The Buddhist schools have had an unbroken tradition of development. Most of the leaders of the schools had received their knowledge from some of the celebrated, disciples of the Buddha like Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, Kāśyapa, Ānanda and others.¹ In course of its progress, a great religion develops and emphasizes certain trends and tendencies implicit in the original inspiration of

¹. Dīpavamsa gives a graphic description of the method how the true teachings of the Master orally handed down from Upāli, Ānanda etc. like this way

paripūno Kevalaṁ sabbāṁ navanigam suttamāgatāṁ
uggahevatāṁ vācesi upāli buddhasantike /
Sāṅghamajjhī viyākāsi buddho upāli paññitāṁ
ago vinayapamokkho Upāli mayha sāsane!
evam upariṇo santo sāṅghamajjhī mahāgaṇī
sahassāṁ Dāsakapamokkāṁ vācesi pitāko tayo!

parinibbutamhi sambuddhe Upālithero mahāgaṇī :
Vinayāṁ tāva vācesi timsa vassaṁ anūnakaṁ /
Dīpavamsa, Ch. - IV, verses : 30-45.


Early Buddhist historians like Vasumitra and Bhavya speak of the 18 schools, all claiming to embody the true teaching of Buddha - 'astādaśanikāyabhedabhinnāṁ bhagavato dharmasāsanaṁ'. Nikāyalambana Śāstra of Vasumitra (Nanjio, Nos. 1284-6) translated into English by J. Masuda - 'Origin And Doctrines of Early Indian Buddhist Schools, Asia Major, Vol - II, 1925; Hiuen - Tsang noticed after a long time of Buddha's demise that on auspicious days the Abhidharmikas worshipped Śāriputra, the Vinayists Upāli, the Śramaṇas Rāhula, the Śūtraist Pūrṇa Maitrīyaṇāṁputra, the Samādhist Mahāmoggallāna, the Bhikkhuṇīs Ānanda, the Mahāyānist Matjusrī and other Bodhisattvas. Watter's Yuan Chwang, Vol-I, P. 302.
the founder. In case of Mādhyamika, though it owes its origin to celebrated phisolopher Nāgārjuna of the second or third century A.D., the law of evolution teaches that later phases are potentially contained in the earlier. Thus to trace the genesis of the Mādhyamikas is to search the religious history besides doctrinal and philosophical background of its emergence, T.R.V. Murti observes that there was, however, no sudden jump from the earlier pluralistic Buddhism of the Hiñayāna to the Mādhyamika. A number of transitional and intermediatory schools and doctrines paved the way for the advent of the Mādhyamika Absolutism.² Naturally, in understanding this process, we cannot neglect nor ignore the most active and competitive phase in Buddhist history known as the 'Abhidharmika period'. It has actually played the central role in the development and propagation of Buddhism as a whole. The so called eighteen schools which arose in this stage and vied for the true understanding of the historical Buddha's teachings express the flower of the struggle of that period³. This is the period when Buddhist order broke into many sects and dispersed over various parts of India. This resulted in a keen contest between the old and new schools as reflected in the literatures as well as the propagation of the tenets of the

². The Central Philosophy of Buddhism' p. - 76.
³. B.M. Barua suggested that four well defined stages of growth of Buddhism. The second stage is called - "Schismatic Period" (395-367 B.C.) to first century A.D. "Prolegomena to a History of Buddhist Philosophy", pp. 42-43. In the introduction of 'The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa' by Th. Stcherbatsky, Thakur Jaidev Singh had made suggestion about the growth of 'Buddhist Philosophy and religion where the above mentioned period is called as "The Abhidharmic phase" and comprised the period "from the Buddha's death to 1st Century A.D.". Introduction., p.-2.
respective schools among the populace, which in its turn again, helped in extensive propagation and spread of Buddhism. Thus the catholic inspiration of Buddha's teachings led in course of time to distinct lines of thought and practices which were broadly divided into two well-known historical divisions, viz. - Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna.4 The frequent mention of the 'eighteen schools' in various sources probably indicates that at one time 'eighteen schools' did, in fact, exist. But the historical tradition about them are uncertain, contradictory and confused. The genesis of the sects as also their inter relationship has always posed a problem to the researches due to miscellaneous undated Buddhist documents, with traditional lists of schools, alleged to have its own cannon.5 These traditions are confused and, at times, contradictory. Some attempts have been made to ascertain the stratification and affiliation of these sects but the problem still seems to be far from clear.6

4. Generally there are three names current for Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. The three names for the former are 'Southern Buddhism', 'Original Buddhism' and 'Hīnayana', and those for the latter 'Northern Buddhist', 'Developed Buddhism', and 'Mahāyāna'. 'Southern' & 'Northern' are used in Geographical basis. But this division is not quite correct. According to J. Takakusu, the Buddhism prevalent in Java and Sumatra which lie in a southern direction from India is similar to that prevalent in the North. Dr. R. Kimura discussed in details in the 'Historical Study of the terms Hīnayāna & Mahāyāna and Origin of the Mahāyāna Buddhism etc. in the Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University, Vol. - XII, 1925.

5. 'Les Sects Bouddhiques du petit véhicule.', A. Bareau, pp. 27-29.

6. M. Andre Bareau has first arrived at a fairly correct conclusion, on the basis of the information available in different traditions. Vide. "Les sects Bouddhiques du Petit Vehicule", (Saigon, 1955); There are different authorities, such as the traditions of the TheraVādins, Sammīṭṭiyā, Mahāsaṅghikas and the subsequently the Tibetan and Chinese translations which gives us accounts of the origin of the different schools. Dutt, 'Early History of the spread of Buddhism And The Buddhist Schools', (Specially, *Book - II - Schools of Buddhism) pp. 109-163, and 'Buddhist sects In India' by the same author.
in the Brahmanical philosophical texts, only four traditions were listed, viz., - the Madhyamika and the Yogacara of the Mahayana tradition and the Vaibhasika and the Sautrantika of the Hinayana. According to the scholars Vedanta schools probably chose these four schools of Buddhism because they represented a variety of positions and could be presented in a diagromatic fashion. Regarding this matter Madhavacarya deserves special attention who remarked on these four Buddhist philosophical schools and their respective views very clearly.7

There are many scattered references to them in Buddhist and Brahmanical literatures, supplying for the most part little useful information on their organisation. The study of either the Pali or the Buddhist Sanskrit and the Sanskrit literature can give only a partial view of them, as such literature embodies the beliefs and doctrines of one or two schools of Buddhism which at the time attained dominance over the Other schools. The followers of each of the schools believed that they preserved faithfully than the rest the words of Buddha and were acting up to their spirit better than others. Each of the schools professed to preserve intact, or make the nearest approximation to the words and thoughts

of the Teacher (Sattka) in and through its literature and practices. D.T. Suzuki opines that the fundamental propositions about which they all agreed were:

1) All is momentary (Sarvam Kṣanikam),
2) All is without self (Sarvam anatman),
3) All is suffering (sarvam duhkham). But round this nucleus of agreement were ranged several divergences of opinion as to both tenets and rules of discipline. A detailed delineation of the four principal philosophical schools of Buddhism including resumes of their doctrines as far as they have been ascertained at present is the object of this chapter. It is worthy of mention that each of these four schools has its origin in the teaching of the same Master - Lord Buddha. So we have to trace their origin from the time of Buddha's passing away i.e. the Mahāparinirvāṇa. Though the first prominent division in the Buddhist Saṅgha we meet with in the second Buddhist council of Vaissali, the example of such dissension can also be noticed in the proceedings of the First Buddhist Council. Even during his time Buddha had to face the existence of dissenters among his followers, only two of which attracted his attention and which were called by him sanghabheda and condemned to be as crime as patricide or

9. There were some dissident aged monks like Purāṇa and Gavāmpati who reached at Rājagaha after the Council and declared that - "susamkāt avuso therehi dhammo ca vinayo ca, api ca yath'eva maya bhagavato sammukhā sataṁ sammukhaṁ patigatiṁ tath' evaṁ dhāressāmi ti". - Vinaya, P.T.S. Cullavagga, Chapter - XI, pp. 290ff, Lamotte mentioned that 'this Gavampati presented by the texts as a cloven - hooved ruminants, is a mythical person and J. Pryzaluski believed him "a deity of drought and wind'. Lamottée, E. History of Indian Buddhism. Ch. - II, pp. 140-143.
matricide. The first dissension occurred at one of the monasteries of Kosāmbī where a bhikkhu through ignorance of the law committed a breach of discipline. This dissension, it is true, did not last long owing to the presence of the Teacher who removed the doubts of both the parties by his lucid explanations. The next dissension originated with Buddha's cousin, Devadatta, who, in his advocacy for more austere discipline, requested the Teacher to introduce the five rules. The Teacher did not agree to it. Devadatta took this opportunity to create a division in the Saṅgha and departed to Gayāśīsa with five hundred followers. The two foregoing instances of the division in the Saṅgha during Buddha's lifetime illustrate that the Buddhist Saṅgha could not keep itself intact inspite of his personality and sublime teachings. We have reasons to believe that the existence of germs of dissension in the monastic order, which though well-organised with precautions against schisms, had to give way to growth of as many as eighteen sects or more. The time of emergence of the schools cannot

10. Vinaya, P.T.S., Mahāvagga, X, 3.1; kathāvatthu, xii, 1.
12. Vinaya, P.T.S., Cullavagga, Ch.-VIII, 1; Jātaka, P.T.S., Vol., I.P. 34; Oldenberg’s Buddha, pp. 160-161. Not only Devadatta, there were always a few persons who tried to circumvent the rules made by the Buddha 'Subhadra', 'Channa', 'Mettiya', Bhummajaka Sadavargiyas etc. were example of this type.
be definitely specified still now.\textsuperscript{13} The first prominent division in the Buddhist Sangha, we meet with in the second Buddhist Council of Vaisali.\textsuperscript{14} Authorities\textsuperscript{15} differ in regard to the cause of convening of the second Buddhist Council. But all the accounts record unanimously that schism occurred a hundred years after the Great decease of the Buddha due to efforts of few a monks for a relaxation of the rigour of the rules of conduct current at that time. The orthodox monks were not ready to allow that. According to Simhalese chronicles\textsuperscript{16}, the

\begin{enumerate}
\item Mrs. Rhys Davids tried to assign an approximate date to the Simhalese traditions, 'Points of Controversery', P.T.S. Prefatory Notes, pp. xxxii-li; According to Prof. Nalinaksha Dutt, the origin of the various schools, not long after Buddha's death, was rather a healthy sign of Tathagata's religion'. 'The spread of Buddhism And the Buddhisch Schools, Book-II, Introduction, p. 109. He has also mentioned following six factors for the formation of Buddhist Schools; (1) Want of provision for the supreme headship of the Buddhist church after the Founder's death; (2) Grouping of disciples around a noted thera; (3) Division of monks into bodies, each of which was meant to preserve a particular portion of the Buddhist scriptures; (4) Elasticity of the rules of discipline; (5) Dialectical differences; (6) Austerities and ritualism. Ibid. pp. 109-119.
\item Some scholars think that the authenticity of the second council of Vaiśālī is evermore controversial than the council of Rājagṛha. In this regard R.O. Franke's name is particularly noticeable. N. Dutt and M. Hofinger do not suspect the authenticity of the Second Buddhist Council of Vaisale Regarding this matter, B.C. Law also has made a valuable discussion in his 'Buddhist Studies', pp. 26-72.
\item There are different authorities such as the traditions of the Theravādins, Sāmmittīya, Mahāsāṃghikas and subsequently the Tibetan and Chinese translations which give us accounts of the origin of the different schools. M. Andre Bareau, has first drawn our attention, on the basis of the information available in different traditions in his 'Les sects Bouddhiques du petit véhicule" (Saigon, 1955). Prof. Nalinaksha Dutt in his 'Buddhist Sects In India', has given a list of these traditions in Buddhist sects In India, Ch. - II, pp. 12-14 & Ch. - IV, pp. 51-59.
\item Dīpavāṃsa, Ch. - IV, verses 47-49, Ch. - V, Verses: 40-43, Mahāvaṃsa, Ch. - IV, Verses 50 and 63.
\end{enumerate}
monks who opposed the orthodox view, were expelled from the Sangha. But they were strong enough and soon convened another assembly, in which ten thousand monks participated. This new group of monastics came to be known as the Mahāsāṃghika. And the upholders of the orthodox view were known as Sthaviravāda (Pali-Theravāda). Thus occurred the first prominent schism, which divided the primitive Buddhist order into two schools and the second Buddhist Council marked the evolution of new schools of thought in Buddhism. This schism was followed by a series of schisms and in course of time eleven sub-sects branched off from Sthaviravāda and from Mahāsāṃghika. These branches appeared one after another in close succession, drawing their names either from local or mode of life or adherents to a particular book or tenet. many

17. The 'Mahāsāṃghika' may be described as the precursors of the Mahāyāna religion and philosophy. Dipavamsa records that the sect introduced ten new Vinayic rules and tried to propound new doctrines. They had a Cannon of their own, is referred to the in the inscription of Amaravati and Nagarjunakonda. They claimed Mahakasyapa as their founder and the language of their Pitaka was Prakrt. The Mahasamghika was split up into i) Ekavyavaharika, ii) Lokottaravada, iii) Kokkullika (Gokullika), iv) Bahusrutiyata, v) Prajnaprivada, Dipavamsa - Ch. IV & V, Mahavamsa, Ch. - IV, Verse - 50, and 63; The Spread of Buddhism & The Buddhist Schools, Book - II, pp. 124-136.

18. It is the most primitive & conservative school of Buddhism preserving its doctrine in Pali in the Dipavamsa, it is said that -
'aggassa santike aggāṃ gohetvā vākyam tathāgataṃ/ agganiikkhittakā therā aggāṃ akaṃsu samgaham'/
tasmāhi so theravādo aggavādo'ti vuccati//
        Ch. - V, verse - 14
The Kathāvatthu employs the term 'Sakavāda' in place of Sthaviravāda (Pali-Theravāda) or Vibhajjavāda' vide. N. Dutt's, 'The Early History of the Spread of Buddhism And the Buddhist Schools', Book-II, pp. 137-145; Banerjee, A.C. 'Sarvāstivāda Literature', p. 3ff; also 'Buddhism In India And Abroad' page 79-83.
of them had their sacred Canons — complete or partial which was written in a
variety of dialects such as Pali, Sanskrit, Prākrit or even Apabhṛṣṭa. It is
generally agreed that the eighteen schools (or even more) were in existence
during or shortly before the time of the Third Council. It is at that time that

19. A very important information has been conveyed to us by Padmākaraṇghoṣa, author
of 'Vṛṣabhārāṇjana', as to the medium of preaching adopted by these different
schools. Vide Obermiller's 'History of Buddhism', pp. 99-100, Prof. P.V. Bapat also
mentioned in his discussion on different Buddhist sects as well as about the medium
of their preaching in the 'The Cultural Heritage of India' vol. - I, pp. 456-461. Vinita
Deva of 8th century A.D. makes a statement like this — The Sarvāstivādins used
Sanskrit. The Mahāsamghikas Prākrit, the Sāṃmitiyas Apabhṛṣṭa and the
Sthaviraṇādins used Pāli. (Quoted from Ōkuma's Hiṇayāna & Mahāyāna,
P.7). This is in accord with the permission that Buddha give his followers to maintain
their canons in their own language:

20. The narrative of the Third Buddhist Council has been embodied chiefly in the
Mahāvamsa (Ch.-V), Dipavamsa (Ch.-VII) and Sāmantapāsādikā, (Vol.-I, in Pali
and its chinese recension, Taisho-1462, Ch. -II, p. 684ab) of Buddhaghosa. It is
even unknown to the Buddhists of Northern India, Tibet and China. This fact is
enough to raise suspicion as to the historical character of the Council. H. Kern,
Mrs. Rhys Davids observe - this council was no general, but a party meeting of
the Theravādins or Vibhajjāvādins. The great Chinese itinerary of Hiuen-Tsang
remains silent on the actual holding of the council. No reference to the council is
made in the yet discovered edicts which the Mauryan King Asoka has bequeathed
to us*. E.J. Thomas is of the view that the accounts of the council are later inventions
of the Sinhaleese tradition. (History of Buddhist Thought, P.35). On the other
hand, M. Winternitz, V.A. Smith, N. Dutta, F. W. Thomas, Andrew Barlow, B.M.
Barau etc accept that the Council was held. The date of the council is generally
given as the years 236/38 after the Nirvāṇa of the Lord i.e. in the years 250 B.C.
in the seventeenth or eighteenth years of Asoka's reign. (Law. B, C. Buddhistic
Studies', P. : 64-69).
religions, philosophical and doctrinal differences arose among Buddhists. 'Kathāvatthu'21, the only outcome of this council, is no doubt an examination and refutation of the doctrines of these heretical sects without mentioning their names. Mrs. Rhys Davids opines, - It is true, alas! that the commentator lacks either the will, or the power to enlighten us much regarding the schools he names. It may be that his superficial references partake of the characteristic negligence of the orthodox with respect to the non-conformist. It may be that his interest is chiefly engaged, not by the history of external movements, but rather by the varieties and evolution of ideas. Certainly the distinctions he draws among terms and their import are often interesting and valuable. Or it may be that, for him, most of the schools he names were mere names and no more.22

It is to be noted that the first epigraphical evidence of the development of sectarian tendencies is found in the As'oka's three pillar edicts popularly known

21. 'Kathāvatthu' is the most important treatise of the Abhidhammapitaka. In 23 sections, of which each one contains 8-12 questions and answers, various sorts of heretic remarks have been advanced and refuted. The authorship of the work is ascribed to Tissa Moggaliṣutta, the chairman of the Third Buddhist Council. It was first edited by A.C. Taylor, P.T.S. 1894. An analysis of the work has been given by T.W. Rhys Davids in the JRAS, 1892. A German translation of the work by Shwe Zan Aung and Mrs. Rhys Davids, P.T.S. 1915, also the 'Points of Controversy', P.T.S., by the same authors, in 1915 and Law, B.C., P.T.S., 'The Debate commentary' 1940, 1969.

The problem of determining the period that elapsed between the Buddha and Asoka though has been solved today by the efforts of eminent scholars, still the information is based on literary sources without epigraphic corroboration.

The Simhalese Pali tradition furnishes us with the information that Asoka convened the Third Buddhist Council at Pataliputra, in order to reorganise the

---

23. Of the minor pillar inscriptions the most important Pillar No. -1 is engraved in the pillars at Sarnath. Kosambii and Sarni. Form the historical stand point these Pillar edicts known as 'Schism Pillar Edicts', recorded the royal decree of the king, thus:

- Kosambiyam mahamat(a) --- (sa) ma (geta) te sa(m)gh(a) si no l(a) bhiye ...
- (Samgham bhā) khati bhikh(u) v(ā) bhikh(u) nīvā (se pi) ca.... (O) dāt (ā) ni dusāni
- (sa) nāmdhāpayitu a (nāva) sa(s) (ia) v(ā) sayi(y)e.

Inscription of Asoka' (Text) by B.M. Barua, edited by Dr. Binayendranath Chaudhury, Calcutta, Sanskrit College, Research series no. - cxxxiii, 1992, page-154. Also vide p.155 (Sanchi copy) and p.156 (Sarnath).

24. Latter capital of Magadha built by king Kālasōka (Beal: Records on Hiuen - Tsang II, 85n, 11). But there is a controversy about the date of founding the capital of Magadha at Pataliputra. From the ‘Mahāparinibbāna - Sutta of the Dīghaniķīya (Vol.-II, Ch.-p. 87ff.) We came to know that it was merely village named ‘Pātaligāma’.

The 'Sūmantapāṣadikā' P.T.S. (Volume-I, p. 62) and the Jaina Sources contain statement that the ‘Pātaliputta’ as the capital of Magadha was founded by Udāyībhadda, son of Ajatasatru (Vinaya texts, volume-II, 102, n.t.) twenty - eight years after the demise of Buddha. For details also vide. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, P.T.S. 'Volume-II, p.278'.

Samgha as well as put an end to heretical growth. In this council, Vibhajyavāda was accepted as the true follower of the Buddha and afterwards began to grow as an institution of faith and culture under the royal patronage. Thus they established their supremacy over a large territory even beyond the land of India. Besides them, those who were expelled from the Samgha fled away.

