

Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal (2009, 22:25-44)

Taipei: Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies

中華佛學學報第二十二期 頁25-44 (民國九十八年)，臺北：中華佛學研究所

ISSN:1017-7132

“That the Powers of the Buddha Are Common to Disciples...”

Bart Dessein

Professor, Ghent University

Abstract

This article discusses the opinion attributed to the Andhakas in the *Kathāvatthupparakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā*, a fifth century commentary on the *Kathāvatthu* by Buddhaghosa, that the wisdom powers (*jñānabala*) of the Buddha are common to the Disciples (*śrāvaka*). We will, more precisely, address this Andhaka opinion in its relevance for the issue of the rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism. It will be shown that the claim that the Disciples share the wisdom powers (*jñānabala*) with the Tathāgata, is part of a gradual process of attributing specific qualities, the so-called ‘Unique Dharmas of a Buddha’ (*buddhāveṇikadharmā*), to the Buddha only, towards attributing such qualities also to the *śrāvakas*; a process that is in line with the gradual development of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Keywords:

Hīnayāna, Mahāyāna, *Śrāvaka*, Arhat, Bodhisattva, Buddha

聲聞弟子與佛陀的相同之力

Bart Dessein
根特大學教授

摘要

此文將討論覺音尊者在五世紀時所寫的論注—《論事注釋》(*Kathāvatthupparāṇa-atthakathā*)中提到安達羅派 (Andhakas) 認為聲聞弟子與佛陀具有相同之力，更精確地來說，我們將闡述此派對於大乘佛教興起的見解，安達羅派主張聲聞弟子與如來一樣具有十智力，這是主張聲聞也具有佛陀不共法之特質的漸進過程，而此也與大乘佛教逐漸發展的過程一致。

關鍵字：小乘、大乘、聲聞、阿羅漢、菩薩、佛陀

The Ten Wisdom Powers of the Buddha

In Sūtra literature, ten wisdom powers (*jñānabala*) are attributed to the Buddha: (1) the wisdom power of the possible and impossible (*sthānāsthānajñānabala*): the Buddha's power to know all factors, their causes and conditions (*hetupratyaya*), and the mechanism of their fruits of retribution (*vipākaphalāniyāma*); (2) the wisdom power of retribution of action (*karmavipākajñānabala*): the power to know the sphere of action (*karmasthāna*) of all kinds of actions of the past, present and future; (3) the wisdom power of trances, liberations, meditative attainments and *samādhis* (*dhyānavimokṣasamādhisamāpattijñānabala*): the power to know all these auxiliary factors of the path to liberation; (4) the wisdom power of higher and lower faculties (*indriyaparāparajñānabala*): the power to know the moral faculties of all beings; (5) the wisdom power of resolve (*nānādhimuktijñānabala*): the power to know the purity (*prasāda*) and the inclinations (*ruci*) of all beings; (6) the wisdom power of dispositions (*nānādhātujñānabala*): the power to know acquired dispositions of all beings in all spheres of existence; (7) the wisdom power of the courses (*sarvatragāminīpratipajjñānabala*): the power to know which way leads to which destination; (8) the wisdom power of former existences (*pūrvanivāsānumṛtijñānabala*): the power to know all his and all other beings' previous existences; (9) the wisdom power of birth and death (*cyutyupapādajñānabala*): the Buddha's power to see with his divine eye (*divyacakṣus*) the place of death and rebirth of all beings; and (10) the wisdom power of destruction of impure influence (*āsravakṣayajñānabala*): the power to know the destruction of impure influence, the nature of impure influence and the mindset of himself and of all beings.¹ It is the possession of these ten wisdom powers and of the four confidences (*vaiśāradya*)² that justifies why "it is the Tathāgata who is fully awakened, who

1 MN I: *Mahāsīhanādasutta* (Trenckner 1888, 68-71 and Horner trans. 1954, 91-95); AN V (Hardy 1958, 32-36 and Woodward trans. 1961, 23-26); SA, *Za ahan jing* (T 99, 186b27-187b6); EA, *Zengyi ahan jing* (T 125, 776b14-777a14). The order in the *Ekottarāgama* (T 125, 776b16-c20) is (1) *sthānāsthānajñānabala*, (2) *karmavipākajñānabala*, (3) *nānādhātujñānabala*, (4) *dhyānavimokṣasamādhisamāpattijñānabala*, (5) *indriyaparāparajñānabala*, (6) *nānādhimuktijñānabala*, (7) *sarvatragāminīpratipajjñānabala*, (8) *pūrvanivāsānumṛtijñānabala*, (9) *cyutyupapādajñānabala*, and (10) *āsravakṣayajñānabala*. Sanskrit versions of the *Daśabalasūtra* are quoted in the *Sphuṭārthābhīdharmakośavyākhyā* (Wogihara 1971, 614-642), attesting many variants. An abridged version of the same is found in T 99, 189a7-13. For fragments of manuscripts see Lamotte (1970, 3:1506). For an extensive treatment of the ten wisdom powers see Lamotte (1970, 524-1563). Notice that these 'ten wisdom powers' are different from the 'ten knowledges' (*daśa jñānāni*).

2 The four confidences are (1) full knowledge of all elements (*sarvadharmābhisambodhivaiśāradya*); (2) knowledge that every impure influence has been destroyed (*sarvāsravakṣayajñānavaiśāradya*); (3) knowledge of all hindrances to emancipation and exposition of the same (*antarāyikadharmavyākaraṇavaiśāradya*); and (4) knowledge of the sameness of all paths leading to spiritual advancement and emancipation (*nairyāṇika-*

obtains leadership, who is able to set the Brahma-wheel (*brahmacakra*) turning, and who roars the lion's roar in the multitude of people".³ It is explicitly stated that only the Tathāgata possesses these qualities and that it is impossible for the *śrāvaka* to possess them.⁴

Contrary to this sūtra opinion, in *Kathāvatthu* III.1, we read "That the powers of the Buddha are common to Disciples".⁵ According to tradition, the *Kathāvatthu* was composed by Moggalliputtatissa, 218 years after the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*, on occasion of a synod under Aśoka.⁶ It has, however, been proven that the text was not completely edited at the time of this synod.⁷ As the title indicates, this text is aimed at refuting the – according to Sthaviravāda viewpoint – heretical doctrines. Unfortunately, the different 'points of controversy' are not attributed to some Buddhist sect/school in the *Kathāvatthu* itself. We do possess a commentary on the work by Buddhaghosa (5th century CE), entitled *Kathāvatthupparakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā*, in which these doctrinal positions are attributed.⁸ Although this commentary is of a much later date, Buddhaghosa shows to be very well informed on the diverging doctrinal opinions of the different schools.⁹

From Buddhaghosa's commentary to the statement "That the powers of the Buddha are common to Disciples", we learn that the opinion that the Tathāgata has all wisdom powers in common with his Disciples is an opinion of the Andhakas, based on their reading of *Samyuttanikāya* V, Suttas 15-24.¹⁰ This Andhaka opinion is contested by the Sthaviravādins.

pratipadyākaraṇavaiśāradya). These four confidences are treated in AN II (Morris 1955, 8-9; Woodward trans. 1962, 9-10); T 125, 645b26-c17 and further also in MN I: *Mahāsīhanādasutta* (Trenckner 1888, 71-72; Horner trans. 1954, 95-97); T 125, 776c20-777a5. For an extensive treatment of the confidences, see Lamotte (1958, 1567-1604).

