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Cui bono? or Follow the Money
Identifying the Sophist in a Pāli Commentary*

Jonathan A. Silk

Twenty years ago Mori Sodō published a study in which he attempted to identify the so-called Sophists or Vītaṇḍavādins referred to in Pāli commentarial literature. He concluded from his detailed investigation that there are two general types of Vītaṇḍavādin mentioned in this literature: those corresponding to the ancient Indian Lokāyata (here probably Materialists for the most part), and those to whom reference was added by Ceylonese authors of the Mahāvihārin lineage to disparage their opponents. In other words, this second type of Vītaṇḍavādin is someone who, from the point of view of the self-proclaimed orthodox Mahāvihāra, holds objectionable or unacceptable opinions. Mori suggested three possible identities for these opponents: 1) Those belonging to the Abhayagiri school; 2) An Indian group accepted by the Abhayagiri school, such as the Vetūllavāda; 3) Some Indian sect other than Ceylonese Theravāda, and went on to tentatively deny the likelihood of the first two of these possibilities. Most of the fifteen examples cited by Mori concern matters of doctrinal systematics, that is, points of Abhidhammic exegesis, and have not so far

* I would like to express here my profound thanks and appreciation to my friends Yoichi Kaji, Harunaga Isaacson, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Gregory Schopen and, most especially, Lance Cousins, for their kind and helpful comments on an earlier draft.

1 Jayatilleke 1983: 21?ff. questions whether "sophist" is an appropriate translation of vītaṇḍavādin, identifying a rather narrow technical definition which he maintains is not sophistic but eristic. In our case here, however, it appears that the term is used in a much more general sense of "opponent," but for the sake of convenience, and since it seems very likely that the term was chosen to convey a (generalized) sense of opprobrium, I adopt the rendering "sophist" below.

2 Mori 1982.

3 There is no reason to accept the flat assertion of Rahula 1978: 71, who equates the Vītaṇḍavādins with the Vetūllavādins, adds that Vaitulya refers to Mahāyāna, and concludes: "we can be certain that the terms Vītaṇḍa and Vetulya used in Pali Chronicles and Commentaries refer to Mahāyāna." I learn from Lance Cousins (email 19 January, 2002) that the reasons for Rahula's assertion of this identity is the correspondence between a description in the Mahāvamsa XXXVI. 41 (Geiger 1908: 309.3) referring to a position rejected in the reign of Voharikatissa (3rd c.) as Vētūllavāda (Vetūllavāda) and the reference to the same event earlier in the Dipavamsa XXII. 43-45 (Oldenberg 1879: 110.31-111.2) in which the position is characterized as Vītaṇḍavāda (with a variant in Oldenberg's Singhalese manuscripts of Vetūllavāda).
been noticed to correspond to known sectarian positions. In one case, however, Mori discovered that a position attributed to the Vītāṇṭavādīn in the commentaries to the Mahānigārīkāya and Vībhaṅga corresponds to that cited in the commentary to the Kāṭhāvatthu as a view of the Mahānīsāsaka (Sanskrit Mahāsāsaka) school. With only this one piece of evidence, he was constrained to say quite cautiously that “there is no additional proof that all of the other fourteen views are also attributable to the Mahānīsāsakas.” While further research in scholastic sources may still potentially offer some insights into the background of the cited dogmas, here I would like to explore one other particular instance of Mori’s fifteen from a rather different point of view.

Some time ago when I chanced to be reading Tomomatsu Entai’s very interesting study on the Theory and Practice of Distribution in Buddhism, I came across his quotation of a passage from the Pāpañcasūdana, Buddhistaghosa’s commentary to the Majjhima Nikāya, in which reference is made to a Vītāṇṭavādīn. I remembered Mori’s article, and discovered that although naturally Mori had noted the passage in question, he contented himself with saying of it: “Regarding the commentary on a passage in the Dkkhhāvibhaṅga Sutta, the MA [= Majjhima Nikāya-Āṭṭhakathā] quoted a view of the Vītāṇṭavādīns differing from that of the Mahāvihāra fraternity.” I believe that, taking more than a small hint from the work of Tomomatsu, we might be able to say a bit more.

The sutta passage being commented upon is, as Mori says, from the Dkkhhāvibhaṅga Sutta, number 142 of the Majjhima Nikāya. After the stock opening, we read:

atha kho mahāpajāpati gotami navaṃ dussayugantarī añāya yena bhagavā tenupasārakāmi | upassākamītvā bhagavantarī abhiśādētvā ekamantarī nisiddi | ekamantarī nisinnā kho mahāpajāpati gotami bhagavantarī etad avoca | idāṁ me bhante navaṃ dussayugantarī bhagavantarī uddissā sāmān kantarī sāmān váyītānī | tam me bhante bhagavā patiggațbahu anukampanī upādāyā tī | evanī vutte bhagavā mahāpajāpatisa gotamīyā navaṃ dussayugantarī |

5 Tomomatsu 1970: 63–65. Oddly, he does not there offer any suggestion as to the identity of this vitāṇṭavādīn.
6 Mori 1982: 8 (181).
7 My debt in the following to Tomomatsu 1932 and 1970 is thoroughgoing, despite the failure to specifically acknowledge each case of my reliance on his work.

Then Mahāpajāpati Gotami took a new pair of clothes and went to the Blessed One. Having approached him and respectfully saluted him, she sat down at one side. Sitting to one side, Mahāpajāpati Gotami spoke to the Blessed One: “Venerable, this new pair of clothes has been spun by me, woven by me, especially for the Blessed One. Venerable, may the Blessed One accept it from me out of compassion.”

When she had said this, the Blessed One spoke to Mahāpajāpati Gotami: “Give it to the monastic community, Gotami. If it is given to the monastic community, both I and the monastic community will be honored with offerings.”

A second time … a third time Mahāpajāpati Gotami spoke to the Blessed One: “Venerable, this new pair of clothes has been spun by me, woven by me, especially for the Blessed One. Venerable, may the Blessed One accept it from me out of compassion.”

When she had said this, the Blessed One spoke to Mahāpajāpati Gotami: “Give it to the monastic community, Gotami. If it is given to the monastic community, both I and the monastic community will be honored with offerings.”

When he had said this, the Reverend Ānanda spoke to the Blessed One: “Venerable, may the Blessed One accept the new pair of clothes from Mahāpajāpati Gotami. . . .”

Here, apparently quite simply, Gotami wishes to make a donation to the Buddha personally, but he directs her that the donation should instead be made to the monastic community. The wording of the scripture itself is straightforward, and in fact almost exactly the same crucial phrase is again found in recensions of the episode recorded in texts attributed to sects other than the Theravāda. The *Gautami-sūtra in the Sarvāstivāda Madhyamā-gama says:
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To the best of my knowledge, no traces of this episode have been found in Buddhaghosa’s translations.

The version in the *Dakṣināvibhanga, Fenbie bushi-jing* (部分布施經) sectarian identification of which appears to be unknown, has:12

The exchange as follows:¹⁴

9 To the best of my knowledge, no traces of this episode have been found so far in an Indic language other than Pāli. The Turfan materials contain one fragment of the sūtra, but it does not include the portion of interest to us; see Waldschmidt, Clavitter and Sanders-Holtzmann 1971: §979. Note, however, that the crucial sentence is quoted in many and various texts. Among the most unexpected versions is that quoted in the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra, which has the Buddha say that honoring the monastic community means honoring the three refuges. See T. 374 (XII) 395e27-396a6 (juan 5), translated from Chinese into Tibetan in Derge Kanjur 119, mdo sde, p. 84a, noted and translated from Chinese by Tomomatsu 1995: 231.5-232.23. The latter seems to contain a better text, however, so too does Indic pādī, which refers quintessentially, to food offerings. In principle I have published in the

10 T. 26 (180 部類圖論) 72lc27-29 (juan 47).

11 The term 供养 implies the offering of material gifts. Despite its common translation with words such as honor, venerate and so on, however, so too does Indic pādī, which refers quintessentially, to food offerings. See Tomomatsu 1970: 55-58, 67-68.


13 Probably the plural marker 以上 here indicates the two communities of monks and nuns.

14 Horner 1938: 67.15-69.15, and the devanga edition of the Sixth (Burmese) Sāsana Council text published in the Dhammagiri-Pāli-Gantherālā series, vol. 18 (Igatpur: Vipassana Research Institute, 1995): 231.5-232.23. The latter seems to contain a better text, although it is sometimes hard to see whether we simply have to do with misprints in Horner’s edition. In principle I have quoted the text from the Burmese edition, noting those variants which seem to be even remotely significant, although nowhere does the meaning of the text actually change. The passage is partially translated in Tomomatsu 1970: 63-64.

As simple and straightforward as this discussion may seem, within it lie the seeds of a considerable controversy. This controversy reaches not only skyward toward ethereal questions such as those concerning the very status and significance of the Buddha himself, but also deep down into the pockets of sectarian identification of which appears to be unknown, has:¹²

At that time the Buddha said to Mahāprajāpati: “You should give this robe of fine fabric to the great communities.¹³ The special benefits you receive will equal those from honoring me with offerings, without any difference whatsoever.”
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“dutiyaṁ pithe ti saṅgha gotami dehi” ti vutte | pahom’ ahaṁ bhante dussaṅgoṭṭhāgāratto bhikkhusatassāpi bhikkhusahassassāpi bhikkhusatasahasassāpi civa tendassānā dātther | “idam pana me bhagavantu uddissā sāman kantām sāman vīyataṁ | tathā bhante bhagavā pāṭissagāhāti” ti nimantayamanāḥ¹⁵ ahaṁ evam yātvatītiyāṁ yāci | bhagavā pāṭiṅkhipi yeva | kasmā pana bhagavā attano diyyamānāṁ bhikkhusaṅghassa dāpeti ti | mātari anukampāya | evam kirassa ahosi | “imissā maṁ arabbha pubbacetaṁ muñcancetanā apara cetanā ti tissā cetanā uppannā bhikkhusaṅgham pissā arabbha uppajjantu | evam assa cha cetanā ekato huttā diṅgharattāṁ hitāya sūkhīya pavattissanti¹⁶” ti | vitanḍavādi pānāha | “saṅgha dinnāṁ mahapphalaṁ” ti tasmā evam vuttan ti |

so vattabbo | “kiriṁ tvāṁ saṁtha dinnāt saṅgha dinnāṁ mahapphalaratārā vadaśi” ti | “āma vadhāmi” ti |

“suttaṁ āharā” ti |

“saṅgha gotami dehi saṅgha te dinne ahaṁ ceva pūjito bhavissāṁ saṅgho cā” ti |

“kiriṁ panassa suttassa ayam eva attha” ti |

“āma ayam evā” ti |

yadi evam “tena hāṁnda² bhagavān pūvaṁ dehi” ti ca “tena hi tvā² kaccāna bhagavān gulara dehi” ti ca vacanato bhagavān dinnāṁ mahapphalaratārā ca bhaveyya | evam pi hi saṁtha attano diyyamānaṁ dāpeti² ti | rajarajahamattādāya² ti attano āgatarā² panñākaṁ hariyogopakā�ānaṁ dāpenti | te rājādi mahahantāraṁ bhaveyyaṁ tasmā mā evam ganha |

na-y-imaṁsiṁ loke parasmaṁ v pana buddhena satṭho sadiso v vijjati |

yam abhuruyeyahā āgatarā gato puṇṇaththikānaṁ vipulabhale-siṇan ti |

vacanato² hi satthāraṁ uttaritavo dakkheyyeyo nāma naṭhi | evam assa cha cetanā ekato huttā diṅgharattāṁ hitāya sūkhīya bhavissanti² kiṁ pana² sandhāya yātvatītiyāṁ pātiṭhāhetvā² saṅghassa dāpesi | pacchimāya jāntāya saṅgha cīlīcīrājananathanthā² cāpi² evam ahaṁ | evam kirassa ahosi | “ahāṁ na ciraṭhitiko mayhaṁ pana sāsanaṁ bhikkhusaṅgha pāṭiṭhāhassati pacchimā jāntā saṅgha cīlīcīrāranā thā” ti |

yātvatītiyāṁ pātiṭhāhetvā saṅghassa dāpesi | evam hi² satthā attano diyyamānam pī saṅghassa dāpesi saṅgho nāma dakkheyyeyo” ti pacchimā jāntā saṅgho² cīlīcīrāranā pāpaṭṭaṁ cattāro pacchay e tatthābe
Buddhist and Indian Studies

manissati | sañgho catūhi paccayehi aklamanto\textsuperscript{15} buddhavacanaṁ upgahetvā samapadhammaṁ karissati | evāṁ mama sāsanāṁ pāncavassassahassāṁ thassati tī |