25. Mainly the Srilankan Theravāda school believed that Buddhism is the 'teaching of discrimination' i.e. Vibhajjavāda. 'The Theravāda school was also called the Vibhajjavāda' (Hirakawa, Akira. A History of Indian Buddhism', pp. 109-110). 'It is true that Buddha proclaimed himself to be a Vibhajjavādin in the Ariguttara - Nikāya, meaning by that, - 'that he blamed the blame worthy, praised the praise worthy, thus establishing necessary discriminations and avoiding unilateral position' (Lamotte, E. *History of Indian Buddhism* Chapter - III, P. 300). Banerjee A.C. Observed - 'It may be noted that the term 'Vibhajjavāda is applied to Sarvāstivāda or other sects as well. It is very likely that the term 'Vibhajjavāda' implied that the adherents belonged to the main sect with some special views, for which they distinguished themselves as 'Theravāda - Vibhajjavāda' or 'Sarvāstivāda - Vibhajjavāda' -- "Sarvāstivāda Literature", pp. 3-4.

26. One of the momentous result of the Third-Buddhist Council was the despatch of missionaries for the propagation of the 'Saddhamma' (True-Religion) according to the will of Tissa-Moggaliputta. Aśoka sent nine missionaries to nine different countries for propagation of the 'Dharma'. There names and the countries where they were deputed may be stated below :-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Monks</th>
<th>Countries of deputation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Majjhantikathera</td>
<td>Kasmīr - Gāndhāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mahādevathera</td>
<td>Mahāsaṅkamāṇḍala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rakkhitathera</td>
<td>Vanavāsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Yonaka-Dhammarakkhita therā</td>
<td>Aparāñña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mahādharmarakkhita</td>
<td>Mahāratthā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mahārakkhita</td>
<td>Yonakaloka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Majjhima</td>
<td>Himavantapadesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sonaka &amp; Uttara</td>
<td>suvaṇṇabhūmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambala, Bhaddasāla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dīvavamsa, Ch.-VIII, verses : 1-13;
Mahāvamsa, Ch. - XII, verses : 3-10;
from Pātaliputra, the capital of Asoka, and ultimately went to Kasmiśra-Gāndhara. Pali or Theravāda Buddhist sources are utterly silent about them. On the other hand, we notice that in the Fourth Buddhist Council Sarvāstivāda school became prominent and enjoyed royal patronage of the Kuśāna monarch Kaniska.27

The eleven sub-sects of Sthaviravāda were expelled from the Saṅgha by Asoka in accordance with the will of the Moggaliputta-Tissa. The expelled monks from the the Pātaliputra first went to Nālandā and they came to be known as Sarvāstivāda in the later days. Due to political turmoil towards the end of the Mauryan age, Sarvāstivadin of Nālandā fled to Nātabhaṭiya Vihāra of Mathurā.

27. The account of the 'Fourth Buddhist Council' are available from two different sources, - one from Simhalese and other from Indian tradition. The Theravāda Simhalese tradition [Dīpavamsa (Ch.-XX, verses 19-20) and Mahāvamsa (Ch. -xxxii, verses : 95-102)] tells us that the Fourth Buddhist Council took place during the reign of king Vattaṭgāmanī Abhaya (101-77 B.C. or 88-46 B.C.). The venue was Āluvihara or Ālokavihārā in the village Methail of Srilanka. Venerable Rakkhita was the chairman. Whole of the Pali Tripiṭaka along with its Atthakathās were caused to be written on palm (Bhūra) leaves after very careful and thorough examination of the original matter of the Buddha's teachings.

The Indian tradition of the Northern Buddhists furnishes us with another account of the Fourth Buddhist council which was held in the reign of Kuśāna monarch Kaniska about 100 A.D. The place of the convocation has been differently recorded in different authorities, V.A. Smith opines that "The council was of the Sarvāstivadin school and the works so prepared were also of that school." -- Early History of India, pp. 283ff; also Dutt, N, The spread of Buddhism And The Buddhist schools", Bk.-II, Page. 146; also the 'Buddhist sects in India' by the same author, Ch. -iv, vi, and pp. 134-183; 'The Sarvāstivāda school of Buddhist Thought' - a article by Dr. Anukul Chandra Banerjee in 'The Sarvāstivāda Literature And Its Traditions'. - ed. by. Dr. Saṅghasena Singh, Delhi,'Department of Buddhist Studies'.

region and Mathura became one of the famous centres of the Sarvāstivādins.\textsuperscript{28} The Vibhajjyavādins had a strong hold in Kāsmīra - Gandhāra region due to the missionary activities of the followers of this sect under the leadership of Madhyantika thera (Majjhantika Thera in Pali), sent by As'oka after the Third Council. Thus Buddhism flourished in the North - Western India before the advent of Kuśānas.\textsuperscript{29} H. Kern observes that Buddhism flourished in North Western

\textsuperscript{28} No evidence has yet been found of Buddha's visit in Mathurā. Buddhism introduced to Mathurā by elder Sanavāsi and Upagupta. Having reached the land Sanavāsi came into conflict with two dragons (Nāga) but easily quells them and as the price of this victory, acquires a mount - Urumuṇḍa; afterwards two young men of Mathurā Naṭa and Bhāṭa provide the money necessary to build a monastery on the mount Urumuṇḍa; where monks can devote themselves at leisure to dhyāna. History of Indian Buddhism, Lamotte, E, pp. 208-210; Prof. Nalinaksha refers the same legends about the selection of Mathurā by the Sarvāstivādins with some illustration. 'Buddhist sects in India', p. -137ff. He writes in this connection, --- 'The Sarvāstivāda selected Mathurā as the venue of their early activities and it was from this place that they fanned out to Gandhāra and Kasmīra and ultimately to Central Asia and China'. -- Ibid. p. 135f. also 'Mahāyāna Buddhism', p. 9ff. also Buddhist Sects in India, Appendix, p.288.

\textsuperscript{29} A legend appears in the Sanskrit Buddhist tradition which refers that As'oka became later on repentant and wanted the monks who had fled to Kasmīr to return to Māgadha. Divyāvadāna and As'okavadāna recorded that As'oka convened a council to reconcile the monks of different Buddhist schools towards the end of his life, to which he particularly invited the monks living at Tamasāvana in Kasmīr 'Vasanti kāsmīrapure suramye ye āpi dhīrā Tamasāvane' asmin;' Indian Antiquiary, 1895, p. 241f) and Vivyavadava p., 399). The Sarvāstivādins also claim As'oka as their patron. Their Avadāna literature is full of episodes dealing with As'oka's life and munificence. Tāranāth speaks of his lavish gifts to Sarvāstivāda monks of Aparāntaka, Kāsmīr and Tukhara (Schiefner, page 38); Kalhana writes that As'oka not only built Śrīnagar but also covered Suskaletra and Vitasta with numerous Stūpas, Rājatārāṅgīṇī, ed. by Stein, M. Vol.-I, p. 79) Huien -Tsang noticed four As'okās topes there each of which contained relics of Buddha. The Simhalese chronicles maintain a silence over this incident perhaps in the view of the sectarian spirit permeating the chronicles. 'The Sarvāstivāda Literature And Its Tradition' (ed. by Dr. Sangha Seva Singh).
India, in the domain of the Bactrian Greeks. The most celebrated of the Bactrian or merely the Bactrian Greek Rulers, the king Menander (Pali-Milinda) seems to have had Buddhist sympathies, and is said to have been converted by the Sthavira Nāgasena. Our only authority for this alleged fact is Milindapañha, in which the date of the Menander is fixed at five centuries after the Parinirvāṇa.

He mentions, "wholly apart from the literary documents, and exclusively relying on architectural and epigraphical texts, we arrive at the conclusion that the propaganda in the period from about 200 B.C. and 100 A.D. was successful. The foundation of the Oldest stupas, as at Sāñchi and Bharhut, may go back to the reign of As'oka, the numerous donations of the pious believers, as recorded in the inscriptions, bear the stamp of a somewhat later period. The production of Buddha images, so unmistakably betraying the influence of Greek art, must have begun somewhere in the same intervals". On the various literary and epigraphical sources it is manifest that in the Kaniska -Samgiti or Fourth Buddhist Council Sarvāstivādins enjoyed the royal support. On the otherhand, emergence of Mahāyāna Buddhism after this Council is now well ascertained by the scholars. Therefore it would not be impertinent to say that the Sarvāstivāda school had a significant contribution in this transitional phase. Nāgārjuna made the main target of attack of the Sarvāstivādins' view in propounding his subtle philosophy.

30. 'Manual of Indian Buddhism', pp. 118-119; also 'Indian Antiquary' volume XX, 394, Questions connected with the period of Greek influence and inscriptions have been treated by Senart, 'Notes d' e'pigraphic indienne.' - III.
of Śunyata, from the Mahāyāna standpoint, and Vaibhāṣikas and Sautrāntikas emerged out by following Sarvastivād view. The Yogacara or idealistic school of Mahāyāna was also an adherent of the Sarvastivādins.  

Before the rise of Mahāyāna and of four Buddhist Philosophical schools, the history of the evolution of Buddhism as a religion is thus reconstructed by scholars with a proper co-ordination of different literary and epigraphic evidences. About the second or first century B.C. Mahāyāna Buddhism became a recognised phase of the religion, and it gradually passed on to Central Asia, China, Korea and Japan. In Tibet, Butan, Mongolia and in the Far East border of former U.S.S.R. appeared its later phase, viz., Tāntrik Mahāyāna Buddhism. During this phase there was no paramount power in India. Many smaller kingdoms into which it was divided at one time or another, did not maintain a position of superiority over others. Indeed no one of them attained at any time to so much as a quarter of the size of the old empire of Magadha. From the death of Asoka onwards to the time of the Guptas, the history of India presents a state of utmost confusion and darkness. The labours of numismatists and epigraphists have been directed to the reconstruction, from such isolated


32. Banerjee, A.C. - Buddhism In India And Abroad, Pt. II (Buddhism Abroad), pp. 183-253. Dutt, N. Mahayana Buddhism, Ch.-I, pp. 1ff.
data as the coins and inscriptions give us, of a continuous chronology and of a connected history. 33 But the field is so vast, the data are so sporadic that the difficulty of this reconstruction is immense. According to Prof. Nalinaksha Dutt the stream of Buddhism, which received its impetus from emperor As'oka, flowed quietly without being affected by the political changes. 34 But the social background of Buddhism after the invasions by the Greeks (fourthcen B.C.), the Sakas, the Pahlava, and the Parthians, finally the Kusaṇas had been remarkably changed. Buddhism at that time, both Hinayāna and Mahāyāna, was of an extremely international character. Buddhist intercourse between India and China flourished in those days, and different ways of contact were made clear. The Buddhist monks who came to China between 148 A.D. and 400 A.D. were from Kaśmīr, Parthia, Samarkhand and Tahia. 35 The Sarvāstivāda diffused the Buddhism among foreign peoples in North-Western India, speaking foreign languages. Gandhāra arts came into existence in the first century A.D., flourished

33. RoyChaudhuri, H.C. Political History of Ancient India', Ch. VII-IX, pp. 353-454;
34. "It should be noted also that the Buddhist religious movement was not affected by the political changes that took place after the Kushānas and the Śātavāhanas. The Buddhist monks and scholars carried on their activities in the solitude of their monasteries and practised the ethical and meditational practices as prescribed in the Pitakas." - Dutta, N, 'Mahāyāna Buddhism', Ch.-I, p. 33.
till the end of the reign of Vasudeva (C. 230 A.D.) continued to exist in spite of its
decline. Mathura was then another big centre of Buddhist art. Quite a number
of cave temples were built along the West Coast of India, and were financially
supported by religiously devoted traders and land lords.

In Mathura and Gandhara there have been found many Buddhist
inscriptions dating from the reign of the Greeks, the Sakas, the Parthians and
the Kušānas. They reveal various facts of great importance for the history of
Indian Buddhism. The details of the Buddhist order under Kuśāna rule were
fully investigated by means of epigraphic records. As the daily life of Indians under
went a considerable change in this period. Even Christianity was conveyed to
Malabar in South India by St. Thomas probably in 52 A.D. As regards the
question when and where the bulky sutras of Mahāyāna were produced, the
sutras contain no information whatever; until now a fairly large number of these
have been discovered and many of them published as well as many of these
can be compared with and cross-referred to Chinese translations.

Almost at the same time as Mahāyāna originated, statues of Buddhas

36. Sharma, R.S. 'Kuśāna - Polity', JORS, 1957, Vol-XLIII, p. 1880198; Mukherjee,
B. N. 'The Kuśāna Genealogy : Studies in Kuśāna Genealogy and Chronology
Chattopadhyaya, B. 'The Age of Kushānas - A Numismatic Study' Calcutta, 1967;
Sircar, D.C. 'Studies In Indian Coins', Delhi. 1968.
37. 'The Indian Christians of St. Thomas'. An account of the ancient Surian Church of
Malabar Cambridge, 1956.
and Bodhisattvas came into existence. It is likely that the proto type of Buddhist statues existed prior to those Gāndhāra and those of Mathura and that Buddhist statues developed from the prototype. The relationship of Mahāyāna Sutras with Buddhist arts has been still controversial. Gāndhāra sculpture started towards the end of the first century B.C. There is a theory that the art of Gāndhāra contains hardly anything which can be considered as an expression of Mahāyāna. All evidences seem to indicate that the character of Buddhism which prevailed at the time of the "Gracoo - Buddhist" art of Gāndhāra was Hinayānistic. The Sarvāstivādin sect was predominant in this area at the time when the first Buddha image was made.40

Though the rise of Mahāyāna is traced during the reign of Kaniska about the 2nd or 1st Century B.C., the beginning of the Mahāyāna can be distinctly traced in the Mahāsāṃghika schools. Scholars like Prof. A.B. Keith, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, T.R.V. Murti, Dr. N. Dutt, Prof. Venkataramanan and so on have drawn our attention to this fact. But the slow gestation of the Mahāyāna within the Mahāsāṃghika schools is still wrapped in obscurity. Dr. Hiramawa Akira opines that - "Many modern scholars have maintained the view that Mahāyāna Buddhist developed out of the Mahāsāṃghika School. But since the Mahāsāṃghika school continued to exist long after Mahāyāna Buddhism arose, the..."

40. Dutt, N. Buddhist Sects in India', (Epilogue) p., 260-262, also (Appendix) pp. 281ff.
the rise of Mahāyāna cannot be explained simply as the transformation of the Mahāsāṃghikas into Mahāyānists. Thus the development of Buddhism, as religion and philosophy has been seen by the scholars through a proper evaluation of the following three aspects:

1. The external history of the order. viz. i) the rise of schools, their distribution and migration; ii) various attempts made from time to time in the Councils and Synods to stamp out heresy and to evolve an orthodox creed.

2. The literary history of Buddhism will throw much light on our understanding of its philosophy and religion. Under this section, scholars have considered the - i) language of the schools, ii) the nature of extent of their literary productions with the ascertainment of their dates.

41. 'A History of Indian Buddhism', p. 260.
42. Regarding the spread of Buddhist schools and sects references may be made to Dutt, N., 'Early History of the spread of Buddhism & Buddhist School's and also 'Buddhist sects in India'; Dutt. S. 'Early Monastic Buddhism' and the Buddhist Monk and Monasteries' Kimura, R. The Shifting of the Centres of Buddhism in India. (Journal of Letters, Vol. -1, Calcutta University) and the 'History of Early Buddhist Schools', (Asutosh Mukherjee Commemoration Vol.-IV) Barua, Dr. S. Buddhist, 'Councils And Development of Buddhism.'
43. The best summary of the Buddhist Literature is found in the Winterhitz, M. 'History of Indian Literature,' Volume - II; Bustons 'History of Buddhism', 2 Volumes. Trans. by obermiller. (R. L. Mitrás 'Nepalese Buddhist Literature' and Narimans A Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism' are out of date and unsystematic). Chowdhury, Prof. B. N. Buddha - Sahitya' (in Bengali). Law, B.C. 'History of Pali Literature, in 2 volumes.
3. Based on the literary sources they have examined ideological or doctrinal development.\textsuperscript{44}

In connection with the external history of the Order it should be noted that Prof. Nalinaksha Dutt held the view that Buddhist religious movement was not affected by the political changes. T.R.V. Murti, S. Radhakrishnan, emphasised on the internal doctrinal developments. But it is apparent that Buddhism passed through good and evil days from the reign of Asoka up to 12th Century. It did enjoy glorious periods at intervals when several stupas and viharas were erected for them.

\textsuperscript{44} Most significant contribution towards the ascertainment regarding this aspect is from pens of Thomas E.J. History of Buddhist Thought, Prof. Dutt, N, Mahāyāna Buddhism, Murti, T.R.V., The Central Philosophy of Buddhism and of course Radhakrishnan, S. 'Indian Philosophy', Volume - I,
But they have to face inhuman cruelties and depredations perpetrated
by the rulers.\footnote{45}

45. The destruction of the Sākyas by King Vişuddhabha of Kośala in the last year of
Buddha's existence on earth, is well known (Bhaddasāla Jātaka, Jātaka No. - 465
The most violent persecution of Buddhists was at the hands of Puṣyamitra Suñga
(Circa 187-151 B.C.). He waged a cruel war against the helpless Buddhist monks,
and announced a prize of 100 gold pieces (dinar Satam) for each head of a bhikṣu;
he destroyed or burnt the Vihāras from Pātaliputra to Sākala (i.e. from Magadha
to Gāndhār). This tradition, which has all the force of a historical fact, is recorded
in - i) Divyavatāna, Cambridge edition -- p. 434; Buddhist Sanskrit Texts edition,
P. 282; ii) Āryamañjuśrīmālākāra, pp. 619-620; iii) Chinese and, iv) Japanese
Buddhist traditions place Puṣyamitra at the head of the list of persecutors. (Jounal
of the Department of Letters, Volume-1, p.19); v) Tāranāth (Schiefer), p.81, dwells
at length on this episode. The argument that the Buddhist monuments of Sanchi
and Bharhut were raised during the reign of Suñgas, does not exoneratePuṣyamitra
from the blame; the monuments were the creation of the local officers, artisans,
guild - leaders and wealthy laity and not of an Suñga king. Among the ancient
Indian princes, the most notable example of anti-Buddhist Brahmanical fanaticism
after Puṣyamita, is presented by Sasāņka Yuan Chwang, Volume -I, p.343; Volume
- II, p. 43,92, 115-116; Si-yu-ki, pp. 236, 290, 326, 349. also 'An Imperial History
of India in a Sanskrit Texts, Chapter - 53, verses 715-718; also 'Gayā and Buddha
Gayā' by B.M. Barua, Chapter - II, pp. 12f. 'History of Bengal', (Ed) R.C. Mazumdar,
I. p. 67, note 2. Besides, Hūnas like Mihirkul-a and Torman, king Sudhanvan of
Ujjaini were cruel persecutors of Buddhism in India. From the records of Chinese
pilgrims we get an elaborate idea of their persecution. Joseph Edkins Writes in
his 'Chinese Buddhism' - 'at the beginning of the sixth century, the number of
Indians in China was upwar of three thousand. They came as refugees from
Brahmanical persecution'. p. 99. Also vide Joshi, L. M. 'Studies. In the Buddhistic
Culture of India', Chapter - XII, pp. 311-322. Dutt, N. 'Mahāyāna Buddhism', Chapter
-I, specially page. 70.
About the rise of schools, their distribution and migration Prof. N. Dutt's work deserves special attention.46

In the Dipavamsa, it is said that the Mahâsamghika were split up into - i) Ekavyavahârika, 2) Caityika, 3) Kaukutija (Gokulika), 4) Bahusrutîya, 5) Prajñâptivâda, 6) Pûrvasâla and 7) Aparasâla and from the Theravadins branched off - i) Mahisasaka, 2) Vatsiputriya, 3) Sammitiya, 4) Sannâgarika, 5) Bhadrayânya, 6) Dharmottariya, 7) Sarvastivâda, 8) Dharmaguptika, 9) Kâśyapîya, 10) Haimavata and 11) Samkrântika. On the other hand early Buddhist historians, like Vasumitra and Bhavya speak of the eighteen different schools, all claiming to embody the true teaching of Buddha. Based on Viníadeva and the author of the Bhikṣuvârṣa grâpârâya, eighteen sects are grouped into four classes as follows:

46. Dr. A. Bareau has dealt with the different traditions about the origin of sects Chronologically. Following his 'Les Sects du Petit Vehicule'. Prof. Dutt in his 'Buddhist Sects in India' Chapter - IV, pp. 51-54 has given a comparative idea about the Buddhist sects. Also reproduced list of the geographical distribution of them on the basis of inscription discovered so far, (Ibid. pp. 54-59) he has utilised the informations furnished by Prof. Lamotte in his 'Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien.

