

ĀNANDA IN THE THERAVĀDA:
A HAGIOGRAPHIC STUDY

THE CHARACTERIZATION OF ĀNANDA IN THE PĀLI CANON
OF THE THERAVĀDA:
A HAGIOGRAPHIC STUDY

By

MICHAEL FREEDMAN, M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

June 1977

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1977)
(Religion)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Characterization of Ānanda in the Pāli Canon
of the Theravāda: A Hagiographic Study

AUTHOR: Michael Freedman, B.A. (Sir George Williams
University)
M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISORS: Dr. Paul Younger and Dr. Jan Yun-hua

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii , 513

ABSTRACT: This study concerns itself with the characterization of Ānanda, the Buddha's personal attendant, in the Pāli Canon of the Theravāda. Its purpose is to describe and analyze Ānanda's characterization in this literature from an hagiographical perspective.

Our study undertakes for the first time a thorough analysis of every instance in which Ānanda's name appears in the sources we have utilized. This approach enables us to see how even seemingly insignificant events have often contributed to Ānanda's characterization. While the study is centered in the Pāli sources, we have also utilized Buddhist sources from the Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan where these have contributed to our understanding of Ānanda's place in the Theravāda.

The result of our study is to cast important light on such problems as Ānanda's late arahanthood, his characterization as bahussuta, his attendance on the Buddha, his relationship to Sāriputta and his place at the Council of Rājagaha.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Paul Younger and Dr. Jan Yun-hua for their guidance and advice during the preparation of the study which follows. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. C.D.C. Priestley of the Sanskrit and Indian Studies Department of the University of Toronto for his conversations with me on the content of the thesis and for his reading of the final draft. To Dr. R.M. Smith of the above University of Toronto Department, my thanks for his friendship and advice during the research and preparation of this study. Finally, I want to extend my deep appreciation to my close friend Shirley Josephs for not only typing the final copy of this thesis but for assisting me in the laborious task of editing the final version.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	iv
Abbreviations	vi
I. Introduction	1
II. Ānanda: His Place in the Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka	19
A. The Suttavibhaṅga	19
(i) Pārājika	19
(ii) Nissaggiya	36
(iii) Pacittiya	39
B. The Mahāvagga	68
C. The Cullavagga	88
III. Ānanda: His Place in the Pāli Sutta Piṭaka	129
A. Introduction	129
B. Dīgha Nikāya	138
C. Majjhima Nikāya	171
D. Ānanda: His Position as Bahussuta	222
E. Samyutta Nikāya	262
F. Anguttara Nikāya	324
IV. Ānanda: His Place in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta	375
V. Ānanda: His Place at the Council of Rājagaha	442
VI. Conclusion	485
VII. Bibliography	499

ABBREVIATIONS

Note: References to the Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka (except for the Mahāvagga and Cullāvagga) are given in the following format in the study which follows: (BD I [III 10-11] p.20), which means: This reference is to be found in the Book of the Discipline (i.e. the English translation), Vol.I, p.20, and in the Vinaya Piṭaka (i.e. the Pāli edition), Vol.III, pp.10-11.

Similarly, references to the first four Pāli Nikāyas are given as in the following example, (S II 92, p.65), which means: This reference is to be found in the English translation of the Samyutta Nikāya (i.e. Kindred Sayings) at Vol.II, p.65, and in the Pāli edition at Samyutta Nikāya, Vol.II, p.92.

All the texts of the Pāli Canon, whether translations or Pāli editions, refer to the Pāli Text Society editions, unless otherwise indicated.

A	Anguttara-Nikāya
AA	Anguttara-Nikaya Commentary (Manorathapūraṇi)
BD	Book of the Discipline (Vinaya Piṭaka, English translation)
BHSD	Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary (Edgerton)
BSO(A)S	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies (London)
D	Dīgha Nikāya
DA	Dīgha Nikāya Commentary (Sumaṅgalavilāsinī)
DB	Dialogues of the Buddha (Dīgha Nikāya - English translation)
Dh	Dhammapada
DhA	Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā
DPPN	Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names (ed. G.P. Malalasekera)
EB	Encyclopaedia of Buddhism
ERE	Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (ed. Hastings)

GS	Gradual Sayings (Anguttara Nikāya - English translation)
IHQ	Indian Historical Quarterly
J	Jātaka
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JAS	Journal of Asian Studies
JASP	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan
KS	Kindred Sayings (Samyutta Nikāya - English translation)
M	Majjhima Nikāya
MA	Majjhima Nikāya Commentary (Papancasūdanī)
Mhvu	Mahāvastu
MLS	Middle Length Sayings (Majjhima Nikāya - English translation)
MPNS	Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta
PEB	Psalms of the Buddhists - Part I, The Sisters, Part II, The Brethren (The Theri-Theragāthā in translation)
PTS	Pāli Text Society
PTSD	Pāli Text Society Dictionary
S	Samyutta Nikāya
SA	Samyutta Nikaya Commentary (Sāratthappakāsinī)
Smp	Samantapāsādikā (Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka)
Sn	Sutta Nipāta (V. Fausboll)
SnA	Sutta Nipāta Commentary
Thag	Theragāthā
ThagA	Theragāthā Aṭṭhakathā
UCR	University of Ceylon Review
Ud	Udāna

INTRODUCTION

This study concerns itself with Ānanda, the Buddha's personal attendant. In particular, the study is concerned with two factors: (1) describing Ānanda's presentation in the sources we have selected, and (2) trying to explain the manner in which he is characterized in those sources. Thus we are concerned respectively with (1) description, and (2) interpretation.

It is our contention, and our thesis, that the manner in which Ānanda's place in the Buddhist tradition has been preserved is largely dependent on the nature of the literature and on the intentions of the chain of authors and compilers who preserved the Buddhist tradition for us, culminating in the now extant Buddhist sources. Before we comment further on our thesis, some general remarks would seem in order.

David Snellgrove makes the point, "Despite the admonitions of responsible scholars, writers of books on Buddhism still tend to assume that a reasonably historical account of the life and personal teachings of Śākyamuni Buddha may be extracted from the earliest available canonical accounts. This quest of the historical Buddha began as a Western nineteenth century interest, imitating both in its

presuppositions and its methods of inquiry the parallel quest of the historical Jesus of Nazareth."¹

What Snellgrove is telling us, as are such Buddhist scholars as Richard Robinson and Étienne Lamotte, is that the presentation and preservation of Buddhist personalities (e.g. the Buddha and Ānanda) is principally the work of hagiographers and not of historians.² The authors and compilers of the extant Buddhist sources were not without historical interests, but they tended, as a matter of course, to express or subsume these interests under their 'real' concerns which may be described as falling under such labels as hagiography, eschatology and soteriology. This tendency is illustrated by the fact that, even in the cases of the Buddha and his major disciples, very little is known of their personal histories outside of the Buddha's sāsana.³

¹David L. Snellgrove, "Śākyamuni's Final Nirvāṇa," Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, XXXVI, Part 2, 1973, p.399.

²Ibid., p.411. Snellgrove quotes Richard H. Robinson (The Buddhist Religion, p.13), "The quest for the objective Gautama, like that of the historical Jesus, is foredoomed to a measure of failure. We cannot get behind the portrait that the early communities synthesized for their founders; their reports are all we have."

Also worth quoting, again from Snellgrove's article, p.411, are the remarks of Louis de la Vallée Poussin (Nirvāṇa, p.26), "Il est utile de distinguer dans le Bouddhisme, comme dans d'autres religions, la foi et les systèmes, celle-ci essentielle et stable, ceux-là secondaires et variables. L'indianisme officiel ignore la foi bouddhique au profit d'un des systèmes que la communauté a patronés, et fait sortir le Bouddhisme de ce système."

See also, Étienne Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme indien, p.x, pp.16-25.

³See e.g. "Ānanda", EB I, Fascicle 4, p.529, regarding

Again, this is not to say that interest was not taken in working out a connected life story of the Buddha and his major disciples, but that these life stories are primarily hagiographical productions reflecting the importance of each of the individuals as the various Buddhist traditions wished to have them presented.⁴ A few examples of the way in which the Buddhist sources utilize historical information would seem in order.

One example, an important one, concerns the death location of the Buddha. Most sources discussing the matter of the Buddha's death (parinibbāna) concur that the Buddha died at Kusinārā or in its environs. However, by the time the various Buddhist sources were written down, the authors and compilers of these sources felt that the location of the Buddha's death, which by their time was not very important, should have been more significant, that perhaps the Buddha's death should have taken place in one of the then existing

the divergencies in the treatment of Ānanda's early life in the extant literature.

G.P. Malalasekera's DPPN makes it clear that much of the personal information concerning Buddhist personalities is to be found in the Commentaries or in such sources as the Apadāna, the latter, for example, being regarded as one of the latest books of the Pāli Canon (see DPPN I, pp.115-116).

⁴An appreciation of the variations in the preservation of the various Buddhist personalities in the extant sources can be had by examining the work of André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha dans les sūtrapiṭaka et les vinayapiṭaka anciens, Tomes 1 & 2.

major cities. In order to right this wrong, the authors and compilers of the account of the Buddha's parinibbāna first had Ānanda ask the Buddha why he should choose to die in such an obviously insignificant location, and secondly had the Buddha inform Ānanda that Kusinārā was hardly without its significance. The Buddha goes on to explain how formerly the great Mahā Suddassana (a cakkavattin) had ruled there and how the Buddha himself had, in previous births, chosen this location for his death. In this way the authors and compilers of the accounts of the last days of the Buddha could attribute greater significance to the Buddha's death, and to his death's location, than merely asserting that 'a man cannot always choose where he is to die.'⁵ Thus, in this instance, we can see that historical truth is only acknowledged because (a) it cannot be avoided (there existed a well circulated account of the location of the Buddha's death by the time the authors and compilers came to write their accounts of the closing days of the Buddha's life) and (b) it could be used, as in this case, to point out and illustrate the significance of the Buddha and his place of death.

⁵D II 147, p.161. See also, André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha..., Tome 2, pp.72-76, and our study, pp.155-162, p.424.

Another illustration of the use of historical information in the Buddhist sources is contained in a study by A.L. Basham, who points out regarding the death of Mahāvīra or Nigaṇṭha Natāputta, who is recorded in the Pāli sources to have pre-deceased the Buddha, "We suggest that the Pāli record may not, in fact, refer to the death of Mahāvīra at Pāvā, but to that of Gosala at Sāvattthī, which the Bhagavati Sutra also mentions as having been accompanied by quarrelling and confusion. At a later date, when the chief rival of Buddhism was no longer Ajivikism but Jainism, the name may have been altered to add to the significance of the account."⁶ If Basham's analysis is correct, as it seems to be, we can see in this second example that the authors and compilers of the Buddhist sources were not beyond transforming history to suit their immediate needs.

One could go on providing examples ad infinitum and, indeed, our study has much to add to the above list. Our purpose in bringing forward the above two examples is to show quite specifically the nature and the type of interests expressed in the literature we will be studying. With the above in mind, let us now turn to the Buddhist personality with whom our study concerns itself, Ānanda, the Buddha's attendant.

Ānanda as is known, gains his importance in the Buddhist tradition, from essentially two factors: (1) he was the Buddha's personal attendant in the closing period of the

⁶A.L. Basham, History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas, p.75.

Buddha's active ministry, according to the Pāli tradition, an attendanceship which lasted twenty five years; and (2) Ānanda was one of the bhikkhus, or the bhikkhu (depending on the source consulted) who, because of his characterization as bahussuta, was chosen to recite a portion or all of the buddhavacana at the so-called First Council. These two, as well as other, factors have made Ānanda an important figure for the recorders of the Buddhist tradition(s). Some of the other factors reflecting the importance of Ānanda are that he was a cousin to the Buddha, a relatively early convert, and was characterized, like Sāriputta, as a man of great learning (bahussuta/mahāpaṇṇā) in the Buddha's sāsana.

Interestingly, the very reasons which have made Ānanda important are, in many cases, historically speaking, very tenuous. For example, there is doubt on the part of a large proportion of modern scholars as to the historicity of the so-called First Council or Council of Rājagaha.⁷ Further, there is even some doubt about the quality and length of time of Ānanda's attendanceship on the Buddha, as we shall see.

In addition to the positive elements inspiring the authors and compilers of the extant Buddhist sources to include Ānanda in their hagiographies (which, by the way, originated in an oral tradition), there are a number of negative elements in Ānanda's characterization in the Buddhist

⁷Charles S. Prebish, "A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils," Journal of Asian Studies, XXXIII, No.2, Feb. 1974, pp.245-246.

tradition. Thus, for example, Ānanda is regarded as having: single-handedly gained the admission of women into the Sangha; failed to request the Buddha to extend his life when the Buddha offered him the opportunity to do so; and failed to get the necessary details from the Buddha on certain disciplinary procedures which the Buddha suggested the bhikkhus could waive if they so desired after his death.⁸

The combining of these positive and negative elements provides a picture of Ānanda as a bhikkhu who did not achieve his arahanthood during the Buddha's lifetime. In those accounts which discuss Ānanda's arahanthood, this achievement takes place on the evening prior to the convening of the Council of Rājagaha. This postponement of arahanthood for Ānanda would not seem so unusual if Ānanda's place in the Buddha's sāsana had been less important and/or if we had other examples in the Buddhist literature of major disciples like Ānanda having their arahanthoods postponed to so late a time in their lives. Unfortunately, Ānanda's case is unique. We can find him in virtually every list of theras, all of whom, with the unique exception of Ānanda, appear to be arahants. Yet the most convincing evidence suggesting the peculiarity of Ānanda's late arahanthood comes from Buddhists themselves. Thus, Nāgārjuna in his Mahāprajñāpāramitā Śāstra felt the need to interpret Ānanda's

⁸ Ānanda is accused of these faults at the Council of Rājagaha, see Cullavagga XI, 288-289, pp.400-401.

late arahanthood and to provide suitable reasons to explain it.⁹ On the other hand, Harivarman (third century A.D.) asks the question, if Ānanda was, like Sāriputta, characterized as bahussuta and mahāpaṇṇā, a man who had heard much and was of great knowledge, then why did Ānanda's arahanthood, unlike that of Sāriputta, come so late?¹⁰ Obviously both Nāgārjuna and Harivarman were at the mercy of their sources, sources which originated in an oral form and were thus subject to many developments which preceded the oral traditions being set down in writing.¹¹

In spite of Ānanda's difficulties in achieving his arahanthood, a number of the extant Buddhist sources herald and record Ānanda as a Buddhist patriarch, thereby testifying to his supreme importance to the Buddhist tradition.¹²

Ānanda's characterization in the extant Buddhist sources is, as we have described, markedly ambivalent, contrasting sharply with the more stereotyped and regular treatment of such early disciples of the Buddha as Sāriputta

⁹Étienne Lamotte, trans., Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra), Tome 1, pp.222-225.

¹⁰Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "Musīla et Nārada: le chemin du nirvāṇa", Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, Vol.5-6, 1936-1937, p.198, fn.2.

¹¹Regarding oral tradition see, e.g., Jan Vansina, Oral Tradition: A Study of Historical Methodology, trans. H.M. Wright.

¹²See Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, pp.50-58; trans. with additional notes and comments by D.K. Biswas.

and Mahā Moggallāna. The different treatment accorded Ānanda in comparison with some of the early disciples may find its explanation in the fact that Ānanda, unlike such bhikkhus as Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna, outlived the Buddha. Thus it is possible that the hagiographies of bhikkhus like Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna had, by the time of the Buddha's death, or by that of Ānanda, already received a traditionalized form, a form which Ānanda, who outlived them, did not have when his hagiographies were composed.¹³

Ānanda, having outlived the Buddha, stands between two worlds, the world of the Buddha's lifetime and the world which followed after the Buddha's death, and thus it is likely that his characterization partook of developments which occurred at a date subsequent to the death of the Buddha.

It is the willingness both to praise and denigrate Ānanda, often within the body of literature of a single Buddhist school, which makes Ānanda an intriguing subject for study. A study of Ānanda cannot but raise historical questions for the scholar, but while we acknowledge that history has played its part in forming the characterization of Ānanda in the Buddhist sources, we must, again, as in the opening remarks of our introduction, emphasize that history in the sources we will study is best subsumed under hagiography. Thus, while we will be looking for some possible historical explanations for Ānanda's characterization

¹³ See e.g. the remarks of André Migot, Un grand disciple du buddha: Sāriputra, pp.535-536.

in the Buddhist sources, we will, for the most part, do so in a hagiographic esprit.

Before turning to a discussion of the choice of sources and the methodology utilized in the study to follow, we might provide the reader with some indications of the scholarship which has already been attempted on Ānanda. For the most part the best, if not the only, significant scholarship on Ānanda has emerged primarily in the work of two individuals, Jean Przyluski and André Bareau, both of whom wrote their studies in French. While these scholars have contributed enormously to our understanding, neither of them has provided a comprehensive study on the subject of Ānanda's place in the Buddhist tradition. Their studies include an analysis of certain features of Ānanda's characterization, but only as one aspect of their larger study.¹⁴ Both these scholars, and others, are, as the reader will see, well documented in our study and they have done much that was of assistance to us. However, our study undertakes the most thorough investigation of Ānanda yet undertaken and thus adds further to the scholarship on Ānanda, most

¹⁴e.g. André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha..., Tomes 1 & 2, and Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, pp.7-17.; Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, and Le concile de Rājagṛha, and "Le parinirvāṇa et les funérailles du buddha," Journal Asiatique, Série XI, Tome XI (mai-juin, 1918), pp.485-526; Série XI, Tome XII (nov.-déc., 1918), pp.401-456.

Also worth consulting is Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "The Buddhist Councils," The Indian Antiquary, XXXVII, 1908, pp.1-18.

There are other Buddhist scholars who have contributed their share to the scholarship on Ānanda; however, the above individuals are particularly worthy of attention.

especially to the part Ānanda plays in the literature we have chosen to study. With this remark let us turn to a discussion of the sources and the methodology we have utilized in our study.

We have, after careful deliberation, decided to examine Ānanda's position primarily within the body of a single Buddhist school, the Theravāda. In particular, we have decided to investigate Ānanda's place in the Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka (excluding the Parivāra) and in the Dīgha, Majjhima, Samyutta and Anguttara Nikāyas of the Pāli Sutta Piṭaka. Before commenting further, let us explain the reasoning behind our choice.

To undertake a comparative study, of the magnitude we have undertaken, in all the extant Buddhist literature, is here out of the question. Such a study would not only entail fluency in at least Pāli, Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese, but the sheer amount of time that would be required to read all of the extant Buddhist sources (largely unindexed) would make this virtually a lifetime project. One has only to look at the work of André Bareau's comparative study of the closing months of the Buddha's active ministry (the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta of the Pāli Canon) which consists of two volumes of more than three hundred pages each¹⁵ to realize that a comparative study of Ānanda in all of the extant Buddhist sources is beyond the scope of a doctoral thesis.

¹⁵See fn.4 above.

The question then becomes, should one limit oneself to only specific issues in Ānanda's characterization in all of the extant sources, for example Ānanda's attendanceship on the Buddha during the closing months of the latter's ministry, Ānanda's late arahanthood and his position at the First Council? While this seemed like a good idea, especially since much of the extant material on these questions has been made available in French translations, we decided against it for a number of reasons. Firstly, to concentrate on the above events in Ānanda's characterization (i.e. his late arahanthood, etc.) overlooks much of the other material in the Buddhist sources which reflects the attitudes of the traditions towards Ānanda and which might shed light on the more significant events in Ānanda's hagiography. Secondly, we intended in our study to make some use of the existing comparative research on some of the important issues in Ānanda's characterization as an adjunct to our own further discoveries in the sources chosen by us.

Another possibility was to investigate Ānanda in, for example, only the Pāli and Sanskrit sources. This seemed arbitrary; why not choose the Pāli and Chinese sources? We therefore came to the conclusion that we would investigate Ānanda's characterization in a single school while utilizing, to some degree, Ānanda's appearances in the literature of other Buddhist schools where we felt these comparisons helped us to understand Ānanda's position in the school chosen by us - the Theravāda.

The author had already done a great deal of reading and research in the Pāli sources and was sensitive to them - an important adjunct to the type of study we have undertaken here. The material was easily available in the original and in translation and, in both cases, was well indexed. The thought of a detailed investigation of every instance in which Ānanda appeared within the body of literature of a single school seemed to be a worthwhile approach to a thesis whose interests rest primarily in hagiography.

Further, the work of Jean Przyluski makes it clear that Ānanda's characterization was affected to an important degree by the various Buddhist hagiographers of the different schools. Thus, for example, he states, "In giving precedence to Upāli over Ānanda, the redactor of the Pāli Chullavagga or a late compiler has only expressed his desire to indicate the excellence of the Vinaya, which in other respects appears consistent with the general tendencies of the Sthaviravādins. The Mūla-Sārvāstivādins, on the contrary, recognize the pre-eminence of the sūtras over the vinaya and that of Ānanda over Upāli."¹⁶

Before commenting further, it seems advisable that we make clear one point and that is that we realize Ānanda's characterization in any school of Buddhism contains many similarities to that in other schools because of the fact that the 'literatures' all owe their origins to an oral

¹⁶Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, p.29.

tradition. Thus we do not have reliable access to the most 'primitive' materials on Ānanda except as they have been transformed, as they surely were, in the intervening years before the Buddhist sources were set down in writing. We make no claim that the Theravāda Pāli sources are generally 'earlier' than are the parallel sources of other Buddhist schools.¹⁷ Thus we accept the fact at the outset that Ānanda's depiction in the extant Buddhist sources is, in many ways, a shared depiction, one which has, to a large degree, covered over the 'real', 'primitive' and historical person of Ānanda. In investigating the place of Ānanda in the body of literature we have chosen, we take cognizance of both of the above factors. We turn now to our selection of our sources.

On perusing the extant Pāli sources, we ascertained, through both our own researches and those of others,¹⁸ that an investigation of Ānanda in the Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka (excluding the Parivāra)¹⁹ and the first four Nikāyas of the

¹⁷Edward Conze, Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies, p.3, states, "The Pāli Canon, as we have it, is no older than that of other schools, say that of the Sarvastivadins."

¹⁸G.P. Malalasekera's DPPN (Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names), 2 volumes, was particularly helpful, as also was C. Witanachchi's article (though heavily reliant on the work of Malalasekera), "Ānanda," EB I, Fascicle 4, pp.529-536.

¹⁹We omitted the Parivāra or Parivārapāṭha because it is merely a digest of other parts of the Pāli Vinaya and has nothing to add on the subject of Ānanda. It is quite likely a late production. See DPPN II, pp.161-162.

Pāli Sutta Piṭaka (with some materials from the Khuddaka Nikāya) would provide us with a body of literature large enough, and important enough, to determine, in great detail, the place and understanding of Ānanda's characterization in the Theravāda Pāli Canon. In choosing to investigate what we considered to be the most important materials, we have also taken into consideration the fact that the materials we have chosen are regarded as the most authoritative by the Theravāda school itself.²⁰ Further, as the sources we have selected often have their parallels in the extant literature of other Buddhist schools, our selection offers us the opportunity both now, and in future studies, to extend our researches on Ānanda.

As alluded to above, we have only utilized certain of the materials subsumed under the title Khuddaka Nikāya,²¹

²⁰ We have approached the order of the Pāli literature in light of the fact that, according to the Cullavagga account of the First Council, the Vinaya was recited first, then each of the five Nikāyas. The specifics of the ordering of the Pāli Canon from the point of view of Buddhaghosa can be found in his Bahiraṇidāna (Smp.I 4-30, pp.3-27).

A.K. Warder, Indian Buddhism, p.203, in discussing the ordering of the Five Nikāyas (i.e. Dīgha, Majjhima, Samvutta, Anguttara and Khuddaka), states, "This order of the five 'traditions' happens also to be the order of their authenticity, probably because it was easier to insert short texts among a large number or to get a composition of doubtful origin admitted to the already doubtful Minor Tradition [i.e. Khuddaka Nikāya] of a school. This is soon ascertained by comparing the various available recensions... It has been suggested that some schools did not have a Minor Tradition at all, though they still had some of the minor texts, incorporated in their Vinayas, hence the 'Four Agamas' are sometimes spoken of as representing the Sūtra."

²¹ Regarding the Khuddaka Nikāya, see DPPN I, p.721.

for the most part because many of the texts comprising the Khuddaka Nikāya provide us with no, or little, valuable material on Ānanda, a notable exception being the Theragāthā. Thus, while we have not studied in detail Ānanda's place in the Khuddaka as a Nikāya, we have utilized materials from that collection, for example the Udāna, Jātaka and Theragāthā, where these materials provided us with important information. Further, we have also, upon occasion, where the case seemed warranted, consulted the Pāli commentarial literature. However, as a general rule, because of the extensive nature of the Pāli commentarial literature and the fact that much of these materials reveal themselves to be late (as we will, in certain cases, explore in our study) in their understanding of the Pāli literature, we have avoided over-reliance on the conclusions of the commentaries, relying instead on the Pāli Canon proper.²²

Having decided on our sources, we also decided that we would go through these sources in serial fashion, beginning with the Suttavibhaṅga of the Vinaya and then move through the rest of the Vinaya and the four Nikāyas (Dīgha, Majjhima, Samyutta and Anguttara).²³ This procedure provides a framework for our study which also allows fairly easy access to any section in which Ānanda plays a part in the literature. There are, on occasion, in the interest of gaining the most from a study such as we have undertaken, situations in which

²²Regarding the nature and make-up of the Pāli Commentaries, see E.W. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon.

²³See fn.20 above.

we have drawn materials from elsewhere in the Pāli Vinaya and Sutta Piṭakas together to explain a problem at hand. Further, on occasion we have lumped together or altered our serial treatment of sections located nearby in order to improve on the stylistics of our study where nothing was to be gained from treating the material serially or in detail. However, no situation, no mention of Ānanda's name in the literature we have selected, has been left out. When certain sections of a sutta have had a parallel account elsewhere in the Pāli Canon, we have used our discretion in bringing these together in our serial approach, always indicating our choice. Finally, we have made two major exceptions to our rule of treating the materials serially, that is in the cases of the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta and the Cullavagga account of the First Council. It is likely that both these pieces of literature were once a single account and, more importantly, they contain a large share of the key issues which have gone to characterize Ānanda not only in the Pāli sources, but in Buddhist literature generally. The Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta, the longest Sutta in the Pāli Canon, though made up of many pieces which are located elsewhere in the Pāli Canon, is an attempt to describe the last months of the Buddha and the events immediately following his death. The Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta as a compilation, wishes us to see Ānanda as the almost constant companion of the Buddha during these final days and it is

useful to examine Ānanda's appearance in a Sutta of such length and magnitude to see if an attempt at a coherent picture of Ānanda emerges. Finally, the Cullavagga account of the Council of Rājagaha is important because it is one of the few places where we are provided with a characterization of Ānanda supposedly after the Buddha's death.

To return to the subject which opened our introduction, we hope that the reader will find in the study which follows, not only a picture of Ānanda's characterization in the Pāli sources we have selected, but an appreciation of the reasons behind his hagiographical treatment in these sources and some speculations on the possible historical factors which modified the characterization of Ānanda in the Buddhist sources left to us by the authors and compilers of the Pāli Canon.

ĀNANDA: HIS PLACE IN THE PĀLI VINAYA PĪṬAKA¹

The Suttavibhaṅga

Pārājika

The Pārājika section of the Suttavibhaṅga is that portion of the Pāli Vinaya Pīṭaka which lists and elaborates the four most important paṭimokkha rules - cattāro pārājika dhamma (the four causes of defeat). These four pārājika rules are concerned with: (1) engagement in sexual intercourse (methuna) and related sexual offences (e.g. masturbation); (2) stealing (adinna); (3) involvement in the loss of a human being's life (jīvita voropeti); and (4) the "claiming of a state or quality of further-men" (uttar-manussa dhamma) i.e. claiming to have achieved a level of spiritual development without really having done so.² The violation of any of the above rules leads to automatic expulsion from the Sangha.

¹For a discussion of the order of the contents of the Pāli Vinaya and the reasons for beginning with the Sutta-vibhaṅga, see I.B. Horner, BD I, vii-viii. Regarding the omission of the Parivāra, see our introduction, p. 14, fn.19.

²I.B. Horner, BD I, xxv, suggests, we believe rightly, that the offences listed in the Pārājika section "are arranged in an ascending scale of gravity in which the offence held to be the worst morally, though not legally, is placed last." For a succinct summary of the four pārājika rules and their subdivisions, see I.B. Horner, BD I, xix-xxviii; also, Nāṇamoli Thera, The Patimokkha, pp. 18-33.

Before proceeding to a discussion of Ānanda's place in the Pārājika section of the Suttavibhaṅga, some general discussion of the Vinaya Piṭaka would seem in order. The Vinaya Piṭaka, in describing the reasoning behind the promulgation of its disciplinary rules, often utilizes the names of certain bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs. This approach to the promulgation of the rules provides a 'historical' framework to what otherwise might appear dogmatic, dull and arbitrary. There are insurmountable difficulties involved in trying to ascertain the historical veracity (as opposed to the historical/hagiographical usefulness) of the named bhikkhu's and/or bhikkhuni's involvement in the framing of the vinaya rules. The Buddhist tradition does not see itself as the preserver of mere historical data but is rather interested in preserving what can best be termed its 'religious history.' That is, the Buddhist sources, while likely rooted in certain historical events, when recording these events (either orally or in writing) reveal that the true aim of their use of 'history' is rather a concern with preserving the soteriological and hagiographical elements of the 'tradition' which this literature represents.

For example, we have the well-known debate among Buddhist scholars as to the historicity of the so-called First Council, at least as the Council is described in the extant Buddhist sources. Diversity in the Buddhist accounts of the Council reveals the fact that sectarian influences

are at work.³ The historicity of the First Council is assumed by all the Buddhist Schools. What is at stake in recording the events of that Council are: (1) the teachings of the Buddha; and (2) the characterizations of his followers.

The approach which is taken by Buddhists to the First Council is also applicable to the preservation and recording of the vinaya rules. As G.S.P. Misra states, "The Vinaya is a well-worked out code which appears to have received its present shape long after the Buddha. Though it traces all the rules to the Master himself, the reading of the text leaves no doubt that it is a mixture of old as well as late materials which, as S. Dutt says, 'have been welded together by a theory.'"⁴

Again, the fact that the Pāli Vinaya, as do the Vinayas of other Buddhist Schools, uses the names of certain bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs in describing how new disciplinary rules were promulgated is no guarantee that those named bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs were actually

³See e.g. Charles S. Prebish, "A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils," JAS XXXIII, No.2, Feb. 1974, pp. 239-246.