\textit{"paṭiggahātū bhante bhagavā"} tī vacanato pi cetāṁ veditabbāṁ | \textit{"satt hailed uttaritato dakkhinyeyo nāma nattti"} tī | na hi ānandatherassa mahāpajāpatiyā āghato vā verāṁ vā attiḥ | na therō \textit{"tassā dakkhiṇā mā mahappalāhī ahosi"} tī icchati | paṇḍito hi therō bahussuto sekkhapati- sambhidāppatto | so sattā dinnassa mahāppalāhūvē\textsuperscript{9} sarippassamānō\textsuperscript{9} va \textit{"paṭiggahātū bhante bhagavā"} tī gāhanatthāṁ yāci tī |
puna vītanāvādi āha | \textit{"saṅge te dinne ahaṁ ceva pūjito bhavissāmī saṅgho ca"} tī vacanato satthā saṅgahapariyāpanno vā vā tī | so vattabbo \textit{"janāśi pana tvāṁ kati saranāni kati aviccappasāda"} tī | \textit{jānanto "tīnī"} tī vakkhati | tato vattabbo | \textit{"tava laddhiyā satthu saṅghapariyāpannātī dvē yeva honti \ evāṁ sante ca \ anujānāmi bhikkhave imehi"} tī sarānagamaniehi pabbajjarāṁ upasampadāṁ tī evāṁ anuññātā pabbajjā pūjito pī upasampadā pī na rūhī | tato tvāṁ neva pabbajjito aṣi na gīhi | sammaśambuddha ca gāndhakujīyāṁ nissiṁ bhikkhū uposatham pī pāvāraṇāṁ pī saṅghākammāṁ pī karonti | tāni satthu saṅgahapariyāpannātī kuppāṁ bhaveyyāṁ na ca honti tasmā | na vattabbo etāṁ \textit{"satthā saṅgahapariyāpanno"} tī tī \textsuperscript{18}

\textit{"A second time [Mahāpajāpāti Gotamī asked the Buddha to accept the clothing she had made, and a second time the Blessed One said:] Give it to the monastic community, Gotamī."} She urged him saying \textit{"I am able to give from my warehouse of clothing robe cloth for a hundred monks, a thousand monks, a hundred thousand monks. This [cloth] now has been spun by me, woven by me, especially for the Blessed One. Venerable, may the Blessed One accept it from me."} So she requested a third time [too], but the Blessed One flatly refused. Why did the Blessed One order that what was being given to himself be given [instead] to the community of monks? Out of compassion for his mother [Gotamī]. It then occurred to him thus: \textit{"She has three intentions concerning me..."} \textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{15} This form is not noticed by the Critical Pāli Dictionary, Trenckner et al. 1924-- (but see 540b, aklamana).
\textsuperscript{16} Variant readings (H = Horner's PTS edition; B = Burmese edition):
\begin{itemize}
  \item a) H: nibandhamānā.  
  \item b) H: sanvattisanti  
  \item c) H: tenānanda  
  \item d) H: omits tvā  
  \item e) H: dīpepi  
  \item f) H: adds ca  
  \item g) H: ābhāhatām  
  \item h) H: adds ti  
  \item i) B: omits kim pana  
  \item j) B: paṭīsābhtāvā, and below  
  \item k) H: spells citā", and below.  
  \item l) H: vē ti  
  \item m) H: evan pl  
  \item n) H: adds hi  
  \item o) H: "bhāvāḥ  
  \item p) H: passamāṇo  
  \item q) H: saraṇā ti  
  \item r) H: omits imehi
\end{itemize}

\textit{Cui bono? or Follow the Money}

[with regard to this gift]: prior intention, an intention of relinquishing, and subsequent intention. She should direct these [intentions] to the community of monks as well. Thus the six intentions [three for the Buddha, three for the community] together will lead to benefit and happiness for a long time.

But the Sophist says: \textit{"That was said thus [by the Buddha in the scripture] because What is given to the monastic community yields a great [karmic] result."}

He should be asked: \textit{"Do you say that what is given to the monastic community yields a greater result than what is given to the Teacher?"}

He replies: \textit{"I say yes, it does."}

\textit{"Quote the scripture!"}

\textit{"Give it to the monastic community, Gotamī. If it is given to the monastic community, both I and the monastic community will be honored with offerings."}

\textit{"Is that the meaning of this scriptural passage?"}

\textit{"Yes, precisely!"}

\[We disagree.\] If this were so, according to the [Vinaya] expressions \textit{"Well, Ānanda, give the cakes to those who eat scraps of food,"}\textsuperscript{17} and \textit{"Well then, Kaccāna, give those who eat the remains of food [as much] sugar [as they want],"}\textsuperscript{18} what is given to those who eat the remains of food would yield a greater result. For just so [the scripture] says that the Teacher had what was being given to him given [instead to the community]. Kings, royal ministers and others too have presents which were delivered to themselves given [instead] to their mahouts and others. [According to your thinking,] those [mahouts and others] would become much greater than the kings and others [which is impossible]. Therefore it must not be understood in this way.

Neither in this world nor in the other is there one better than or equal to the Buddha, the first among those who are worthy of oblations, for those [donors] who are desirous of merit, who seek abundant results.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{17} Oldenberg 1879–1883: iv.91.5–6 (Pācattīya 41); Homer 1938–1966: 2.347.
\textsuperscript{18} Oldenberg 1879–1883: 1.225.5–6 (Mahāvagga VI.26.4); Homer 1938–1966: 4.306.
\textsuperscript{19} The same verse, the source of which is untraced but certainly not canonical, is also found with minor variations in the Kathāvātthu (Taylor 1897: 555.32–555.3): no-y-imasmin vā lokasaṇamaṁ vā samo ca viṣṇaṁ ca samma ca viṣṇaṁ ca; yam dhūneyyānam ayyatām gāto pathahāti dhikānam vījñāpalahāsītān iti; translated there by Aung and Rhys Davids 1915: 321. See below for a discussion of the Kathāvātthu passage.
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According to this expression, there is no one worthy of offerings greater than the Teacher. Thus the six intentions together will lead to benefit and happiness for a long time.

Intending what, then, did [the Buddha], refusing up to three times, have [the donation] given to the monastic community? For the sake of future generations and in order to produce esteem for the monastic community he spoke thus: “I will not remain long [in the world], but my teaching will be established in the community of monks. Later generations must esteem the monastic community. This being so, later generations, esteeming the monastic community by saying ‘The Teacher had even what was being given to him given [instead] to the monastic community. It is indeed the monastic community which is worthy of offerings,’ will think that the four requisites must be given [to monks]. The monastic community [thus] adequately provided with the four requisites will study the Buddha’s words and practice the teaching of the ascetic. Thus my teaching will last for five thousand20 years.”

“Venerable, may the Blessed One accept it.” From this expression too should be known: “There is no one more worthy of offerings than the Teacher.” For the Elder Ānanda has neither loathing nor hatred for Mahāpajāpatī. The Elder does not wish [to harm her karmically by hoping] “Let her donation not yield a great result!” For the scholarly Elder is greatly learned, has attained the analytic insight of a learner. Perceiving the fact that what is given to the Teacher yields a great result, he requested “Venerable, may the Blessed One accept it” in order that he receive it [which will benefit the donor, Mahāpajāpatī].

Again the Sophist, however, says: Because of the expression “If it is given to the monastic community, both I and the monastic community will be honored with offerings,” the Teacher is included within the monastic community.

He should be asked: “Do you know how many refuges there are, how many kinds of faith based on understanding?” Knowing, he will say “three [Buddha, Dharma and monastic community].” Then he should be told: “In your view, the fact of the Teacher’s being included in the
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monastic community means that there are only two [Buddha/monastic community, and Dharma]. And that being so, the [Vinaya] injunction ‘Monks, I stipulate novice ordination and full ordination by going to these three refuges’21 is not effective for either novice ordination or full ordination. So you are neither ordained nor a householder. When the Perfect Buddha sits in the Perfume Chamber, the monks perform the uposatha rite, the pavāraṇa and the ecclesiastical acts of the monastic community. From the fact of the Teacher’s being included in the monastic community those ecclesiastical acts would become reversible, but they are not.22 Therefore it is not acceptable to say ‘The Teacher is included within the monastic community.’”

There are a number of crucial issues raised here. The central ones include the following: the opponent, the Sophist, suggests that not only are donations made to the monastic community productive of great merit, but this merit is greater than that produced by donations to the Buddha himself. Moreover, the Buddha is to be considered as included within the monastic community, and therefore donations to the monastic community are by definition also donations to the Buddha, which leads to the conclusion that separate donations to the Buddha are unnecessary.

What is at stake here does not, at least initially, appear to be any issue of doctrinal systematics, but rather a very practical and essentially economic question: to whom are gifts to be offered, and who is to benefit from gifts offered to the monastic community? The opinion of Buddhaghosa, the author of the commentary, which ipso facto represents the dominant and orthodox Theravāda view, is that the primacy of the Buddha cannot be challenged by the idea that the monastic community may compete with him for patronage.

Although one issue is certainly that of economics, and specifically the legitimacy of directing donations to one recipient or another, there is also a connected doctrinal question: just what is the status of the Buddha? For although the narrative time of the Dakkhīnāvibhanga Sutta is of course the

20 Tomonomatsu 1970: 64, who used the “Siamese edition, III.709 et seq.,” cites the text as reading pahcavassasati. Homer quotes no variants. The five thousand year dating is standard in the Theravāda system, on which see briefly Nattier 1991: 56–58. It would be very interesting indeed if a Thai text were to contain this five hundred year date, and the editions should be carefully checked, which I regret I am not able to do at present.

21 Oldenberg 1879–1883: i.22.21–22.
22 That such ecclesiastical acts would be subject to reversal or be illegal (koppa, Sanskrit koppya) is due to the Vinaya legal requirement that all members of the community be present during the execution of an act. Were the Buddha, counted as a monk, to remain nevertheless in his chamber and hence not be present among the rest of the community, the assembly would be incomplete and its actions invalid. Therefore, argues Buddhaghosa, the Buddha cannot be considered to be a monk.

Gregory Schopen points out to me that the Perfume Chamber is unknown to the Pāli canon, and thus Buddhaghosa’s argument here is clearly informed by other, non- or post-canonical sources.
time of the Buddha, an imaginary present when the Buddha walks the earth along with his disciples, for the sūta’s authors as much as for its commentator their world was in reality one in which the Buddha as a human presence had already ceased to exist. We will see below that Buddhist authors, including Buddhaghosa, were quite well aware of this.

To help us understand the debate we find in Buddhaghosa’s commentary, it will be very helpful if we can identify the Sophist whose views contradict those of the Theravāda orthodoxy. Happily, we have excellent evidence in this regard. In the very first place, valuable indications come to us from a number of interrelated doxological treatises: Bhavya’s Nikāyabhedavibhāga-vākyākkhyāna (in fact an extract from his Tarkajvalā) and Vinītadeva’s Samayabhedoparacanacakrasya Nikāyabhedopadarsana-saṅgahāra, both preserved only in Tibetan, and Vasumitra’s Samayabhedoparacanakara, of which we have one Tibetan and three Chinese translations.23 In the course of laying out the doctrinal positions of a number of different Buddhist schools, all of these texts in their various versions set forth the following thesis:

Bhavya:24 sangs rgyas ni dge ’dun gyi khongs su gto(s) pa’o || dge ’dun ni ’bras bu chen po’ byung bar byed kyi sangs rgyas ni de la ma yin no||

The Buddha is included in the monastic community. The monastic community generates a great result [from donations to it], but this is not so with respect to the Buddha.

Vinītadeva:25 ston pa ni dge ’dun gyi nang du gto(g)s te | de ’i phyir dge ’dun la phul ba lhag par don che’o ||

The Teacher is included within the monastic community. Therefore the benefit of giving to the monastic community is greater.

Vasumitra:26 sangs rgyas ni dge ’dun la dmigs so || dge ’dun la phul ba ni ’bras bu che’o || sangs rgyas la ni ma yin no ||

The Buddha is perceived to be in the monastic community. [So,] according to the monastic community has a great result. [Giving] to the Buddha does not.

