

# Who Composed the Lotus Sutra?

## — Antagonism between wilderness and village monks — \*

Seishi KARASHIMA

### Table of Contents

1. Verses in the *Utsāha-parivarta*
  - 1.1. Sanskrit Text
  - 1.2. Kern's English translation
  - 1.3. Kumārajīva's Chinese translation
  - 1.4. Who slandered whom?
2. Antagonism between wilderness and village monks
  - 2.1. *araṇya* ("wilderness") and *grāma* ("village")
  - 2.2. *Araññavāsī* (wilderness monks) v. *Gāmaṇvāsī* (village monks) in Sri Lanka
  - 2.3. *Araññavāsī* (wilderness monks) v. *Gāmaṇvāsī* (village monks) in Myanmar
  - 2.4. *Araññaka* (a wilderness monk) and *gāmantavibhāri* (a village monk) in Pāli literature
  - 2.5. *Āraṇyakas* (wilderness monks) v. *Grāmāntikas* (village monks) in the *Abhisamācārikā-Dharmāḥ*
  - 2.6. Wilderness monks v. village monks in Mahāyāna texts
    - 2.6.1. Praises for the *Āraṇyakas* in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*
    - 2.6.2. Praises for the *Āraṇyakas* in the *Ugrapariprcchā Sūtra*
    - 2.6.3. Wilderness bodhisattvas v. monastery monks in the *Rāṣṭrapālapariprcchā Sūtra*
    - 2.6.4. *Dhutaḡuṇa* monks v. village-oriented monks in the *Sarvadharmāpravṛtti-nirdeśa Sūtra*
    - 2.6.5. Antagonism between wilderness and village(-oriented) monks in Mahāyāna texts
- 3.1. Further to the verses in the *Utsāha-parivarta*
4. Composers and holders of the Lotus Sutra assumed from other chapters
  - 4.1. The *Bodhisattvapṛthivivivārasamudgama-parivarta*
  - 4.2. The *Puṇyaparyāya-parivarta*
  - 4.3. The *Dharmabhāṇaka-parivarta*
  - 4.4. Composers of the Lotus Sutra
5. Searching for the origins of Mahāyāna Buddhism
  - 5.1. The position of the Lotus Sutra in the history of Mahāyāna Buddhism
  - 5.2. The origins of Mahāyāna scriptures

---

\* I am very grateful to Mr. Takamichi FUKITA (Bukkyo University), Mr. Keikyo NAKAMIKADO (Bukkyo University), Mr. Tetsujo MIYAKE (Kyoto University), Prof. Hiromichi HIKITA (Aichigakuin University) and another person who does not wish to be named. They were all kind enough to send me quickly articles for which I asked. My heartfelt thanks are also due to our librarian, Miss Naoko SUZUKI, my colleague, Mr. Noriyuki KUDO, and our visiting professor Dr. M. I. VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSĀKAYA, who read through my first draft and offered many useful suggestions. I cannot close my acknowledgements without expressing gratitude to Mr. Peter Lait, who not only encouraged me to write this paper in English but also went to great trouble in checking my English.

## 1. Verses in the *Utsāha-parivarta*

The *Śloka*-verses in Chapter XII, the *Utsāha-parivarta*, in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, give us a great deal of evidence as to the composition of the Lotus Sutra. However, their importance for the historical research of this scripture and consequently that of so-called Mahāyāna Buddhism has not really been taken into true consideration. I assume that the prime reason for this is that not only modern translators of the Sanskrit version, but also the authors of ancient Chinese commentaries on Kumārajīva's translation of the Lotus Sutra, whose interpretations have significantly influenced Japanese Buddhist scholars and consequently Western translators of the Chinese version, interpreted these verses incorrectly.

### 1.1. Sanskrit Text

The verses in question in the Kern-Nanjio Edition of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* read as follows:

KN.271.9~274.6

*ākrośāms tarjanāś caiva daṇḍa-udgūraṇāni ca* <sup>1/</sup>  
*bālānām saṃsabhiṣyāmo 'dhivāsiṣyāma nāyaka* // 3  
*durbuddhinaś ca vaṅkāś ca śaṭhā bālādhibimāninaḥ*<sup>2/</sup>  
*aprāpte prāpta-saṃjñī ca ghoṛe kālasmi paścime*<sup>3/</sup> // 4  
*araṇyavṛttakāś caiva kaṅthām prāvāriyāṇa ca* /  
*saṃlekhaḥcaritā asme*<sup>5/</sup> *evaṃ vaksyanti durmatī* // 5

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter, I shall refer to the readings of five relatively old manuscripts only when their readings differ significantly from those in the Kern-Nanjio Edition. They are namely:

- (1) Pk = MS. of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, formerly kept in the Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities (民族文化宮图书馆), Beijing. A photographic edition: Míngzú-wénhuàgōng 1984; transliteration: Jiang 1988; Toda 1989-1991.
- (2) D2 = Gilgit MSS. of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, kept in the National Archives of India (New Delhi). Facsimile edition and transliteration: Watanabe 1972-1975.
- (3) D3 = Gilgit MSS. of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, kept in the National Archives of India (New Delhi), the British Museum (London), and in the possession of Mr. M. A. Shah (Lahore). Facsimile edition and transliteration: Watanabe 1972-1975. Verses 3~5 are missing in D3.
- (4) O = the so-called Kashgar manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, actually found in Khādaliq but purchased in Kashgar. Facsimile edition: Lokesh Chandra 1976; transliteration: Toda 1981: 3-225.
- (5) F = the Sanskrit Manuscripts of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, discovered in Farhād-Bēg, romanised in Toda 1981: 229-258.

Moreover, the sign "\*\*\*\*" is used here to designate a missing portion in a Sanskrit manuscript.

Pk. *ākrośānām tarjanām tāḍanām caiva daṇḍa-udguruṇāṃni ca*; D2. *ākrośāms tāḍanāms caiva daṇḍa-udgiriṇāni ca*; O. *ākrośā tāḍanā bhīkṣmā daṇḍāni mudgarāni*; F. *ākrośā tāḍanā bhīkṣmā daṇḍā mudgarāṇāṃni ca*.

<sup>2</sup> O. *durbuddhīnām ca vaṅkānām caṇḍābālādhibimānīnām*; F. *durbuddhīnām ca vaṅkānā śaṭhābālādhibimānīnām*.

<sup>3</sup> O. *aprāpte prāptasamjñīnām bhīkṣūṇām kāli paścime* (= F)

<sup>4</sup> Pk. *araṇya-cintakāś* (= D2); O. *araṇya-vṛttakāś*; F. *araṇya\*\*\*\**.

*rāseṣu gr̥ddhā saktās<sup>6</sup> ca gr̥bhīnām dharma deśayī /  
 satkṛtās ca bhaviṣyanti ṣaḍabbijñā yathā tathā<sup>7</sup> // 6  
 raudracittās ca duṣṭās ca gr̥ba-cintā<sup>8</sup>-vicintakāḥ /  
 aranyaguptiṃ praviśitvā asmākaṃ parivādakāḥ<sup>9</sup> // 7  
 asmākaṃ caiva<sup>10</sup> vakṣyanti lābha-satkāra-nīritāḥ /  
 tīrtbhikā vat<sup>11</sup> ime<sup>11</sup> bhikṣū svāni kāvyāni<sup>12</sup> deśayuh // 8  
 svayaṃ sūtrāṇi grantbitvā<sup>13</sup> lābha-satkāra-betavaḥ /  
 parṣāya<sup>14</sup> madhye bhāṣante asmākaṃ anukūṭtakāḥ<sup>15</sup> // 9  
 rājeṣu rājaputreṣu rājāmātyeṣu cā(← vā) tathā<sup>16</sup> /  
 viprāṇām<sup>17</sup> gr̥bapatīnām ca anyeṣām cāpi<sup>18</sup> bhikṣuṇām // 10  
 vakṣyanty avarṇam asmākaṃ<sup>19</sup> tīrtavyādāṃ ca cārayi<sup>20</sup> /  
 sarvaṃ vayaṃ kṣamiṣyāmo gauraveṇa maharṣiṇām // 11  
 ye cāsmān kutsayiṣyanti<sup>21</sup> tasmīṃ kālasmī<sup>22</sup> durmatī /  
 ime buddhā bhaviṣyanti<sup>23</sup> kṣamiṣyāma 'tha<sup>24</sup> sarvaśaḥ // 12  
 kalpa-saṃkṣobha-bhīṣmasmin<sup>25</sup> dāruṇasmi mahābbaye /*

<sup>5</sup> Pk. saṃlekha-vṛtti-dhārāya; D2. saṃlekha-vṛtta-cāri (?)sma; O. saṃlekha-caritā asme; F. saṃlekha-cāritā asmai.

<sup>6</sup> Pk. gr̥ddhā saktās ca; D2. gr̥ddhāḥ saktās ca; O. gr̥ddhā ātmane; F. gr̥ddhā : ātmāne.

<sup>7</sup> O. yathāiva te (= F).

<sup>8</sup> D2. gr̥bhī-citta-; A3. gr̥bhavittā-; several Nepalese MSS. read gr̥bhacittā-. The Tibetan translation reads *khyim dang nor* (= gr̥bhā-vittā-), s. Nakamura 1986: 272.7. Presumably, the original reading was gr̥bhā-vittā-, which was mistakenly changed to gr̥bhā-cittā, gr̥bhacintā. Cf. Karashima 1992: 160. For the alternation *v / c*, cf. Norman 1971: 59(vs. 12); *do.* 1990: 169, 215; *do.* 1995: 146-147(vs. 38); *do.* 1997: 74(vs. 50).

<sup>9</sup> O. parikuṭṭakāḥ (= F).

<sup>10</sup> Pk. asmākaṃ ca evaṃ (= D3); D2.\*\*\*; O. asmākaṃ e\*\*; F. asmākaṃ eva. As the metre requires a short vowel, *evaṃ* changed to *eva*. The same situation is also seen in other Buddhist texts, cf. BHSD, s.v. *eva*; Norman 1971: 168.

<sup>11</sup> D2. tīrtbhikā vata 'me (= D3); O. tīrtbhikevādi 'me; F. tīrtbhikāvādi 'me.

<sup>12</sup> Some Nepalese MSS. read *vākyāni* instead of *kāvyāni*. Cf. Toda 1984: 239; Karashima 1992: 160.

<sup>13</sup> Pk. kaṭṭitvā; D2. gaṇitvā; D3. gaṇṭbitvā.

<sup>14</sup> D2. pariṣāya (= D3, O, F).

<sup>15</sup> Pk. anukūṭanām; D2. anukūṭtanām; D3. °kuṭṭanām; O. parikuṭṭakā; F. °kuṭṭakāṃḥ.

<sup>16</sup> Pk. rājeṣu rājāmātreṣu rājāmātyeṣu cottamā; D2. rājeṣu \*\*\*\*jāmātyeṣu vā tathā; D3. rājeṣu rājaputreṣu rājāmātyeṣu vā tathā; O. rājānām rājaputrāṇām rājāmātyāna ca tathā (= F). The form *cā*, which is m.c. for *ca*, seems to have been confused with *vā*. For the alternation *v / c*, see note (8)

<sup>17</sup> O. brāhmaṇa- (= F).

<sup>18</sup> O. caiva (= F).

<sup>19</sup> O. asmākāvarṇa bhāṣanti; F. asmākaṃ avarṇa bhāṣanti.

<sup>20</sup> Pk. tīrtavyādāṃ ca cārayi; D2. tīrtva-vādāṃ ca cārayet (= D3); O. tīrtbhikā vāca cārayi; F. tīrtbhikāṃ vāca cārayi.

<sup>21</sup> O. kupsayiṣyanti; F. (ku)p(sa)yiṣyanti.

<sup>22</sup> Pk. kālesya; D2. \*\*\*; D3. kālesmi (= O, F).

<sup>23</sup> O. ime buddhā 'ti vakṣyanti; F. ime buddhā 'ti vakṣyanti. Parallels in the Chinese translations agree with these readings. Cf. Karashima 1992: 161, 335.

<sup>24</sup> Pk. kṣamiṣyāyusa (a corruption?); O. adbhivāsiyāma (= F).

*yakṣarūpā babū bhikṣū asmākaṃ paribhāṣakāḥ // 13*  
*gauraveṇēha<sup>26</sup> lokendra utsahāma suduskaram /*  
*kṣāntīya kaksyāṇ<sup>27</sup> bandhitvā sūtram etaṃ prakāśaye<sup>28</sup> // 14*  
*anarthikā 'sma kāyena jīvitena ca nāyaka /*  
*arthikāś ca 'sma bodhīya<sup>29</sup> tava nikṣepadhārakāḥ // 15*  
*bhagavān eva jānīte<sup>30</sup> yādṛśāḥ pāpabhikṣavaḥ /*  
*paścime kālī bheṣyanti saṃdhābbhāṣyam ajānakāḥ // 16*  
*bhṛkuṭī sarva<sup>31</sup> soḍhavyā aprajñaptiḥ punaḥ punaḥ /*  
*niṣkāsanam<sup>32</sup> viharebhyo bahukutṭī<sup>33</sup> bahūvidhā // 17*  
*ājñaptiṃ lokanāthasya smarantā kālī paścime /*  
*bhāṣiṣyāma idaṃ sūtram paṣan-<sup>34</sup>madhye viśāradāḥ // 18*  
*nagareṣu ca grāmeṣu<sup>35</sup> ye bheṣyanti<sup>36</sup> ihārtikāḥ<sup>37</sup> /*  
*gatvā gatvāṣya dāsyāmo nikṣepam tubhya<sup>38</sup> nāyaka // 19*

## 1.2. Kern's English translation

Kern translated these verses as follows (1884: 259-261)<sup>39</sup>:

3. We will suffer, patiently endure, O Lord, the injuries, threats, blows and threats with sticks at the hands of foolish men.
4. At that dreadful last epoch men will be malign, crooked, wicked, dull, conceited, fancying to have come to the limit when they have not.
5. 'We do not care but to live in the wilderness and wear a patched cloth ; we lead a frugal life;' so will they speak to the ignorant
6. And persons greedily attached to enjoyments will preach the law to laymen and be honoured as if they possessed the six transcendent qualities.
7. Cruel-minded and wicked men, only occupied with household cares, will enter our retreat in the forest and become our calumniators.
8. The Tīrthikas, themselves bent on profit and honour, will say of us that we

<sup>25</sup> O. -bhikṣasmim; F. -bbi\*\*\*.

<sup>26</sup> Pk. gauraveṇa te; D2. gauraveṇa ti (= D3); O. goraveṇā ti; F. goravaina tu.