3 MNI (Trenckner 1888, 69 and Horner trans. 1954, 93) and AN V (Hardy 1958, 33 and Woodward trans. 1961, 24). See also T 99, 187b2-4 and T 125, 776b15-16.

4 MN I: *Mahāsīhanādasutta* (Trenckner 1888, 71 and Horner trans. 1954, 96); T 99, 187b4-5.

5 Taylor (ed. 1894, 228-232); Aung Shwe Zan and Rhys Davids (trans. 1915, 139). See also Bureau (1955, 90).

6 *Mahāvamsa* V, 278-279 (Geiger trans. 1912, 49-50). See also Hinüber (1996, 71). Frauwallner (1972, 124), agreeing with Poussin (1922). See also Malalasekera (1961, 42); Willemen, Dessen, Cox (1998, 55-59). See further also Rhys Davids, (1892, 2).

7 See Law (1974, 27), Poussin (1930, 133-139) and Bureau (1951, 31). The *Kathāvatthu* in the form in which we have it now is not a unitary work, see Frauwallner (1972, 124). Frauwallner (1971, 105-106) convincingly showed that the Pāli Abhidhamma was conceived in the mother country (Vidīśā), and brought from there to Ceylon. See also Norman (1983, 103-105).

8 Jayawickrama (ed. 1979) and Law (trans. 1940). See also Hinüber (1996, 73, 150 and 153).

9 Bureau (1951, 32).

10 Feer (ed. 1960, 304-309). See Jayawickrama (1979, 63) and Law (1940, 75-77). See also Aung and Rhys Davids, C.A.F. (trans. 1915, 139). Notice, in this respect, that the *Mahāsāṃghika Ekottarāgama* (T 125, 777a12) exhorts the bhikkhus to accomplish the ten wisdom powers and the four confidences.

They claim that the Tathāgata holds the wisdom power of destruction of impure influence (*āsravakṣayajñānabala*) in common with the Disciples; that he does not share the wisdom power of higher and lower faculties (*indriyaparāparajñānabala*) with them; and that he partly shares the other eight wisdom powers with his Disciples, *i.e.* the Tathāgata knows them without limit, while the Disciples possess them only within a certain range.

Before we can attempt to formulate a hypothesis on the nature of these Andhaka and Sthaviravāda positions, however, we need to shed light on the identity of the so-called ‘Andhaka’ schools.

The Andhakas, Mahādeva, and the Rise of the *Bodhisattvayāna*

The name ‘Andhaka’ in Buddhaghosa’s commentary to the *Kathāvatthu* comprises four schools: the Rājagirikas, the Siddhatthikas, the Pubbadeliyas, and the Aparaseliyas.¹¹ ‘Andhaka’ hereby refers to their popularity in Andhra country, present-day Andhra Pradesh.¹² In his Chinese translation of Vasumitra’s *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* (*Yibuzong lun lun*), a work attributed to the Sarvāstivāda master Vasumitra¹³, Xuanzang informs us that, of these schools, the Pūrvaśailas (Pubbadeliyas) and the Aparāśailas (Aparaseliyas) issued from the Mahāsāṃghikas when two hundred years had passed since the death of the Buddha.¹⁴ The second list of *Bhavya, included in the *Nikāyabhedovibhaṅgavyākhyāna*,¹⁵ distinguishes

11 See Aung and Rhys Davids, C.A.F. (trans. 1915, 104). See also Bareau (1954, 89).

12 Dutt (1930, 23).

13 Lamotte (1958, 301-302), dates Vasumitra 400 years after the Buddha’s *parinirvāṇa*. Masuda (1925, 8) situates Vasumitra in the 1st century CE. On the dates of the three Chinese versions of the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* – *Yibuzong lun lun* (T 2031), *Shiba bu lun* (T 2032), and *Buzhiyi lun* (T 2033), see Masuda (1925, 5-6), Lamotte (1958, 302) and Wang (1994, 171, 175-176). On the problem of Vasumitra’s authorship, see Cousins (1991, 28), where he proposes a date from the 3rd to 4th century CE. On the problem of the attribution of the *Shiba bu lun* to Paramārtha or Kumārajīva, see Masuda (1920, 1), Masuda (1925, 5-6) and Demiéville (1925, 48).

14 T 2031, 15b1-4; T 2032, 17c6-9 and 18a17-20; T 2033, 20b2-4. See also Masuda (1920, 5-6), Masuda (1925, 15) and Bareau (1954, 236-237). This chronology is parallel to the one in *Dīpavaṃsa* V, 30-54 (Law 1958, 1-4, 41-43 and Oldenberg trans. 1879, 162-164). See also Bareau (1955, 16-18).

15 See Bareau (1955, 22) for the attribution of this text to what he calls a “second period of texts recording the affiliation of Buddhist schools”; Lamotte (1958, 592-593). Taranātha attributes this list to the Mahāsāṃghika tradition (See Schiefner trans. 1868, 271). See further also Rockhill (1992, 186), Walleser (1927, 81), Bareau (1955, 22-23) and Kiefer-Pülz (2000, 291). It, more precisely, should then be situated in the Andhra region around Amarāvātī, and be dated

three major groups of Buddhist schools: the Sthaviravādins, the Mahāsāṃghikas and the Vibhajyavādins, whereby the following schools are said to have issued from within the Mahāsāṃghika¹⁶ school: the Pūrvaśailas, the Aparāśailas, the Rājagiriya, the Haimavatas, the Caitiyas, the Saṃkrāntivādins¹⁷, and the Gokulikas.¹⁸ We thus have textual evidence that the four ‘Andhaka’ schools mentioned in the *Kathāvatthu* issued from within the Mahāsāṃghikas, whereby the Pūrvaśaila and the Aparāśaila schools were formed in the course of the third century after the demise of the Master.