Although there are the kind of trivial differences in wording one would expect from any group of independent translations of the same text, the central point is crystal clear: The Buddha is a member of the monastic community. Because of this fact, donations made to the monastic community yield greater karmic results than donations made to the Buddha alone. This is of course precisely, and virtually verbatim, the position set forth by the Sophist in the Majjhimanākāya commentary we noticed above. And the clue we have been looking for to identify that Sophist is right here: this thesis is listed as one of the doctrinal stances held by the Mahāsāṃghika school, a fact which goes some way toward supporting the hypothesis hesitantly proposed by Mori on the basis of more limited evidence.

It is significant that the same doxographic texts also present a position directly contrary to this Mahāsāṃghika view, categorizing it as one belonging to the Dharmaguptakas. We again read:

Xuanzang:27 佛在僧中，僧有佛故，施僧者，便獲大果，非別施佛。

Because the Buddha is in the monastic community, one who gives to the community will immediately obtain a great result, but not one who gives separately to the Buddha.

Paramārtha:28 大眾中有佛，若施大眾得報則大，若別施佛功德則不及。

The Buddha is in the community. If one gives to the community, the result one obtains will be great. If one gives separately to the Buddha, the merit [one obtains] will be less than [what one obtains from giving to the community].

Anonymous:29 佛僧中。可得施僧得果報，非佛。

The Buddha is in the monastic community. If one is capable of giving to the monastic community, one will obtain a result, but not [if one gives to] the Buddha.

23 T. 2031 [XLIX] 17a12; Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 73–74. Translated in Masuda 1925: 62. Probably it is on the basis of this very text that Kuiji makes the same claim in his encyclopedia Dacheng fayuan yilin-zhang 大乘法苑彙林章 T. 1861 [XLV] 346c3–5 (juan 6), see Tomomatsu 1932: 152.
25 T. 2032 [XLI X] 19b24–25; Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 73–74. This translation is attributed in many catalogues to Paramārtha (T. 2034 [XLI X] 99a; T. 2147 [LV] 156a1; T. 2148 [LV] 188c24; T. 2149 [LV] 266a29, 30b10, 325a16; T. 2151 [LV] 364a15–16; T. 2153 [LV] 435b18–19). However, the detailed consideration in the Kaiyuan shijiao-Iu 開元順敟錄 T. 2154 [LV] 621c1–5, repeated in T. 2157 [LV] 955a15–20, refutes this, and mentions the suggestion that the translation is due to Kumārajiva. (See also T. 2154 [LV] 519a1, 538c16–17.) The issue has been discussed in Moebius 1932–1936: 169bc, and Kanakura 1962: 275–76 (who seems to be willing to accept the attribution to Kumārajiva).
Buddhist and Indian Studies

Bhavya: \[1^{30} \text{sangs rgyas ni dge 'dun gyi khongs su gtogs pa ma yin no || sangs rgyas las 'bras bu chen po 'byung ba de itar}^{31} \text{dge 'dun las ni ma yin no ||}^{32} \]

The Buddha is not included in the monastic community. [Donations] to the Buddha generate a great result, but it is not so [for donations made] to the monastic community.

Vinitadeva: \[3^{33} \text{sangs rgyas ni dge 'dun gyi nang du ma gtogs so || sangs rgyas la phul ba 'bras bu che ho} \]

The Buddha is not included within the monastic community. Presentations to the Buddha have a great result.

Vasumitra: \[3^{34} \text{sangs rgyas ni dge 'dun la dmigs so || sangs rgyas la phul ba ni 'bras bu che ba ho || dge 'dun la ni ma yin no} \]

The Buddha is perceived to be in the monastic community. [Hence,] presentations to the Buddha have a great result. Those to the monastic community do not.

Xuanzang: \[3^{35} \text{Presentations to the Buddha have a great result. Those to the monastic community does not [produce a result] equal to this.} \]

Anonymous: \[37 \text{The Buddha is not in the monastic community. If one is capable of giving to the Buddha, one will obtain a great result, but not [if one gives to] the monastic community.} \]

Aside from the very odd fact that the Tibetan translation and the Chinese translations of Xuanzang and Paramārtha of Vasumitra’s treatise appear to have omitted a negation, since they state (somewhat incoherently) the Buddha to be included within the monastic community, the basic meaning is clear here as well. For the Dharmaguptakas the Buddha is separate from the monastic community, and donations to him (or to the stūpa, his presence after his nirvāṇa) are more meritorious than those to the monastic community. At a casual glance there might seem to be a coincidence between the Dharmaguptaka position and that asserted by Buddhaghosa but, as we will see, in fact the classic Theravāda position is much closer to that of the Mahiśāsakas than it is to that of the Dharmaguptakas.

While obviously we cannot always be sure that our doxographical texts correctly represent the doctrines of the schools whose views they purport to cite, in the present case we have some additional evidence supporting the hypothesis that the position of Buddhaghosa’s opponent corresponds to that of the Mahiśāsaka school, since other sources contain the same indication. For instance, in section 33 of the so-called *Satyasiddhi or *Tattvasiddhi (成實論) of Harivarman, apparently a work of the Bahūsrutiya school,39 the Mahiśāsaka position is explicitly described. There we find the following passage: \[40 \text{據-expand the 33rd} \]

Cui bono? or Follow the Money

Anonymous: \[37 \text{The Buddha is not in the monastic community. If one is capable of giving to the Buddha, one will obtain a great result, but not [if one gives to] the monastic community.} \]

But it is said to incorporate Sarvāstivāda and Saṅgharāṣṭriya elements as well; see Tsukamoto, Matsunaga, and Isoda 1943, 202–206. One hypothesis he suggests is a possible shift over time in the doctrine, but we cannot reconcile this with the agreement between T. 2032, the anonymous translation, and Vinitadeva, probably our earliest and latest sources, respectively.

30 Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 29.7–9; Miyasaka in Takai 1928/1978: 23.22–23; Derge Tanka 3836, abu ma, ada 15284. See Bareu 1954–1956: 181. Bareu (181, n. 3) correctly notes that the Tibetan text printed by Teramoto has omitted a necessary negation, which is however found in Miyasaka’s edition (without variants) and the Derge Tanka valid text. Almost certainly this merely represents a misprint in Teramoto’s edition (in which they are, unfortunately, common).

31 v.l. dag for itar.

32 I understand here both times la for las, in accord with the context and parallels.


34 Overprint of Harivarman, apparently a work of the Bahūsrutiya school,39 the Mahiśāsaka position is explicitly described. There we find the following passage: \[40 \text{據-expand the 33rd}

37 T. 2032 (XLIX) 19c3–4; Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 79.

38 It seems evident that Xuanzang sensed the problem here, for which he apparently attempted to compensate by the addition of “although.” Why the negation might have been missing from the completely independent manuscripts of the Sanskrit original which however stand behind the different translations I cannot say. Because the doctrinal point is so clear, the case is quite puzzling.

39 But it is said to incorporate Sarvāstivāda and Saṅgharāṣṭriya elements as well; see Tsukamoto, Matsunaga, and Isoda 1943, 202–206. One hypothesis he suggests is a possible shift over time in the doctrine, but we cannot reconcile this with the agreement between T. 2032, the anonymous translation, and Vinitadeva, probably our earliest and latest sources, respectively.

The meaning of these four groups is highly problematic, and this is an odd characterization to attribute to the Buddha. We might more literally translate expression translated in accord with this understanding.

You honor me with offerings, and honor the monastic community with "Gotami, donate these robes to the monastic community. Through this you honor me with offerings, and honor the monastic community with offerings as well."

The commentator says: The Mahāsākās practitioners say: The Buddha is within the monastic community.

Answer: If you state that the Buddha is part of the four groups — the group of beings, the group of those who are born, the group of noble humans — then there is no objection. If you are saying that the Buddha is among the auditors (*śrāvaka), then this is an error. They are called "auditors" because they hear the teaching and obtain awakening. Because the Buddha's characteristics are different, he is not among them.

Objection: The Buddha is the head of those who dwell in the monastic community.41 If someone donates [something to him], this is called donating to the monks.

Answer: To which monks does this donation belong? The scripture has a small lacuna. It should say "the donation belongs to the Buddha and the community."

Objection: The Buddha said [in the Daksināvibhaṅga Sūtra]: "Gotami, donate these robes to the monastic community. Through this you honor me with offerings, and honor the monastic community with offerings as well.

41 We might more literally translate "這四種中只有佛陀在僧中，是則有答。以聞法得悟，故曰聲聞。佛相異故，不在此中。" since I think this here likely represents gona (and thus *bhikkugana or saṅghagana?), I have translated in accord with this understanding.

42 The meaning of these four groups is highly problematic, and my translations speculative.

43 This is an odd characterization to attribute to the Mahāsākās. See the discussion below of the expression buddhapramukha bhikkusangha.

44 Compare the expression in the Pāli Vinaya, Mahāvagga VIII.26.3 (Oldenberg 1879–1883: i. 302.19–20): yo bhikkhave mahā upatthato su gilīnaṁ upatthatassu. Perhaps even closer is the expression in the Ekottarakāgama T. 125 (11.4) (II) 569cl–2 (juan 5): 具有僧羯摩，則為僧羯摩也，有是者也，即為僧衣。Also quoted by Vanamala and Saṅghabhārada in the Zanpașanti pasa suvī-tan Сцітаємо промінь Правди T. 1549 (XXVII) 768a26-27 (juan 5). The point is the reciprocal identity of the Buddha and the monastic community, not the inclusion of one within the other.
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the so-called Spitzer manuscript, the earliest surviving philosophical manuscript from India. There we find in Sanskrit an expression precisely parallel to that in the doxologies quoted above, buddhaḥ saṅghaḥ narpaṭalhaṇya (te),45 and another very close to an expression we have just seen in Harivarman’s text: ye ācārya-gunasāmanyavisesa-yuktaḥ saṅghaḥ ... sayuktaḥ atāh paśyāmaḥ bhagavān api saṅghaḥ iti, meaning that “the general and specific qualities of the Buddha are present in his disciples ... and therefore ‘we’ see that he too is in the saṅgha.”46 As noted by Eli Franco, who is now studying these materials, already in 1962 Yūshō Miyasaka detected similarities between the Spitzer text and the *Satyasiddhi,47 an impression only reinforced by this passage. It is a shame that the Spitzer text has come down in such a partial condition, which does not permit us to more fully appreciate its arguments here.

A doctrinal position similar to that attributed to the Mahīśāsaka in the *Satyasiddhi, offered here however without any such attribution, is also mentioned and criticized in the Mahāyāna *Upāsakaśila-sūtra. Although the text has a complex history, and a portion of it even appears to be based upon the Bodhisattvabhumi,48 this is not relevant for the material of interest to us here. We find there the passage:49

若有說言佛入僧数，是义不然。何以故。佛若入僧则无三宝及三归依，四不律信。

If someone were to say that the Buddha is a part of the monastic community, this is not acceptable. Why? If the Buddha were part of the monastic community, then there would be no Three Jewels, no three refuges, and no four indestructible faiths [in the Three Jewels and the monastic discipline].

There is very little question that, despite the absence of attribution, we may now recognize this as a Mahīśāsaka position, although the sūtra’s silence as to its source renders it of little direct use to us here.

Equally without provenance is the recounting of the episode of Gautami’s gift in the Chuyao-jing, an Udānavarga commentary and therefore evidently a Sarvāstivādin work which, however, illustrates the same standpoint.50

昔佛在世，大愛道者羅彌親佛母，以金編織成衣奉獻如來。佛告大愛道：夫施施者，當為大衆。何獨及向我耶。吾亦是大衆之一數。亦有微分。可持此金編織成衣往施聖衆。如來三界特尊。猶尚不能偏受信施。鮮譚聖衆不自專己。

Long ago, when the Buddha was still in the world, Mahāprajāpati Gautami, the Buddha’s maternal aunt, presented to the Tathāgata a robe made from finely woven gold threads. The Buddha said to Mahāprajāpati: “Now, if you want to present it, you should direct it to the community. What is the point of aiming it to me alone? I am [but] one member of the community, and I have [only] a minute share. Go and give this robe made from finely woven gold threads to the noble community.” The Tathāgata is the most honored one in the three worlds. But [even] he could not accept this religious gift (*dharmadāna), and declining and passing it on to the noble community he did not keep it for himself.