⁴G.S.P. Misra, The Age of Vinaya, p. 20. For S. Dutt's remarks, see his Early Buddhist Monachism, p. 11 ff. For some view on the problem of historicity in Buddhist sources, see e.g. in the case of the Vinaya, I.B. Horner, BD I, xv ff.; Charles S. Prebish, "The Prātimokṣa Puzzle: Fact Versus Fantasy," JAOS 94, No.2, 1974, pp. 168-176. See also, A.K. Warder, Indian Buddhism, p. 60.

involved.⁵ In some cases this 'freedom' on the part of the Buddhist Schools probably operated within certain restrictions. For example, there existed in many instances a core of tradition which could not easily be altered. This core of material (the generally agreed-upon similarities in the extant Buddhist sources) is often considered to correspond to 'early Buddhism,' to the Buddhism of the Buddha during his lifetime. More likely, though not always the case, this 'core' is itself the product of a variety of forces operating in the period prior to the establishing of Canons in the various Buddhist Schools. This approach to the Buddhist sources may sound overly critical and self-defeating for those who would search out the 'facts' of early (original) Buddhism. However, the point we wish to make is basically a methodological one. We cannot allay our curiosity about just who and what the 'real' Ānanda was, nor prevent ourselves from making attempts to solve this historical question. At the same time, we must be aware of the problems inherent in such a quest.

Ānanda's place in the Buddhist tradition is affected

⁵G.S.P. Misra, The Age of Vinaya, p. 20 states, "Buddha could not have framed all the rules for himself and one cannot also imagine that the transgressions might have occurred in the same systematic manner as these are given in the text ... Nevertheless, the tradition presented in the Vinaya cannot be wholly pushed aside." If the authors of the Vinaya could have universally attributed the formation of the disciplinary rules to the Buddha, it is likely that they could also have utilized the names of the important disciples in events in which they took no part.

by a number of 'facts' accepted by all the Buddhist Schools, two of which 'facts' are: (1) that he was the Buddha's permanent attendant in the period prior to the Buddha's death; and (2) that he participated at the First Council in recording the buddhavacana. These two 'facts', and others, seem central in shaping the personality called Ānanda. How then does the Pārājika section of the Suttavibhaṅga present Ānanda?

Ānanda is sometimes described in the Pārājika as the Buddha's attendant (pacchāsamaṇa) and, for example, in this capacity Ānanda accompanies the Buddha to Verāñjā to thank the brāhmaṇa of Veranjā for hospitality afforded the community of bhikkhus during the rains-retreat (BD I [III 10-11] p. 20). The term pacchāsamaṇa is explained in the PTSD as, "a junior Wanderer or bhikkhu (Thera) who walks behind a senior (Thera) on his rounds" (p.386). The Pāli Canon does not provide us with any details about the role and selection of attendants to senior (thera) bhikkhus. The Manorathapurāṇī provides the following idealized depiction of Ānanda's attendanceship of the Buddha:

He [Ānanda] served the Buddha, following him everywhere like a shadow, bringing him toothwood and water, washing his feet, rubbing his body, cleaning his cell and fulfilling all his duties with the greatest care. By day he was at hand forestalling the slightest wish of the Buddha. At night, staff and torch in hand, he went nine times round the Buddha's cell and never put them

down lest he would fall asleep and fail to answer a call from the Buddha.⁶

The silence that surrounds the position and function of the pacchāsamana (attendant) in the Pāli Vinaya is unusual in light of the very purpose of the Vinaya - to state the disciplinary requirements of the Sangha. It is possible that the position of attendant was later subsumed under the relationship which was said to exist between a student (sāmaṇera - novice) and his preceptor (upajjhāya) and/or teacher (ācariya).⁷

As a further illustration of Ānanda's service to the Buddha, we find Ānanda (BD I [III 6] p.12) preparing the Buddha's food and, on that occasion, being described, along with other unnamed bhikkhus, as "sappurisa" ("men indeed"). The epithet sappurisa is applied to Ānanda because he is content, during a period of food scarcity, to eat the simple foods of boiled rice and gruel. The Buddha suggests that the bhikkhus who "come after", perhaps implying after his parinibbāna and/or after the first group of major disciples have died, will show disdain for these simple foods.

⁶The passage represents C. Witanachchi's summary of AA I, p.296 and is to be found in his article on "Ānanda" in EB I, Fascicle 4, p.530. See also, Dhammapāla's Commentary to Ānanda's verses in the Theragāthā; Mrs. Rhys Davids, PEB II, p.351.

⁷See e.g. the duties of a novice to his "preceptor" (upajjhāya) at Mahāvagga I, 45: pp.58 ff.

If we are tempted to point to the epithet sappurisa as illustrating the great regard the Buddha had for Ānanda, then we are possibly soon to be disappointed. We learn (BD I [III 10] p.19) that the Buddha says to Sāriputta, "Sāriputta, the most backward [pacchimako] of these five hundred monks is one who has entered the stream [sotāpanno avinipātadhammo]" . We are not told specifically that Ānanda is that "most backward" bhikkhu, but that seems to be the interpretation of some, as I.B. Horner indicates in a footnote to the passage.⁸ In order to clarify the use of the term "pacchimaka" we will make a short digression.

In the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta we have a case where the Buddha says to Ānanda, "For even the most backward, Ānanda, of all these five hundred brethren has become converted [sotāpanno avinipātadhammo], is no longer liable to be born in a state of suffering, and is assured of hereafter attaining to the Enlightenment [of Arahantship]" (D II 155, p.173). Buddhaghosa believes that this statement (in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta) was made to Ānanda in order to encourage him.⁹ There is also a parallel passage to the above examples which appears in the Anguttara Nikāya where, after Ānanda informs the Buddha that he is convinced

⁸ I.B. Horner, BD I, p.19, fn.6.

⁹ See fn.8 above and D II, p.173, fn.1.

that the Sangha of bhikkhus has no bhikkhus in it who have any misgivings about the "Buddha, Dhamma, the Order, the Way or the Practice," the Buddha states:

You Ānanda, speak out of faith, but the Tathāgata has knowledge therein. There is indeed in this Order of monks no doubt or misgiving in a single monk as to the Buddha, the Order, Dhamma, the Way, or the Practice. Of these five hundred monks here, Ānanda, the most backward is a Stream-winner, one saved from the Downfall, assured, bound for enlightenment (A II 80, p.89).

Buddhaghosa, in his Commentary to the above passage, refers to the possibility that the "pacchimaka" statement was made to encourage Ānanda. However, as F.L. Woodward indicates, there is some doubt about applying the term pacchimaka to Ānanda.¹⁰

The PTSD provides the following definition of the term "pacchimaka" (translated above as "most backward"), "(1) last, latest ... (2) lowest, meanest" (p.386). The PTSD interestingly does not include any references to the above examples wherein the term "pacchimaka" appears. To translate "pacchimaka" in the above passages as "most backward" is, perhaps, to invest the term with more of a negative connotation than is really intended. After all, the stage or state of sotāpanna ("stream-winner") is not to be judged as an insignificant achievement for, as the Buddha states, it is a guaranteed route to arahanthood, "... a Stream-winner, one saved from the Downfall, assured, bound for enlightenment."

¹⁰

GS II, p.89, fn.2.

The likely intention of the term "pacchimaka" in the passages quoted above is to imply that even the "latest" (i.e. using the first definition provided by the PTSD) of the five hundred brethren is bound for enlightenment. That is, even the newest member of the group of five hundred brethren will achieve arahanthood.

It should additionally be noted that the term "sotāpanna" is to be equated with "conversion" in the sentence, "For even the 'newest/latest member' [our re-translation of "most backward"] ... of all these five hundred brethren has become converted [sotāpanno avinipata dhammo], is no longer liable to be born in a state of suffering...".¹¹ The above statement maintains that "entering the stream" is concomitant with the novice's obtaining the upasampadā ordination.

There is no need to "encourage" Ānanda (as Buddhaghosa in his commentarial remarks suggests) because Ānanda is knowledgeable of the fact that receiving ordination is also to "enter the stream". In fact, Ānanda is described after his conversion by the Buddha as having attained the "fruit of stream winner" (sotāpattiphala).¹²

One of Ānanda's duties as the Buddha's attendant was to act as an intermediary between the Buddha and those

¹¹See also PTSD, p.725 under "Sota²".

¹²Cullavagga VII 183, p.257.

wishing an audience with him. Thus, for example (BD I [III 23] p.40 ff.), a certain group of bhikkhus dwelling at Vesālī, unable to keep the discipline, believed that if they could receive the pabbajjā ("going forth") and upasampadā ordinations in the Buddha's presence, they would be inspired to strive for those "states belonging to enlightenment [bodhipakkhikānaṃ]." ¹³ Ānanda, as intermediary, conveys the request of the group of bhikkhus to the Buddha and presumably carries back to them the Buddha's refusal to see them. Since the term "bodhipakkhika" does not belong to the early literature of Buddhism ¹⁴ we may have in the above example an illustration of the author's and/or compiler's attempt to write into the Vinaya events which do not belong to the early period of the discipline. On the other hand, the use of the term "bodhipakkhika" may merely illustrate the fact that the authors and/or compilers while recording early events in the discipline's development availed themselves of terminology current at their time.

In addition to Ānanda's conveying requests to the Buddha, we also find the Buddha requesting Ānanda to forward requests to the bhikkhus. Such is the case with the Buddha asking Ānanda to "call together in the assembly-hall as many monks as dwell near Vesālī" (BD I [III 69] p.119 ff.). The

¹³ This group of bhikkhus are described as "self-abusers", BD I [III 23] p.41.

¹⁴ I.B. Horner, BD I, p.41, fn.1. See also, Y. Karundasa, "Bodhipakkhiyā-dhammā" in EB III, Fascicle 2, pp. 209-212. See further I.B. Horner, The Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected, p.52.

Buddha's request arises as the outcome of a talk to the bhikkhus on the subject of the impure (asubhabhāvanā). This lecture seems to have caused great consternation among the bhikkhus concerning their attitudes towards their own bodies, resulting even in premature death. Ānanda in conveying this information to the Buddha repeats at some length the subject of the Buddha's lecture and thus illustrates his powers of memory, a faculty made much of by the Buddhist tradition.¹⁵

Ānanda seems to have been held in very high esteem by the Buddha when it came to the question of Ānanda's honesty. Thus, on one occasion (BD I [III 58] pp.97-98) Ānanda mistakenly wears, as his own, the inner garment (antara-vāsaka) of another bhikkhu and, as a result, is reported to the Buddha. The Buddha listens to the charge against Ānanda, but accepts Ānanda's explanation that it was a mistake. One may posit the question: does the incident in using Ānanda's name do so to record a 'fact' or is there some other purpose behind it? In this regard, it is interesting to note that the offences surrounding the above

¹⁵The Commentary on the Majjhima Nikāya (MA i, 501) maintains that, "Ānanda could remember anything he had once heard up to fifteen thousand stanzas of sixty thousand lines" DPPN I, p.263 and pp. 253ff. The factor of Ānanda's memory is one of the justifications for his place at the First Council. See also A I 24, p.19; Theragāthā, verse 1024.

incident involving Ānanda do not have as their subjects named individuals but rather refer to, for example, "... a certain monk."¹⁶ This use of un-named parties does not, in itself, prove that Ānanda's name has been taken in vain. The fact that bhikkhus were supposed (at least ideally) to be mindful of their actions results in us seeing Ānanda's above-mentioned mistake as an illustration of his unmindfulness. Thus, regardless of the factual basis, or lack of it, the Buddha's acceptance of Ānanda's explanation may, in addition to providing the basis for a new rule, also carry with it some indication of Ānanda's 'personality'.

The Pārājika (BD I [III 66-67] pp. 111-112) contains an episode involving both Ānanda and Upāli and allows us to gauge the relative importance of these two Buddhist personalities in the Pāli Vinaya. The incident revolves around the bhikkhu Ajjuka and the householder who supports him. It seems that the householder has two charges of his own, one his son and the other his nephew. The householder asks the bhikkhu Ajjuka to grant an audience to whichever of the two children has "faith and belief" (saddha/passana). Since Ajjuka judges (we are not told how) that only the nephew satisfies the conditions set forth by the householder, only the nephew is granted an audience. As a direct result of Ajjuka's evaluation, the householder decides to set up an

¹⁶BD I [III 56] p.94 ff.

estate for, and grant a gift to, the nephew. The householder's son feels that his father's actions toward the nephew will eventually result in the usurpation of his place as his father's rightful heir. With this dilemma in mind, the son approaches Ānanda with the following question, "Which is the father's heir, the son or the nephew?" In keeping with tradition, Ānanda of course replies that the son is the father's heir. Ānanda does not question the householder's son as to all the details which gave rise to his concern about whether or not he was the true heir. The son, armed with Ānanda's reply, feels justified in accusing Ajjuka of not being a true bhikkhu (like Ānanda). Ajjuka, concerned about the justification for the son's charge, asks (supposedly Ānanda) for a trial ("vinicchaya"). The text suddenly introduces us to the fact that Upāli was at this time an "adherent" (pakkha) of Ajjuka.¹⁷ Upāli sets out to vindicate Ajjuka by questioning, first him, and then Ānanda.¹⁸ Upāli asks Ānanda whether it was wrong for Ajjuka to have granted an audience to the householder's nephew in light of the householder's request that such an interview be based on "faith and belief."

¹⁷The PTSD, p.380, explains: "pakkha¹... [definition No.] 2. side, party, faction; adj (-.) associated with, a partisan, adherent...". It is still difficult to ascertain just exactly what the relationship between Ajjuka and Upāli was.

¹⁸We assume that Upāli gained his information of the affair from the individuals directly involved.

Ānanda replies, "Honoured Sir, he does not fall at all, (not) even to the length of an offence of wrong-doing." In this way Upāli is able to show how, through an analysis of all the events (even though we are not privileged to this analysis in the account itself), Ajjuka is innocent. Upāli also shows that he is able, perhaps unlike Ānanda, to settle the question of the charge brought against Ajjuka.

The above, in essence, is the circumstance for the meeting of Ānanda and Upāli. There are a number of points in the above treatment of the Ajjuka incident worthy of comment. Is it Ānanda who, on Ajjuka's request for a "trial", contacts Upāli; or does Upāli merely come to Ajjuka's aid?¹⁹ Why does Upāli question Ānanda and not the son of the householder who actually originated the charge? Ānanda's role in the incident, it would seem, is to show Upāli's superior ability to deal with disciplinary matters. Ānanda, under Upāli's questioning, is able to provide the 'correct' answer, so that it seems that Ānanda's fault rests with his not having investigated/analyzed the matter thoroughly. Perhaps Upāli's use of Ānanda (i.e. questioning him) is intended not to denigrate Ānanda's abilities, but to verify, in front of the householder's son (who obviously approves of Ānanda), that Ajjuka has been wrongly charged. It is not easy to resolve the above questions. One thing

¹⁹ According to Malalasekera the implication seems to be that Ānanda sought Upāli out to be the judge. See DPPN I, p.39 "Ajjuka."

is certain and that is that the Ajjuka affair is regarded by the Pāli Commentaries as an illustration of Upāli's ability as a Vinaya-master (Vinayadhara).²⁰

One of the surprising aspects of the Ajjuka affair is that the Pārājika account does not involve the Buddha in its final decision. This is surprising because in most cases the Buddha is the final authority in serious matters of discipline. Perhaps, with this lacuna in mind, we can assume that the Pāli Vinaya commentary indicates that the Buddha did (eventually?) give his approval.²¹

We can gain some further idea of the relative status of Ānanda and Upāli by examining the terms of address used by each party in the incidents above. Unfortunately, the differences in these terms of address do not make themselves known in the English translation, though in the Pāli the differences are apparent. The use of terms of address are as follows: Upāli and Ajjuka address Ānanda as āvuso; Ānanda addresses Upāli as bhante; Upāli addresses Ajjuka indirectly (i.e. in the course of speaking about Ajjuka) as āvuso āyasmā; and the text addresses both Upāli and Ānanda as āyasmā.

According to Narendra Wagle's study, the commonest mode of address between bhikkhus is āvuso. The term bhante

²⁰ See ThagA i 370 and AA i 172. See the section on Upāli in Max Walleser, ed., The Manorathapūraṇi, I, Part 1, p.311.

²¹ See references in fn.20 above.

(used by Ānanda to address Upāli) is usually reserved for an elder (thera); that is, a junior bhikkhu will often address his superior by the term bhante.²² Wagle points out:

It seems that the term bhante, which later became a common mode of address for senior monks, came into vogue after the Buddha's death. It is also worth noting that such monks as Anuruddha, Mahākassapa, Upāli, Mahākaccāna and Sāriputta, who are addressed as bhante by some of the monks, are of considerable seniority and importance in the Buddhist Saṃgha.²³

The fact that Ānanda addresses Upāli in the Ajjuka affair as bhante, while Upāli addresses Ānanda as āvuso, suggests that Upāli is to be regarded as Ānanda's senior. Upāli was supposedly ordained before Ānanda; thus Upāli is 'legally' (i.e. within the Vinaya system) regarded as Ānanda's senior.²⁴ However, the account of Upāli and Ānanda's "going forth" happens, as do their ordinations, virtually at the same time and it seems unusual to stress seniority between them solely on the basis of such a small difference in ordination time.²⁵

²²Narendra Wagle, Society at the Time of the Buddha, pp. 57-59.

²³Ibid., p.57 and also fn.70. Regarding the term "bhante", it is also useful to examine Wagle's Appendix, especially p.276.

²⁴See the discussion beginning on p.92 of our study.

²⁵Technically speaking, that is speaking from the point of view of the monastic disciplinary system as laid down in the Vinaya Piṭaka, the fact that Upāli precedes the others in "going forth" makes Upāli their senior. However, seniority in terms of ordination time is not the only type of seniority recognized in the Pāli Canon, nor, for that matter, in the Pāli Vinaya. The Pāli Canon also recognizes seniority

The above distinction in terms of address between Upāli and Ānanda likely reflects the orientation of the authors and/or compilers of the Vinaya to place Vinaya interests above Sutta interests. After all, the Ajjuka affair is regarded, at least by the Pāli Commentaries, as an important example of Upāli's abilities as a vinayadhara. This orientation and favouring of the Vinaya is openly expressed in the "key" (mnemonic device) to the first section of the Mahāvagga, "Although the Suttantas and Abhidhamma be forgotten, for all time /the teaching persists while Vinaya is not destroyed."²⁶ The Mahāvagga verse just quoted is obviously late (i.e. it mentions the Abhidhamma). Still, as we have indicated in our introduction (see p.13) it was not unusual in the development of Buddhism to see some bhikkhus and schools favouring the discipline over the doctrine.

in terms of 'spiritual' success in the Buddha's sāsana. This 'spiritual' seniority is reflected in the 'fact' that the Canon often mentions that certain individuals attained quickly to arahanthood immediately or shortly after their ordination. This 'spiritual' seniority is recognized by the Buddha when he supposedly excuses some individuals from having to go through the customary four month probationary period (e.g. see Mahāvagga I 71, p.89). It is also interesting to note the Buddha's comments (Mahāvagga I 42, p.55) before he ordains Sāriputta and Moggallāna (i.e. Kolita and Upatissa), "this pair of disciples will be my chief, my eminent pair". While the Buddha's statement may obviously be construed as a later accretion, it is interesting to find in the Dhammapada's Commentary (see F.W. Burlingame, Buddhist Legends, Part I, pp. 203-204) the claim made by some Buddhist bhikkhus, about the Buddha's statement regarding Sāriputta and Moggallāna, that his choice showed favouritism over earlier (i.e. senior) converts.

²⁶Mahāvagga I 98-99, p.127.

Ānanda's last appearance in the Pārājika section (BD I [III 91], p.158) is connected, once again, with his position as an intermediary between the bhikkhus and the Buddha. We learn that a large company of bhikkhus thought that they had attained what, in fact, they had not. On realizing their error, they approached Ānanda with the aim of having him convey their error to the Buddha and asking of the Buddha the results of their actions. Ānanda conveys the information to the Buddha who points out the dangers of falsely declaring oneself to have achieved the "state of further-men [uttarimanussa]" and indicates that such a false declaration results in "defeat".

Nissaggiya

Ānanda makes his next appearance in the Nissaggiya section of the Suttavibhaṅga.²⁷ In this section of the Pāli Vinaya we find Ānanda responsible for, among other things, certain changes in the existing Vinaya rules. We learn (BD II [III 195-196] p.4) that Ānanda in acquiring an extra robe wishes, out of his fondness for Sāriputta, to give him the robe as a gift. However, because of a rule

²⁷The Nissaggiya section of the Pāli Vinaya is concerned with thirty rules regarding a bhikkhu's behaviour and with the "wrongful acquisition or unsuitable usage of things." See I.B. Horner, BD II, pp. vii-xxiv. See also Nānamoli Thera, The Pātimokkha, p. 35ff.

forbidding the wearing of an extra robe and because Sāriputta is not expected to return from Sāketa for ten days, Ānanda is faced with a dilemma. The Buddha, with Ānanda's problem in mind, decides that Ānanda (and by implication all bhikkhus with the same problem) may wear the extra robe for ten days. We find a parallel to the above incident later in the Vinaya, except that a bowl is substituted for the robe. Here too the Buddha changes the rule for Ānanda (see BD II [III 243] p.114).

Ānanda's high regard for Sāriputta is equalled by Sāriputta's high regard for Ānanda.²⁸ The friendship between these two men is important since it shows that one of the Buddha's major disciples (i.e. Sāriputta) thought well of Ānanda. However, Ānanda's wishes to make gifts to Sāriputta perhaps reflect a concealed attempt on the part of the authors and/or compilers to denigrate Ānanda. Do incidents like the above reveal Ānanda to be, as is often charged, a bhikkhu still under the influence of his desires? Or are Ānanda's actions to be regarded as truly altruistic? Was the fact of Ānanda's attendanceship on the Buddha seen by the other bhikkhus as an act of altruism, or was it understood to carry more selfish desires?²⁹ In fact one

²⁸See DPPN II, pp. 1111, 1113.

²⁹The Pāli version of Ānanda becoming the permanent attendant to the Buddha is supplied by the commentaries and indicates that the Buddha himself chose Ānanda. See DPPN I, p.250. See also our study, pp.104-105, fn.32.

may ask whether it is reasonable to assume that many bhikkhus would (consciously or unconsciously) have envied Ānanda's closeness to the Buddha.

The position of Ānanda as an intermediary between the bhikkhus and the Buddha is a privileged one and may be partly responsible for his 'final' type of characterization in the Pāli Vinaya. What, for example, are the psychological ramifications of an event like the following? Ānanda (BD II [III 198,p.12) reports some bhikkhus to the Buddha because they are seen to be wearing soiled robes. As a result of Ānanda's report, the bhikkhus are chastised by the Buddha. Are we to assume that those chastised bhikkhus would be thankful for Ānanda's concern with their disciplinary welfare? Ideally, this should be the case.³⁰ However, the Vinaya is itself not only a testimony to the need for disciplinary rules, but also details infractions which led to changes in these rules. It seems logical that the position played by Ānanda in events like the above would make him the target of much hostility. In fact, Ānanda is a much better target

³⁰ See, for example, the discussion of the role of the "student" towards his "preceptor", Mahāvagga I 48-49, pp.65-67. The rules of the Vinaya Piṭaka are primarily the result of criticisms brought to bear on the conduct of bhikkhus and this indicates that 'criticism' was integral to forming the 'proper' disciplinary procedures necessary to follow in the Buddha's path. On the other hand, it is easy to imagine, as the sources themselves indicate, that some individual bhikkhus did not favour the implementation of the discipline. See e.g. Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, pp.26-29.

for hostility than the Buddha himself. After all, the Buddha represents the 'perfected one'; he is the Path-finder, the very reason for the sāsaṇa. It would thus be more difficult to have the Buddha become, at least consciously, the target of the bhikkhus' hostilities and frustrations which must have, in many cases, arisen as the by-products of monastic-like living. Ānanda seems to be the ideal candidate for bhikkhus wishing to express the hostility and frustration they encounter in living the disciplinary life appropriate to the Brahmacariya.³¹

The above analysis suggests some of the more 'unconscious' motives contributing to Ānanda's characterization in the sources under discussion. Yet, as we shall subsequently see, there are other, more overt reasons which result in his final characterization.

Pācittya³²

Ānanda makes a number of appearances in the Pācittya section of the Suttavibhaṅga, some of which are indirect. Thus, for example, we find Ānanda's name among a list of elders (thera). This list is the outcome of bhikkhunī

³¹ Ānanda is one of the best candidates for hostility because he, in his position of attending to the Buddha, becomes a ready target for jealousy. In addition, 'orders' to the bhikkhus and 'reports' from the bhikkhus to the Buddha are often mediated through Ānanda.

³² Regarding the make-up of the Pācittya section of the Pāli Vinaya, see I.B. Horner, BD II, pp.xxv-xliv. Also see Nāṇamoli Thera's summary in his, The Paṭimokkha, p.47 ff. In general, the Pācittya section of the Pāli Vinaya deals with those offences in discipline requiring confession.

Thullanandā's questioning of a householder (BD II [IV 66] p.295). One of the interesting features of the list of elders provided by the householder (gahapati) is the fact that Upāli's name precedes that of Ānanda. The order of the list might be viewed as expressing seniority. We shall have more to say about this list and others later in our section on the Vinaya.³³

As elsewhere in the Suttavibhaṅga, Ānanda shows himself to be constantly in tune to the affairs of the community of bhikkhus. When the Buddha (BD II [IV 82] p.327) asks Ānanda for the reason behind all the noise he is hearing, Ānanda is able to provide the answer without first having to investigate. This suggests that it was one of Ānanda's duties to keep his eyes and ears tuned to the events of the community. Again, this approach to the community of bhikkhus may have placed Ānanda in the position of a 'spy' and thus contributed to his final characterization in the Buddhist sources.

Also in the Pācittiya section we are informed of the 'fact' that Ānanda had, at one time, a preceptor (upajjhāya) whose name was Belaṭṭhasīsa (BD II [IV 86] p.338). We find the Buddha having to reprimand Belaṭṭhasīsa because he eats stored food rather than going out daily for alms. The Dhammapada Commentary maintains that the Buddha later declares Belaṭṭhasīsa free from guilt on that occasion

³³See e.g. pp.88-91 of our study.

because he had stored food, not out of greed, but because he had few wants (appicchata). In addition, the Commentary notes that Belatthasīsa had stored the food prior to the Buddha's having promulgated the rule against such acts.³⁴ It is noteworthy that the Dhammapada Commentary chooses to correct the Buddha's evaluation of the events involving Belatthasīsa as they are stated in the Pācittya section under discussion. One wonders whether the re-evaluation of Belatthasīsa's conduct has something to do with his being described as Ānanda's upajjhāya.

Since Ānanda supposedly had Belatthasīsa as upajjhāya it is useful at this time to attempt an investigation of this 'fact'. The primary source in the Pāli Canon for understanding the position and function of the upajjhāya is the account provided in the Mahāvagga (I 44, pp.57ff.). There we learn that bhikkhus went on their tour for alms improperly dressed and showed a great lack of control in their eating habits. The people (manussā) complained about the poor habits of these bhikkhus and as a direct result the Buddha called for the establishing of a system of upajjhāyas.

The preceptor (Pāli: upajjhāya; Sanskrit: upadhaya) was expected to "arouse in the one who shares his cell [...saddhiviharika] the attitude of a son".³⁵ The Buddha

³⁴See E.W. Burlingame, Buddhist Legends, II, p.200.

³⁵Mahāvagga I 45, pp.58-59.

(Mahāvagga I 45, p.59ff.) describes the method for choosing a preceptor and the obligations that should exist between the preceptor and his pupil. The pupil who shares his preceptor's cell is expected to, among other things, care for the bodily health of his upajjhāya, for his clothes and utensils, and be willing, at his preceptor's request, to be interrogated in matters of discipline and doctrine. In addition, it is the duty of the pupil of the preceptor to inform his preceptor of the latter's infringement of any of the Vinaya rules. Should dissatisfaction (anabhirati) arise in the preceptor, it is the pupil's duty to provide him with a talk on the dhamma. Finally, depending on the infringement, the pupil, for the good of his preceptor, should report him to the Sangha (Mahāvagga I 49, pp.65-66).

In return, the preceptor has certain obligations towards his pupil (Mahāvagga I 50, p.67ff.) which include "recitation, interrogation, exhortation and instruction" in matters of discipline and doctrine. In addition, the preceptor is to look after his pupil in the event of his pupil becoming ill and, if necessary, to help him procure a robe and bowl.

The establishment of a preceptor system as an institution of the Sangha is closely paralleled by changes that took place in the ordination procedure. In particular, there developed a division in what was once a single approach to the "going forth" and ordination (upasampadā). The

candidate was required to undergo a period of training after his "going forth" (preliminary admission) and could only be ordained (upasampadā, i.e. final admission) with the permission of the Sangha. The ordination was performed as the result of a "formal act (Kamma) [put before the Sangha] consisting of a motion and a resolution put three times...".³⁶ This meant that an "experienced competent monk" would proclaim before the Sangha:

This (person) so and so wishes for ordination from the venerable so and so. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may ordain₃₇ so and so, through the preceptor so and so.

It should be noted that the pupil's (i.e. novice: sāmaṇera) training under a preceptor does not end with the upasampadā but continues until the bhikkhu is considered qualified in matters of doctrine and discipline. Regarding the length of tutorship under an upajjhāya, the Mahāvagga (I 60, p.79) states that the period should persist for ten years. However, elsewhere in the Mahāvagga (I 80, p.101) the Buddha maintains that "an experienced competent monk" can live in dependence (i.e. on an upajjhāya and/or ācariya) for only five years, but an "inexperienced" (avvatta) bhikkhu all his life.

In addition to the upajjhāya, the student was often provided with an ācariya (teacher). The position of the

³⁶ I.B. Horner, BD IV, p.x.

³⁷ Mahāvagga I 57, p.73.