The presence of these four ‘Andhaka’ groups in Andhra is attested by epigraphical evidence, dating from the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE.¹⁹ These inscriptions postdate the earliest epigraphical evidence for the presence of the Mahāsāṃghikas (or one of their subgroups) in the North of

in the 6th century. On the latter, see Bareau (1955, 22-23).

16 Lamotte (1958, 592) calls them “Mūlamahāsāṃghikas”.

17 Bareau (1956, 171) and Lamotte (1958, 592-593) call them ‘Siddhārthikas’.

18 See Schiefner (1868, 271), Bareau (1954, 171). For the reliability of the chronology of schools issuing from the Mahāsāṃghika, see Rhys Davids (1892, 5-6), and Bareau (1955, 28).

19 The Pubbadeliyas (Pūrvaśailas) are referred to as ‘Puvasel[i]ya’ on a pillar in Dharanikota, probably dating from Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulomā (ca. 130-159) and as ‘Puvaseliya’ on an undated inscription in Allūru (Jouveau-Dubreuil 1914, 83). See *Epigraphia Indica* XXIV, 256-260 and *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy for the year ending 31 March 1923* (1924, 97). Two inscriptions mention the Aparaseliyas (*Aparāśaila*), i.e., as ‘Aparamahāvinaseliya’ (*Epigraphia Indica* XX, 17 and 19-20). Both these inscriptions are found on a pillar in Nāgārjunikoṇḍa from the year 6 of Māṭharīputra Vīrapuruṣadatta of the Ikṣvākus (ca. 250-275). We further find ‘Aparamahāvinaseliya’ in a temple in Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, from the year 18 of the same king (*Epigraphia Indica* XX, 21-22 and *Epigraphia Indica* XXXV, 7-9). See also Mitra (1971, 206) and ‘[Apa]raseliya’ on a tile from Ghaṇṭasālā (*Epigraphia Indica* XXVII, 1-4). The Aparamahāvinaseliya are also referred to as ‘Ayirahamgha’ (*Epigraphia Indica* XX, 15-17) and as ‘Ayirahagha’ (*Epigraphia Indica* XX, 19-20), i.e., “Holy Community” on inscriptions found in Nāgārjunikoṇḍa that have to be dated in the 6th year of Māṭharīputra Vīrapuruṣadatta of the Ikṣvākus (ca. 250-275). According to Lamotte (1958, 582), “Āryasamgha” is the title that the Mahāsāṃghikas of the region of Guntur assumed in the first centuries of the Christian era. On the Aparamahāvinaseliyas, see also Rosen (1980, 114-115) and Schopen (1997, 159-161). The Rājagirikas are referred to as ‘Rājagirinivāsika’ on an undated sculpture at Amarāvati (Lüders 1973, No.1250), and as ‘Rājagiri’ (toponym) on an equally undated sculpture at Amarāvati (Lüders 1973, No.1225). The Siddhatthikas are referred to as ‘Sidhata’ on an undated sculpture at Amarāvati (Lüders 1973, No.1281; Sivaramamurti 1942, No.102, p.298). For some reflections on the traditional view of the primacy of literary sources over epigraphical evidence: see Schopen (1997, 1-9). Kieffer-Pülz (2000, 292) remarks that: “Schulen sind inschriftlich meist erst ab dem 1. Jh. n. Chr. belegt, als die meisten der frühen Nikāyas bereits existierten. Die Inschriften können daher nicht für die Entstehung der Schulen, wohl aber für ihre geographische Verbreitung herangezogen werden”.

India. Here, the inscriptions date back to the first century CE.²⁰ This suggests that along with the formation of the different Mahāsāṃghika subschools, as it is outlined in the historical records, the school gradually also spread towards the South of the Indian subcontinent. In this process, the Andhaka schools came to be especially dominant in the region of Amarāvātī and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa.²¹

The *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* connects the rise of the Pūrvaśailas and the Aparāśailas with Mahādeva who is reported to have studied ‘the five points’, thus causing a schism within the Mahāsāṃghika school.²² The famous five points of Mahādeva are the claim that:

“(1) Arhats can be tempted by others (*paropahrta*), (2) [some arhats] are subject to ignorance (*ajñāna*), (3) [some arhats] have doubts (*kāñkṣā*), (4) [some arhats] attain enlightenment through the help of others (*paravitṛna*), and (5) they obtain their path by emission of voice.”²³

These five points of Mahādeva clearly demote the arhat from the status ascribed to him in early Buddhism.²⁴ Texts of early Buddhism give testimony for it that, at the outset, arhat-ship

20 See Konow (1969, 48-49). See also Lamotte (1958, 580), and Roth (1980, 85). A further Mahāsāṃghika inscription in the North is a Mathurā inscription “Mahāsāghikā”, edited by Sircar that records a gift to the Mahāsāṃghikas. See *Epigraphia Indica* XXX, 181-184; Schopen (1997, 37). For other inscriptions referring to the Mahāsāṃghikas in the North: see Konow (1969, 165-170). See also Harrison (1982, 228) and Lüders (1973, No.1105 and No.1106).

21 See Majumdar (1953, 380-381, 390).

22 T 2031, 5a26-b8. See also Masuda (1920, 15-16), Bareau (1954, 236-237); and further T 2032, 18a14-23 and T 2033, 20a26-b7.

23 T 2031, 15c17-18; T 2032, 18b25-27; T 2033, 20c20-21. The *Kathāvatthupparakaṇa-aṭṭhakathā* ascribes the first of these five positions to the Pūrvaśailas and Aparāśailas, and the other four to the Pūrvaśailas. See Jayawickrama (1979, 55-56). Law (1940, 65-70) attributes the first of these positions to the Pūrvaśailas and the Aparāśailas, the second, third and fourth to the Pūrvaśailas, and the fifth to the Andhakas. Aung Shwe Zan and Rhys Davids (1915, 111-123) ascribe the first of these statements to the Pūrvaśailas and the Aparāśailas, the second and the fifth to the Pūrvaśailas. See Poussin (1910, 413-423), Masuda (1925, 24), Walleser (1927, 26, 32), Bareau (1954, 242), Bareau (1955, 64-65), Lamotte (1956, 148-151) and Bareau (1957, 242-243).