<sup>27</sup> Pk. kakṣam; D2. kakṣām (= D3); O. kaksyām; F. kaccha.

<sup>28</sup> Pk. prakāśayi; D2. prakāśayī (= D3); O. prakāśaye; F. prakāśayī.

<sup>29</sup> Pk. arthikāś cāsma bodhāya; D2. arthikā cāsma bodhāya (= D3); O. arthikā vāya bodhāya; F. arthikā vāyam bodhāya.

<sup>30</sup> O. jānāti (= F).

<sup>31</sup> D2. bhṛkutyā sarvi (= D3); O. bhṛkuṭī tivrā; F. bhṛkuṭī tīvra.

<sup>32</sup> O. niṣkālanā (= F).

<sup>33</sup> Pk. babu-kutṭa; Other Nepalese MSS. read baddha-kutṭī, °-kūṭī, °kūṭā etc. (cf. Toda 1984: 239; Karashima 1992: 161); D2. baddhra-kutṭā (= D3); O. upākrrausā; F. upākkrośā.

<sup>34</sup> O. pariṣa- (= F).

<sup>35</sup> Pk. nagareṣu atva grāmeṣu (= D2, D3, O, F).

<sup>36</sup> O. bhaviṣyanti; F. bhaviṣya(nt)i.

<sup>37</sup> O. arthikā; F. (a)rtthikāḥ.

<sup>38</sup> Pk. tava (= D2, D3); O. tubhya (= F).

are so, and—shame on such monks ! They will preach their own fictions.

9. Prompted by greed of profit and honour they will compose Sûtras of their own invention and then, in the midst of the assembly, accuse us of plagiarism.

10. To kings, princes, king's peers, as well as to Brahmans and commoners, and to monks of other confessions,

11. They will speak evil of us and propagate the Tîrtha-doctrine. We will endure all that out of reverence for the great Seers.

12. And those fools who will not listen to us, shall (sooner or later) become enlightened, and therefore will we forbear to the last.

13. In that dreadful, most terrible period of frightful general revolution will many fiendish monks stand up as our revilers.

14. Out of respect for the Chief of the world we will bear it, however difficult it be ; girded with the girdle of forbearance will I proclaim this Sûtra.

15. I do not care for my body or life, O Lord, but as keepers of thine entrusted deposit we care for enlightenment.

16. The Lord himself knows that in the last period there are (to be) wicked monks who do not understand mysterious speech.

17. One will have to bear frowning looks, repeated disavowal (or concealment), expulsion from the monasteries, many and manifold abuses.

18. Yet mindful of the command of the Lord of the world we will in the last period undauntedly proclaim this Sûtra in the midst of the congregation.

19. We will visit towns and villages everywhere, and transmit to those who care for it thine entrusted deposit, O Lord.

### 1.3. Kumārajīva's Chinese translation

In Kumārajīva's translation of the Lotus Sutra, we find verses corresponding to the above-cited Sanskrit ones (*Taishō*, vol. 9, No.262, 36b23~37a1)<sup>40</sup>. I shall cite only the part, parallel to Sanskrit verses 5~11, here.

<sup>39</sup> Burnouf translated verses in question (i.e. 5~11) as follows(1852: 165-166):

5. « Ne songeant qu'au désert, couverts d'un morceau d'étoffe, nous passerons « notre vie dans la pauvreté : » c'est ainsi que parleront les insensés.

6. Désirant avec avidité tout ce qui flatte le goût, et pleins de cupidité, ils seront honorés, quand ils enseigneront la loi aux maîtres de maison, comme s'ils possédaient les six connaissances surnaturelles.

7. Pleins de pensées cruelles et de méchanceté, exclusivement occupés des soins de leur maison et de leur fortune, ils pénétreront dans les retraites des forêts pour nous accabler d'outrages.

8. Avides de gain et d'honneurs, ils nous parleront d'une manière conforme à leurs sentiments ; ces religieux Tîrthakas nous exposeront leurs propres pratiques.

9. Composant eux-mêmes des Sûtras dans le but d'obtenir du gain et des honneurs, ils parleront au milieu de l'assemblée pour nous insulter.

10. Auprès des rois, auprès des fils de roi, auprès de leurs conseillers, auprès des Brâhmanes, des maîtres de maison et des autres Religieux,

11. Ils nous blâmeront dans leurs discours, et feront entendre le langage des Tîrthakas; mais nous supporterons tout cela par respect pour les grands Rîchis ;

<sup>40</sup> In another Chinese translation of the Lotus Sutra, namely Dharmarakṣa's *Zhèngfāhuā Jīng* 正法華經, one can also find relevant verses: *Taishō*, vol. 9, No.263, 106c29~107b8.

或有阿練若 納衣在空閑 自謂行真道 輕賤人間者：“貪著利養故 與白衣說法”  
 爲世所恭敬 如六通羅漢 是人懷惡心 常念世俗事  
 假名阿練若 好出我等過 而作如是言 “此諸比丘等 爲貪利養故 說外道論議”  
 自作此經典 誑惑世間人 爲求名聞故 分別於是經”  
 常在大衆中 欲毀我等故 向國王大臣 婆羅門居士 及餘比丘衆 誹謗說我惡  
 謂：“是邪見人 說外道論議” 我等敬佛故 悉忍是諸惡

Hurvitz translated these Chinese verses as follows (1976: 205-206):

Or there are *āranyakas* [forest-dwelling hermits], clothed in patched rags and living in the wilderness, who say of themselves that they are treading the True Path, holding mankind cheaply.

Because they covet profit and nourishment, they preach Dharma to white-robed laymen, and are held in humble reverence by the world, as though they were arhants of the six penetrations.

These men, harboring evil thoughts, constantly mindful of the affairs of the world, borrow the name of *āranyakas* because they love to display our faults.

Then they make such talk as this: “These bhikṣus, out of greed for profit and nourishment, preach the arguments of external paths.

Having themselves created this scriptural canon to deceive worldlings and lead them astray, in the quest for name and renown they preach this scripture with much discrimination.”

Since within the great multitude they ever wish to ruin us, turning to kings and great ministers, to Brahmans and householders, and to multitudes of other bhikṣus, they slanderously speak evil of us, saying, “These fellows of wrong views preach arguments of external paths.”

Out of veneration for the Buddha, we will endure all these evils.

#### 1.4. Who slandered whom?

The Sanskrit and Chinese verses which are given above in boldface, have been wrongly understood, as I shall explain in the following sections.

In particular, there is a great deal of confusion between those who slandered and those who were slandered, which is found not only in the modern translations of the Lotus Sutra but also in ancient Chinese commentaries, resulting presumably from the lack of marks or words which would indicate a quotation (such as *iti* in Sanskrit or 曰 in Chinese), in the verses in question. The cause of this confusion may also be attributed to these modern translators’ insufficient understanding of past antagonism between wilderness and village monks.

In the following section, we shall see the dichotomy and antagonism between these two groups, found in various texts.

## 2. Antagonism between wilderness and village monks

### 2.1. *araṇya* (“wilderness”)<sup>41</sup> and *grāma* (“village”)

Since Vedic and Brahmanical times throughout the Hindu tradition, we find a dichotomy in Indian culture, namely *araṇya* (“wilderness”) and *grāma* (“village”).<sup>42</sup> Regarding this, Olivelle writes:<sup>43</sup>

... the two religious paths, Vedic ritualism and asceticism, are symbolised by the places—village and wilderness.

This opposition is also to be found in the Buddhist tradition as we shall see below.

### 2.2. *Araññavāsī* (wilderness monks) v. *Gāmaṇvāsī* (village monks) in Sri Lanka

In ancient Sri Lanka, three schools (or *nikāyas*) of monks, namely the *Mahāvihāra*, the *Abhayagiri* and the *Jetavana*, are known to have existed which are often mentioned in Pali chronicles. According to Rahula<sup>44</sup>, long before these, records from around the latter part of the first century B.C.E. show there were two groups of monks, known as *Pamsukūlika* (lit. “one, who wears clothes made of rags”) and *Dhammakathika* (lit. “one, who preaches the *Dhamma*”). The former maintained that the practice (*paṭipatti*) of the *Dhamma* was the basis of Buddhism (*sāsana*), while the latter held that learning (*pariyatti*) was of more importance. They argued with each other, bringing forth reasons in support of their theories, and, in the end, the *Dhammakathikas* won.<sup>45</sup> It must be remembered that they were not two different schools but rather two groups of monks living in the same community, holding different opinions and leading two different lifestyles.<sup>46</sup> However, when the three schools—namely the *Mahāvihāra*, the *Abhayagiri* and the *Jetavana*, were later formed, they had their own *Pamsukūlikas*.<sup>47</sup> As well as this,

<sup>41</sup> The Sanskrit word *araṇya* is usually rendered as “forest”, but, following Sprockhoff (1981, 1984) and other, I use the English word “wilderness” for *araṇya* in contrast to *vana* (“forest”) in this paper. Citing P. Thieme’s definition of *araṇya*: “Es ist dabei — nicht etwa an einen undurchdringlichen Dschungel, sondern — an eine unbesiedelte, menschenleere Steppenlandschaft zu denken, die ausschließlich wegen ihrer Einsamkeit und der bei Eintritt der Dunkelheit drohenden Angriffe bössartiger Wesen die Fruchtbarkeit erregt und das Bewußtsein der Gefahr erzeugt.”, Sprockhoff, himself, describes the picture of *araṇya* as follows: “Im Araṇya gibt es bergendes Gebüsch (*kakṣa*) und Dickicht (*gabanāni*), tückische Erdspalten (*svabhra*) und Gruben (*kūpa*); Dornen und Splitter durchbohren die Füß dessen, der sich dorthin traut.” (Sprockhoff 1981: 33-34). Cf. also von Hinüber 1996: 106. The *Visuddhimagga* (PTS ed., p. 72, l. 11f.), however, gives us other definitions: “‘Forest’ (*arañña*), according to the Vinaya method firstly, is described thus: ‘Except the village and its precincts, all is forest’ (Vin.iii,46). According to the Abhidhamma method it is described thus: ‘Having gone out beyond the boundary post, all that is forest’ (Vbh. 251; Ps.i,176). But according to the Suttanta method its characteristic is this: ‘A forest abode is five hundred bow-lengths distant’ (Vin.iv,183).” (Ñāṇamoli 1956: 71).

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Malmoud 1976; Olivelle 1990; Sprockhoff 1981, 1984.

<sup>43</sup> Olivelle 1990: 131.

<sup>44</sup> Rahula 1956: 195.

<sup>45</sup> Rahula 1956: 158-159.

<sup>46</sup> Rahula 1956: 195.

according to Rahula, from about the 6th century C.E., another “pair” of groups of monks, namely the *Araññavāsī* (Skt. *Āraṇyavāsin*; lit. “dweller in the wilderness”; also known as *Vanavāsī* [“forest dweller”]) and the *Gā mavāsī* (Skt. *Grā mavāsin*; lit. “village dweller”), are referred to in Pali chronicles as distinct groups, though not as separate schools.<sup>48</sup> He tells us that the *Pamsukūlika* and the *Araññavāsī*, both of which were practitioners of the *dhutaguṇas* (ascetic practices), were regarded as separate groups<sup>49</sup>, though he remains silent on the relationship between the *Dhammakathika* and the *Gā mavāsī*.

Therefore, from Rahula’s study, it is clear that since olden times, there have been, broadly speaking, two types of groups of monks, namely, those who, practising *dhutaguṇas*, lived outside the village in the wilderness, and those who lived in (or nearby) towns and villages.

### 2.3. *Araññavāsī* (wilderness monks) v. *Gā mavāsī* (village monks) in Myanmar

Though Rahula’s study does not say anything concerning the attitudes of the two groups towards each other, a later Pali chronicle, the *Sāsanavaṃsa*, written in Myanmar in 1861, reports of a separation and conflict between wilderness monks (*araññavāsī*) and village ones (*gā mavāsī*) in the Maramma-saṃgha or the Community of Myanmar.

In the thirteenth century<sup>50</sup>, a king, named Ujana, built seventy-seven monasteries (*vihāra*) and dedicated many fields and much land (*khetta-vatthu*) in support of these monasteries. Then, monks began to quarrel on account of these fields and land. On hearing of the quarrel, one elder, who was a holder of the teaching (*sāsanadharathera*), and two others, who were exerting themselves (*parakkamathera*), left there and took up residence in the mountains. They were called those who walked alone (*ekacāra*), while the remaining monks were known as village-dwellers who walked with many (*gā mavāsī bahucāra*). Since then, there have been two groups of monks, namely wilderness dwellers (*araññavāsī*) and village dwellers (*gā mavāsī*).

Much later<sup>51</sup>, in 1698, an elder monk (*thera*), named Guṇābhilaṃkāra, ordered his novices to cover only their left shoulders when entering a village, which the traditionalists thought as an offence against monastic rules. He, also, did not allow them to use palm leaves for head-dresses, which seems to have been the custom of village monks.<sup>52</sup> After

<sup>47</sup> Rahula 1956: 196.

<sup>48</sup> Rahula 1956: 196.

<sup>49</sup> Rahula 1956: 197.

<sup>50</sup> *Sāsanavaṃsa* 83.10f. An English translation of this part is found in Law 1952: 91-92.

<sup>51</sup> *Sāsanavaṃsa* 118.1f.; Law 1952: 123f.; cf. also Hinüber 1995: 39f.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *Sāsanavaṃsa* 116.27f.; Law 1952: 122.



this happened, Guṇābhilaṃkāra's group, which was named "the group which covers one shoulder", and the traditionalists, known as "well-covered", began disputing and quarrelling over this matter. As the "one shoulder" group could not find any textual evidence supporting their stance, they bribed (*lañchaṃ datvā*) a lay devotee to compose a book (*gandha*) in accordance with their views. This quarrel was intensified by a conflict between village monks (*gāmaṃvāsī*), who used palm leaves for their head-dresses, and wilderness monks (*araññāvāsī*). A group of village monks (*gāmaṃvāsibhikkhugaṇa*) was reported to have destroyed this book (*gandha*) and driven the wilderness monks out from the place, saying: "Let there be no inauspicious monks in the religion (*sāsana*), who do not put on head-dresses". Then, other village monks took up arms and also went forth to drive away the wilderness monks who were at that time dwelling in a monastery (*vihāra*). The king, having heard of this matter, sent a royal writ stating: "The group of village monks is one and that of the wilderness is another. The former should not harass the latter. They should dwell in their own places according to their own views." Thus, the wilderness monks could live happily. However, even after these incidents, the "one shoulder" group and the traditionalists still continued the dispute until it was finally settled by the king in 1784.