ācariya developed out of occasions when a preceptor would:

a) leave the Sangha to return to ordinary life; b) decide to join a schismatic faction; c) travel; or d) die.³⁸

The intention behind the ācariya provision was to ensure the Sangha that the novice would be under guidance at all times (Mahāvagga I 60, p.78ff.).

An attempt to ascertain a date for the appearance of the upajjhāya is extremely difficult, if indeed possible. Most scholars seem to take the appearance of the upajjhāya for granted.³⁹ In her introduction to the Mahāvagga, I.B. Horner points out:

The first twenty-four chapters of the First Section [i.e. Mahāvagga I], the Mahākhandhaka, of the Mahāvagga appear to give a chronological account of the events from the night of Awakening under the Bo-tree ... to the admission and ordination of Sāriputta and Moggallāna ... From this point on, a precise historical narration is not so apparent, for the Mahāvagga now begins to group together subject-matter that belongs together. Strict chronology is suspended, no doubt in the interests of classifying this subject-matter and reducing its complexity to some kind of manageable order, the better to be fixed in the memory.⁴⁰

The need for the institutionalization of the upajjhāya is directly connected to a number of factors: growth in the number of the Buddha's following; movement towards monasticism in place of peripateticism; and a

³⁸ Mahāvagga I 59, pp. 78-79.

³⁹ e.g. E. Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme indien, p.61 and A.K. Warder, Indian Buddhism, p.56.

⁴⁰ BD 4, p.xiii.

growing interaction with society.⁴¹ The Pāli texts suggest that, prior to the period of growth in the Buddha's following, the Buddha and his chief disciples were the sole supervisory force over new additions to the bhikkhu-hood.⁴² In addition, as the early chapters of the Mahāvagga suggest, the primary concern of the Buddha at the beginning of his ministry was with the Dhamma. Thus, the Buddha upon attaining enlightenment states (Mahāvagga I 4, p.6), "This dhamma, won to by me, is deep, difficult to see, difficult to understand...". Furthermore, the early conversions to the Buddha's Way do not distinguish the discipline (vinaya) as distinct from dhamma.⁴³

⁴¹By the term "institutionalization", we mean the disciplinary system described in the Mahāvagga, a system which utilizes the upajjhāya and is to be regarded as the standard approach to be taken towards all new Buddhist converts. We do not question the fact that "institutionalization" did eventually take place; the question is, when did it acquire the characteristics described in the Mahāvagga?

⁴²The general impression gained from reading the Pāli Suttas is that the Buddha favoured self-discipline, with the odd assistance of a senior bhikkhu. Since many of the Buddha's converts had been members of other religious sects, they brought with them some understanding of disciplinary procedure so that it would be easy, in a small group, for the Buddha and his major disciples to assist new converts (see for example Cullavagga VII 199, p.279). It is also likely that, at first, Buddhist discipline did not distinguish itself radically from the disciplinary procedures already available. In addition, as we state below in the body of our study, the Buddha's first concerns were with Dhamma, not Vinaya.

⁴³See the descriptions of the first conversion made by the Buddha as recorded in the beginning of the first chapter of the Mahāvagga, e.g. the case of Ānāta Koṇḍañña (Mahāvagga I 12, p.18). See also the remarks of Herman Oldenberg, The Vinaya Piṭakam, Vol.1, p.xv.

A likely event for the establishing of a preceptor system would be the conversion of the Kassapa brothers and their one thousand jaṭila followers.⁴⁴ Prior to this massive influx of new converts, the Buddha's following, according to the Mahāvagga (I 20, p.28), numbered only sixty-one. The fact that as large a number as one thousand is used to describe the Kassapas' conversion may speak to later embellishment.⁴⁵ However, the fact that the discussion of the preceptor (upajjhāya) and teacher (ācariya) follows soon after the conversion of the jaṭilas suggests that the authors and/or compilers of the Vinaya likely wanted to relate the two events.

As in the case of the sixty earlier followers (Mahāvagga I 20, p.28), the one thousand jaṭilas (Mahāvagga I 34, p.46) quickly achieved arahanthood. The Vinaya seems to need no justification for the 'fact' that, after the above conversions, there suddenly develops, at least in the Vinaya text, a more gradual and disciplined approach to achieving the 'goal'. This may be explained by the fact that events which preceded the jaṭilas' conversion reflect a well-established tradition by the time of the compilation of the Vinaya. However, the events which follow the early conversions

⁴⁴Mahāvagga I 27, p.36ff.

⁴⁵Ajay Mitra Shastri, An Outline of Early Buddhism, pp. 10-11.

do not, as I.B. Horner suggests (see our p. 44), pay attention to dating the material, but rather represent a systematization of the discipline in a final form, one which must have taken some time to develop. The systematization in its intention avoids revealing to us the causes and detailed history of certain disciplinary changes which must have taken time to develop. This explains why the account of the upajjhāya's development and the changes in the ordination procedure in the Vinaya's account retain a certain opaqueness.

Though it may seem credible that the preceptor system had sufficient reason to develop in the period of the Buddha's active ministry, it is unusual to find that the only major bhikkhus credited with having preceptors who were named are Ānanda and Upāli.⁴⁶ None of the other bhikkhus, supposedly ordained with Ānanda and Upāli, are credited with having preceptors. How does one explain this fact?

There are a number of possible explanations for the lack of information regarding the naming of preceptors for other bhikkhus. It is possible that, because preceptorship became a common element of the discipline, there was no need to burden the Pāli Canon with the name of every bhikkhu's

⁴⁶This information has been gained from an examination of Malalasekera's DPPN.

preceptor. In addition, since the period during which a bhikkhu remains under his preceptor is best regarded as his 'apprenticeship', there was no need to describe it. Though the above 'reasons' carry a certain plausibility, they do not do justice to what we find in the Pāli Canon. For example, the Pāli Canon and its Aṭṭhakathās (i.e. Commentaries) often sees fit, especially in regard to its major disciples, to provide the events and circumstances surrounding their conversion into the Buddha's following as well as describe the eventual level of success achieved by that individual in the Buddha's Sāsana. In addition, scattered throughout the Pāli Canon and its Commentaries is preserved, especially as regards the major disciples, information on which of the Buddha's bhikkhus, in particular, assisted in leading other bhikkhus towards the goal. The tenor of the Vinaya, specially the Mahākhandhaka of the Mahāvagga, would have us believe that all the bhikkhus, except the group preceding the jaṭilas' conversions, went through a standard disciplinary scheme under a preceptor. This disciplinary scheme does not seem to be visible in the Suttas of the Pāli Canon, at least not in the organized fashion suggested in the Mahākhandhaka of the Mahāvagga. One approach to the preceptor problem is to examine the development which took place in the "going forth" and ordination procedures.

We know, as the Mahāvagga records, that there were

a number of changes made in the ordination procedure. In particular, it is with the third stage of development in the ordination procedure that the upajjhāya becomes important:

... the third phase now arose: that of the Order ordaining a candidate, presented by his preceptor, by means of a formal act (kamma) consisting of a motion and a resolution proclaimed three times... This means that it is now the Order alone which has authority, the power and the legal right to ordain. In addition, the candidate for ordination now has to have a preceptor, agreed upon by the Order, who must present him to the Order - that is to the one dwelling within the boundary where he wants to take up his residence - and who must have prepared him beforehand so that, without feeling ashamed or confused, he will be able to answer a number of routine questions that will be put to him in the midst of the Order. No doubt of gradual growth, these routine questions formed a kind of examination...⁴⁷

It should be noted, as I.B. Horner's summary above implies, that the preceptor, as the Mahāvagga records, was present before the "third phase" developed in the ordination procedure. However, if this was truly the case, the role of the preceptor prior to the "third phase" had, as the Mahāvagga itself records, only limited success.⁴⁸ It was with the "third phase" that the preceptor's power would reach fulfilment because in this phase ordination (upasampadā) was connected with having a preceptor and having one who was approved by the Sangha.

G.S.P. Misra maintains that the "third phase" of the

⁴⁷ I.B. Horner, BD IV, p.x.

⁴⁸ Mahāvagga I 56, p.72.

ordination procedure was not used during the Buddha's lifetime.⁴⁹ I.B. Horner disagrees, although she expresses concern about the fact that the second stage of the development of the ordination procedure (i.e. the "three goings for refuge") disappeared surprisingly quickly.⁵⁰ Regarding the question as to whether or not the "third phase" in the ordination procedure developed during the Buddha's lifetime, it is interesting to note the description of Subhadda's ordination.

Subhadda was the last person to be admitted into the Sangha before the Buddha's parinibbāna (see D II 152-153, pp. 168-169). According to Buddhaghosa, Subhadda was taken by Ānanda who:

... poured water over his head from a water vessel, made him repeat the formula of meditation on the impermanency of the body ... shaved off his hair and beard, clad him in yellow robes, made him repeat the 'Three Refuges', and led him back to the Exalted One. The Exalted One himself admitted him then into the higher rank [i.e. upasampadā] of the brotherhood, and pointed out to him a subject for meditation ... [and not long after, Subhadda achieved] arhantship.⁵¹

Mr. and Mrs. Rhys Davids comment on the description

⁴⁹G.S.P. Misra, The Age of Vinaya, p.113.

⁵⁰The reference to I.B. Horner's disagreement is to be found in G.S.P. Misra's The Age of Vinaya, p.115, fn.2. The footnote alludes to some correspondence between Horner and Misra over the 'date' of the "third phase" of the ordination procedure as Misra presents it in his book (i.e. the "third phase" is post-Buddha). Unfortunately, we are not provided with the details of Horner's views which have, in any case, not caused Misra to change his position.

⁵¹See DB II, pp.170-171, fn.2.

of Subhadda's ordination as follows, "According to this [account], no set ceremony for ordination (Sanghakammam), as laid down in the Vinaya, took place; and it is otherwise probable that no such ceremony was usual in the earliest days of Buddhism."⁵² Thus, the Rhys Davids confirm Misra's conclusion that the "third phase" of the ordination procedure, ordination through the sanghakamma, does not belong to the Buddha's lifetime.

Are we to assume that the conclusion of the Rhys Davids and Misra are conclusive and constitute proof for the 'lateness' (i.e. post-parinibbāna) of the "third phase"? One might conclude that the Sangha was not involved in Subhadda's ordination because the Buddha was himself present. However, if this was the case, why was not Subhadda provided with a preceptor after his ordination? In fact, Subhadda supposedly attained arahantship shortly after his ordination and before the Buddha's death (D II 154, p.169). In addition, if the commentarial account(s) used by Buddhaghosa in compiling his Commentary on the Dīgha passage contradicts the Mahāvagga position that the "third phase" existed in the Buddha's time, why does Buddhaghosa not say anything about that 'contradiction'? Another objection to seeing the ordination of Subhadda as pre-"third phase" is the 'fact' that in the description of Subhadda's "going forth" (D II 153, p.168) mention is made of the four month probationary

⁵²DB II, p.171, fn.2.

period.

I.B. Horner says of the probationary four month period, "... when pabbajjā ["going forth"] was functionally separated from upasampadā [ordination proper], it received a new and specialized significance, coming to mean admission to noviciateship. One becomes a novice, samaṇera, by the conferment of pabbajjā, a newly ordained monk, nava, by the conferment of upasampadā".⁵³ In addition, Horner points out that the "three refuge" formula (i.e. homage to the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha) was still utilized in the "third phase", but only for pabbajjā (see Mahāvagga I 82, p.103). In fact this is exactly what happens in Buddhaghosa's description of Subhadda's "going forth": Ānanda performs the pabbajjā using the "three refuge" formula before leading Subhadda into the presence of the Buddha, who will perform the upasampadā. The fact that no mention is made of the Sangha's participation (sanghakamma) in Subhadda's ordination is significant, but may be explained by the fact of the Buddha's presence. There would be no need for the Sangha to judge Subhadda's qualifications because the Buddha represents the judge par excellence.

In spite of what has just been stated above, problems still exist. Regarding the separation of pabbajjā from the upasampadā, this may have happened during the Buddha's lifetime, but the separation does not imply that, at the same

⁵³BD IV, p.xi.

time, a preceptor system of universal applicability, such as the Mahāvagga describes, was concomitant with the 'division', nor, for that matter, followed soon after the Buddha's death. Nor can we assume that the separation of pabbajjā from upasampadā necessarily implies that the "third phase" of ordination came into being. It is noteworthy that though the four month probationary period is mentioned in the Dīgha Nikaya's account of Subhadda's "going forth" (D II 153, p.168), Subhadda is excused from having to go through it on the basis that the Buddha recognizes the difference in the qualifications of individuals (D II 152, p.168). We are not told of specific details behind the waiving of the probationary period for Subhadda, but his quick attainment of arahanthood may be seen as its justification.

If the "third phase" of the ordination procedure was in operation during the period of the Buddha's active ministry, why was it not, as the above examples suggest, universally applied? Are we to assume that the Buddha's remarks regarding the "distinction there may be between individuals" (e.g. D I 176-177, p.240)⁵⁴ represents an

⁵⁴This "distinction ... between individuals" operates beyond the usual waiving of the probationary period for members of the Sākyans and Jāṭilas. In this case, the individual concerned is Acela Kassapa who, like Subhadda, quickly attained arahanthood upon being ordained. Malalasekera (DPPN I, p.26, "1.Accela-Kassapa") concludes incorrectly that Acela Kassapa actually went through the four month probationary period. See D I 176-177, p.240 and Sumaṅgala Vilāsinī (DA I 363).

attempt to endow the Buddha with special powers?⁵⁵ Or are we to assume that, in instances where the Buddha himself performs the ordination, we are dealing with a situation where there is not a sufficient number of bhikkhus present to utilize the sanghakamma approach?⁵⁶ If this second question is answered in the affirmative, then what does this say about the size of the Buddha's following?

Returning to the subject at hand, the question of Ānanda's training under an upajjhāya, it is instructive to note that his "going forth" (Cullavagga VII 183, p.257) makes no mention of any preceptor being provided. In fact, the Cullavagga account only mentions the request to "go forth" (pabbajjā) without separately mentioning ordination (upasampadā). This approach is surprising because it is usual for individuals wishing to join the Buddha's following to ask for both the "going forth" and ordination, even though the

⁵⁵To the best of our knowledge, no individual other than the Buddha waives the probationary period for new candidates to the Buddha's following.

⁵⁶For a discussion of the number of bhikkhus required to constitute sanghakamma sufficient to carry out the "third phase" ordination procedure, see Mahāvagga IX 319, p.457ff. The discussion there speaks of a fourfold, fivefold, tenfold, twentyfold and more than twentyfold Sangha. However, according to the account, the ordination can only be effected by at least a tenfold Sangha. Ordination may be carried out by a fivefold Sangha if it is not in the middle districts (majjhimesu janapadesu). Regarding this exception, see Mahāvagga V 197, p.265ff. The relatively small numbers of bhikkhus mentioned above as constituting a Sangha leads one to wonder about the success of the Buddha's sāsana in his lifetime and the likelihood of a monastic system such as we find in the extant Vinaya existing during the Buddha's active ministry.

two may have been treated separately in the "third phase" development of the ordination procedure. The Mahāvastu's account of Upāli and the Sākyans' entry into the Buddha's following uses the 'standard' request form, "Let the Lord admit me to the religious life [i.e. pabbajjā]. Let the Sugata ordain me [i.e. upasampadā]" (Mahāvastu III 181-182, pp.176-177). The fact that the Cullavagga account (i.e. Cullavagga VII 182-183, pp. 256-257) goes on to list the attainments of the individuals just having "gone forth", in which it is said, among other things, that the Venerable Bhaddiya within a year attained arahanthood, makes us suspicious about assuming the preceptor system to be in operation at that time. After all, the Buddha maintained that a bhikkhu (newly ordained) should live for five years in dependence (Mahāvagga I 80, p.101). On the other hand, since the Buddha seems to have allowed for exceptional cases (see the Mahāvagga passage indicated above) it is possible to see Bhaddiya as a 'special case'. However, the whole tone of the Cullavagga account suggests (as does its counterpart in the Mahāvastu where the case is clear) that ordination was given at the same time as pabbajjā.⁵⁷

If Ānanda did have to go through pabbajjā, he did not, necessarily, have to go through the four month probationary period (i.e. assuming it was operating at the time of Ānanda's

⁵⁷Both Malalasekera (DPPN I, p.250) and Witanachchi (EB I, Fascicle 4, p.529) consider the Cullavagga account of Ānanda's "going forth" to be his ordination.

"going forth") because the Buddha maintained that the Sākyans were to be excused from this probationary period (see Mahāvagga I 71, p.89).⁵⁸ Thus, if the 'Sākyan-excuse' was operative in Ānanda's time, it was likely that he would have received ordination soon after "going forth". In fact we have no information available in the Pāli Canon which would lead us to assume that Ānanda was not ordained soon after, if not at the same time as, his "going forth". In spite of the provision excusing the Sākyans from the probationary period, this requirement would have applied in Upāli's case because Upāli was neither a Sākyan nor a jaṭila (the other excused group). One might be tempted to assume that Upāli was recognized by the Buddha, perhaps as a result of his previous births, as already suited for ordination. However, the whole treatment of Upāli's "going forth", his position as Ānanda's and the other Sākyans' attendant and barber, belies such an interpretation, at least in the Cullavagga's presentation of the case.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Some scholars have maintained that the epithet "Sākyans" used to describe the Buddha's kinsmen belongs to a post-Buddha's lifetime period. See A.M. Shastri, An Outline of Early Buddhism, p.5. It may also be the case that the jaṭilas, who are, in addition to being the Buddha's kinsmen, excused from the four month probationary period, gained their power at the close of the Buddha's active ministry. See G.S.P. Misra, The Age of Vinaya, p.51. It should be noted that Misra, p.52 (top), has confused Mahākassapa with Urvela Kassapa.

⁵⁹ In the case of the Mahāvastu's treatment of Upāli, the text suggests quite clearly that Upāli had attained perfection in former rebirths (see Mahāvastu III 182, p.177). However, a Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya account (W.W. Rockhill, The Life of Buddha, pp.55-56) should also be noted.

It is the Cullavagga's 'intention' to have us believe that Ānanda, the other Sākyans, and Upāli entered the Buddha's following at an 'early' date.⁶⁰ What about Ānanda's and Upāli's preceptors? What information is provided about them in the Pāli Canon?

In the case of Belaṭṭhasīsa, Ānanda's upajjhāya, the Pāli Canon has nothing whatsoever to say about any relationship that might have existed between the two of them except to state that Belaṭṭhasīsa was Ānanda's preceptor.⁶¹ While Dhammapāla in his commentary on the Theragāthā mentions that Belaṭṭhasīsa was Ānanda's preceptor, Belaṭṭhasīsa's single verse in the Theragāthā(verse 16) makes no mention of him having been Ānanda's upajjhāya.⁶²

⁶⁰ While Ānanda is not ordained with Upāli and the Sākyans in the Mahāvastu account, the Mahāvastu (III 181-182, pp. 176-177) wants us to believe that the ordinations of Upāli and the Sākyans were 'early'. In fact, the Mahāvastu makes use of the very first type of ordination used by the Buddha, "ehi bhikkhu [Come bhikkhu]".

⁶¹ See the pertinent references to Belaṭṭhasīsa in DPPN II, pp. 312-313.

⁶² See Mrs. Rhys Davids, PEB II, p.21. Dhammapāla is believed to have flourished in a period later than that of Buddhaghosa. Dhammapāla's reference to Belaṭṭhasīsa being Ānanda's upajjhāya may mean nothing more than that he based his remarks on what he read in the Vinaya Piṭaka. See A. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p.9. Also see K.R. Norman, The Elders' Verses, I, pp.xxix - xxxi.

In the case of Kappitaka, Upāli's upajjhāya, we do have an instance where Upāli goes to his preceptor's aid. However, the details about the relationship between Upāli and Kappitaka (as his upajjhāya) are absent.⁶³ In the case of Kappitaka, the Theragāthā is suspiciously silent.⁶⁴

The Mahāvagga (I 92, p.119) contains a reference to Mahākassapa being Ānanda's "teacher" (garu). I.B. Horner suggests that "garu" may possibly be equated with ācariya⁶⁵ and would thus indicate that Ānanda had both an upajjhāya and an ācariya. The incident which brings Mahākassapa as Ānanda's garu to our attention (Mahāvagga I 92, p.119) contains Mahākassapa's request that Ānanda "proclaim" (anussāveti) before the Sangha the desire of a "certain" (i.e. the text does not name him) individual to receive the upasampadā from Mahākassapa. Ānanda replies to Mahākassapa's request, "I am not able to pronounce the elder's name (for) the elder is my teacher [garu]". The Buddha is told of the difficulty and he formulates the rule allowing a bhikkhu to "proclaim" by using the clan name (gotta).

⁶³ See DPPN I, p.524.

⁶⁴ It is interesting to note that both Belatṭhasīsa and Kappitaka were originally members of the jaṭilas (see their entries in DPPN). If Misra is correct (see fn.59 above) in his assessment of the 'lateness' of the jaṭilas as a power with the Buddha's following, perhaps the preceptorships of Ānanda and Upāli are also later interpolations.

⁶⁵ BD Part 4, p.119, fn.1.

I.B. Horner's claim and translation of the term "garu" as implying "teacher" does not seem to be the intention of the passage. Nor, for that matter, does "garu" have as its primary meaning "teacher" (see PTSD p.246 "garu"). In this regard, it is worth noting Oldenberg's translation of the above sentence (Vinaya Text i 74, I, p.228), "The Venerable Ānanda said, 'I cannot pronounce the Thera's (i.e. Mahākassapa's) name; the Thera is too venerable compared with me.'" We might add that if Mahākassapa was Ānanda's teacher (garu) we cannot assume, without further evidence, that he was Ānanda's ācariya in the sense of the alternative to the upajjhāya. We believe that Oldenberg's translation is true to the pāli and that the sentence in question suggests that, because Mahākassapa is his senior, it is not right for Ānanda to use his personal name.

Another interesting example of Ānanda's involvement in the preceptor system (Mahāvagga I 79, p.100ff.) has Ānanda partly responsible for effecting changes in an already existing preceptor system. Ānanda, in this event, seems to be the attendant of the Buddha, for the Buddha sends information to the bhikkhus through the intermediary of Ānanda and, when problems arise, it is to Ānanda that the Buddha turns. The Buddha informs Ānanda that he is about to set out on tour to Dakkhiṇāgiri and asks Ānanda to inform the bhikkhus of his intention so that those wishing to accompany him may do so. The proposal supposedly results in some

confusion because for the bhikkhus to go with the Buddha (the text supposes that these bhikkhus are training under upajjhāyas and ācariyas) their preceptors and teachers would have to accompany them. If the teachers and preceptors would not go with the bhikkhus, then the only way for the bhikkhus to go with the Buddha would be for them to choose new preceptors and teachers upon reaching Dakkhiṇāgiri. Further, if the Buddha's stay there is short, then they, upon returning, would again have to choose new preceptors and teachers. Because of this problem, the Buddha goes off to Dakkhiṇāgiri with only a very small number of bhikkhus. When the Buddha returns, he asks Ānanda why he was so poorly accompanied and Ānanda provides him with the explanation given above. As a result of receiving this information, the Buddha formulates the general rule (Mahāvagga I 80, p.101) that, "an experienced competent monk... [should] live five years in dependence (but) an inexperienced one all his life."⁶⁶ The episode described above raises a number of important questions

⁶⁶At the same time, the Buddha spoke of "five qualities" which would allow a bhikkhu to live independently. The "five qualities" are described as belonging to the "adept" (asekha). Are we to equate the "adept" (asekha) with the arahant, as is often the case (see PTSD, p.89)? If "preceptors" were 'ideally' arahants, what does this say about those preceptors who left the Buddha's following for other groups, etc. (see Mahāvagga I 62, p.81)? See the sources listed by I.B. Horner, BD Part 4, p.81, fn.5.

regarding the position of the upajjhāya and ācariya as well as Ānanda's connection with the Buddha.

Why was not the Buddha himself able to perform the function of upajjhāya and ācariya for the bhikkhus who would accompany him? Why was the Buddha not aware of the difficulties he was placing the bhikkhus in in requesting those who wished to accompany him? If Ānanda was already acting as the Buddha's attendant at that time, what does this say about Ānanda's training under an upajjhāya? It is unfortunate that chronological information, as we have already indicated, is so largely absent from this section of the Mahāvagga. It is interesting, too, to note the suggested reason for the Buddha's tour to Dakkhināgiri:

Now at that time the Lord spent the rains just there in Rājagaha, the cold weather there, the hot weather there. People ... spread it about, saying: 'The district is crowded up, confused with recluses, sons of the Sākyans; because of them the district is not to be seen.' (Mahāvagga I 79, p.100)

The fact that the above passage maintains that the Buddha remained at Rājagaha for most of the year, coupled with the fact that people complained about his inertia, would suggest that we are dealing with the period in Buddhism's history when peripateticism was giving way to a more stationary way of life. S. Dutt says:

This process of transition from wandering to settled life was a slow and gradual one, but undoubtedly accomplished early in Saṅgha history - perhaps as early as the fourth century. Its consequences were twofold--first, the Saṅgha

became an organization independent of the wanderers' community: the Buddhist Bhikkhus were by themselves as well as by others distinguished from 'wanderers'; secondly, it marked the beginning of cenobium among them. In the Vinayapitaka, the Bhikkhu-saṅgha appears not as a body of wanderers, but as a settled cenobitical society.⁶⁷

However, in spite of our observations and Dutt's comments, it would be foolish to formulate a time for the Dakkhiṇāgiri episode. Are we to assume that the Dakkhiṇāgiri episode's introduction contradicts the monastic subject matter of upajjhāyas and ācariyas which relies for its utility on settled habitation?

The Dakkhiṇāgiri episode is itself a testimony to the fact that the application of a system of upajjhāyas and ācariyas does not lend itself to a body of wandering bhikkhus but to a settled, established community. The Buddha's attempt to solve the problem by shortening, at least for the 'qualified' bhikkhu, the period of training under an upajjhāya and/or an ācariya does not seem to be the desired solution for a body of bhikkhus who will still continue to wander. The authors and/or compilers were, perhaps, through the aid of the introductory section to the Dakkhiṇāgiri episode, suggesting that a permanent monastic community (i.e. a settled community) would become immune from the problems it goes on to describe.

⁶⁷S. Dutt, Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India, p. 57. N.B. The italics are ours. The fact that Dutt dates the beginning of the "settled life" for bhikkhus as beginning in the fourth century suggests that it developed entirely after the lifetime of the Buddha, who died in the fifth century (approximately 483 B.C.).

The attempt to introduce the system of preceptorship as an early event in the Buddha's sāsana, as it is described in the Mahāvagga, does not, as Dutt's remarks suggest (see our study, pp. 61-62), seem feasible. In addition, the description of the last days of the Buddha's ministry, as recorded in the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, would indicate that the Buddha and his following were still wandering. Also noteworthy is the striking absence, or limited use, of the term "upajjhāya" in the Pāli Suttas (see PTSD, p.141) where the general impression of the Buddha's following is that of a wandering body of individuals whose instruction was in the hands of the Buddha and some of his major disciples. The evidence indicates that the systematic use of upajjhāyas and ācariyas as an established ingredient of monastic living belongs to developments which follow largely after the Buddha's parinibbāna.

Finally we may ask, if Ānanda and Upāli did not in their lifetimes actually have upajjhāyas, why should the Vinaya claim that they did? The obvious reason is that by the time of the final compilation of the Pāli Canon the preceptor system had become, as it is today, a standard ingredient of monastic life.⁶⁸ The Theravādins, like other Buddhist schools, link the Vinaya to the very words of the Buddha as they were repeated (orally) at the so-called First Council. Therefore, it was necessary to maintain at the

⁶⁸ See Bhikshu Sangharakshita, The Three Jewels, p. 206ff.

First Council, or at least in the written record of that Council, that the preceptor system was already in operation. What better way to do this than to record that Ānanda and Upāli had preceptors? This need is supported by the nature of the Buddhist sources themselves which, as we have explained, emphasize systematization over chronological treatment.⁶⁹

There is no doubting the fact that the position of the upajjhāya becomes increasingly important in the history of Pāli Buddhism. Oldenberg draws attention to the fact that, "the succession of Vinaya teachers from Upāli down to Mahinda, which is given in the Dīpavamsa (Bhānavāras IV & V), is a succession of upajjhāyas."⁷⁰ We also know that Ānanda was later to be regarded as an upajjhāya to Sabbakāmin who occupies a place in the Second Council.⁷¹

Returning to the Pācittiya section of the Suttavibhaṅga we find (BD II [IV 77-78]pp.318-319) Ānanda accompanying the Buddha as the Buddha's attendant (pacchāsamaṇa) to a household where the Buddha has been offered a meal. The fact of

⁶⁹See p.44 of our study. Also, A.K. Warder, Indian Buddhism, p.59.

⁷⁰H. Oldenberg, Vinaya Texts, Part I, p.179, fn.2.

⁷¹See Charles S. Prebish, "A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils", JAS XXXIII, Feb., 1974, p.246. and Cullavagga XII 303, p.421.

Ānanda's presence results in the householder's request that Ānanda should also be fed along with the Buddha. However, Ānanda is forced to decline eating at that time because he has already accepted a meal from another lay supporter. In spite of the aforementioned fact, the Buddha tells Ānanda to eat with him, and assigns Ānanda's 'expected meal' to some other bhikkhu (not present at that time). As a result of the above incident, the Buddha formulates a rule allowing bhikkhus to eat "an out-of-turn meal" (i.e. a meal not expected) if they assign their 'expected meal' to another bhikkhu.

In another incident involving food (BD II [IV 91] p.347), Ānanda is asked by the Buddha to distribute the 'leftovers' (vighāsāda) among the other (non-Buddhist) wanderers. In distributing the food Ānanda, through error, gives one of the female wanderers two cakes instead of one. As a result of that error, some of the female wanderers accuse the recipient of the two cakes of having intimate relations with Ānanda. The issue does not go before the Buddha for his evaluation though, in the section following the above (BD II [IV 92] p.348), the Buddha regards the giving of food to a Naked Ascetic wanderer, male or female, an offence of expiation. The involvement of Ānanda in the above issue seems, at first sight, to be quite innocent. However, when we recall that the Pāli Canon regards Ānanda as responsible for gaining the admission of women into the

Sangha, the above incident takes on a different significance. The quarrelling among the female wanderers (who are non-Buddhist) may reflect a Buddhist view of the nature of women as unsuited to the 'religious' life. In addition, Ānanda's simple error in distributing the extra food is really more than a simple error, for it carries the implication that he is careless.