47. Dîpavamsa, P.T.S., Ch.-V, Verses, 103-107; Buddhaghoṣa in his Kathâ-vatthu Aṭṭhakathâ added six sects to the list of Dîpavamsa, viz. Râjagirikas, Siddhatthikas, Pubbaseliyas, Aparaseliyas, Haimavata and Vajiriya, Dutt, N. 'Buddhist Sects in India', Chapter - IV, p. 51 (I. The first epoch). The Theravâdâ traditions (mainly Dîpavamsa, Mahâvamsa and Sâsanavamsa) present a connected history of Buddhism in India upto the period of Asóka (i.e. from the sixth to third century B.C.) and then turn to the history of Buddhism in Srilânka, leaving us in the dark about the carreer of the Theravâdins in India.
I. ARYA SARVASTIVADA
i) Mula-Sarvastivada
ii) Kas'yaśyapīya
iii) Mahiṣāsaka
iv) Dharmaguptīya
v) Bahuṣrutīya
vi) Tāmasāṭṭiya
vii) Vibhajyavādin

II. ARYA SAMMITIYA
viii) Kurukullaka
ix) Avantika
x) Vātsiputriya

These ten schools belong to the Vaibhasika school of philosophy.

III. ARYA MAHASAMGHika
xi) Pūrvaśaila
xii) Aparasaila
xiii) Haimavata
xiv) Lokottaravādin
xv) Prajñaptivādin

IV. ARYA STHAVIRA
xvi) Mahāvihāra
xvii) Jetavaniya

xviii) Abhayagirivāsin.

These eighteen schools, other than those mentioned above belonged to the Sautrantika school of Philosophy. Taranāth identified the different names of schools appearing in the lists of Bhavya, Vasumitra Vinitadeva and others. After reproducing the several lists, he gives the following identifications:

i) Kāśyapiya = Suvarsaka

ii) Saṃkrāntika = Uttariya = Tamra-sātiya

iii) Caityaka = Purvāśaśa = Schools of Mahādeva

iv) Lokottaravāda = Kaukkūṭika

v) Ekavyavahārika = Mahāsaṃghikā

vi) Kurukullaka, Vātsīputriya, Dharmottariya, Bhadrayaniya and Saṃgārīkā held almost similar views. A comparison of the different lists of schools shows that the grouping of schools agrees fairly with one another. The question of historical value apart, this account supplies us the important links in the evolution of the Mahāyāna. Only four main schools need be considered in this connection.; the Sthaviravāda, the Sarvāstivāda, the Mahā-

---


49. Taranāth, Schiefner, V, PP.270-274. For details about these eighteen sects, Bapat, P.V. (ed.) - 2500 years of Buddhism' Chapter - VI, PP. 86-106, and Benerjee, A.C. Buddhism in India and Abroad'. Chapter - V, pp. 74-104.
Among them, Mahāsamghika is definitely recognised by the scholars as the precursor of Mahāyāna religion and philosophy. The Satya-siddhi school of Harivarman is sometimes claimed as an intermediary school between Hinayāna and Mahāyāna.

Yamakami Sogen says: "Harivarman's doctrine (the Satya Siddhi School) is to be regarded as the highest point of philosophical perception attained by Hinayānism, and in a sense it constitutes the stage of transition between Hinayānism and Mahāyānism. But as the date of Harivarman is the 3rd century A.D., long after the advent of Nagarjuna and Aryadeva, the Satya Siddhi School may be considered as an attempt at a synthesis between Hinayāna and Mahāyāna than as a precursor of Mahāyāna.

About the literary history or the development of the Mahāyāna literature with its characteristics form and content from out of Hinayāna was preceded.

50. No original works of this sect have come down to us yet now and there is the disadvantage of having to derive our all too meagre knowledge of this school from its opponents. 'Buddhist Sects in India', Chapter - VIII, pp. 194-226.

51. We know very little about Harivarman and his school. There is extant a biography of Harivarman written by Huien-Tsang in the Seventh century. (Ho-Li-Po-Mo, Ch'uan quoted in Chu-San-Tsang-Chi-Chi, II, Taisho, Volume - LV, pp. 78b-79b.) Some scholars estimate Harivarman's date as 263 A.D. For the rise of Satya-Siddhi schools, vide Rhys-Davids T.W. Schools of Buddhist Beliefs' JRAS, 1892, PP.1-38; Dutt, N. 'Introduction To Evolution of the Schools of Buddhism', 'Journal of the Department of Letters', University of Calcutta, 3, 1920, pp. 247-266, Lamotte, E. 'Histoire due Bouddhisme Indien', p. 518. Sogen Y. Systems of Buddhist Thought, Ch.-IV, pp. 172-185.

52. This remark has been quoted by T.R.V. Murti, in his 'The Central Philosophy of Buddhism'. p. 82 from Nalinaksha Dutt's 'Aspects of Mahāyāna .....' p.65.
by a stage of transition. There are considerable literary works which contain
elements of both, Hinayāna and Mahāyāna at the same time. There are however,
definite traces that Bhagavan Buddha had at the back of his mind the
philosophical outlook. Prof. Keith, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Prof. Venakataramanan,
'Bhikkhu Īnānānanda, T.R.V., Murti and several other scholars had drawn our
attention to this fact and Prof. Nalinaksha Dutta has discussed the matter with
textual citation from different Nikāya texts. Apart from the scattered instances,
as collected by him, there is one sutta in the Majjhima Nikāya called the
Ariyapariyesanā Sutta (No. 26), which has almost verbatim similarity with the
'Ajnāta - Kauṇḍinya Jātaka' of the Mahāvastu, a text of the Lokottara vādins -
an off-shoot of the Mahāsāṃghika, the precursor of Mahāyāna, deserves special
attention.

53. 1) 'Mulapariyaya Sutta', Majjhima Nikāya, P.T.S. Volume - I, Sutta No. -1,
   2) Algaddupama - Sutta, Ibid. Sutta No. 22;
   3) 'Aggi-vacchagotta Sutta', Ibid. Sutta No. - 72; 'Kevaṭṭha - Sutta' Dīghanikāya,
P.T.S., Volume - I, Sutta No. -11. For details, vide 'Mahāyāna Buddhism' pp. 71-75,
   Besides these he has referred so many passages from Majjhima & Sāryutta
   Nikāya as well as Dhammapada, Suttani-pāṭha, Milindapaṭṭha, Ma.hāvatthu etc.

54. Ibid, pp. 75-78.

55. The Mahāvastu (Ed. by Senart, Paris. 1892-97) claims to be the Vinaya of the
   Lokottaravādins belonging to the Mahāsāṃghikas. This is a volume of epic
   proportions written in easy, fluent Mixed Sanskrit. It belongs to the class of literature
called Avadāna, moral stories. It is a veritable store house of Jātakas, edifying
   stories and dogmatic Sūtras. Buddha is treated as God who had descended into
   the world and who underwent penance etc. as a sort of make-believe. To some
   extent the Mahāvastu also anticipates the Mahāyāna spiritual discipline, especially
   its conception of the ten bhūmis of the Bodhisattva. Winternitz, M. History of Indian
   Literature, Volume - II, pp. 214 - 220.
Hinayānism and Mahāyānism, with the Lalitavistara, Avadāna literature as well as the works of Āśvaghoṣa. T.R.V. Murti has pointed out three distinguishing features of Mahāyāna in those texts as follows:

1. The conception of the supermundane Personality of Buddha (Lokottara) as the essence of phenomena;

2. The Bodhisattva ideal of salvation for all beings, as against the private and selfish salvation for oneself of the Śrāvakāyana, and the attainment of full Buddhahood instead of Arhatship.

3. The metaphysics of Śuniṭā Absolutism - instead of a radical pluralism.

56. Lalitavistara (first ed by R.L. Mitra, Bibliotheca Indica, and S. Lefman, I. Volumes, Halle) thogh strictly belonging to the Dharmagupta sect a branch of the Sarvāstivada, it is, in style and content, a Vaipulya Sūtra of the Mahāyāna, and has been considered as one of the Nine Dharmas along with such works as Suddhārtha Pūḍḍārika, Āgastāhasrīkā, Lāṅkāvatārā etc. The precise date of this work is uncertain. Ibid. pp. 220-228.

57. Special mention may be made of Avadāna - Śataka and Divyāvadāna. Avadāna - Śataka was edited by Dr. J. S. Speyer of Leiden University (Holland) and published in the Bibliotheca Buddhica-III, in 1906-9 (ed) Avadāna Śatakam, P.L. Vaidya Introduction, pp. IX-XII, Ibid. pp. 243-258.

58. Āśvaghoṣa - was contemporary of Kaṇiṣṭha-I. About the date of Kaṇiṣṭha, some scholars continue to adhere to an earlier date (A.D. 78 or even 58 B.C.) and others favour the beginning of the 2nd Century, A.D. For the date of Kaṇiṣṭha, 'The Kushāṇa Genealogy', B.N. Mukherjee, Chapter - II, pp. 48ff. Āśvaghoṣa is the author of Buddha Carita, Saurdarāṇānda and Śrāṇgputraprakaraṇa, besides many lyrical poems. To Āśvaghoṣa is attributed the 'Mahāyāna-Sraddhotpāda', wholly lost in Sanskrit but preserved in Chinese only and translated therefrom by Suzuki D.T. and Richard, T. as 'The Awakening of Faith.' It is to be noted that there is no reference to this book in any Mahāyāna work. Probably this is the work of Āśvaghoṣa-II, (5th Century. A.D.). Kimurla, R. 'Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna', pp. 41,84 etc. also vide. History of Indian Literature volume - II, pp. 229-243.
of ultimate elements.\textsuperscript{59} Prof. N. Dutta has given a brief comparative list regarding this point.\textsuperscript{60} With the Prajñāpāramitās\textsuperscript{61} an entirely new phase of Buddhism begins. The Prajñāpāramitās revolutionised Buddhism, in all aspects of its philosophy and religion. Prof. N. Dutta explains with a thorough textual analysis that the Prajñāpāramitās are not innovations. They can and do claim to expound the deeper, profounder teachings of Buddha. The fourteen avyākṛta (inexpressibles) of Buddha receive their significant interpretation here. The Prajñāpāramitās constitute the principal basis of the Madhyamika school. Prof. N. Dutt considers that the Prajñāpāramita had its origin in Kāśmīr after the death of Kanishka and before the advent of Christ.\textsuperscript{62} From the graphic and biased description of the Dīpavamsa, we get an idea of the revolutionary nature of the

\textsuperscript{59} The Central Philosophy of Buddhism', P. 76.
\textsuperscript{60} 'Mahāyāna Buddhism', pp. 80-82.
\textsuperscript{61} The most important and most esteemed of all 'philosophical Mahāyāna Sūtras are, however, the 'Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra' - "Sūtras on Perfection of Wisdom'. These deal with the six 'Perfections' (Pāramitās) of a Bodhisattva, but particularly with 'Prajñā' or 'Wisdom', the highest perfection. The works differ in vol.. The biggest one has 125000 stanzas and there are others that contain only a few syllables. As a matter of fact there have been a current number of Prajñāpāramitās in Tibet, China and India of various sizes varying from one of 1,25000 slokas to that of a few syllables (svalpāksara), upto the extent that one Bhagavati-Prajñāpāramitā - Sarva-Tathāgata-mato-Ekāksare in which the work has its content reduced to one a single syllable. 'History of Indian Literature, volume - II, pp. 283-292, 327-330, specially the notes (656a-683) are very important regarding this texts where the details informations about modern works on various types of Prajñāpāramitā manuscripts - its editions, translations and new interpretations are enlisted.

\textsuperscript{62} Dutt, N. 'Notes on the Prajñāpāramitā in Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism', London 1930 (Calcutta Oriental Series No. 23), p. 323 ff, also pp. 39f. and p. 328 where the date of the Astasahasrika is given as the 1st century B.C.
method of the Mahāsāṃghikas and their creation of new canons. It is said to have over-turned religion and 'broken up the scriptures", "distorted the sayings of the Nikāyas" and "destroyed the spirit of Buddha's teaching." Thus they introduced a new method of Buddha's teaching besides the practices of dasavatthuni. On the Mahāsāṃghika side, the complaint was that the Sthavira were literists and did not understand the deeper and truer meaning of scriptures. Thus the movement started after a century of Buddhas's demise reached its culmination between the 1st Century B.C. to 2nd Century A.D. with the development of the doctrine in a mystical, theological and devotional way in the Prajñāpāramitā literature.

The evolution and development of ideological and doctrinal ideas from Hinayāna to mahāyāna stage has been very systemetically chalked out by Prof. Nalinaksha Dutt in his 'Mahāyāna Buddhism with special references to the following aspects:

1. Daśabhūmi or Pre-Bodhisattva stage. (Chapter -IV, pp. 83-135)

2. Conception of Kāya: (Chapter -V, pp. 136-170)

63. Mahasāṃghikā. bhikkhu-vilomaṃ akāṃsu Sāsanaṃ,
      bhinditvā mūlasāṃghahamānīṃ akāṃsu samgāhaṃ,
      aṭṭhattha samgāhaṭtam suttam aṭṭhattha akāṃsu u te,
      attām dhammaṃ cā bhindiṃsu ye nīkāyesu pāṇḍitaṃ /
      pariyāya ca ēpi ............. /
      nāmaṃ liṅgam parikkhāraṃ ākappakaraṇāni ca
      pakatibhāvam vijahetvā taṁ ca aṭṭhām akāṃsu te/
      Dīpavamsa, Ch-V, Verses 32-38.
3. Exposition of Nirvāṇa: (Chapter-V, pp. 171-243)

4. Conception of Truth: (Chapter-VII, pp. 244-276)

5. Conception of Absolute: (Chapter-VIII, pp. 277-281)

His previous and contemporaneous scholars also hold the view with less or more alternations that the seven sects headed by the Mahāsanghikas held semi-Mahāyānic views, paving the way for the advent of Mahāyānam. They conceived Buddha as super-human and even super-divine. Their Buddha's Kāya conceptions were vague and was in a nascent form. The Sautrantikas and the Harivarman's Satyasiddhisāstra held views simply midway between Hinayāna & Mahāyāna. The main point of difference between them seems to have been on the question of the attainment of Buddhahood. T.R.V. Murti writes with citations from several canonical, non-canonical as well as modern works regarding this issue in the following way: "The beginnings of the Mahāyāna can be distinctly traced in the Mahāsanghika schools which seceded from the Sthaviravāda at the Second Council held at Vaiśālī. The doctrinal differences attributed to this influential and progressive section of Buddhism by Vasumitra, Bhavya and others leave little doubt that they were evolving the Buddha-kāya conception, the Bodhisattva ideal and Buddhabhakti. By implication, they had some vague notion of an underlying reality as the ground of the changing phenomena. It was natural for them to identify this reality with the Thāgata whom they considered as Lokottara (Supremundane, transcendent) and divine. These undeveloped notions mark the incipient stages of the Mahāyāna.
Buddhalogy, Sūnyatā and Bodhisattva ideal which are fully developed in the Prajñāpāramitā and other Mahāyāna treatises. It is to be noted that the so many sanskrit works of Buddhism belong to the Mahāyāna but it does not

65. T.R.V. Murti quoted from Kimura; Hīnayāna & Mahāyāna; pp. 86-7: “If we look at the Nikāyabheda - dharmamati cakra śāstra (or I-Pu-tsun-lun-lun) of Vasumitra, we come across the following pasages: ‘The fundamental and common doctrines of the Mahāsāṅghika, the Ekavyāvahārika, the Lokottaravāda and the Kaukkutikā schools’. The four schools unanimously maintained that (1) the Blessed Buddhas are all supermundane (lokottara). (2) The Tathāgatas have no worldly attributes (Sāsrava dharmas). (3) The words of Tathāgatas are all about the Turning of the wheel of Law (dharma-cakrapravartana). (4) Buddha preaches all doctrines (dharma) with one utterance. (5) In the teachings of Bhagavan (Buddha) there is nothing that is not in accordance with the Truth. (6) The physical body (rupa-kāya) of Tathāgata is limitless. (7) The majestic powers of Tathāgata also are limitless. (8) Lives of Buddhas too are limitless. (9) The Buddha is never tried to enlightening living beings and awakening pure faith in them etc. The Central Philosophy’, p. 80. also vide pp. 81 ff for the part played by some philosophical schools in this transitional phase notably Vatsīputrīyas, Sautrāntikas and ‘Satyasiddhi’ of Harivarman.

66. The most important works of the Mahāyāna are the following nine: 1) Aṣṭasahasrikā-prajñāpāramitā, 2) Gaṇḍavyūha, 3) Daśabhūmikāvara, 4) Samādhīrāja, 5) Laṅkāvatāra, 6) Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, 7) Tathāgataguhya, 8) Lalitavistara, 9) Suvarṇaprabhāsā. The Prajñāpāramitā deals with six perfections. The Gaṇḍavyūha celebrates the Bodhisattva Mahāsattā, and teaches the doctrines of Sūnyatā, dharmakāya and the redemption of the world by bodhisattvas. The Daśabhūmikāvara details the ten stages by which Buddhahood is reached. Samādhīrāja, or the king of meditations, is a dialogue describing the various stages of contemplation through which a bodhisattva can attain the highest enlightenment. The Laṅkā-vatāra-Sūtra describes the Yogācārā views. The Saddharmapuṇḍarīka makes Buddha a god above gods, an exalted being who has lived for countless ages and will live for ever. According to it every man can become a Buddha who has heard his preaching and performs meritorious act. Even those who adores relics and erects stupas attain the highest enlightenment. Tathāgataguhya begins with the prescription for different classes of meditation, but immediately passes on to teach all sorts of mysterious figures spells that are obligatory for worship of the Buddha. Lalitavistara, as its title signifies, gives a detailed account of the sports of Buddha. It looks upon the life-work of Buddha as a diversion of the supreme being. The contents of Suvarṇaprabhāsa are partly
truly possess any canon like Hinayana, since it could not be claimed as a "homogenous sect." But a Chinese text translated by Huen-Tsang mentions one Bodhisattva pitaka Vinayapitaka and Abhidharmapitaka and a number of Mahayanasutras. From the above discussion it is reflected that the tendencies that developed during the period from Asoka to Kaniska (3rd Century B.C. - 1st Century A.D.) became explicit and thereafter from the Mahayana Buddhism. It introduced and established a 'neo-Buddhism' with a system of new concepts and a new outlook on the aim and purpose of spiritual life. It did not produce sects, but schools of philosophy in which there was a complete reorientation of interest from outward observances to the inner contemplative life. To the Mahayaniist thinking, the Vinaya had an use and significance different from what the Theravada conceived. Therefore a Mahayaniist Bhiksu is not one who belongs to a Mahayana order in the sense of a separate religious corroboration, philosophical and partly legendary. It deals also with tantra ritual. Noriman, Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism, Mitra, R.L. Nepalese Buddhist Literature', Radhakrishnan, S. History of Indian Philosophy, (Vol.-I); Winternitz, M.HIL, Vol-II, pp. 259ff. Authors of those above mentioned texts are unknown. They are collectively called 'Nine Dharmas' or 'Vaipuly Sutra' or 'Mahavaipulya Sutra' in Nepal. A formal religious sanctity is accorded to these nine books there. Besides these, there are so many Mahayana texts written by well-know Mahayana masters and poets. Vide Ibid., Winternitz. p. 288ff.

67. S. Radhakrishnan in 'Indian Philosophy', Volume -I, p. 585 also vide History of Indian Literature, p:259f.

but simply one who, observing in fundamentals the same monastic discipline as a Hinayāṇa monk, devotes himself to the study and practice of Mahāyāṇa sutras. Out of its emphasis on Bhakti (devotion) as fundamental in the religion, the Mahayana evolved an elaborate ritualism of Puja (Worship), but by-passed the ancient Vinaya.70 We shall notice here the geneal philosophical principles of Mahāyāṇa, postponing to a later section a detailed discussion of its two important schools - the Mādhyamika and the Yogācāra.