Here, we can see an instance of antagonism between village and wilderness monks, which even took the form of an armed attack. It is also noteworthy that a group forged a text — in this case a text of discipline — and another group destroyed it.

The *Sāsanavaṃsa* also tells us of a well-learned elder monk (*thera*), who had formerly been a village monk and followed the tradition of his teacher, but later gave up such a practice and became a wilderness monk.<sup>53</sup> From this, we learn that it was possible for a monk to alter his mode of living in the midst of his religious practice.

The dichotomy of wilderness monks and village ones is found not only in the history of Sri Lanka and Myanmar, but also in Thailand.<sup>54</sup>

#### 2.4. *Āraññaka* (a wilderness monk) and *gāmantavibārī* (a village monk) in Pāli literature

In Pāli scriptures, we come across some instances in which *āraññaka* (a wilderness monk) and *gāmantavibārī* (a village monk)<sup>55</sup> are mentioned along side each other. For instance:

Vin. III 171.-2f. *yo icchati āraññako hotu, yo icchati gāmante vibaratu, yo icchati piṇḍapātiko hotu, yo icchati nimantanam sādīyatu, ...* ("Whoever wants, let him be a

<sup>53</sup> *Sāsanavaṃsa* 116.27f.; Law 1952: 122.

<sup>54</sup> As to the evolution of this dichotomy in Southeast Asia, cf. Tambiah 1976, 1984.

**wilderness monk**; whoever wants, let him  **dwell in a village**; whoever wants, let him a be beggar for alms; whoever wishes, let him accept an invitation ....”)

MNI 30.-3f. *kiñcāpi so hoti āraññako pantasenāsano, piṇḍapātiko sapadānacārī, paṃsukūliko lūkhacīvaradharo, atha kho naṃ sabrahmacārī na sakkaronti ..... kiñcāpi so hoti gāmantavibhārī nemantaniko gahapaticīvaradharo, atha kho naṃ sabrahmacārī sakkaronti...* (“then for all he may be a **forest dweller**, a frequenter of remote abodes, an almsfood eater, a house-to-house seeker, a refuse-rag wearer, a wearer of rough robes, still his fellows in the holy life do not honour, ..... then for all he may be a **village dweller**, an acceptor of invitations. a wearer of robes given him by householders, yet his fellows in the holy life honour ....” [Ñāṇamoli 1995: 112]).

MN I 473.1~3. *āraññakenāpi kho āvuso Moggallāna bhikkhunā ime dhammā samādāya vattitabbā, pag-eva gāmantavibhārīnā* (“Friend Moggallāna, these things should be undertaken and practised not only by a **forrest-dwelling bhikkhu**, but by a **town-dwelling bhikkhu** as well” [Ñāṇamoli 1995: 576]).

The following scriptures show explicitly that the opposition between wilderness monks and village ones existed in early times.

*Ānguttara-Nikāya* III 341f. runs as follows. The Buddha, on hearing the tumult of the people who came to pay homage to him, told his attendant Nāgita that he preferred the bliss of seclusion to homage. He said further: “Whosoever cannot obtain the bliss of seclusion, of calm, of enlightenment, should enjoy profit, honour and praise (*lābha-sakkāra-siloka-sukha* ) which is to be likened to the pleasure of drowsing or filthy pleasure”, then he disparaged life in villages in the following way (AN III 342.-1f.):

“When I see a village monk (*gāmantavibhārī*), seated in concentration, I think: ‘Presently, a park attendant or a novice might disturb and distract him from his concentration.’ Therefore, I am not pleased with his dwelling in the village (*gāmantavihāra*).

When I see a wilderness monk (*araññaka*), seated nodding in the wilderness, I think: ‘Presently, he will get rid of this sleepiness and fatigue, then surely ponder on the wilderness as a single object.’ Therefore, I am pleased with his dwelling in the wilderness (*araññavihāra*).

Or I see a wilderness monk, seated uncomposed in the wilderness, I think: ‘Presently, he will compose his uncomposed mind, or will keep his mind composed.’ Therefore, I am pleased with his dwelling in the wilderness.

Or I see a wilderness monk, seated composed in the wilderness, I think: ‘Presently, he will liberate his unliberated mind, or will keep his mind liberated.’ Therefore, I

<sup>55</sup> The *Visuddhimagga* (PTS ed., p. 71, l. -4f.) defines the Pāli word *gāmantā* as follows: *tattha saddhim upacārena gāmo yeva gāmantasenāsana* (“Herein, a village abode is the village itself with its precincts.” [Ñāṇamoli 1956: 70]). Cf. also SN IV 37.11~14. *kiñcāpi gāmante vibarati ākiṃṇo bhikkhūhi bhikkhūhi upāsakehi upāsikāhi rājūhi rājamahāmattehi titthiyehi titthiyasāvakehi, atha so ekavibhārī vuccati* (“Even if he dwells in a village [*gāmantā*], crowded with monks, nuns, laymen, laywomen, kings, royal ministers, heretics and their followers, yet he is called ‘one, who dwells alone’.”).

am pleased with his dwelling in the wilderness.

Or I see a village monk, who, having obtained robes, alms, beds, chairs, medicaments and utensils, and delighting in their profit, honour and praise, abandons the solitude, the wilderness and woodlands (*arañña-vanapatthāni*), solitary lodgings (*pantāni senāsanāni*), and then enters a village, town or the capital, and dwells there. Therefore, I am not pleased with his dwelling in the village.

Or I see a wilderness monk, who, having obtained robes, alms, beds, chairs, medicaments and utensils, but warding off their profit, honour and praise, does not abandon solitude, the wilderness, woodlands, solitary lodgings. Therefore, I am pleased with his dwelling in the wilderness.”

We find a similar description also in AN IV 343.23f. These two scriptures are apparently on the side of wilderness monks, disparaging the lifestyle of those of the village.

In contrast to the above, a scripture named *Migajālena* in the *Samyutta-Nikāya* (SN IV 35.-4f.) seems to pay due respects to life in the village. Being questioned by a monk named Migajāla about the meanings of “dwelling alone” (*ekavihārī*) and “dwelling with a partner” (*sadutiya-vihārī*), the Buddha replied in the following way:

“There are forms, sounds, odours, flavours, tangibles and mental objects which are wished for, desired, agreeable, and provoking lust. If a monk delights in them, welcomes and clings to them, pleasure and passion will occur to him, and finally, he will be bound with the fetter of pleasure. Such a monk is called ‘dweller with a partner’. Even if he frequents the wilderness, woodlands, solitary lodgings, which are free from sound and uproar, hidden away from people (*manussa-rāha-seyyaka*), and fit for solitary meditation, he is still called ‘one, who dwells with a partner’.

On the contrary, if a monk does not delight in agreeable forms, sounds *etc.*, pleasure and passion will not occur to him, and he will not be bound with the fetter of pleasure. Such a monk is called ‘one, who dwells alone’. Even if he dwells in a village (*gāmanta*), crowded with monks, nuns, laymen, laywomen, kings, royal ministers, heretics and their followers, yet he is called ‘one, who dwells alone’.”

From these descriptions in the Pāli scriptures, we learn that the opposition between wilderness monks and village ones already existed in early times.

## 2.5. *Āraṇyakas* (wilderness monks) v. *Grāmāntikas* (village monks) in the *Abbisamācārikā-Dharmāḥ*

In the *Abbisamācārikā-Dharmāḥ*, a portion of the *Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda-Vinaya* for which we have an extant Buddhist Sanskrit text (I am preparing a new transliteration and an annotated German translation of this text), we find very good descriptions which may help to clarify the relationship between these two groups in olden times.<sup>56</sup>

A chapter in this text deals with rules of conduct of wilderness and village monks concerning having meals.<sup>57</sup> Namely, the following rules were laid down by the Buddha, after knowing that these two groups of monks quarrelled on the occasion of the common

meal (*ekabhaktatarppaṇa*): When both groups have meals together, whether it is in a monastery of wilderness monks (*āraṇyaka~ vihāra~; āraṇyaka~ śeṅgāsana~*) or that of village monks (*grāmāntika~ vihāra~; grāmāntika~ śeṅgāsana~*), residing monks should wait for any visiting ones until the very last moment and, even if the latter do not appear, the former should keep food reserved for them; When a lay devotee (*upāsaka*) invites the community (*saṅgha*) for a meal, making village monks inform wilderness monks about it, the former should inform the latter and the latter should go there on time; When someone invites village monks for a meal, they should ask him to also invite the wilderness monks, and so on.

The Buddha also told the two groups not to abuse one another but to please each other in the following way:

Now, wilderness monks must not revile village monks in any situation (by saying): “You have much to do, you are very busy, (because) you seek for the most tasty (foods) with the tip of your tongue.” (Wilderness monks) rather should please (the latter) by saying: “O venerable ones, you do good. You do much by bearing burdens (and) by preaching the *Dharma*. You take care of cloisters, burn incense, please (lay) families (, so that they become Buddhist).” Thus (village monks) should be pleased.

58

Now village monks must not revile or abuse wilderness monks in any situation (by saying): “You live in an empty house, //hoping to gain fame//. (However,) jackals also live in the wilderness. You sit (there) all day long, while you (just) accumulate (the number of) years (counted since ordination).” (Village monks) should say to (the latter): “It is hard to live in lodgings in the wilderness, which are secluded, isolated, devoid of humans (*vigata-janapada*), in which one can dwell, hidden away from people (*manuṣya-raba-śayyaka*), (and) fit for solitary meditation. It is difficult and unpleasant

<sup>56</sup> A facsimile edition of this text was published in Beijing 1996. A new transcription of it was also published: *A Guide to the Facsimile Edition of the Abhisamācārika-Dharma of the Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādin*, ed. Abhisamācārika-Dharma Study Group, the Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taishō University, Tokyo 1998; “Transcription of the Abhisamācārika-Dharma, Chapter V-VII” ed. Abhisamācārika-Dharma Study Group, in: *The Annual Report of the Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism* 大正大學綜合研究所年報, vol. 21, 1999, 234(1)-156(79).

<sup>57</sup> Facsimile edition 30B5f.; Jinananda 1969: 140.2ff.; cf. Prasad 1984: 146f.

<sup>58</sup> *Abhisamācārikā-Dharmāḥ* 31B5. *nāpi dāni āraṇyakehi grāmāntikā kutsetavyā, “babukṛtyā babukaraṇīyā jibvāgre<na> yūyaṃ rasāgrāṇi paryeṣatha”. | atha khalu saṃrādhayitavyā, | vaktavyaṃ, “āyusman”, sobhanam (read: śobbh) kriyati, babukarā yūyaṃ bhāraṃ vabatha. | dharmmadeśanām karetha. | saṅghārāmo kelāpiyati, | dbūmo kriyati, kulāni prasādiyanti” ti. | evaṃ saṃrādhayitavyāḥ |*. A parallel in the Chinese translation of the *Mahāsāṅghika-Vinaya*, reads as follows: *Taishō*, vol. 22, No. 1425, 510a23f. 阿練若比丘不應輕聚落中比丘言: “汝(v.l. 如汝)必利舌頭, 少味, 而在此住.” 應讀: “汝聚落中住, 說法教化. 爲法作護, 覆蔭(v.l. 陰)我等”(Wilderness monks should not despise village monks by saying: “You must have certainly sharpened the tip of your tongue and //refined your sense of taste//[少味. The meaning of the phrase is not clear], and therefore you dwell here.” [The former rather] should praise [the latter] by saying: “You live in the village, preach the *Dharma* and teach [the people]. You guard the *Dharma*, and protect us.”).

for one (to stay) one (or) more nights in solitude, controlling one's mind or one's own self.”; (and also) “O venerable ones, you do good; you take care of lodgings in the wilderness. The Blessed One also said: ‘As long as monks shall dwell in lodgings in the wilderness, only an increase in good things is expected not a decline.’ With you, not even *Māra*, the Evil One, will find an opportunity of causing the true doctrine to disappear (and) confusing (you concerning it).” (Village monks) should please (wilderness monks) in this manner and leave.<sup>59</sup>

From the above descriptions, it is evident that there was antagonism between wilderness and village monks, who belonged to one and the same community.

## 2.6. Wilderness monks v. village monks in Mahāyāna texts

### 2.6.1. Praises for the *Āraṇyakas* in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*

As Ray(1994: 251f.), Mochizuki(1988), Silk(1994) and others have demonstrated, there are several early Mahāyāna texts which praise seclusion in the wilderness.

For instance, the eleventh chapter, *i.e.* the *Āraṇyasamvarṇana* (“Praise of the Wilderness”), in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* or A Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine, attributed to Śāntideva of the eighth century, cites many passages from early Mahāyāna sutras, which praise seclusion in the wilderness.<sup>60</sup>

### 2.6.2. Praises for the *Āraṇyakas* in the *Ugraparipṛcchā Sūtra*

One such early scripture, the *Ugraparipṛcchā Sūtra*, which is also completely preserved in Tibetan and Chinese, proclaims that a bodhisattva should enter the wilderness in order to attain enlightenment.

<sup>59</sup> *Abhisamācārikā-Dharmāḥ* 32A6f. *nāpi dāni grāmāntikebi āraṇyakā kutsetavyā | paṃsetavyā* (MS. *yaṃ*°), | “*sūnyāgaragatā* (MS. °*āgāranātā*) *yūyam prajñā*(32A7)*vaitakṣiyā* (a corruption?) *śṛgālāpi āraṇye vasanti. divasaṃ yūyaṃ varṣāṇi piṇḍentā āsatha*”. | *atha khalu vaktavyā*, “*durāvāsakāni āraṇyakāni seyyāsanāni prāntāni* (MS. *prāptāni*) *viviktāni vigatajanapadāni manusyarahasāyyakāni pratisaṃlayanāsāropyāni, duṣkaram pravivekena* (MS. *prativekena*) *durabhiramaṃ ekaṃ paraṃ rātri vinayamāno mānasam ādhyātman vè*” ti. | “*āyusman{a}, sobhanam kriyati, āraṇyakaṃ seyyā*(32B1)*sanam kelāpīyati, | uktaṃ cēdam bhagavatā »yāvākīyaṃ ca bhikṣavo āraṇyakāni seyyāsanāni adhyāvasīyatha, | tāva vṛddhī yeva pratikāṃkṣitavyā | kuśalebi dharmmebi no parihāṇi. « na ca vo māraḥ | pāpīyaṃ avatāram adbigamīyati | saddharmmasya antarddhānāya sa<ṃ>mobhāya.”* ti (MS. *nti*) | *evam saṃrūdhīya* (MS. *saṃrūviya*) *gantavyaṃ* |. A parallel in the *Mahāsāṃghika-Vinaya* reads as follows: *Taisbū*, vol. 22, No. 1425, 510a25f. 聚落比丘不應輕阿練若言：“汝在阿練若處住，希望名利。羣鹿、禽獸亦在阿練若處住。汝在阿練若處，從朝竟日，正可數歲(v.l. 數歲耳)，數月耳”。應讚言：“汝遠聚落，在阿練若處，閑靜思惟，上業所崇。此是難行之處，能於此住而息心意” (Village monks should not despise wilderness monks by saying: “You live in the wilderness, hoping for fame and gain. Roe-deer, deer, birds and beasts also live in the wilderness. In the wilderness, you just count the number of years and months [since ordination] all day long from morning.” [Village monks] should praise [the latter]: “Far away from the village, in the wilderness, you meditate in the stillness. // [This is] an excellent, admirable deed. // It is a place for hard practices, but [能] [you] dwell here and quiet your thoughts”).