Ānanda's misfortunes with women are repeated elsewhere in the Pācittiya (BD III [IV 158-159] pp.72-73) when, for example, Ānanda is assigned by the Buddha to teach dhamma to Queen Mallikā (wife of King Pasenadi of Kosala). Ānanda enters the Queen's apartments unannounced and catches her in the nude. As a result of this 'error', the Buddha chastises Ānanda for his carelessness and proceeds to expound the ten dangers of entering a king's women's quarters. It is interesting to note in the prologue to Ānanda's 'error' that it is the Buddha who teaches dhamma to King Pasenadi although it is Ānanda who teaches, or is supposed to teach, dhamma to Pasenadi's queen.

This brings to a close the discussion of the place of Ānanda in the Suttavibhaṅga; however, before moving on to the Mahāvagga, it might prove useful to provide, in addition to what has already been stated, the view taken of Upāli in the Suttavibhaṅga.

In general, Upāli conforms to the stereotype of the Vinaya-master (Vinayadhara). When a certain bhikkhu of

Bharukaccha considers leaving the Sangha because he dreamed that he had committed a sexual offence, Upāli informs him that there is no offence in dreaming of the sexual act (BD I [III 39] pp.60-61). Upāli's position in the above event marks him as a vinayadhara. The fact that the Buddha makes no appearance in Upāli's evaluation is rare in light of the general methodology of the Vinaya and may indicate a later interpolation.

When a group of bhikkhus are robbed of their robes and taken in their nakedness for Naked Ascetics, it is Upāli who is asked to question the naked Buddhist bhikkhus to make sure they are of the Buddha's following (BD II [III 211-212] p.45). Later in the Suttavibhaṅga, the Buddha (BD III [IV 142] p.40) praises Upāli for his expertise in matters of discipline.

The above, in summary, is the position taken of Upāli in the Suttavibhaṅga and can best be described as stereotypical. Unlike that of Ānanda, Upāli's characterization is devoid of any personality, but merely reflects his qualifications as a vinayadhara.

The Mahāvagga¹

We have already, in previous sections of our study, utilized much of the Mahāvagga's subject matter on Ānanda and we will not repeat ourselves here, except in those instances where a reminder seems warranted.

One of these reminders is connected with the "Key" (uddāna)² or mnemonic device to the first section of the Mahāvagga:

Although the Suttantas and Abhidhamma be forgotten, for all time
the teaching persists while Vinaya is not destroyed (I 98-99, p.127).

Leaving aside the question of the 'date' of the above verse, the verse reflects the 'superior' position given to the Vinaya in the Theravāda (Sthaviravāda) School. The fact that the above verse actually mentions the superiority of the Vinaya over the Suttas and Abhidhamma is significant in the light of Ānanda's connection with the sutta tradition by way of the First Council.

W. Rahula draws our attention to the Samantapāsādikā's record of a remark supposedly made by Mahinda, "When a son

¹Regarding the name and the subject matter of the Mahāvagga, see I.B. Horner, BD IV, pp.xxi-xxii. See also the remarks of E. Frauwallner, The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Sanskrit Literature, p.2.

²See PTSD, p.135, "uddāna."

born in Ceylon (Tambannidīpa) of Ceylonese parents, becomes a monk in Ceylon, studies the Vinaya in Ceylon and recites it in Ceylon, then the roots of the Sāsana are deep set."³

Generally speaking, in contrast to the Suttas, the subject matter of the Vinaya represents that aspect of the Buddha's sāsana which is visible, readily seen, by those individuals outside of the Sangha. Thus it is no surprise to find that many of the rules promulgated and modified in the Vinaya are directly connected to complaints made by those outside of the Buddha's following of bhikkhus. Because of this visibility factor, it is likely that, under certain conditions, the disciplinary aspect of the Buddha's sāsana (as contained in the Vinaya Piṭaka) would be emphasized to a greater extent than the more 'invisible,' 'inner' aspect of the Buddha's teaching. We do not, in our previous statement wish to maintain that a rigid distinction exists between the discipline and the doctrine. It is obvious that 'inner' changes should be recognized in a bhikkhu's outward behaviour.⁴

³W. Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p.54; see also p.56.

⁴It is interesting to note, for example, Mahāvagga I 40-41, p.54, "Then the wanderer Sāriputta approached the wanderer Moggallāna. Then the wanderer Moggallāna saw the wanderer Sāriputta coming in the distance and seeing the wanderer Sāriputta, he spoke thus: 'Friend, your faculties are quite pure, your complexion very bright, very clear. Can it be that you, friend, have attained the deathless?' 'Yes, friend, I have attained the deathless.'"

However, the fact that the Pāli Canon reflects the compartmentalization of the various aspects of the buddhavacana (i.e. Vinaya, Sutta, Abhidhamma) is, in itself, an illustration of the division discussed above. With this distinction between 'outer' and 'inner' in mind, it is interesting to note the remarks of R.C. Mitra, "The increasing manifestation of Hinduistic tendencies in rituals and worship is an unfailing symptom of the weakening of the original impulse of Buddhism ... However much opinions may differ as to the origin and prognosis of the malady, all scholars seem to agree on the fact that Buddhism in India 'suffered from a hopeless inward decay.'"⁵

It is possible to see the treatment of Ānanda in the Pāli Canon partly as a manifestation of the syndrome alluded to above. In this light, Ānanda's treatment reflects a 'turning' away from 'inner' cultivation⁶ to more 'visible' outward manifestations. This 'turn' of approach would be the outcome of, among other things, the death of the Buddha,

⁵R.C. Mitra, The Decline of Buddhism in India, p.155.

⁶Again, we do not intend here to imply a rigid bifurcation between 'inner' and 'outer' (dhamma/vinaya) but merely to emphasize that a great deal of emphasis is placed on the visible, noticeable, shortcomings of Ānanda. One should also remember that a bhikkhu 'sitting in meditation' while suggesting 'inner cultivation' has an important 'external' component noticed by the laity.

the spread of Buddhism, and the growing 'interaction' with other 'religious' traditions and their lay supporters.

The Mahāvagga provides us with information about bhikkhus other than Ānanda who attended upon the Buddha. Thus we are informed (Mahāvagga I 18, p.26) that, at one time or on one occasion, Yasa was the Buddha's attendant (pacchāsamaṇa). One of the interesting aspects of Yasa's attendanceship of the Buddha is that he performed the task as an arahant. This 'fact' is interesting because Ānanda's late arahanthood is sometimes explained in terms of the fact that full-time attendance on the Buddha did not allow Ānanda the necessary time to cultivate himself in the 'higher' aspects of the Buddha's sāsana.⁷ However, a close look at Yasa's attainment of arahanthood reveals that it seems, unlike most cases, to have preceded his actual ordination into the Buddha's following (Mahāvagga I 17-18, pp.25-26).⁸

⁷In this regard it is interesting to read Nāgārjuna's remarks, Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse (Mahāprajñā-pāramitāśāstra), trans. Etienne Lamotte, Tome I, p.22, "3. En outre, par amour pour le service du Bhagavat, Ānanda était son serviteur (upasthāyaka) et il se disait: 'Si je prenais trop tôt l'état qui comporte la destruction des impuretés (āśravaṣaya), je m'éloignerais du Buddha et je ne pourrais plus être son serviteur.' C'est pourquoi Ānanda, qui aurait pu devenir Arhat, avait décidé de ne pas assumer cet état."

⁸The term "arahant" is not used though Yasa is described as having his mind "freed from the cankers without grasping" before being ordained by the Buddha. Sāriputta's case (Mahāvagga I 40, p.54ff.) is also interesting as he is described as having attained the "deathless" (amata) before joining the Buddha's following. Amata has been used to describe nibbāna (see PTSD, p.73) though the fact that elsewhere Sāriputta is described as taking three weeks to achieve arahanthood militates against accepting the amata statement here as signifying arahanthood. See DPPN II, p.1109, fn.5

Yasa's arahanthood and attendanceship on the Buddha indicate that Ānanda's inability to attain arahanthood during the Buddha's lifetime reflects his own inadequacies to fulfill the 'goal' rather than that it is the result of his attendance on the Buddha.

Other individuals are also described as attendants to the Buddha in the Mahāvagga. In one place, the Mahāvagga (V 186, p.247) tells us that the Buddha, after dressing and taking his robe and bowl, entered Rājagaha for alms "with a certain monk as his attendant." We are not provided with any information about this "certain monk" other than that he had sore feet and that the Buddha, with this bhikkhu's welfare in mind, formulated a rule allowing the bhikkhus to wear cast-off sandals with many linings.

Elsewhere in the Mahāvagga (V 179, p.236ff.) we are informed that at one time the Buddha was attended (upaṭṭhāka) by the Venerable Sāgata.⁹ Thus, when a group of "eighty thousand village overseers" wish an audience with the Buddha, they make their request through Sāgata (Mahāvagga V 179-180, pp.236-237). In addition to Sāgata's position, on this occasion, as the Buddha's attendant, his abilities with "psychic powers" (iddhi) are also noted. Thus, with the Buddha's permission, Sāgata uses his "psychic powers" to bring the "eighty thousand village overseers" to a state receptive

⁹Regarding Sāgata, see also BD II [IV 108], p.382ff. Note that the term used here for attendant is upaṭṭhāka; see PTSD, p.141. See also our study, pp.149-150.

to listening to the Buddha's dhamma (Mahāvagga V 180, p.237ff.)¹⁰
 We might note here that, unlike Yasa, Sāgata does not seem to have been an arahant at this time.¹¹ In addition, the abilities of Sāgata to win over an audience with his "psychic powers" is an ability lacked by Ānanda.

The description of Sāgata's conveying of the "eighty thousand overseers" request for an audience with the Buddha runs as follows, "Then the venerable Sāgata, having stepped down from the moonstone (step) [pāṭikā] in front of the eighty thousand watching overseers, having stepped up in front of the Lord, spoke..." (Mahāvagga V 180, p.237). I.B. Horner says of the term "pāṭikā" (BD IV, p.237, fn.3), "pāṭikā, such as is (in the old cities of Ceylon) an architectural feature placed at the bottom of a short flight of steps leading up to a vihara or a 'temple'. See Mhvs. [i.e. Mahāvamsa] 31, 61. Nowadays it is called a 'moonstone step', although in shape it is a half circle." The Mahāvamsa (Ch.31, Verse 61, p.214) says of the pāṭikā, "Nay, but all the jewels in the whole island of Laṅkā are not of so great worth as the stone-slab at the foot of the steps [i.e. pāṭikā]."

¹⁰ See above footnote for another instance of Sāgata's abilities to perform psychic feats.

¹¹ See DPPN II, p.1088. Malalasekera suggests there that Sāgata's arahantship followed after Sāgata had been the Buddha's attendant. The case, as far as we are concerned, is not clear. It is also noteworthy that as Malalasekera states, "It is curious that no verses are ascribed to Sāgata in the Theragāthā" (p.1088). One often wonders about the sparseness of details on the so-called former attendants of the Buddha.

The interesting feature of the term "pāṭikā" is that it seems to be an architectural term peculiar to Sri Lanka.¹² This may indicate that, at the very least, the setting for the Sāgata episode discussed above was written, or an 'original' account further elaborated, with Sri Lanka's monastic architecture in mind. Also of interest is the surprising fact, as Malalasekera himself notes (DPPN I, p.1088), that Sāgata has no verses ascribed to him in the Theragāthā. Does the above information suggest that Sāgata and/or his attendanceship of the Buddha is a later interpolation? Was this 'possible interpolation' designed to provide a background of previous attendants on the Buddha prior to Ānanda occupying the post permanently?

Let us, once again, make a short digression to other areas of the Pāli Canon. The Mahāpadana Sutta (D II 3-8, pp.6-7) describes all the Buddhas, previous to Gotama, as also having had permanent attendants (aggupaṭṭhāka). Regarding Ānanda as the Buddha's 'permanent attendant' the text states, "He [Gotama Buddha] has had one assembly, friend, of disciples, 1250 in number, and in this company all are arahants. He has for attendant, friend, for chief attendant, one named Ānanda" (D II 52, p.40). Thus the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Canon considered the position and need for a permanent attendant as part of the 'biography' of any Buddha. Does the

¹²See Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, "Indian Architectural Terms," JAOS, XLVIII, 1928, pp.267-268 ("Paṭṭa").

fact that Ānanda is mentioned separately from the twelve hundred and fifty member assembly of arahants suggest that he was not an arahant and that permanent attendants should not be arahants? Does the fact that the same wording is used to describe the previous assemblies of former Buddhas and their attendants (D II 3-8, pp.6-7) suggest that, at some point, it was felt that arahanthood was not a prerequisite for a 'permanent attendant'? If one takes the number twelve hundred and fifty seriously, what can one ascertain about Ānanda's relationship to this group?

The number twelve hundred and fifty is the number used in the Mahāvagga (I 247, p.340) to describe the number of arahants in the Buddha's "large Order" (mahatā bhikkhusaṃgha). This number seems to be comprised of the one thousand followers of Urvela Kassapa (including him and his two brothers)¹³ and the two hundred and fifty followers of Sanjaya (which included Sāriputta and MahāMoggallāna) who were all converted by the Buddha.¹⁴ The number thus does not include: the group of five bhikkhus (i.e. Āññāta Koṇḍañña, Vappa, Bhaddiya, Mahānāma and Assaji);¹⁵ Yasa;¹⁶ Vimāla, Sabāhu, Puṇṇaji, Gavampati;¹⁷ and the fifty householder friends of Yasa;¹⁸ all of whom were part of the Buddha's early

¹³ Mahāvagga I 35, p.46.

¹⁴ Mahāvagga I 43, p.56.

¹⁵ Mahāvagga I 14, p.21.

¹⁶ Mahāvagga I 17, p.25.

¹⁷ Mahāvagga I 19, p.27.

¹⁸ Mahāvagga I 20, p.28.

ministry of arahants. The omission of the above in the number twelve hundred and fifty is explained, one supposes, by the Mahāvagga's statement that, at the time when there were sixty arahants (i.e. the above group), the Buddha told them to, "walk ... on tour for the blessings of the many folk, for the happiness of the many folk ... Let not two (of you) go by one (way). Monks teach dhamma" ¹⁹ If our understanding of the number twelve hundred is based on the above explanation, then Ānanda is not part of the twelve hundred and fifty and is rightly mentioned separately. At the same time, his separate mention may possibly indicate that Ānanda, as the Buddha's permanent attendant, was not or did not have to be an arahant (remember the other attendants to previous Buddhas are described in the same words).

One of the obvious questions one should raise regarding the above account is whether the number twelve hundred and fifty is always to be considered constituted of those individuals we have alluded to. The number twelve hundred and fifty is likely 'arbitrary;' for example, at the time of the Buddha's death, only five hundred bhikkhus were present (D II 164, p.186) some of whom (e.g. Mahā Kassapa, Anuruddha and Upāli) were not part of the 'original' twelve hundred and fifty.

¹⁹ Mahāvagga I 21, p.28.

According to the Mahāpadana Sutta (D II 2-7, pp.6-7), the number twelve hundred and fifty refers to the "number of arahants present at assemblies." In doing so, it suggests that other bhikkhus present at an assembly were not necessarily arahants.

Obviously it is foolish to expect that the number twelve hundred and fifty coincides with a modern day view of census-taking. Further, even the names of Sāriputta and Moggallāna appear separately from the remark about the Buddha's assembly of twelve hundred and fifty arahants (D II 52, p.40). Yet, their names appear before the statement regarding the twelve hundred and fifty, while Ānanda's appears after the statement. We have gone to the lengths we have, not to discover some historical fact concerning the size of the Buddha's following, but to try to determine, hagiographically speaking, whether the authors and/or compilers of the Sutta under discussion intended, in the Mahāpadana Sutta, to make the point that a permanent attendant to the Buddha should not and could not be an arahant at the same time.

We do know that men like Nāgārjuna in his Mahāprajñā-pāramitāśāstra considered Ānanda's attendance on the Buddha as a reason for Ānanda's 'late' arahanthood.²⁰ The fact that Nāgārjuna needed to undertake this project suggests that the 'late' arahanthood of Ānanda was a 'traditional' problem for any Buddhist thinkers. If the Buddhist tradition had been clear on the question at hand, they would have said so.

²⁰See fn.7 above.

There seems to be little purpose in requiring the permanent attendant of the Buddha to be a 'sekha' if the 'learner' is to be constantly reminded, as is often true in Ānanda's case, of the fact that he is still not an adept (asekha). Adding confusion to what has already been stated is the fact that it was the Buddha who chose Ānanda as permanent attendant and not vice versa, so that to constantly point out Ānanda's shortcomings regarding arahanthood seems to undermine the fact that the Buddha chose him. Further, as we have indicated, the so-called previous attendants to the Buddha do not fall into the category of either being sekha or asekha. Thus, the case of attendance on the Buddha being the explanation for Ananda's 'late' arahanthood is a case which, though carrying weight, especially in the 'logical' sphere, is difficult to substantiate as a reason in the sources we are discussing.

Returning to the Mahāvagga, we learn (Mahāvagga I 78, pp.97-98) that the Buddha, when disturbed by the noise of a group of boys, turns to Ānanda for an explanation.²¹ Ānanda explains the noise as the result of misinformed bhikkhus having ordained individuals who were less than twenty years of age. The Buddha held that the individual, prior to his twentieth year, was incapable of exerting the

²¹The only places where Ānanda is called the Buddha's permanent attendant" (aggupatthāka) are in the Mahapadana Sutta (e.g. DII 52, p.40) and in the Pāli Commentaries where his position of becoming the Buddha's permanent attendant are described. See e.g. the summary provided by Malalesekera, DPPN I, p.250. See also our study, pp.104-105, fn.32.

self control required in the disciplinary life of the bhikkhu.²²

When the adult members of the family supporting Ānanda die (Mahāvagga I 79, p.99), Ānanda attempts to find some way to ensure that the two young boys left behind at the time of their parents' death will be taken care of. Ānanda's solution is to have the two boys "go forth" into the Buddha's following. However, as we have indicated above, the Buddha did not want to allow those individuals who were less than twenty years of age into his following. Ānanda approaches the Buddha with the problem and the Buddha establishes a rule allowing a youth less than fifteen years of age and who is a "scarer of crows" to "go forth." The Commentators have explained the above exception to the general rule as an expediency for controlling the nuisance of crows while the bhikkhus are eating. In addition, as justification for the Buddha's original judgment, the Commentators suggest that the act of scaring crows entails some measure of self control on the part of young men.²³ Again we should point out the double aspect of Ānanda's participation in changing an established rule. At one

²² Mahāvagga I 78, p.98: "Monks, an individual under twenty years of age is not able to endure cold, heat, hunger, thirst, the sting of gadflies or mosquitoes, wind and sun, creeping things, abusive, hurtful language; he is not the kind (of person) who endures bodily feelings which, arising, are painful, acute, sharp, shooting, disagreeable, miserable, deadly."

²³ See I.B. Horner's remarks, BD IV, p.99, fn.3.

level, Ānanda's compassion for the two young boys of his former supporter is to be lauded; however, at another level, it shows Ānanda involved with the ways and feelings of the 'worldly.'

When Soṇa Kotīkaṇṇa (Mahāvagga V 196, p.264) after acquiring his preceptor's (i.e. Mahākaccāna) permission, and to fulfil his preceptor's request, visits the Buddha, the Buddha tells Ānanda to prepare a lodging for him. Ānanda, seemingly 'reading' the Buddha's thoughts, knows that the Buddha wishes to have Soṇa in his own (i.e. the Buddha's) dwelling (vihara).²⁴

One of the problems presented by the Soṇa episode is that Ānanda knew that the Buddha wanted Soṇa to share the same vihara with him. Because no technical term for 'thought-reading' (often considered one of the fruits of meditation) is used, it is difficult to tell whether the text wishes to imply that Ānanda had the power to read the Buddha's thoughts. Since it does not seem likely that anyone should be able to read the Buddha's thoughts without his permission, perhaps it is the Buddha who makes his wish known to Ānanda. Regarding this question, it is

²⁴The Udāna (58, p.68ff.) also provides us with the Soṇa episode, though it makes no mention of Mahākaccāna being the upajjhāya of Soṇa. This is not to say that Soṇa was not his disciple, but that the term "upajjhāya" is not used to describe their relationship. As we have indicated, there is some problem in believing the upajjhāya system to be part of 'early' Buddhism (see pp. 40-60 of our study).

interesting to draw attention to some Sanskrit accounts of the Soṇa episode which actually have the Buddha tell Ānanda to prepare Soṇa's lodging in the Buddha's vihara. Other accounts of the Soṇa visit support the Mahāvagga's rendering.²⁵

Ānanda's participation in the Soṇa-Buddha meeting testifies to the seriousness and legitimacy of the concessions made by the Buddha to the missionary activities of Mahākaccāna in the region of Āvanti. There are good grounds to believe that the Soṇa-Buddha meeting is an early event in the Buddha's ministry.²⁶ We know that by the time of the Council of Vesālī, Āvanti was regarded as an important center of the orthodox school and a source for the Council's participants.²⁷ It is possible that Ānanda's ability to know the Buddha's wishes regarding Soṇa's lodging is meant to mark out the importance of missionary activities in Āvanti. The fact that Ānanda's name is connected with the incident (where he seems to be functioning as the Buddha's attendant) helps to

²⁵In the Divyāvadāna (ed. Cowell & Neil, p.20) we read, "gacchānanda tathāgatasya Sronasya ca Koṭikaranasyaika-vihare mancam prajñapaya." Here we have the Buddha actually telling Ananda to place Soṇa with him in the same vihara. For other examples in the literature of other schools, see Sylvain Levi, "Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques," Journal Asiatique, Mai-Juin 1915, p.401ff. See also Udāna 57, p.68ff. and Burlingame, Buddhist Legends, Part 3, p.254, fn.1.

²⁶See the unpublished paper of Gregory Schopen, "The Atthakavagga (Sn.766-975) as a Text-source for Pre-formularized Buddhism: Preliminary Studies. I. The Chronological Place of the Atthakavagga in Nikāya Literature," McMaster University, 1972."

²⁷See DPPN I, p.194, and Etienne Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme indien, pp.356-357.

'authenticate' what has transpired.

When the Buddha (Mahāvagga VI 199, p.269ff.) is concerned about the poor health of the bhikkhus, it is to Ānanda that he turns for information before rectifying the situation with a rule providing the appropriate medicines.

The Mahāvagga (VI 210-211, p.286ff.) records that when the Buddha developed "an affliction of wind in the stomach" Ānanda prepared a conjei as a remedy. However, in preparing the conjei for the Buddha's 'stomache-ache' Ānanda transgressed certain of the Vinaya rules and the Buddha was forced to chastise him. The preamble which precedes the Buddha's decision to chastise Ānanda suggests that the Buddha recognized Ānanda's genuine concern with the Buddha's health, but felt that, for Ānanda's own good, the breaking of the rules should not go unacknowledged.²⁸ Again we see Ānanda succumbing to his concern for the Buddha at the expense of his own self-development.

We learn (Mahāvagga VI 219, p.301ff.) that a certain brāhmaṇa, who has been following the Buddha and the Sangha for two months, waiting his turn to provide the Sangha with

²⁸The 'preamble' runs as follows (Mahāvagga VI 210, p.287): "Now Truth-finders (sometimes) ask knowing, and knowing (sometimes) do not ask; they ask knowing the right time (to ask), and they do not ask knowing the right time (when not to ask). Truth-finders ask about what belongs to the goal, not about what does not belong to the goal; bridge-breaking for Truth-finders is among what does not belong to the goal. Awakened ones, Lords question monks concerning two matters: either, 'Shall we teach dhamma?' or 'Shall we lay down a rule of training for disciples?'"

a meal, eventually consults Ānanda, for the brāhmaṇa, in looking into the refectory, finds it lacking in conje and "honey-lumps" and asks Ānanda if he may be allowed to provide them for the Sangha. Ānanda forwards the brāhmaṇa's request to the Buddha who allows the brāhmaṇa to supply the missing items. On being brought these two foods by the brāhmaṇa, the Buddha tells the brāhmaṇa to give them first to the bhikkhus. However, the bhikkhus, "being scrupulous," (kukkuccāyati) will not, at first, accept these foods until ordered to do so by the Buddha.²⁹

Ānanda, it seems, was regarded by the Buddha as having knowledge of the Vinaya rules. Thus (Mahāvagga 238, p.326) the Buddha asks Ānanda whether certain allowances made in the feeding habits of the bhikkhus in time of famine are still in operation.

When poor weather conditions threaten to destroy the food which a group of country people are waiting to serve to the Sangha, the group approaches Ānanda (Mahāvagga VI 238-239, p.326ff.). Ānanda, on their behalf, speaks to the Buddha who eventually suggests that the Sangha should decide upon an appropriate outside building and location to store food.

Ānanda (Mahāvagga VI 247, p.340ff.) seems to have been the friend of Roja, the Malla, who lived in Kusināra. Hearing of the Buddha's intended arrival, the Malla chieftains

²⁹Regarding the use of the term "kukkucca" see also Mahāvagga VI 245, p.338 and VI 248, p.344, "It is difficult to ascertain just exactly what is to be made of the term "kukkucca" (scrupulousness); see PTSD, p.218 "kukkucca."

proclaimed that those individuals who did not go and pay their respects to the Buddha would be fined. Roja, under the threat of the fine, goes out to meet the Buddha and, on encountering Ānanda, states, "I, honoured Ānanda, am not much impressed by the awakened one or dhamma or the Order, but a compact was made among the kinsfolk that whoever does not go out to meet the Lord is fined five hundred." Ānanda, disquieted by his friend's feelings, approaches the Buddha and tells him of the problem, pointing out that it would be useful to have men like Roja on their side. The Buddha, as a result of Ānanda's request, "suffused Roja the Malla with a mind of love" and Roja then develops an admiration for the Buddha, going so far as to request that the Buddha and the Sangha should rely solely upon him (and the Mallas) for the requisites of robes, almsfood, lodgings and medicine. The Buddha, of course, objects to this exclusive request.

The story of Roja is an unusual one in Pāli Canonical literature, for one wonders what the basis of friendship between Roja and Ānanda was, especially when Roja shows so much hostility to Ānanda's 'vocation.'

The Vaccha-Nakha Jātaka (J II 231, pp.160-161) points out that on one occasion Roja invites Ānanda to his house and attempts to persuade him to leave the Sangha. Ānanda relates this incident to the Buddha who informs Ānanda, by way of this Jātaka, that Roja had attempted the same thing with the Buddha in a former life. Roja seems to have the

conviction that the 'hermit's life' is an unhappy one, so that his efforts to 'free' Ānanda have a positive aspect. Still, the episode reflects the fact that at the beginning of the relationship between Roja and Ānanda (and Roja and the Buddha in a former life) the basis of admiration has nothing to do with the fact that Ānanda (and Vacchanakha - the Buddha's name in the former life) is a wanderer.

When the Buddha (Mahāvagga VIII 278-279, p.394) develops a "disturbance of the humours of the body," he asks Ānanda to help, and Ānanda seeks the assistance of Jīvaka Komārabhacca.

The Buddha (Mahāvagga VIII 287, p.408) asks Ānanda whether he can provide the bhikkhus with a certain type of robe. Ānanda says that he can and the Buddha, upon returning from a tour of Dakkhiṇāgiri, finds that Ānanda has indeed produced the desired robes. The Buddha states, "Monks, clever is Ānanda; monks of great intelligence [mahāpañña] is Ānanda, inasmuch as he can understand in detail the meaning of that which was spoken of by me in brief, and can make a cross-seam..." The Buddha thus praises Ānanda for his ability to follow his instructions regarding the making of robes. The praise of Ānanda is not the praise for one who is progressing towards the 'goal' but rather presents Ānanda in a light which reveals his 'feminine' ability to perform household tasks. It is interesting to note here that Ānanda does not accompany the Buddha as his attendant when the Buddha goes to Dakkhiṇāgiri.

The account of Ānanda's acceptance of the position of permanent attendant to the Buddha, found in the Commentaries, allows for situations in which Ānanda will not, for some reason, always accompany the Buddha.³⁰ We should point out that the use of the term "attendant" (i.e. pacchāsamaṇa) is, in the Mahāvagga, primarily used to describe a situation when the Buddha is accompanied while travelling to another location.³¹ The fact that the majority of situations involving Ānanda do not mention him as the Buddha's attendant can, in no way, be construed as supporting the view that Ānanda is not, at that time, the Buddha's permanent attendant.³²

On one occasion (Mahāvagga VIII 298, p.425) Ānanda enters a village for alms "unmindful" (asatiya - i.e. heedlessly, unintentionally - see PTSD, p.87) of the fact that he is wearing only his upper and inner robes. Bhikkhus point out to Ānanda that his apparel contravenes a Vinaya rule and they report him to the Buddha. The Buddha seems to accept Ānanda's explanation of "unmindfulness" for he says nothing about the incident to Ānanda. Once again, we have a depiction of Ānanda as anything but the mindful person

³⁰ See the summary of Ānanda's conditions for becoming the Buddha's permanent attendant, DPPN I, p.250. See also our study, pp.104-105, fn.32.

³¹ e.g. Mahāvagga I 17, p.25; V 186, p.247; VIII 294, p.420; VIII 301, p.431.

³² It is difficult to resolve this 'problem'. For example in the case of Ānanda's making of the robes (see p.85 of our study) we know that he did not accompany the Buddha

that the bhikkhu is supposed to be.

This brings to a close the discussion of Ānanda's place in the Mahāvagga; however, before turning to the Cullavagga we might say something about Upāli's treatment in this source.

The treatment of Upāli in the Mahāvagga contrasts sharply with that of Ānanda for, as usual, Upāli appears in the stereotyped role of the vinayadhara.³³ Thus (Mahāvagga I 86, p.109) from Upāli's first appearance in the Mahāvagga he shows himself to be the vinaya master in a case where he is asked, by other bhikkhus, to examine some individual (who is posing as a bhikkhu) in order to determine the degree of his knowledge in the Buddha's discipline. In addition to this function, Upāli, on a number of occasions, consults with the Buddha on matters of discipline.³⁴

to Dakkhiṇāgiri. However, does this lead to an interpretation that Ānanda was not at that time the Buddha's permanent attendant? After all, as we have indicated above in the body of our study, Ānanda supposedly made allowances for times when, for some reason or other, he could not be with the Buddha. Unfortunately, the compilers of the Pāli Canon recognized Ānanda as the Buddha's permanent attendant and were not, so it seems, particularly interested in drawing attention to those instances when Ānanda had not yet assumed the permanent attendant role.