As already observed that with the decline of the Sthaviravādins in India Sarvāstivāda school bore brunt of the battle against Mahāyānists and held the most important position in popularity, expansion and philosophical views among the schools of Buddhist thought. The tendencies of the speculative systems of Buddhism, though they were long in existence, were formulated and codified only after the time of Kaniska. The systems of Hindu thought criticise these schools, thus indicating that the latter belong to a period earlier than the Hindu systems themselves. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan refers an approximate date of their origin. According to him - 'We shall not be far wrong if we assign them to the second century A.D. though some of the more distinguished exponents of this or that school may belong to a later era. In the third century after Buddha's death the Vaibhāṣikas came into prominence, and the Sautrantikas in the fourth century after his death. The Mādhyamikas, according to Āryadeva came into

existence five hundred years after Buddha's death. Asaṅga, the founder of the Yogācāra school, is at least as late as the third century A.D. Buddhist philosophic thought reached its most vigorous life in the fifth sixth and seventh Centuries.71

Our information regarding the external history of Buddhism from the second to the eighth century A.D. is very fragmentary. However, the information supplied by Hiuen-Tsang though scanty is not entirely to be disregarded when he stayed in India i.e. in the seventh century A.D., the four philosophical schools of the Vaibhāśikas, Sautrāntikas, Yogācāras and Mādhyamikas had already reached their full development. The former two clung to the Hinayāna party; the latter two supported the tendencies of the Mahāyāna. With regard to the condition and the peculiarities of the two great parties during this period we possess very contradictory indications. Because, the mighty champions like Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Bhānagā, Gunabhadra, Sthiramati, Dharmapāla, Śilabhadra, Jayasena, Candrāgomin, Candrakīrti, Gōnāmati, Vasumitra, Vāsommata, Bhavya Buddhapālita, Prajñākaramati etc. were partly Hinayanists and partly Mahayanists.72 Therefore, it is not easy to label them as adherent to a particular school. However, the reputed founder of the Mādhyamika school is Nāgarjuna, whereas his contemporary kumāralabdha is said to be the originator of the Sautrāntika system. The school of Vaibhāśika was illustrated by the Śadgata Dharmatrāta, Ghoṣaka, Buddhadeva and Vasumitra. Asaṅga, originally an

71. Indian Philosophy, Volume-I, P. 613.
72. Kern, H. Manual of Indian Buddhism 128ff for the scholastic activities during this particular period by those above mentioned philosophers.
adherent of the semi-orthodox Mahāśākas, became in course of time a convert to the Mahāyāna and also was regarded as a founder of Yogācāra school of philosophy.

THE VAIBHĀSIKA

The appellation of vaibhāsika was given to this speculative school of Buddhism attached to the Hinayāna by the Hindu philosophers in view of the fact that its doctrines were completely based upon the Viśvaśāstra on Commentarial literature. The Vaibhāsika, formerly known as Sarvāstivāda, first came into prominence in the first century A.D. during the fourth Buddhist Council patronized by the Kusana monarch Kaniska. The "Samayabheda paracakram aśamgrahanāma"73 of the Vasumitra records that the Sarvāstivāda arose out of the Theravāda in the third century after Buddha’s demise. Bhavyavinafeadeva and I-tsing also corroborate this date.74 But the Dīpavamsa records that the Sarvāstivāda issued out of the Mahāśākas, a branch of the Theravāda.75 In later times, the so-called Vaibhāsikas came to be identified

73. Preserved in Tibetan translation. Banerjee, A.C., Buddhism In India And Abroad, Page-86.
74. Ibid.
75. Visuddhatheravādamhi puna bheda ajāyathā;
   Mahīmsāsakā Vajjīputtakā duvidhā bhijitha bhikkhavo /
   Ch. - V, Verse - 45
   Mahīmsāsakānāṃ dve bheda aparākālamhi jāyathā;
   Sabbatthavādā Dhammaguttā duvidhā bhijitha bhikkhavo./
   - Ibid. Verse - 47
with the Sarvāstivadins and the two names became mutually interchangeable, although properly speaking, the Sarvāstivadins originally formed a section of the Vaibhāsikas. The Sarvāstivadins also claimed king Kaniska as their great patron. He used to read Buddhist scriptures with a monk but was much puzzled at the conflicting interpretations of the different sects. He convened a council to reconcile the varying opinions of the different sects and to restore Buddhism to eminence and to have the Tripitaka explained according to the tenets of the various schools. Monks of different sects participated in the council - the Sarvāstivādins of course, forming majority. Monks assembled there settled the texts of the canonical literature and also composed extensive commentaries on the Sūtra, Vinaya and Abhidharma texts. They are known as upadesāstra, Vinayavibhāsāstra and Abhidharma vibhāsāstra respectively. The seven Abhidharma texts of the Sarvastivādins are:

i) Viśnuprasthānasūtra of Arya Kātyāyanīputra,

ii) Sangītiparyaya of Mahākausthila,

iii) Prakaraṇapāda of Sthavira Vasumitra,

iv) Viśnunakāya of Sthavira Devasarma,

v) Dhātukāya of Purṇa

vi) Dharmakāya of Ārya Sāriputra

vii) Prajñaptisāstra of Ārya Maudgalyāyana.

Of them, the Jñānaprasthānasūtra of Kātyāyaniputra occupies the most prominent place. In his sputārthabhī - dharmakṣāvyākhyā, Yasōmitra has compared the Jñānaprasthāna to the body of a being and the other six to its legs. A huge commentary on the Jñānaprasthānasūtra called the 'Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā' or simply 'Vibhāṣā' was compiled by five hundred Arhats beginning with the venerable Vasumitra. The Vaibhāṣīka philosophy was based exclusively on this commentary and hence was the name Vaibhāṣīka. It is worthy of mention that they rejected the authority of the Sūtras and admitted only the Abhidharma. Prof. Takakusu writes that the Sarvāstivādins were also distinguished in the Vaibhāṣā as Kāśmirian and Gandharvian, but after compilation of the Mahāvibhāṣā the former eclipsed the latter and became known as Kāśmīra - Vaibhāṣikas, or simply Vaibhāṣikas. Vasubandhu, the eminent author of Adhidharmakosa and its Bhaṣya, though belongs to Sautrāntika school of

77. ‘Anyevyācakṣate śastramīti jñānaprasthānam / tasya śaṅkabhūtasya sat pādāḥ, prakaraṇapādo viśījñāna-kāya dharmaskandhāḥ prajñāptiśastram dhātukāyah samgūlijiparyāya iti. ....Bāf.ketiko - abhidharma ityucaye II Kosāsthamāya, Kā-2, Sphuṭārthabhīdharmakosā II.

78. Nalinaksha Dutta writes that there were four scholars, bearing the name Vasumitra: - i) Vasumitra of Kaṇḍikas council and one of the author of Mahāvibhāṣā. ii) Vasumitra of the Sautrāntika school. iii) Vasumitra, who appeared a thousand years after Buddha's parinirvāṇa and iv) Vasumitra of the Sarvāstivāda school, from whom Hiuen - Tsang learnt the Sarvāstivāda doctrines. - 'Buddhist Sects in India', Introduction p. V-VI. A discussion on the various author's bearing the name of Varumitra is found in Minayeff's Researches, I, 196ff. Dr. Dutt also utilised this source.

79. "Prajñāma a sānucaḥdhiharmastat-prāptaye yāpi ca yacca śastram" II Kosasthamāya, I, also Radhakrishnan's Indian Philosophy Kā-2, Vol-I, P-613-614.

80. JPTS, 1904-5, page -119.
philosophy his authoritative work is regarded as a fundamental work of Kāśmirian Vaibhāṣika sect. It upholds the theories of the seven adhidharma treatises. Yasomitra's famous commentary on it is known as Sphūtārthabhidharmakośa. Infact, Vasubandhu compiled his Abhidharma Kośa for a definite purpose. In the eight Kośasthān of the Adhidharma-Koṣa, the author himself gives hint about the school or sect to which his treatise belongs and the definite purpose of its compilation. He says it is based mostly (prayah) on the tradition of the Vaibhāṣikas of Kāśmira. However, the Nyāyānasarasasrastra of Sanghabhadra was another learned work of this system of thought. Dharmatrāta, ghosaka and Buddhadeva were othe prominent exponents of this philosophy. It was Dharmatrāta who first of all systematised the dogmas of the sarvastivāda school in his Abhidharma-hṛdayasāstra. Next appeared Vasubandhu who very closely followed the Abhidharma-hṛdayasāstra of Dharmatrāta and after rearrangement gave a concrete and systematic form to the Sarvāstivāda dogmas in his treatise.

Owing to the labours of savants like Poussins, Stcherbatsky, Rosenberg, Sylvain Levi, Wogihara and others. We have before us a fairly complete and coherent picture of the system.

82. Banerjee, A.C. Ibid. page. - 104.
83. Chaudhury, S. Ibid.
84. Dr. Sukomal Chaudhury gives us a complete list of those pioneer scholars in this field. Ibid. page 6-11.
The Vaibhāsikas were realist. They admit the reality of an outer world. The world is open to perception. It is working to think that there is no perception of the external world. For without perception there can be no inference. We cannot derive a vyāpti or universal proposition if we do not have perception for our data.

Knowledge can be produced by direct contact with the object. The mind is conscious of objects. Our knowledge of things is not mental perception or creation, but only discovery. Things are given to us. The substance of things has a permanent existence throughout the three divisions of time - past, present and future.85 The objects we see cease to exist when they are not perceived. They have but a brief duration like a lightning flash. Things exist for four moments those of production, existence, decay and death. The objects have an existence independent of our perception even though they cease to exist the moment we cease to perceive. However, the objects are distinguished by them into the bāhya (external) and abhyantara (internal). Under the former they have bhuta (i.e. elements) and under the later they have a citta (i.e. mind or intelligence) or Caitta (those belonging to intelligence). We may take note of the subjective and objective classification noticed in Vasubandhu's Abhidharmakośa. The subjective classification is very simple. We have fine skandhas or constitutes of being, twelve āyatanas or locations and eighteen dhātus or bases. The objective classification deals with two kinds of object, the asamskrta-dharmas (non-

compose and the asamskrtadharmas (composite). Asamskrtadharmas are free from origin, growth and destruction, there are there - i) Pratisamkhyaninirdha, 2) Aprati-samkhyaninirdha and 3) Akas or space.66 The composite dharmas are of four kinds, 1) the eleven rupa-dharmas, 2) the one citta (mind) (matter), 3) the forty six caitta dharmas and the 4) fourteen cittaviprayukta. The seventy-two composite or sastrava dharmas and three non-composite or anasravadharmas exhaust all the things. By the term 'dharma', the vaibhāsika67 might be held to have meant phenomenon.67 'Dharma' is what is grasped by the senses and it is by the particular activities of the respective senses that the particular characteristics (Skalaksana) are grasped and until they are duly grasped, liberation is not possible.68 The analysis of the entities as given has clearly demonstrated that they are realists69 contend that matter (or form) and the 'paramanu' (atom) are real. The paramanu (or atom) is 'immediately separated and their aggregation is but instantaneous. All the objects are ultimately reducible

66. "Anasrava margasatyam trividhanoapyasmskrtam / akasam dvau nirodhau ca" (tatrakaum anaviti) /1/ Kosa-1, ka.5.
67. By the term 'Dharma', Buddhists refer number of things, such as 'law', 'rule', 'faith', 'religion', 'worldly phenomenon', 'things', state etc.
68. Vasubandhu said - Dharmanam pravicyam antarena nasti / Klesanam yata upasamtyae abhyupayaht / Abhidharmakosa, ka. 3.
   'i.e. without real and due knowledge of the essence of the entities, Klesas can not be done away with and without the annihilation of the Klesas, Nirvana remains a far cry'.
69. Radhakrishnan says - 'The Vaibhāsikas are natural dualists who maintain the independent existence of nature and mind. Epistemologically their theory is a naive realism', Indian Philosophy, Vol. -I, pp. - 614.
to atoms. It is the smallest particle of rūpa. The atom has six sides and yet is one, for the space within the atom cannot be divided. It is indivisible, unanalysable, invisible, inaudible, untastable and untangible. 'It should be realised, however, that by Paramanu' they understand the minutest possible stage of an aggregate of matter and not the atom or monad (dravyaparamāṇu) of the Vaiśeṣikas. The Paramanus of the Vaibhāṣikas have no substantiality (dravyatā). The 'paramāṇu'- or the minutest possible state of an aggregate of matter is not devoid of its 'svalakṣaṇas' and its svalakṣaṇas are eight in number - the four mahābhūtas and the four corresponding things born of the mahābhūtas (Kṣīti, āpeja, vāyu and rūpa, rasa, gandha, sparsa). Hence, it has no 'ultimate simplicity'. The paramāṇu of Vaiśeṣika does not die out - it is eternal, while that of the Vaibhāṣikas is only temporary since it involves an aggregate of matter only. On the expiry of previous 'paramāṇu' (aggregate), a new one steps in. The birth, existence, and decay of every paramāṇu is determined a casualty.90

In regard to 'Pudgala' (or atīna), the Vaibhāṣikas' view is very clear. 'Jīna' is an aggregate of elements. 'Jīna' is born of the combination of forms (Rūpi) and the formless (Arūpi), the skandhas and the mahābhūtas. As the army is of individual soldiers, there is no permanent link between them comprising the army. So also is the case with the stream of a river which is nothing but the serial flow of temporary nature of so many water atoms. There are therefore, 90. Chatterjee, Dr. K. N. (ed). Vasubandhu's Vijñapti - Mātratā-Siddhi, Introduction - pp. XXVIII-XXIX.
only elements like skandhas, āyatanas, dhātus and the like and no ātmā or pudgala.\textsuperscript{91}

They believed that Nirvāṇa was a real blissful existence although they did not believe in the existence of any soul or individuality. Accordingly, they believed that Buddha is an ordinary human being, who after attaining the qualified Nirvana by his Buddhahood and final Nirvāṇa (Mahāparinirvāṇa) by his passing away, lost his being. The only divine element in Buddha is his intuitive knowledge of the truth, which he attained without the aid of others.

Among the Vaibhāṣikas themselves there are different views in certain points. Those of Kāśmīra were known as kāśmīrīan Vaibhāṣika, those of Western Country (Gandhāra) were called Pāścātya Vaibhāṣikas, also referred to as Aparantakas, Bāhirdeka - Gāndhariacāryas. This Gāndhārian group affirm the existence of past, present and future. As regards the apparent anomaly as to how in view of non-existence of all objects, an object can exist at that point of time, Ākārmatrātā replies that any kind of change in fact is a change of modes and not in substance. The substance gold undergoes several changes through which it comes to be called necklace ear-ring etc. but there is no change in gold itself. Ghoṣaka argues that then an object is said to be past, it is not entirely deprived of the character of future and the present. Basumitra holds that the changes undergone by the things are in their aspects of positions, states.

\textsuperscript{91} It has already been discussed in the chapter relating to the Upaniṣadic Soul - Theory And Buddhist - Theory of Soullessness.
He says that thing is spoken of variously according to the varying aspects and these variations relate to the aspect and not to the substance, as the substance remains the same in full three points of time. Lord said that the changes are due to the change in relativity (anyathāanyakathā). A woman is called mother as well as daughter in the same time. Prof. Herambanath Chatterjee observed that the text on which this philosophy is based belonged to the sect Ārya staviras, who also held the first council in 490 B.C. and possibly also the sect of the Mahāsāṃghikas. The philosophical principles of this school are said to have been formulated in Kaśyapa during the reign of Kaniska about 78 A.D.  

THE SAUTRĀNTIKA

The Pali tradition records that the Sautrāntika was an offshoot of Saṃkrāntika which was again a branch of the Kaśyapa-piṭhya. Kaśyapīya was again a sub-sect of the Sarvāstivāda.  

The origin of this Abhidhārmika school like the Vaibhāsikas is also traceable to the kaniska-Samgāta in the 1st Century A.D. According to the Chinese Tradition, the founder of this school was Kumāraśāta. Tibetan tradition also makes him a

94. Beal. S. Life of Hiuen-Tsang, pp. 67, 199; also Si-yu-ki. p. 181.
Sautrantika ācārya,95 The Kalpanāmanditikā, a work of Kumāralāṭa, bears the witness that the Sautrāṇṭika branched off from Sarvāstivāda and in fact doctors of the Sarvāstivāda school are praised in it.96 It is to be noted that Kumāralāṭa was a contemporary of Asvaghosa, Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva.97 According to Pryzluski, Kumāralāṭa, the author of Dārṣṭāntika - pāṇkati, a portion of Kalpanāmanditikā, is also known as the Dārṣṭāntikācārya and Mūlācārya.98 According to Yasomitra Dārstāntika and Sautrāṇṭika is the same. They are also called Tamrāsātiyas, on account of their copper-coloured clothes.99 P. V. Bapat suggests that "the views ascribed by the Vibhāṣa to the Dārṣṭāntikas are those ascribed by Abhidharma to Sautrāṇṭikas.100"

Of the origin of the term Sautrāṇṭika it is said that they deny all authority to the Abhidharma and keep to the sūtras which alone retained Buddha’s teachings. Madhavācārya opines - ‘the name Sautrāṇṭika arose from the fact that the venerated Buddha said to some of his disciples, who asked what was the ultimate purport (anta) of the aphorism (sūtra), be sautrāṇṭikas.101

95. Tārānāṭh, (Schiefner), p. -78.
96. Winternitz, M. History of Indian Literature, Volume - II, pages 267, 269; also Sanskrit Fragments published by Lider’s, Leipzig, 1926.
97. Life of Huien - Tsang, p-67, 199; Si-yu-ki. p. 181.
98. IHQ, Vol. - XVI, No. 2 pp. 246ff ("Darstantika, Sautrantika And Sarvastivadin").
99. Dutt, N. Early Monastic Buddhism, p.-49.
Besides Kumaralabdha (or Kumaralaja), Dharmottara, the logician, Yosamitra, the author of Abhidharma-kosavyakhyā, Harivarman, Paramātra and Sthiramati were eminent scholars of this school. Vasubandhu, author of Abhidharmakos'ā, Santaraksita and Kamalaśīa were also regarded as Sautrāntikas. Yasamitra, the famous commentator of Vasubandhu’s treatise, also called him a Sautrāntika. Dr. Sukomol Chaudhury observes that he was not a rigid disciple of any particular school of Buddhism, and in his Kosasāstra he was able to gather into a harmonious synthesis all the great doctrines accepted in general by Buddhists of all schools of his time.\(^\text{102}\) In another occasion, he opines that ācārya Vasubandhu was a sautrāntika before his initiation into Yogācāra - Viśānapravāda.\(^\text{103}\) There seems to be some confusion with regard to the correct standpoint of these two philosophers - Santaraksita and Kamalasīa.\(^\text{104}\) Bhavaviksa is the founder of the famous Svātantrika Mādhyamika school which had some following and which later on gave rise to combination with the Sautrāntika and Yogācāra\(^\text{105}\) is criticized by Candrakīrti severely for being in consistent, although Mādhyamika,\(^\text{106}\) in advancing independent

103. Ibid.
arguments for his fondness for exhibiting his skill as a logician. However the views of the Sautrāntikas are referred to by Vasubandhu, Bhavaviveka, Candrakirti, Samkaracarya, Haribhadra and Madhavacarya. The historicity of Śrīlabdha as a notable ‘Sautrāntika Sastra Master’ is attested not only by Hiuen-Tsang but also by Tāranāth.