24 Notice that these ‘five points of Mahādeva’ are also given as the cause of the original schism between the Mahāsāṃghikas and the Sthaviravādins in the sources that belong to the Northern tradition. See T 2031, 15a24-25 and 15c17-18; T 2032, 18a9-14 and 18b25-27; T 2033, 20a22-27 and 20c20-21; *Nikāyabhedovibhaṅgavyākhyāna*, list 3; T 1545, *Apidamo da piposha lun*, 510c23-512a19; T 1852, *San lun xuan yi*, 8b22-c13; T 1509, *Da zhidu lun*, 70a4 ff. See also Rockhill (1992, 186), Bareau (1954, 172-3). Also statement VIII.11 of the *Kathāvatthu*, “that because of karma an Arahant may fall away from Arahantship” (Aung Shwe Zan and Rhys Davids 1915, 228-229) is attributed to the Pūrvaśailas in the *Kathāvatthupparakaṇa-aṭṭhakathā* (see Jayawickrama 1979, 112-113 and Law 1940, 139-140).

of the Disciples and of the Tathāgata were thought to be of the same quality.²⁵ Gradually, however, in circumstances where, on the one hand, no difference seems to have been made between the Buddha's liberation and the one of a *śrāvaka*, and, on the other hand, some characteristics were ascribed to the Buddha only, discussion must have arisen on precisely what the difference between an arhat and a buddha is, and the infallibility of an arhat must have become questioned.²⁶ As a result, some Buddhists no longer regarded arhat-ship as the goal to be attained, but, instead, chose to strive for bodhisattva-ship, thus aspiring to become a buddha – or, at least, to possess some of the same qualities a buddha has.

That Mahādeva attempted to introduce this new goal of religious praxis is evident from the *Fenbie gongde lun*, a half Mahāsāṃghika, half Mahāyāna commentary on the *Ekottarāgama*.²⁷ Jizang's *San lun xuanyi* states that “in addition to advocating the heretical five points,” Mahādeva also “tried to incorporate Mahāyāna sūtras into the Tripiṭaka”.²⁸ Given the impossibility that philosophical development within Buddhism would have reached the state in which the bodhisattva-ideal could be introduced and Mahāyāna sūtras could have been composed at the moment of the first schism in the Buddhist community, it is likely that the five points of Mahādeva have to be connected to the further schismatic movement within the Mahāsāṃghika school, *i.e.* the movement that give rise to, among others, the Andhaka schools.²⁹

The Ten Wisdom Powers According to the Andhakas.

The development of the bodhisattva-ideal as it was, among others, prevalent among the Andhaka schools, fundamentally changed the mode of religious praxis. From Nāgārjuna's *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*, a commentary on the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*, a long recension of the *Prajñāpāramitāsūtra*,³⁰ a work that belongs to the time period for which we find epigraphical

25 Both the Buddha and whoever reached liberation are called ‘arhat’. See Barea (1957, 241-250). See also Jaini (1992, 135-145) and Bronkhorst (2000, 127).

26 See Nattier and Prebish (1976/77, 251-256).

27 T 1507, 32c9-10. According to T 2154, 484b3-6, this work was translated between CE 25 and 220. T 2153, 434b24 dates this translation to the Western Jin Dynasty. See also Lamotte (1956, 156). In this text, Mahādeva is referred to as a ‘dashi’, *i.e.*, a mahāsattva, or, possibly a bodhisattva.

28 T 1852, 8b18-19. See also Demiéville (1931-32, 20, 30 and 41), Lamotte (1956, 153-154) and Williams (1996, 17-18).

29 On the importance of Mahādeva in the further schismatic movement within the Mahāsāṃghika school: see Dessein (2008).

30 The short recension is the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. The long recensions are the *Aṣṭadaśasāhasrikā*, the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* and the *Śatasāhasrikā*. The 2nd century text

evidence for the Andhaka schools in South India, we learn that a bodhisattva should first exercise the qualities of a *śrāvaka*. Having acquired the qualities of a *śrāvaka*, the bodhisattva is desirous to obtain and desirous to know the qualities that particularly pertain to the Buddha.³¹ To attain this aim, he has to cultivate *prajñāpāramitā*.³² From this statement, it is clear that the *śrāvakayāna* is seen as a preparatory vehicle for the *bodhisattvayāna*. This also explains why, when listing the qualities of a *śrāvaka*, a bodhisattva, and a buddha, the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* states that a bodhisattva has twenty-one characteristic marks, seventeen of which he shares with the *śrāvaka* and four of which he shares with the Buddha.³³ The seventeen he shares with the *śrāvaka* are the thirty-seven members that lead to enlightenment, and a series of meditative states of various qualities.³⁴ The four he shares with the Buddha are the ten wisdom powers, the four confidences, the four discriminations (*pratisamvid*), and eighteen unique factors. This list positions the bodhisattva as an intermediate between the *śrāvaka* and the Buddha. This intermediate position also explains why the bodhisattva, contrary to a buddha, delays his eventual entry into nirvāṇa and remains in saṃsāra with the purpose to consecrate himself for the well-being of worldlings as long as possible. It is therefore that he first has to practice the *śrāvakayāna* so as to be able to help the adherents of this vehicle to shift to the Mahāyāna.³⁵

As mentioned above, in early Buddhism, the Buddha was thought to possess fourteen unique dharmas: the ten wisdom powers and the four confidences. Gradually, however, this list was increased to form the eighteen unique dharmas we find in the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*.³⁶

was translated into Chinese as *Dazhidu lun* (T 1509) by Kumārajīva between CE 402-406 (see T 1509, 756c9-18; T 2145, 75b10-18). See also Lamotte (1970, v-vi and xlv-l).

31 See Basham (1981, 21-22) for remarks on the etymology of the word ‘bodhisattva’ as ‘one who is ‘attached to’, or ‘devoted to’ enlightenment.

32 T 1509, 235c3-21, 236b10-12 and b21-22.

33 *Pañcaviṃśati*, T 223, 218c17 ff.

34 The seventeen he shares with the *śrāvaka* are (1) four applications of mindfulness (*smṛtyupasthāna*), (2) four forms of right abandoning (*samyakpradhāna*), (3) four footings of supernatural power (*rddhipāda*), (4) five faculties (*indriya*), (5) five powers (*bala*), (6) seven members of enlightenment (*sambodhyaṅga*), (7) eight members of the path (*mārgāṅga*), (8) three concentrations (*samādhi*), (9) eleven kinds of knowledge (*jñāna*), (10) three faculties (*indriya*), (11) three concentrations (*samādhi*), (12) ten kinds of mindfulness (*anusmṛti*), (13) four meditations (*dhyāna*), (14) four infinitudes (*apramāṇa*), (15) four meditative attainments (*samāpatti*), (16) eight liberations (*vimokṣa*), and (17) the attainment of nine successive stages (*anupūrvavivihāra*).