³³Regarding the term "vinayadhara" see I.B. Horner, BD III, p.36, fn.2.

³⁴e.g. Mahāvagga IX 325, p.466ff.; X 358, p.511ff.

The Cullavagga

The Pāli Cullavagga, "the Less or Lesser Division of the Vinaya,"¹ contains, among other things, important information on Ānanda's entry into the Buddha's following, his role in obtaining permission for women to enter the Sangha and his position at the First Council.

First mention of Ānanda's name in the Cullavagga (I 15-16, pp.22-23), is in a list of theras:

Now at that time several monks who were elders - the venerable Sāriputta and the venerable Moggallāna the Great and the venerable Kaccāna the Great and the venerable Koṭṭhita the Great and the venerable Kappina the Great and the venerable Cunda the Great and the venerable Anuruddha and the venerable Revata and the venerable Upāli and the venerable Ānanda and the venerable Rāhula - walking on tour in Kāśī arrived in Macchikāsaṇḍa.

Regarding the above list, it is useful to note I.B. Horner's comments to Pācittiya XXIX where the same list of names appears:

Another Pācittiya which betrays the marks of some later accretion is No. XXIX. In it there is a list of eleven persons who, for a householder, were elders, therā, and whom he invited to a meal. It contains the names of nine out of the ten to twelve men whom Mrs. Rhys Davids considers were at the beginning of his ministry "clustering about the Leader in the Vinaya." Two therefore look like intruders into this early company: Upāli, "the Vinaya expert" - but expert only on the assumption that by his day the discipline had had time to grow into some coherent form; and Rāhula, the founder's son. He was probably not among his father's followers from the very beginning

¹Regarding the structure of the Cullavagga see e.g. I.B. Horner, BD IV, pp.xxi-xxii and BD V, pp.v-xxi.

of his teaching, and was never a particularly satisfactory monk, although several earnest discourses were addressed to him.²

Mrs. Rhys Davids' position regarding Upāli and Rāhula is supported by the fact that elsewhere in the Pāli Canon we find lists of theras where no mention is made of either Upāli or Rāhula.³ However, in all the lists alluded to above, Ānanda's name appears near or at the end of the list of theras. The arrangement of the names in the list is related to a number of factors. For example, the following divides the theras in terms of 'caste':⁴

<u>brāhmaṇa</u> (B)	<u>khattiya</u> (K)	<u>other</u> (O)
Sāriputta	Anuruddha	Upāli
Moggallāna	Kappina	
Kaccāna	Ānanda	
Cunda	Rāhula	
Revata (Sāriputta's brother)		
Koṭṭhita		

The problem in seeing the Cullavagga list (see p.88 of our study) of theras as being arranged completely along 'caste' lines is related to the fact that Cunda and Revata are out of place:

Sāriputta	(B)
Moggallāna	(B)
Kaccāna	(B)
Koṭṭhita	(B)
Kappina	(K)
Cunda	(B)

²BD II, p.xl.

³e.g. A III 299, p.214; M III 79-80, p.121; and Udāna 4, p.4.

⁴See C.A.F. Rhys Davids, "The Relations Between Early Buddhism and Brahmanism," IHQ, Vol.10, 1934, p.280, fn.2. Also the DPPN for the names under discussion and our study p. 119.

Anuruddha	(K)
Revata	(B)
Upāli	(O)
Ānanda	(K)
Rāhula	(K)
	(B) = brāhmaṇa
	(K) = khattiya
	(O) = other

However, at AN III 298, p.214, we find the following list:

Sāriputta	(B)
Moggallāna	(B)
Kassapa	(B)
Kaccāna	(B)
Koṭṭhita	(B)
Cunda	(B)
Kappina	(K)
Anuruddha	(K)
Revata	(B) ⁵
Ānanda	(K)

Thus, while caste influences may play some part in the arrangement of lists like the above, the evidence is not conclusive.

Another factor which obviously plays a part in the arrangement of the list is the factor of seniority. For example, it is noteworthy that all the Mahā theras (which includes Sāriputta) appear at the head of the lists. The insertion of MahāKassapa's name in the Anguttara Nikāya list, especially in the third position, likely reflects the important place he was to hold at the First Council and as first patriarch (remember Sāriputta and Moggallāna did not

⁵It is interesting to note that if Revata had perhaps been someone other than Sāriputta's brother, perhaps a khattiya, we would have an arrangement which would seem to fall along caste lines. The Commentary to Udāna 4, p.4, where a similar list of therā is provided, feels it necessary to distinguish one Revatā (Kaṅkhā-Revata) from Revata (Sāriputta's brother), called in addition to Revata, Khadiravaniya. This may suggest that there was at least room for confusion; see F.L. Woodward, The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon, II, p.4,

outlive the Buddha). The fact that Upāli's name precedes Ānanda's in the Cullavagga list may be explained by the fact of seniority, since Upāli went forth and was ordained before Ānanda. The Anguttara Nikāya list (see p.90 of our study) does not even mention Upāli's name, though it inserts that of Kassapa. In addition, the Anguttara Nikāya list makes no mention of Rāhula who, we might add, was a problem for Buddhist 'hagiographers.'⁶ The foregoing information may indicate that the Anguttara Nikāya's list is 'earlier' than that of the Cullavagga; however, the evidence is not conclusive. As far as we can tell, Upāli's name is never absent from the above types of lists in the Vinaya, again indicating the Vinaya's investment in Upāli as a vinayadhara. In general, the most easily recognizable feature of these lists seems to be a division according to degrees of seniority.

Returning to the Cullavagga, we find (Cullavagga V 111, p.151) the Buddha asking Ānanda for the reason behind all the noise he is hearing. Ānanda is, as usual, able to provide the Buddha with the correct information. In this case the noise is the result of Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja, through the practice of the iddhis, bringing down a bowl which had been placed atop a pole. The Buddha objects to this display

fn.6. Interestingly, it is difficult to determine the caste affiliation of Kaṅkha-Revata; see DPPN I, pp.474-475.

⁶See the remarks of E.J. Thomas, The Life of Buddha, pp. 59-60.

before householders and so informs Bhāradvāja (Cullavagga V 112, pp.151-152).

Ānanda is responsible (Cullavagga V 125, p.174) for conveying the Sangha's decision to the Licchavi Vaḍḍha that, because of his poor moral habits, he is barred from eating with the Sangha.⁷ Once again we have a situation in which Ānanda is placed in the unfortunate position of having to convey information likely to incur the anger (perhaps only in the unconscious sense) of the individual concerned.

Ānanda (Cullavagga V 136, p.190) while on alms tour finds that his light weight robes are being blown about by the wind. Upon returning to the community of bhikkhus, Ānanda informs the other bhikkhus of his difficulty. They convey his problem to the Buddha who, in turn, promulgates a rule allowing bhikkhus to use a tie to keep their robes about them in windy weather.

The Cullavagga (VII 183, p.257) contains the only account in the Pāli Sutta and Vinaya Piṭakas of the entry of Ānanda into the Buddha's following:

... As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, these young Sakyan men spoke thus to the Lord:

'We, Lord, are Sakyans, we are proud. Lord, this barber Upāli, has been our attendant for a long time. May the Lord let him go forth first. We will greet him, rise up before him, salute him with joined palms, and do the proper duties. Thus will the Sakyan pride be humbled in us Sakyans.' Then the Lord let Upāli the

⁷See Cullavagga 128, p.178.

barber go forth first, and afterwards these young Sakyan men. Then the venerable Bhaddiya within one year realized the threefold knowledge, the venerable Anuruddha obtained deva-sight, the venerable Ānanda realized the fruit of stream attainment [āyasmā Ānando sotāpattiphalaṃ sacchākāsi], Devadatta acquired ordinary psychic power.⁸

The Madhuratthavilāsinī, the commentary to the Buddhavaṃsa, implies that the "going forth" of Ānanda and the others took place in the second year of the Buddha's ministry, just after the Buddha's first return to Rājagaha upon his obtaining enlightenment.⁹

⁸Other, though similar, accounts are to be found in the Commentaries, e.g. in the Theragāthā-Atthakatha of Dhammapāla, F.L. Woodward, ed., III, pp.109-112. Also, Mrs. Rhys Davids, PEB II, p.349. In addition, see the Dhammapada Commentary, E.W. Burlingame, trans., Buddhist Legends I, pp.233-234.

⁹It is important to note that the Cullavagga (VII 182-183, pp.256-257) account of Ānanda's "going forth" makes no mention of any date. The dating for the conversions of Ānanda and the others is provided by the commentators on the Canon, in particular the commentary to the Buddhavaṃsa. See the remarks of E.J. Thomas, The Life of Buddha, p.97, fn.1. Both C. Witanachchi ("Ānanda," Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Vol.I, Fascicle 4, p.529) and Malalasekera (DPPN I, p.249, "Ānanda") accept the intention of the Pāli Canon in dating the entrance of Ānanda and the others to the second year of the Buddha's ministry. However, as E.J. Thomas notes (see above reference), "The commentators invented one [i.e. an exact chronology] for the first twenty years, into which they fitted the various legends." Thus we must not assume that the ascribed date of Ānanda's entry into the Buddha's following, at least in the Pāli Canon, is historically the case. At the most, it shows the intention of the compilers (knowingly or unknowingly) to 'date' the early period of the Buddha's sāsana. Finally, we may draw attention to the fact that various accounts of Ānanda's entry in the Buddha's following can be found in the literature of other schools. See Witanachchi's article mentioned above (pp.529-530).

The description of Ānanda's "going forth" in the Cullavagga account quoted above is not very informative and would suggest, in light of his subsequent importance in the Buddha's sāsana, that little was known about the early period of Ānanda's place in the Buddha's following.

The Manorathapūraṇī, the commentary to the Anguttara Nikāya, informs us that soon after Ānanda's ordination, he realized the "fruit of stream winner" (sotāpattiphala) on listening to a talk on the Dhamma given by the bhikkhu Punṇa Mantāniputta.¹⁰

The Mahāvastu (III 176, p. 170ff.) mentions the "going forth" of Anuruddha, Devadatta and Upāli. Unlike the Cullavagga account of their "going forth" the Mahāvastu does not mention directly the cases of Bhaddiya,¹¹ Bhagu and Kimbila, though it does maintain that five hundred Sākyan princes followed Upāli's "going forth" and this group may have included the above three.¹² While the Mahāvastu does not claim that Ānanda "went forth" at the same time,

¹⁰Max Walleser, ed., Manorathapūraṇī, I, Part I, p. 183ff. Compare S III 105, p.89.

¹¹The Mahāvastu (III 178, p.172) does mention the name of Bhaṭṭikā as the son of Amritodana. Jones (p.172, fn.5 of his translation of the Mahāvastu, III) states on the name Bhaṭṭikā, "Usually called Bhadrīya. In the Pāli texts he is called Bhaddiya and there he is said to be the son of Kaligodhā, or Kālī of the Godhas."

¹²This is probably the case; see Rockhill, The Life of Buddha, p.54, "...Bhadrika, Raivata, Aniruddha, Devadatta, five hundred in all, were about to enter the order of the Blessed One."

it does relate the following incident as happening just prior to Anuruddha, Upāli and the five hundred Sākyan princes "going forth": "Suklodana's sons were Ānanda, Upadhāna and Devadatta. Of these, Devadatta went forth. Ānanda also wanted to leave home but his mother Mṛigī, a Sākyan woman, would not let him. So he went to the country of Videha and lived there under a vow of silence."¹³ Thus, while the Mahāvastu does not tell us when Ānanda "went forth" it does mention his request to do so in a 'period' which coincides, to a large degree, with the description of his "going forth" as recorded in the Cullavagga.

The Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya also contains an account of Ānanda's "going forth" which, as in the Mahāvastu, seems to have followed shortly after the "goings forth" of "Bhadrika, Raivata, Aniruddha, Devadatta" (the aforementioned included among a group of five hundred Sākyans who "go forth") and Upāli.¹⁴ In contrast to the accounts already spoken of, the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya has a lengthy description of Ānanda's entry into the Saṅgha:

Amritodana had a son, Ānanda by name, a boy of the same age as Rāhula [i.e. six years old]. Soothsayers had predicted that he would become the personal attendant of the Buddha, so his father sought to prevent them meeting. He took him to Vaisali when the Buddha came to Kapilavastu,

¹³ Mahāvastu III 177, p.172. Witanachchi ("Ānanda," EB I, Fascicle 4, pp.529-530) says of this event, "Incidentally, this episode also may explain the epithet Vaidehamuni (or Vedehamuni) [SN II, 219], sometimes applied to Ānanda. The Samyutta commentary [SA II, 175], however explains it as pāṇḍitamuni or the 'wise sage.'"

¹⁴ See Rockhill, The Life of Buddha, p.54ff.

and back to Kapilavastu when the Blessed One went to Vaisali. The Blessed One perceived that it would be good for Ānanda if he were converted (f.233^b), for "after my death he will find amrita." So he went to Amritodana's house at Kapilavastu, and sat down in a room next to the one in which was Ānanda. Suddenly the door opened, Ānanda came in, and bowed to the Blessed One; then taking a fan, he stood on one side fanning him. Amritodana on seeing this bowed down at the Buddha's feet, and listened to the words of truth which he spoke. When Buddha rose and went away, Ānanda followed after him, and no one could keep him back. His father, seeing this, consented that Ānanda should enter the order, and on the morrow he led him in great pomp to the Nyagrodha vihara, where he was received into the brotherhood by Dâçabâla Kâçyapa.¹⁵

The Tibetan account quoted above is obviously a 'late' account for, unlike the other accounts discussed, it mentions the 'fact' of Ānanda's eventual arahanthood and his becoming the Buddha's attendant. Thus, all the accounts suggest that Ānanda's entry into the Sangha took place at roughly the same time as did those of Upāli and the others. The fact that the Mahāvastu account maintains that Ānanda went off under a vow of silence likely infers that his (i.e. Ānanda's) entry into the Sangha followed soon after. If this was not the case, we would expect that the Mahāvastu would have said something more.

One of the interesting aspects of the Mahāvastu and Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya accounts of the entry of Upāli and the Sākyans into the Sangha is that the formula used by the Buddha to accomplish both the "going forth" and ordination

¹⁵ Rockhill, The Life of Buddha, pp.57-58.

(upasampadā) was "ehi bhikkhu" (i.e. "come bhikkhu"). As we have already indicated in a previous section of our study, the use of the formula "ehi bhikkhu" is regarded as the oldest known form of bringing new converts into the Buddha's following.¹⁶ This makes it clear that, at least in the cases of Upāli and the other Sākyans (perhaps also in the case of Ānanda)¹⁷ the Mahāvastu and the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya want us to believe that they had an 'early' entry into the Sangha (i.e. before subsequent changes in the ordination procedure developed). The Cullavagga account, on the other hand, makes no mention of any formula being used by the Buddha in the "going forth" of Ānanda, Upāli and the other Sākyans. In addition, the Cullavagga (VII 183, p.257) records that Ānanda and the others only asked the Buddha for permission to "go forth" there being no mention of any upasampadā. The fact that the Cullavagga, in spite of our interpretations, only speaks of a "going forth" may have

¹⁶See I.B. Horner, BD IV, p.ix.

¹⁷However, we should note in the case of the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya, (Rockhill, The Life of Buddha, p.58) that we are not provided with any information on the type of "going forth" and ordination procedure actually used. We are only told that Ānanda was "led in great pomp to the Nyagrodha vihara, where he was received into the brotherhood by Dâçabâla Kâçyapa." In the case of the Mahāvastu, it does not inform us of when or with what 'formula' Ānanda entered the Buddha's following.

represented an attempt on the part of the Pāli Canon's authors and/or compilers to suggest that other systems of ordination could have been used (e.g. the "third phase" ordination procedure).¹⁸ Thus the lacuna regarding what type of formula was used in the Cullavagga's account of the "going forth" could be used to back up the claim that upajjhāyas were provided for the new converts, as the Mahāvagga's attribution of preceptors to Ānanda and Upāli suggests.¹⁹

Another source used to date Ānanda's entry into the Sangha is the account provided in the Theragāthā:

- 1039. No conception of sensual pleasure arose in me during the 25 years I was a learner. See the essential rightness of the doctrine.
- 1040. No conception of hatred arose in me during the 25 years I was a learner. See the essential rightness of the doctrine.
- 1041. For 25 years I served the blessed one with loving deeds, like a shadow not going away from him.
- 1042. For 25 years I served the blessed one with loving words, like a shadow not going away from him.
- 1043. For 25 years I served the blessed one with loving thoughts, like a shadow not going away from him.
- 1044. I paced up and down behind the Buddha while he paced up and down. While the doctrine was being taught, knowledge arose in me.

¹⁸Since the extant Buddhist sources do not agree as to the time of Ānanda's entry into the Buddha's following, we can assume that the authors and/or compilers were apprehensive about providing the details of Ānanda's "going forth" and ordination.

¹⁹See our study, pp.40-64.

1045. I am a learner, who still has something to do, not having attained mental perfection; and the quenching (has occurred) of the teacher who was sympathetic to me.²⁰

Before we comment on the above verses, it would be useful to provide Malalasekera's remarks:

There seems to be some confusion as to the time at which Ānanda entered the Order. In the Canonical account [i.e. in the Cullavagga] he became a monk in the second year of the Buddha's ministry. In the verses attributed to him in the Theragāthā [quoted above], however, he says that he has been for twenty-five years a learner (seka). It is concluded from this that Ānanda must have joined the Order only in the twentieth year after the Enlightenment [the Buddha's ministry supposedly lasted for forty-five years] and the whole story of his having been ordained at the same time as Devadatta [i.e. the Cullavagga account] is discredited. The verses occur in a lament by Ānanda that his master is dead and that he is yet a learner. The twenty-five years which Ānanda mentions probably refer to the period during which he had been the Buddha's personal attendant and not to his whole career as a monk ... If this interpretation be accepted - and I see no reason why it should not be - there is no discrepancy in the accounts of Ānanda's ordination (DPPN I, p.268).

C. Witanachchi in his article on Ānanda objects to Malalasekera's explanation on the grounds that the Theragāthā account claims both that Ānanda was a sekha for twenty-five years and that he was the Buddha's attendant for a similar period.²¹ Thus Witanachchi takes the entire period of Ānanda's appearance in the Buddha's sāsana to have lasted only twenty-five years.

²⁰ K.R. Norman, trans., The Elders Verses, I, pp.95-96; see also Mrs. Rhys Davids, trans., PB II, p.357.

²¹ EB I, Fascicle 4, p.529.

In support of Malalasekera's position one could cite the fact that Dhammapāla's commentary on the Theragāthā has no problem in providing the Cullavagga account of Ānanda's entry into the Sangha along with the account of his becoming the Buddha's attendant (permanent attendant) after twenty years had elapsed in the Buddha's ministry.²² However, Dhammapāla's commentary, no sooner having mentioned the "going forth" of Ānanda, proceeds directly to speak of Ānanda's becoming the Buddha's attendant. Are we to assume that the hagiographers were not interested in the period between Ānanda's entry into the Buddha's following and his taking up the position of permanent attendant to the Buddha?

The Khuddaka-Nikāya (Sanskrit: Kṣudraka Āgama) which contains the Theragāthā is characterized by A.K. Warder as follows:

Kṣudraka Āgama (outside the first four āgamas there remained a number of texts regarded by all the schools as of inferior importance, either because they were compositions of followers of the Buddha and not the words of the Master himself, or because they were of doubtful authenticity, these were collected in this 'Minor Tradition'). This order of the five 'traditions' [i.e. the five Nikāyas] happens also to be the order of their authenticity, probably because it was easier to insert short texts among a large number or to get a composition of doubtful origin admitted to the already doubtful Minor Tradition of a School ... It has been suggested that some schools did not have a Minor Tradition at all, though they still had some of the minor texts, incorporated in their Vinayas, hence the 'Four Āgamas' are sometimes spoken of as representing the Sutra.²³

²² See Mrs. Rhys Davids, PEB II, p.349.

²³ A.K. Warder, Indian Buddhism, pp.202-203.

In addition to Warder's comments above, we may also add, as K.R. Norman points out, that, "Ānanda's verses were clearly not uttered upon a single occasion ... but represent a collection of his utterances."²⁴ Norman also indicates that Dhammapāla's commentary on the Theragāthā is not always reliable.²⁵

Thus the evidence suggests that the Theragāthā's account of Ānanda's sojourn in the Buddha's sāsana is not very reliable; at least it should not be taken as seriously as the accounts of his life found in the more 'authentic' sections of the Pāli Canon, which, as we have noted, are all difficult to date.

Let us, for the moment, forget the above criticism and look at some of the Theragāthā verses 'spoken' by Ānanda (i.e. verses 1039-1045 - see pp. 98-99 of our study). Verse 1045 suggests that, at the time Ānanda uttered the verse, he

²⁴K.R. Norman, The Elders Verses I, p.264, "1018-1050." Dhammapāla states (see PEB II, p.352) regarding Ānanda's verses in the Theragāthā, "Now the verses he had uttered from time to time were collected, and included in the Brethren's Psalms at the recital of the Khuddaka-Nikāya." If Ānanda recited the Sutta Piṭaka at the First Council, then he may have recited the Khuddaka Nikāya as well, as it forms the concluding section of the Sutta Piṭaka. However, it is not clear in the Sthaviravāda recording of the First Council what exactly Ānanda did recite. Ānanda did not recite his Theragāthā verses as we have them recorded in the extant Theragāthā, for those verses mention his death. See also E. Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme indien, p.173, and E.W. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p.25.

²⁵K.R. Norman, The Elders Verses I, pp.xxix-xxxi. See also the introduction to the Theragāthā in Mrs. Rhys Davids' translation, PEB I, p.xix ff.

was still not an arahant.²⁶ After this verse, there is suddenly an eulogy mourning the death of Ānanda and describing him as the treasurer of the Suttas, which is followed by the final verse:

1050. The teacher has been waited on by me, the
Buddha's teaching has been done. The heavy
load has been put down; that which leads to
renewed existence has been rooted out.

The last verse in the Theragāthā section on Ānanda (i.e. verse 1050 above) seems to suggest that Ānanda, having attended on the Buddha and having taught the buddhavaṇṇa, attained arahant-hood. The verse is supposed to have been uttered by Ānanda before his death. However, exactly the same verse appears elsewhere in the Theragāthā in describing the attainments of other bhikkhus, including Sāriputta (verse 1016) and Anuruddha (verse 918).²⁷ If, as Dhammapāla indicates, the verses eulogizing Ānanda (i.e. verses 1047-1049) were added later,²⁸ then we must consider that, at one

²⁶It is also worth noting that in the same verse Ānanda mentions the fact that the Buddha is at that time dead.

²⁷See also Theragāthā, verses 604, 792 and 891.

²⁸Dhammapāla's commentary on verses 1047-1049 (in which Ānanda's death is mentioned) implies that, "The three following stanzas were added by the members of the Council in praise of the Thera [i.e. Ānanda]." Does this reference to the "members of the Council" refer to the members of the First Council? Does this imply that Ānanda died not long after the conclusion of the First Council? The Pāli Canon does not provide us with any information on Ānanda's death (see DPPN I, p.265).

time, verse 1050 followed immediately after verse 1046:

1046. Then there was terror, then there was excitement, when the fully-enlightened one, possessed of all excellent qualities, had been quenched.²⁹

We must conclude, at the very least, that verse 1045, in which Ānanda declares, after the Buddha's death, that he is still a learner (sekha) and verse 1050, in which he declares himself an arahant, were uttered at different times. Dhammapāla was himself aware of this difference in time and so, wisely, mentioned it. However, the fact that verse 1050 is found elsewhere in the Theragāthā only complicates the picture. This is not to suggest that the mere fact that verse 1050 uses a stereotyped form of expressing arahanthood is to constitute the sole grounds for not accepting the verse as Ānanda's. What surprises us is that, in light of all the difficulties Ānanda had in attaining his arahanthood and in light of his importance in the Buddha's sāsana, his final statement would partake of a stereotyped form rather than a more 'personalized' one, and this applies also to Sāriputta and Anuruddha where the same verse appears (verses 1016 and 918 respectively). However, in both Sāriputta's and Anuruddha's cases, an additional verse is added.³⁰

²⁹This is the verse attributed to Ānanda on the death of the Buddha; see D II 158, p.177.

³⁰See verses 1017 and 919 respectively. One may note that Revata (verse 658) has the same last verse as his brother, Sāriputta.

Still remaining problematic are Ānanda's verses 1040-1043, which claim that he was for twenty-five years both the Buddha's attendant and a "learner" (sekha). The twenty-five years claim of being both a sekha and the Buddha's attendant seems to militate against our accepting the interpretation of the Cullavagga (provided by the commentary on the Buddhavaṃsa) that Ānanda entered the Sangha during the second year of the Buddha's ministry.³¹

Further, as our study has shown, virtually every appearance of Ānanda in the Pāli Vinaya depicts him in an attendance-like position to the Buddha. The Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya in fact takes the event of Ānanda's entry into the Sangha as the fulfilment of Ānanda's desire to attend upon the Buddha (see p. 95 of our study). Perhaps we should not expect to find much information about Ānanda's position in the Sangha prior to his assuming the position of the Buddha's permanent attendant. The account of Ānanda's taking up the position of the Buddha's permanent attendant is not to be found in the Pāli Canon but in one of its commentaries - the Manorathapūraṇī, the commentary to the Anguttara Nikāya.³² This fact should raise our suspicions

³¹See our study, p. 93, fn.9.

³²See AA I, p.292ff. C. Witanachchi, EB I, Fascicle 4, p.350, summarizes the account as follows, "For twenty years after the enlightenment, the Buddha had no permanent attendant ... In the twentieth year, i.e. at the age of fifty-five, he made known to his disciples his wish to have a permanent attendant. All the chief disciples, except Ānanda, offered to serve him, but were rejected on one account or another.

about the availability of information on Ānanda's assuming the role of the Buddha's permanent attendant.³³ The Mahāvastu does not provide us with any account of Ānanda's taking on the position as the Buddha's attendant.

The Manorathapūraṇī (AA I 292) seems to imply that, by the time of the Buddha's request for a permanent attendant, Ānanda was a thera of some stature. In order for Ānanda to have reached this stage, he would have had to have been in the Sangha prior to taking on the attendanceship. Thus, if Ānanda had entered the Buddha's following eighteen years³⁴ before he became the Buddha's attendant, he would have had ample time to become a thera.

However, what about the Theragāthā's claim that he was a "learner" for twenty-five years? Are we to assume

Ānanda sat in silence and when requested by his colleagues to come forward as the Buddha's attendant he refused on the ground that the Buddha himself would select him if the Buddha thought him fit. Later, Ānanda offered to serve the Buddha on eight conditions, viz., (1) he should not be given good robes received by the Buddha, (2) nor good food received by him, (3) he should not be asked to stay in the Buddha's 'fragrant cell' (gandhakuṭi) or have a separate cell appointed for him, (4) he should not be included in the invitations accepted by the Buddha, (5) he should be permitted to accept invitations on behalf of the Buddha, (6) to bring to him at any time a devotee coming from a far-off place and (7) to place before him any problem as soon as it arose, (8) the Buddha should repeat to him any discourse delivered in his absence." See also DPPN I, pp.250-251 and ThagA II 121 ff.

³³ Regarding the status of the Pāli Atthakathās, see the excellent study by E.W. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon.

³⁴ i.e. in the second year of the Buddha's forty-five year ministry.

that this twenty-five year reference to Ānanda as a sekha³⁵ and as the Buddha's attendant applies to his entire time in the Sangha prior to the Buddha's death? Would this view not find support in the 'fact' that, as we have indicated, almost every instance of Ānanda's appearance in the Vinaya seems to depict him as the Buddha's attendant? Perhaps Ānanda wanted to emphasize that while he was the Buddha's attendant he was still a "learner." Are we to assume that the silence of the Pāli Buddhist tradition about the possible contradiction with the Cullavagga account speaks for Malalasekera's interpretation (see p.99 of our study)?

The other possibilities are to assume, as does E.J. Thomas, that the Theragāthā account represents an "earlier tradition" than does the Cullavagga account,³⁶ or, as does Rhys Davids, that the Cullavagga is to be shifted forward twenty years.³⁷

The dating of the Cullavagga account is rooted in the commentarial tradition and indicates that it is not to be considered reliable.³⁸ However, if we take Rhys Davids'

³⁵The term "sekha" ("learner") is understood to mean, in Pāli sources, one who has not yet become an arahant. See I.B. Horner, The Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected, pp. 43, 156, 271.

³⁶E.J. Thomas, The Life of Buddha, p.123.

³⁷"Devadatta," ERE, Vol.4, p.675.

³⁸See fn.33 above and the remarks of E.J. Thomas, The Life of Buddha, p.97, fn.1. Thomas points out, "... there is nothing like an exact chronology. The commentators invented one for the first twenty years, into which they fitted the various legends."

account seriously, we have to ask the question, why does the Cullavagga account of Ānanda's entry into the Sangha not mention Ānanda becoming the attendant to the Buddha on or shortly after this event? This is an important question since the position of Ānanda as the Buddha's attendant is crucial to the Buddhist tradition. In addition, since the Cullavagga account mentions the attainments of the new converts on or subsequent to their entry into the Sangha, why does it not list the fact that Ānanda became the Buddha's attendant?³⁹ The Cullavagga account does not seem to be contemporaneous with the Theragāthā account.