<sup>60</sup> An excellent analysis of the chapter concerning wilderness and village monks, is found in Ray 1994: 252-254.

“Bodhisattvas who stay at home will never be able to rightly attain supreme enlightenment. All of them, having left their homes, thinking of the wilderness (*dgon pa*), applying their minds to the wilderness, go to the wilderness and then attain supreme enlightenment. The multitude (*tsogs*) (of bodhisattvas) was thus formed.”<sup>61</sup>

In another place in this scripture where the twelve *dbutagūṇas* (ascetic practices) are explained in detail, “living in the wilderness” is included in the following way.

“An ordained bodhisattva, having realised merits, should not stop dwelling in the wilderness as long as he lives.”<sup>62</sup>

The text also tells that a wilderness monk occasionally visited village monks and even stayed in their monastery primarily to learn.

“Then, householder, if a bodhisattva, who dwells in the wilderness, goes to a lodging in a village (*grāmāntika śayanāsana*), wishing to listen to the *Dharma*, to meet teachers (*ācārya*) and instructors (*upādhyāya*), or in order to visit a sick person, he should think: ‘I should go back in the evening.’ If he, relying on others in terms of instruction (*upadeśa*) and recitation (*svādhyāya*) (of Buddha’s teachings), stays in a monastery (*vihāra*), should keep the wilderness and hillsides in his mind. When he thinks of the wilderness at (the sight of) everything, and seeks the *Dharma* untiringly, it is regarded as a (true) wilderness life (*araṇyavāsa*).”<sup>63</sup>

“When an ordained bodhisattva goes amongst the multitude (*gaṇa*) for the purpose of (receiving) instructions (*uddeśa*) and recitation (*svādhyāya*), he should be courteous there, respectful towards teachers and instructors, he should respect (in terms of years since ordination) elder, middle-ranked, and newly-ordained monks.”<sup>64</sup>

A wilderness monk is also said to practise the six perfections (*pāramitā*) in the wilderness.<sup>65</sup> After having done so together with other practices, and “having established a root of good (*kuśalamūla*), then he will enter a village, town, market-place, kingdom and capital and preach the *Dharma*”.<sup>66</sup>

From these descriptions, we learn that wilderness monks, dwelling alone, practised the six perfections and meditated, while village monks engaged in preaching the *Dharma*.

<sup>61</sup> *byang chub sems dpa' khyim na gnas te bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub mngon par rdzogs par sangs rgyas pa ni gang yang med de, de dag thams cad kyang khyim gyi gnas nas mngon par byung nas dgon pa la sems, dgon pa la gzhol, dgon par song nas bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub mngon par rdzogs par sangs rgyas so. tsogs de yang yang dag par bsgrubs so* (D[T], vol. 9, p. 324, 541.7f.; Q, vol. 23, p. 265, 313b8f.).

<sup>62</sup> *byang chub sems dpa' rab tu byung bas phan yon bcu mthong nas ji srid 'tso ba'i mtha'i bar du dgon pa la gnas pa yongs su mi gtang bar bya ste* (D[T], vol. 9, p. 326, 555.5.; Q, vol. 23, p. 269, 322b2f.).

<sup>63</sup> Śiks.200.7f.; cf. the Tibetan translation of the *Ugraparipṛcchā Sūtra*, D(T), vol. 9, p. 326, 556.1f.; Q, vol. 23, p. 269, 322b7f.

<sup>64</sup> Śiks.199.15f.; cf. D(T), vol. 9, p. 327, 565.2f.; Q, vol. 23, p. 271, 328a2f.

<sup>65</sup> D(T), vol. 9, p. 327, 562.7f.; Q, vol. 23, p. 270, 326b5f.

<sup>66</sup> Śiks.199.14f.; cf. D(T), vol. 9, p. 327, 565.1f.; Q, vol. 23, p. 271, 328a1f.

### 2.6.3. Wilderness bodhisattvas v. monastery monks in the *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā Sūtra*

Another early Mahāyāna text, also cited in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, praising life in the wilderness, is the *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā Sūtra*, which is preserved in Buddhist Sanskrit — edited by Louis Finot (1901) and translated into English by Ensink (1952) — as well as Tibetan and Chinese translations.

In this scripture<sup>67</sup>, those who seek enlightenment are advised to dwell in mountains, the wilderness (*araṇya*) or caves.<sup>68</sup> Bodhisattvas thus abandon their homes and dwell in a desolate wilderness, in which they find pleasure.<sup>69</sup> They live alone without the company of women or men, like a rhinoceros.<sup>70</sup> They are satisfied with whatever they obtain, like birds they do not store up things, they have no home anywhere in the world.<sup>71</sup> They are indifferent to gain or respects (*lābha-satkāra*) as well as obtaining acquaintances with good families (*kula-saṃstava*).<sup>72</sup> They, who seek the Buddha's wisdom, abide in generosity (*dāna*) and self-control (*dama*); they have attained the perfection of meditation (*dhyaṇa*) and the virtue of energy (*vīryaguṇa*).<sup>73</sup> The practice of the six perfections is said to be one of the main factors which leads to Buddhahood.<sup>74</sup> A bodhisattva lives with his mind, centred on emptiness (*śūnyatā*) and “causelessness” (*ānimitta*), delighting in tranquillity (*śama*) and self-control (*dama*).<sup>75</sup> The Buddha tells us that in his former lives, he gave his flesh, skin, marrow, blood and everything forming his body as well as all his possessions, thus he practised generosity along with good conduct, patience, vigour, meditation, expedients and wisdom.<sup>76</sup> In short, he practised the six perfections and expedients. He also practised *dhutas* (ascetic practices) constantly, when he was a bodhisattva.<sup>77</sup>

Therefore, to sum up, in this scripture, true bodhisattvas are expected to dwell alone in the wilderness, mainly practising *dhuta*, the six perfections and meditation without associating with lay people. They are not expected to preach to people. A passage: “they do not look for the stuttering of Dharma-preachers (*dharmabhāṇaka*)”<sup>78</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Ray (1994: 260f.) has gathered descriptions concerning the wilderness bodhisattva from this text and carefully summarised them.

<sup>68</sup> RP. 59.7 (Ensink 58).

<sup>69</sup> RP. 13.5 (Ensink 14); RP. 14.5 (Ensink 15). Cf. Ray 1994: 261.

<sup>70</sup> RP. 13.6-7 (Ensink 14).

<sup>71</sup> RP. 16.5-6 (Ensink 17).

<sup>72</sup> RP. 12.17-13.1 (Ensink 14).

<sup>73</sup> RP. 13.10-11 (Ensink 14).

<sup>74</sup> RP. 21.7 (Ensink 21).

<sup>75</sup> RP. 16.13-14 (Ensink 17).

<sup>76</sup> RP. 27.13-15 (Ensink 27-28).

<sup>77</sup> RP. 27.18 (Ensink 28).

may also indicate that their way was different from that of the latter, as Ray points out (1994: 263). Thus, in the *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā Sūtra*, ideal bodhisattvas are depicted as wilderness monks.

This scripture also tells us that these monks had antagonists. When bad monks, we are told, see a patient one absorbed in meditation, they expel him from the monastery, beating him with sticks.<sup>79</sup> They are said to be intent upon worldly things, alms-bowls and robes, and always zealous in obtaining acquaintances with good families.<sup>80</sup> They, desiring gain, are thus bound by the ties of such acquaintances.<sup>81</sup>

This text also describes in detail the activities of degenerate monks in later times, when the Dharma decays (RP.28.17ff.). They are said to serve householders, holding the banner in their hands; having abandoned the multitude of virtues which the teaching brings, they always carry a scripture (*lekha*) with them.<sup>82</sup> They go around to houses in villages (*grāmakuleṣu*), intoxicated by alcohol and pride.<sup>83</sup> “You should not indulge in delights”, thus they always tell householders, but they themselves are uncontrolled, groups of their pupils are equally uncontrolled; they spend days and nights with talk of food and sexual intercourse.<sup>84</sup> Even when they live in the forest (*vana*), their minds still dwell in the village.<sup>85</sup> Having abandoned meditation (*dhyāna*) and study (*adhyayana*), they are always occupied with the administration of monasteries (*vihāra-karman*), desirous of a dwelling, surrounded by unrestrained pupils; they say: “I am not a worker (*karmika*) in the monastery. It is built for my sake. Only the monks who are obedient to me shall get a room in the monastery.”; they are not kind to those who conduct themselves well and are well-restrained, they say to the latter: “This cell (*layana*) is allotted to me, this for my fellow-pupil, and that for my companion. Go away, there is no dwelling place for you. Lodgings (*śayyāsana*) are completely distributed, many monks are taken in here. There is also no chance of getting anything here. What will you eat here? Go away, monk!”; they do not allocate lodgings (*śayyāsana*), but store up things like householders, possessing many utensils and attendants.<sup>86</sup> Being maltreated and despised in this manner, true bodhisattvas leave villages and capital cities and dwell in the wilderness.

---

<sup>78</sup> RP. 15.11-12 (Ensink 16).

<sup>79</sup> RP. 18.8 (Ensink 19).

<sup>80</sup> RP. 19.10 (Ensink 21).

<sup>81</sup> RP. 21.1 (Ensink 21).

<sup>82</sup> RP. 29.3-4 (Ensink 28-29).

<sup>83</sup> RP. 29.2 (Ensink 28).

<sup>84</sup> RP. 29.15-30.2 (Ensink 29).

<sup>85</sup> RP. 30.13 (Ensink 30).

<sup>86</sup> RP. 31.1-12 (Ensink 30).



In brief, in this scripture, the antagonists of wilderness bodhisattvas were those who stayed in monasteries in or near villages and associated with lay people and gave them teachings. Also, judging from the description of allotments of lodgings, we can assume that both of them originally belonged to the same community.

#### 2.6.4. *Dbutaḡuṇa* monks v. village-oriented monks in the *Sarvadharmaṇṇapṛavṛttinirdeśa Sūtra*

Recently, Sanskrit fragments of the *Sarvadharmaṇṇapṛavṛttinirdeśa Sūtra* have been discovered in Afghanistan which are now kept in the Schøyen Collection in Norway. Prof. Jens Braarvig has meticulously edited them in juxtaposition with their Tibetan and Chinese parallels as well as an English translation, mostly from the Sanskrit (Braarvig 2000: 81-166). This text, which, according to Braarvig, belongs to the middle period of the Mahāyāna sūtra literature, provides very remarkable testimony to the antagonism between *dbutaḡuṇa*-practising monks and village-oriented ones.<sup>87</sup>

The antagonism is demonstrated in the two *vyākaraṇa* parts in the text, namely §6 and §12, based on Braarvig's division of the text. The first one (pp. 125-131) is about a *dbutaḡuṇa*-practitioner called Cāritramati and a Dharma-preacher (*dharmabhāṇaka*), Viśuddhacāritra.

There was once a monk named Cāritramati, who believed in very severe practices (*lābhādhimukta*), was perfected in the rules of the most pure morality, had attained the fivefold worldly supernatural knowledge, was an expert in monastic rules, and was a practitioner of severe austerities (*ugra-tapas*). He founded a monastery (*vihāra*), where he stayed, practising meditation.

The *Dharma*-preacher, Viśuddhacāritra, came with his followers to the monastery where the monk Cāritramati lived, and stayed there. From there, they went into the town out of compassion, and when they had conducted the rituals of meals, they returned. He and his followers thus made many people believe in Buddhism, while Cāritramati and his followers were only intent on meditation, without going for rounds in the town.

Cāritramati, out of hatred for these other bodhisattvas, prohibited dwellers in the monastery going to the village, while, at the same time, criticised Viśuddhacāritra and his followers for not practising properly, and talking too much. Saying that the Buddha praised life in the wilderness (*āraṇya*), he urged them to practise meditation without going into the village.

After three months, Viśuddhacāritra and his followers moved to another monastery, from which they went again to towns, villages and the capital in order to preach the *Dharma* to people. Knowing Viśuddhacāritra's activities, Cāritramati blamed him, saying: "He has bad morality, perverted morality. How can he attain enlightenment?"

<sup>87</sup> I wish to thank Dr. M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya for directing my attention to this text.

His enlightenment is far away. He lives associating with lay people (*'du 'dzir gnas gnas pa*).”

Because of this misdeed, Cāritramati later fell into the great hell of Avīci.

The second story (pp. 158-164; cf. also pp. 84-85), of which no Sanskrit fragment is extant, is about a *dbutaguna*-practitioner, Jayamati by name, and a Dharma-preacher, called \*Pramuditendriya.

There was a *dharmabhāṇaka* named \*Pramuditendriya, who did not teach people the practices of small passion, contentment, restraints (*sdom pa*), solitary life, disassociation from lay people (*'du 'dzi ma mchi pa*), but rather taught that all *dharmas* had the nature of craving, aversion and ignorance, and that they were, therefore, by no means hindrances. He taught also that all practices were of one characteristic (type).

At that time, there was a bodhisattva named Jayamati, who was also a Dharma-preacher. He had attained the four states of meditation and practised the twelve *dbutagunas*. One day, by mistake, he visited a householder who was an adherent of Pramuditendriya, and praised the practices of small passion, contentment, restraints, solitary life, disassociation from lay people, blaming Pramuditendriya for teaching heresy. The intelligent householder asked him in return about craving, whereupon he answered that craving was an impurity. The householder, however, said that craving was to be found nowhere, hence, there was neither an impurity nor a purification.

Jayamati became angry and slandered Pramuditendriya, saying that the latter taught the Buddhist teachings the wrong way round, and then he left the house. Having returned to the wilderness (*dgon pa*), he criticised Pramuditendriya in front of other monks for teaching perverted ideas. Pramuditendriya, thereupon, elucidated his teaching in the form of 43 verses. After having heard these, many of those present gained intellectual receptivity into the truth that states of existence have no origination (*anutpattika-dharma-kṣānti*), others attained emancipation of the mind which is absolutely free from afflictions, whereas Jayamati fell into a great hell.