35 T 1509, 235b1-c3.

36 This list is also found in the Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma* works **Abhidharmahṛdaya* by Dharmasreṣṭhin (T 1550, *Apitan xin lun*, 823a14-26), **Abhidharmahṛdaya* by Upaśānta (T 1551, *Apitan xin lun jing*, 855c15-28), and **Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya* by Dharmatrāta (T 1552, *Za apitan xin lun*, 923b4-c18). The latter work also contains an alternative series that is composed of the ten wisdom powers, the four confidences, great compassion (*mahākaruṇā*) (T 1552,

As the *śrāvakayāna*, leading to arhat-ship, came to be seen as a preparatory vehicle for the *bodhisattvayāna*, this implies that the qualities a *śrāvaka* was thought to obtain when reaching arhat-ship were no longer regarded as qualities that are characteristic for a buddha. According to the early doctrine, a *śrāvaka* reached arhat-ship when developing the knowledge of destruction, *i.e.* the knowledge that all defilements have been destroyed, and the knowledge of nonorigination, *i.e.* the knowledge that these defilements will not originate again. Obtaining these knowledges equals the status of nirvāṇa. As, further, the knowledge of nonorigination is a constitutive part of the tenth wisdom power, this naturally implies that taking possession of the knowledge of nonorigination makes it possible that the *śrāvaka* obtains the tenth wisdom power. In the early doctrine, this meant obtaining nirvāṇa, a state shared with the Buddha.

When arhat-ship gradually came to be seen as inferior to buddha-ship, this implied that obtaining the knowledge of nonorigination and the tenth wisdom power did not mean that one had reached the final goal. In conformity with this new concept, a *śrāvaka* was thought to possess some qualities also a Buddha has, while the Buddha has some qualities he does not share with the *śrāvaka*. This explains why the Andhakas were of the opinion that the ten wisdom powers are common for the *śrāvaka* and the Buddha. This is affirmed in the following:

The arhat, *pratyekabuddha*, and bodhisattva [in some way take part in the ten wisdom powers that Kātyāyanīputra took as attributes unique to the Buddha]: they too know the possible and impossible, have the wisdom power of retribution, have the knowledge of *dhyāna* and *samāpatti* and so up to the knowledge of the extinction of impure influence (T 1509, 255b25-c22).³⁷

In this line of development, new series of qualities that made a bodhisattva and a Buddha different from and excell over a *śrāvaka* were composed. For the material from which the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra* derives, there are two different lists enumerating ten powers of the

927c17 and 24, and 945c13-17), and three kinds of mindfulness (*smṛtyupasthāna*) (T 1552, 922c16-17). Dharmatrāta explains that great compassion is unique for the Buddha, while compassion is common with the *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*. This alternative list is further also found in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma works **Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāsāstra* (T 1545, 85a26-27, 156c16 ff., 624a14-15, 735c16-18. See also T 1546, *Apitan piposha lun*, 277b13-14), in Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa* (T 1558, *Apidamo jushe lun*, 140b2-19 and 140c17-21), and in Saṃghabhadra's **Nyāyānusāra* (T 1562, 746a10-749c1).

37 Notice that the Sarvāstivāda **Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāsāstra* (T 1545, 157c29-158a11) suggests that the *śrāvaka* acquires the knowledges only, but not the power, or the wisdom power.

bodhisattva,³⁸ there is a list of four confidences of the bodhisattva,³⁹ a list of ten confidences of the bodhisattva,⁴⁰ a list of eighteen unique factors of the bodhisattva,⁴¹ a list of ten unique factors of the bodhisattva,⁴² a list of ten concentrations of the bodhisattva,⁴³ a list of twelve magic formulas (*dhāraṇī*) of the bodhisattva,⁴⁴ a list of six higher faculties (*abhijñā*) of the bodhisattva,⁴⁵ and a list of ten sovereignties (*śitā*) of the bodhisattva.⁴⁶

The difference between a bodhisattva and a buddha is also visible in the following passage of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra*: The question is raised why, as there are thirty-six attributes of the Buddha (ten wisdom powers, four confidences, three kinds of recollection, great compassion and eighteen unique factors) only eighteen are said to be unique (*āveṇika*). The answer given is that the *śrāvakas* and the *pratyekabuddhas* have part in the first eighteen, but have no part in the second series of eighteen.⁴⁷

The newly developed list of factors that are unique for the Buddha is of non-canonical origin, however, is adopted in the Mahāyāna texts. We find the list in the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*,⁴⁸ in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra*,⁴⁹ and in the section *Bodhisattvabhūmi* of Asaṅga's *Yogācārabhūmi*.⁵⁰ The latter text is the fundamental text of the Yogācārin and was translated into Chinese by Xuanzang (*Yujia shidi lun* T 1579) in 647 CE.⁵¹ This text explicitly states that the eighteen factors that are unique for the Buddha belong to the stage of after having

38 The first list is found in the *Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra* (T 642, 643a25-b3), and in the *Vikurvānarājaparipṛchāsūtra* (T 420, 932c13-27 and T 421, 945b8-25). The second list is found in the *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra* (T 278, 649c4-14, and T 279, 295b29-c10), as well as in the *Ratnameghasūtra* (T 660, 301b14-17 and T 489, 722b7-11).

39 T 420, 932c27-933a7, T 421, 945b26-c10, T 660, 301b17-25 and T 489, 722b11-19.

40 T 278, 649c16-650b24 and T 279, 295c11-296b17.

41 T 420, 933a7-934b3 and T 421, 945c11-947b4. A list of eighteen unique factors of the bodhisattva is also found in T 220, *Da panruopoluomiduo jing*, 81b25-c7 and in T 223, 255c24 ff..

42 T 278, 650c4-651b21 and T 279, 296b20-297b1.

43 T 660, 301a11-17 and T 489, 722a7-12.

44 T 660, 301a18-25 and T 489, 722a12-17.

45 T 660, 301a25-28 and T 489, 722a17-20.

46 T 660, 301a28-b14 and T 489, 722a20-b7.

47 T 1509, 247b19-22.

48 T 223, 255c25-256a5 and 395b20-28.

49 T 220-6, 302a17-27, T 220-7, 81b26-c4 and T 220-7, 489b4-14.

50 T 1579, 738b18-c25. Note, however, that the *Yogācārabhūmi* (T 1579, 574b4) apart from the 18 unique factors, also distinguishes a series of 140 unique factors. The *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (Dutt, 1966, 282) concludes with stating that the difference between a bodhisattva in the last *bhūmi* and a Tathāgata is almost negligible.

