadatta's Madhuratthavilasini. 18

Dhammakitti's Mahavansa Supplement refers the Ceylon career of the great Buddhaghosa to the reign of Mahanama (A.D. 409-431). This Buddhaghosa mentions the name of no contemporary ruler, either of India or of Ceylon. The author of the Samantaipasadika, 19 on the other hand, definitely says in the epilogue that he began to write the work in the zoth 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-pala and Siri-nitissa. The author of the Dhammapada Commentary belonging to the serial commentary called Paramathajotika, 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-kotta. Buddhadatta on the Indian side connects his literary career with the reign of the Accuta king Accuta-Vikkanta of the Kalabbha or Kalamba family and his residence with the monastery erected at Kaveripattana by Visnudasa or Krsnadasa, evidently a Vaisnava name. It may be noted here that the Shandha Purana preserves the tradition of an unnamed ancient and powerful king of Coja who had the seat of his government at Kacchipura and during whose reign Vispadasa, a pious Vaisnava saint, flourished and succeeded with much difficulty in persuading the contemporary Coja king to give up the performance of the pompous and cruel Brahmanical sacrifices. From Buddhaghosa's expression, Kacchipurasu, it is clear that Kacchipura was the chief town of Coja in his time. All the same, neither the great Buddhaghosa nor the author of the Samantaipasadika can be placed later than the reign of Mahasaena, if it cannot be shown that the text of the Dipavamsa 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 Dhatusena (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 Vinya and Nidasa Aciaryakathas 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 Kathavatthu 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 (Purvasaila), Aparaseliya (Aparasaila), Raja-giriya, Siddhatthika, Uttarapathaka, 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 Kusana, Satakavhana and Iksvaku rulers which are all pre-Gupta. The statements—"just as now (asayatha pi etara) the Sambitiyas and others", "just as now the Andhaka and the like" are significant as to contemporaneity. With regard to the four later Indian sects called Pubbaseliya, Aparaseliya, Raja-giriya and Siddhatthika, 21 Buddhaghosa characterises the doctrine of the Vetullakas as mahammadhasanadita or the Mahayana Doctrine of the Great Void. In all probability the reference is to the Doctrine of the Void as developed in the Prajñaparamitā and such other Vaitulya Sāstras. He was aware of the difference and distinction between the two kinds of nirroda, paśsarikhā and appasārankhā, discussed by Vasubandhu in his Abhidharmakosa and other later writers. 22

(iii) That if the great Buddhaghosa had flourished after king Kitti-Siri-Meghavanam'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. Cariyapitahathakathā, pp. 1, 15, 16.
19. Here the Nigamana to the Kammhikavatari, too, is taken into consideration.
20. Cullavamsa, XXXVIII 58; Malalasekera, A Dict. of Pali Proper Names, i, p. 1088.
22. Ibid., ii, 9; Ceylon Lectures, p. 199.
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(iv) That assigning the great Buddhaghosa to a pre-Gupta age, it becomes easy to connect the author of the *Samantapādasādikā* with the reign of Kitti-Siri-Meghavanṇa who was a contemporary of Samudragupta.

The pioneer Buddhaghosa and the author of the *Samantapādasādikā* have discussed in different contexts the scriptural and doctrinal position of certain texts associated with the early Vaitulyaka or Mahayana tradition of Ceylon. In the *Samantapādasādikā* (iv, p. 742), these are presented in two different lists. The texts of the second list alone find mention in Buddhaghosa's *Sīratthapādikā* (ii, pp. 201-2), while the first text of the first group is considered in the *Atthasālinī* (pp. 91-2). Some of the typical texts of the second or common list are considered in another connexion in the *Sāntavijaya*. 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 (tissa *sanghiyo anālayam*). In discarding the texts of the common list as *a-Buddhavacanā*, Buddhaghosa adduces this additional reason, that their subject-matters fall outside the scope of the five recognized topics of Buddhism, viz., *dhāta* (elements), *drāmanā* (objects), *asaḥha* (loathsomeness), *rājagutta* (foundations of knowledge) and *Vijjākhāmadāhaka* or *Vijjākarandāhaka* (body of acquisitions). 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 (*vivatthanissitā*). 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-Buddhavacanā*).

The first list in the *Vinaya Commentary* consists of the five Suttas called *Kūṭumṇa* (Kūṭumṇa), *Rājovadā* (Rājovadā), *Tikkhindriya* (Tikkṣṇendriya), *Catuvipārīṭa* (Catuvipārīṭa), and *Nandopananda*.

