CONCLUSION

Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa was a great celebrity of Theravāda Buddhism. The accounts given in the Mahāvaṃsa and the Burmese chronicles and also the account in the Sāmantapāṇḍikā attest to the fact that he flourished during the 5th century A.D. Buddhaghosa's career in Ceylon was almost co-terminus, with the reign of king Māhanāma. 412-434 A.D. Buddhaghosa's reference in his works to Buddhadatta confirms 5th century as the period of Buddhaghosa's life. In fact the Sāmantapāṇḍikā was translated into Chinese's in 489 A.D. This also authenticates the age of Buddhaghosa as 5th A.D. The reference in the inscription at Kanherī to Buddhaghosa was referred to by Dr. Stevenson and he concludes this name is identical with Buddhaghosa the great celebrity. But the details given in this inscription especially the teacher's name as Dharmanātha of Sāmantapāṇḍikā contradicts the available literary reference to Novata as the teacher of Buddhaghosa.

Regarding the nativity of Buddhaghosa recent studies have shown that Buddhaghosa was a native of Southern India especially Andhra region. Kosambi states that Buddhaghosa was a Telugu by birth and came from Telugu country for he was referred to in the Burmese account as Telēnga. This view is more plausible because Buddhaghosa's knowledge of
north Indian geography is very confusing while his description of Dakshinapadha and Andhra country and Dhanakataka, Dantapura, Kanchi, Maurasuttapattans (Mylapore in Madras) and finally to Mooradakkataka as his birth place reveals his Andhra origin. Prof. Subrahmanya had identified Mooradakkataka with Kotanemalipuri and Gundalapalli of Palnadu Taluk of Guntur district. These two villages have Buddhist remains and they are close to Dhanakataka and Nagarjunakonda. During this period Buddhism was on the decline in Andhra and the royal patronage to brahmincal religion was remarkable. In his wanderings Buddhagbosa became a convert to Buddhist creed and his stay at Mylapore before embarking upon his voyage to Ceylon is recorded in his Majjhimanikaya Atthakata. From very early times cultural contacts with Ceylon and Andhra was a feature of Buddhist religion. Earlier Mahadeva went to Ceylon from Palnadu at the invitation of king Devanampiya Tissa of Ceylon for the inauguration of a stupa in Anuradhapura. The existence of Simhala Vibhara at Galle-Dharmagiri at Nagarjunakonda is recorded in the inscription of Virapurusha Datta an Ikshwaku king of 3rd century A.D.

Regarding the caste of Buddhagbosa Mahavamsa states that he was born in a brahmin family. This literary evidence was questioned by Kosambi and he opines that Buddhagbosa belongs to Gabapati class i.e., farmer community. Our examination
of the term Gabapati in North and South India shows that Gabapati is generally applied to a house-hold head of standing irrespective of the caste. Hence there is no need to doubt the traditional account which uniformly records that Buddhaghosa was a brahmin by birth.

He wrote his first treatise Navkdaya before going to Ceylon. In his stay at Mahavihara in Ceylon Buddhaghosa wrote Visuddhimagga the commentaries on the four Nikayas and the commentaries on the seven Abhidhamma books. The literary career of Buddhaghosa culminated with the writing of Abhidhamma commentaries.

There is strong evidence in Burma for Buddhaghosa's stay in Burma after returning from Ceylon. But according to Mahavamsa he returned to India to worship the Bodhi tree. Examining the available accounts on Buddhaghosa we can conclude that the information regarding his last years of life after his return from Ceylon is scanty.

According to Culavamsa Buddhaghosa was directed by Indian teachers to proceed to Ceylon since authoritative Attakathas were preserved there. The commentarial tradition developed and cherished at Mahavihara at Anuradhapura by the P harmaka Thera's, Banakes, Tripitaka Theras and Atthakathacariyas formed the nucleus for Buddhaghosa's works. His
The successors of Buddhaghosa are very few. Among them Dhumapāla of Kāñchipura is considered to be the most prolific writer of commentaries. Culla-Buddaghosa, Buddhaghosa III Mahānāma and Upesena are also considered as the successors of Buddhaghosa. Dīrgha of Kāñchi who was later converted to Mahāyānism is also an illustrious successor of Buddhaghosa.