51 See Dutt (1966, 4) and Nakamura (1996, 256-257). A first translation of this text had been done by Dharmarakṣa in 414-418, and a second translation by Guṇavarman in 431.

extinguished all impure influence of the arhat.⁵² Also the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra* adopts this newly developed list of eighteen.⁵³

The Mahāyāna list of eighteen attributes unique for the Buddha are: (1) the Tathāgata has no corporeal imperfections (*nāsti tathāgatasya skhalitam*), (2) he has no vocal imperfections (*nāsti ravitam*), (3) he has no failing memory (*nāsti muṣitasmṛtitā*), (4) he has no notion of difference (*nāsti nānātvasaṃjñā*), (5) he has no unconcentrated thoughts (*nāsty asamāhitam cittam*), (6) he has no unconsidered indifference (*nāsty apratisaṃkhyāyopekṣā*), (7) he has no loss of will (*nāsti chandaparihāṇiḥ*), (8) he has no loss of energy (*nāsti vīryaparihāṇiḥ*), (9) he has no loss of memory (*nāsti smṛtiparihāṇiḥ*), (10) he has no loss of wisdom (*nāsti prajñāparihāṇiḥ*), (11) he has no loss of deliverance (*nāsti vimuktiparihāṇiḥ*), (12) he has no loss of knowledge and of vision of liberation (*nāsti vimuktijñānadarśanaparihāṇiḥ*), (13) all corporeal actions of the Tathāgata are preceded by knowledge and accompanied by knowledge (*sarvaṃ tathāgatasya kāyakarma jñānapūrvamgamam jñānānuparivarti*), (14) all vocal action is preceded by knowledge and accompanied by knowledge (*sarvaṃ vākkarma jñānapūrvamgamam jñānānuparivarti*), (15) all mental action is preceded by knowledge and accompanied by knowledge (*sarvaṃ manaskarma jñānapūrvamgamam jñānānuparivarti*), (16) he has knowledge and vision of the past without attachment and without obstacle (*atīte 'dhvany asaṅgam apratihataṃ jñānaṃ darśanam*), (17) he has knowledge and vision of the future without attachment and without obstacle (*anāgate 'dhvany asaṅgam apratihataṃ jñānaṃ darśanam*), and (18) he has knowledge and vision of the present without attachment and without obstacle (*pratyutpanne 'dhvany asaṅgam apratihataṃ jñānaṃ darśanam*).

This new list of eighteen qualities of the Buddha concern his supramundane characteristics, indeed that type of characteristics that was at the fundament of the debate concerning the difference between an arhat and a buddha and that was one of the elements that evoked the rise of the *bodhisattvayāna*.

Conclusion

In circumstances where, on the one hand, the early doctrine appears to have seen no difference between liberation of the buddha and the one of a Disciple, and, on the other hand some characteristics – the ten wisdom powers – were ascribed to the buddha only, discussion must have arisen on precisely what the difference between an arhat and a buddha is. This appears to be part of the process of the development of the concept of the *bodhisattvayāna* and bodhisattva-ship as final goal of religious praxis. The *śrāvakayāna* hereby became interpreted as a preparatory step towards the *bodhisattvayāna*, and arhat-ship came to be seen as inferior to buddhahood. Therefore, in the gradual process of becoming a bodhisattva, and, eventually, a buddha, the qualities that earlier were ascribed to the buddha became regarded as, at least,

52 T 1579, 738b19-20.

53 T 1509, 255b25-c24.

also partly possessed by the *śrāvakas*, and a new Mahāyāna series of qualities of the buddha was formed.

The difference in opinion between the Andhakas and the Sthaviravādins on this issue – whereby the Andhakas show to have had a more advanced opinion than the Sthaviravādins had – appears to be part of a general evolution, peculiar for the Mahāyāna, to ascribe supramundane qualities to the buddha only. When agreeing with the Andhakas that the Tathāgata holds the wisdom power of destruction of impure influence in common with the Disciples, the Sthaviravādins are in conformity with the early doctrine that sees no difference between arhatship of the *śrāvaka* and of the buddha. That, according to the Sthaviravādins, the Tathāgata does not share the wisdom power of higher and lower faculties, *i.e.* the power to know the moral faculties of all beings, with them, while partly sharing the other eight wisdom powers in that sense that he knows them without limit, points to the supramundane characteristics of the buddha. Indeed, it has been shown that Mahāyānistic development also occurred within the Sthaviravāda school of Buddhism.⁵⁴

54 See Bechert (1973, 16-17) and Bechert (1977). We can here also refer to the so-called ‘Sthavira-Mahāyāna’ referred to by Xuanzang in T 2087, 934a15. See also Bechert (1976, 36-37, 47), Bechert (1964, 535), Schopen (1979), Cohen (1995, 7-9 and 16-19) and Harrison (1995, 56-57).

References

Buddhist Canonical Sources

- T 99: *Samyuktāgama. Za ahan jing.*
T 125: *Ekottarāgama. Zengyi ahan jing.*
T 220: *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra. Da panruopoluomiduo jing.*
T 223: **Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā[mahā]prajñāpāramitāsūtra. Mohepanruopoluomi jing.*
T 278: *Avataṃsakasūtra. Da fanguang fo huayan jing.*
T 279: *Avataṃsakasūtra. Da fanguang fo huayan jing .*
T 420: *Vikurvaṇarājaparipṛcchāsūtra. Zizaiwang pusa jing.*
T 421: *Vikurvaṇarājaparipṛcchāsūtra. Fenxunwang wen jing.*
T 489: *Ratnameghasūtra. Chu gaizhang pusa suo wen jing.*
T 642: *Śūraṃgama[samādhi]sūtra. Shoulengyan sanmei jing.*
T 660: *Ratnameghasūtra. Baoyu jing.*
T 1507: *Fenbie gongde lun.*
T 1509: *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa. Da zhidu lun.*
T 1545: *[Abhidharma]mahāvibhāṣā[śāstra]. Apidamo da piposha lun.*
T 1546: *[Abhidharma]vibhāṣā[śāstra]. Apitan piposha lun.*
T 1550: **Abhidharmahṛdaya[śāstra]. Apitan xin lun.*
T 1551: **Abhidharmahṛdaya. Apitan xin lun jing.*
T 1552: **Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya[śāstra]. Za apitan xin lun.*
T 1558: *Abhidharmakośaśāstra. Apidamo jushe lun.*
T 1562: *Nyāyānusāraśāstra. Apidamo shunzheng li lun.*
T 1579: *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra. Yujiashi di lun.*
T 1852: *San lun xuan yi.*
T 2031: *Samayabhedoparacanacakra. Yibuzong lun lun.*
T 2032: *Samayabhedoparacanacakra. Shiba bu lun.*
T 2033: *Samayabhedoparacanacakra. Bu zhi yi lun.*
T 2087: *Da Tang xiyu ji.*
T 2145: *Chu sanzang ji ji.*
T 2153: *Da zhoukan ding zhong jing mulu.*
T 2154: *Kaiyuan shi jiao lu.*

Primary Sources

Epigraphia Indica XX

Epigraphia Indica XXIV

Epigraphia Indica XXVII

Epigraphia Indica XXX

Epigraphia Indica XXXV

Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy for the year ending 31 March 1923. 1924. Ed. Government of Madras. Madras: Government Press.