The expression “I have [only] a minute share” here is significant. As we will see below, according to Buddhaghosa, for example, items gifted to the Buddha and monastic community are to be divided evenly between them, with half going to the Buddha and half to the rest of the monks. The Chuyao-jing seems to suggest that the Buddha is to receive only a single share, not half of all shares of whatever is donated. This too appears to correspond to Mahīśāsaka doctrine.

A further passage of interest is found in the *Abhinisramaṇa-sūtra, which explicitly identifies its source here as the scholars of the Mahīśāsaka school, 尼沙師等.51 In this account of King Bimbisāra’s attempt to give the Bamboo Grove (Venuvana) to the Buddha, we find the following:52


51 T. 190 (III) 860b28–c19 (juan 44). This passage was translated, or better paraphrased, in Beal 1875: 314, but so freely as to obscure every essential point. It was translated and studied by Tomomatsu 1932: 129–133.
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At that time King Bimbisāra ... spoke to the Buddha, saying: “Greatly Noble Blessed One, this Bamboo Grove is neither too far from nor too close to Rājagaha, [meets a number of other conditions detailed in the text previously], and is splendid as a practice ground for good people. Please tell me, Blessed One, the procedure for offering this Bamboo Grove to the Blessed One as a place for sitting in meditation.”

At that time the Buddha said to King Bimbisāra: “So it is, Great king. If you want to offer the Bamboo Grove to me, I ordain (*anujānāmi) that it be offered [instead] to the universal monastic community of the four quarters.”

Then King Bimbisāra spoke to the Buddha, saying: “[I will do] as the Blessed One instructs.” And King Bimbisāra, rising from his seat, took in his hands a golden vase, and offered water to the Blessed One. Then he again spoke to the Blessed One, saying: “Excellent, Blessed One! This Bamboo Grove is close to Rājagaha, [meets the other conditions], and is splendid as a practice ground for good people. Now I present it to the Buddhas, Blessed Ones, and the universal monastic community of the four quarters. After the presentation, please, Blessed One, consent to accept it out of compassion for me.”

The Blessed One accepted it then out of compassion. ...

At that time the Blessed One assembled the great community, and having assembled it spoke then to the monks, saying: “You monks, from now on I allow monks to themselves take possession of groves.”

There are several peculiarities in this passage. In conformity with the expected Mahiśāsaka stance, the Buddha declines a gift offered to him personally and directs that it be given instead to the community at large. But when Bimbisāra actually makes the gift, which the Buddha accepts, he seems to subvert that intention by presenting it to the Buddhas (plural!) and the universal community. However, the expression 諸佛世尊招提僧等 is odd. What might it mean in such a context to speak of plural Buddhas? And how are we to understand the plural suffixes standing at the end? There is only one universal community, but it might be possible to see a reference to the (plural) monks of that community. On the other hand, the Buddha’s permission, given at the end of the passage, for monks to take possession of (literally, accumulate) groves seems to suggest that acquisition of offerings should be done by the monks, rather than by the Buddha, which is to say, practically speaking, the stūpa or Buddha image. Despite these ambiguities, which merit further study, the overall position of this passage does seem to conform to what we expect of the Mahiśāsaka ideology.

If the materials we have cited so far are still not decisive, further confirmation, which may be considered almost conclusive, is happily to be found in the unique Mahiśāsaka text available to us, that sect’s own Vinaya, the Mishasaibu hexi wufenlu 漢沙塞部和龺五分律. Since this is a work of the sect itself, there can be no question here of any possible false attribution of views. And precisely the indications we wish to find do indeed appear. In this Vinaya’s account of King Bimbisāra’s attempt to give the Kalandaka-nivāpa (Veñuvana) to the Buddha, we read:53

53 T. 1421 (XXII) 110b1–4 (jñava 16). The passage has also been translated by Bareau 1963: 337, and 1966: 52.
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community, where we find the following:\(^54\)

白佛言。毘舍離諸園觀中此園第一。我慚此園本欲為福。今奉世尊。願垂納受。佛言。可以施僧得大果報。懺女重以上佛。佛言。但以施僧。我在僧數。懺女受教即以施僧。

[Amrapali] said to the Buddha: “Among the gardens of Vaiśālī, this is the finest. From the beginning I have tended this garden with the desire for the merit [to be gained from its donation]. Now I present it to the Blessed One. Please accept it.”

The Buddha said: “Give it to the monastic community, and you will obtain great results.”

Amrapali repeated her request to the Buddha as before. The Buddha said: “Just give it to the monastic community. I am within the monastic community.”

Amrapali agreed to this, and gave it to the monastic community.

These passages lead us virtually beyond doubt to the conclusion that the position attributed to the Sophist in the Majjhimanikāya commentary corresponds to the stance of the Mahāśāsakas.\(^55\) This conclusion is only strengthened by the fact that, as Mori has also pointed out,\(^56\) the Indic Mahāśāsaka Vinaya manuscript later translated into Chinese by *Buddhajīva* with Zhisheng 智勝 and others was acquired by Faxian 法顯 in Ceylon.\(^57\) This shows quite nicely that right around the time of Buddhaghosa, in the early fifth century of the Common Era, original Mahāśāsaka literature was available in Ceylon.\(^58\) All of this seems to fit together well.

---

55 The comparative importance of these passages was observed by Bareau 1963: 341, and 1996. Unfortunately, as he himself feared the crucial characteristic of the Mahāśāsaka formulation escaped Boucher 2000: 68 in his reference to Bareau’s arguments. (Incidentally, as far as I have noted, in none of his various references to the issue does Bareau evince any familiarity with the work of Tomomatsu, despite the fact that already in Tomomatsu 1931: 324–333 he discussed the matter, in French and in the Journal Asiatique.)
56 Mori 1982: 13 (176).
57 According to the Gaoseng Faxian-zhuan 伽徠傳緯傳 T. 2085 (LI) 865a24; see also Nagasawa 1996: 118–120. (Translations in Legge 1886: 111, and Giles 1923: 76, although the latter is virtually incomprehensible.) See also Hirakawa 1960: 142–143. Note that Faxian also apparently acquired there a Dīghaṇkosāma, which was however never translated, and a Sarvāstivāda Somaparibhāṣa. See de Jong 1981, and Enomoto 1986.
58 Buddhaghosa’s dates are controversial, but von Hünüber places him between 370 and 450 (von Hünüber 1996 §207). Faxian was in Ceylon between 409 and 411 (Nagasawa 1996: 120, n. 6).
1) The gift made to the/a communities of monks when the Buddha was present before them.

2) The gift made to the/a communities of monks after the Buddha has perished.

3) The gift made to the/a community of nuns after the Buddha has perished.

4) The gift made to the/a dual community of monks and nuns after the Buddha has perished.

Setting aside the various problems attending these variant textual traditions, discussed by Tomomatsu without any convincing conclusions, we may once again turn to Buddhaghosa's commentary in the *Papāṇcasūdana* and his treatment of this list. For here too he appeals to the same discussion, and the same central sentence, we have seen repeatedly explained in various ways above:


\[\text{\textit{satta kho panimā ti kasmā ārabhī | "sāṅге gotamī dehi sāṅге te dīrṇe ahaṁ ceva pūjīto bhavissāmi sāṅге cā" ti hi vutta?}}\]

| tattva sattasu \(\text{ṭhānesu} \) dinnadānāṁ sāṅge dinnarāṁ nāma \(\text{hoti} \) ti \(\text{dassetūrā} \) imāṁ desanāṁ ārabhī | tattva \textit{buddhappamukhe ubhatosāṅge} ti ekato bhikkhusaṅgho ekato bhikkhusaṅgho sattā mahatāya nisāno hoti ti | ayāṁ buddhappamukho ubhatosāṅgho nāma | ... kiṁ pana \textit{tathāgatā pariṇibbute} buddhappamukhassa ubhatosāṅghassa dānāṁ dāturāṁ sakkā ti | sakkā | kathāṁ | ubhatosāṅghassa hi pamukhe sadhātuṁ paṭiṁaraṁ āsane \(\text{ṭhāpetvā} \) ātihāraḵaṁ paṭiṭhāpetvā \(\text{dakkhiṇa} \) dānam \(\text{cā} \) dinnarāṁ āsane | tattva sattussa paṭhamanāṁ datvā ubhatosāṅghassa dattabbaṁ | evaṁ buddhappamukhassa ubhatosāṅghassa dānāṁ dinnarāṁ nāma \(\text{hoti} \) ti | tattva yaṁ sattussa paṭhamanāṁ taṁ kiṁ kātābbaṁ ti | yo sattussa paṭiṭhāgaṁ vattasampanno bhikkhu tassa dattabbaṁ | pittusantaṁ kaṁ hi puttassa pāpunaṁ | bhikkhusaṅghaṁ dattūṁ pi vattati | sappitellāṁ paṇa gahetvā dipā jāliṭabhā sāṭhakāṁ gahetvā paṭiṭkāro āropetabbā ti |}

How [do we find here the passage which] begins by saying "there are these seven"? For earlier it was stated: "Give it to the monastic community. Gotami. If it is given to the monastic community, both I and the monastic community will be honored with offerings." It begins with this exposition in order to show that the gifts which are given in these seven cases are given precisely to the monastic community. There "to the dual monastic community with the Buddha at its head" means the community of monks is on one side, the community of nuns on the other, and the Teacher is seated in the middle. This is what is meant by the dual monastic community with the Buddha at its head. ... Now, is it possible to give offerings to the dual monastic community with the Buddha at its head after the Tathāgata has attained nirvāṇa? It is possible. How? Having placed an image containing a relic on an altar at the head of the dual community and setting up a stand, starting with offerings of water giving all of those first of all to the Teacher, one must [then] give them to the dual community. Thus the offering is given to the dual monastic community with the Buddha at its head. What is to be done with what was offered to the Teacher? The ritually observant monk who prepares [the offerings] for the teacher shall be given them, for the son comes into his father's possessions. It is also right to give it to the community of monks. Again, lamps should be lit with ghee and sesame oil, and banners should be raised with cloths.

With this we move firmly into the realm of the material, and begin to confront the practical question of the economic significance and implications of the configurations discussed so far only in a rather abstract way. Buddhaghosa clarifies here precisely what it means to make and accept donations to a monastic community with the Buddha at its head, and most importantly how this will function in an age when the Buddha is no more present in a manner which would enable him to consume what he is offered. An elaborated version of this very same discussion is found in Buddhaghosa's Vinaya commentary, the *Samantapāśādikā*.

63 Gregory Schopen brought to my attention the parallel expression *ārhati putraṁ paṭīkṣayaṁ* in the *Chauvasārī* of the Mulasarvāstivāda Vinaya (Dutt 1939–1959: 2.125.8–9), although the context is different. The notion of the son's right to inherit is treated in quite overwhelming detail in the *Dharmaśāstra* literature (see Kane 1968–1977: III. 543–661), but the most generalized notion is captured in this simple expression.

64 Horner 1938: 73.8–30; Dhammagiri-Pāli-Ganhamālā series, vol. 18 (Igatpuri: Vipassana Research Institute, 1995): 235.9–21. The only textual variant is at a), where the Burmese text has *ṭhāpetvā*.  