The commentaries on Tripitaka, as recorded in Mahāvamsa were not extant in India and as they were available in Ceylon Buddhaghosa went to Ceylon to translate the Sinhalese works into Pāli. Buddhaghosa himself admits in his prologue to several commentaries that he annotated those passages only which were not commented upon by his predecessors and the rest he only translated. In our discussion on the origin and development of Buddhaghosa's commentaries we have pointed out six landmarks in the development of Buddhist commentaries i.e., Suttas, six Abhidhamma books, the works of Mahākaccāna, Kathāvatthu, Milindapañha and finally the commentaries of Buddhaghosa on the above.
Buddhaghosa's works reveal his knowledge of various subjects and his wide range of scholarship. Truly he may be regarded as a polymath. Our review of his works on matters other than Buddhism show that his remarks on the times were only incidental. As he rigidly confined himself to the exposition of Buddhist literature, the mention of monarchs, kings and nobles centred round the time of Buddha and Asoka but not his own age. So also his remarks on administration and justice are only time honoured ones and in certain cases they refer to the contemporary period, as in the case of Mahānāttaśa. However his observations on the coins and currency systems are valuable. His accounts on anatomy and astronomy reveal the knowledge of the times. His knowledge of the country's geography is sound so far as the southern India and Ceylon are concerned but his remarks on North India are based on heresy.

With regard to the state of Buddhism, Buddhaghosa mentions the two schools Mahāsāṃghika and Theravāda and its sects. In addition to the list of sects given in Dipavamsa Buddhaghosa refers to new sects the Rājaśīrikas, Siddhāṃthikas, the Pubbasaliyas, the Aparassaliyas, the Hetuvāda, the Vatullaka the Rainvatas, the Uttarapathikas and the Vejjirīva. A persual of Theravāda tradition reveals that Buddhaghosa's
list of sects is elaborate. Our review of the development of sects in Buddhism can be briefly stated.

Buddhagāosa has attributed some of the sects to 5th century whose thesis were discussed in Kathāvattthu. The sects Vatulyakas, Hāruvadīna, Pubbaseliyas, Aparaseliyas, Rājagirikas and Siddhātttikas in general belong to a later date. Buddhagāosa himself points out these sects as of late origin and the Pubbaseliyas, the Aparaseliyas etc., as derived from the Andhakas in his own time. Further the six schools, the Hemesvatika, the Rājagirika, the Siddhāttthika, the Pubbaseliya, the Aparaseliya and the Vajjirīya do not figure among the 18 sects given by him. The Vatullakas also does not figure in the original eighteen sects.

These were sub-sects and not the principle sects. When the Kathāvattthu was composed, the major principal sects elaborated the doctrines of the sub-sects. The sects later on had developed the doctrinal peculiarities and acquired specific names after separating from the main body. During the time of Buddhagāosa all these sects must have been in existence for six centuries have passed since the third Buddhist council.

In the development of Buddhism two lines of thought stand out in the proliferation of sects. The Theravāda and the Mahāsāṅghika are the two essential schools around which
several sects emerged. All along there existed an homogeneity in the basic tenets of the Theravada sects. The split into Theravāda and Mahāsaṅghika was due to the inherent possibilities of difference in the interpretation of "Buddha Vacana." In the fitness of things the differences in the interpretation acquired peculiarity in the emphasis on the cardinal doctrines of their own. Besides this the differences in locality and society have shaped the peculiar character of the various sects.

The Mahāsaṅghikas, on the other hand have revealed a transitional stage from Hinayāna to Mahāyāna. The apotheosis of Buddha and Bodhisattava and of the Arhat were the guiding principles on which the Mahāsaṅghikas were developing. The early centuries of Christian era witnessed the Avatāra doctrine gaining ascendency in the Bhakti cult.

The orthodox sects were preoccupied over the definitions and classification of Dharmas. The Theravāda and Sthavira-vaḍa canons are full of such analyses. But the Mahāyāna schools do not recognise the reality of Dharmas, themselves. The Mahāsaṅghikas have emphasised the Dharmatā and as a result the number of Āsamkhatas have grown. Tradition records that Buddhaghosa was previously, an adherent of the system of the Patanjali. He is strong throughout his works, in
his attacks on Prakritivāda i.e., the Sāmkhya and Yoga systems which believe in the dual principle Purūsa and Prakriti. He always differentiates the Buddhist conception of Āvijjā from the Prakritivāda conception of Prakriti and as the root cause of things. He distinguishes the Buddhist conception of Nemerūpa from the common idea of Purūsa and Prakriti. He betrays himself nevertheless his previous predilection for the Sāmkhya and the Yoga systems. His conception of Nemerūpa is very much like the Sāmkhya conception of Purūsa and Prakriti.

Buddhagbosa expounded his psychology in terms of five aggregates (khāndas), these being material qualities, feelings, sense, perception, complexes of consciousness or co-efficient and consciousness itself.

According to Buddhagbosa, Āvijjā involves the obtaining of that which is not to be obtained e.g., bodily sin and so on. It is thus at the root of our existence in this world. It is the back of formless existence (Arūpa Sākhāras).