Professor Malalasekera rightly refers us to the *Atthasālinī* (p. 91) where the *viddhatthavinī* (sophistic opponent, i.e., Veṭullavādin) is said to have cited the authority of the unauthentic *Kūṭumṇasutta* 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 *Samangala Jāta* where we have mention of the Buddha’s

23. The references are given by G.P. Malalasekera in his *Dict. of Pali Proper Names*.
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Discourse, *Rājovadassutta*, addressed to the Kosalas king Pasenadi.27 The suggestion is welcome in so far as it concerns the *Rājovadassūtra* in Nanjio’s *Catalogue* No. 988, which, though a work of Mahāyāna, bears in Tibetan the full Sanskrit title of *Āryarājavātadāna-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. Sāntideva in his *Śīkṣāsamuccaya*, cites passages from different *Rājovodassūtras*, one bearing the stamp of Mahāyāna28 and the other that of Hinayāna.29 The text in the *Samantapādasādikā* first list must be identified with the Mahāyāna Sūtra.

The fourth Sutta called *Catuvipārīṭa* can in all probability be identified with the *Caturvargīśuddhârma* of Mahāyāna quoted by name in the *Śīkṣāsamuccaya*30 or the *Caturvargīśuddhârma* 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 *Vāmanapiṭaka*, *Āṅgulimālāpiṭaka*, *Ratthapāлагajjīṭā*, *Ālavagajjīṭā*, *Gālīha* or *Gīyha* *Vinaya*, *Gālīha-Vessantara*, *Vedalla*, *Vedulīha* or *Vetulla Piṭaka*. The *Sāratthapādāsārini* (Siamese ed.) includes also the name of the *Gīyhamagga* and *Gālīha-Mahasadha*. These texts are mentioned in two slightly different orders in the two works. In another context the *Vinaya Commentary* names only the *Gālīha-Vinaya*, *Gālīha-Vessantara* and *Vedalla* as three typical texts to be treated as extraneous (*bhūtrahatasūtra*) and discarded as unworthy of study (*gīyhasuttuttama*).31 Here four works of the *Gālīha* (Secret) or *Gīyha* (Esoteric) class, and the rest belong to the *Pārīta* or *Dhārani* type. The works bearing the title of *Piṭaka* cannot but remind us of the *Dhārani* or *Vibhādhara Piṭaka* and the Bodhisattva *Piṭaka* quoted by name in the *Śīkṣāsamuccaya* of Sāntideva and probably also in the *Śīrasamucceya* of Nāgārjuna who was a predecessor of Sāntideva.

In connection with the *Gālīha* or *Gīyha* texts belonging to the *Gīyha* cult of Mahāyāna, mention may be made of the *Gīyharagāhara* or the *Śī-Gīyha-samajā-tantrarāja*, *Gīyhararamahārāja* and *Gīyharasammayasagharāja* in Nanjio’s Nos. 1026-29. The *Tathāgatagīyha Sūtra* is quoted by name in the *Śīkṣāsamuccaya*.

The *Vaidulyatā Sūtra* in Nanjio’s No. 671, translated in A.D. 265-326, seems to answer well to the *Vetulla* or *Vetulla Piṭaka*.

28. *Ch.* i; Bendall and Rouse’s Transl., p. 16.
30. *Ch.* vii; Bendall and Rouse’s Transl., p. 158.
The Ratthaṭṭhāyāgajīta is no other than the Ratṭṭhāṭṭhāyāgajīta in Nanjio’s No. 23 (18), translated in A.D. 589-618 and quoted by name in the Siṅghasa-muccaya. Here Rākṣasa is the name of a Yakṣa.

The Alavakaṭṭhāgajīta, too, belongs to the Mahāyāna Pariśīṭā class, and it may be compared with the Ugraparīṣṭā and Pārṇasparīṣṭā in Nanjio’s Nos. 23 (19) and 23 (17), translated in A.D. 220-65 and A.D. 384-417, here Alavaka, Ugra and Pūrṇa being all Yakṣas.

The Āgulimāḍipitaka corresponds with the Mahāyāna Āgulimāḍiya Sūtra in Nanjio’s Nos. 621 and 434, translated in A.D. 265-315 and A.D. 420-39 and quoted by name in the Siṅghasa-muccaya. The Pali counterpart seems to be the Āgulimāḍaparīṣṭa (Milinda, p. 151).

The Vaṃśadīpāṭaka may be provisionally identified with the Kanahavarna-pārava-yoga in Nanjio’s No. 390, translated in A.D. 534-54.

The Mahāvyutpattisūtra list includes the name of Rājḍavādakam (wrongly Rājupavādakam), Rākṣaṭṭhāyāgajīta, Sarvavardanalasaṅgraha and Āgulimāḍiyam.44

The Pali Parittas which are claimed to be Buddhabhāṣitas in the Milinda (p. 150ff.) were literary developments similar to the Dhamani’s, and deserve as such to be relegated to the Vidyādhara-pitaka quoted by name in the Siṅghasa-muccaya or to the Dhamani-saṅgraha Sūtra in Nanjio’s No. 795. The Theravāda of Ceylon itself came subsequently to have a Parīśīṭasāṅgraha of its own.