Dutt, Nalinaksha, ed. 1966. The Bodhisattvabhumi (being the XVth section of Asangapada's Yogacarabhumi). *Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series* 7. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

Feer, Leon, ed. 1960. *Samyutta-nikāya. Part V. Mahā-vagga*. London: Pali Text Society.

Hardy, Edmund, ed. 1958. *The Anguttara-nikāya. Vol.V Dasaka-nipāta and Ekādasaka-nipāta*. London: Pali Text Society.

Jayawickrame, N.A. 1979. *Kathāvatthu*. London: Pali Text Series. 169.

Konow, Sten, ed. 1969. *Kharoshthī Inscriptions – With the Exception of Those of Aśoka, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum. Vol.II, Part I*. Calcutta: Government of India, Central Publication Branch. 1929. Reprint, Varanasi: Indological Book House (page references are to reprint edition).

Lüders, Heinrich., ed. 1973. *A List of Brahmi Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to About A.D.400 With the Exception of Those of Aśoka*. Calcutta: Government of India, Central Publication Branch. 1912. Reprint, Varanasi: Indological Book House (page references are to reprint edition).

Morris, Richard, ed. 1955. *The Anguttara-nikāya. Vol.II*. London: Pali Text Society.

Sivaramamurti, C. 1942. Amarāvati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum. *Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum, New Series, General Section IV*. (No.102). Madras: The Director of Stationary and Printing.

Taylor, Arnold C, ed. 1894. *Kathāvatthu*. London: Pali Text Society.

Trenckner, V, ed. 1888. *The Majjhima-nikāya. Vol.I*. London: Pali Text Society.

Wogihara, Unrai, ed. 1971. *Sphuṭārthābhīdharmakośavyākhyā of Yaśomitra*. 2 vols. Tōkyō: Sankibō Buddhist Book Store.

Secondary Sources

- Alsdorf, Ludwig and Max F. Müller, eds. 1973. *German Scholars on India. Contributions to Indian Studies*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- Aung Shwe Zan and C.A.F. Rhys Davids, trans. 1915. *Points of Controversy or Subjects of Discourse: Being a Translation of the Kathāvatthu From the Abhidhamma-piṭaka*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Bareau, André. 1951, Dhammasaṅgaṇi. Traduction Annotée. Ph.D thesis, Université de Paris.
- Bareau, André. 1954. Trois traités sur les sectes bouddhiques dus à Vasumitra, Bhavya et Vinīta-deva. Première Partie. *Journal Asiatique* 1(2):229-266.
- Bareau, André. 1955. *Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule*. Paris: Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Bareau, André. 1956. Trois traités sur les sectes bouddhiques attribués à Vasumitra, Bhavya et Vinīta-deva. II^e Partie. *Journal Asiatique* 244:167-191.
- Bareau, André. 1957. Les controverses relatives à la nature de l'arhant dans le Bouddhisme ancien. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 1:241-250.
- Basham, Arthur Llewellyn. 1981. The Evolution of the Concept of the Bodhisattva. *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhism*. Ed. L. S. Kawamura. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press. 19-59.
- Bechert, Heinz. 1964. Zur Frühgeschichte des Mahayana-Buddhismus. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 113(3):530-535.
- Bechert, Heinz 1973. Notes on the Formation of Buddhist Sects and the Origins of Mahayana. *German Scholars on India: Contributions to Indian Studies*. Eds. L. Alsdorf and F.M. Müller. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 6-18.
- Bechert, Heinz 1976. Buddha-Feld und Verdienstübertragung: Mahayana-Ideen im Theravada-Buddhismus Ceylons. *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques*. Académie Royale de Belgique, 5^e Série – LXII. 27-51.
- Bechert, Heinz. 1977. Mahayana Literature in Sri Lanka: the Early Phase. *Prajnaparamita and Related Systems. Studies in Honor of Edward Conze*. Ed. L. Lancaster. Berkeley: Regents of the University of California. 361-368.
- Bechert, Heinz, ed. 1980. Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung. (The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition). *Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, II*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bechert, Heinz. et al. 2000. *Der Buddhismus I. Der indische Buddhismus und seine Verzweigungen*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2000. Die buddhistische Lehre. *Der Buddhismus I. Der indische Buddhismus und seine Verzweigungen*. Ed. H. Bechert et al. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. 23-213.
- Buswell, Robert.E. and Robert.M. Gimello, eds. 1992. Paths to Liberation: The Mārga and its Transformations in Buddhist Thought. *Studies in East Asian Buddhism* 7. Honolulu: Kuroda Institute.
- Cohen, Richard.S. 1995. Discontented Categories: Hinayana and Mahayana in Indian Buddhist History. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 63(1):1-25.
- Cousins, Lance.S. 1991. The 'Five Points' and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools. *The Buddhist Forum*. Ed. T. Skorupski. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. 2:27-60
- Dallapiccola, Anna.L. and Stephanie.Z. Lallemant, eds. 1980. *The Stūpa. Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance*. Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag.
- Demiéville, Paul. 1925. Les versions chinoises du Milindapañha. *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient XXIV*. 1-253.
- Demiéville, Paul. 1931-32. L'origine des sectes bouddhiques d'après Paramārtha. *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques I*. 15-64.
- Dessein, Bart. 2008. Of tempted Arhats and Supermundane Buddhas: *Abhidharma* in the Kṛṣṇā Region. *Buddhism in the Krishna River Valley of Andhra*. Eds. S. Padma and A. W. Barber. Albany: State University of New York Press. 41-80.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1930. *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relation to Hīnayāna*. London: Luzac & Co.
- Frauwallner, Erich. 1971. *Die Entstehung der buddhistischen Systeme*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Frauwallner, Erich. 1972. *Abhidharma-Studien*. IV. Der *Abhidharma* der anderen Schulen. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Sud- und Ost-Asiens XVI*. 95-152.
- Geiger, Wilhelm, trans. 1912. *The Mahāvamsa or the Great Chronicle of Ceylon*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Harrison, Paul. 1982. Sanskrit fragments of a Lokottaravādin Tradition. *Indological and Buddhist Studies, Volume in honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his sixtieth birthday*. Eds. L.A. Hercus et.al. Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies. 211-234.
- Harrison, Paul. 1995. Searching for the Origins of the Mahayana: What Are We Looking For?. *The Eastern Buddhist New Series XXVIII* 1:48-69.
- Hercus, L.A. et.al, eds. 1982. *Indological and Buddhist Studies, Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*. Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies.
- Hinüber, Oscar. von. 1996. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