In the verses, uttered by Pramuditendriya, we come across the following expressions which disparage the practices of wilderness monks:

“For someone, who, reflecting in a lodging in the wilderness, praises himself, despises others, and (thus) sticks to the false view concerning the wilderness, there is no (hope to attain) heaven, not to say of enlightenment.”<sup>88</sup>

“If a layman with the five qualities of desire (*kāmaguṇa*) hears this teaching but does not become afraid, he is superior to one who, after entering this religion, holds the (heretical) view of (reliance on) imagination (*upalambha-dṛṣṭika*), and boasts of the qualities of *dhuta*.”<sup>89</sup>

From these stories, we learn the following points:

<sup>88</sup> *gañ žig dgon pa'i gnas la rtog byed ciñ || bdag la stod byed gžan la smod byed pa || dgon par kta la rab gnas de la ni || mtbo ris med na byañ chub ga la yod | 7 | (Braarvig 2000: 160).*

<sup>89</sup> *cbos 'di thos sñ mi dnāñ gañ gyur pa'i || 'dod pa'i yon tan kha chags khyim pa'an bla'i || bstan pa 'di la rab tu byuñ gyur ciñ || dmigs kta sbyaṅs pa'i yon tan rlom pa min | 41 | (Braarvig 2000: 163).*

- (1) Wilderness monks also built monasteries in the wilderness.
- (2) There were *Dharma*-preachers who dwelt (in monasteries) in the wilderness and entered villages to preach to lay people.
- (3) There were *Dharma*-preachers who kept moving from one monastery to another.
- (4) There was antagonism between practitioners of *dhutaṅgas*, who also practised meditation in the wilderness, and *Dharma*-preachers who entered villages to preach.
- (5) From the second story, we learn that traditional Buddhists and Mahāyāna monks used to dwell together in monasteries, slandering each other.

Thus, in this text, *dhutaṅga*-practitioners are antagonistic towards monks who dwell in the wilderness, possessing village-oriented minds. The rivalry depicted here is different from that in the *Ugraparipṛcchā* and *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā Sūtras*. I assume that the descriptions in this text reflect more or less the realities of the situation at that time when so-called Mahāyāna Buddhism was gradually forming in and around monasteries. We can assume, in conclusion, that this Sutra was composed by those who belittled *dhutaṅga*-practices. We shall, henceforth, call such monks, who themselves did not dwell in villages but were inclined to be active there, “village-oriented monks”.

#### 2.6.5. Antagonism between wilderness and village(-oriented) monks in Mahāyāna texts

As we have seen in §2.6.2 and §2.6.3, the composers of the *Ugraparipṛcchā* and *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā Sūtras* were themselves presumably wilderness monks or at least their sympathisers. Apart from these Mahāyāna texts, the *Kāśyapa-parivarta* and the *Ratnarāśī* were also evidently composed from the point of view of these monks, as both of them, praising more or less the *dhutaṅgas* or ascetic practices, call for dwelling in the wilderness.

These sutras of “wilderness monks” show antagonism towards those who stayed in monasteries in or near villages and associated with lay people, and they present a picture of conflict between “wilderness monks” and “village monks” not only with regard to the living areas but also to their activities. The wilderness monks were preoccupied primarily with meditation and the *dhutaṅgas*, while village monks associated with lay people, taught the Dharma and managed monasteries. The conflict within these two groups as well as the antagonism between them are basically the same as those described in the *Abhisamācārikā-Dharmāḥ* which we have already seen above.

On the other hand, the two opposing groups in the *Sarvadharmāpravṛttinirdeśa Sūtra*, namely the *dhutaṅga*-practitioners and the village-oriented monks, dwelt together (in monasteries) in the wilderness, though the latter did not seem to have stayed there

permanently. Therefore, the dual structure of wilderness / village monks does not exactly fit in here. However, if we pay attention to the division of their activities, namely *dbutaḡuṇas* and meditation on one hand and preaching and association with lay people on the other, the opposing theme found in this text is exactly the same as that of wilderness / village monks.

### 3.1. Further to the verses in the *Utsāba-parivarta*

Now, we shall return to the verses in the *Utsāba-parivarta* in the Lotus Sutra. As there is no quotation marks in the Sanskrit original, it is quite difficult to discern the spoken word from narrative description, which has confused not only modern scholars but also the ancient Chinese and Tibetan translators. If we take the antagonism between wilderness and village(-oriented) monks into consideration and, at the same time, pay attention to the use of the aorist forms (*deśayī*, *deśayuh*, *cārayī*) with an optative meaning, which presumably mark the spoken word here in contrast to future forms in the narrative parts, we may translate verses in question (5~11) as follows:

Ignorant practitioners of austerities<sup>90</sup>, who dwell in the wilderness<sup>91</sup> and wear patched garments, will say of us as follows<sup>92</sup>: (vs. 5)

“They, greedily attached to tastes (*rasa*), preach (*deśayī*) the *Dharma* to householders.”(vs. 6ab)

They (*i.e.* the wilderness monks) will be honoured as if they were those who possess the sixfold supernatural knowledge (*ṣaḡabhijñā*)<sup>93</sup>. (vs. 6cd)

They are (in reality) cruel-minded, wicked, occupied with thoughts of houses<sup>94</sup> (vs. 7ab)<sup>95</sup>

<sup>90</sup> O. *saṃlekha-caritā* (= F); D2. *saṃlekha-vṛtta-cūri*.

<sup>91</sup> *araṇyavṛttaka-*. Nepalese and Gilgit MSS. read *araṇyacintaka-* (“reflecting upon [the life in] the wilderness”).

<sup>92</sup> *asme evaṃ vakṣyanti* (= O); F. *asmai evaṃ vakṣyanti*; D2. (*asma evaṃ vakṣyanti*). The form *asme* appears in the so-called “Kashgar” MS. not only as a nominative but also as an accusative plural form of the first person, e.g.: KN. 147.10. *asmo* / O. *asme* / K’. *asmai* (nominative); KN.190.12. *asmāṃ* / O. *asme* (accusative). The *asmai* in F. is probably its hyper-sanskritised form. For the accusative plural form *asma* in D2 (here the initial vowel is lost in saṃdhi), see BHSG §20.45. The phrase *asme(or asma) evaṃ vakṣyanti* in this verse is similar to that of vs. 8: *asmākaṃ caiva* (Pk, D2. *asmāṃs ca evaṃ) vakṣyanti*. The expression *asme evaṃ vakṣyanti durmatī* in the verse in question is comparable also with verse 12. *ye cāsmān kutsayiṣyanti .... durmatī*. Therefore, I take *asme(or asma)* not for the nominative but for the accusative, though the Tibetan and modern translators took it for nominative.

<sup>93</sup> A man with sixfold supernatural knowledge was regarded as the highest in the hierarchy of the community, cf. Vin II 161.8f. *khattiyakulā pabbajito ... brāhmaṇakulā pabbajito .... gahapatikulā pabbajito .... suttantiko .... vinayadharo .... dhammakathiko .... paṭhamassa jhānassa lābhī .... dutiyassa jhānassa lābhī .... tatiyassa jhānassa lābhī .... catuttbassa jhānassa lābhī .... sotāpanno .... sakadāgāmi .... anāgāmi ... arabā .... tevijjo .... chalaḡbhijñā (= ṣaḡabhijñā).*

<sup>94</sup> *gr̥ba-cintā-vicintakāḡ*. Or “thinking upon house and property” (*gr̥ba-vittā-vicintakāḡ*, see note [8]).

Having entered (their) retreat in the wilderness, our slanderers, (vs. 7cd) //who are (themselves) bent on gain and honour //<sup>96</sup>, will say of us as follows (*eva[ṃ]*)<sup>97</sup>: (vs. 8ab)

“For sure these monks are heretics! They preach (*deśayuh*) their own verses (*kāvyaṃ*)!” (vs. 8cd)

Prompted by (greed for) gain and honour, they compose sutras by themselves and preach in the midst of the assembly (*parṣā*).” (vs. 9abc)

Our revilers (vs. 9d)<sup>98</sup> will speak evil of us (vs. 11a) to kings, princes, king’s ministers, Brahmins, householders, as well as to other monks (vs. 10) (saying:) “They are propagating a heresy!” (vs. 11b)

We shall endure all these out of reverence for great seers (*i.e. buddhas*). (vs. 11cd)

The part, parallel to this in Kumārajīva’s Chinese translation, can be understood in a similar way.<sup>99</sup> On the other hand, the Tibetan parallel differs from my understanding concerning verse 6ab.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>95</sup> I cannot exclude the possibility that verses 6cd and 7ab could be also slanderous words uttered by wilderness monks towards “us”.

<sup>96</sup> *asmākaṃ caiva vaksyanti lābha-satkāra-nisritāḥ*. Or “They will say of us as follows: ‘[These] are bent on gain and honour. ...’”. This interpretation goes with the Tibetan translation: *bdag cag la ni ’di skad mchi* “*rnyed dang bkur sti gnas pa ste, dge slong ’di dag mu stegs can, bdag gi rang bzo rab tu ’chad*”.

<sup>97</sup> see note (10).

<sup>98</sup> Vs. 9 of the Tibetan version reads: *rnyed pa dang ni bkur sti’i phyir / rang gi mdo sde byas nas su // ’khor gyi dbus su ’chad byed ces / bdag cag rnams la shin tu ’phyi* // (They abuse us greatly: “Having composed sutras by themselves for the sake of gain and honour, [they] explain [them] in the midst of the assembly”). Here, I temporarily follow the Tibetan translator’s interpretation. However, I cannot exclude the possibility that this verse is not slanderous, spoken by wilderness monks, but a narrative description concerning these monks. If that is the case, then we may translate verses 8~9 as follows: “(The wilderness monks say of us: ) ‘For sure these monks are heretics! They preach their own verses!’ (However,) our revilers (themselves), being prompted by (greed for) gain and honour, compose sutras by themselves and preach in the midst of the assembly.”

<sup>99</sup> The parallel verses in Kumārajīva’s translation can be interpreted as follows:

Or there are wilderness monks, wearing patched rags and dwelling in the wilderness, who claim that they are practising the True Path, and despise (monks who dwell) amongst people (人間\*), (saying: ) “Because they desire gain, they preach the Dharma to lay people”.

(Wilderness monks) are revered by people, as though they were arhats who possess transcendental powers. (However,) they bear evil thoughts, constantly thinking of worldly matters.

In the name of wilderness monks, they like to expose our faults, saying: “These monks, out of greed for gain, preach heretical doctrines.

Having themselves composed this scripture to delude lay people, they preach it, hoping to obtain fame.”

Wishing to defame us in the assembly, they slander and speak evil of us towards kings, ministers, Brahmins, householders and towards other monks saying: “These are of wrong views and preach heretical doctrines.”

Because we revere the Buddha, we shall endure all these evils.

\* The word “人間” in Chinese has meant “amongst people; in the world” since olden times, while in Japanese, it means “human being[s]”. However, all the modern translators of Kumārajīva’s Lotus Sutra, including Hurvitz, have interpreted this word incorrectly to mean “human beings”.

Though I must admit that there is still uncertainty as to the distinction between slanderous words and descriptive parts, we can still learn the following points from these verses:

- (1) Wilderness monks<sup>101</sup> blame “us”. (vs. 5~6ab; vs. 7cd)
- (2) Wilderness monks are ignorant (*durmati*). (vs. 5d)
- (3) “We” are blamed for preaching to householders. (vs. 6b; vs. 8cd; probably also vs. 9c)
- (4) “We” are blamed for composing scriptures. (vs. 9a; probably also 8d)
- (5) “We” are blamed for being attached to tastes. (vs. 6)
- (6) “We” are Buddhist monks. (vs. 8c)

Apart from these, we learn another two facts from verses 18~19 in the same chapter (cited in §1.1 and §1.2):

- (7) “We” shall preach this Sutra, *i.e.* the Lotus Sutra, in the assembly. (vs. 18cd)

<sup>100</sup>The Tibetan translation reads here as follows (Nakamura 1986: 272,3~273.4):

*dgon pa dag la rab sems shing tshim(v.l. tshem) bu dag kyang bgos nas ni /  
yo byad bstyungs tshul spyod do zhes blo ngan de skad smra bar 'gyur // (vs. 5)  
ro bro chags shing zhen pa rnams khyim pa dag la chos kyang 'chad /  
mngon shes drug can ji bzhin du bsti stang dag kyang bgyid par 'gyur // (vs. 6)  
gtum pa'i sems dang sdang sems ldan khyim dang nor la rnams par sems /  
dgon pa dben par rab zbugs te bdag cag rnams la skur pa 'debs // (vs. 7)  
bdag cag la ni 'di skad mchi rnyed dang bkur sti gnas pa ste /  
dge slong 'di dag mu stegs can bdag gi rang bzo rab tu 'chad // (vs. 8)  
rnyed pa dang ni bkur(v.l. bskur) sti'i phyir rang gis mdo sde byas nas su /  
'khor gyi dbus su 'chad byed ces bdag cag rnams la shin du(v.l. tu) 'phyu // (vs. 9)  
rgyal po dang ni rgyal bu dang de bzhin rgyal po'i blon po dang /  
bram ze dang ni khyim bdag dang dge slong gzhan dag drung du ni // (vs. 10)  
bdag(v.l. dag) cag rnams la mi bsnags brjod mu stegs can zhes tsig kyang brjod /  
drang srong che la gas pas na thams cad bdag cag bzod par bgyi // (vs. 11)*

The following is my provisional translation of the Tibetan parallel:

Thinking of the wilderness and also wearing patched garments, the wicked-minded will say: “We practise the minimum of necessities.”(vs. 5)

Those, who are attached to tastes, also preach the *Dharma* to householders.

Like those who possess the sixfold supernatural knowledge, they will be honoured also. (vs.6)

They, who are furious and ill-minded, thinking of houses and properties, enter into a calm wilderness and abuse us. (vs.7)

They say of us as follows: “Adhering to gain and honour, these monks, who are heretics, preach self-made verses. (vs.8)

Having composed sutras by themselves for the sake of gain and honour, (they) explain (them) in the midst of the assembly”, thus they abuse us greatly. (vs.9)

To kings, princes, king’s ministers, Brahmans, householders, and to other monks, (vs. 10)

they speak evil of us. They even say: “They are heretics!” Out of reverence for great seers, we shall endure all these. (vs. 11)

I take 6ab for slanderous words uttered by wilderness monks towards “us”, while the Tibetan translator took it for a narrative which describes wilderness monks.