The Mahāvyutpata 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 Meghavanṇa, father and predecessor of Jetṭhātissa and Mahāsaṇa. 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 Mahāsaṇa 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 (dhiṭṭhaviṭṭhi-kovida). 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, 283.
33. Ch. vi; Bendall and Rouse’s Transl., p. 131.
35. Ch. vi; Bendall and Rouse’s English Transl., p. 140.

BUDDHADATTA AND BUDDHAGHOSHA

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-Meghavanṇa by defeating in argument the Thera Goṭhābhaya of Saṅghapāla’s Parīveṇa who happened to be the king’s namesake and maternal uncle.45

The Mahāvyutpata 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 Mahāyānīs monk and Colian vindicator of the Vetullavāda who came in as a powerful disputant.46 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 Samantabodhiś. Referring as if to an issue raised there, Buddhaghosa in his Atthāsālinī (p. 91), observes: Vidyādhara (Vīśkaṇḍa) pāṇḍita: “Akṣaraṃ kāyaṇaṃ manonvedeṣa pi samuṭhāhā “tī. So “tāy saṅgāhe drāhāṃ sutteṃ dhārāhā “tī tuṭhe, tām Kṣīravatsitāt nāma dāhiri.

In the Sārathappāṭhasīni (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 Samantabodhiś not such a rough-shod but an elaborate and more thorough-going and rational judgement on the point at issue. 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 (sammāpīti), the Mahāvyutpata 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 Parīveṇa of Saṅghapāla. There is nothing to prevent me thinking that, like the Māyūra and other Parīveṇas, the Parīveṇa (an aṣṭamana 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 Buddhaddatta, their age cannot be earlier than the reign of Goṭhābhaya-Meghavanṇa (A.D. 302-15) and later than that of his immediate suc-

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.
cessor Jeṭṭhatissa (A.D. 323-33), while that of the author of the Samantapāsādīkā must have been somewhat later, and it was most probably the reign of Mahāsena’s great son and successor and Samudragupta’s Ceylon contemporary, king Kitti-Siri-Meghavanna.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 Kitti-Siri-Meghavanna—a ruler well deserving the epithet of Siri-kūta.40 The cross references in the Nikāya Commentaries to the Samantapāsādīkā are later additions, while the treatment of the Sutta topics in the Samantapāsādīkā clearly presupposes the first four Nikāya Commentaries as well as the Paramatthajotikitā. 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.

Pali “Vado Vedeyyo” and Upanisadic “Avāki-Anādarah”

In the famous ‘Śāndilya-vidyā’ section of the Chandogya Upaniṣad (1.14.1-4), also found in a somewhat different version in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (10.6.3), occurs the following: “… Now, verily, a person (puruya) consists of volition (kṛta). According as his volition is this world, so does he become on departing hence (itah pretya). So let him exercise for himself volition. Consisting of mind (manomaya), having a body of life (prāṇaśārīra), of the colour of light (bhū-rūpaḥ), of true conception, of the nature of ākāśa, possessing all actions, all desires, all smells, all tastes, pervading all this, speechless and indifferent (avākyanādarah) … this self (ātmanā) of mine within the heart—this is Brahma—into him shall I evolve on departing from here,…” The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa version, while generally agreeing with the above, has the latter part as follows: “Let him meditate on the Self (Ātmānam), consisting of mind … etc … changing its shape at will, swift as thought, of true conception, and resolve, possessing all smells, and tastes, which holds sway over all the regions and pervades all this, which is speechless and indifferent (avākkam-anādarah), … that self of life (prāṇa) is my self (ātmanā); hence departing, into (this) self (Ātmānam) shall I evolve. A study of these passages shows that the attributes ‘speechless’ and ‘indifferent’ refer to the pantheistic Ātmā which is immanent in the transmigrating individual self in all its vicissitudes.

In his commentary on the Chandogya Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara interprets the term ‘manomaya puruya’ as “the self that resides in the prāṇic or subtle body, i.e. the līṅga, consisting of the two energies of consciousness (vijñāna) and activity (bṛtyā). That the self transmigrates in the form of the līṅga is attested to at Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, 4.4.6, which says ‘where one’s mind is attached, the līṅga goes thereto with action …’ Hence the passage may be taken generally to refer to the mental or intellectual self of the person departing from this life; it is to be observed that ‘pretya’ and other forms of pra+ in most Upanisadic contexts imply the departure of the individual self.

1. The Chandogya passage is very early and belongs to what Belvākar and Ranade have called the “Brāhmaṇa-Upaniṣadic Period.” History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. II, p. 135. Perhaps both versions go back to one original source.
2. This parenthetical phrase is probably a later interpolation, for it does not occur in the Brāhmaṇa version.
3. The verb ‘ākhi + sam + √bhū’ is usually employed in the Upaniṣads in the sense of ‘evolve into’ with the accusative of the noun denoting the new state, as seen from Jacob’s Concordance.
5. See Jacob’s Concordance, s. ‘pre.’