The Sautrāntikas are also realists like the Vaibhāṣikas, the difference between them being that while the Vaibhāṣikas hold that the external world is perceived, the sautrāntikas affirm that it is known by inference. They admit the reality of an outer world and divide it into the bāhya (external) and abhyantara (internal), but deny the reality of it in the three periods i.e. in the past, in the present and in the future. Particularly in this very point they differ from the Sarvāstivādins as well as Vaibhāṣikas. According to them the world is external to consciousness. Our belief in it is based on inference. They proclaimed both

107. atmanas tarkasastrikasalamatra
āvīsākīrṣayā. Madhyamakavṛtti. page-25;
also tasmāt pariyānumānātām evātmana
ācaryah prakaṭayati. Ibid. p.16.
108. Abhidharmakosāvyākhya on I.20
110 Prasannapadā, pp. 61, 263, 281f.
111 Brahmāsūtra - Saṃkarabhāṣya, II, 2,18.
112 Sadadarśan-samuccaya, p-3.
113 Sarvadarśansamgraha, pp. 27ff,
114 Yuan-Chwang, I, 355-56.
115 Tāranāth, (Schiefner), pp: 4 and 7.
116 Utpadaśca nāma abhūtvā bhāvalakṣana / sautrāṇtika nayena utpatti
pudgalasunyata and dharmasunyata. To them, a 'jīva' is like an empty pitcher containing no 'ātmā' (or 'pudgala') while a pitcher (ghata) is only a name (or Sajñā). The Sautrāntikas contended that dharmas exist only in our streams of consciousness; they are objectively unreal. The Pratyayas (conditions) are the causes of origin of an element (dharma) i.e. a posterior element comes to exist by way of an effect of a previous element.\textsuperscript{117}

The atomic theory is accepted by them with very little difference from the Vaibhāšikas. In opposition to Vaibhāšikas and Madhyamikas, the Sautrāntikas maintain that thought can think itself, and that we can have self-consciousness. According to Radhakrishnan, 'this theory is quite compatible with realism.'\textsuperscript{118}

\textbf{MĀDHYAMIKA SCHOOL}

The Mādhyamikas derived the name of their school from the madhyamapratipada (Pali-Majjhimapatipada) or Middlepath doctrine expounded by the historical Buddha (C.B.C. 6th - 5th century) during his first sermon known as 'Dharmacakrapravartana' in the Buddhist religious history. The term 'Mādhyamika' is used both for the system and its advocate. Non-Buddhist writers

\textsuperscript{118} Radhakrishnan, S. Ibid. p. 623.
invariably refer to the system as well as the adherents of it as Madhyamika.\textsuperscript{119}

This system seems to have been perfected by the second century philosopher Nāgārjuna on the basis of the class of sūtras called Prajñāparamitā. Although the philosophical principles of this system have been laid down in the Prajñāparamitā yet the arguments leading to them as well as the subject matter have been systematically expounded in his foundational Mūlamadhyamakakārikā.\textsuperscript{120} The pivotal concept of Madhyamikas is sūnyatā-voidness. It is treated as equivalent to 'Pratityasamutpāda' i.e. dependent - origination ' as well as 'Madhyamā-pratipada'\textsuperscript{121}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{117} Radhakrishnan, S. Indian Philosophy, Vol-I, pp. 619ff. Banerjee, A.C., Buddhism In India and Abroad, pp. 104-105.
\item \textsuperscript{118} Radhakrishnan, S. Ibid. p. 623.
\item \textsuperscript{119} Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva donot seem to have used either of these two terms. Nāgārjuna only says - आस्ति एसवतंग्राहो नास्तित्युच्चिददारसां |
\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{120} MMK, Chapter - XV, Verse - 10}
\textsuperscript{tasmādastivānāśītvē nāśītēta vicaksanāḥ}!!
\item \textsuperscript{120} A full chapter is devoted to study of this particular text.
\item \textsuperscript{121} Yah pratityasamutpādāḥ sūnyatām tam pracaksāmahe/
\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{121} MMK, Ch - XXIV, Verse - 18}
sa praśūntīr upādāya pratipet saiva Madhyamā //
Kalupahana says that there seems to be no other statement of Nāgārjuna more controversial than this one. 'In what way can dependent arising and emptiness, which are synonymous,represent a middle path?' Vide Mūlamadhyamaka Kārikā of Nāgārjuna, p-340; also vide "The Middle Way: The Emptiness View", by Hajime Nakakura, S. Y. Chi (ed), Journal of Buddhist Philosopy, Richard. [Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana], 1 (1984): 81-111]
\end{itemize}
In this very text, Nāgārjuna also expounds the central Buddhist doctrine of madhyamapratipada in terms of interdependent origination technically called pratitya-samutpāda prajñāpti i.e. conventional language, nihsvabhāva i.e. non-self nature etc. The Madhyamika philosophy is so called because it denies two extremes, for, it advocates neither the theory of absolute reality nor that of total unreality of the world, but chooses a middle path, advocating that the World has only a conditional existence. According to T.R.V. Murti, the Middle path is the non-acceptance of the two extremes, the affirmative and the negative views, the sat and asat. This path is the avoidance of both the dogmatism of realism, the reality of object and the scepticism of nihilism; it rejects objects and consciousness both as unreal122 Existence and non-existence are called bhavaditthi and vibhavaditthi. Those who analyse and understand the origin, nature and contradictions of these two views can be free from birth and death. Lord Buddha himself says - that everything exists is Kaccāyana, one extreme, that it does not exist is another. Not accepting the two extremes, the Tathāgata explains the truth - dharma from the middle position. Nāgārjuna has utilised this reference in his Kārika saying that the Lord has rejected both the 'is' and 'not is' views. The co-ordinated doctrine of philosophy was founded by Nāgārjuna and his immediate disciple Āryadeva followed his path with full devotion. After

122. Vide - f.n.119 of this ch.

Āryadeva also says - ‘Sad, asat sadassaccetiya pakso na vidyate / upalambhas cirenāpi tasya vaktum na sakyate // Catuhsātaka, Ch-XVI, Verse-25.
the third or fourth century this system divided into two schools the Prāsaṅgika and Svātantrika. A close study of the system reveals to us the stresses and strains to which philosophy was subject in India down the ages. The Madhyamika system has had a continuous history of development from the time of its formulation by Nāgārjuna (A.D.150) down to the total disappearance of Buddhism from India (11th Century A.D.)\textsuperscript{123}. It is to be noted that we have a succession of brilliant teachers practically in every period. On the other hand, the basic ideas of the Madhyamikas were equally accepted as well as negated by the scholars of contemporary philosophical schools both Buddhists and non-Buddhists\textsuperscript{124}. Thus the Madhyamika system performs the high office of philosophy in taking stock of itself from time to time. Historically the Madhyamikas in India comprises three periods -

A) the early period (2nd to 5th century A.D.) represented by the activities of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva;

B) the middle period (5th to 7th century A.D.) exemplified by Buddhāpalīta and Bhāvaviveka founders respectively of the Prāsaṅgika and Svātantrika schools and Candrakīrti, Śaṅtideva etc.

\textsuperscript{123} Cheng, Hsueh-Li, Empty logic, p. 29 also p. 32 where, he shows with a diagram the Outline of Madhyamika Movement.

\textsuperscript{124} T.R.V. Murti says "The Madhyamika is a philosophy of higher order; it is a philosophy of philosophies." - Ibid; page - 98. Specially "The Copernican Revolution In Indian Philosophy", Ibid. page. -123ff.
C) the later period (8th Century A.D. to 11th Century A.D.) which includes Sāntaraksīta and Kamalāsīla, who fused the ideas found in the Mādhyamika and the Yogācāra systems.¹²⁵

These latter two Buddhist scholars culturally conquered Tibet and made it a land of Buddhism. Many of the Indian Mādhyamika scholars of later period contributed to Mādhyamika developments in Tibet. Even today Mādhyamika remains as official philosophy of the Tibetan monasteries.¹²⁶

**THE EARLY PERIOD**

*(Circa 2nd - 5th Century A.D.)*

Both archeological records and textual evidences point to Nāgārjuna as a historical person. Nāgārjuna developed his philosophy of Śūnyata as a critical response to views held by Indian Realists such as Sāṅkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Naiyāyika and such Hinayāna Buddhist schools Sarvāstivāda and Abhidhārmikas. Practically, Nāgārjuna concentrates on earlier Buddhism and directs the dialectic mainly against the Abhidhārmikas and establishes Śūnyata as the true import of scriptures. His references to the ātma tradition are slight and indirect.

Āry Deva: The correct Madhyamika standpoint is upheld by Āryadeva

---

¹²⁶. Joshi, L.M. 'Studies In the Buddhistic Culture of India' pp. 142-149.
Therefore Madhyamika system owes much of its popularity and stability to him.\textsuperscript{127} Aryadeva is also known as Deva, Kāṇadeva Pingalākṣa and Nīlānetra. His biography is, however, wholly a legend. The most trustworthy account of the main incidents of his life is given by Candrakīrti in the introductory part of his commentary on the Catuḥśatāka.\textsuperscript{128} Aryadeva was born in Śrīlanka and was a son of the king of that country. After having become the crown prince he renounced the world, came to the southern part of India and becoming a disciple of Nāgarjuna, followed his doctrine. His principal works are the Catuḥśatāka,\textsuperscript{129}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{127} Santina, P.D. 'Madhyamaka Schools In India', pp. -21 ff.
\item \textsuperscript{128} Prof. V. Bhattacharya's Restoration of Catuḥśatāka, Introduction, P. XIX, Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt questions the authenticity of these incident, and Prof. Bhattacharya answers the criticism Indian Historical Quarterly, IX(1933), pp. 18ff. and pp. 193ff.
\item \textsuperscript{129} Fragments mixed up with Vṛtti discovered and published by MM. Pt. H.P. Sastri-Memoirs of the A.S.B. Volume III, No. 8, PP. 449-519. This contains only the 129 verses or about one third of the whole work. Part - II, Chapter - VIII-XVI, reconstructed and edited with copious extracts from the commentary of Candrakirti by Prof. Vidhusekhara Bhattacharya, Visvabharati, 1931. This work grew as a Criticism of the restoration made by Dr. P. L. Vaidya in his Etudes sur Arya Deva et son Catuh Sataka. Paris, 1923. Prof. Bhattacharya had also previously restored the chapter - VII in the Proceeding of IV Oriental Conference (Allahbad, 1926) pp. 831ff. Regarding the number of verses and arrangement of the chapters or others valuable informations vide Preface to the Fragments from Catuhsatika cited above and Dr. P. L. Vaidya's Introduction to his restoration.
\end{itemize}
Dvādasānīkāyāsastra, Satasastra, SatasaṭaVaipulya, Aksarasataka, Hastabālaparakarana, Cittavisuddhiprakarana and Jñānasarasamuccaya.

131. The Satasastra was translated by Kumārajīva A.D. 404, into Chinese. Translated by Prof. G. Tucci in the 'Pre-Dīnāga Buddhist Texts on Logic', G.O.S. XLIX, Baroda.
132. It was translated by Hiuen Tsang A.D. 650. The last 8 chapters of the Catuḥṣataka are resuffled here.
133. Translated by V. Gokhale from Chinese and Tibetan materials, Heidelberg, 1930. In Chinese (Sataksara Sastram, Nanjio, NO. 1254; Hobogerin, 1572) and also in Tibetan where it is wrongly ascribed to Nagarjuna. With regard to the genuineness of the work, Mr. Gokhale remarks: "as regards the short basic text - the Aksara Sataka proper - it is by no means improbable that Arya Deva was the author it is; the title in itself is so typical of an Arya Devic production that one might easily be tempted to suggest a chronological, sequence among the works: Catuḥṣataka, Sataka (Satasastra) and Aksara-sataka, where beginning from the Catuḥṣataka, where beginning from the Catuḥṣataka the logical arguments become more and more systematic and pointed till in the present text they develop into a short and neat refutation solely directed against the Śāṅkhyas and Vaiśeṣikas, who probably formed in Arya Deva's time the most powerful opponents of Buddhism." (Vide, Aksara Satakam, p. 14; also 'The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, T.R.V. Murti, pp. 93-94),
134. Prof. F.W. Thomas has edited the Tibetan and Chinese texts with a restoration in Sanskrit of the text and commentary and an English translation in the J.R.A.S. 1918, pp. 267-310. In his prefatory note to this, Dr. Thomas discusses the authenticity of the work and the peculiar nature of the title. In Chinese it is called Muṣṭiṣprakarana, Nanjio Nos. 1255-6; Hobogerin Wrongly attributed to Dīnāga. It is an another attempt by Arya Deva at summarising the doctrines in six verses.
136. T.R.V. Murti opines that Cittavisuddhi prakaraṇa and Jñānasārasamuccaya are also attributed to Arya Deva, perhaps with less justification. According to him in the Chinese Tripiṭaka, the Refutation of Four Heretical Hiñayāna Schools and of the Conception of Nirvāṇa according to 20 heretical schools mentioned in the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra are also attributed Arya Deva. The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, pp. 94-95. also Kimura, 'Hiñayāna and Mahāyāna', pp. 28-9 and 350 and M. Winternitz, History of Indian Literature, Vol. - II. p. 298.
However, Catuḥsataka or simply Śataka is the most celebrated work of Aryadeva. The full name of Catuḥsataka is 'Bodhisattva yogācāra - Catuḥsataka', it is also known as Śataśāstra. This catuḥsataka with Candrakīrti's commentary named Catuḥsatakavṛtti belongs to the basic works of the Madhyamika school and along with Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka-Kārika and Aryadeva's another work Dvadasa-nikāya-Śāstra constitutes the basic work of the Chinese (Sanlun School) and Japanese (Sanron) Buddhism. It is lost in original, but is preserved in its entirety in Tibetan, from which it has been reconstructed into Sanskrit. It consists of 400 Kārikas arranged symmetrically under 16 chapters, each consisting of 25 verses.

The first half is devoted to the Madhyamika spiritual discipline and second to a refutation of dogmatic speculations of Buddhists and non-Buddhists, e.g. Saṃkhya and Vaiśeṣika. There remain Candrakīrti's commentary in Tibetan translation and Dharmapala's (C.A.D. 530-61) commentary into Chinese.

About Ayadeva's contribution to the Madhyamika thought movement T.R.V. Murti states - *In Aryadeva, we find not only criticism of the Abhidhamma, but greater attention is paid to Saṃkhya and Vaiśeṣika conceptions. This is done in his Chief work Catuḥśataka. There was need to consolidate the Madhyamika position against the non-Buddhist systems and to show that the dialectic is equally valid against them. Coupled with the accounts we have of him that Aryadeva was a great debator and that in many discussions he vanquished his adversaries, there is no doubt that he shares the honour of founding the Madhyamika system with his master, Nāgārjuna.*

---

137. The central Philosophy of Buddhism', page -92.
Rahulabhadra (C. 200-300 A.D.) belonging to this period, was a disciple of Aryadeva. Very little is known about him other than that information of his compositions, two Sanskrit works, remain - ‘Prajñāparamitāstotra’ and Saddharmapundarikastava. Other works seem to have been attributed to him, as some of these verses are quoted by Asaṅga and Paramārtha in their works.138

THE MIDDLE PERIOD

(Circa 5th - 7th Century A.D.)

According to later Tibetan doxographies, the Middle Period (5th-7th Century A.D.) is also characterized by Madhyamaka splitting into the Prāsaṅgīka and Svātantrika schools. The fact that Bhāvaviveka (C. 450-540 A.D.) the well-known expounder of Svātantrika school, criticised by Candrakīrti (C. 600-650 A.D.) defended Buddhapālita (C. 500-570 A.D.) indicates a two-way split in the Mādhyamika school, although the terms ‘Prasaṅgīka’ and ‘Svātantrika’ are not to be found in any of the extant Sanskrit texts. Both of them developed their respective stand points by writing commentaries on the Mādhyamika Śāstra; these are lost in the original but are available in Tibetan translation.139

139. Tibetan BSTAN-HGYUR is a miscellaneous collection of literary work, both sacred and secular consisting 225 volumes. Very few of the BSTAN-HGYUR treatises have Tibetan authorship. They are mostly translations into Tibetan from Chinese and Sanskrit. ‘Dbu-ma’ is included in BSTAN-HGYUR which means Mādhyamika Philosophy by Nāgārjuna. Prof. Raghunath Pandeya translated Madhyamakaśāstram including four most important commentaries, viz.
terms - Prāsaṅgika and Svātantrika L.S. Kawamura opines that - "they are probably derived from translating into Sanskrit the Tibetan terms that gyur ba and rang rgyud pa respectively. Although these terms are found in Tibetan Buddhist literature prior to Tsong Kha pa, it is he who can be credited with giving them prominence, after which they began to be utilized in the Tibetan Grub-mtha' texts.\textsuperscript{140} However, the controversy between the two was not settled by Candrakīrti, he only defended Buddhapālita, and followed the way of Chief Madhyamika teachers - Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva. It is worthy of mention that he belongs to this very period. Along with Candrakīrti, Śāntideva (C. 691-743 A.D.) gives to the Madhyamika system its rigorous, orthodox form. \textsuperscript{141} However, only those by Buddhapālita, Bhāvaviveka and Candrakīrti are renowned, as the remainder are either not very useful, or not extant at present. But along with these famous Madhyamika thinker, Avalokitavrata (seventh century?) and Prajñākaramati (C.950-1030A.D.) were also active in its period. About the period of Avalokitavrata, L.S. Kawamura says that 'Avalokitavrata Knew about Candrakīrti, and Dharmakīrti (C. 600-660

\textsuperscript{140} Craig, Edward, (ed.) Ibid. page. - 61.

\textsuperscript{141} Murti, T.R.V. The Central Philosophy of Buddhism' page. 87.
A.D.) but because he did not utilize their logic, we can surmise that he was their contemporary. He also places Prajñākaramati into this Middle period (5th - 7th Century A.D.) But it is indeed difficult to determine to which school he belonged. On the basis of Prajñākaramati criticism of Sautrāntika and Yogācāra schools of Buddhism, L.S. Kawamura opines that "Prajñākara-mati was a Mādhyamika." But he has doubt about his own assumption and explicitly says that "Although in terms of his dates Prajñākaramati falls into the later period, he is discussed here as a commentator on Śāntideva." Thus the Middle period of the development of Mādhyamika school comprises the activities of the above mentioned scholars, viz -

1) Buddhapālita (C. 470 - 540 A.D.)
2) Bhāvaviveka (C. 500 - 570 A.D.)
3) Candrakīrti (C. 600 - 650 A.D.)
4) Śāntideva (C. 691-743 A.D.)
5) Avalokitavrata (Seventh Century ?)
6) Prajñākaramati (C. 950 - 1030 A.D.)

Buddhapālita (C. 470-540 A.D.) is regarded as the founder of the Prasāṅgika school. He takes the essence of the Mādhyamika method to consist in the use of reductio ad absurdum arguments alone. "Prasāṅga' is disproof

143. Ibid.
simply, without the least intention to prove any thesis. Regarding this point of view all the chief Mādhyamika teachers - Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva. Buddhapālita, Candrakīrti and Sāntideva invariably adduce prasaṅga (reductio ad absurdum) arguments. The true Mādhyamika cannot upheld a position of his own; he has therefore no need to construct syllogism and adduce arguments and examples. "The Mādhyamika is a prāsaṅgika or vaitandika a dialectician or free lance debator", - says T.R.V. Murti. 144 S. C. Vidyābhusana uses the term 'Cavil' for 'Vitanda which means copious fault - finding objections. He explains this saying that cavil is a kind of wrangling which consists in mere attacks on the opposite side. A caviller does not endeavour to establish anything, but confines himself to finding out faults in the arguments of his own opponents. Nyāyasūtra characterises it saying "Sa pratipaksasthāpanāheno Vitanda". 145 Like Vaitandika the Mādhyamika also confutes the opponents' thesis; he does not prove any thesis of his own. Ācaṭya Gautama has drawn a clear picture of the examination of the doctrines of other systems of philosophy. The Samkhya proof of the Satkāryavāda by disproving the opposite theory of asatkāryavāda as also the Buddhist proof of momentariness by the disproof of the permanent are typical examples in Indian philosophy. 146 But Mādhyamikas from the very beginning reject all these views using their prasaṅga vyākhya or prasaṅgapādanaṁ.

144. 'The Central Philosophy of Buddhism', p. 131
sole endeavour is to reduce to absurdity the arguments of the opponents on principles acceptable to them.147 Buddhapālita held prasāṅga to be the real method of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva, he therefore initiates the Prāsaṅgika school of the Madhyamika. Buddhapālita's Mulamadhyamakavṛtti, a commentary in twenty-seven chapters. Bhāvaviveka vehemently criticised this text. According to L.S. Kawamura the text's distinctive character lies in Buddhapālita's presentation of Nāgārjuna's use of dilemma and prasaṅgapādanam. Their sole endeavour is to reduce to absurdity the arguments of the opponents on principles acceptable to them.147 Buddhapālita held prasāṅga to be the real method of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva; he therefore initiates the Prasangika school of the Madhyamika. Buddhapalita's Mulamadhyamakavṛtti, a commentary in twenty-seven chapters exists only in Tibetan translation. Bhāvaviveka vehemently criticised this texts. According to L.S. Kawamura the text's distinctive character lies in Buddhapalita's presentation of Nagarjuna's use of dilemma and tetralemma from the standpoint of plural prasāṅgas - that is, he divides the tetralemma into two or four different prasāṅga (reductio ad absurdum) arguments. The seventh Karikā of the chapter twenty three the context of the text is identical with

147. Śūnyatā sarvadrśṭiṁ saṁ proktā nissaranāṁ jinaḥ.
MMK, Ch-XIII, Verse - 8.

MMK. ends with the same note :
'Sarvadrśṭiprahānāya yāḥ saddharma adesāyat,
anukampam upādāya tam namasyāmi gautamam //
MMK, Ch - XXVII, Verse - 30.
Nagarjuna’s own commentary Akutobhayā of the Mulamadhyamaka-karika.148

Dr. Raghunath Pandeya opines that Nāgārjuna’s immediate disciples, such as Āryadeva, Buddhapālita, Candrakīrti etc. have turned aside from truthful opinions without arguing formally. They violated the rules of their preceptor Nāgārjuna, who has given a formal statement of doctrines containing precepts in ‘Upāya-Kausālya-Sūtra’. In the first chapter of the sūtra he explains that a thesis can be established through a reason and example which may be affirmative or negative.

A syllogism according to him consists of three propositions of which the first two are called the major and minor, and the last, which follows from them, the conclusion.149

Bhāvaviveka (C. 500 - 570 A.D.) lived at the same time as Buddhapālita but was a younger contemporary of the latter. Bhavya or Bhāvaviveka is known by many different names, but because Candrakīrti, in his Prasannapada, a commentary of Mulamadhyamaka-karikā, calls him Bhāvaviveka, he is known generally by that name150. He dwelt in Malaya, southern part of Middle-country.