- Horner Isaline.B, trans. 1954. *The Collection of The Middle Length Sayings (Majjhima-nikāya). Vol. I. :The First Fifty Discourses (Mūlapaṇṇāsa)*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Jaini, Padmanabh. S. 1992. On the Ignorance of the Arhat. Paths to Liberation: The Mārga and its Transformations in Buddhist Thought. *Studies in East Asian Buddhism* 7. Eds. R.E. Buswell and R.M. Gimello. Honolulu: Kuroda Institute. 135-145.
- Jouveau-Dubreuil, Gabriel. 1914. *Archéologie du Sud de l'Inde*. Paris: Geuthner.
- Kawamura, Leslie. S, ed. 1981. *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhism*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Kiefer-Pülz, Petra. 2000. Die buddhistische Gemeinde. *Der Buddhismus I. Der indische Buddhismus und seine Verzweigungen*. Ed. H. Bechert, et al. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. 281-401.
- La Vallée Poussin, L. 1910. The 'Five Points' of Mahādeva and the Kathāvattu. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*. 413-423.
- La Vallée Poussin, L. de. 1922. Le Vijnanakaya et le Kathavatthu. *Bulletins de la classe des lettres*. Academie Royale de Belgique 5^e Série 8(11):516-520.
- La Vallée Poussin, L. de. 1930. *L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas et des Barbares, Grecs, Scythes, Parthes et Yue-tchi*. Paris: E. De Boccard.
- Lamotte, Etienne. 1956. Buddhist Controversy Over the Five Propositions. *Indian Historical Quarterly* 32:148-162.
- Lamotte, Etienne. 1958. Histoire du bouddhisme indien: des origines à l'ère Śaka. *Bibliothèque du Muséon* 43. Louvain: Publications universitaires.
- Lamotte, Etienne. 1970. *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahā-prajñāpāramitāsāstra)*. Louvain: Insitut Orientaliste.
- Lancaster, Lewis, ed. 1977. *Prajnaparamita and Related Systems. Studies in Honor of Edward Conze*. Berkeley: Regents of the University of California.
- Law, Bimala.C. 1940. *The Debates Commentary (Kathāvattthupparakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā)*. London: Luzac & Company.
- Law, Bimala. C., 1957-1958. "The Chronicle of the Island of Ceylon" or the Dipavamsa. A Historical Poem of the 4th century A.D. *The Ceylon Historical Journal* 7.
- Law, Bimala. C. 1974. *A History of Pāli Literature*. 2 vols. Varanasi: Bhartiya Publishing House.
- Majumdar, Ramesh. C, ed. 1953. The History and Culture of the Indian People. *The Age of Imperial Unity*. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
- Malalasekera, Gunaoala. P. 1961. *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*. Colombo: Government of Ceylon.

- Masuda, Jiryo. 1920. Early Indian Buddhist Schools: A Translation From the Hsüan-Chwang Version of Vasumitra's Treatise. *Journal of the Department of Letters* 1:1-11.
- Masuda, Jiryo. 1925. Origin and Doctrines of Early Indian Buddhist Schools: A Translation of the Hsüan-Chwang Version of Vasumitra's Treatise. *Asia Major* 2:1-78.
- Mitra, Debala. 1971. *Buddhist Monuments*. Calcutta: Sahitya Samsad.
- Nakamura, Hajime 1980. *Indian Buddhism – A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*. Tokyo: Kufs Publication, 1966. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. (page references are to reprint edition).
- Nattier Janice. and Charles. S. Prebish. 1976/77. Mahāsāṃghika Origins: The Beginnings of Buddhist Sectarianism. *History of Religions* 16:237-272.
- Norman, Kenneth. R.1983. *Pāli Literature. Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. trans. 1879. *The Dīpavaṃsa: An Ancient Buddhist Historical Record*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Rhys Davids, T.W. 1892. Schools of Buddhist Belief. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*. 1-37.
- Rockhill, William. W. 1992. *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of his Order. Derived From Tibetan works in the Bkah-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur; Followed by Notices on the Early History of Tibet and Khoten*. London: Trübner, 1884. Reprint, Delhi: Asian Educational Services. (page references are to reprint edition).
- Rosen, Elizabeth. 1980. Buddhist Architecture and Lay Patronage at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa. *The Stūpa: Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance*. Eds. A.L. Dallapiccola and S.Z. Lallemand. Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag. 112-126.
- Roth, Gustav. 1980. Particular Features of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokkottaravādins and their Importance for Early Buddhist Tradition. *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung. The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition. Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, II*. Ed. H. Bechert. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 78-93.
- Schiefner, Anto, trans. 1868. Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien. Aus dem Tibetischen übersetzt. *Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. St. Petersburg: Eggers et Company.
- Schopen, Gregory. 1979. Mahayana in Indian Inscriptions. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 21:1-19.
- Schopen, Gregory. 1997. *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Walleser, Max. 1927. *Die Sekten des alten Buddhismus*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

- Wang, Bangwei. 1994. Buddhist Nikāyas through Ancient Chinese Eyes. Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfanfunden, Beiheft 5*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 165-203.
- Willemsen, Charles, Bart Dessein, C. Cox. 1998. Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism. *Handbuch der Orientalistik. Zweite Abteilung, Indien 11*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Williams, Paul. 1996. *Mahāyāna Buddhism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Woodward Frank. L., trans. 1962. *The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Anguttara-nikāya) or more-numbered suttas. Vol.II. (The Book of the Fours)*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Woodward Frank. L., trans. 1961. *The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Anguttara-nikāya) or More-Numbered Suttas. Vol.V. (The Book of the Tens and Elevens)*. London: Pali Text Society.