---

65 T. 84 (1) 904a16–19.  
66 Horner 1938: 73.8–30; Dhammagiri-Pāli-Ganhamālā series, vol. 18 (Igatpuri: Vipassana Research Institute, 1995): 235.9–21. The only textual variant is at a), where the Burmese text has *ṭhāpetvā*.
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punbhaṃ buddhappamukhassa ubhatosangghassa dānāṃ denti bhagavā majjhe nisidati dakkhīṇato bhikkhū vāmato bhikkhuniyo nisidanti bhagavā ubhinnarā saṅghathero tadā bhagavā attanā laddhapaccaye attanā pi paribhūjati bhikkhuniarī pi dāpeti etaraha pana paṇḍitamanussā sadhātukanaṃ paṭīmaṃ vā cetiyarī vā ṭhappavā buddhappamukhassā ubhatosangghassā dānāṃ denti paṭīmaṃ vā cetiyasassā vā purato ādhārake pattaṃ ṭhappavā dakkhīṇopakaraṇaṃ datvā buddhānāṃ demā ti tathā yaṃ paṭīmāṃ kādhāniyaṃ bhujanāniyaṃ denti vihāraṃ vā ahaṃva idam cetiyasassā demā ti piṇḍapātāṃ ca mālāgandhādini ca denti | tathā kathāṃ paṭīpaṭijjtabban ti | mālāgandhādiniṃ tāva cetiyae ṛopetabbāni vatthehi paṭākāṃ telena padippā kātabbā piṇḍapātadhamadhupiṇṇītadini pana yo nibuddhaṃ cetiyajaggako hoti pabbajito vā gahaṭṭho vā tassa dātabbāni | nibuddhajaggake asati āhataṭhātānaṃ 67 ṭhappavā vattaraṃ kattvā paribhūjiturvā vattati | upakaṭṭhe kāle bhujīvittavā pacchā pi vattaraṃ kāturvā vattati yeva | mālāgandhādīsu ca yaṃ kincī idam haritvā cetiyassā pūjaṃ karothā ti vutte dūrāḥ pi haritvā pūjtabbāhaṃ | bhikkhusangghassā haṃ dāti vutte pi haritabbam | sace pana “aḥaṃ piṇḍaṃ carāmi āsanasālāya bhikkhū atthi te ahaṃva saṭṭhā” ti vutte “bhante tuhyarā kālo pabbajito padīpa katabharī saṭṭha vutte pi haritabbam | “buddhanāṃ demī dāti pi tathā yeva viṭṭhaṃ viṭṭhaṭhī idam cetiyasassā demā ti piṇḍapātāṃ ca mālāgandhādini ca denti | tathā kathāṃ paṭīpaṭijjtabban ti | mālāgandhādiniṃ tāva cetiyae ṛopetabbāni vatthehi paṭākāṃ telena padippā kātabbā

The corresponding Chinese translation is brief, T. 1462 (XXIV) 794a28-795a2 (juan 17): 若人將飲食佈施及數, 以獻佛眾次第行。若飯餚食、若飯飯比丘梵食, 乃至應兩比丘、或自布施亦得食。若“if someone who serves the Buddha, he is able to eat it. If there is no monk who serves the Buddha, and there is a layperson who serves the Buddha, he then may eat it.” The translation in Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 524 adds in brackets that it is an image of the Buddha that is in question, but it seems significant to me that the text does not say this. On the complex relationship between the Pāli Samantaṃpāsādikā and its Chinese version see Minzao 1937, 1938. It is true that von Hübner (1996: 108-109, §220), in discussing the authorship of the Samantaṃpāsādikā, suggested that “perhaps three different specialists were at work, when S [amanat] p [āsādikā] as a whole was created,” going on in fact to say that “there is no evidence that the chief redactor was Buddhaghosa.” Nevertheless, with regard to the present passage, its close association with the just quoted passage in the Majjhimaṇīkāya commentary strongly suggests a common authorship.

67 Not noted in Trencker et al. 1924–

Cui bono? or Follow the Money

In the past, [donors] donated gifts to the dual monastic community with the Buddha at its head; the Blessed One sat in the middle, the monks sat on his right and the nuns on his left, with the Blessed One the senior monk of both [communities]. Then the Blessed One consumed by himself the requisites he had obtained by himself, and had them given to the monks as well.

In the present day [in which the living Buddha is not present], wise men set up an image containing a relic, or a shrine, and donate gifts to the dual monastic community with the Buddha at its head. Setting a bowl on a stand in front of the image or the shrine, giving offerings of water they say “we give to the Buddhas.”68 That is, in the first place they give things to eat and things to drink, or bringing them back to the monastery they donate their alms and garlands, perfumes and so on, saying “we give this to the shrine.” How is this practice to be followed?

First, the garlands, perfumes and so on must be put on the shrine, and banners should be made of cloth and lamps of sesame oil.

The alms, honey, sugar cane juice and so on [which are offered] should be given to the renunciant or householder who is the regular caretaker of the shrine. If there is no regular caretaker, [someone else], taking the food which was brought and following [the appropriate] custom [such as chanting], may eat it. When time is tight [because the noontime restriction on eating approaches], it is quite acceptable to follow [the appropriate] custom after having eaten.

When he is told “Taking whatever it is among garlands, perfumes and so on, you must give worship to the shrine!” even if [the time for the ritual] is a long way off he must take it and give it in worship.

When he is told “Take it to the community of monks!” he must take it [and not eat the food portion himself]. But if [the monk spoken to] says “I am going for alms. The monks are in the assembly hall. They will use it,” and [the donor] says “Venerable, I give it to you particularly,” it is acceptable to eat it. On the other hand, [even when he is told] “I give it to the community of monks,” as in the case when he is taking it and going [to deliver it] but time is tight [and he will not be able to deliver it to the monks in time for them to eat it before the post-noontime restriction comes into effect], it is acceptable for him to help himself and eat it.

There is a great deal of interest in these passages, not least the
description of the offering ritual which has, as far as I know, so far hardly been noted in modern scholarship.69 These descriptions deserve their own detailed study, but what we have to notice here most is the distribution of offerings. In a long passage immediately preceding that just quoted from the *Samantapāśādīkā*, detailed rules are set out for the distribution of alms, in which it is stated that those given to the Buddha and the community must be divided evenly, one to one, or we may say, half and half.70 That is, if one hundred pieces of fruit are offered to the community of monks and the Buddha, the community will receive fifty and the Buddha fifty.71 Such a distribution probably would not be advocated by the Mahāsākāra. For them, at least in Tomomatsu's opinion, if we assume a community of ninety-nine monks, a donation of one hundred pieces of fruit to the community would result in each monk receiving one piece of fruit, and the Buddha, as a monk, himself also receiving only one piece, the type of distribution we may have seen implied for instance in the quotation above from the *Chuyao-jing*. Buddhaghosa does not agree with this mode of distribution. When we come to the passage just quoted, however, we see that even the food offered to the Buddha, by way of offering it to the shrine, almost certainly to be understood as the stūpa and the image, is in fact passed on to a monk or monks, or caretaker layman. Here we can see the very similar approach of the Mahāsākāra and of Buddhaghosa and his tradition, in contrast to more radically separatist schools such as the Dharmaguptaka (and Kāśyapīya), for whom such donations may in no wise be consumed but must rather be left to rot. For Buddhaghosa, the Buddha is a presence, but within the monastic community, not outside it. Food offerings are to be made to the Buddha, but these obviously cannot be consumed by an image or a shrine, and thus they are to be passed along to the monks, and most particularly to the individual(s) responsible for preparing the offerings or looking after the shrine. At least in theory the Mahāsākāra would probably not face the problem of distribution since they would not, in the first place, encourage donations to the shrine or image, being more likely to suggest those directed to the monastic community as generative of greater merit.

We may bring forward one final piece of evidence in an attempt to understand the origins and structure of Buddhaghosa's exposition. This comes in the form of a passage from the *Milindapāṇha* that deals with the question of the monastic community's fitness to receive donations. The text's fifty-third 'dilemma,' (VI.3), provides the following:72

bhante nāgasena bhāsitam petarh bhagavata mātucchāya mahā-pājāpatiyā gotamiyā vassikasātikāya diyamanāya | sanghe gotami dehi | sanghe te dinne ahaṁ ceva pūjito bhavissāmi sangho cā ti | āha bhante nāgasena tathāgato saṅgharatanato na bhāhiko na garuko na dakkhineyyo yath tathāgato sakāya mātucchāya saṃyampiṣiṭiṁ saṃyajñiacchiṁ saṃyajñacchāya vassikasātikāṁ atato diyamānaṁ saṅghassa dāpesi | yadi bhante nāgasena tathāgato saṅgharatanato uttaro bhaveyya adhikho vā visiṣṭho vā maṁ dinne mahāpphalaṁ bhavissati ti na tathāgato mātucchāya saṃyampiṣiṭiṁ saṃyajñiacchāya saṃyajñacchāyaṁ tāṁ vassikasātikāṁ saṅgha dāpeyya | yasmā ca kho bhante nāgasena tathāgato attānaṁ na pattiṭṭhā na upanisayati tasmā tathāgato mātucchāya tāṁ vassikasātikāṁ saṅghassa dāpesi ti |

bhāsitam petarh mahārāja bhagavata mātucchāya mahā-pājāpatiyā gotamiyā vassikasātikāya diyamanāya | sanghe gotami dehi | sanghe te dinne ahaṁ ceva pūjito bhavissāmi sangho cā ti | taṁ paṇa na attānaṁ patimānaṁna avipākataṁya na adakkhineyyatāya na cā kho hitatthāya anukampaya anāgatam addhanāṁ sangho maṁ accayena cittikato bhavissati ti | vijaṁāne yeva guṇe pariṁkittayanto evam āha | sanghe gotami dehi | sanghe te dinne ahaṁ ceva pūjito bhavissāmi sangho cā ti | yathā mahārāja pitā dhammadānaṁ yeva amaccabhaṭṭabalamathadovārika- anikatthapariseraijanamajjhe ranno santike putassa vijaṁāne yeva guṇāṁ pakkitti idha āpito anāgatam addhanāṁ janamajjhe pūjito bhavissati ti evameva kho mahārāja tathāgato hitatthāya anukampaya anāgatam addhanāṁ sangho maṁ accayena cittikato bhavissati ti vijaṁāne yeva guṇe pakkittiyaṁ evam āha | sanghe gotami dehi | sanghe te dinne ahaṁ ceva pūjito bhavissāmi sangho cā ti | na kho mahārāja tāvataKENA vassikasātikānuppadānamattaṁca sangho tathāgato adhiko nāma hoti visiṣṭho vā | yathā mahārāja mātāpitaro puttānaṁ ucchādenti parimaddhanti nāhāpenti sambhāhenti api na kho mahārāja tāvataKENA uccchādananparimaddananahāpananāmabhānanmat-

---

69 Rahula 1956: 125 contains the only reference to the *Samantapāśādīkā* passage I have yet seen, but even he does not notice the parallel in the *Mahāsākāra* commentary.
71 For this discussion cp. Tomomata 1932: 154–155.
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If the Tathagata less important, less significant, and less worthy of his maternal aunt reverence than the jewel treasure of the monastic community, that the Tathagata community will be honored with offerings.

Venerable Nāgasena, the Tathāgata had his maternal aunt give the cloth for use in the rain retreat which she herself had dyed, combed, beaten, spun and woven, and which was being given to him? If, Venerable Nāgasena, the Tathāgata were really superior, or greater, or more excellent than the monastic community, then he would have said: ‘What is given to me will yield a great result,’ and he would not have had his maternal aunt give to the monastic community the cloth for use in the rain retreat which she herself had dyed, combed and beaten. But since the Tathāgata, Venerable Nāgasena, does not himself make use of [the donation] and does not depend [on such gifts],75 the Tathāgata had his maternal aunt give the cloth for use in the rain retreat to the monastic community [instead]."

[Ngāsena:] “Indeed this was said by the Blessed One, Great king, when his maternal aunt Mahāpajāpati Gotami, was giving him cloth for use in the rain retreat: ‘Give it to the monastic community, Gotami. If it is given to the monastic community, both I and the monastic community will be honored with offerings.’ But that was not said because of any absence of [positive karmic] result from providing for [the Tathāgata] himself, nor because of his unworthiness for reverence. Rather, for the sake of the welfare of the monastic community and out of compassion [for it], praising [the monastic community’s] existing good qualities he thought: ‘In a future time when I am gone the monastic community will be esteemed,’ and he said: ‘Give it to the monastic community, Gotami. If it is given to the monastic community, both I and the monastic community will be honored with offerings.’ As a father, Great king, while still alive, praises the existing good qualities of his son amongst ministers, servants, military officials, door-keepers, palace guards, councillors and the people, and in the presence of the king himself, saying ‘If my son is’ established in a position here he will, in a future time, be honored amongst the people,’ just so, Great king, for the sake of the welfare of the monastic community and out of compassion [for it], praising [the monastic community’s] existing good qualities the Tathāgata thought: ‘In a future time when I am gone the monastic community will be esteemed,’ and he said: ‘Give it to the monastic community, Gotami. If it is given to the monastic community, both I and

---

73 Not in TRENEKNER et al. 1924– s.v. upajivin.
74 Not in TRENEKNER et al. 1924– s.v. upajivin.
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the monastic community will be honored with offerings.’ It is not, Great king, the case that through so much as a mere granting of cloth for use in the rain retreat the monastic community becomes greater or more excellent than the Tathāgata. Parents, Great king, anoint their children with perfumes, rub, bathe and shampoo them; but, Great king, is it the case that through so much as a mere anointing, rubbing, bathing and shampooing a child becomes greater or more excellent than his parents?”

[M:] “Not at all, Venerable. Parents must take care of their children even against the latter’s wishes. Therefore parents anoint their children with perfumes, rub, bathe and shampoo them.”