What about E.J. Thomas' position that the Theragāthā is to be considered as the "earlier tradition" the more reliable account of Ānanda's period in the ministry? There might be grounds for Thomas' conclusion if the Theragāthā had, for example, mentioned the fact that Ānanda had for twenty-six years been a "learner" (i.e. for a number other than twenty-five). This would at least allow us the explanation that Ānanda had, by the twenty-fifth year of the Buddha's ministry, been able to assume the position as the Buddha's attendant after having become a thera of some standing. The fact that the Theragāthā (verses 1039, 1040) mentions that Ānanda was a "learner" for twenty-five years may simply imply,

³⁹ Cullavagga VII 183, p.257.

as we have suggested, that Ānanda was a "learner" at the time, while he was the Buddha's attendant. Dhammapāla in his commentary actually describes the stanzas which utilize the number twenty-five (verses 1039-1042) as, "spoken to show his [i.e. Ānanda's] position as chief attendant."⁴⁰ In addition, if the Pāli Theragāthā did constitute an 'exact' dating reference for Ānanda's length of time in the Sangha, why was this information not upheld by the other Buddhist Schools?⁴¹ Finally, we should also add that there was something to be gained by making Ānanda an 'early' convert; it would explain how he could be considered an authority on the Suttas by the time of the First Council. If Ānanda had missed twenty-years of the Buddha's Suttas, it seems unlikely that the tradition would have made him the "expert in the doctrine, guardian of the great seer's treasury" (Theragāthā 1048).⁴²

In summary, we can conclude that any attempt to establish with accuracy the date of Ānanda's entry into the Buddha's following is virtually impossible. One notes that the description of Ānanda's "going forth" does not appear in the Mahāvagga where, for example, we have an attempt to establish a chronology which begins with the enlightenment

⁴⁰ PEB II, p.357.

⁴¹ See Witanachchi's article on Ānanda in the EB I, Fascicle 4, pp.529-530.

⁴² This is not to deny the claim of the Manorathapūraṇī (AA I, 292ff.) that, as part of Ānanda's acceptance speech for the position of the Buddha's permanent attendant he asked that the Buddha should repeat to him any discourse delivered in his absence. It does not seem, at least for us, reasonable to assume that the Buddha would have repeated twenty years of missed discourses.

of the Buddha but concludes with the conversions of Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna.⁴³ The fact that Ānanda's "going forth" appears in the Cullavagga, which is outside of the attempt by the Mahāvagga to provide an early record of the history of the founding of the Buddha's followers, suggests that the Cullavagga account is likely not part of the early tradition describing the establishing of the Buddha's Sangha. Also, in the many lists of therā which appear in the Pāli Canon, the names of Upāli, Ānanda and Anuruddha are always found towards the close of these lists. This suggests that these three bhikkhus were not so senior as Sāriputta and the others whose names appear before theirs in these lists.⁴⁴

Still, in spite of the fact that there exists, among the commentarial literature of the Pāli Canon and the Thera-gāthā the belief that Ānanda was the permanent attendant of the Buddha for the last twenty-five years of the Buddha's forty-five year ministry, other information (e.g. the commentary to the Buddhavaṃsa) leads us (wants us) to believe that Ānanda's "going forth" was in the 'early' period of the Buddha's ministry (i.e. in the second year of the Buddha's ministry).⁴⁵

⁴³ See Mahāvagga I 1-44, pp.1-57; also André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha dans les sūtrapitaka et les vinayapitaka anciens: De la quête de l'éveil à la conversion de Sāriputra et de Maudgalyāyana.

⁴⁴ See, for example, our study, pp.89-90.

⁴⁵ See our study, p.93, fn.9.

Since the Vinaya Piṭaka seems to present Ānanda in virtually every instance where his name appears as an attendant to the Buddha, we have little ground for assuming that he was prominent in the Buddha's following prior to taking up the position of permanent attendant to the Buddha. This may, of course, find its explanation in the fact that hagiographically speaking Ānanda's importance to the tradition rests with his being the Buddha's permanent attendant and thus there was no need, or little information available, to describe the period preceding the important event.⁴⁶

Bhikkhus like Ānanda, Upāli and Anuruddha seem only to come to real prominence in the closing period of the Buddha's active ministry and this suggests that they were not part of the old guard as represented by Sāriputta and Moggallāna both of whom died before the Buddha did. It is difficult to go beyond the analysis we have undertaken above, and so we shall move on to another issue of Ānanda's "going forth."

The Cullavagga account of Ānanda's "going forth" (pp.92-93 of our study) informs us that he attained the

⁴⁶The fact that, for example, in the Pāli sources the description of Ānanda's becoming the Buddha's permanent attendant is relegated to the commentarial literature (see p.104, fn.32 of our study) raises our suspicions about what was known of this important 'event.' The account of Ānanda becoming the Buddha's permanent attendant is 'highly idealized' and shows all the other bhikkhus applying for the job before Ānanda is chosen by the Buddha. Ānanda's conditions for accepting the post of permanent attendant to the Buddha are meant to reflect the extreme altruism of Ānanda.

"fruit of stream attainment" (sotāpattiphala). The commentary to the Dhammapada provides the following account:

Thus did they first cause Upāli the barber to be admitted to the Order, and after that entered the Order themselves.
Of the six Sakyan princes, Venerable Bhaddiya attained Threefold Knowledge in that very rainy season. Venerable Anuruddha attained Supernatural Vision, and after listening to the Sutta entitled "The Reflections of a Great Man," attained Arahantship. Venerable Ānanda was established in the Fruit of Conversion. Elder Bhagu and Elder Kimbila, subsequently developed Spiritual Insight and attained Arahantship.⁴⁷ Devadatta attained the lower grade of Magic Power.

The above description differs from the account provided in the Cullavagga (VII 183, p.257) in a number of points. Firstly, the Dhammapada Commentary, unlike the Cullavagga account, includes the attainments of Bhagu and Kimbila (i.e. eventual arahanthood); secondly, the Dhammapada Commentary informs us, further to the account in the Cullavagga, that Anuruddha attained arahanthood.⁴⁸

The Dhammapada Commentary, like the Cullavagga account, agrees that Ānanda attained the "fruit of stream attainment," Bhaddiya the "three fold knowledge," and Devadatta attained the "lower grade of Magic Power." Thus, according to the Dhammapada Commentary, everyone mentioned in the account, except Ānanda, Devadatta and Upāli (who has no attainment ascribed to him), attained arahanthood.

⁴⁷ E. Burlingame, Buddhist Legends, Part I, p.234.

⁴⁸ See also A IV 228-235, pp. 154-159.

One cannot help but wonder why the Dhammapada Commentary does not mention Ānanda's eventual arahanthood just as it does for Anuruddha, Bhagu and Kimbila. One notes also that Upāli has no attainment ascribed to him whatever; his arahanthood is ascribed in the Pāli Commentaries.⁴⁹

Is there any way to interpret the lacunae mentioned above? The Dhammapada Commentary is attributed to Buddhaghosa. If Buddhaghosa did, in fact, author and/or compile this Commentary, it is not possible that at the time of its compilation he did not know of the arahanthoods of Ānanda and Upāli. Assuming Buddhaghosa to have been the author and/or compiler of this Commentary, we must assume that he chose to be faithful to his sources and thus, if they lacked the statements of Ānanda's and Upāli's arahanthoods, he likewise excluded them.⁵⁰ At any rate, the impression gained from the Dhammapada Commentary is that Ānanda's arahanthood did not as, for example, Bhaddiya's arahanthood, happen in the same year as he "went forth."

What are we to make of the fact that the Cullavagga account credits Ānanda with having attained the "fruit of the streamwinner" (sotāpattiphala)? Why, for instance, does

⁴⁹ThagA I 360f; 370; AA i 172; also DPPN I, p.408.

⁵⁰See N.A. Jayawickrama, "Buddhaghosa and the Traditional Classification of the Pāli Canon," UCR XVII, Nos. 1 & 2, 1959, pp.1-17, and appropriate sections in E.W. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon.

it not say as, for example, in the Manorathapūraṇī (AA I 292) that Ānanda became a 'stream winner' after hearing a discourse by Puṇṇa Mantāniputta?⁵¹

The two terms "sotāpattiphala" and "sotāpanna" cannot be taken, in spite of some confusion in the Pāli Canon,⁵² as synonymous. The PTSD defines "sotāpanna [as] one who has entered the stream, a convert," and "sotāpattiphala [as] the effects of having entered upon the stream, the fruit of conversion" (p.725). Thus, to obtain the "fruit of conversion" (sotāpattiphala) is to achieve a 'spiritual state' beyond the mere 'entering of the stream' (sotāpanna). The fact that Ānanda progressed from the state of sotāpattiphala to arahant within his own lifetime speaks for his special abilities.⁵³

Because we so rarely encounter any reference to Ānanda's attainments, and because his arahanthood is so problematic, it is interesting to draw attention to the following remarks of I.B. Horner:

I think that it is possible that the notion of the four fruits [i.e. the fruits of stream winner, once returner, never returner and arahant] preceded that of the four Ways; that there were perhaps originally only three fruits corresponding to the

⁵¹See also S III 106, p.89 and F.L. Woodward, KS III, p.89, fn.3.

⁵²This fact may be explained as I.B. Horner suggests (The Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected, p.210), "... it is possible that as time went on the Ways came to be more emphasized than the fruits."

⁵³Ibid, pp.222ff.

various aspects of renewed becomings, which were thought of as going on after life had ceased; that the fruit of arahanship was a later accretion added when the finite concept, that of man perfected with nothing more to do, ousted the concept of an infinite becoming; and that the division of the Way into four parts was also a later device made to balance the four fruits. Yet Way, not fruit, belongs to the First Utterance.

The term "stream winning" [sotāpatti] especially appears to belong to an earlier date than do the other terms in this group.⁵⁴

Elsewhere in her study of the arahant concept, I.B. Horner suggests as a possibility "that the Way of stream-attainment belongs to original Sākya, while the others [i.e. the Way of once-returner, etc.] were added at some later time." In addition, as a corollary to the above, Horner suggests that when arahanthood did develop, it was, at first, not the arahanthood of "here and now"; rather, "Arahantship here and now is the offspring of Monastic Buddhism."⁵⁵

With I.B. Horner's remarks in mind, the following questions may be formulated. Is it possible that the Cullavagga's claim that Ānanda attained the "fruit of stream attainment" (sotāpattiphala) is an ancient remnant, perhaps the earliest known opinion regarding Ānanda's success in the Buddha's sāsana? Furthermore, is it possible that this hypothetical ancient account of Ānanda's success was not edited out of the Pāli Vinaya because, by the time the Pāli Vinaya was compiled the term "sotāpattiphala" had become reinterpreted as merely the successful completion of the first

⁵⁴I.B. Horner, The Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected, pp.210-211.

⁵⁵Ibid, p.223

stage of the then established four Ways and their Fruits?⁵⁶
 Does this explain why the Manorathapūraṇī (AA I 292) could refer to Ananda's attainment as "sotāpanna" and not "sotāpattiphala" and how Dhammapāla could refer to "sotāpattiphala" as indicating that Ananda had fulfilled the First Way?⁵⁷

Obviously, the above discussion is, to say the least, highly speculative. We do not suggest in any way that we have solved the problem of Ānanda's arahanthood. In order to make such a claim we would have to insist that virtually the entire Pāli Canon as we have it is a product of developments which took place after the Buddha's death. Further, we would have to explain why, as far as we can ascertain, there are no other references in the extant Buddhist sources to Ānanda's attainment of sotāpattiphala.

On the other hand, it is intriguing to note that the arahant conception would eventually, to a large extent, become a highly critical position to maintain. Perhaps the evaluation of the arahant in negative terms in the so-called Mahāyana literature does actually reflect a return to a more 'original' Buddhism.

The Cullavagga informs us (VII 182-183, pp.256-257) that when the Sākya princes decide to "go forth" into homelessness, they give Upāli, in appreciation for his services to them, all of their belongings. The Sākya princes hope

⁵⁶e.g. see that Mrs. Rhys Davids in her recording of Dhammapāla's remarks on Ānanda's attainment states that he "completed the First Path," PEB II, p.349.

⁵⁷See fn.56 above.

that this gesture will provide Upāli with sufficient material support. Upāli at first welcomes the gifts but shortly after realizes that by accepting the Sākya's belongings he has placed himself in the dangerous position of being considered a robber and murderer by those who do not recognize the fact that his 'treasure' originated as a gift. In this state of consternation Upāli returns to the princes and informs them of his thoughts. The princes agree with Upāli's evaluation and decide that he should accompany them in "going forth:"

We, Lord, are Sakyans, we are proud. Lord this barber, Upāli, has been our attendant for a long time. May the Lord let him go forth first. We will greet him, rise up before him, salute him with joined palms and do the proper duties. Thus will the Sakyian pride be humbled in us Sakyans.

The Mahāvastu (III 181-182, pp.176-177) describes Upāli's "going forth" as follows:

Then the Sākya princes took off their clothes and trinkets, and threw them down before Upāli, saying, "Let these be your possessions, Upāli. As we are going forth to the religious life we have no need of them." But Upāli reflected, "These Sākya princes have renounced their kingdoms, and given me their clothes and trinkets. They are going forth from home into the homeless state. Why should not I, too, though earning my living with the razor, go forth to the religious life? Yes, I will go forth..." And Upāli the barber went to the Exalted ... "Let the Sugata ordain me." The Exalted One pronounced over Upāli ... the formula of "Come, monk," The Exalted One then addressed them [i.e. the Sākya princes], saying, "The monk Upāli is senior to you. Therefore bow at his feet and stand in due order... This became known and the great crowd of people cried, "The Sākya's have overcome pride and anger; they have put down pride and arrogance."

The Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya records the following after the Sākyaans offer Upāli their goods:

"If I had not had an evil birth, I would have entered the order of the well-spoken dharma, and have devoted myself to crossing the stream and to freeing myself of all bonds." Now Sāriputra knew that Upāli would become famous as a bhikshu, so he went to where he was standing, and said, "Upāli, what troubles you?" and then he told him the thoughts of his mind. Sāriputra led him to where the Blessed One was, and told him that Upāli wanted to enter the order. "Come hither, bhikshu," the Blessed One said...

When the young Sakyans arrived, the Blessed One consented to their admission into the order with misgivings, for he saw that some of them would soon become dissatisfied ... Upāli had been received while they were yet on their way, so they were obliged, on being received into the order, to do him homage... Devadatta, however, would not consent to this. "Son," the Buddha said to him, "bow down. Hast thou not entered the order to cast off pride? But he still refused... .⁵⁸

The three above accounts of Upāli's entry among the Buddha's following show some important divergences. The Cullavagga has the Sākyaan princes ask the Buddha to allow Upāli to "go forth." In the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya account, it is Sāriputta who makes the request and, in the case of the Mahāvastu, it is Upāli who, under his own initiative, makes the request.

The Mahāvastu's account of Upāli's "going forth" seems to be particularly favourable to Upāli. In contrast to the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya account which points out Upāli's "evil birth," the Mahāvastu (III 180, p.175) says, "Upāli ... was a barber's assistant, who had acquired the root of virtue under previous Buddhas, had retained the impressions

⁵⁸W.W. Rockhill, The Life of Buddha, pp.55-56.

of his former life, had broken his bonds, was not liable to rebirth." The Cullavagga, on the other hand, tells us nothing at all about Upāli's karmic make-up; in fact, as we have already pointed out, it does not even mention his name in the list of attainments.

One fact which all the above accounts have in common is that Upāli precedes the others (i.e. the Sākyans) in "going forth" and that the Sākyans who follow after him in subsequent "goings forth" are forced to acknowledge Upāli's seniority. This is particularly true of the Mahāvastu and the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya accounts, where the words are put into the Buddha's mouth. In the case of the Cullavagga, it is the Sākyans themselves who ask that Upāli precede them in the "going forth" so that their Sākyan pride will be humbled. The Mahāvastu and the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya accounts, more than the Cullavagga, suggest that it was the 'fact' of Upāli's "going forth" first that forced the Sākyans to humble their pride. In this regard, it is interesting to note the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya account which records that Devadatta and some others (implying the later 'schismatics') refused to acknowledge the seniority of Upāli.

One might speculate as to why there seems to have been hostility towards Upāli, especially in the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya case. Rockhill draws attention to Upāli's claim, "If I had not an evil birth, I would have

entered the order," and points out:

Can the Buddhist order have been in the first place only open to men of higher castes? Upāli is the first bhikshu mentioned in the legends who does not belong to the brahman or kshatriya caste.⁵⁹

Without going into details regarding Rockhill's question, one can point out that 'caste' differences seem to be a factor here. This probably explains why mention is made in all three accounts of the humbling of the Sākya pride. The Mahāvastu (II 180, p.175), in a sense the most appreciative of Upāli's accounts, actually has Upāli barbering the Buddha, while in the other two accounts Upāli performs his function as barber on the Sākyans (not on the Buddha).⁶⁰

T.W. Rhys Davids alludes to the fact:

It is sufficiently evident from the comparative frequency of the discussions on the matter of Brahman pretensions that this was a burning question at the time when the Dialogues were composed. No other social problem is referred to so often.⁶¹

P.L. Baura states:

It appears that though the rigidity of caste rules may not go back to the date of the Buddha himself, yet the caste rules became strictly rigid by the time of Buddhaghosa, and he, in order to maintain the purity of generations of

⁵⁹W.W. Rockhill, The Life of Buddha, p.55, fn.4.

⁶⁰The Mahāvastu account states that the Buddha found Upāli in general to be a 'satisfactory' barber, but far from perfect.

⁶¹DB I, p.96.

the Kshatriya clan of the Sākya, invented the idea of marriage between brothers and sisters in describing the origin of the Buddha's caste or gotra (clan) i.e. the Sākya.⁶²

We do not intend, at this time, to undertake a detailed study of the 'caste' question in the Buddhist sources. Is it possible, however, that the 'caste' factors in Upāli's treatment in the three accounts discussed above point to a 'late' evaluation of his "going forth" or, at least, to aspects of the event? Is it possible that 'caste' factors influenced Ānanda's treatment in Buddhist sources because he, like Upāli, outlived the Buddha?

Let us now return to the Cullavagga where (VII 194, p.271ff) we learn that the Buddha asks Ānanda for the cause of all the noise he is hearing. Ānanda informs the Buddha that the bhikkhus have heard that Devadatta intends to murder the Buddha. The Buddha asks Ānanda to summon the bhikkhus together and he points out, to alleviate their fears, "it cannot come to pass that anyone could deprive the Truth-finder of life by aggression; monks, Truth-finders attain nibbāna not because of an attack."

Devadatta (Cullavagga VII 198, p.278ff.) desires to form a Sangha of his own, feeling that the Buddha does not provide sufficient place to austerities in his praxis. The Buddha informs Devadatta of the danger and demerits

⁶²P.L. Baura, "The Doctrine of Caste in Early Buddhism," JASP, Vol.IV, 1959, p.153; see also Thomas R. Trautmann, "Consanguineous Marriage in Pali Literature," JAOS, Vol.93, 1973, pp.158-180.

of splitting the Sangha, but this has no effect on Devadatta. When Ānanda, out on an alms tour, encounters Devadatta, the latter informs him that he intends to go ahead with his plans despite the Buddha's warning. Ānanda does not attempt to talk Devadatta out of his intentions, but returns to the Buddha and conveys news of his encounter with Devadatta. Ānanda's lack of involvement in the Devadatta issue is surprising in light of the gravity of the situation, and seems to present him in a rather stereotyped manner. One wonders whether such characterizations are intended to denigrate Ānanda or whether they are merely literary devices.

Ānanda (Cullavagga IX 236, p.330), because it is Observance Day (uposatha) informs the Buddha that it is time to recite the Pāṭimokkha. The Buddha, knowing that a member of the assembly "is not entirely pure" (aparīsuddha) refuses to recite the Pāṭimokkha until eventually Mahā-Moggallāna, with "his mind compassed the minds of the entire Order of monks", found the guilty party.

The next appearance of Ānanda (Cullavagga X 253, p.352ff.) deals with his role in getting women into the Sangha. Supposedly, so the story goes, Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great (Mahā Pajāpatī Gotamī) suggests to the Buddha that it would be good if women could be allowed to "go forth." The Buddha warns Gotamī about the "going forth" of women, though we are not informed of any details he may have used in this attempt to dissuade her. Ānanda, encountering

Gotamī in a condition of sadness and learning of the denial of her request, asks her to wait while he consults with the Buddha. The Buddha reaffirms his original decision to Ānanda, so Ānanda decides to use another approach. He asks the Buddha (Cullavagga X 154, p.354) if women, having "gone forth" would be able to realize the fruits of stream-attainment, once returner, never returner or perfection (i.e. arahanthood). The Buddha replies in the affirmative and Ānanda then draws attention to the fact that Gotamī had acted as the Buddha's foster mother and it would be "well" to allow women to "go forth." The Buddha then changes his mind and asserts that Gotamī (and by implication all women) can "go forth" if she accepts eight important rules "that may be ordination for her." Gotamī accepts the Buddha's conditions and enters the Sangha as the first member of the bhikkhunī Sangha. When the Buddha hears that Gotamī has accepted the eight conditions, he suddenly informs Ānanda:

If Ānanda, women had not obtained the going forth from home into homelessness in the dhamma and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder, the Brahma-faring, Ānanda, would have lasted long, true dhamma would have endured for a thousand years. But since, Ānanda, women have gone forth ... now, Ānanda, the Brahma-faring will not last long, true dhamma will endure only for five hundred years (Cullavagga X 256, p.356).

The Buddha then follows his statement with a list of similes. However, the Buddha's conclusions do not seem to impress Ānanda, for we find him shortly after the Buddha's 'lecture'

once again assisting Gotamī (Cullavagga X 257, p.357).

The Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya also records the entry of women into the Sangha:

When the Buddha had finished preaching to her [i.e. Gotamī] and her companions, she renewed her request to be admitted into the order, but she received the same answer as previously ... So she went and sat down outside the entrance of the house and wept, and there Ānanda saw her and asked her what was the matter. She told him, and Ānanda went to where the Buddha was and renewed Gautami's request. "Ananda," replied the Buddha, "ask not that women be admitted into the order, that they be ordained and become bhikshunis, for if women enter the order the rules of the order will not last long ... However, Ānanda, if Gautami accepts the eight following rules, she may enter the order ..." Gautami accepted all these rules, and so she and the other women were received into the order, and among them was Yaçôdhâra, the Buddha's wife.⁶³

The two accounts (i.e. Tibetan and Pāli) treat the issue and place of Ānanda in getting women into the Sangha in a somewhat different fashion. The Pāli account emphasizes the fact, or suggests, that Ānanda manipulated the Buddha, against the Buddha's own opinion, into allowing women to "go forth." Ānanda accomplishes this feat by having the Buddha admit that women, if allowed to "go forth", could achieve success in the Buddha's Way. However, the 'crushing blow' seems to have been the fact, as Ānanda points out, that Gotamī had nursed the Buddha after his mother's death and thus implies that the Buddha owes her a debt (see MN III 253, p.301).

⁶³W.W. Rockhill, The Life of Buddha, pp.61-62.

In the case of the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya, Ānanda's influence in getting women into the Sangha is based primarily on the fact that he "renewed Gautami's request." The implication here, as in the Pāli case, is that Ānanda carries great weight with the Buddha, to the point of having the Buddha, against his own better judgment, admit women into his following.

The Pāli account has the Buddha warn Ānanda that if women are admitted to the "going forth" there may be trouble. It is only after the Buddha suggests that Gotamī can "go forth" and be ordained by accepting the eight rules, and only after Gotamī does "go forth" and receives ordination that the Buddha informs Ānanda of the real consequences (i.e. the true dhamma will not last long).

The Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya's account actually has the Buddha tell Ānanda before mentioning the eight rules, that allowing women into the Sangha will have a detrimental effect on the "rules of the order."

Thus the Tibetan account mentions the danger in terms of the discipline, while the Pāli account does so in terms of the dhamma. What are we to make of Ānanda's place in the above accounts?

It seems somewhat ridiculous to claim that Ānanda was able to convince the Buddha against his own better judgment to allow women to "go forth." Can we believe, as the Pāli account suggests, that the Buddha succumbed to the artifice

of Gotamī having been the Buddha's fostermother. Granted, this might be true of an 'ordinary' man, but can it be true of a Buddha? What about the fact that the Buddha actually warns Ānanda that there are dangers in allowing women to "go forth?" Can we assume that the Buddha, who so often shows great tolerance, could have been so firmly opposed to allowing women to "go forth?" Do we see in the Buddha's attitude merely the traditional denial of women as capable of fulfilling certain tasks?

Perhaps the 'problem' of women is best seen as a monastic problem. After all, the presence of women within or in sight of a male community given over to sexual repression can hardly be considered an asset. In this regard it is interesting to note that the eight rules which women converts must accept are all designed to place the bhikkhunīs under the control of the bhikkhus. A.K. Warder describes the Buddha's attitude to the discipline as follows:

Before we leave the Vinaya, it is worth noting the evidence it provides as to the character of the Buddha. The promulgation of rules of discipline is clearly not the primary concern of the teacher, who is shown reluctant to formulate rules and willing to have the less important ones abolished. He is always most ready to take extenuating circumstances into consideration, particularly illness, including mental illness. It is the doctrine and the 'excellent way having eight factors' which the Buddha is concerned with, and restraint and discipline ought to follow automatically from the latter without separate prescription.⁶⁴

Does Warder's view find substantiation in the Pāli

⁶⁴A.K. Warder, Indian Buddhism, p.60.

Vinaya when the Buddha sees the danger of allowing women to "go forth" in terms of the dhamma? Or is it, as the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya makes out, a danger to the discipline? Or are both at stake?

The Pāli Vinaya (Cullavagga X 255, p.354) says, "If, Ānanda, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, accepts eight important rules, that may be ordination for her." At the same time, one of the eight rules states (p.355), "When, as a probationer, she has trained in the six rules for two years, she should seek ordination from both Orders. This rule too is to be honoured ... during her life." The Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya makes in its list of eight rules no mention of the above rule, which appears in the Pāli account.⁶⁵

The discrepancy between the Buddha's statement that Gotamī's acceptance of the eight rules would constitute her ordination (upasampadā) and one of the eight rules which states that having trained "in the six rules for two years, she should seek ordination from both Orders" seems to have caught the attention of the authors and/or compilers. Thus, Buddhaghosa, in his commentary to the Anguttara Nikāya (AA iv 134 - see BD V, p.354, fn.3) maintains that the 'discrepancy' between the two statements is cleared if we recognize the following. Since Gotamī is the first woman to "go forth" her ordination would not be preceded by two

⁶⁵W.W. Rockhill, The Life of Buddha, pp.61-62.

years of probation. This implies that she would begin the Women's Sangha which would establish the grounds for the probationary rule. Conferment of upasampadā would only result from a decision of both Sanghas. The 'explanation,' if one can call it that, is highly unsatisfactory. What does the mention of "six rules" imply? Does it imply that it and the five previous rules are to constitute grounds for the subsequent granting of ordination? Or does the mention of "six rules" hint at an earlier collection of rules allowing women into the Buddha's following?

There are other problems as well, such as the fact that women are able to receive ordination after only two years. How does this relate to the system of training for bhikkhus?⁶⁶ Are women supposed to have upajjhāyas provided for them, or does the nature of the eight rules placing them under the guidance of bhikkhus account for the upajjhāyas? What about the fact that Ānanda appears in the account; does the simple ordination for women have any bearing on his ordination and his training under an upajjhāya? Finally, does the whole account and Ānanda's appearance and treatment in it suggest that it was the product of monastic inclinations which are likely to have arisen after the Buddha's death?

The remaining sections in which Ānanda appears in

⁶⁶See Mahāvagga I 80-81, pp.101-103.

the Cullavagga are all related to his appearance at the First Council. However, as we have indicated in our introduction, we will discuss the First Council in a subsequent chapter of our study (see Chapter V, p.442).

As we asked of the Mahāvagga, so we may ask of the Cullavagga: what is Upāli's place in this body of literature? We have already drawn attention to the fact that Upāli's name precedes that of Ānanda in a list of theras (Cullavagga I 16, p.23) and suggested that this seems to indicate that Upāli is to be regarded as senior to Ānanda (i.e. at the very least in terms of ordination time). As in the Mahāvagga, we find Upāli frequently in conversation with the Buddha about Vinaya matters, suggesting once again that he is to be regarded as a vinayadhara.⁶⁷ It is in this characterization as a vinaya-dhara that Upāli is praised by the Buddha:

Now at that time the Lord in many a figure talked a talk on discipline to the monks, he spoke in praise of discipline, he spoke in praise of accomplishment in discipline, he spoke in praise of the venerable Upāli, referring (to him) again and again (Cullavagga VI 168, p.236).

Thus we conclude, as we have in previous sections, that Upāli's 'claim to fame' is based solely and stereotypically on his being described as a vinayadhara.

⁶⁷ see e.g. Cullavagga II 33, p.48ff.; II 36, p.52; VII 203, p.285 and IX 246, p.344ff.

ANANDA: HIS PLACE IN THE PĀLI SUTTA PITAKA¹

Introduction

The Buddhist tradition assigns Ānanda an important relationship to the Suttas when it claims (e.g. Cullavagga XI 287, pp.397-398) that, after the parinibbāna of the Buddha, Ānanda was the person chosen to recite, under the direction of Mahākassapa, the five Nikāyas. While we will devote a separate chapter of our study to the Pāli account of the First Council, some general remarks about Ānanda's connection with the Pāli Suttas would seem in order.

While the Cullavagga, as we have just indicated, maintains that Ānanda recited the Five Nikāyas at the First Council, the introduction to the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī (I, pp.14-15), Buddhaghosa's commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya, informs us beyond the information provided in the Cullavagga that each of the first four Nikāyas (i.e. Dīgha, Majjhima, Samyutta and Anguttara) was entrusted, as a body of tradition, to certain of the Buddha's followers. Thus, Ānanda was made custodian of the Dīgha Nikāya, the pupils of Sāriputta (Sāriputta's death preceded that of the Buddha) received custody of the Majjhima Nikāya, while the Samyutta and Anguttara Nikāyas were entrusted to Mahākassapa and Anuruddha

¹We have, in our study of Ānanda's position in the Sutta Pitaka, limited ourselves to the first four Nikāyas. Regarding the limitation of sources, see our introduction to this study, pp.11-18.

respectively.² The Sumaṅgalavilāsinī (I, p.17; see also p.15), while describing the contents of the Khuddaka Nikāya, does not assign it to any one disciple or group of disciples. In fact, E.W. Adikaram states, "In no Commentary, as far as I am aware, is there any reference to the reciters [bhāṇakas] of the Khuddakanikāya."³

In the Bāhiranidāna to the Samantapāsādikā (I 16, pp.13-14), Buddhaghosa's introduction to his Vinaya commentary, Buddhaghosa confirms the Cullavagga account that Ānanda recited the five Nikāyas at the First Council. However, as an elaboration to the Cullavagga account of the First Council, the Bāhiranidāna (Samantapāsādikā I 16, p.14) states, "... Khuddakanikāya means the rest of the sayings of the Buddha excluding the four Nikāyas. The venerable Elder Upāli explained the Vinaya therein and the Elder Ānanda the remaining sections of the Khuddakanikāya and the four Nikāyas." N.A. Jayawickrama explains the above remark in terms of the belief that, "... the nucleus of both the Vinaya and the Abhidhamma [is to be found] in the Khuddaka."⁵

²This event supposedly took place, as the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī indicates, after Ānanda's recitation. Regarding the bhāṇakas, see E.W. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, pp.25-32 and Walpola Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p.287ff.