149. The Madhyamakaāstram of Nagarjuna, Volume -1, Introduction, page. - XVI.

In that very country he took his renunciation and became an eminent scholar of Tripitakas. He engaged himself in literacy pursuit and studied Mahāyāna literature - from Samgharaksita and accepted the gospel of Nāgārjuna. After that he proceeded to the southern province and visualized Vajrapāṇi. It is said that he served as chief abbot of over fifty monasteries, and achieved the mystic 'Gutika' and departed to the Vidyādhara's world.151 After the death of Buddhapālita, Bhavya studied Buddhapālita's treatises and composed 'Mūlamadhyamika - Vṛtti - Prajñāpradīpa.'152 He is said to have written other works; Madhyamakahṛdayakarika Tarkajāva, Karatalaratna, Madhyamaka-ratnaprādīpa and Madhyamakārtha-samgraha. The authenticity of the latter two works, is doubtful. L.S. Kawamura mentions only four works of him, viz. Prajñāpradīpa [-Mūlamadhyamaka-avṛtti], Madhyamakahṛdayakārīka and Tarkajāva and Dashenzhangzheng (extant in Chinese only). In the Tibetan canon there is another work 'Nikāyakśeṣadibhāṣga - vyākhyāna, attributed to Bhāvaviveka, but its content corresponds to Hinayāna found in fourth chapter of the Tarkajāvala.153

The 'Prajñāpradīpa' is the first full scale commentary on the Mūlamadhyamaka - Karikā and is important in two respects:

152. Raghunath Pandeya has it into Sanskrit from Tibetan BSTAN-HGYUR, Dbu-ma, Vide his ‘The Madhyamakāstram of Nagarjuna in two volumes.
1. Bhāvaviveka's interpretation of the various arguments presented by Nāgārjuna was strongly presented by Nāgārjuna was strongly influenced by Diṇṇāga's logic.\textsuperscript{154} Here Bhāvaviveka established many chategorical syllogisms, the so-called Svatantra - anumāna (independent inference) and hence his system is known as the 'Svātantrika - School; 2) he criticised Buddhapālita's version of Prasāvita as being merely prasanga without the minor and major premises.

The Madhyamakahāṛdayakārikā consists of eleven chapters. The first three chapters contain the pohilosophical discussion on Mādhyamika doctrine. In the rest, he endeavoured to discuss the doctrines of H. nayana Buddhism, Yogācārā. Sāṁkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Vedānta and other contemporary views of different philosophical schools. That also proves his scholastic inquisitiveness. Regarding his scholastic approach Prof. T.R.V. Murti also opines that Bhāvaviveka was eventually a man of great scholarship; for his Tarkajñava gives full exposition of the views of Sāṁkhya, Vaiśeṣika and Vedānta, often quoting from the Original texts.\textsuperscript{155} According to Kawamura, in this manner, he establishes the Madhyamaka

\textsuperscript{154} Like Diṇṇāga, Bhavya was a logician, a critical realist in logic, and a transcendenfalist in philosophy. We know that Candrakīrti attacked Bhavya for the latter's faith in logic, in tathāya-saṁyrti and in maintaining a positive thesis. - Joshi, Studies In The Buddhistic Culture of India, p.196, Candrakīrti's criticism as quoted by T.R.V. Murti - - "Angīkrtamādhyānākdarsānāsyāpi yat svaḥtātprayogavāyābyādhānāmasya tārīkashyopāloṣyate* ātmagastārakāsāstrālikamālamālmātra - māvisckīṣāya, tasmātprīyānumāna - tāmēvātmanāḥ śācāryāḥ prakatayati. - The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, page -96, f.n. -4.

\textsuperscript{155} The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, page. - 98.
on the one hand, and on the other he criticizes other schools and thus develop
his work around the system of doctrinal classification that was further developed
by scholars such as Śantaraksita. The Sanskrit manuscript of this text was
discovered in 1938 (circa).

The Tarkajavālā is an auto-commentary on the Prajñāpradīpa. It is extant
only in Tibetan translation. There is some doubt as to whether Bhāvaviveka is
the author, because within this text, reference to Bhāvaviveka is made by the
title acārya. Besides these works and Prajñāpradīpa, the commentary on the
Madhyamikakārikas, Bhāvaviveka - has written an independent work -
Madhyamakāvatāra - Pradīpa, (mdo-XVII, I) and another prakarana :
Madhyamaka Pratityasamutpāda. His Madhyāmarthasamgraha begins with
the two truths (Paramārtha & Saṃsvit) and proceeds to subdivide them. T.R.V.
Murti has given a brief summary on it to explain the position of Bhāvaviveka in
the field of Madhyamika philosophy.

In his Karatalaratna, Bhāvaviveka attempts to establish the basic

---

159. Restored from the Tibetan version with an English Translation by Pt. N. Aiyaswami
Sastri and published in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras - Vol. - V, Part -
I, (March, 1931).
160. The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, pp. - 248-9. He also expressed his
indebtedness to Pt. Aiyaswami’s introduction to this valuable restoration.
161. Pandit N. Aiyaswami Sastri has restored this text from the Chinese translation
of Hiuen Tsang (Nanjio, 1237, Taisho, 1578) into Sanskrit under the title,
Madhyamika standpoint by syllogistic arguments. He formulates the syllogism thus. The conditioned things (samskrta) are unreal (sunya) from the standpoint of ultimate truth (tattvatah), because they are produced through causes and conditions (pratyayodbhavat) like things created by magic (mayaavat). The unconditioned (asamskrta), such as space, Nirvana etc. are non-existent from the standpoint of ultimate truth, because they are non-originating (anutpadah), like the sky-lotus (khapuspavat). The syllogism are mainly intended to convince the Hinayanist of the truth of the Void (Sunya). Bhavaviveka defends his argument against possible formal and material objections. He points out that he does not mean to deny the empirical validity of things (Sam-vrtisat) but only their ultimate reality (Paramarthasat) Bhavaviveka further clarifies his position by stating that Sunya does not mean the assertion of the non-existence of things, but only the denial of dogmatic assertion of existence. He also distinguishes his standpoint from that of the Vibhajyavadin. He points out that Sunya does not nullify or make them disappear but shows up their real nature as devoid of essence (nihsvabhava). T.R.V. Murti raises some questions 'Does Bhavaviveka' succeed in 'proving' Sunya by positive arguments ? ..... Can we, however, establish the concomitance (vyapti) between 'dependent origination' (the middle term) which is claimed to be a universal factor of all things and their unreality, Sunya (the major term)? According to him "as all things are brought within the compass of the rule, there can be no negative example (vipaksa-drstanta). We are not in a position to say : What is not unreal
is also not dependent in origination. The argument is inconclusive, as the method
of Agreement alone is used and not the method of Difference or Exclusion.\textsuperscript{162}

He points out that Bhāvaviveka follows the same method that Sāmkhya or the
Vaiśeṣika or even the Buddhist realists make use of the same method merely
means that they are equally inconclusive, or that the Madhyamika is equally
dogmatic. The characteristic Madhyamika stand as a review or criticism of all
positions and theories does not emerge from Bhāvaviveka's procedure. And to
review a position, we should not have a position of our own but be alive to the
contradictions of other positions.\textsuperscript{163} From another reference to Bhāvaviveka, it
appears that he held that the realisation of Sūnyatā was not absolutely necessary
for Nirvāṇa and that he conceded that the Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas could
also attain final release. T.R.V. Murti claims that this is certainly opposed to the
ekanayavāda of Nāgarjuna according to which eventually the votaries of the
other paths have to be initiated into the Śūnyatā discipline for attaining final
release.\textsuperscript{164} It is to be noted that he has reached this conclusion following
Candrakīrti. On the otherhand, another renowned expert in this field Dr.
Raghunath Pandeya draws an opposite conclusion on the same source material.

\begin{flushright}
162. The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, p. 97.
163. Ibid p. 97ff. and 131.
164. Ibid. pp. 248-255.
\end{flushright}
angrily and, as a quibbler evades questions by a play upon words to embarrass others in precepts of Ācārya Nāgarjuna in ignoring the latter's philosophical standpoint and in putting forward a pretentious claim to be a real Madhyamika, as he says in Prasannapada that Buddhapālita held prasaṅga to be the real method of Nāgarjuna. Again he claims that "Ācārya Bhāvaviveka followed the rules in his own way and applied inference as an independent philosopher. He deserves all praise for his independent approach to the subject." Tāranātha adds that while Buddhapālita did not have many followers Bhāvaviveka had thousands of disciples and monks. As a result Tāranātha says his views were spread more extensively than those of Buddhapālita. He became the head of about fifty monasteries in the south and delivered numerous discourses on the doctrine.

**Candrakīrti** (C. 600 - 650 A.D.)

Candrakīrti's Prasannapada' is not only the sole extant Sanskrit commentary on Nāgarjuna's Mūlamadhyamakakārikā but is also the one from which the Sanskrit Kārikas are derived. Candrakīrti is the chief exponent of the Prāsaṅgika School. Prof. Th. Stcherbatsky describes him as "a mighty champion of the purely negative method of establishing monism." He succeeds in driving Bhāvaviveka's school into the shade and finally settles that form of Madhyamika

165. The Madhyamakāstāram of Nāgarjuna, Introduction, pp. XVI-XVII.
167. Buddhist conception of Nirvāṇa, p. 67
system which is now studied in all monastic schools of Tibet and Mongolia, where it is considered to represent the true philosophic basis of Mahāyāna Buddhism. He was born in Samanta in the South. He entered the order and studied Madhyamika philosophy under Kamalabuddhi - the disciple of Buddhapaśita and Bhāvaya. His Prasannapada Commentary on Nāgārjuna's Mūdhyamaka Sastra, has already been mentioned. Candrakirti has also written lucid and authoritative commentaries on the other works of Nāgārjuna as well as Āryadeva, such as Sūnyatāsaptati, Yuktīsāṭika and Āryadeva's Catuḥsāṭaka. Two other Prakaranas or Manuals viz., Madhyamaṇaprajñāvatara and Pancaskandha are also attributed to him. Of all his works, only Prasannapada is available in the original; other works are available only in Tibetan translation. He also wrote an independent work, named Madhyamaṇavatara with an auto-commentary. Frequent reference to the Madhyamaṇavatara in his Prasannapada reveals the fact that the former was written earlier than the latter.

Candrakirti re-affirms the Prasangika standpoint of Buddhapaśita against Bhāvaviveka, whom he severely criticises for his un-Madhyamika position and several other inaccuracies, in advancing independent arguments and for his fondness for exhibiting his skill as a logician. He is even castigated for his

170. Stcherbatsky, Th. Ibid. Tārānāth's History of Buddhism In India, pp. 401-402.
inconsistency in stating the opponent's position. His criticism directed against
the Vijnānavāda and the Sautrāntika. He has shown the unsoundness of its
doctrine of self-consciousness (Svasamvṛtti) and the existence of knowledge
(vijñāna) without the object. He even suggests that 'Vijñāna is Ātman of the
heretics (Tirthakaras) in disguise. He has no hesitation in concluding that Vijnāna-
vāda is inconsistent with the truth of empirical reality. They are not in the middle
position, which is non-acceptance of both 'is' and 'is not' (astitva and nāstitva)
whereas Vijnānavādins accept both, the non-existence of the Parikalpita and
the existence of the Paratantra. Finally Vijnānavāda is not the final teaching
(nīśartha) but merely a step to it (neyārtha).

There is some difference of opinion with regard to the exact time of
Candrakīrti. Winternitz says: "One of Dharmapāla's pupil is Candrakīrti, who
must accordingly have lived in the 6th Century and not, as it usually taken for
granted, in the 7th". As Bhāvaviveka lived in about the second half of
the sixth century A.D. and was a contemporary of Dharmapāla, the immediate
predecessor of Silabhadra (Cir. 640 A.D) at Nalanda, Candrakīrti who criticizes
Bhāvaviveka may be placed between 560-620 A.D. T.R.V. Murti suggests that
'Candrakīrti's time is certainly subsequent to Dinnāga and probably
contemporaneous with Dharmakīrti.' Dharmakīrti's date seems to be circa

171. Stcherbatsky, Th. Ibid. also Murti, T.R.V., Ibid.
A.D. 580-650. It is a moot point that Hiuen-Tsang who may have come to Nalanda in 635 A.D. does not mention Dharmakirti. Therefore T.R.V. Mutri's suggestion is not quite justified. And the recent researchers like Kawamura mentions his date as circa 600-650 A.D. However, it may be said from the above discussion that Candrakirti must have flourished early in the seventh century A.D.

Santideva (C. 691-743 A.D.) belonging to this period is also a great pillar of the Prasangika school of Madhyamika philosophy. There are four biographical accounts of Santideva given by Bu-Ston, Sumpa-mkhan-po, Taranath and a fourteenth century Nepalese Tantrik author. Three of these four sources record that Santideva was known as Bhusukupa and he wrote the Sikṣasamuccaya, the Sutrasamuccaya and the Bodhicaryavatara, besides many Tantrik works. There is evidence to the fact that there was a second Tantrik Santideva whose name was Bhu-Su-Ku or Bhusukupa. Bu-ston, Sumpa and the Nepalese biographer have confounded the Mahayana Philosopher and poet with the Tantrik Siddha Namesake. Even scholar like H.P. Sastri following the Nepalese manuscript believed that Santideva, the famous author of Sikṣasamuccaya was identical with Bhusukupa or

175. Craig, Edward., Ibid. p. 60.
177. Pag Sam Jon Zang, pp. CXLVII, 120.
Bhusukupa, the author of Tantras and Dohas.\textsuperscript{181} Therefore the accounts of the life and works of philosopher Santideva seem to be confused. It is important to note that Tarānāth is free from this confusion. He does not identify Bhusukupa with Santideva and regards the former as a contemporary of Dipankar Śrijñāna (C. 1000 A.D.) and therefore much later than the author of Śiṣṭasamuccaya. Moreover, it is clear from the above discussion that Bhusukupa is a different person.

About the time of Santideva, Dr. B. Bhattacharya opines that Santideva flourished "in a period between the departure of T'ung from India in 695 and before Sāntarakṣita's first visit to Tibet in A.D. 743"\textsuperscript{182} A verse from Bhodhicaryāvatāra is found quoted in the Tattvasiddhi of Sāntarakṣita. B. Bhattacharya has drawn his conclusion from the above mentioned fact. T. R. V. Murti expressed the same view about the date of Santideva.\textsuperscript{183} But L. M. Joshi suggests - "it is neither possible nor necessary to push his date so late as the early 8th Century A.D. The works of Santideva do not show any dominant influence of Tantra and he may have actually lived in the second half of the seventh Century A.D. although Tʻung did not know him."\textsuperscript{184} The Śiṣṭasamuccaya was translated into Tibetan by three persons: Jinamitra, Danasila and Ye-ses-sde. Among them Danasila, (an Indian) and Ye-ses-sde (a Tibetan) - these two scholars lived in the reign of Khri-lde-sron-bstan, A.D. 816-838.

\textsuperscript{181} Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLII, 1913, p. 51
\textsuperscript{182} JBORS, 1928, p. 355.
\textsuperscript{183} Murti, T. R. V., Ibid. p. 100
\textsuperscript{184} Joshi, L. M. Ibid. p. 150
Therefore most scholars consider the middle of the seventh century A.D. as the possible date of Śāntideva. However, the biographical accounts collected from the previously mentioned sources are as follows: Taranātha states that he was born in the days of Śīla and son Śrī Harsa. He was a pupil of Dharmapāla's successor at Nālandā, Jayadeva by name. Bu-ston says that Śāntideva before becoming a monk at Nālandā under Jayadeva was known as Śāntivarman and was the son of king kalyāṇavarman of Surāstra. His favourite deity was Manjuśrī. He travelled widely in India and converted many heretics to Buddhism. He was also expert in exorcism and performed many miracles in the South where he spent some years in Śrīparvata. This biographical account is corroborated by Sumpā-mkhan-po and Taranātha. They further add that Śāntideva served as a minister to a king of Magadha named Pañcasimha.

Śāntideva is famed in the Tibetan tradition as the author of three works: Śikṣasamuccaya, Sūtrasamuccaya and Bodhicaryāvatāra. But only two works, the Śikṣasamuccaya and the Bodhicaryāvatāra are known to us. These two works are the two most popular texts in the entire Mahāyāna literature. The Śikṣa is a compendium of the doctrines of the Mahāyāna, especially of the Mādhyamika. The entire work consists of three parts: 1) the kārīka portion, comprising 27 memorial verses, (ii) the commentary portion, and (iii) the illustrations consisting of quotations, often long, from various older Mahāyāna Sūtras. The Tibetans ascribe both the Kārīkās and the commentary to Śi-ba-
The work is extant in Chinese and Tibetan translations as also in the Original Sanskrit. Another important work Bodhicaryavatara contains memorial Karikas; it consists of ten chapters. Its subject matter like that of the Śikṣāsamuccaya, is also moral and religious. T.R.V. Murti confirms that these two works of Śāntideva are "our chief sources for the Mādhyamika path of spiritual realisation." Specially the ninth chapter of Bodhicaryavatara named Prajñāparamita deserves special attention as containing the metaphysics of Mādhyamika. Like Candrakīrti, Śāntideva is consistent in following the Prasanga method, and he is as thorough in his criticism of Vijñānavāda.

About the Śūtrasamuccaya, it may be mentioned that Nāgārjuna was the author of a collection of Mahāyāna - sūtras, - Śūtra Samuccaya. Bu-ston includes it into the list of the works of Nāgārjuna. Prof. A.C. Banerjee after a thorough investigation says - "It is clear that there were two texts of the Śūtrasamuccaya, one by Śāntideva and the other by Nāgārjuna, and that Śāntideva regarded the work of Nāgārjuna as of great importance and recommended its more careful study than that of his own." However, there is little philosophy in his

188. IHQ, Vol - XVII, pp. 126ff. also Santideva in Bodhicaryavatara,

Samksepanāthava paśyey Śūtrasamuccayam
ārya - Nāgārjunabaddham dvīfiyam ca prayatnataḥ Verse - 106.
Sīkṣāsamuccaya. He does not appear to deal with the comparative merits of the views of the Prāsangika and the Svātantrika Madhyamikas. But he himself seems to adopt the Prāsangika standpoint. The main outline of his thought is identical with that of Nāgārjuna. He does not say anything of Bhāvavideka’s classification of paramārtha nor does he refer to Candrakīrti’s division of samvṛtti. But his commentator does refer to this latter division of Candrakīrti and elucidates the views of Śāntideva by quotations from the works of Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti.

Avalokitavrata (seventh century?). There is a great confusion about his date. He knew about Candrakīrti and Dharmaśīla (C. 600-60), but because he did not utilize their logic, we can surmise that he was their contemporary.191

Avalokitavrata was born in Sāketa in a brahmana family. Tāranāth informs that he was a follower of Svātantrika - Madhyamika school.192 His famous and only known work is 'Prajñāpradīpa-mūlamadhyamaka - vṛtti.

189. Bodhicaryāvatāra, IX. 2; Bodhicaryāvatāraṭṭīkā, pp. 170-171; also Murti, Ibid. p. 101.
190. Joshi, L. M. Ibid. p. 174
191. Craig, Edward., Ibid. p. 60
192. Tāranāth, p. 260 (n.21). It is cited that colophon of Tg. mDo-viii. 3, where Buddha - Srījñāna is mentioned as the principal disciple of Haribhadra.

.................. 'Those who assume that Bhavya, Avalokitavrata, Buddhajñānapāla, Jñānagarbha and Śāntarakṣita were Madhyamika - Svātantrika , without seeing any commentary .................. 
193. Ibid. (note 15)
Prajñākaramati (C. 950-1030): Like Avalokita-vrata, we know very little about Prajnakaramati. Prajnakaramati became famous as a commentator of Santideva. His Bodhicaryavatara Panjika, a famous commentary on Bodhicaryavatara of Santideva, was a very popular work. The popularity of this work is evidenced by the fact that as many as two commentaries have been written on this. It is extant in Sanskrit. It comments on the first nine chapters of the Bodhicaryavatara, but not the tenth. Prajnakaramati probably began it as a commentary on the ninth chapter and then added commentary on the first eight chapters later. Bodhicaryavatara Panjika contains names of so many philosophical and religious works in the 7th and 8th centuries, which are not cited by Santideva in his Siksasamucceaya. Judging from his criticism of Sautrantika and Yogacara, we can assume that Prajnakaramati was a Madhyamika, but it is not clear to which school he did belong. To elucidate the views of Santideva he refers Prasangika Madhyamika by quotations from the works of Nagarjuna and Chandrakirti. But he did not leave any hint of his own standpoint. Therefore it is difficult to determine his stand.