<sup>101</sup>The word “(Buddhist) monk” does not occur here. However, from the context, it is obvious that the practitioners in the wilderness, described here, are none other than Buddhist wilderness monks.

(8) “We” shall visit people in towns and villages in order to further transmit what the Buddha consigned “us” to do (*i.e.* the Lotus Sutra) (vs. 19)

In short, the “we” are monks who preach the *Dharma* to lay people in villages and towns, being blamed by “our” antagonists, namely wilderness monks, for the composition of new scriptures. In future, “we” shall bear and preach the Lotus Sutra.

According to the prose which proceeds the verses in question, eighty hundred thousand bodhisattvas uttered these stanzas. In the Sutra, these bodhisattvas are meant by the word “we”, but, in reality, the “we” here is none other than the composers/holders of the Lotus Sutra.

Therefore, we may conclude that those who composed and preached the Lotus Sutra were village or village-oriented monks.<sup>102</sup> Also, it is to be noted that the wilderness monks’ slander against “us” in the Lotus Sutra is similar to that against village(-oriented) monks found in the *Abhisamācārikā-Dharmāḥ* (e.g. “You seek for the most tasty [foods] with the tip of your tongue.”) and the *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā Sūtra* (e.g. “They always carry a scripture [*lekha*] with them.”).

#### 4. Composers and holders of the Lotus Sutra assumed from other chapters

##### 4.1. The *Bodhisattvaprthivivivarasamudgama-parivarta*

In the preceding section, we concluded that the composers of the Lotus Sutra were village(-oriented) monks, of whom wilderness monks were critical. When we understand this as the background to the Lotus Sutra, we can then realise why Maitreya and his fellow bodhisattvas were surprised at the sight of so many unknown bodhisattvas emerging out of the earth, which is described in Chapter XIV, the *Bodhisattvaprthivivivarasamudgama-parivarta*.

In this chapter (KN. 297ff.), we are told that countless bodhisattvas, headed by four others namely, Viśiṣṭacāritra, Anantacāritra, Viśuddhacāritra, and Supratiṣṭhitacāritra, suddenly emerged out of the earth and paid homage to the Buddha, Prabhūtaratna-buddha and other buddhas who had gathered at the Buddha’s assembly. Maitreya and other bodhisattvas in the assembly were surprised at the sight and wondered, whence they came and who they were as they had neither seen nor heard of them before. Thereupon Maitreya asked the Buddha about them, to which the latter replied that he, himself, had taught and converted them long before and that they were, therefore, his “sons”. Further, the Buddha gave Maitreya (= Ajita) a presentation of these bodhisattvas who had emerged out of the earth as follows:

“And these Bodhisattvas Mahāsattvas, Agita, occupy in this Saha-world the domain

<sup>102</sup> Mochizuki (1988: 36f.) and Okada (2001: 378) seem to be of the opinion that the Lotus Sutra stands on the side of wilderness monks.

of the ether-element below. Only thinking of the lesson they have to study, and devoted to thoroughly comprehend it, these young men of good family have no liking for social gatherings. nor for bustling crowds; they ..... delight in seclusion, are fond of seclusion. These young men of good family do not dwell in the immediate vicinity of gods and men, they not being fond of bustling crowds.” .....

“All have devoted themselves to a hermit life (*āraṇya-dhuta-abhiyukta*)<sup>103</sup> and are assiduous in shunning places of bustle (*saṃsargabhūmi*); they walk detached (*asaṅga-cārin*), these sons of mine, following my precepts in their lofty course (*caryā*). (vs. 39) They dwell in the domain of ether, in the lower portion of the field, those heroes who, unwearied, are striving day and night to attain superior knowledge. (vs. 40) All strenuous, of good memory, unshaken in the immense strength of their intelligence, those serene sages preach the law (*dharmu kathenti*), all radiant, as being my sons.” (vs. 41) (Kern 1884: 292-293. The Sanskrit words in brackets are added by the present author.)

In short, these bodhisattvas were wilderness monks who practised *dhutagaṇas*.

In the Lotus Sutra, Maitreya is depicted as the representative of bodhisattvas who had a close association with lay people, preached the Dharma to them, and propagated the Lotus Sutra. Therefore, his activities were, in the above-stated system, none other than those of a village(-oriented) monk.

We are told that these *dhutagaṇa*-practising bodhisattvas dwelt spatially as well as temporally far away from Maitreya, and that he had, therefore, neither seen nor heard of them before. Here, again, we come across another piece of evidence of the dichotomy between wilderness monks and village(-oriented) ones, and we can assume with certainty that the composers as well as the bearers of the Lotus Sutra, symbolised by Maitreya, were on the side of village(-oriented) monks.

#### 4.2. The *Puṇyaparyāya-parivarta*

Verses 17~32 in the *Puṇyaparyāya-parivarta* (KN. 334~336) describe the unlimited merit (*puṇya*) for those who, upon hearing this religious discourse (*dharmaparyāya*) which elucidates the duration of the *Tathāgata*'s life — namely the *Tathāgatāyus-pramāṇa-parivarta* which precedes this *Puṇyaparyāya* chapter —, believe in it for a single moment. We are told this merit far surpasses that acquired by the practices of the five *pāramitās*. I shall cite here Kern's English translation to give a convenient explanation.<sup>104</sup> The Sanskrit words in brackets are added by the present author.

17. Let a man who is seeking after this knowledge, superior Buddha-knowledge, undertake to practise in this world the five perfect virtues (*pāramitāḥ pañca*);

18. Let him, during eight thousand kotis of complete *Æons* (*kalpa*), continue giving

<sup>103</sup> The Central Asian manuscripts read as follows: O. *āraṇya-dhutādhimuktāḥ*; F. *ādhimuktāḥ*.

<sup>104</sup> Kern 1884: 318-319.



repeated alms to Buddhas and disciples ;

19. Regaling Pratyekabuddhas and kotis of Bodhisattvas by giving meat, food and drink, clothing and lodging ;

20. Let him build on earth refuges and monasteries of sandal-wood, and pleasant convent gardens provided with walks (*caṅkramasthāna*) ;

21. Let him after so bestowing gifts, various and diversified, during thousands of kotis of Æons, direct his mind to enlightenment ;

22. Let him then, for the sake of Buddha-knowledge, keep unbroken the pure moral precepts which have been recommended by the perfect Buddhas and acknowledged by the wise ;

23. Let him further develop the virtue of forbearance, be steady in the stage of meekness (*dāntabbūmi*), be constant, of good memory, and patiently endure many censures ;

24. Let him, moreover, for the sake of Buddha-knowledge, bear the contemptuous words of unbelievers who are rooted in pride ;

25. Let him, always zealous, strenuous, studious, of good memory, without any other preoccupation in his mind, practise meditation, during kotis of Æons ;

26. Let him, whether living in the forest (*aranyavāsi tiṣṭhanto*) or entering upon a vagrant life (*caṅkrāme abhirubhya*), go about, avoiding sloth and torpor, for kotis of Æons ;

27. Let him as a philosopher (*dbāyī*), a great philosopher (*mabūdbāyī*) who finds his delight in meditation (*dbyānārāma*), in concentration of mind (*dbyāyet*), pass eight thousand kotis of Æons ;

28. Let him energetically pursue enlightenment with the thought of his reaching all-knowingness, and so arrive at the highest degree of meditation (*dbyāna-pāramitāṃ gataḥ*) ;

29. Then the merit accruing to those who practise the virtues oft described, during thousands of kotis of Æons ,

30. (Is less than that of) a man or a woman who, on hearing the duration of my life (*āyus*), for a single moment believes in it ; this merit is endless.

31. He who renouncing doubt, vacillation, and misgiving shall believe even for a short moment, shall obtain such a reward.

Thus, the merit acquired through the practices of the perfection of giving (*dāna-pāramitā* : verses 18~21), good conduct (*sīla-pāramitā* : verse 22), patience (*kṣānti-pāramitā* : verses 23~24), vigour (*vīrya-pāramitā* : verse 25), and meditation (*dbyāna-pāramitā* : verses 26~28) is said to be far inferior to that of a (lay) man or woman who hears the Buddha's discourse, concerning the duration of his life and believes in it for even a single moment. In the verses, in boldface, we may clearly see that the composers of the Lotus Sutra depreciated the practices of wilderness monks (Kern's "living in the forest") compared to lay people's belief in the Sutra.<sup>105</sup> Here, again, we may conclude that these composers were on the side of village(-oriented) monks who supposedly

preached the Sutra to lay people in the name of the Buddha.

### 4.3. The *Dharmabhāṅaka-parivarta*

In the preceding sections, we assumed that the composers and holders of the Lotus Sutra were most probably village(-oriented) monks of whom wilderness monks were critical. Did the composers and holders of the Sutra constitute a powerful faction in the community and hence held power in the monasteries? Presumably, this was not the case. They seemed to have been a fringe group. It is repeatedly alluded to in the text itself that the bearers of the Lotus Sutra used to be rejected in the community, suffer terrible persecution, be expelled from monasteries. For instance, verses in the *Utsāha-parivarta* read<sup>106</sup>:

“We will suffer, patiently endure, O Lord, the injuries, threats, blows and threats with sticks at the hands of foolish men.” (vs. 3)<sup>107</sup>

“One will have to endure frowns, repeated disapprobation, banishment (*niṣkāšana*) from monasteries, manifold bindings and reviling<sup>108</sup>.” (vs. 17)<sup>109</sup>

Passages, found in Chapter X, the *Dharmabhāṅaka-parivarta*, also indicate that holders of the Lotus Sutra in early times, received constant rejection in the community.

In this chapter, the Buddha told a bodhisattva named Bhaiṣajyarāja the following:

A *Dharma*-preacher in future should propound the Lotus Sutra with confidence in the assembly. The Buddha would send a magically-conjured audience who would not reject nor contradict the preacher. If (*sacet*) the preacher stayed in the wilderness (*araṇya*), then the Buddha would send large numbers of gods, dragons, spirits, gandharvas, asuras, and others to listen to him preach. If the preacher forgot words or expressions of the Lotus Sutra during recitation, the Buddha would remind him.<sup>110</sup>

These descriptions, concerning the preacher of the Lotus Sutra, are repeated in verses 25~33 in the same chapter.<sup>111</sup> I shall cite Kern’s English translation of these verses here.<sup>112</sup> The Sanskrit words in brackets are added by the present author.

25. Where clods, sticks, pikes, or abusive words and threats fall to the lot of the

<sup>105</sup> The verses, cited above, are important also for the consideration of the relationship between the Lotus Sutra and *prajñāpāramitā* thought. In the latter, *prajñāpāramitā* is given the highest position. However, in the case of these verses in the *Puṇyaparyāya* chapter, the acts of hearing the Sutra and believing in it, are placed at the highest position. We may assume that the composer(s) of the chapter, being aware of the *prajñāpāramitā* thought system, modified it and gave pride of place to that of the acts of hearing and believing in the Sutra, which was usually suited for lay people.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. also, KN. 285.1~2; 293.5~6.

<sup>107</sup> KN. 271. 9-10; Kern 1884: 259.

<sup>108</sup> *baddha-kuṭṭī* or *baddhra-kuṭṭā*. Cf. note (33) in this paper.

<sup>109</sup> KN. 274.1-2.

<sup>110</sup> KN. 234.10~235.7.

<sup>111</sup> KN. 236.11~237.14.

<sup>112</sup> Kern 1884: 224-225.

preacher, let him be patient, thinking of me.

26. My body has existed entire in thousands of kotis of regions ; during a number of kotis of Æons beyond comprehension I teach the law to creatures.

27. To that courageous man who shall proclaim this Sutra after my complete extinction I will also send many creations.

28. Monks, nuns, lay devotees, male and female, will honour him as well as the classes of the audience.

29. And should there be some to attack him with clods, sticks, injurious words, threats, taunts, then the creations shall defend him.

30. And when (*yadāpi*) he shall stay alone, engaged in study (*svādhyāyat*), in a lonely place, in the forest (*aṭavi*) or the hills (*parvata*),

31. Then will I show him my luminous body and enable him to remember the lesson (*svādhyāya*) he forgot.

32. While he is living lonely in the wilderness (*vana-cārin*), I will send him gods and goblins in great number to keep him company.

33. Such are the advantages he is to enjoy ; whether he is preaching to the four classes, or living, a solitary, in mountain caverns (*vana-kandara*) and studying his lesson (*svādhyāya*), he will see me.

From the descriptions in the *Utsāha-* and *Dharmabhāṅaka-parivartas* cited above, we can recognise the harsh realities of those who preached the Lotus Sutra in early times. They often received rejection and were persecuted in the Buddhist community. There were even cases where they were expelled from monasteries and had no choice but to dwell in forests or the wilderness, reciting the Sutra.

There are certain scholars who take the verses in the *Dharmabhāṅaka-parivarta*, cited above, for indicating that the holders of the Lotus Sutra were wilderness monks who practised in recluse.<sup>113</sup> However, it must be noted that the text itself reads “Even when (*yadāpi*) he shall stay alone, .... in the forest”, which shows that they dwelt in the forest because of some special reason. Further, their practices, namely reciting (*svādhyāya*) the Lotus Sutra and preaching it to non-human spirits, are evidently different from those of true wilderness monks, namely *dhutaḅuṅas* and meditation. Moreover, according to the Lotus Sutra, preachers or holders of the Sutra had (and still have) a particular mission in life entrusted by the Buddha, that is, to go to villages and towns everywhere, where there was a person who sought the Dharma, and to preach this Sutra.<sup>114</sup> This mission evidently contradicts the lifestyle of wilderness monks who abstained from associating with lay people and merely concentrated on practising austerities and meditation.

<sup>113</sup> For instance, Okada 2001: 379.

<sup>114</sup> Vs. 19 in the *Utsāha-parivarta* (KN. 274.5-6).

#### 4.4. Composers of the Lotus Sutra

In conclusion, we may assume that the composers of the Sutra as well as its holders in early times were village monks or those who dwelt outside villages while possessing village-oriented minds. They seemed to have constituted a minor group in the monasteries. They were criticised by wilderness monks on one hand and persecuted by factions in power in the monasteries on the other.

In history, we come across many cases where those who dared to state the truth loudly in public were simply ignored, or even persecuted by those in power or by the masses which were, in their turn, often manipulated by the latter. I assume that the composers and holders of the Lotus Sutra in early times were such courageous people.

The truth, which they proclaimed openly, in my opinion, was that everyone could equally obtain the Buddha's knowledge (*buddha-jñāna*; or *mahā-jñāna* "the great knowledge" as it is also known) and should, therefore, aim at obtaining it.<sup>115</sup> Such a view is by no means shocking to us who are familiar with Mahāyāna Buddhism nowadays but it must have been a complete antithesis of Nikāya Buddhism in those days, in which knowledge of the Buddha, that of *pratyekabuddhas* and *śrāvakas* were strictly graded. Probably, these composers and holders were criticised and persecuted because they uttered this simple and self-evident truth openly in public.