[N:] “Just so, Great king, it is not the case that through so much as a mere granting of cloth for use in the rain retreat the monastic community becomes greater or more excellent than the Tathāgata. Yet the Tathāgata, acting against her wishes, had his maternal aunt give cloth for use in the rain retreat to the monastic community. Or again, Great king, some person might present a gift to a king, and the king might give that gift to another — to a servant, military official, general or court priest. Would that person, Great king, through so much as a mere acceptance of a gift become greater or more excellent than the king?”

[M:] “Not at all, Venerable. That man, Venerable, who is in a king’s employ is dependent on the king for his livelihood, and the king, having appointed him to that station, gives him a gift.”

[N:] “Just so, Great king, it is not the case that through so much as a mere granting of cloth for use in the rain retreat the monastic community becomes greater or more excellent than the Tathāgata. Rather, [the monastic community] is in the employ of the Tathāgata, is dependent on the Tathāgata for its livelihood. The Tathāgata, having appointed [the monastic community] to that station had [Mahāpajapati] give the cloth for use in the rain retreat to the monastic community. Moreover, Great king, the following occurred to the Tathāgata: ‘The monastic community is worthy of honor by its very nature; I will have the monastic community honored with [what, by virtue of its having been offered to me, is] my property.’ And he had [Mahāpajapati] give the cloth for use in the rain retreat to the monastic community. The Tathāgata, Great king, does not praise honor done to himself with offerings, but rather the Tathāgata praises honor being done with offerings to those in the world who are deserving of honor with offerings. Indeed, this too was said, Great king, by the Blessed One, the god of gods, in the most excellent.

Cui bono? or Follow the Money

Majjhimanikāya, in the discourse called ‘Dhammadāyāda,’ when he was exalting the practice of being content with little:77 “For me, the first monk [who declines food left over by the Buddha] is more worthy of honor, more praiseworthy [than one who accepts it].” There is, Great king, no being whosoever in [all] the worlds more worthy of reverence, superior or greater or more excellent than the Tathāgata. The Tathāgata indeed is superior, great and excellent.”

Although it is possible that both texts share a common source, the very close wording, use of examples and other similarities strongly suggest that Buddhaghosa’s main source for his commentary on the crucial passage of the Dakkhināvibhanga Sutta in his Papāhācasatidani is this very discussion in the Milindapāṇha. It is established and accepted tradition that Buddhaghosa’s commentaries were based on older sources, and it has been shown that he knew and quoted from the Milindapāṇha, even its later books,78 so there is every possibility that he may have been inspired by that text here as well. (Incidentally, if the suggestion that this is Buddhaghosa’s source here is correct, it is a delicious circle made whole that the modern Milindapāṇha-Ajṭakathā written by a Burmese monk, Thaton Mingun Zetawun Sayadaw, and published in 1948, comments on this section of the Milindapāṇha by quoting verbatim precisely the two passages of Buddhaghosa’s commentary to the Dakkhināvibhanga Sutta we have cited above.)79

---

76 I follow Rhys Davids and Horner here in so rendering varalāṭhāka. See Edgerton 1953, s.v.

77 Majjhimanikāya §3, Trenckner 1888: 13.27–28. Horner 1964: 47, n. 2, states that the reference is to “a monk who, though exhausted, refused to take almsfood on the grounds that it is a ‘material thing’. It is not this, he reflects, that he is to be heir to, but the Dhamma.” This slightly misrepresents the importance of the case. Indeed, the Buddha praises this monk, but the almsfood he has refused is the Buddha’s leftover almsfood. What the Buddha is praising, at least as Buddhaghosa quotes the passage, is the monk’s appreciation of the Buddha’s infinite superiority, which renders his leftover food too pure and too full of power for the monk to consume. This issue requires detailed investigation, especially with regard to the different ways the general principle was understood, but some general and preliminary observations may be found already in Tomonatsu 1933.


79 Deshpande 1999: 259–261. How the commentator came to do this is not completely clear. He himself notes (Deshpande 1999: 1, and 13 of the editor’s introduction) that Buddhaghosa took the Milindapāṇha as an authority, also mentioning two Burmese language commentaries, Milindapathāvivara and Milindapathāhānissaya. Rhys Davids 1890: xvi had already mentioned the existence of a Burmese nissaya, which may be the same as the latter text. Thus the commentator was plainly familiar with Buddhaghosa’s work and its relation to the Milinda, and with previous texts to which I do not have access. These may well be the source of his conception of Buddhaghosa’s discussion with this passage, if he did not make the link himself. The recensions of the Milindapāṇha itself are said to differ somewhat one from another, while I
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However, despite the obvious similarities in the use of the motif of the future health of the monastic community and the example of kings passing gifts along to their servants, there are some quite radical differences between the attitudes of the author(s) of the *Milinda* and those of Buddhaghosa.80 For Buddhaghosa, the Buddha is the head of the monastic community, within it but before it. For the author(s) of the *Milinda*, the Buddha is quite totally other. The text’s position, in this respect, is rather closer to that we have noticed above identified with the Dharmaguptaka school, a stance held also by the Kāśyapiyas. The example of a parent and child is quite striking. As any parent knows, parents and children are not equals, despite their mutual love and respect, and the hierarchy of parent and child cannot be overcome. A parent is not even an older brother or sister, as a kind of first among equals, but entirely separate. For the author(s) of the *Milinda*, too, the Buddha is not and cannot be *prīmus inter pares*, but rather is like a father in relation to his son. Buddhaghosa seems of two minds about this. On the one hand, he clearly accepts the ideology embedded in the expression “the monastic community with the Buddha at its head,” an idea we will explore further below. On the other hand, the author(s) of the *Milinda* conclude that what the monastic community receives it receives because the Buddha allows it, going so far as to apparently make the claim that the clothes given by Mahāpājapati to the Buddha have become his property (*mama santaka*), which he then passes on to the community. While other interpretations, including that of Buddhaghosa, understand that the Buddha never takes possession of the gift, and thus the clothes have no opportunity to become his property, Buddhaghosa still employs in his *Majjhimanikāya* commentary the proverbial expression “the son comes into...

---

80 The influence on the formation of the *Milinda* have, surprisingly, been little studied. Homer 1963: xii has noted an example of what may be Sarvāstivādin influence (cp. also Kawamura 1976), and she has listed in the same discussion a number of what she terms “innovations,” that is “words and concepts . . . that do not appear to occur in the Pali Canon.” No doubt this is an important subject of inquiry, but just as vital would be a survey of interpretations of canonical materials that differ from those given by the later Theravāda tradition. Despite Thich’s assertion 1964: 23 that “It is crystal clear that the P[i][l]i text [of the *Milinda*] as opposed to its Chinese translations] belongs to the Theravāda school,” to the best of my knowledge the relation between this tradition and the later classical Theravāda remains unclarified.

81 We should more cautiously say, for the author(s) of the section in question. It is almost certain that the text as we have it represents a compilation of originally somewhat disparate materials.

---

82 T. 1545 (XXVII) 678b20–29 (juan 130), translated in Tomomatsu 1970: 79–80 (and see 1932: 111). This passage was already noted by Takai 1928/1976: 141–142, along with a number of other relevant sources, in his excellent discussion. Tomomatsu 1932: 111 (and 1970: 79–80) identified the stūra cited as the *Sudatta stūra* in the Mahāyāna-mārga, T. 26 (155) (I) 677c–678a (juan 39). There are a number of parallel versions including T. 74 (I) 881a19–21, T. 73 (I) 879c, T. 72 (I) 876c, T. 125 (II) 644c (juan 19), and the Pāli *sutta* in the Abguttaramālā (ts.20). See also the stūra in the Vīna-pāvīvibhanga of the Milāsa-sarvāstivādins, T. 1442 (XXIII) 870b–871a (juan 64), and in the Derge Kanjur 3, ʻhat ba, nya 87bff. Further study of the significant differences between these versions of the *stūra* source must await another occasion.

Cui bono? or Follow the Money

...his father’s possessions,” implying that he too accepts in some way the allegorical equation of the Buddha with the father and the monastic community (or an individual monk) with the son. The relation between Buddhaghosa’s commentaries and the *Milinda* is complex, and requires more attentive investigation than we can give it here. What is nevertheless clear is that, far from simply reproducing his source, if that is what it really is, Buddhaghosa has taken inspiration from the earlier work, but cast his own presentations in a quite different overall ideological frame.

I have argued above that Buddhaghosa, perhaps inspired in part by the *Milinda*, composed his *Majjhimanikāya* commentary’s presentation of the ideology of the relative merits of donations to the Buddha and the monastic community using as a foil for his own opinion the putative objections of a Mahiśīsaka opponent, whom he characterized as a Sophist. I think this conclusion is correct, but it is nevertheless incumbent upon us to also consider to whom the position criticized by Buddhaghosa might possibly belong, were it not to be to the Mahiśīsaka. Some indication of this might come from an early Sarvāstivāda compendium, the *Abhidharma Mahāvimśāsā*, in which a similar opinion is found:82

此經復言。若以飲食奉施如來、有造僧伽藍四方僧衆、此獲福德果大於彼。以僧伽藍無障礙故。

聞。施僧功德勝於施僧。此中施僧皆先擊劣後擊其勝。何故此中先僧後僧。

答。即以是故、先施後僧。所以者何。若聲聞僧、便不攝佛。若四方僧、則亦攝佛。是福田僧屬僧僧也。若唯施佛、但佛應受、僧衆不受、故福為劣。若施僧衆、僧衆與佛俱應受、故福為勝。無障礙故。獲福無際故。

This sūtra [the *Sudatta sūtra*] again says: “If one donates food and drink to a Tathāgata, and builds a monastery (*saḥgārāma*) and donates it to the monastic community of the four quarters, the latter gift yields greater meritorious fruit than the former. This is because the monastery
is free from obstructions (*anāvarana").

Question: The merit from donating to the Buddha surpasses that from donating to the monastic community. Among this [series of items in the sūtra, the preceding members of which are omitted here], in every case the merit of giving to the former [recipient] is weak and that to the latter surpasses it. Why in this [sequence] is the Buddha listed first, then the monastic community [when, as I understand it, the merit of giving to the Buddha should surpass that of giving to the monastic community]? 

Answer: It is just for this reason that the Buddha is listed first, then the monastic community [namely, that they are listed in hierarchical order]! Why? If it is a question of the community of auditors (*sravakasangha), then it does not include the Buddha, but if it is a question of the monastic community of the four quarters (*cāturdiśasangha), then it does include the Buddha. This is because the monastic community which is the field of merit (*puṇyaśetra) is the community of monks (*bhikṣusangha). If one only makes a donation to the Buddha, then only the Buddha will receive it, and not the monastic community, so the merit will be weak. If one makes a donation to the monastic community, both the monastic community and the Buddha will receive it, and so the merit will be superior, because [the monastic community] is free from obstructions, and because its acquisition of merit is limitless.

Here in this clearly Sarvāstivādin text, the viewpoint being expressed is entirely in concert with the position of the Mahiśīsakas that we detailed above. According to Tomomatsu, this is an old Sarvāstivādin position, in contrast to the newer, later idea of the same school that the Buddha and the entire monastic community are distinct.83 And indeed, later Sarvāstivādin sources offer an opposite point of view. The *Nyāyānusāra of Saṅghabhadra has the following:84

*saṅgha*所施佛何得大果。有作是言。施僧果大。一切無漏聖法種類。皆於僧中具可得故。又言僧是上福田故。又有施主將物施佛世尊勸令回施僧故。然我所施佛果大。以契經說。諸佛世尊證得一切增上自在殊勝功德名最尊故。…所言施主將物施佛世尊勸令回施僧者。此證非理。觀別因

83 Tomomatsu 1932: 111, and 444.
84 T. 1562 (XXIX) 559b23–29, 559a13–16 (juan 38). Translated in Tomomatsu 1970: 200–201. Saṅghabhadra actually gives reasons of his own for his position, and then refutes the opponent’s positions one by one; here I quote only the last of these refutations.
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The Buddha is within the monastic community, but its head, so this community of monks is called “the monastic community headed by the Buddha.” Again, it is explained that because the Buddha is the most superior one among the field of monks, he is called the head monk. Although the Buddha is not included among the auditors (*sīrāvaka), he ranks as a noble monk, and thus the *Nyāyānusāra [of Saṅghabhadra, in *juan 38] says:87 “If the Buddha is not included among the monks, why did the scripture say ‘If you can make a small donation, you should honor in sequence the monastic community with the Buddha as its head. Therefore, [by giving] to the field [of merit that is the] monastic community one obtains the completely pure merit of giving’?” The *Nyāyānusāra interprets this saying:88 “There are many types of monks, namely those ranked as sentient beings, auditors, fields of merit, and noble monks. The Buddha is not an auditor within this [classification], but he can belong to one of the other [categories of] monks, because he awakened to true reality.” Thus it explains in detail, and understanding the matter through this discussion, we know therefore that the Buddha is also called a monk.