³E.W. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p.25.

⁴For the English translation, we have used N.A. Jayawickrama, The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna, pp.13-14.

⁵N.A. Jayawickrama, "Buddhaghosa and the Traditional Classifications of the Pāli Canon," UCR, Vol.XVII, Nos. 1 & 2, 1959, p.8.

The Cullavagga account of the Pāli Canon's recitation makes no mention of Upāli reciting the Vinaya section of the Khuddaka. It would seem that ascribing to Upāli the recitation of the Vinaya portions of the Khuddaka Nikāya and the allotment of individual Nikāyas to specific individuals or groups of the Buddha's following was part of a process which developed at a later date.⁶

The Cullavagga (XI 285, p.395), in discussing the need to recite the buddhavaṇṇa, expresses that need in terms of dhamma and vinaya:

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great informed the Order, saying: "Your reverences, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may agree upon these five hundred monks to chant dhamma and discipline [vinaya] while they are spending the rains in Rājagaha, and that the rains should not be spent in Rājagaha by any other monks."

Jayawickrama states, "In the earliest known references to the Buddha's Teaching the term dhammavinaya is used as a synthetic whole to signify the Sāsana ... The two [terms] are mentioned separately in phrases such as Dhammo ca vinayo ca

⁶Neither the Cullavagga account of the First Council nor indeed any other account we have found of the First Council (see e.g. Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha) mentions the custody of individual Nikāyas to particular bhikkhus and/or their followers after Ananda's recitation of the dhamma. Since, for example, the Cullavagga account of the First Council actually continues beyond the close of the Council, one would have expected the allotment of individual Nikāyas to appear at the Council's closing.

desito paññatto (The Dhamma and the Vinaya which have been proclaimed and laid down respectively - D II, 154). Both these usages go back to the very words of the Buddha himself."⁷ We should add, further to Jayawickrama's remarks, that the Buddha also mentions the term "dhamma" without the accompanying term "vinaya". Thus, for example, the Buddha speaks of his "ariyan quest" in that period preceding his 'enlightenment' solely in terms of dhamma:

In this way, monks, did Ālāra the Kālāma, being my teacher, set me - the pupil - on the same level as himself ... Then it occurred to me, monks: "This dhamma does not conduce to disregard nor to dispassion..." So I, monks, not getting enough from this dhamma, disregarded and turned away from this dhamma (M I 165, p.209).

In fact, even when the Buddha does achieve his 'enlightenment' he still speaks, at least in the Sutta alluded to above, of only the dhamma, "It occurred to me, monks: 'This dhamma, won to by me is deep, difficult to see, difficult to understand...'" (M I 167, p.211). At any rate, all the evidence suggests that the division of the Buddha's sāsana into Piṭakas was not known to the Buddha; the Buddha makes no reference to a Sutta Piṭaka, Vinaya Piṭaka nor Abhidhamma Piṭaka.⁸

The problem of the classification of the buddhavaṇṇa into Piṭakas was obviously a problem for the 'later' commentators of the Pāli Canon. Take, for example, the following

⁷ N.A. Jayawickrama, "Buddhaghosa and the Traditional Classification of the Pāli Canon," UCR, Vol.XVII, Jan-April 1959, p.3.

⁸ Ibid., p.3.

remarks of Buddhaghosa in the Bāhiranidāna (Samantapāsādikā I 17, p.14):

How is it [the words of the Buddha] twofold as the Dhamma and the Vinaya? All this, in its entirety, is reckoned as the Dhamma and the Vinaya. Herein the Basket of the Discipline is the Vinaya, the rest of the word of the Buddha is the Dhamma. Hence was it stated [implying at the time of the First Council]: "Let us, friends, rehearse the Dhamma and the Vinaya, and I shall question Upāli on the Vinaya and Ānanda on the Dhamma."⁹

Buddhaghosa is careful, in his above remarks, to avoid calling the dhamma the Sutta Piṭaka, though he labels the Vinaya as the Vinaya Piṭaka. Buddhaghosa's classification, as Jayawickrama rightly points out, is cognizant of the problem of how to include the Abhidhamma Piṭaka as part of the buddha-vacana.¹⁰ By not referring to the dhamma as the Sutta Piṭaka, Buddhaghosa is able to suggest that the Abhidhamma material was also recited by Ānanda.

If one is tempted to answer the question of what Ānanda actually recited at the First Council on the basis of a chronological study of the Pāli Suttas, it is noteworthy that, as with attempts at chronological studies of the Vinaya, the Suttas show themselves relatively opaque to any accurate chronological evaluation. C.A.F. Rhys Davids, writing in 1929, says of the chronology of the first four Pāli Nikāyas:

...the question of precedence in time is an obscure and probably a very untidy one. In this way: whereas it is perhaps probable that

⁹The translation is provided by N.A. Jayawickrama, see fn.4 above.

¹⁰N.A. Jayawickrama, The Inception of Discipline and The Vinaya Nidāna, p.99, "15 fn.9."

the first two Nikāyas, especially the first, were, as definite finished compilations, begun before the latter two, both those and these bear fairly close marks of accretion - i.e., of having had sayings appended most likely at different dates. In this way there will have been much overlapping in their various stages of progress.¹¹

Dipak Kumar Barua, in a work published some forty years after the remarks of Rhys Davids, does not provide us with any real improvement in chronological studies of the Pāli Nikāyas.¹² Barua re-affirms the work of his predecessors (e.g. Louis de la Vallée Poussin) when he declares, "Thus from the above discussion it may be said that the growth of the four Nikāyas may be ascribed to a period ranging between the fifth [i.e. the time of the Buddha] and the third centuries B.C."¹³

A.K. Warder comments as follows regarding the ordering of the Nikāyas in the extant Sutta literature of various Buddhist 'schools':

This ordering of the five 'traditions' [i.e. Dīgha, Majjhima, Samyutta, Āṅguttara and Khuddaka Suttas] happens to be the order of their authenticity, probably because it was easier to insert short texts among a large number or to get a composition of doubtful origin admitted to the already doubtful Minor Tradition [Khuddaka Nikāya] of a school.¹⁴

¹¹C.A.F. Rhys Davids, KS V, p.vii.

¹²Dipak Kumar Barua, An Analytical Study of Four Nikāyas, pp.1-8.

¹³Ibid., p.8. Barua's book also leans heavily on the work of G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, pp.1-17.

¹⁴A.K. Warder, Indian Buddhism, p.203.

Warder's reference to "authenticity" reflects, for example, the fact that, at the First Council (e.g. Cullavagga XI 287, p.398), the Suttas of the Dīgha Nikāya were the first to be recited by Ānanda.¹⁵ Certainly, internal evidence suggests that the Suttas of the Dīgha and Majjhima Nikāyas were considered more important than the remaining three Nikāyas. It is in the first two Nikāyas that we find such things as lengthy discussions of the dhamma and the recording of important pieces of the Buddha's early biography as well as the last days of his ministry. Yet, as Rhys Davids has suggested, these two Nikāyas, by virtue of the length and literary development of their Suttas, also show themselves to contain accretions. We should then expect that the first two Nikāyas are, in the case of the depiction of Ānanda, likely highly re-worked pieces of hagiography.

All thirty-four of the Dīgha's suttas, as in the case of the one-hundred and fifty-two suttas of the Majjhima, open with the words, "evam me sutam [thus by me was heard]" while in the remaining Nikāyas this introduction is largely absent and replaced, for example (though not always), by such phrases as, "ekam samayam bhagavā Kosalesu viharati" or "savatthiyam viharati."¹⁶

¹⁵ The record of what was recited at the First Council shows some variation according to the account consulted. See Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha.

¹⁶ See e.g. S I 167, p.209 and S II 140, p.101 respectively.

According to the Buddhist tradition, the words, "evaṃ me suttam" are the words used by Ānanda at the reciting of the dhama at the First Council.¹⁷ Technically speaking, from a vantage point outside of the Buddhist tradition, the words, "evaṃ me suttam" need not apply only to Ānanda, but to anyone who is reporting what he has heard. One can safely rule out the case that the words are those of the Buddha because the Buddha did not rely on the hearsay of others for his talks; the Suttas are to be construed as the repetition by another who has heard the self-generated insights uttered by the Buddha. Interestingly, the Cullavagga (XI 287, p.398) recording of Ānanda's recitation of the Brahmajāla and the Sāmaññaphala Suttas does not have Ānanda using the words "evaṃ me sutam." This lacuna may be explained by the fact that the Cullavagga does not record all the details but is basically a summary. However, if Ānanda did recite all of the Nikāyas, as the Cullavagga (XI 287, p.398) claims, why is the phrase in question so often absent from the Samyutta and Anguttara Nikāyas? This latter question applies in particular to the Anguttara Nikāya where "evaṃ me sutam" is noticeably absent. According to Nanjio the Chinese, Ekottarāgama (No.543) does use the phrase, which may suggest that the omissions in the Pāli Anguttara Nikāya are the omissions of the compilers.¹⁸

¹⁷ e.g. Etienne Lamotte, Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna, Tome I, pp.80-114. See also, "Thus Have I Heard...", BSO(A)S, Vol.13, Part II, 1950, pp.424-425.

¹⁸ See G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, p.230.

It is also noteworthy that the Vinaya does not often resort to the phrase "evam me sutam" which one might have expected Upāli to have used in his report at the First Council. Regardless of how one attempts to answer the above questions, it is clear that Ānanda could not have been present at every one of the Buddha's dhamma-talks, if only because he did not join the Buddha's following immediately after the Buddha attained bodhi. In fact, some accounts of the Council of Rājagaha are aware of the above problem and have Ānanda say, "There are some sūtras which I have myself received from the mouth of the Buddha, and others which I have not myself so received. But I shall now recite them all as I heard them."¹⁹ Further, according to the Pāli Commentary (AA I 292) one of the conditions of Ānanda's accepting the position of permanent attendant to the Buddha was that the Buddha should repeat to Ānanda any suttas delivered in his absence.

There is no purpose in trying to ascertain the historical 'truth' of whether Ānanda actually recited all of the Suttas as we now have them in the Nikāyas. The important point is that the tradition wants us to believe that the five Nikāyas were recited by Ānanda at the First Council.²⁰

¹⁹John Brough, "Thus Have I Heard...", p.425.

²⁰For further information, see Cullavagga XI 286, p.398.

The Dīgha Nikāya

In the first thirteen suttas of the Pāli Dīgha Nikāya, Ānanda makes only one appearance - in the Subha Sutta (D I 204, p.267ff.).²¹ The opening of the Subha Sutta states clearly, as does Buddhaghosa in the commentary,²² that the events taking place happened "Shortly after the Exalted One had died away." As T.W. Rhys Davids points out, the Subha Sutta is virtually the same as the Sāmaññaphala Sutta (D I 47, p.65) except that the 'three fruits of the life of a recluse' in the Sāmaññaphala Sutta are categorized in the Subha Sutta under the headings: sīla, samādhi and paññā.²³

²¹There is one version of the Sāmaññaphala Sutta where Ānanda's name appears - the Ekottarāgama (Nanjio 543). The nidāna of that sutta informs us that the Buddha was in Rājagṛha with a group of 1,250 mendicants all arahants, except Ānanda. See P.V. Bapat, "The Sāmaññaphala-Sūtra and its Different Versions in Buddhist Literature," Indian Culture, Vol.XV, Nos. 1-4, July 48-June 49, p.110.

There is no Subha Sutta in the Chinese Collection of the Dīrghāgama; see Dipak Kumar Barua, An Analytical Study of Four Nikāyas, p.11.

The fact that the first sutta in the Dīgha Nikāya to mention Ānanda's name relates to a time after the Buddha's parinibbāna reflects the fact that the ordering of the suttas in the Dīgha Nikāya, as the term "dīgha" implies, are not chronologically determined but relate to the "length" of the suttas. See for further information Barua (cited above), p.367 ff. and G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, Chapters I and II.

²²Sumaṅgalavilāsinī II, p.384.

²³T.W. Rhys Davids, DB I, pp.265-266; see also Pande (cited in fn.21 above), p.91; and Barua (also cited in fn.21 above), pp.428-429.

The Subha Sutta, set in the ārāma of Anāthapiṇḍika at Sāvattthī,²⁴ opens with the young brāhmaṇa Subha asking a certain young man to approach Ānanda in his name and ask of Ānanda whether his health has improved sufficiently to allow a visit. Ānanda informs the young 'go-between' that he has just taken medicine, but that he may visit with Subha the following day (D I 205, p.267). The sutta does not reveal to us the nature of Ānanda's illness, but the commentary (Sumaṅgalavilāsinī I, p.7) relates Ānanda's illness to the death of the Buddha. The incident reported in the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī is summarized by B.C. Law as follows:

Ānanda with five hundred bhikkhus returned to Jetavana at Sāvattthī. The people at Sāvattthī seeing Ānanda coming there thought that the Buddha would be in their midst: but being disappointed in this and learning the news of the Master's parinibbāṇa they began to cry. Ānanda worshipped the Gandhakūṭi [the name of a room or hut occupied by the Buddha, supposedly made by Anāthapiṇḍika - see PTSD, p.244] where the Buddha used to dwell, opened its door and cleansed it. While cleansing ... he cried saying, "The Blessed One, this is the time of your taking bath, preaching, instructing the bhikkhus, this is the time of your lying down, sleeping, washing your mouth and face." He went to Subha's house for alms where he preached [the] Subha-Suttam of the Dīgha Nikāya.²⁵

The above events were to have taken place shortly before the First Council and thus reveal Ānanda, at that

²⁴Regarding the locations in which the suttas were delivered, see our remarks and the sources cited on pp.160-161 above; also to be consulted are: Binayendra Nath Chaudhury, Buddhist Centres in Ancient India; B.C. Law, Geography of Early Buddhism; and D.K. Barua, An Analytical Study of Four Nikāyas, pp.272-366. See also our study, pp.400-402.

²⁵B.C. Law, "Data from the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī,

crucial time, to be suffering the loss of the Buddha. The lack of control exhibited by the people of Sāvattthī at the news of the Buddha's death is mirrored in Ānanda's cleansing of the habitation of the former Buddha. However, the sutta itself makes no mention of the cause of Ānanda's illness and, from the description of Ānanda's meeting with Subha (D I 205-206, p.268) one does not get the impression that Ānanda was, at least visibly, distraught. The emphasis placed in the commentary on the fact that Ānanda's illness is related directly to the death of the Buddha is in keeping with a strain of Ānanda's characterization elsewhere in the Canon that he, unlike the 'perfected' bhikkhu, should reveal, under situations calling for composure, the feelings and desires of an ordinary man. At any rate, Ānanda, accompanied by a bhikkhu from the Cetiya country, visits Subha and relates to him the re-cast Sāmaññaphala Sutta (D I 205, p.268ff.), at the close of which Subha asks Ānanda to make him a lay disciple (D I 210, p.271). The fact that Ānanda relates the Subha Sutta may be a way for the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Canon to introduce, under the authority of Ānanda, a re-arrangement of the Sāmaññaphala.²⁶

Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya of the Sutta Piṭaka," Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, N.S., XXI, 1925, p.109. See also Samantapasādika I 9, p.7.

²⁶See fn.21 above. Also, Cullavagga XI 287, p.398. The fact that Ānanda recited the Sutta at the First Council does not mean he was necessarily present at its original delivery. See our study, pp.104-105, fn.32; p.137.

Ānanda next receives mention in the Mahāpadāna Sutta (D II 52, p.40; see also D II 6, p.6) where he is described as the Buddha's "chief attendant" : "He [i.e. the Buddha] has for attendant, friend, for chief attendant, one named Ānanda [Bhagavato mārisa Ānando bhikkhu upaṭṭhāko ahosi aggupaṭṭhāko]." The Mahāpadāna Sutta (D II 3-8, p.6) suggests that Ānanda's position as the Buddha's "chief attendant" is in keeping with the 'tradition' of the previous six Buddhas who also each had a "chief attendant." Since we have discussed this Sutta and Ānanda's place in it elsewhere in our study, we will not repeat ourselves here.²⁷

The Mahānidāna Sutta, containing the "fullest exposition accorded to [paṭīcasamuppāda] throughout the Piṭakas,"²⁸ (D II 55, p.50ff.), informs us that Ānanda approached the Buddha and declared:

Wonderful, lord, and marvellous it is, that
whereas this doctrine of events as arising
from causes is so deep and looks so deep, to
me it seems as clear as clear can be.

The Buddha replies:

Say not so Ānanda, say not so! Deep is this
doctrine of events as arising from causes, and
it looks deep too. It is through not under-
standing this doctrine, through not penetrating
it, that this generation has become a tangled
skein, a matted ball of thread, like to munja-
grass and rushes, unable to overpass the doom
of the Waste, the Woeful Way, the Downfall, the
Constant Round (of transmigration).

²⁷Our study, pp.74-77. Also see Sumaṅgalavilāsinī
II, pp.432-435.

²⁸T.W. & C.A.F. Rhys Davids, DB II, p.42.

G.C. Pande says of the section in the Mahānidāna Sutta under discussion:

Buddha disagrees with Ānanda when the latter describes Paṭiccasam ... as "simple", and proceeds to explain it. In other words, the sutta represents a deliberate essay in philosophic interpretation undertaken to refute those who considered Paṭiccasam "simple". This suggests a scholastic authorship, delighting in metaphysical subtleties.²⁹

Pande's remarks lead us to question whether Ānanda's remark on the "simplicity" of the doctrine of causation is an attempt on the part of the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Canon to denigrate Ānanda. In an attempt to answer this question, we may refer to the Samyutta Nikāya, which contains an entire vagga on the question of paṭiccasamuppāda.

The Samyutta Nikāya (S II 36, p.29) records that Ānanda, upon hearing the Buddha maintain, "I have said that ill happens through a cause. Because of what? Because of contact", replies:

Wonderful, lord, marvellous, how the whole matter will have been said in one clause. If this matter were spoken in detail, it were deep and it would seem deep.

This remark of Ānanda's reminds us of what he says in the Mahānidāna Sutta above, except that, in S II 36 (p.29) Ānanda does not go on to say, "... to me it [i.e. paṭiccasamuppāda] seems as clear as clear can be." In fact, in the case of S II 36 (p.29) the Buddha, picking up on Ānanda's statement of joy, asks Ānanda to answer his own question and to speak about

²⁹G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, p.96.

'causation' in detail. Ānanda (S II 36-37, p.30) then goes on to deliver to the Buddha a talk on the details of the 'causal chain.' Pande comments on S II 36 (p.29) as follows:

It is declared that 'sukha-dukkha' are 'paṭiccasam-uppanna' and is equated to "arising dependently on phassa (Phassapaccayā)." Ānanda is surprised at the depth of this single expression (pada) and for his benefit a new section is added containing the full formula of Paṭiccasam ... The juxtaposition of older and newer strata is apparent.³⁰

Pande is incorrect regarding his statement that "the full formula of paṭiccasamuppāda" is provided, as only eight of the twelve links are mentioned. Pande believes that the section, supposedly uttered by Ānanda, on the 'details' of 'causation' is added for Ānanda's benefit. It is difficult to know what Pande means by this last statement, as the words are not those of the Buddha, but those of Ānanda himself. Yet Pande's observations regarding the fact that the elaboration which follows on Ānanda's question of surprise and desire for detail is apparently a "juxtaposition of older and newer strata" would certainly seem to be true. It makes little sense, however, that Ānanda's asking the Buddha for a detailed statement on 'causation' should result in Ānanda himself delivering that detailed statement. Thus, while there is difficulty with the text, Pande's evaluation of it seems not to unravel the knot. The ability of Ānanda to respond in a knowledgeable way seems to belie his presentation

³⁰ G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, pp.202-203.

in the Mahānidāna Sutta which we have just discussed.

In addition, one can also find in the Samyutta Nikāya (S II 92, p.64) a sutta which opens in exactly the same manner as the Mahānidāna Sutta; this 'repetition' may be explained by the fact that the Nidāna-vagga in the Samyutta represents a collation of suttas concerned with 'causation.' On the other hand, it is also possible that the Mahānidāna Sutta's introduction was taken from the Samyutta (i.e. sutta S II 92, p.64).

Is there any way to untangle Ānanda's participation in the suttas quoted above? There seems to have been particular interest in having Ānanda commit the error of claiming the 'causal law' to be 'simple.' We know this because Buddhaghosa in his commentary on the Mahānidāna Sutta (see Sumaṅgalavilāsinī II 48lff) goes to great lengths to provide a background for Ānanda's remark. In addition, we know that as far as the discussion of 'causation' goes, the Mahānidāna Sutta represents the fullest exposition in the Piṭakas. Rather than concentrating on the number of 'links' recorded³¹ or the details provided as to the elements of the 'causal chain' let us look

³¹Alex Wayman, "Buddhist Dependent Origination," History of Religion, Vol.10, No.3, Feb. 1971, p.185, states, "Even though sometimes fewer than twelve members occur in the Pāli scriptures, I am convinced that the full twelve members have been in Buddhism since earliest times." Unfortunately, Wayman does not provide us with the reasoning behind his 'conviction.' A recent work on the subject of 'causality', David J. Kalupahana, Causality: The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, does not take up the historical question alluded to by Wayman.

closely at the statements of Ānanda.

The statement at Samyutta II 36 (p.29; see p.142 above) has Ānanda express 'wonder' at the fact of a terse statement ("in one clause") regarding the fact that "ill happens through a cause" (namely, through "contact"). At the same time as Ānanda marvels at the terseness of the statement, he also expresses the response, "If this matter were spoken in detail, it were deep and it would seem deep." It is this latter statement of Ānanda's, coupled with the remark (D II 55, p.50; see p.141 above), "... to me it seems as clear as clear can be," which gets Ānanda into hot water. There is a clear contradiction between the two accounts. The contradiction is brought out by the fact that in the Samyutta II 36 (p.29) Ānanda is able to provide a 'detailed' discussion of 'causation,' a discussion which is close to the Buddha's own remedy in the Mahānidāna Sutta and, more particularly, the other Samyutta sutta (i.e. S II 92, p.65). That is, Buddha's chastisement of Ānanda's statement in the Mahānidāna Sutta and its parallel in the Samyutta Nikāya (S II 92, p.64) takes the form of a lecture on 'causation', a lecture which reminds us of the one Ānanda himself delivers (S II 36, p.29).

Perhaps we are to believe that Ananda's favourable expression of the 'non-simplicity' of paṭiccasamuppāda (S II 36, p.29) is to be regarded as the outcome of the lesson learned on the occasion of the Mahānidāna Sutta. Yet there

are a number of 'facts' which militate against such a view. The 'detailed' exposition of the doctrine of 'causation' which appears in the Mahānidāna Sutta is obviously, as G.C. Pande's remarks indicate, "scholastic" (see p.142 above). In addition, we have drawn attention to the difficulties in accepting Ānanda's 'detailed' exposition (S II 36, p.29; see p. 145 above) as anything but an accretion. This accretion may be explained as a reaction against the view taken of Ānanda in the other suttas discussed above, where Ānanda claims the 'simplicity' of paṭiccasamuppāda. This might then indicate that not all of the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Suttas considered Ānanda incompetent in the case in point. In addition, the Samyutta sutta which provides a parallel to the Mahānidāna Sutta (i.e. S II 92, p.64) must, in its exposition of paṭiccasamuppāda, also be regarded as 'late'.³²

Thus we are forced back to the statement which opens the three suttas, two of which claim that Ānanda expressed the 'simplicity' view of 'causation' and the one which does not. On close inspection, it would seem that the 'favourable' statement is more reliable. Or, to put it another way, it would seem as though the 'unfavourable' statement has a specific purpose, and that is to denigrate Ānanda. Why? If Ānanda, as we are supposed to believe, witnessed many of the Buddha's dhamma-talks, then we would not expect him to make the 'simplicity' statement about a doctrine so central to the dhamma.

³²G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, pp.197-198.

Furthermore, as we have indicated, the commentary to the Mahā-nidāna Sutta goes to some length to explain Ānanda's statement in terms of past events, perhaps because such an explanation was needed if the statement was to be accepted. In addition, the statement, "If this matter were spoken in detail, it were deep and it would seem deep" shows poor logic when connected with the phrase, supposedly uttered by Ānanda, "to me it seems as clear as clear can be." One does not get the impression, when reading the Pāli Suttas, that Ānanda would exhibit such arrogance before the Buddha in a doctrinal matter as important as that of paṭiccasamuppāda.

The above analysis is not undertaken with the aim of establishing the 'historicity' of Ānanda's statements, but rather to evaluate the intention of placing such statements in the mouth of Ānanda. One may view Ānanda's participation in the suttas discussed as a way for the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Canon to make some point about the difficulty of the doctrine of paṭiccasamuppāda and, at the same time to rob Ānanda of any claim to perfection in the Buddha's sāsana. We must always remember that, since Ānanda is credited with reciting the Suttas at the First Council, the appearance of his name in any sutta is, as far as the tradition is concerned, a guarantee of its authenticity as buddhavacana.

Returning to the Dīgha Nikāya, Ānanda's next appearance is to be found in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta which, as we have

already indicated, will receive a chapter of its own later in our study.³³ However, before moving on, we would like to take up for study one feature of the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta which seems warranted at this time - the attendanceship of the Buddha.

The Dīgha Nikāya, like the Vinaya Piṭaka, informs us that Ānanda was not the first person to attend upon the Buddha. In the Mahāli Sutta (D I 150, p.198) we learn that at one time Nāgita was the Buddha's personal attendant (upaṭṭhāka). Unfortunately, as with other cases we have noted, the sutta does not provide us with a detailed statement of Nāgita's duties. The Mahāli Sutta merely informs us that Nāgita, as the Buddha's attendant, informed the brāhmaṇas of Kosalā and Magadhā that the time was not right to seek an audience with the Buddha who was then in solitude.³⁴

The Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 138-139, p.151) tells us of another attendant to the Buddha, Upavāna:

Now at that time the venerable Upavāna was standing in front of the Exalted One, fanning him. And the Exalted One was not pleased with Upavāna, and he said to him: "Stand aside, O brother, stand not in front of me!"

Then this thought sprang up in the mind of the venerable Ānanda: "This venerable Upavāna has long [dīgha-rattaṃ] been in close personal attendance and service on the Exalted One. And now, at the last moment, the Exalted One is not pleased with Upavāna ... What may be the cause and what the reason... ."

The Buddha, in answer to Ānanda's question, states (D II 139,

³³See pp.375-441.

³⁴For further details on Nāgita see DPPN II, p.47, "2. Nāgita Thera."

pp.151-152), "In great numbers, Ānanda, are the gods [devatās] of the ten world-systems, assembled together to behold the Tathāgata ... this eminent brother [i.e. Upavāna] stands in front of the Tathāgata, concealing him ... thus, Ānanda, do the spirits murmur." The above incident is intriguing because one wonders why Ānanda, the supposed attendant to the Buddha at that time, was not the person fanning the Buddha. Perhaps there is no necessity, as far as the sources of the Pāli Canon go, to assume that Ānanda was the only bhikkhu to attend the Buddha. This makes good sense as it is likely that on occasions Ānanda's duties for the Buddha might make it necessary for another bhikkhu to assist the Buddha.

The term "upaṭṭhāka" is generally used and understood to mean "personal attendant" (see PTSD, p.141) while the term "aggupaṭṭhāka" is used to describe the "chief personal attendant" (see PTSD, p.4, under "agga") and is used for Ānanda in the Mahā Padāna Sutta (D II 52, p.40). The Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance indicates (Vol.I, pp.24-25) that the term "aggupaṭṭhāka" which is translated in the Concordance as "chief attendant" is used in the Mahā Padāna Sutta (quoted above) and in the Ghaṭṭikāra Sutta (M II 46, p.243). In the latter source, the term "aggupaṭṭhāka" is used to describe the fact that Ghaṭṭikāra, a potter, was the "chief supporter" of Lord Kassapa (the Buddha who preceded Gotama). Thus the term is here applied to a householder and is not used exclusively to describe the relationship between a Buddha and a bhikkhu who attends him. In fact, even the term "upaṭṭhāka" cannot be

said to have as its primary meaning the Buddha's attendant; as the PTSD (p.141) indicates, the term suggests a "servant" or "famulus."³⁵ There is thus no reason to assume that the terms "aggupaṭṭhāka" and "upaṭṭhāka" are particularly Buddhist terms or need apply only to the person attending on the Buddha. In fact Buddhaghosa, commenting on Upavāna being the Buddha's attendant (upaṭṭhāka), says little more than that upaṭṭhāka (in the case in point) has the Buddha as its object (Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, II, p.579).³⁶

The important point of Upavāna's appearance in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta is to glorify the death of the Buddha by providing the occasion for the Buddha to point out the large audience of devatās. Waldschmit contends that the reason given by the Buddha for chastising Upavāna seems to be a later addition, but André Bareau disagrees, claiming, "Il nous semble au contraire que cette raison est un élément ancien, qui a pu paraître normal aux premiers hagiographes, mais inadmissible à ceux de générations postérieures, d'où les interprétations qu'ils en ont imaginées."³⁷

³⁵ The term "pacchāsamaṇa" is also used to describe a situation of attendance; see PTSD, p.386, "... a junior Wanderer or bhikkhu (Thera) who walks behind a senior (Thera) on his rounds." The term is used for Ānanda, but is not the most frequently used one in the Suttas, nor does it seem to carry an official sense.

³⁶ See also Sumaṅgalavilāsinī II, pp.418-419.

³⁷ André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha ..., Tome II, p.25, fn.1.