According to Buddhagbosa Citta is that which recognises external objects. Its characteristic is recognition and it is pre-supported by every sense conception. He describes Citta as the element of mind-consciousness in Visuddhimagga.
According to Buddhaghosa, Vedanā means whatever has the characteristic of being felt; it consists of three classes according to its origin, good, bad and indifferent (neither good nor bad) though these are of the same nature on account of being felt. According to its nature, Vedanā is of five kinds, Sukha (happiness), Dukkha (suffering), Somanassa (delight), Domanassa (despair) and Upekkhā (indifference). Vedanā means sensation of feelings, which is pleasurable or painful. From contact feeling arises. In the Atthasarini feeling is likened to the king, while the remaining associated states are like the rook.

Kamma is defined by Buddhaghosa as volition and quotes the Buddha and means consciousness of good and bad. The seven factors of wisdom, like mindfulness etc., may be said to be Kamma, which being neither impure nor pure, productive of neither impurity nor purity, lead to the destruction of Kamma. Buddhaghosa says that volition which is morally indeterminate is without moral result and points out that the six sense spheres have arisen through the doing of past action and therefore they are the results. He further points that the doctrines of Kamma is inseparably bound up with that of renewed existence.

Buddhaghosa says that on the existence of Khandhas
such as Rūpa etc., there is the usage of न्यवेदनम् न्यवेदन। Because of this usage common consent and name, there is the Ruggala. The Buddha described that there are four kinds of persons, he who applies himself to the good of another, not of the self etc. It is clear that no adequate answer to argue, as Keith shows that in such expressions the self is nothing but the thought (Citta) for that is merely a question of phraseology. An individual is nothing but a combination of the five constituent elements or the four primaries and matters derived therefrom. The point may well be illustrated by the simile of a chariot and its parts.

In his Visuddhimagga Buddhagosa explains name and form as whatever state his its characteristic of changing thought, cold, heat, hunger, thirst and so forth. All such states taken together are to be known as the aggregate of matter (Rūpam). Whatever form there is, all such may be explained in terms of the four great primunies and others derived from them. And so the explanation of name lies in the sense organ of mind and the associated mental processes resulting therefrom and this name and the form give rise to the dual idea of name and form. Depending on name, form proceeds and depending on form, name follows, either is powerless and unable to proceed by its own efforts. Separately
they are unable to perform their various functions.

In the treatment of Sīla and Indriya Buddhagbosa refers to four divisions of Sīla and twenty two Indriyas.

Buddhagbosa derives the word Upekkhā as Upapattiioikkatati i.e., look at form the very origination and says further that the word implies, 'looking equally and looking without being particle. He classifies it into ten kinds.

Buddhagbosa describes "Semādhī" as "Kusalecitte saka-graṭe" or concentration of good thought. It is called Semādhī because at that Semādhī all the thoughts are simultaneously and rightly centred on a particular object. Its characteristic is absence of distraction. Its essence is the destruction of distraction, its immediate cause is firmness and its remote cause is happiness. Semādhī has been variously divided according to its pre-dominant characteristics. Regarding the purity and impurity of Semādhī, Buddhagbosa says that the condition which leads to its excellence causes its purity while that which causes deterioration brings about its impurity.

According to Buddhagbosa Dhamma has a very wide application. It is in the last sense i.e., nissattadhamma of the word, that it has been dealt with in the Atthasāliṇī.
Buddhagbosa following the Dhammasangani divides Dhamma into Kusala, Akusala and Ayākata.

Buddhagbosa prescribes a number of qualities to an Arahant. He gave detailed answers to many controversies about the qualities of the Arahant. He describes the Saddhārā-kuṣala Arahant as Panñāvimutta i.e., his knowledge is confined to his own personal achievement and Paradhamma-kuṣala Arahant Ubbatoppabhesāvimitta i.e., his knowledge is extended to other attainments besides his own. According to him there are two kinds of spiritual acquisitions i.e., acquisition at the present moment and acquisition accruing at rebirth hereafter.

Buddhagbosa describes nirvāṇa as a void. This appears to be contradictory but this apparent contradiction can easily be removed if we take into consideration the fact that the Buddhists believed in two different stages of nirvāṇa, one they used to call the savupaddisesanibbāna and the other, anupaddisesanibbāna. The first is reached with the attainment of Arahatship and the second after death. The first is a blissful state and the second is a void in as much as it means complete cessation of existence. So Buddhagbosa when he speaks of nirvāṇa as a blissful existence, refers to the state of an Arahant and when he speaks of it as a void, he
evidently means the second stage of *Nirvāṇa* or complete cessation of existence.

It was Buddhaghosa who developed and perfected the Buddhist system of thought. The explanation of the sacred texts, literary and philosophical is really the explanation given by Buddhaghosa and his school. Some hold the view that the religion of *Sakyaśuni* as it is in vogue in Ceylon today is virtually a creed as interpreted by Buddhaghosa.