<sup>115</sup> In support of my assumption, we find a passage in the Central Asian MSS. and the Chinese translations of the Sutra, which proclaims that the Sutra is a scripture which shows the equality of the great knowledge (*mahājñāna*):

KN.240.3. *sādbu sādbu bhagavān Śākyamune* (= the Nepalese MSS. The Gilgit MSS. are missing here).

O. *sādbu sādbu bhagavān cchākyamune(r) yad imaṃ bodhisattvasaṃgrahaṃ mahājñāna-samatā-nirdeśaṃ sarvabuddha-parigrhītaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ deśayasi samprakāśayanti* (read °*kāśayasi*) ("It is excellent, excellent, Lord Śākyamuni, that you show and expound this religious discourse which is a compendium for *bodhisattvas*, an elucidation of equality of the great knowledge, and which all *buddhas* embrace.").

Lü(B-11.Recto 7). // [v]āṃ Śākyamuniṃ ya imaṃ bo[dhi]satva[h sum]grahaṃ mahājñāna-samata[ni](r)de // ("[It is excellent], O Lord Śākyamuni, [that you show and expound this religious discourse which] is a compendium for *bodhisattvas*, an elucidation of equality of the great knowledge, ...").

Kumārajīva's translation: *Taishō*, vol. 9, No.262, 32b28. 善哉！善哉！釋迦牟尼世尊！能以平等大慧教菩薩法，佛所護念《妙法華經》為大眾說("Excellent! Excellent, O Śākyamuni, O World-Honoured One, that you teach the *bodhisattva-dharma* with impartial great wisdom, [and] preach the Lotus Sutra, which *buddhas* keep in mind, to the great assembly.").

Cf. Karashima, forthcoming §2.7.

## 5. Searching for the origins of Mahāyāna Buddhism

### 5.1. The position of the Lotus Sutra in the history of Mahāyāna Buddhism

As I have written elsewhere<sup>116</sup>, I assume that the Lotus Sutra was shaped gradually to its present form. Based on results of the research of our predecessors<sup>117</sup> as well as my own, I have tentatively divided the process of formation of the Sutra into four stages as follows:

- (1) Triṣṭubh-Jagatū verses, found in chapters from the *Upāyakaṣāya-* (II) to the *Vyākaraṇa-parivarta* (IX)
- (2) Śloka verses and prose, found in those chapters
- (3) Chapters from the *Dharmabhāṣya-* (X) to the *Tathāgatarddhyabhisamkāra-parivarta* (XX), as well as *Nidāna-* (I) and *Anuṣarīdanā-parivarta* (XXVII)
- (4) The other chapters (XXI-XXVI) and the latter half of the *Stūpasamdarśana-parivarta* (XI), i.e. the so-called *Devadatta-parivarta*

While exact dates of formation are impossible to determine, I assume that the Sutra came into existence in this order, apart from some exceptions such as the verse portion of the *Samantamukha-parivarta* (XXIV) which probably existed as an independent text but was later incorporated into the Lotus Sutra.<sup>118</sup>

Further, I have assumed that when the *prajñāpāramitā* thought system developed in southern India, Gandhara region or elsewhere, the earlier stages of the Lotus Sutra, namely (1) and (2) in the above list, were composed in another area completely unrelated to it. Sometime later, and probably in North-Western India, these two texts met with the result that the Lotus Sutra was influenced by *prajñāpāramitā* literature and the third stage was appended to it.<sup>119</sup> After that, the fourth stage was added when it came across other beliefs, such as in Avalokiteśvara, Amitābha, Samantabhadra, *dhāraṇīs*, and so on.

Therefore, if we compare the Lotus Sutra in the present form and *Prajñāpāramitā* literature, the former definitely appears much newer than the latter. However, the earlier stages of the Lotus Sutra were probably composed not later than the formation of this said literature.

Moreover, I have pointed out<sup>120</sup> that there are at least seventeen instances in which

<sup>116</sup> Karashima 1991, 1993. Prof. Kajiyama has cited my theory in detail in his article in Japanese, which was later translated into English by Wayne Yokoyama (Kajiyama 2000). I use his English translation here with some revision.

<sup>117</sup> Especially, Fuse 1934 and Rawlinson 1977.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. Karashima 1999.

the Nepalese and Gilgit manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra read *jñāna* and (*buddha-*, *tathāgata-*, *sarvajña-*)*jñāna*, while the Central Asian ones read *yāna*, (*buddha-*, *tathāgata-*, *sarvajña-*)*yāna* instead, which lead me to the assumption that, in the earliest stage of transmission of the Lotus Sutra, the Middle Indic form *jāṇa* or *\*jāna* (< Skt. *jñāna*, *yāna*) had previously stood here, and that later, some redactors back-formed it to *jñāna* (“knowledge”), while others sanskritised it to *yāna* (“vehicle”). At the same time, I have shown that there is a word play between *jñāna* (“knowledge”) and *yāna* (“vehicle”) in the famous parable of the burning house, found in the *Aupamyā-parivarta* of the Lotus Sutra. I have also assumed, further, that the Mahāyānist terms, *buddha-yāna* (“the Buddha vehicle”), *mahāyāna* (“the great vehicle”), *bhīṇayāna* (“the inferior vehicle”) originally meant *buddha-jñāna* (“buddha-knowledge”), *mahājñāna* (“great knowledge”), *bhīṇajñāna* (“inferior knowledge”) respectively, and that the term *mahāyāna* (< *\*mahājāna* < *mahājñāna*), which originally meant “great knowledge, buddha-knowledge” in the earliest stage of the Lotus Sutra, was later interpreted as “the great vehicle”, and was then adopted by composers of scriptures to designate the new idea of “Mahāyāna Buddhism”. Presumably, the word play of *yāna* / *jñāna*, found in the parable of the burning house, may have given rise to this misinterpretation.

<sup>119</sup> Only when we assume in this way, we can explain the following phenomena:

- (i) The *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (hereafter as *Aṣṭa*), which has been deemed as one of the earliest Mahāyāna sutras, emphasises the performance of *pūjā* for sutra scrolls but rejects it for stupas, while the earlier stages of the Lotus Sutra, namely (1) and (2) in the above list, positively recommends the building and veneration of stupas. From the *Dharmabhāṇaka-parivarta* (X) and onwards, however, the building of sutra burial mounds (*caitya*), representing the performance of *pūjā* to sutra scrolls, was recommended.
- (ii) In the *Aṣṭa*, the dharma practices of holding, professing, expounding, copying, and the performing of *pūjā* are explained, but in the first two stages of the Lotus Sutra, the practice of copying does not appear, and it is not until the third stage that copying is first mentioned.
- (iii) In the *Aṣṭa*, Bodhisattvas Mañjuśrī and Maitreya appear. In the Lotus Sutra, these two appear only in the third and fourth stages not before.
- (iv) In the *Aṣṭa*, the term preacher of the dharma, or *dharmabhāṇaka*, appears, and it is used frequently in the third stage of the Lotus Sutra, whereas in the first two stages, there is no clear-cut instance of the term.
- (v) In verses in the first two stages, *sūnyatā* (emptiness) is mentioned, but since it does not go beyond the treatment found in Āgama and Nikāya literature, it is merely an artifact. The portion in the Lotus Sutra where we can clearly see the influence of the *sūnyatā* thought system, is in the second half of the *Oṣadhi-parivarta* (V). Hence this verse portion, which is not found in Kumārajīva’s translation, is thought to have been interpolated at a much later time.
- (vi) The *Aṣṭa* from the beginning explains the *prajñā-pāramitā* (perfection of wisdom) as the basis of the five *pāramitās*, while in the Lotus Sutra the six *pāramitās* are merely enumerated. It is not until the third stage, in the *Puṇyaparayāna-parivarta* (XVI), that the *prajñā-pāramitā* thought system is first mentioned as the basis of the five *pāramitās*.
- (vii) The notion of a bodhisattva is first explained in the third stage and not before.

Cf. Karashima 1993: 176-178; Kajiyama 2000: 75-76.

<sup>120</sup> Karashima 1991, 1993, and forthcoming §2.7. Cf. also Boucher 1998: 491-492.

Also, I have demonstrated elsewhere<sup>121</sup> that the old Sanskrit fragments of the Lotus Sutra are much more Middle Indic in nature than other manuscripts, and that some of these forms show the peculiarities of Eastern dialects. These facts lead me to agree with the hypothesis of H. Lüders and Prof. Dschi Hiän-lin (or Ji Xianlin) that “the original text of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka was written, if not in pure Māgadhī, in a ‘mixed Sanskrit’ which was based on that dialect”<sup>122</sup>.

As well as this, it is to be noted that the descriptions, which tell us that the composers and holders of the Lotus Sutra were rejected, criticised, and even persecuted, occur in the third stage, which means that probably the composers and holders of the first two stages, who had been, in reality, rejected, criticised, and persecuted by other groups of Buddhists, described these unfortunate experiences together with their strong resolve to further propagate the Sutra under such adverse circumstances. However, the first stages, primarily dealing with the equality of the “great knowledge”, as it is known from the Sutra’s own subtitle “An Elucidation of Equality of the Great Knowledge” or *Mahājñāna-samatā-nirdeśam*<sup>123</sup>, contain by no means sophisticated ideas compared with other Mahāyāna texts. The fact that the composers and holders of the Sutra with such primitive ideas were severely criticised and persecuted seems to indicate that the earlier stages of the Sutra date back to the time of the very formation of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Therefore, in conclusion, I assume that the formation of the earlier stages of the Lotus Sutra dates back to much earlier times than is supposed, maybe even back to the period when the earliest Mahāyāna came into existence, as it indicated above.

## 5.2. The origins of Mahāyāna scriptures

It is very difficult to say who were the first who proclaimed themselves as Mahāyānists: wilderness monks, village(-oriented) ones or others. As we have already seen, there are several early Mahāyāna texts which praise seclusion in the wilderness, like the *Ugraparipṛcchā*, the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*, the *Kāśyapa-parivarta*, the *Ratnarāśi*, and the *Akṣobhyavyūha*<sup>124</sup>. Based on this fact, some scholars have been inclined to think that the Mahāyāna originated as a tradition of wilderness (or forest) monks.<sup>125</sup>

However, as we have already seen above, we know of two Mahāyāna sutras which reject *dbutaḡaṇa*-practices in the wilderness, namely the *Sarvadharmāpravṛtti-nirdeśa Sutra* and the Lotus Sutra. As well as these, in my opinion, there are at least two more

<sup>121</sup> Karashima 1991, 1993, and forthcoming §1.

<sup>122</sup> Hoernle(ed.) 1916: 162; Dschi, Hiän-lin 1944: 139-143.

<sup>123</sup> See note (115).

<sup>124</sup> All of them are contained in the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, which is possibly not a coincidence.

<sup>125</sup> E.g. Ray 1994: 404f.; Harrison 1995: 65; Deleanu 2000: 81f.

Mahāyāna scriptures which are critical of such practices, namely the *Ratnaguṇasamcayagāthā* and the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*.

Verses 3~8 in Chapter XXI in the *Ratnaguṇasamcayagāthā* evidently demonstrate that the Sutra is not on the side of wilderness monks. I shall cite Conze's English translation of these verses here<sup>126</sup>:

3. If he is one who has behaved in accordance with the ascetic practices, a devoted Yogin,  
[Mara will tell him:] 'Formerly [in your past lives] you have also had these very same qualities.'  
The Bodhisattva who, on hearing this, becomes conceited,  
One should know him to be possessed by Mara, of little intelligence.
4. Though he might practise quite detached from villages or cities in a mountain cave,  
In a remote forest, or in isolated woods,-  
The Bodhisattva who exalts himself, who deprecates others,  
One should know him to be possessed by Mara, of little intelligence.
5. Although they may constantly dwell in a village, a royal city [or] a market town;  
If therein they do not generate longing for the vehicle of the Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas,  
But are devoted to enlightenment for the sake of maturing beings:  
Then this has been preached as the detachment of the Sugata's sons.
6. Though he may reside in mountain caves, five hundred miles wide,  
Infested with wild beasts, for many kotis of years:  
That Bodhisattva does not know this [true] detachment  
If he dwells contaminated by conceit.
7. When he feels superior to Bodhisattvas who practise for the weal of the world,  
And who have attained the concentrations, emancipations, faculties, trances and powers,  
On the ground that they do not course in the detachment of the remote forest,-  
Of him the Jina has said that 'he is established in Mara's sphere.'
8. Whether he dwells in the neighbourhood of a village, or in the remote forest:  
If he is free from the thought of the twofold vehicle and fixed on the supreme enlightenment,  
Then this is the detachment of those who have set out for the weal of the world.  
As one whose self is extinct should that Bodhisattva be considered.

In my view, these are a summary of prose passages found in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* pp. 192.1f~196.14 (Conze 1973: 230~235), rather than the other way round. From these verses and passages in which *dbutaguṇas* are depreciated, it is evident that the *Ratnaguṇasamcayagāthā* as well as the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, presumably upon which the former is based, are not on the side of wilderness monks, but rather on village(-oriented) monks.

Thus, there are also several early Mahāyāna scriptures which were apparently composed by those who were critical of the wilderness tradition.

<sup>126</sup> Conze 1973: 49-50.



Therefore, my preliminary hypothesis is that those, who were frustrated by groups of monks who were dogmatic as well as formalistic in the community, gradually removed themselves from the latter and finally began to compose texts according to their own ideas—they could have been *dbutaguna*-practitioners, monks who were occupied with meditation, village(-oriented) monks or others. Though they may have been critical of the established monasticism of the day, they may have remained within the community, at least in early times, criticising each other. The following description found in the *Ugraparipṛcchā* presents a picture of various groups of monks living together in one community.

When he (*i.e.* a householder bodhisattva) enters a monastery (*vihāra*), he should discern all the practices of the community of monks: who is a learned monk?; who is a Dharma-preaching monk (*dge slong chos brjod pa*)?; who is a monk who observes discipline?; who is a monk who holds the *mātrkā*?; who is a monk who holds the *Bodhisattva-piṭaka*?; who is a wilderness monk?; who is one who lives by alms?; who is one who wears rag-robles, one who has few desires, one who is content with oneself, or one who lives in solitude?; who is a monk who practises *yoga*?; who is a monk who meditates?; who is a monk who belongs to the *Bodhisattva-yāna* (*dge slong byang chub sems dpa'i theg pa pa*)?; who is a monk who is in charge of the buildings (*lag gi bla*; Skt. *navakarmika*)?; who is a monk who supervises (the monastery) (*zhal ta byed pa*; Skt. *vaiyāpṛtyakara*)?; who is a monk who is the head (of the monastery) (*dpon sna byed pa*; Skt. *vihārasvāmin*)? After having discerned all this, he should dwell rightly in harmony in order to get along well with all of them.<sup>127</sup>

New scriptures, composed by monks who were disillusioned with the established monasticism, might have been later labelled as Mahāyāna texts all in all, regardless of their origins.