It is beyond the scope of the present study to investigate in detail the position of the *Nyāyānusāra on this matter,89 or to explore the significance of Puguang’s text. But obviously there is a disjunction between the position of the *Mahāvibhāṣā on the one hand and that of Saṅghabhadra and Puguang on the other. The development of this idea within the Sarvāstivāda (or even specifically within the Kāśmīra Sarvāstivāda) is a question which should be addressed by specialists in the Abhidharma. We have seen here the possibility that the position argued against by Buddhaghosa might, from the point of view of its doctrinal content, conceivably belong to the older Sarvāstivāda. The weight of other evidence we have seen does, nevertheless, still suggest the correctness of the Mahāsāsaka identification.

Although I do, then, believe that we have succeeded in establishing not only the identity of Buddhaghosa’s Viññāṇavādin opponent, but also in identifying in the *Milindapañha a likely model upon which he based the overall framework of his response to this opponent, it is vital to recognize that there does exist some evidence which tends to make parts of the case presented above less than perfectly conclusive. In the very first place, and most importantly, some strong evidence confronts us in our sole extant Mahāsāsaka source, that sect’s Viñaya. Although we have no extant sûtra-piṭaka of the Mahāsāsaka school,90 and thus no exact parallel to the Dākkhinnāvibhāṅga Sūtra, and despite the evocative, structurally parallel passages concerning the gifts of Bimbisāra and Ānāmapāli we were able to quote from the Mahāsāsaka Viñaya, we do find in that same Mahāsāsaka Viñaya a version of the episode of greatest interest to us here, Gotamī’s gift to Śākyamuni. But there things are presented slightly differently than they are in any other version we have examined. Gotamī’s gift of a robe to the Buddha there reads as follows:91

世尊，我自織此衣。今以奉上，願垂納受。佛言，可以施僧。得大果報。復如上白。佛言，可以施僧。我在僧數。復如上白。佛言，我受一。以一施僧。然後受此。施佛及僧。

[Gotamī says:] “Blessed One, I wove this robe myself. Now I present it to you; please agree to accept it.”

The Buddha said: “Give it to the monastic community; this will produce a great result.”

[Gotamī] spoke to the Buddha as before [repeating her request],

---

85 T. 1821 (XLI) 247b38-39 (*juan 15).
87 T. 1562 (XXIX) 55c4-6 (*juan 39). Immediately after this Saṅghabhadra quotes (or rather paraphrases) the sûtra passage with which we began: “Gotamī, if you donate to the monastic community, you honor me with offerings as well.” The entire discussion in this section deserves closer study.
88 T. 1562 (XXIX) 55c9-11 (*juan 38). Both of these passages closely precede that we quoted above.
89 It is dealt with in detail by Tomonumatsu 1970: 199–205.
90 Mizuno 1970 has wondered whether one Chinese Sanskritāgama translation (T. 100) might not belong to the Mahāsāsaka (or Dharmaguptaka), but this has been refuted by Enomoto 1980 (see 1986: 24–25), and recently again by Hiraoka 2000, who agree in attributing the text to the Sarvāstivādata or Mūlasarvāstivādates.
91 T. 1421 (XXII) 183b21–25 (*juan 29).
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and the Buddha said: “Give it to the monastic community. I am enumerated among the monks.”

She again spoke to him as before, and the Buddha said: “I will accept one [robe]. Give another to the monastic community.”

Then she agreed, and gave [robes] to the Buddha and to the monastic community.

From the point of view of all we have seen above, this is a very odd and seemingly internally contradictory presentation. Why, if the Buddha is enumerated among the monks, should he accept a portion of the donation personally, directing that another portion be given to the community? The orientation revealed here seems, from a theoretical point of view, closer perhaps to a later Theravāda, Dharmaguptaka or even later Sarvāstivādin approach to this question than to what we thought we had established as the (a?) Mahiśāsaka position.92 Examples of later Theravāda texts presenting this orientation may be found in a text popular in Thailand, the *Pathama­sambodhi*, and in the commentary to the *Anāgatavamsa*, both of which apparently recount the episode almost exactly in this manner.93 I frankly confess my inability to explain this framework here in the presentation in the *Mahisasaka*.94 Perhaps to a later Theravāda, Dharmaguptaka or even later Mahiśāsaka, from the point of view of all we have seen above, this is a very odd and seemingly internally contradictory presentation. Why, if the Buddha is enumerated among the monks, should he accept a portion of the donation personally, directing that another portion be given to the community? The presentation in the *Mahisasaka* source the event is not portrayed in this way, but rather in a manner which agrees with the presentation in the Pāli scriptures.

95 Edition here and below *pamokkho*.
96 See above, n. 19.
If this argument were correct, we would be compelled to content ourselves with the conclusion that, although the position of the Sophist in the Majjhimanikāya commentary seems to overlap with the opinion of the Mahisasakas cited above, Buddhaghosa saw things differently. However, things are not so simple. First of all, the item in the Kathavanațthu immediately preceding that we just quoted, XVII.9, reads as follows: 

1. na vattabbari “saṅghassa dinnarî mahapphalan” ti | 

   “It should not be said ‘What is given to the monastic community yields a great [karmic] result.’”

   Yes, that’s right.

   Did not the Blessed One say [in the Dakkhīnāvibhaṅga Sutta]: “Give it to the monastic community, Gotami. If it is given to the monastic community, both I and the monastic community will be honored with offerings”? Isn’t this scripture?

   Yes, it is.

   According to this, it should be said “What is given to the monastic community yields a great [karmic] result.”

Here the text seems to be objecting to a view strictly opposite to that offered in XVII.10. Namely, it seems to say here that denying the karmic efficacy of gifts to the monastic community is also an objectionable position. From one point of view, XVII.9 and XVII.10 may seem to be flatly contradictory. We might naturally assume that either gifts to the Buddha or gifts to the monastic community yield a great result, but not both. But the text here, unlike that in the Majjhimanikāya commentary, does not attribute any comparative view: the merit of one type of donation is not suggested as greater than another. Rather, both types of donation are criticized. Who might hold that gifts to the monastic community or to the Buddha do not yield great results? According to the Kathavanațthu commentary, both of these heterodox opinions belong to the same source, the Vettaḻavādin. And if these Vettaḻavadins are Mahāyānists, as is often suggested, this makes some sense. It is not charity which leads to great merit, although it generates some, but, depending on the tradition, wisdom, or faith, and so on. Given this, it is very hard to conclude simply that these Vettaḻakas are to be taken as the Vittavādin of Buddhaghosa’s sūtra commentary. Had the Kathavanațthu commentary attributed only the position denying that gifts to the Buddha are very meritorious, an idea which essentially agrees with that attributed by Buddhaghosa to the objector in the Majjhimanikāya commentary, we might have concluded that, irrespective of other evidence, the Vittaḻavadins we seek are indeed Vettaḻakas. We might also have assumed that the second position is to be attributed to the Dharmaguptaka. But given the coincidence of the commentary’s attribution to the Vettaḻakas of both this view and its apparent opposite, we cannot identify only one pole of the set with the position set forth in the Kathavanațthu, and ignore the other pole. This is true even if the suggestion that Vettaḻavāda represents Mahāyāna is not correct.

---

98 Taylor 1897: 553.10–554.3. See the translation in Aung and Rhys Davids 1915: 320.

99 For further explorations of these passages see Tomomatsu 1970: 110–116.
But once again, all is not what it seems.

First, it is possible that for the Kathāvatthu commentary which we must remember, considerably post-dates the Kathāvatthu itself and may or more likely may not accurately represent its original intentions, Vetullaka is a term which can be applied to aberrant views of various origins. In Bareau's opinion,100 ”The doctrine of the Vetullaka as presented by Buddhaghosa is very eclectic. These four and five [the two we have just cited] represent the two contradictory positions of the Mahāsāsaka and the Dhammaputta on the merits of donations to the Sangha and Buddha.” While we have just seen this could conceivably be so, it is also quite possible that these negative theses are not themselves contradictory if they are understood to imply a third, not explicitly stated, positive position, namely, one which advocates practices other than charity as productive of even greater merit. Moreover, we may conclude that, first, the Kathāvatthu commentary of the Mahāsāsaka and Dharmagupta on the need for further investigation.

We are, however, not yet quite finished with potential complications for

our hypothesis. In a fourth or fifth century donative inscription from the Northwest, apparently recording a gift to the acāryas of the Mahāsāsaka school, we find the phrase buddhāpramukh(a) caturdiśe bhikṣusanghe deyadharmo ya [m], that is to say, “the religious donation directed toward the community of monks of the four quarters with the Buddha at its head.”103 This is a very important expression, which we have already noticed above several times. Although Hirakawa has claimed that this phrase is a “characteristic expression” (特有の表現) of the Pāli Vinaya and Nikāyas,104 this is not correct if it is understood to mean that the expression belongs uniquely to this tradition.105 The phrase is also found in Sanskrit in the Abhidharmakosabhāṣya,106 different versions of the Mahāparīnirvāṇa-sūtra,107 Mahāsāsaka Vinaya and Divyāvadāna,108 the Avadāna-śataka,109 the *Nyāyānusāra,110 various other Turfan Sanskrit fragments,111 and so on, as well of course as in texts in Tibetan and Chinese. All of this proves that the expression was in use also by at least the Sarvāstivādins and Mahasāsaka Vinaya and Divyāvadāna. But the fact remains that it depicts a configuration probably unacceptable to the Mahāsāsaka, for whom the Buddha is a member of the monastic community, but not its head in the sense of standing apart from that community.112 That is, as the sources referred to above

---

100 Bareau 1955: 254.
101 This is very similar to a part of the hypothesis mooted by Mori 1982: 14 (175), namely that the term viṣṇavāsī is applied to those whose views were seen as unacceptable.
102 Jayawickrama 1979: vii-xii. The text does, however, seem to be connected with Buddhaghosa in some way. Tomomatsu 1970: 64 already noticed the disjunction between the Majjhimanikāya commentary and the Kathāvatthu commentary, and the need for further investigation.
103 Bühler 1892: 240, l. 6–7; Sircar 1965: 422–424; Tsukamoto 1996: 976–978 (Kura 1); Shizutani 1978: 297, n. 232, and 166–168; Lüders 1912: §5; Shizutani 1975: Gupta 85. The inscription and the expression have been noted by Schopen 1990: 265.
104 Although oddly he writes "Pāli Agama". Antarctic research.
105 Hirakawa 1964: 354.
106 Pradhan 1975: 232.17–18, in the introduction to IV.56. As we will see below, in Xuanzang’s Chinese translation the term is incorporated into the verse itself, and commented upon in the bhāṣya.
108 See Gnoli 1978: 14.28; Gnoli 1977: 166.33; Cowell and Neill 1886: 43.11. These examples could easily be multiplied.
111 For instance, in a portion of the Kāśyapadhyāyā in Sander and Waldschmidt 1985: §120 cr3, and in two unidentified fragments in Bechert and Wille 1989: §1468 B2, and §1519 Vx.
112 This point has been misunderstood by Takahashi 1993: 269 (809). (Note also that another inscription mentioning the Mahāsāsaka quoted by Takahashi had been treated much more reliably already by Fussman 1985.) It has, however, been noted by Shizutani who suggests that, while the expression is more at home in the context of the Pāli literature, it may depend here on the Mahāsāsaka idea that the Buddha is part of the monastic community; I do not agree with this.
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suggest, the Mahāśāsaka stance is much more one of equality between the Buddha and the monastic community. The idea encapsulated in the expression “the monastic community with the Buddha at its head” fundamentally differs from this egalitarian attitude. Thus the appearance of this very expression in an apparently Mahāśāsaka inscription seems to complicate the picture significantly.