197. A list of those unknown works from Siksasamucceaya is given by L. M. Joshi in his 'Buddhistic Studies ....' p. 153.
We find a new phase in the development of the Mādhyamika system with the appearance of Śāntarakṣita and Kamalāśīla. They accept the Sautrāntika - Viśīṇavāda position with regard to the empirical, and the Mādhyamika with regard to the ultimate reality. It is marked as later period (8th-11th century) in the history of Mādhyamika evolution.

**THE LATER PERIOD**

(Circa 8th - 11th Century A.D.)

The special characteristics of the later period were: (1) the influence of Dharmakīrti’s logico - epistemological school; (2) the fact that most philosophers belonged to the Svātāntrika school; and (3) the incorporation of tenets of the Yogācāra tradition. The evidence for our contention is two-fold: the nature of their works and the testimony of Tibetan historians. Specially the evidence of Buston and other Tibetan historians settles the issues. Buston writes: “Buddhapālita and Candrakīrti are the chief representatives of the Mādhyamika - prāsaṅgika school. The teacher Bhavya and the rest are the Mādhyamika - Sautrāntikas. Jñānagarbha, Śrīgupta, Śāntarakṣita, Kamalāśīla, Haribhadra and others belong to the school of the Yogācāra - Mādhyamikas.”

laid the foundation of another school of the Madhyamikas which denies the
"Empirical Reality" of the "External World, acknowledges the introspective
perception, but on the other hand does not consider consciousness to have an
'Ultimate Reality'. According to T.R.V. Murti this is the differing point between
Yogācāra - Viśṇuavādins and Yogācāra - Madhyamikas. Kamalasila as well as
Vimuktiṣeṇa, Haribhadra, Buddhajñānapada, Abhayakara Guptā etc., agree
with Śāntarakṣita as to the main standpoint which is that of the Yogācāra -
Madhyamika Svātāntrikā. Bhāvaviveka and Jñāna-garbha express the point of
view of the Sautrāntika - Madhyamika - Svātāntrikas. There were others,
such as Jitari, Bodhibhadra and Advayabaja (eleventh Century), who wrote
expositions of the doctrines of the various Buddhist schools, while others still -
for example, Kambala (C. 700 A.D.), Ratnakarasāntī (C. 11th Century A.D.)
and Atīśa (C. 982 - 1055 AD) were active in the synthesis of Madhyamaka and
Yogācāra in India and in the development of Madhyamika Buddhism in Tibet.
It is to be noted that Śāntarakṣita and Kamalasila introduced and spread
Buddhism in Tibet. Owing to their efforts and those of other eminent teachers
mentioned above, the Madhyamika has continued to be the dominant philosophy
in Tibet and Mongolia even to this day. We are also told that even in distant

202. Ibid.
Japan it constituted the faith of the Sanron sect. However, among them, these following personalities belonged to the same lineage as \( \text{Santarakṣita} \) and \( \text{Kamalasāla} \).

1. \( \text{Jñānagarbha (8th Century A.D.)} \)
2. \( \text{Santarakṣita (C. 725 - 784 A.D.)} \)
3. \( \text{Kamalasāla (C. 740 - 797 A.D.)} \)
4. \( \text{Vimuktisena (Eight Century A.D.)} \)
5. \( \text{Haribhadra (C. 800 A.D. approx.)} \)

\( \text{Jñānagarbha} \) (8th Century A.D.) was \( \text{Santarakṣita's} \) teacher and the author of 'Satyadvayavibhanga' (Analysis of the two Realities), the 'Satyadvayavibhangavṛtti' (Analysis of the Two Realities Commentary) and 'Yogabhāvanāmārga' (Path to the Practice of Yoga) - all extant in Tibetan only. In fact, nothing is known about him except that he was \( \text{Santarakṣita's} \) teacher and consequently may have entered Tibet before him as well as written those treatises and translated texts on Madhyamika and epistemology in Tibetan.  

---

206. Ibid.
207. Craig, E. Ibid. p. 61
208. Ibid.
209. The only reliable source to determine the date of \( \text{Santarakṣita} \) is the Tibetan tradition which, however, is liable to different interpretations. B. Bhattacharyya, relying on the information given from Tibetan sources by S.C.Das, placed Santarakṣita in A.D. 705-762, giving him a life-span of 57 years. (Forward to the Tattvasaṅgraha, by Dr. Bhattacharyya, in G.O.S. XXX- XXXI, Baroda) According to Vidyābhūtisūrya, Santarakṣita was born in A.D. 728 and died in A.D. 864. Rāhula-Sāmkritīyāyaṇa, Santarakṣita enjoyed a life-span of one hundred years, C. 740-
Śāntarākṣita (C. 725 - 784 A.D.) - One of the most important personalities in the history of Buddhism in India and Tibet and the greatest philosopher of the 8th Century A.D. was Śāntarākṣita. He composed the Tattvasamgraha,210 the Madhyamakālāmkāra and its commentary - the Madhyamakālāmkaravṛti211 and a commentary on Jñānagarbha's Satyadvaya-vibhanga. With the exception of the first, which can also be found in Sanskrit, all are extant in Tibetan only. His other logical work is a commentary, the Vādanyāya - vṛtti - vipaṇcitārtha. A Tibetan translation of Dharmāga's Hetucakradamaru is also attributed to him.212 Some Tantrik texts extant in Tibetan and one text, entitled Tattvasiddhi extant in Sanskrit, are also attributed to one Śāntarākṣita. But scholars are a bit sceptical whether they are from the pen of the author of the Tattvasamgraha.213

840 A.D. (Bauddha Sanskriti, pp. 404-405; Puratattvanibandhāvali, p. 181). The Blue Annals (I. p. 44) records that the great vihāra bsam-yas was built from 'the hare year' (787 A.D.) till the 'sheep year' (791 A.D.). According to Bu-Ston (Ibid. Vol. - II, p. 189) the construction work continues 12 years, from 'the fire-hare year' (787 A.D.) to 'the earth hare year' (799 A.D.) According to Tucci's chronology (Tombs of the Tibetan kings, SOR, I, 1950, pp. 44, 81, 95) king khri-sron-idle-btsan ruled from A.D. 742 to A.D. 792 and Śāntarākṣita was invited by him. These chronological arrangements, however, do not seem to be in agreement with the latest studies in the history and chronology of Tibet which have been substantiated by epigraphic records. Kawamura has placed him C. 725-84. Craig, E. Ibid. p. 61.

210. Edited with Commentary of Kamalāśīla by Embar Krishnamacharya in GOS Nos. XXX, XXXI, Baroda, 1926.
211. Winternitz, M. Ibid. p. 317
According to Sumpa\textsuperscript{214}, Santarakṣita was born in a royal family of Zahor during the reign of king Gopala (Cir. 750-770 A.D.) and died when king Dharmapāla (Cir. 770-810 A.D.) was ruling. There is difference of opinion among scholars with respect to the identification of Zahor.\textsuperscript{215} Before proceeding to Nepal and thence to Lhasa he had been the Chancellor of the Nalanda University. He had been invited by Khri-sron-Ide-bstan from Man-Yul, near Nepal. He taught ten precepts to the Tibetan monarch and established the first regular monastery at bSam-yas, probably in the year A.D. 775. Some four years later the sad-mi monks (the monks on probation) were ordained. In 763, he entered Tibet and then returned to India. Again, he returned to Tibet at 771 A.D. and devoted the rest of his life to the development of Buddhism there. He died of the Kick of a horse.\textsuperscript{216}

In criticising the Indian philosophical traditions, both Buddhist and non-Buddhist, Santarakṣita gives a wealth of information regarding the philosophical status of the time.\textsuperscript{217} The reason for his critical analysis was of course to establish


Madhyamaka as the highest doctrine of all. Although he considered Śūnyatā as the highest truth, he claimed that from the worldly-level (Vyāhārīkāsatsya) one should accept the Yogācāra claim of Vijnaptimagatā (mind only), and thus he can be seen as an adherent of the Yogācāra - Mādhyamika. Based on his Tattvasamgraha, T.R.V. Murti observes that the structure of this particular text is Mādhyamika in character and every chapter of it is devoted to the examination (parikṣa) of a particular category or system; refutation is the predominant note. The prefatory verses in the beginning are an echo of Nāgārjuna's opening verse in the Mādhyamika Karikās. Santarakṣita makes his obeisance to Buddha. It has been pointed out that at places author shows his manifest inclination to Vijnānavāda. But he likewise expounds the doctrine of momentariness, svalaksana etc. According to him all this can be explained on the hypothesis that Santarakṣita accepts the Vijnānavāda contention about the non-existence of objects from the empirical (Vyāhārīkā) point of view.

Kamalasīla (C. 740-797 A.D.) was a worthy pupil and commentator of Santarakṣita. The Mādhyamika tradition is supposed to have become firmly established in Tibet by him. According to Tibetan sources Santarakṣita had recommended in his will on his death bed that if need be, his pupil Kamalasīla should be invited from India. Then, invited by king khri-srong-lde-btsan,

---

218. Joshi, L.M. Ibid.
219. The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, P. 102.
220. Foot Note No. - 207 of this chapter for the date of Kamalasīla as well as the other informations regarding Kamalasīla.
Kamalasila entered Tibet in 794 A.D. It is said that he defeated the Chinese monk, Hva-shang -Ma -he - yan, in a debate held in bsam-yas (Samyaya) monastery.²²¹ It was a clash between the Indian Buddhists who advocated gradual path and the Chinese Buddhists who advocated the Sudden Path.²²² After the conclusion of the debate, Kamalasila composed three booklets for the Tibetan Buddhists, known as First, second and Third Bhavanākrama,²²³ respectively. They expound the way of gradual progress through meditation on truth from the standpoint of the Yogācāra Mādhyamika.

Kamalasila wrote brilliant comenataries on his teacher's works, the Tattvasamgrahapalihika and the Madhyamakalamkarapalihika. Tattvasamgrahapalihika is a monument of his phenomenal learning, sharp wit and uncommon power of reasoning and debating. He has rendered the terse Kārikas of the Tattva samgraha intelligible and has supplied the names of the thinkers criticised by his master.²²⁴ His another logical work is Nyāyabindu - pūrvapakṣa - samkṣepa, extant only in Tibetan. Bu-ston²²⁵ attributes to Kamalasila a work ²²¹. Foot Note no.-214. ²²². 'Sudden enlightenment' view held by Chinese Chan Buddhists' - Craig. E. Ibid, p. 61. ²²³. Bu-Ston, II, p. 136. Bhāvanākrama edited by G. Tucci has been published in its original form in Roman letters along with Tibetan Translation in the Minor Buddhist Texts, II, pp. 5-154. The Third of it called Uttarabhāvanākrama, exists in original Sanskrit and in Tibetan and Chinese versions. Sanskrit original is found in the Journal of The Greater Indian Society, Vol.-II, 1935, pp. 1-11; The Tibetan and Chinese Versions have been translated into French by E. Lamotte and P. Demieville in Le Concile de Lhasa, pp. 333-353. ²²⁴. Joshi, L. M. Ibid. p. 160. ²²⁵. Bu-Ston, II, p. 136
called the Madhyamika-āloka. The Tibetan Tanjur ascribes the following works also to the authorship of Kamalaśila:

1) Āryasaptasatikā - prajñāparamitā - tīkā;
2) Āryavajracchedikā - prajñāpāramita - tīkā;
3) Prajñāpāramitā - hṛdayanāma - tīkā;
4) Dakini vajraguhya-gītānāma - mahopadesa. 226

Besides these, he is said to have translated into Tibetan a work called 'Maḥā-mudropadesāvajraguhya-gītī'. 227

Nothing of his early life is known to us except that he was a Professor of Tantra in the Nalanda University. About his death we learn from Tibetan sources that he was murdered. According to Bu-ston, the murderers were the followers of Hva-San. 228 But old Tibetan chronicles record that they were native heretics, the Bonpos. 229

Vimuktisena (eighth century) was a well-known figure in Tibetan tradition, but his biography is not clear. Tibetan tradition mentions him as a philosopher of the same school of Santaraksita and Kamalasila. 230 His only known work is Abhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti - a commentary on the Abhisamayālaṃkāra, attributed

227. Ibid.
228. Bu-Ston, II : pp. 195f; cf. Blue Annals, I.P. 41
to the founder of Yogācāra school Maitreyanātha.\textsuperscript{231} It is even difficult to determine the extent of Vimukti-sena's dedication to Madhyamaka thought as much is not known about his work. He was a teacher of Haribhadra.

\textbf{Haribhadra} (C-800 A.D.) Haribhadra explained the basic Madhyamaka teaching of no-self nature (niḥsvabhāva) for all entities in his only known treatise called - ‘Aṣṭaśāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāvyākhyābhi - samayālaṃkāraloka”. In this treatise, he criticised the Sarvāstivāda, the Sautrāntika and the "Alkākāravāda Yogācāra" as well as "Satyākāravāda Yogācāra" by following the method of critique in Sāntarakṣita's Madhyamālaṃkāra.\textsuperscript{232} It is interesting to note that he composed that treatise as a commentary on the Aṣṭaśāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāstra in accordance with the divisions of the "Abhisamayālaṃkāra" of Maitreyanātha, the founder of Yogācāra school.\textsuperscript{233} Confusion regarding his philosophical position may arise for that. L.M. Joshi refers him as a Yogācāra teacher who specialised in the Prajñāpāramitā literature.\textsuperscript{234} But, Kawamura\textsuperscript{235}, following his literary compositions places him as a representative of Madhyamika school. T.R.V. Murti also referred him as a follower of Yogācāra - Madhyamika - Svātantrika school of Sāntarakṣita.\textsuperscript{236} Infact,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{231} Craig, E. Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{232} Craig, E. Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{233} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{234} Ibid. p. 165.
\item \textsuperscript{235} Craig, E. Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{236} Ibid. p. 103, Bu-Ston Vol. - II, p. 136n. also Oberrmiller's 'The Doctrine of the Prajñāpāramitā', p. 90n.
\end{itemize}
observations of Kawamura proves how Haribhadra and others represent a 
syncretism of the Madhyamika with the Yogacara. Bu-ston\textsuperscript{237} attributes the 
following works to him:

1) A summary of the Pañcavimsati-sahasrikā in 8 chapters;
2) the Abhisamayālāṃkārāloka
3) the great commentary on Aṣṭasāhasrikā, called Sputārtha;
4) the commentary on the Saṃcaya called Subodhinī;
5) Prajñāpāramitābhāvanā.

Sputartha was a short comment on the Abhisamayalankāra and the 
Sanḍaya is probably the Prajñāpāramitāsancaya - gāthā.\textsuperscript{238}

Haribhadra was the first spiritual teacher of Dharmapāla\textsuperscript{239}. Bu-Ston\textsuperscript{240} 
says he was contemporary of king Mahipāla - I of the Pala - dynasty of Bengal 
i.e. in the last decade of tenth century A.D.\textsuperscript{241}. His disciple Buddhajñāna \textsuperscript{242} - 
pāda, who was also the second spiritual teacher of Dharmapāla, performed the 
consecration ceremony of the Vikramasīla - Vihara founded by Dharmapāla 
(C.770- 810 A.D.). Therefore, Haribhadra must have appeared before this event.

\textsuperscript{237}. Bu-Ston, II, p. 158.
\textsuperscript{238}. Blue Annals, I, pp. 31, 367.
\textsuperscript{239}. Schiefner, Taranath, pp. 229-232; Pag Sam Jon Zang, p. XCIV.
\textsuperscript{240}. Bu-Ston, II, p. 158.
\textsuperscript{241}. Mazumdar, R. C. History of Bengal, I, p. 177.
\textsuperscript{242}. Blue Annals, I, 367; Bu-Ston, II, p. 159.
so the above contention of Bu - Ston that Hare Bhadra Mahipala - I were contemporary is wrong. He died in the 22nd year of Dharmapala's reign.\(^243\) In the great commentary on the Astasahasrika, it is said that this work was composed at the monastery of Trikatuka under the patronage of Dharmapala.\(^244\)

Vimuktiṣena is mentioned by him self as his teacher and owing to the aid of Vimuktiṣena he perceived the meaning of the doctrine during the time of his composition.\(^245\)

**'THE YOGĀCĀRĀ'**

Yogācārā is the second school of Mahāyāna Buddhism. The founder of this school is traditionally ascribed to Maitreya or Maitreyanātha, the future Buddha, in the third century. (C.150 - 265 A.D.)\(^246\) About the tradition of Maitreya, Winternitz opines that 'if this be correct, in that case Maitreya would have to be considered to have a historical character and to have been the real founder of the Yogācārā school.\(^247\) Asaṅga is said to be the pupil of Maitreya and wrote commentaries on the works of his master. Some modern scholars, such as

\(^243\) Abhisamayalamkāraloka (Colophon), G.O.S., LXIII, pp. 563-64, History of Bengal, I.P. 417.

\(^244\) Bu-Ston, II, p. 158.

\(^245\) Ibid. p. 159.

\(^246\) Vapat, Prof. P. V. (ed.) '2500 years of Buddhism' P. 108, H.P. Sastri (IHQ, l. 1927, p. 465f) has declared Maitreyanātha to be the founder of Yogācārā School and he has placed him in between 150 and 265 A.D.

\(^247\) Winternitz, M. Ibid. p. 298.
H. Ui (1929) have argued that this Maitreya was an actual human teacher, not the future Buddha.\textsuperscript{248}

Another Story runs thus: When Nāgārjuna was the abbot at Nālandā there appeared dissensions among his followers over certain issues leading to the evolution of Yogācārā - Viśnūnavāda school of Mahāyāna philosophy.\textsuperscript{249}

However, the classical phase in the history of the school was the age of Asaṅga and his brother Vasubandhu in the fourth or fifth century A.D. Most of its fundamental doctrines had appeared in a number of scriptures a century or more earlier and its basic tenets and doctrines were already in circulation for at least a century before the brothers lived.\textsuperscript{250} The Yoga practice is not unknown to the Hinayana Buddhism either.\textsuperscript{251} The Yogācāra view is called Viśnūnavāda or idealism because it admits that there is only one kind of reality which is of the nature of consciousness (Viśnūna) and objects which appear to be material or external to consciousness are really ideas or states of consciousness. They

\textsuperscript{248} Craig, E. Ibid. p. 65. G. Tucci also adduced some evidences in support of the hypothesis that Maitreya is an historical personage and that he is the author of the six works (generally ascribed to Asaṅga) including Yogācārabhūmīsāst.: He held that Maitreya is the author of the Kārikās of the six works and Asaṅga of the commentaries on them - 'On Some Aspects of the Doctrines of Maitreya (natha) and Asaṅga and JASB, NS-XXVI, 1930, p. 125ff.

\textsuperscript{249} Stcherbatsky, The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa, pp. 36ff; Haldar (De) Dr. Manikuntala, Baudhā Dharmer Itihas' (in Bengali), p. 239.

\textsuperscript{250} Stcherbatsky, Th. Ibid. p. 36 (n.1). The Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra describes a visit paid to Rāvaṇa in Ceylon by Buddha, who answered a number of questions according to the doctrine of Yogācārā school. Radhakrishnan S. Indian Philsophy, p. 62 (n.1).

\textsuperscript{251} Craig, E. Ibid. p. 64.
introduce several important new doctrines to Buddhism, including Vijñapatimātra, three self-natures, three turnings of the dharma - wheel and a system of eight consciousness.

About the term 'Yogācāra' Radhakrishnan writes - "The school is called Yogācāra since it declares that the absolute truth or bodhi manifested in the Buddhas is attainable only by those who practise Yoga." A. C. Banerjee explicitly says that the practice of Yoga (meditation) is the most effective method for the attainment of the highest truth (bodhi) by going through all the ten stages of spiritual progress (dasabhumī) of Bodhisattvahood. It was otherwise known as the Vijñānavāda on account of its holding Vijñānamātra (pure consciousness) as the reality. The appellation Yogācāra was given by Asaṅga while the term

252. Michael Heidelberger, (Contributor of an article on Yogācāra in the Craig, E. (ed) Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy) says among the key Yogācāra concepts introduced in the Saṃghinirmocanasūtra are the notions of 'only cognition' (vijñaptimātra), three self-natures (trisvabhāva), warehouse consciousness (ālayavijñāna) overturning the basis (asṛṣṭaparśvā) and the theory of eight consciousness.' Ibid. p. 64. This is, indeed, a new source of information for the study of Yogacara school.