As in the case of the Lotus Sutra, each Mahāyāna text must have its own complex background and history. Therefore, before we can come to a final conclusion concerning the origins of Mahāyāna Buddhism, we need many more careful, philological studies into all the sutras relevant to this theme.

While writing this article concerning the history of Buddhism, I have noticed anew the importance of Buddhist philology. Historical research on Buddhism is, in my opinion, like building a house, while philological study—identification, editing, translation of manuscripts, or compilation of grammar, glossaries, dictionaries—is likened to making the bricks, which must be made solid and applicable for any design, otherwise they are useless. When we possess such bricks, we can build a sound house

<sup>127</sup> D(T), vol. 9, p. 325, 547.5f.; Q, vol. 23, p. 267, 317b5f. These passages were minutely studied by Hirakawa 1968: 524f. = 1990: 123f.; Shizutani 1974: 368f.; cf. Silk 1994: 238.

according to our design. If we use very weak material, we merely build castles in the air. After having baked many solid bricks myself, while possessing good ones made by others, I shall, one day, come back to the question as to the formation of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

#### ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGNS

Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are those adopted by CPD. Editions are those of the PTS.

Other abbreviations:

BHS(D, G) = Edgerton 1953

D(T) = *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Taipei Edition* 台北版西藏大藏經, ed. A. W. Barber, 72 vols, Taipei 1991 (SMC Publishing 南天書局).

KN = Kern and Nanjio 1908-12

Lü = Jiang 1997

O = the so-called Kashgar manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*, see footnote (1).

Q = *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition* 影印北京版西藏大藏經, ed. Daisetz T. Suzuki, 168 vols, Repr. under the Supervision of the Otani University, Kyoto, Tokyo 1955-1961 (Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute).

RP = *Rāstrapālapariṣcchā. Sūtra du Mahāyāna*, ed. Louis Finot, St. Petersburg 1901(Academy of Sciences); reprint: Tokyo 1977 (Meicho-Fukyū-Kai) (Bibliotheca Buddhica II)

Śikṣ = *Śikṣāsamuccaya : A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching, Compiled by Śāntideva*, ed. Cecil Bendal, St. Petersburg (Académie imperiale des sciences); Reprint Tokyo 1977 (Meicho-Fukyū-kai) (Bibliotheca Buddhica I)

vs = verse

~ = stem of a word, e.g. *dharmā-*.

° = except for letters, following or preceding the sign, the word is the same as the preceding one.

← =  $\alpha \leftarrow \beta$ : the Sanskrit form  $\beta$  should be changed to  $\alpha$ .

//A// = the meaning of A is unclear.

#### List of Works Quoted in This Paper

*Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā with Haribhadra's Commentary Called Āloka*, ed. P.L. Vaidya, Darbhanga (The Mithila Inst. of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning), 1960 (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 4).

Boucher, Daniel

1998 "Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered: the Case of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*", in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118.4(1998), pp. 471-506.

Burnouf, Eugène

1852 *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi, traduit du sanscrit, accompagné d'un commentaire et de vingt et un mémoires relatifs au Bouddhisme*, Paris

Conze, Edward

1973 *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & Its Verse Summary*, San Francisco (Four Seasons Foundation), Delhi <sup>2</sup>1994 (Sri Satguru Publications).

Deleanu, Florin

2000 "A Preliminary Study on Meditation and the Beginnings of Mahāyāna Buddhism", in: *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, Vol. 3(2000), pp. 65-113.

Dschi, Hiän-lin

- 1944 “Die Umwandlung der Endung *-am* in *-o* und *-u* im Mittelindischen”, in: *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist.Klasse. Nr.6, S.121-144.
- Edgerton, F.  
1953 *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols, New Haven.
- Ensink, Jacob  
1952 *The Question of Rāṣṭrapāla. Translated and Annotated*. Zwolle (J. J. Tijl).
- Fuse, Kōgaku 布施浩岳  
1934 *Hokekyō Seiritsuishi* 法華經成立史 (The Historical Formation of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra*), Tokyo (Daitōshuppansha).
- Harrison, Paul  
1995 “Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What Are We Looking For?”, in: *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, vol. XXVIII, No. 1, pp. 48-69.
- von Hinüber, Oskar  
1995 “Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya: A Survey of Theory and Practice”, in: *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 18/1, pp. 7-45.  
1996 “Zu einer Göttinger Dissertation über das buddhistische Recht”, in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 40 (1996), pp. 101-113.
- Hirakawa, Akira 平川 彰  
1968 *Shoki Daijōbukkū no Kenkyū* 初期大乘仏教の研究, Tokyo (春秋社).  
1990 *Shoki Daijōbukkū no Kenkyū* 初期大乘仏教の研究 II, Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 4, Tokyo (春秋社).
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf (ed.)  
1916 *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*, Oxford.
- Hurvitz, Leon  
1976 *Scripture of the Lotus Blossom of the Fine Dharma, translated from the Chinese of Kumārajīva*, New York (Columbia University Press).
- Ji Xianlin 季羨林  
1982 *Yīndū Gùdàiyǔyán Lùnjǐ* 印度古代語言論集 [Collected Papers on Ancient Indian Languages], Beijing (中国社会科学出版社)
- Jiang, Zhongxin 蔣忠新  
1988 *A Sanskrit Manuscript of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka kept in the Library of the Cultural Palace of the Nationalities, Beijing, Romanized Text*, 民族文化宮圖書館藏梵文《妙法蓮華經》写本, ed. Jiang with the preface by Ji Xianlin, Beijing.  
1997 *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lüshun Museum Collection, Facsimile Edition and Romanized Text*, ed. by Jiang Zhongxin, Dalian and Tokyo 1997 (Lüshun Museum and Soka Gakkai) (蔣忠新編『旅順博物館藏梵文法華經殘片 影印版及羅馬字版』, 旅順博物館・創価学会, 1997).
- Jinananda, B.  
1969 *Abhisamācārikā (Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka)*, ed. by B. Jinananda, Patna (Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute) (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 9)
- Kajiyama, Yūichi 梶山雄一  
2000 “The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* and *Sūnyatā* Thought”, in: *The Journal of Oriental Studies*, vol. 10, pp. 72-96.
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋静志  
1991 “Fāhuājīng zhōng de Shèng(yāna) yǔ Zhìhuì(jiāna)” 法華經中的乘(yāna)與智慧(jiāna) [Vehicle (yāna) and Wisdom (jiāna) in the Lotus Sūtra] in: *Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. Ji Xianlin on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday* (季羨林教授八十華誕紀念論文集), ed. Li Zheng et al., Nánchāng (南昌, 江西人民出版社) 1991, vol. II, pp. 607-643  
1992 *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra—— in the light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*, Tokyo (山喜房佛書林).  
1993 “Hokekyō ni okeru jō (yāna) to chie (jāna) — Daijō Bukkyō ni okeru yāna no gainen no kigen ni tuite” 法華經における乘(yāna)と智慧(jāna)——大乘仏教における yāna の概念の起

- 源について[Vehicle (yāna) and Wisdom (jñāna) in the Lotus Sūtra — On the Origin of the Concept of Yāna in Mahāyāna Buddhism], in : Taiga Ryūgen 田賀龍彦 ed., *Hokekyō no juyō to tenkai* 法華經の受容と展開, Kyoto, pp. 137-197.
- 1998 “Hokekyō Bonpon no Gentenhihan Oboegaki” 法華經梵本の原典批判覚書, in: *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, Vol. 1(1998), pp. 49-68.
- 1999 “Hokekyō no Bunkengakuteki Kenkyū (2)” 法華經の文献学的研究(二) — 観音 Avalokitasvara の語義解釈, in: *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, Vol. 2(1999), pp. 39-66.
- forthcoming “Some Features of the Language of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*”, in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* (2001) (in press)
- Kern, H  
 1884 *The Saddharmapuṇḍarīka or the Lotus of the True Law*, Oxford (*The Sacred Books of the East Series*, vol. 21) (repr.1965, 1980, Delhi).
- Kern, H. and Nanjio, B.  
 1908-12 *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, St. Petersburg (Bibliotheca Buddhica X).
- Lokesh Chandra  
 1976 *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra. Kashgar Manuscript*, edited by Lokesh Chandra with a foreword by Heinz Bechert, New Delhi 1976 (Śāta-Piṭaka Series 229) [repr. Tokyo, Reiyukai, 1977].
- Malmoud, Charles  
 1976 “Village et forêt dans l'idéologie de l'Inde brāhmanique”, in: *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 17, pp. 3-20.
- Mínzúwénhuàgōng 民族文化宮  
 1984 *Mínzúwénhuàgōng Túshūguān Cáng Fānwén Bèiyèxiěběn zhī yī, Miào fǎ lián huā jīng* 民族文化宮圖書館藏梵文貝葉寫本之一·妙法蓮華經 (*A Sanskrit Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra kept in the Library of the Cultural Palace of the Nationalities*), Nationalities Culture Palace 民族文化宮, Beijing.
- Mochizuki, Ryōkō 望月良晃  
 1988 *Daijō Nehangyō no Kenkyū* 大乘涅槃經の研究——教団史的考察(Studies on the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*. An Examination of Institutional History), Tokyo (春秋社).
- Nakamura, Zuiryū 中村瑞隆  
 1986 “Dam paḥi chos pad ma dkar po shes bya ba theg pa chen poḥi mdo (7)”, in: *Hokke-Bunka Kenkyū* 法華文化研究, No. 12, pp. 267-314.
- Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu  
 1956 *The Path of Purification (Visuddhimagga)*, translated from the Pali by Bhikkhu Nanamoli, <sup>1</sup>1956 Colombo (A. Semage); <sup>5</sup>1991 Kandy (Buddhist Publication Society).
- 1995 *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha : A New Translation of the Majjhima Nikaya*, original translation by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli; translation edited and revised by Bhikkhu Bodhi, Boston (Wisdom Publications) (Teachings of the Buddha).
- Norman, K.R.  
 1969 *The Elders' Verses I, Theragāthā*, London (PTS).  
 1971 *The Elders' Verses II, Therīgāthā*, London (PTS).  
 1990 *Collected Papers I*, Oxford (PTS).  
 1995 *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta)*, volume II, revised translation with introduction and notes, Oxford (PTS)(Pali Text Society Translation Series No. 45).  
 1997 *The Word of the Doctrine (Dhammapada)*, translated with an introduction and notes, Oxford (PTS).
- Okada, Yukihiro 岡田行弘  
 2001 “Nāgārjuna to Hokekyō” ナーガールジュナと『法華經』(Nāgārjuna and the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*), in: *Ejima Ekyō Hakase Tsuitō Kinen Ronshū: Kū to Jitsuzai* 江島恵教博士追悼記念論集 空と実在, Tokyo (春秋社).
- Olivelle, J. Patrick

- 1990 "Village vs. Wilderness: Ascetic Ideals and the Hindu World", in: *Monastic Life in the Christian and Hindu Traditions. A Comparative Study*, ed. Austin B. Creel and Vasudha Narayanan, Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter (The Edwin Mellen Press) (Studies in Comparative Religion 3).
- Prasad, Maulichand  
 1984 *A Comparative Study of Abbisamācārikā. Abbisamācārikā-Dharma-Vinaya of the Ārya Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins and the Pali Vinaya of the Theravādins*, Patna (K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute) (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 26).
- Rahula, Walpola  
 1956 *History of Buddhism in Ceylon. The Anuradhapura period, 3d Century BC -10th Century AC*, Colombo 1956, <sup>2</sup>1966 (Gunasena), Dehiwala <sup>3</sup>1993 (The Buddhist Cultural Centre).
- Ray, Reginald A.  
 1994 *Buddhist Saints in India. A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations*, New York and Oxford (Oxford University Press).
- Rawlinson, Andrew  
 1977 "The Position of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* in the Development of Early Mahāyāna", in: *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems. Studies in Honor of Edward Conze*, ed. Lewis Lancaster and Luis O. Gomez, Berkeley (The Center for South & Southeast Asian Studies, the University of California) (Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 1).
- Sāsanavaṃsa*, ed. Mabel Bode, London 1897, Oxford <sup>2</sup>1996 (The Pali Text Society).
- Shimoda, Masahiro 下田正弘  
 1997 *Nebangyō no Kenkyū — Daijō Kyōten no Kenkyūbōbō Shiron* 涅槃經の研究——大乘經典の研究 方法試論, Tokyo (春秋社).
- Shizutani, Masao 静谷正雄  
 1974 *Shoki Daijōbukkō no Seiritsukatei* 初期大乘仏教の成立過程, Kyoto (百華苑).
- Silk, Jonathan Alan  
 1994 *The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism with a Study of the Ratnarāsisūtra and Related Materials*, Diss. University of Michigan.
- Sprockhoff, Joachim Friedrich  
 1981, 1984 "Āraṇyaka und Vānaprastha in der Vedischen Literatur. Neue Erwägungen zu einer alten Legende und ihren Problemen", in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 25 (1981), pp. 19-90, 28 (1984), pp. 5-43.
- Tambiah, Stanley Jeyaraja  
 1976 *World Conqueror and World Renouncer. A Study of Buddhism and Polity in Thailand against a Historical Background*, Cambridge, New York etc. (Cambridge University Press).  
 1984 *The Buddhist saints of the forest and the cult of amulets. A study in charisma, hagiography, sectarianism, and millennial Buddhism*, Cambridge, New York etc. (Cambridge University Press).
- Toda, Hirofumi 戸田宏文  
 1981 *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra, Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text*, Tokushima.  
 1984 "A Classification of the Nepalese Manuscripts of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*", in: *Tokushima Daigaku Kyōyōbu Kiyō (Jinbun Shakai Kagaku)* 徳島大学教養部紀要(人文・社会科学), vol. 19, 211-256.  
 1989-1991 "*Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*, Nepalese Manuscript (北京民族文化宮圖書館蔵)", in: *Tokushima Daigaku Kyōyōbu Rinri Gakka Kiyō* 徳島大学教養部倫理学科紀要 17(1989), 18(1990), 19(1990), 20(1991), 21(1991).