Naturally, as one possibility we might suppose that those writing the inscription may simply have been unfamiliar with the finer points of Mahāśāsaka doctrine. However, a closer look at the inscription itself reveals another explanation of this anomaly which is much more compelling. As is clearly stated in the initial edition of the inscription by Bühler, but not in later reproductions of his transcription, of the last two lines of the inscription, “the right-hand portion of the twelfth and the [whole of the] thirteenth seem to have been obliterated by the writer of the original and to have been partly rewritten.” 113 Bühler read from the middle of the twelfth line as follows: acāryamahīś (āsakāṇāṁ sādāhakapu) - tēna [ācā]. He added in a note to acāryamahīś (āsakāṇām): “The bracketed letters of the latter word and those following seem to have been written under a line of intentionally obliterated characters.” 114 Having access only to a reprint of Bühler’s edition in which the plate is not very legible, I can say nothing certain, but what is abundantly clear from Bühler’s presentation is that the reading of the name Mahāśāsaka here is far from straightforward. Schopen, in fact, has gone farther, saying that since the sect name “has been written over an intentional erasure, and since the formula [earlier in the inscription mentioning that the merit of the donation is to be dedicated toward the attainment of Buddhahood by all beings] nowhere else occurs in association with a named mainstream monastic order, but always with the Mahāyāna, it is likely that the record

---

113 The question of who did the obliteration seems to me, Bühler’s statement notwithstanding, to be unresolved and insoluble. Shizutani 1978: 167 has noticed Bühler’s statement, but presents it very misleadingly, saying only that the first three and last two lines are damaged. The first three have been, indeed as Bühler says, “seriously injured at both ends,” but this is entirely a different matter from a deliberate erasure and re-writing. Shizutani’s statement (13行から成るが、最初の3行と最後の2行が破壊のほかは保存状態は良好) completely conceals this vital fact. Tsukamoto 1996: 976 is even more misleading, saying only that lines 1–3 and part of 13 are damaged. (In 13 Bühler read only the vowel e and the letter tāl) No mention is made of the condition of line 12 at all. Sircar makes no reference whatsoever to the condition of the inscription.

114 Bühler 1892: 240, n. 7.

115 Schopen 2000: 15. His acceptance of the Mahāśāsaka identification of the inscription apparently led Shizutani 1978: 168 to concluding that the relevant formula need not necessarily signal Mahāyāna influence. (And of course, sectarian identification need not, in theory, preclude Mahāyāna identification as well. As I have suggested in some detail in Silk Forthcoming a, Mahāyānist monks almost certainly belonged to sects as well.)


Buddhagupta’s antagonism for the Mahiśāsaka position concerning the status of the Buddha and donations to the monastic community does not imply his complete rejection of that sect or its doctrines. Given this, we cannot conclude that any Mahiśāsaka representative may be classified as a Vīraṇāvādin by Buddhagupta, nor of course conversely that any Vīraṇāvādin need be a Mahiśāsaka, just because one or two are. It may well be that we will never be able to identify the source(s) of some of the thirteen remaining instances listed by Mori in which the Vīraṇāvādin appears in Pāli commentaries. Even if we were to speculate that one possible source is indeed the Mahiśāsaka tradition, since we lack access to any texts of that school other than their Vinaya, we seem to have no reliable means to trace in Mahiśāsaka sources themselves the Abhidharmic concepts attributed to the Sophists in the Pāli commentaries.

It remains for us here to sketch how and why all of this matters, and what it means. The key to our question lies in the “buddhology” of the respective parties, which is to say, in their conceptions of the Buddha, his relation to the monastic community, and the ways in which he continues to exist and exert authority and power after his death. The doxographic texts whose views we noticed above stating the respective theses of the Mahiśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka regarding donations to the Buddha and monastic community immediately follow these theses which contain the doctrinal keys to their understanding. In other words, part of the reason — or the result; it is hard to say which is the motivator and which the motivated — for the respective positions of the two schools is found in the views set forth by the authors in the Pāli commentaries immediately after theirs. There the texts say that for the Mahiśāsaka the path and the liberation of the Buddha and his disciples is the same, while for the Dharmaguptakas the path and the liberation are different. In other words, the Mahiśāsaka hold a more much more realist and more humanistic, less transcendentalist and less doctriview of the Buddha than do the Dharmaguptakas, at least according to these sources. For the monastic authors of the Mahiśāsaka doctrine, the Buddha is one of them, while for the Dharmaguptakas the Buddha is radically other. This is obviously a profoundly important distinction, with vast and significant implications, but at the same time it is not a difference which Buddhagupta as a Theravādin necessarily feels. For him the Buddha is the head of the monastic community, in it but not entirely of it. While he cannot agree with the Mahiśāsaka that the Buddha and monastic community are on an equal plane, neither does he see the two as radically separated from each other. And of the two, his position is considerably closer to that of the Mahiśāsaka than to that of the Dharmaguptaka on this point.

Among the implications of these differing formulations, not all are abstract and theoretical. There are concrete ramifications of these ideas which apply to the everyday life of the monks and the monastery. In particular, the stance taken with regard to this question determines who is permitted to make use of the possessions of the community, and who to make use of the possessions of the stūpa, that is to say, of the Buddha. Is what is given to the stūpa (= Buddha) also available to the monks, since the Buddha is only one among other monks and the property of one monk is perforce the property of all? Or is the Buddha (= stūpa) radically other, and therefore his (its) property should not be shared with the community? These, in a nutshell, are the basic economic issues at stake here, and obviously they are not trivial. For the Mahiśāsaka, what is given to the monastic community cannot be used individually, that is to say privately, by any one monk, not even the Buddha, but becomes a purely communal property to be evenly shared. There is no room here for special attention to be given to the stūpa. This position is not unique, of course. We recall here the overall relative lack of official interest among Ceylonese Theravāda authors in stūpas or Buddha images, and the Theravāda tradition is of course solidly based on the monastic community. Moreover, in contrast to the Vinayas of other sects, the Pāli Vinaya gives very little attention to stūpas, although we must remember that this did not necessarily prevent or even de-emphasize the actual practice of stūpa worship in any way.

We began our enquiry by asking about the identity of a Vīraṇāvādī. This Sophist suggested that the monastic community be understood, on the basis of a phrase in the Dakkhīṇāvibhanga Sutta, as more worthy of donations than the Buddha himself. We succeeded in identifying this stance with an idea of the Mahiśāsaka school, an identification which becomes more significant when joined with Mori’s earlier linkage of another Vīraṇāvādin position also found in the Majjhimanikīya commentary with the same Mahiśāsaka school. Together with the fact that the pilgrim Faxian was able to obtain a

118 The relevant references are: Mahiśāsaka: Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 15.12, 28.16, 44.5–6; Miyasaka in Takai 1928/1978: 12.15–16, 23.10–11, 35.6–7; T. 2031 (XLIX) 17a13; T. 2033 (XLIX) 22b3–2; T. 2032 (XLIX) 19b25; Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 73. Dharmaguptaka: Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 16.7, 44.8–9; Miyasaka in Takai 1928/1978: 13.7–8, 35.9–10; T. 2031 (XLIX) 17a25, T. 2033 (XLIX) 22b14; T. 2032 (XLIX) 19c4; Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 79.

Buddhaghosa’s attacks, but if they ever existed they seem to have long since disappeared. Perhaps there once were literary sources containing a discussion of them, but these have been lost. We do not know much about the doctrines of the Mahiśāsaka school. Only part of this is due to inadequate sources; careful study of the Vinaya of this school, which according to Frauwallner has been very badly transmitted,¹²¹ will no doubt reveal subtleties of great interest. In this regard comparison not only with the closely related Dharmaguptaka Vinaya,¹²² but also with the Theravāda in Pāli, will be very useful.

It is impossible to say yet whether we should expect that the other examples of Viññāṇavādin objections invoked by Buddhaghosa are to be linked with the Mahiśāsaka school, but we are certainly justified in concluding that simple Abhidharmic analyses will not suffice to locate all points of controversy which appear in our ancient texts. No doubt arcane and abstract doctrinal debates were of great import to many ancient thinkers, but to overlook the practical and the economic issues which they also debated is to fundamentally fail to appreciate the scope of their true concerns. Our investigation above has made it quite clear that disputations also concerned matters other than doctrinal systematics, or to put it another way, that the Vinaya was every bit as much of interest and significance to scholars such as Buddhaghosa as was the Abhidharma. The very existence of the Samantapāsādikā alongside the Visuddhimagga should be enough to make such a reminder unnecessary, but it perhaps bears repeating anyway.¹²³ On the other hand, it is also worth emphasizing another result of our investigation, namely that there is a smaller gap between abstract doctrine and concrete economic issues than we, with our own ways of looking at the world, might imagine. The practical and seemingly comparatively simple question of how wealth is to be distributed has been revealed to entail in its possible answers complex considerations of the status of the Buddha, and his continuing presence in the world after his death. These are, after all, very important problems indeed.

A final lesson we might learn from our inquiry is this: the details should not blind us to the greater overall questions which give those details meaning. Or to put it another way: while giving due consideration of the leaves, we should still be sure, as now, to fully appreciate the Forest.

¹⁲¹ Frauwallner 1956: 183.
¹²² Frauwallner 1956: 182.
¹²³ If anything, the fact that Buddhaghosa has been determined not to be the author of the Abhidhamma commentaries attributed to him makes this suggestion even stronger. See, however, the remarks above in n. 66 on the authorship of the Samantapāsādikā.

120 It is this general problem which Tomomatsu set out to investigate beginning with his 1932 study. I plan to present an overall appraisal of his work and what it can teach us in the near future.
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Appendix

Although it contains nothing of direct relevance to our question, for reference, and since the text is not easily obtained, I quote here the passage from Dhammapala’s Linathapakkasani sub-commentary corresponding to the first passage we studied above from Buddhaghosa’s Papañcasūdana:124

sanghe gotami dehi ... pe ... sangho ca ti idam eva suttadānaḥ saṅgha gotami dehi ti saṅghassa dānaya niyodesi tasmā saṅgho va dakkhiñeyyataro ti ayam evetthā attho | yaddi eva ādinā taṭṭha byabhiçāram dasseti | rājamaññattādayo ti ādinā taṭṭha byatirekatā nidassanāḥ āha | mahantattārā bhaveyyunā ti ānubhāvādāna mahantattārā bhaveyyunā na ca taṁ athi ti | tasmā ti yasmā gūpavisseññhahetukarā dakkhiñeyyataro anapekkhiñvī attanā diyānāma dāpāna labhati tasmā | mā evam ganṭhān ti saṁsām-buddhato saṅgho va dakkhiñeyyo ti mā gαgaḥ |

tathā nīchhayādadhākarā suttadānaḥ dasseto niyamasmin loke ...

... vipulaphalesinān ti āha | svayamattho ratanasutta125 “yam kiñcī vittan” ti gātthāya aggapasadasuttaī126 ca vibhāvetabbo ti | tenāha sattāhāra uttaritaro dukkhiñeyyo nāma nathī ti |

gotamiyā antamabhavikatāya dānasaṁ digharattāṁ hitāya sūkhāya anuppādanato na taṁ garutaraṁ saṅghassā pādāpanā kārānāti saṁcāmīma yanaṁ atīti ti | vacanato pi ti tassa vattathuyassā saththu eva paṭiggahāyāna vacanato pi | tenāha na ki ti ādī |

sattō saṁghapariyāpanno va idīse thāne agarapalāthatthāya atthāraṣṭrapāgalañcāya sace paṇṇasa na sayaṁ saṁghapariyāpannātha kathāṁ saṅgha pūjite sattō pūjito nāma sīyāti adhippāyo | tiṇī saranagamanāṇi tayo eva aggapasadarā vakkhati ti adhippāyo | abhidheyyaṇūrpiṁ hi lingavacanāni | na ruhiṁ ayyāṭṭhavapatipattiñcāya va gihvesagahāyadāna gihvāhassā paṭikkhiṇhitattā | na vattabban atēn sattō saṁghapariyāpanno ti sattabhābāva | saṁvakasamīlo hī saṅgho | saṁghagane hī saṁṭṭhā ṛta tattarato anaññasādha-raṇagunēci samannāgatañcāva mūlaratnatthīva ca |

---

125 Suttapada II, verse 3 (Sn 224) (Cittavagga), Andersen and Smith 1913: 39.11, translated in Normand 1992: 25. Also in the Khuddākāpāyā (Smith and Hunt 1915: 3.36).
126 Īvitakkasūtraa (Windisch 1889: 87.16–88.1. Translated in Masefield 2000: 76. The same is found in the Aṅguttarasuttañcāya (Cittavagga 54) (Morris 1888: 54.13–16).
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