254. Buddhism in India And Abroad, p. 107.

255. Vijñaptimātram evedaṃ asaṅrthavabhāsanāt/ yādvat taimirikasyaṃsaṭikesonṛkādīdāśanām// yadi Vijñāptiṁarthā niyamo āsakālayoh/ santāṇasaṃyāmasca yukti kṛtyakriyā na ca//

Virīṣatīka, Kā. Nos. - 1 and 2

In the Vṛtti, Sthiramati explains - Mahāyāne traidhātukam Vijñaptimātram vyāvsthāpayateḥ. 'Cittamāṭram bho jinaputra! .... / Cittam mano vijnānam vijñaptiscetī paryāyāḥ / Cittamāṭra sasamprayogamabhīpretam/'
Vijnanavāda was used by Vasubandhu. "The title yogācāra brings out the practical side of the philosophy, while Vijnanavāda brings out its speculative features." 256

The Vijnaptimātratā is the only truth. Ācārya Vasubandhu declares that the ātmā, dharma and the like are but 'parināma of Vijnāna' only. Parināma, again, is three-fold-ālayavijnāna, ālambana and viṣaya-vijnāpti. 257 The Ālayavijnāna is the seed of all dharmas i.e. the repository of all elemental knowledge. It retains the seed of all 'samklesika' dharmas that are root of phenomenal world. 258 The Lankavatārasūtra says: "Cittam exists; not the objects perceptible by sight. Through objects visually cognised, cittam manifests itself in body in one's objects of enjoyment, residence etc. It is called the alaya of men." 259 In short, vijñāna constitutes the whole universe. Things of nature are only the other of it. There is nothing outside thought. 260 There can not be any absolute opposition between thinking subject and world of objects which he

256. Radhakrishnan, S. Ibid. p. 625, "The appellation Yogācāra was given by Asaṅga while the term Vijnānavāda was used by Vasubandhu". Bapat, P.V. p.
258. How do the elements emanate from this Vijnaptimātratā is given in Trimsikā-kārikā.

Tatrālayāvikhyāṁ vijñānam vipākaḥ sarvāvijñakaṁ//

Trimsikā, ka. 2.

also Chatterjee, K. N. Ibid. pp. 30ff.
259. Radhakrishnan, S. Indian Philosophy, Vol.-1, p. 630.
260. Vijnāna parināma tyāṁ vikalpa yad vikalpyate
tenā tattvānti tena sārvaṁ viñaptimātratāṁ/

Trimsikā, Ka-17.
thinks. Thought is the beginning and the end of all knowledge. Remove thought, all will vanish into nothing. The individual who thinks is not merely an individual, he is part of all he knows, and all he knows is part of him. Thought is the only reality we have to reckon with. It is the structure as well as the stuff of reality. It knows only so far as it thinks itself to be the object of its knowledge. Thought contains everything in itself.261

The Yogācārins also recognised two kinds of Nairatma (non-substantiality), Pudgalanārātma (non-substantiality of self) and Dharmanārātma (non-substantiality of the things of the world). The former could be realised through the removal of passions (Klesāvaraṇa) and latter by the removal of the veil covering knowledge (jñeyavaraṇa). According to them there are three varieties of knowledge - parikalpita (illusory), paratantra(empirical) and parinispanna (absolute) as against the two of Mādhyamikas.262

Now if the world is viññāna, or if the world is only the 'parināma' of the Viññāna alone, then what about Nirvāna? To this, Vasubandhu replies that resting in 'Viññaptimātrata' means Nirvāna. As long as consciousness does not abide in mind only (Viññānapariñāmaśca), the attachment of the subject - object distinction will not cease263 when the mind no longer seizes on any object whatever, then

261. Ibid. pp. 630ff.
262. Chatterjee, K. N. Ibid. Trimśikavijñaptibhāṣyam, (ātmadharmopacāro hi vividho yah pravartate viññānapariñāmaśca/...... etc.), pp. 27-33.
the mind is established in the nature of mind only (Vijñānamātratva). That is the supreme, world transcending knowledge.264

The Vijnānavāda, however, differed from the Mādhyamika in advancing the theory of Vijnāna as the sole reality. Asanga explains that when one realises that an entity is unreal and that the world is only a fiction, one rests in Citta or Vijnāna only. This Citta or Vijnana is the ultimate reality of all entities and when one realises it, one transcends the sense of duality and attains the knowledge of nonduality. When again one realises that other than citta all are unreal, one gradually understands that 'Citta' also is unreal265. It is now believed that Maitreya was the founder of Yogacara school and Asaṅga (C. 405 - 470 A.D.) was his direct disciple. Vasubandhu, brother of Asaṅga, (C. 410 - 490 A.D.) is also regarded as one of the great doctors of this school. Among the distinguished personalities of this school may be mentioned as Sthiramātī (C. 450 A.D.), Dharmapāla (C. 540 - 610 A.D.), Diṅnāga (C. 450 - 520 A.D.), Dharmakirti (C. 540 - 650 A.D.) Sīlabhadra (C. 635 A.D.), Sāntarakṣita (C. 740 - 797 A.D.),

264. "Yadā tvālambanam jñānam naivo-palabhate tada sthito vijnānamātratve - Trimsikā kā -28,
'sau jñānam lokottaram ca tat' / Trimsikā. kā-29.

265. arthan sa vijnārya ca jalpamātrān santiṣṭhate trannibhacittamātre/ ca dharmadhātustasmadviyukto dvayalaksanaṇa //
Sutralankara vi.
Nāśīn cittatapatparametya buddhiyā cittasya nāstitvamupaiti tasmāt/ dvayasya nāstitvamupetya dhīmān santiṣṭhate atadgatidharmadhātave//
also dhatterjee K.N. Ibid. Introduction, pp. xxxvii ff.

Ratnakūrti (C. 940 - 1000 A.D.)\textsuperscript{266}. Even famous Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-Tsang was also the follower of the school, more specifically to that branch based on Abhidharmik psychology, exemplified by Sthiramati and Dharmapāla.\textsuperscript{267} It is to be noted that after Vasubandhu yogācāra developed into two distinct directions: a logico-epistemic tradition exemplified by Dīnāga, Dharmakīrti, Śāntarakṣita and Ratnakūrti, an Abhidharmik psychology, exemplified by such thinkers as Sthiramati, Dharmapāla, Ratnakūrti etc.\textsuperscript{268} While the first branch focused on questions of epistemology and logic, the other wing refined and elaborated the Abhidharma analysis developed by Asaṅga and Vasubandhu.\textsuperscript{269}

\textbf{Asaṅga} was born in a Brahmin family in Puruṣapura. At first he was an adherent of Sarvāstivāda school, but later, he became a disciple of Maitreyanātha and accepted the doctrine of yogācāra school. He brought the school into prominence by his writings and places it on a high level. Among his works were - Mahāyāna Saṅgraha, PrakaraṇaĀryavācā, Mahāyana - Abhidharma - Saṅgīti Śāstra and a commentary on the Vajracchedikā.\textsuperscript{270} Asaṅga's magnum opus, the Yogācārabhūmiśāstra\textsuperscript{271} is a comprehensive encyclopedia of Buddhist terms and models, mapped out according to his yogācārin view of how one progresses along the stages of the path to enlightenment.

\textsuperscript{266} Craig. E. Ibid. p. 66.
\textsuperscript{267} Joshi, L. M. Ibid. pp. 180ff.
\textsuperscript{268} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{269} Bu-ston assigned to Asaṅga, Pañcabhūmi, Abhidharmasamuccaya and Mahāyānasamgraha, Blue Annals, I.P. 233, Yuan Chwang, I, 355-357.
\textsuperscript{270} It is also called Saptapadasabhūmiśāstra, Winternitz. Ibid. p. 299.
Vasubandhu is famed in legend as the Master of a thousand manuals. According to tradition, Vasubandhu first studied Vaibhāṣika Buddhist teachings, writing an encyclopedic summary of those teachings - the Abhidharmakosā. Later, intellectually restless for a while, Vasubandhu composed a variety of works that chart his journey to Yogācārā, the best known of these being the Karmasiddhi - prakaraṇa and Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa. Besides the commentaries on Mahāyāna-sūtras Vasubandhu wrote Viṃśatikā and Trīṃśikā - two classical works on 'Vijñāpti-mātratāsiddhi' - the consciousness alone is real. Besides being an idealist, Vasubandhu was logician also and wrote three logical works: Vādavidhi, Vādavidhāna and Vādahrdaya. His last work is said to be a devotional one, the Aparimitayus - Sūtropadeśa. According to tradition Asaṅga converted Vasubandhu to Yogācārā after having been taught by Maitreya. He is not known to have had any other notable disciples. Tradition does assign two major disciples to Vasubandhu: Dīnāga, "the father of Indian logic" and Sthiramati, an important early Yogācārā commentator who wrote commentary on Vijñāptimātratā-siddhi. It is unclear whether either Dīnāga and Sthiramati ever actually met Vasubandhu; they may have been disciples of his thought, acquired exclusively from his writings or through some forgotten intermediary teachers. However, these two disciples exemplify the two major

272. Discussion on his philosophical standpoint has been done in the previous pages (specially note. 81). also Chaudhury. S. Analytical study of the Abhidharmakosā, Introduction, pp. 12-15.


274. Craig, E. Ibid. p. 65.
directions into which Vasubandhu's teachings split. These branches were not entirely separate and many Buddhists wrote works that contributed to both. Dīnāga, for instance, besides works on epistemology concede that if one wishes to debate with an opponent, one must first find a common epistemological ground upon which to argue.275

The logico-epistemic tradition exemplified by Dīnāga, finally, inaugurated a new school of critical philosophy. During this period Buddhist philosophy of transcendental idealism, critical realism and universal flux, reached its acme in the hands of Candrakīrti, Dharmakīrti, Śāntarakṣita, Kamalaśīla, Dharmottara, Ratnakīrti -- the towering personalities in the galaxy of Buddhist philosophers of the age. There seems to be some confusion with regard to the correct standpoint of these philosophers. Among them, being the foremost figures in the history of Indian intellectual thought movement Dīnāga and Dharmakīrti deserve special attention.

**Dīnāga** : He has been placed by the modern writers in the fifth century A.D., mainly, on the ground that he was a pupil of Vasubandhu.276 I-tsing places

---

275. Discussion in details has been made regarding this issue in previous pages, in connection with the "The Later Period" (Circa 8th-11th Century A.D.) of the Mādhyamika school.

276. Stcherbasky, Buddhist Logic, Vol. - I, pp. 31-32; But it is doubtful that he was a direct disciple or not. Craig. E. Ibid. p. 5.
him not in the middle ages when Asaṅga and Vasubandhu flourished, but in the
times when lived Dharmapāla, Darmakīrti and others.277 His direct disciple
Iśvarasena (C. 600 A.D.) was a teacher of Darmakīrti (C.580 - 630 A.D.). So it
is, however, possible to place him in the first half of the sixth century A.D. (C.
450-520 A.D.).

Diññāga having heard the Yogācārabhūmiśāstra, gave up Hīnayānism and
espoused the Mahāyāna (Great - Vehicle) with a view to propagate the Yoga-
system.278 This is confirmed from his works specially by the Alambanaparikṣa,
which displays him as a champion of Vijnanavada.279 But he differed from the
protagonists of Vijnanavāda and in fact politely criticised Vasubandhu.280 Diññāga
has been included among the ācāryas of the Abhidharma system. Stcherbatsky
points out that Diññāga quotes from the Abhidharma of the Sarvāstivadins in
support of the formulas of definition of the two pramāṇas.281 The system of
Diññāga appears as a critical and dialectical system. When we compare it with
Candrakīrti's method of reductio - ad - absurdum, bordering on skepticism as
helplessly false (mṛṣā), the doctrine of Diññāga appears realistic.282 His system

279. Keith, A. B. Buddhist Philosophy, p. 305; Stcherbatsky, Th. Buddhist Logic, Vol. -
I, pp. 518-521 for a summary on 'Alambanaparikṣa'.
280. Stcherbatsky, Th. Ibid. pp. 32-33; (Pramāṇa-samuccaya I, 14 cited by Frauwallner
in SOR, III, p. 63)
281. Stcherbatsky, Ibid. p. 32 (note 1)
282. Stcherbatsky, Th. - Ibid. p.7. (note-2)
may best be described as a system of ‘transcendental realism or critical
philosophy. Theodor stcherbatsky recognised in him not only a comprehensive
system of philosophy, but also a most excellent achievement of Indian mind.283
The sharpness of his insight and soundness of his critical logic were so great
that "no praise seems too high for him. Indeed he may fittingly be styled as the
first and last of Indian logicians."284 He was a man of vast learning and wisdom,
and practised during his life-time twelve tested virtues. He attacked his opponents
as frequently as he was attacked by them. His whole life was passed in giving
blow and receiving counter blows. Kālidāsa warns in his poem to avoid the
"rugged hand" (sthūlāhasta) of Dinnaga.285 Uddyotakara, the eminent logician,
calls him "a quibbler" (kutārkika).286 Vācaspati Miśra describes him as "an erring
one" (bhrānta) and speaks of his "blunders" (bhrānti)287. Mallinātha compares
him with a "rock" (adrikalpa)288. Kumāril Bhaṭṭa and Pārthasārathi Miśra turn
their arrows against him.289 The Vedāntins and Jainas were not inactive in their

283. Ibid. pp. 36ff.
286. Uddyotakara's Nyāya-vārtika, Introductory stanza, p. 1. (Bibliotheca Indica Series),
Nyāya-vārtika, 1-1-4, pp. 43-44; 1-1-5, p. 52, 1-1-6; pp. 60-61; 1-1-7, p. 63 etc.
Vidyabhusana quotes the verse, Ibid. p. 273. (note 3)
287. Sastri, Gangadhar, Nyāya-vārtika-tātparyafikā, 1-1-1, pp. 1, 31; 1-1-4, pp. 76-77,
97-98, 102, 1-1-5, p. 102; 1-1-6, p. 136 etc.
288. Mallinātha's commentary on verse-14 of Meghaduta, (Purvamegha).
289. Vidyabhusana, S.C. Ibid. p. 273 (also note - 6)
hostility. Even Dharmakirti, attempted to oppose him. Vidhyabhusan observes that Dinnaga must have been a very strongly built man, both physically and mentally, otherwise he could hardly have lived for a single day under assaults from so many sides.

The Pramanasamuccaya is one of the 'grandest literary monuments' of Dinnaga's works which still exists. It is a Sanskrit work written in anustubh metre. The Sanskrit original of it is lost but a Tibetan translation still exists. It is divided into following six chapters: 1) Perception (Pratyaksa), 2) Inference for one's own self (Svarthanumana), 3) Inference for the sake of others (Pararthanumana), 4) Reason and Example (Hetu-drstanta), 5) Negation of the opposite (Apoha) and 6) Analogue (Jati). The Hetu-Cakra-Damartis another small treatise on logic by Dinnaga. Other important works are Pramanasamuccaya-vrtti, Pramana-sastra Nyaya-pravesa, Alamba na-paiksha, Alamba na-paiksha-vrtti and Trikalaapariksha. The Sanskrit originals of those appear

290. The Digambara Jaina logician Dharmabhusana, in controverting the Vaisesika doctrine of Samanya (generality), quotes in support of his own conclusion the verse of Dinnaga. Dharmabhusana's Nyaya-Dopikaa, ch-ill. also quoted in Vidhyabhusana's Ibid. p. 273 (note. 7). The same verse is quoted by Madhavacaryya in a little altered form in Sarvadarshanasamgraha, Chapter on Bauddhasarana.


292. Ibid. p. 274.

293. Ibid. pp. 276-296; and by the same writer 'Dinnaga and his Pramanasamuccaya' in the JASB, Vol. 1, No. 9. 1905, pp. 3-4.
to be lost. But there exist Tibetan translations.294 A Chinese version of Pramāṇaśāstra - Nyāyapravesa is also available.295

About his life Chinese and mainly, Tibetan source inform us that Ācārya Dinnāga was born in a Brāhmaṇa family in Simhavaktra near Kāñcī (mod. Conjeeveram in Madras). He was initiated by Nāgadatta, an exponent of Vātsiputriya sect, and acquired proficiency in the Tipitaka under his tutelage. Afterwards he became a disciple of Ārya Vasubandhu with whom he studied all the Pitakas of the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna. A few years later he was invited to Nālandā where he defeated Brāhmaṇa Sudurjaya and other Tīrthikas (dialecticians) and won them to the doctrine of Buddha. Dinnāga travelled in Nālandā, Orissa, Mahārāstra and Madras, entering everywhere into disputes with controversialist. Since he had refuted chiefly the Tīrtha controversialists he was called a "Fighting Bull" or a "Bull of Discussion". He spent a considerable part of his life in Andhra. He is said to have died in a solitary wood in Orissa.296

294. I-tsing, (pp. 186-187) gives a list of 8 logical works of Dinnāga, most of them are extant in Tibetan and Chinese translation. Dinnagas Alambanaparikṣa is restored by N. K. Shastri. G. Tucci edited his 'Prajñāpāramitā Pīndārthā' in JRAS, 1947, again re edited by P. L. Vaidya in Buddhist Sanskrit Text No. -4, Several extracts from his works quoted by Uddyotakara and others have been collected and translated by H. N. Randle in 'Fragments from Dinnāga'. Vidyabhusana, S.C. Ibid. pp. 274-301.


296. Ibid. pp. 270-301 for a fuller account of Dinnāga. Later accounts given in the various modern scholars mainly based on this account.
Dharmakīrti: The Tibetan historians represent him as a South-Indian Brāhmaṇa, born in Tirumālai in the kingdom of Cūḍāmaṇi (Probably Cola Country). The name of his father is given as Korunānanda. Bu-ston, Tārānatha and Sumpa make him a contemporary and a rival of kuṃāribhāṭṭa; this may be true. He is said to have been a pupil of Isvarasena and also of Dharmaśāla. His immediate pupil was Devendrabuddhi. He is the author of i) Pramāṇavārttika, ii) Pramāṇaviniścaya, iii) Nyāyabindu, iv) Hetuvindu, v) Sambandhapāksa, vi) Vādanyāya and, vii) Santānantasiddhi. Besides, he also wrote commentaries on the first chapter of the Pramāṇavārttika and on the Sambandha pāksa. According to Tārānātha, Dharmakīrti was a pupil of Dharmaśāla and a contemporary of Sroṇ- bstana - gam - po. This Tibetan king died in cir. 698 A.D. I-ṭsing writing in about 691 A.D., says that Dharmakīrti flourished in recent years. In some Tibetan chronicles of Buddhism, Dharmakīrti is represented as a pupil of Isvarasena, this latter was a direct pupil of Diṅnāga. All these pieces of evidence put together would indicate that Dharmakīrti flourished in the first half of the seventh century A.D. his approximate date seems to be cir A.D. 580-650. It is a moot point that Hiuen-Tsang who may have come to Nālandā in 635 A.D. does not mention Dharmakīrti. Of the seven

treatises, the best and the greatest work of Dharmakīrti is the Pramāṇavārttika. It is not merely a commentary on Dīnāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya, but is an original explanation of the elements of logic and critical philosophy. The work consists of four chapters:

1. Inference (Svārthānumāna)
2. Validity of Knowledge (Pramāṇasiddhi)
3. Perception (Pratyakṣa)
4. Syllogism (Parārthānumāna)

This order of chapter is not standard one which latter should have been as follows: validity of knowledge, perception, inference, and syllogism. The Nyāyavinduh has got three chapters dealing with perception, inference, and syllogism. It is his best known short work and gives in brief the essentials of Buddhist logic. The Pramāṇa-viniscaya is an abridgement of the Pramāṇavārttika, and deals with perception, inference, syllogism in three chapters respectively. The Hetuvinduh is a short classification of logical reasons. The Sambandhapāka is a short work which treats of the problem of relations. The Codanaprakarana discusses the art of disputation, it is also known as Vādanyāya. The Santanantararasiddhi treats the reality of other minds, and criticizes solipsism. In the Tibetan collection three more works are attributed to

Dharmakīrti, viz. a poetical work, and commentaries on Aryasūra's Jātakamālā and the Vinayasūtra. Non-Buddhist literary works also seem to suggest that Dharmakīrti was a poet of some merit.

Philosophically, Dharmakīrti belonged to the school of critical philosophy which was founded by Dīnāgā. He represents the culmination of the Buddha's dynamic philosophy in which Buddha is conceived as an Embodiment of Right knowledge (Pramāṇabhūta). All subsequent creative minds of India seem to revolve round the magnificent and almost invulnerable thought structure built by this subtle genius. According to an eminent scholar, Dharmakīrti 'was never excelled by anyone in his critical reasoning, bold analysis and clear thinking.'

Bu-ston says that even his contemporary heretical panditas were convinced of the subtlety and excellence of Dharmakīrtis intellectual flowers and treatises, but out of jealousy and envy they "fastened them to the tail of a dog" and let the animal run through the streets and hamlets with a view to destroying the leaves of his works.