André Bareau provides us with a comparative study of the Upavāna incident in the extant Buddhist literature.³⁸ Among other things, Bareau points out: the abruptness of the appearance of the incident, the fact that in some of the Chinese sources Ānanda expresses surprise that Upavāna approaches the Buddha without first asking his (Ānanda's) permission;³⁹ that some of the sources do not even mention the fact that Upavāna was an attendant of the Buddha even though the events make it an ideal occasion to do so;⁴⁰ that some of the sources do not have Ānanda questioning the Buddha's decision to have Upavāna stand aside;⁴¹ and that some sources make Upavāna an extraordinary personage in order to explain his approaching the Buddha from the front.⁴² This is not the place to undertake a detailed analysis of the above question and we can safely assume, as does Bareau, that the incident has as its purpose the glorification of the parinibbāna of the Buddha. Bareau, in fact, goes so far as to claim that the 'primitive' version of the event did not make Upavāna the Buddha's attendant.⁴³

³⁸ André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha ... , Tome II, pp.21-29.

³⁹ Ibid., p.23.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p.23.

⁴¹ Ibid., p.24.

⁴² Ibid., p.27.

⁴³ Ibid., p.23.

Ānanda in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta states that Upavāna "had long [dīgha-rattaṃ] been in close personal attendance and service to the Buddha." A close inspection of the Pāli Canon provides us with few references to this supposed "long" relationship. At the very end of the Pāsādikā Sutta (D III 141, p.131) we are suddenly informed of the presence of Upavāna, who is described as "standing behind [our italics] the Exalted One fanning him." The sudden appearance of Upavāna (Ānanda is also present in this Sutta) is hard to understand. The fact that he is described as "standing behind the Buddha" may be intended to suggest that Upavāna, in standing in front of the Buddha (in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta) should have known better.

In the Samyutta Nikāya (S I 174, p.220), Upavāna is described as "attending on the Exalted One [Upavāno Bhagavato upaṭṭhāko hoti]." On that occasion Upavāna, with the help of a brāhmaṇa Devahita, provides some medicine for the Buddha who is ill. It is for this reason that Upavāna is remembered in the Theragāthā (185-186, p.140 in Mrs. Rhys Davids' translation and p.23 in Norman's translation). The Theragāthā verses make no mention of Upavāna being the Buddha's attendant, though Dhammapāla's commentary to the verses does so.⁴⁴ The Pāli Commentaries also mention the position of Upavāna as the Buddha's attendant (e.g. Sumaṅgalavilāsinī II, p.418; AA II 292). However, there is, on close

⁴⁴Mrs. Rhys Davids, PEB II, p.140.

inspection, very little information provided on the supposed "long" relationship of Upavāna and the Buddha; the relationship, for example, is not alluded to in the Vinaya Piṭaka. The fact that the Pāsādika Sutta quoted above (p.152) maintains that Upavāna on that occasion was "standing behind the Buddha fanning him" may have suggested the use of Upavāna in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta. However, since Upavāna in the Pāsādika Sutta makes an appearance only at the close of the Sutta and makes no appearances in the parallel suttas to the Pāsādika, one is reluctant to affirm the aforementioned possibility. In fact, it may be, as we have suggested, that the opposite is the case and that the appearance of Upavāna in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta motivated the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Suttas to include Upavāna in the Pāsādika Sutta so as to show that he knew better than to stand in front of the Buddha. Finally, we should mention one other problem in considering Upavāna's relationship to the Buddha. It may be that Upavāna was not a 'past' attendant to the Buddha but a 'present' one in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta. This view does not preclude Ānanda also being the Buddha's attendant. Nor do we imply that Upavāna's position as the Buddha's attendant was a mere single occasion event, but that he shared this duty with Ānanda, if not others, as an official duty. When Ānanda uses the word "had" (D II 139, p.151) in the phrase, "This venerable Upavāna had long been in close personal attendance and service on the Exalted One," one is tempted, as

the translation of T.W. Rhys Davids indicates, to assume this relationship as a past one. Unfortunately, the Pāli does not make this time element clear. In addition, even the translators were confused about the time sense; in T.W. Rhys Davids' translation (in Volume XI of the Sacred Books of the East, pp.87-88), the sentence runs, "The venerable Upavāna has [our italics] long been in close personal attendance and service on the Blessed One." As we have indicated, Bareau in his study draws attention to the fact that Upavāna seems to be performing a function which Ānanda, as the Buddha's 'personal attendant' should have performed.⁴⁵

The Anguttara Nikāya (A III 192-195, pp.141-144) records the following incident involving Ānanda and Upavāna:

When an unpleasant interview took place between Sāriputta and Lāludāyī ... and no one was found to support Sāriputta, the matter is reported to the Buddha, who declares that Ānanda should have taken Sāriputta's side. Soon afterwards Ānanda seeks Upavāna and tells him that he was too timid to interfere, and if the Buddha referred to the matter again, would Upavāna undertake to answer? In the evening the Buddha engages Upavāna in conversation and asks him to explain the five qualities which make a monk esteemed and loved by his colleagues. At the end of the discourse the Buddha applauds Upavāna.⁴⁶

The commentary on the above Sutta states that at the time Upavāna was the Buddha's attendant and that the Buddha spoke to Ānanda because he was regarded as the "store-keeper of

⁴⁵ André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha Tome II, p.23. See also p.151 of our study.

⁴⁶ This summary is to be found in the DPPN I, pp.399-400.

the Dhamma,"⁴⁷ thus implying that Ānanda should have known that Sāriputta's position was the correct one. The fact that Buddhaghosa and/or the commentaries he relied on needed to respond to the position in which Ānanda is placed in the discussion should arouse our suspicions. What are we to make of the fact that Buddhaghosa separates Ānanda's characterization as a dhammadhara (bahussuta) from his position as attendant to the Buddha? If Ānanda knew the correct position in the debate between Udāyin and Sāriputta, why did he not come to Sāriputta's aid, especially since Ānanda and Sāriputta were regarded as close friends? Why does the Sutta not make use of a bhikkhu other than Ānanda to explain the lack of aid afforded Sāriputta (for example Mahākassapa)?

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the author and/or compiler of the Sutta wished, in using Ānanda, to denigrate him, even though he was the "store keeper of the Dhamma."

Returning to the Dīgha Nikāya, the Mahā Sudassana Sutta (D II 169, p.199) records, as does the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 146, p.161), the following words of Ānanda regarding the Buddha's impending 'death' in Kusinārā:

Let not the Exalted One die in this little wattle-and-daub town, in this town in the midst of the jungle, in this branch township. For, lord, there are other great cities, such as Champā, Rājagaha, Sāvattthī, Sāketa, Kosambi and Benares. Let the Exalted One die in one of them. There there are many wealthy nobles and brahmins and heads of houses, believers in the Tathāgata, who will pay due honour to the remains of the Tathāgata.

⁴⁷E.M. Hare, GS III, p.143, fn.2.

In the Mahā Sudassana Jātaka we find the following:

... This story was told by the Master as he lay on his death bed, concerning Ānanda's words, "O Blessed One, suffer not your end in this sorry little town."

"When the Buddha was dwelling at Jetavana," thought the Master, "the Elder Sāriputta, who was born in Nala village, died at Varaka in the month of Kattika, when the moon was at the full; and in the selfsame month, when the moon was on the wane, the great Moggallāna died. My two chief disciples being dead, I too will pass away at Kusinārā."⁴⁸

The Jātaka goes on to report, in lieu of Ānanda's remarks, of Kusinārā, "'In bygone days [says the Buddha], in the days of Sudassana's universal monarchy, it was in this town that I had my dwelling. It was then a mighty city encompassed by jewelled walls twelve leagues round.' Therewithal, at the Elder's request, he told this story of the past and uttered the Mahā-Sudassana Sutta."

There is little doubt that the Buddha did die in Kusinārā, or in its neighbourhood; this fact is attested to in all extant Buddhist sources which discuss the matter.⁴⁹ In addition, the extant sources concur, through the person of Ānanda, that there were more favourable places for the Buddha's parinibbāna.

André Bareau says, after studying the matter of the Buddha's 'death' place:

Ceci prouve bien qu'an temps où furent composés nos récits, et surtout la version primitive dont ils dérivent, Kuśinagara n'était qu'une misérable bourgade perdue dans une région peu fertile et

⁴⁸ Robert Chalmers, trans., The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births, I, pp.230-231.

⁴⁹ Binayendra Nath Chaudhury, Buddhist Centres in Ancient India, p.50ff.; André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha..., Tome II, pp.72-76.

que nos auteurs et leurs auditeurs étaient tous persuadés, non sans de bonnes raisons apparemment, qu'il en avait été de même au temps où vivait le Bienheureux. En fait, cet étonnement et cette déception qu'on fait exprimer ici à Ānanda sont manifestement ceux que ressentaient tous les anciens pèlerins quand ils arrivaient à l'endroit, sacré entre tous, où s'était éteint définitivement le Buddha. S'il en avait été autrement, si Kuṣinagara avait pu soutenir la comparaison avec les grandes cités nommées plus haut, cet épisode n'aurait eu aucune raison d'être et la tradition ne l'aurait pas conservé. En effet, c'est de toute évidence pour expliquer aux pèlerins pourquoi le Parinirvāṇa s'est produit en un lieu si modeste que ce récit a été inventé et qu'on l'a ensuite transmis fidèlement aux générations postérieures.⁵⁰

Further to what has been said above, the Pāli commentators claim that the Buddha had three reasons for choosing Kusinārā as the location of his death:

(1) Because it was the proper venue for preaching the Mahā-Sudassana Sutta; (2) because Subhadda would visit him there and, after listening to his sermon, would develop meditation and become an arahant while the Buddha was still alive; and (3) because the brahman Doṇa would be there, after the Buddha's death, to solve the problem of the distribution of the relics.⁵¹

The above three reasons do not, at least to one outside the Buddhist conclave, appear valid reasons for choosing Kusinārā as the Buddha's death location; they represent reasons after the fact. The Jātaka account quoted above (p.156) is intriguing because it expresses the fact that the Buddha was particularly conscious of the loss of his two chief disciples,

⁵⁰ André Bareau, Recherche sur la biographie du buddha ..., Tome II, p.75.

⁵¹ See DPPN I, p.653ff.

"My two chief disciples being dead, I too will pass away at Kusinārā." The tone of the Buddha's remark reminds us of the feelings had by Ānanda, and the other 'less-controlled' monks, at the death of the Buddha (D II 157, p.175ff.).

Regarding the deaths of the Buddha's chief disciples, the Jātaka account (again see p.156 above) reports that Sāriputta died at Varaka. The Samyutta Nikāya (S V 161, p.141) maintains that Sāriputta died at his birthplace Nālagāma, a brāhmaṇa village in Magadhā near Rājagaha. Yet, apart from this information, little is known of the circumstances surrounding Sāriputta's (and Moggallāna's) death, unless one consults the commentaries.⁵² This lacuna in the Suttas sharply contrasts with the wealth of detail concerning the death of the Buddha and seems to indicate that the details of the Buddha's death were the most important point of focus for the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Canon. Why the deaths of Sāriputta and Moggallāna did not likewise undergo a 'growth' in the Suttas themselves is difficult to say. Part of the answer may rest with the fact that the deaths of both these disciples preceded that of the Buddha and had become, by the time of the Buddha's parinibbāna, 'traditionalized' accounts. Further, the Buddha was the very raison d'être for the sāsana he founded and would thus be its central figure, especially in the period following immediately

⁵² See the following summaries in the DPPN: for Sāriputta, II, pp.115-116; for Moggallāna, II, pp.546-547. Also André Migot, Un grand disciple du buddha: Sāriputra.

after his death.

Ānanda, in complaining about the choice of location for the Buddha's death, is at the same time expressing his human frailty because he wishes the death of the Buddha to be a significant event for others. The fact that the Buddha defends Kusinārā as a location for his death suggests that the tradition itself wanted an important location for this event, and it used Ānanda to say so. The Mahā Sudassana Sutta goes beyond the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta by claiming, in addition to the past importance of Kusinārā (as Kusāvātī) being the home of Mahā Sudassana, that the Buddha was, in that former time, Mahā Sudassana himself who died at Kusāvātī (D II 198, p.232). Furthermore, the Buddha points out in the Mahā Sudassana Sutta that he has been buried six times previous to the above occasion in the same location. Thus, the Mahā Sudassana Sutta shows itself as interested in ensuring the glorification of the Buddha's death place. The Pāli commentators, as we have indicated, fortified the Buddha's choice by pointing out additional reasons for its eminent suitability.

Ānanda's reason for not wanting the Buddha to die in Kusinārā is connected with the claim that in important cities, "There are many wealthy nobles and brahmins and heads of houses, believers in the Tathāgata, who will pay due honour to the remains of the Tathāgata" (D II 146, p.161 and D II 169, p.189). The Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta shows some ambivalence over worrying about the future of the Buddha's remains. For

example, when Ānanda brings up the matter before the Buddha, the Buddha tells Ānanda to seek his own salvation; that there are others who will look after this problem (D II 142, p.154). Yet, in spite of what the Buddha has just said, he goes on to tell Ānanda how his remains are to be treated (D II 141-143, pp.155-157). The provision of this information by the Buddha finds its justification later in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 161, p.182) when the Mallas of Kusinārā question Ānanda about the method of treating the Buddha's remains.

The Pāli Canon shows tremendous affinity in its accounts of choosing important cities for the location of the Buddha's talks. Trevor Ling draws attention, as did the Rhys Davids before him, to the fact that the largest portion of the Pāli Canon's discourses have as their setting the two major cities of Rājagaha and Sāvattthī. Says Ling, "Twenty-five rainy seasons were spent ... [at Sāvattthī] by the Buddha, the remaining twenty were spent in various other towns and cities mainly Rājagaha. Of the discourses of the Buddha which go to make up the Sutta-Pitaka, 871 are said to have been delivered in [Sāvattthī]. Of 498 canonical Jātaka stories, the telling of which is attributed to the Buddha, 416 are said to have been told in [Sāvattthī]."⁵³ Ling regards the above evidence, as well as the internal evidence of the Suttas, as pointing to the fact that the Buddha's sāsana found its proving ground in urban areas where, because of economic,

⁵³Trevor Ling, The Buddha, pp.99-100.

social and political upheavals of the time, a cure for the 'pains' of individualism were needed.⁵⁴ Ling maintains that the choice of urban areas accounts for the Buddha's attitude towards 'popular' beliefs - quiet acceptance though not necessarily approval.

While Ling's analysis is intriguing, it relies heavily on the Pāli Canon as now extant. However, there can be little doubt of the importance of these major cities for Buddhism, and the above analysis attests to the fact that a major city would have been the preferred death place of the Buddha.

Finally, regarding the past name of Kusinārā as Kusāvātī in the time of Mahā Sudassana, Bareau offers the following observations:

Les deux noms successifs de la ville sont synonymes, Kuśinagara signifiant "la ville de l'herbe kuśa" et Kuśāvātī "celle qui est pourvue d'herbe kuśa." La description de la cité fabuleuse contraste évidemment, et intentionnellement, avec celle qu'Ānanda fait de la bourgade actuelle. L'immense intervalle de temps qui sépare, et pour cause, les deux époques est dans la tradition indienne, l'imagination a toujours conçu aisément de très longues durées comme d'énormes distances dans l'espace. Il se combine avec le contraste ci-dessus pour traiter implicitement la thème de l'impermanence de toutes choses, si cher aux bouddhistes.⁵⁵

If the analysis of Ānanda's place in the Mahā Sudassana Sutta and its literary parallels is correct, as

⁵⁴Trevor Ling, The Buddha, p.96; and, on the question of individualism, pp.50-56.

⁵⁵André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha, Tome II, p.76.

it seems to be, then we see in these sources the utilization of the person called Ānanda for hagiographic reasons. This conclusion is an important one, for it tells us, specifically in the case in point (i.e. the death place of the Buddha), that prior to the Pāli Canon's preservation in writing, the death of the Buddha underwent 'legendary' growth. If such freedom existed, granted within certain 'traditionally' established parameters, to place the issue of the Buddha's death place in the mouth of Ānanda, then we assume it exhibited at least a dual purpose. Firstly, by using Ānanda's name, the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Canon (leaving aside the question of the origination of the story) were able to 'validate' the story because Ānanda, as the Buddha's attendant and the deliverer of the Suttas at the First Council, was the best 'authority' available. Secondly, perhaps only in a minor way, by using Ānanda as the source of origin for the complaint over the Buddha's death place, certain factions were able to, once again, reveal the flaws in Ānanda's character.⁵⁶

⁵⁶The 'fact' that Kusinārā is a place of past significance (as Kusāvātī) and that in the past the Buddha had been 'buried' there six times (D II 198, p.232) implies that the death location of the Buddha is a significant one. The 'fact' that Ānanda asks the question concerning the significance of Kusinārā is an indication, for some bhikkhus, of his understanding of the death of a Buddha. However, it is interesting that in the Mahā Padāna Sutta (D II 2-8, pp.6-7) wherein we are given a description of the former six Buddhas, there is no reference to the death locations of these Buddhas. The latter situation may provide evidence for the fact that the significance of Kusinārā, as we have indicated, is a rationalization which originated in a period after Gotama's death.

Ānanda's next appearance in the Dīgha Nikāya is in the Pāsādikā Sutta (D III 117, p.111ff.) where Ānanda is approached by Cunda the novice⁵⁷ at Sāmagāma and informed:

Nāthaputta, sir, the Nigaṇtha has just died at Pāvā. And he being dead, the Nigaṇthas have become disunited and divided into two parties, ... quarrelling and wounding one another ... so that even the lay disciples ... show themselves shocked ... so badly was their doctrine and discipline set forth and imparted ... imparted as they were by one who was not supremely enlightened, and now they are wrecked of their support and without a protector (D III 118, p.112).

Ānanda, having heard Cunda's news, suggests that the Buddha too be informed. What follows after Cunda and Ānanda report to the Buddha is a long discourse by the Buddha (directed at Cunda) that, unlike Nāthaputta, the Buddha is 'supremely enlightened' (D III 119, p.112).

The Pāli Suttas contain two other Suttas which describe the death of Nāthaputta and the disorder that his death brought to the followers who were left behind: the Saṅgīti Sutta (D III 207, p.201) and the Sāmagāma Sutta (M II 243, p.29). In the Saṅgīti Sutta (D III 209-210, pp.202-203), it is Sāriputta who reports the death of Nāthaputta and who declares:

But to us, friends, the Norm has been well set forth and imparted by the Exalted One. It is effectual for guidance, conducive to self-

⁵⁷Buddhaghosa informs us that Cunda the Novice was the youngest brother of Sāriputta and Revata. See T.W. Rhys Davids, DB III, p.112, fn.3. This Cunda, according to the Pāli Commentaries, was not only the pupil of Ānanda but a one time personal attendant to the Buddha. However, the name Cunda appears in references which sometimes make for difficulties, see DPPN I, "2. Cunda", pp.877-878.

mastery and is imparted by one perfectly enlightened. Herein there should be a chanting by all in concord, not a wrangling, that thus this holy life may persist and be long maintained (D III 211, p.204).

The Sāmagāma Sutta reveals itself to be a closer parallel to the Pāsādika than does the Sangīti Sutta, because it contains an opening section which involves Cunda and Ānanda. Cunda reports the death of Nātaputta to Ānanda (the Pāsādika Sutta uses Nāthaputta) and together they go to inform the Buddha. However, unlike the Pāsādika Sutta, the Buddha in this account addresses his remarks to Ānanda, not to Cunda. Ānanda, in reporting the death of Nātaputta to the Buddha, says:

... Lord: "This novice Cunda, revered sir, speaks thus: 'Revered sir, Nātaputta the Jain has recently died at Pāvā ... the foundations wrecked, without an arbiter.' It occurs to me, revered sir, that we should take care lest, after the Lord's passing, dispute arises in the Order -- dispute for the woe of the manyfolk, for the grief of the manyfolk, for the misfortune of the populace, for the woe, the sorrow of devas and mankind" (M II 245, p.31).

The Buddha replies to Ānanda:

What do you think about this, Ānanda? Those things taught by me to you out of super-knowledge, that is to say the four applications of mindfulness, the four right efforts, the four bases of psychic power, the five controlling faculties, the five powers, the seven links in awakening, the ariyan eightfold Way -- do you, Ānanda, see even two monks professing differently about these things? (M II 245, p.31).

Ānanda replies in the negative, but goes on to say that he is concerned that, after the Buddha's death, "those people who dwell dependent on the Lord might, after the Lord's passing,

stir up dispute in the Order concerning either the mode of living [ajjhājīve] or the Obligations [adhipātimokkhe]..."

The above exchange of discourses is completely absent from the Pāsādika Sutta where the Buddha's dhmma (compare D III 128, p.120 with M II 245, p.31 quoted above), the fact that there are arahants (D III 125, p.118) and the possibility of holding rehearsals of the dhmma (D III 127, p.119) are regarded as guarantees of the future of the Buddha's sāsana. Unlike the Pāsādika Sutta, Ānanda's position in the Sāmagāma Sutta is to see the person of the Buddha as an important factor in holding the Sangha together ("those people who dwell dependent on the Lord"). Ānanda, while acknowledging the importance of the dhmma, shows concern with disputes that might arise in the "mode of living" (ajjhājīva) or the "obligations" (adhipātimokkha). The Buddha regards Ānanda's concern with the above as follows:

That dispute which concerns either the mode of living or the Obligations is a trifle, Ānanda. But, Ānanda, if there should arise in the Order a dispute either concerning the Way or concerning the course, this dispute would be for the woe of the manyfolk, the grief of the manyfolk, the misfortune of the populace, the sorrow of devas and mankind (M II 245, p.32).

No sooner has the Buddha corrected Ānanda than he proceeds to provide Ānanda with a discourse on the six causes of dispute, the four adjudications (adhikaraṇa) for disputes and the seven settlements of adjudication (M II 245, p.32ff.). D.K. Barua describes the Sāmagāma Sutta as "a Vinaya tract

on the Adhikaraṇasamatha [i.e. the settling of questions (disputes) that have arisen]."⁵⁸ Leaving Barua's remarks aside, let us look at Ānanda's complaint. Ānanda expresses concern with the "mode of living" (ajjhājīva) and the "obligations" (adhipātimokkha). Both these terms are rare in the Pāli Canon; in fact, the term "ajjhājīva" appears only in the Sāmagāma Sutta (see F.L. Woodward, Pāli Tipiṭakaṃ Concordance, Part I, p.44), while the term "adhipātimokkha" appears twice, once in the Sutta under discussion and once in the Parivāra of the Vinaya (BD VI 1, p.2; see also Woodward's Pāli Tipiṭakaṃ Concordance, p. 107).⁵⁹

Ānanda's use of the terms "ajjhājīva" and "adhipātimokkha", "mode of living" and "obligations" (i.e. "the higher moral code" - see PTSD, p.29) is surprising, not only because of their rare occurrence, but because of their vinaya-like character. Why should Ānanda, who failed to question the Buddha on the meaning of the "lesser and minor precepts" (D II

⁵⁸ D.K. Barua, An Analytical Study of Four Nikāyas, p.525.

⁵⁹ Regarding the Parivāra, see I.B. Horner, The Book of the Discipline, VI, pp.vii-xxv. Regarding the question of the lateness of the Parivāra, see pp.ix-x of Horner's introduction. Buddhaghosa, in his Majjhima Commentary (MA iv 38) attempts to explain the term "adhipātimokkha"; I.B. Horner (MLS III, p.31, fn.4.) paraphrases Buddhaghosa as follows, "... a monk who claims a state of further-men falls into a Pārājika offence (No.IV); beginning with this, six rules of training are laid down in the Parivāra; with the exception of these, all the remaining rules of training are called adhipātimokkha."

154, p.171) concern himself with the external disciplinary code? The answer seems to lie in the following analysis. The disorder that ensued with the death of Nāthaputta was a visible disorder, a disorder which the "manyfolk" could see for themselves. Ānanda's concern with the "mode of living" and the "obligations" is likewise a concern with the externals, the disciplinary appearance, of the Buddha's following. By having Ānanda draw attention to the external elements of a bhikkhu's life, Ānanda, once again, reveals his unawareness of the true target of the Buddha's teaching. Thus the Buddha emphasizes to Ānanda the importance of the "Way" (magga) and the "course" (paṭipadā) and refers to Ānanda's concern with the "mode of living" and the "obligations" as "trifles" (M II 245, p.32; see p.165 above). If Ānanda's position is so explained, then one must wonder why he does not commit the same 'error' in the Pāsādika Sutta. Unlike the Sāmagāma Sutta, the Pāsādika Sutta underplays Ānanda's part. Ānanda goes with Cunda to inform the Buddha and supposedly listens to the Buddha's discourse, which is directed to Cunda. Yet at the close of the Pāsādika Sutta (D III 141, p.131), we are suddenly informed of Upavāna's appearance; Upavāna is described as fanning the Buddha, and it is he who praises the Buddha's discourse.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ Upavāna appears in a similar situation in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 138-139, p.151) where Ānanda comes to Upavāna's defence. Since the death of Nāthaputta (see however pp. 169-170), according to the Pāli accounts, did not occur too long before that of the Buddha, if we take the

It is difficult to accept as fact that Ānanda, the bahussuta, who recites the dhamma to the members of the First Council, should have failed to recognize the 'core' of the Buddha's teachings. In addition, it is also odd that the Sāmagāma Sutta, having had the Buddha point out the shortcomings of Ānanda's concerns, should have the Buddha deliver to Ānanda a discourse on a particularly vinaya-like subject - the settling of disputes.⁶¹ Which of the three Suttas which report Nāthaputta's death is to be regarded as the 'earliest' remains unanswered because it is likely that all three are constructed around a common account of the disorder which ensued at his death. The fact that the Sāmagāma Sutta does not show the same optimism as do the Pāsādika and Sangīti Suttas is of note.⁶² Ānanda's position in the Sāmagāma Sutta is not without its ambivalence. Ānanda talks about the externals of the "mode of living" because this was obviously an issue at some time, an issue which is not as readily apparent in the optimistic atmosphere of the Pāsādika and Sangīti Suttas. The latter fact, coupled with placing the two rather rare terms "ajjhājīva" and "adhipātimokkha" in

statements about Ānanda's length of attendanceship seriously, we cannot see Upavāna as having, at the time of the Pāsādika Sutta, Ānanda's position as attendant to the Buddha. It may be, as we suggested, that Ānanda's characterization as 'chief attendant' did not preclude other individual bhikkhus from also carrying out, or assisting Ānanda, in that function.

⁶¹Regarding this discourse to Ānanda, see the footnotes in I.B. Horner's translation of the Sutta, MLS III, p.32ff.

⁶²See pp. 165-167 of our study.

Ānanda's mouth, would seem to indicate that the Sāmagāma Sutta is later than the other two Suttas.

Another important point about the Suttas under discussion is brought out by A.L. Basham:

... the Pāli Scriptures record the death of Mahāvira or Nigantha Nātaputta as taking place at Pāvā during the Buddha's lifetime, and as being accompanied by serious confusion and quarrelling among his supporters. The event was reported to the Buddha by the novice Cunda, who expressed the hope that on the death of the Buddha similar quarrels would not arise in his order. This fact indicates that Mahāvira's death was thought of as having taken place towards the end of the Buddha's life, when the Buddhist bhikkhus were very concerned about the future of the community on the death of its founder. We suggest that the Pāli record may not in fact refer to the death of Mahāvira at Pāvā, but to that of Gosāla at Sāvātthi, which the Bhagavati-Sūtra [of the Jains] also mentions as having been accompanied by quarrelling and confusion. At a later date, when the chief rival of Buddhism was no longer Ājivikism but Jainism, the name may have been altered to add to the significance of the account.⁶³

Basham's remarks are based on dating the death of Mahāvira. Basham concludes that Mahāvira's death fell somewhere between 468-467 B.C., while that of Gosāla occurred in 485-484 B.C. If this dating is correct, and if we accept, as does Basham, the death of the Buddha as taking place in 483 B.C., then only Gosāla could have been the original subject of the Suttas we are discussing.⁶⁴ A.K. Warder, having carefully studied the controversy over the date of the Buddha's parinibbāna, believes that the date

⁶³A.L. Basham, History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas, p.75.

⁶⁴Ibid., p.74.

of the Buddha's death was at 486 B.C.⁶⁵ Warder also places Gosāla's date of death at 488 B.C.⁶⁶ Thus adopting Warder's dates for the deaths of the Buddha and Gosāla would still make Gosāla, not Mahāvira, the original subject of the above Suttas, and this supports Basham's conclusions. The fact that the Sangīti Sutta (D III 209, p.203ff.) reports that Sāriputta was alive when the death of Nāthaputta took place, would indicate that the event took place in a period prior to the Buddha's death, because Sāriputta died before the Buddha (see DPPN II, p.1115).

If Basham's reasoning is correct, then we have in the above Suttas another example of the growth in the Buddhist record, a growth which resulted primarily from the fact that the 'tradition' enjoyed a long period in an oral form.

In summary, we may reiterate that the Sāmagāma Sutta suggests itself as the latest of the three accounts. The fact that the Sāmagāma Sutta has, as part of its subject matter, the method for the proper settling of disputes (M II 245, p.32ff.) would indicate that the Sutta is concerned with a period when the Buddha is no longer available as authority. In addition, Ānanda's emphasis in the beginning of the Sāmagāma Sutta on the living Buddha as authority provides an ideal background from which to move into disciplinary procedures to be used after the Buddha's death.

⁶⁵A.K. Warder, Indian Buddhism, p.44.

⁶⁶Ibid., p.40.

The Majjhima Nikāya¹

Ānanda's first appearance in the Majjhima Nikāya is in the Madhupiṇḍika Sutta, "the sutta of the Honey-ball" (M I 114, p.147). Ānanda makes his entry only at the close of the Sutta, where he declares:

Lord, even as a man overcome by hunger and exhaustion might come upon a honey-ball; from each bit that he would taste he would get a sweet delicious flavour - even so, Lord, is a monk who is naturally able in mind; from each bit that he would examine with intuitive wisdom [paññāya] as to the meaning of this disquisition on dhamma, he would get delight, he would get satisfaction for the mind. What is this disquisition in dhamma called, Lord? (M I 114, p.148).

The Buddha replies to Ananda's question, "Wherefore, you may understand this disquisition on dhamma as the Disquisition of the Honey-Ball." Ānanda's role in the Sutta is a limited one and, while it suggests that Ānanda was capable of penetrating the meaning of the Sutta, his appearance in it is largely one of lending authority to what is said.

¹Regarding the structure and characterizing features of the Majjhima Nikāya, see I.B. Horner, MLS, I, p.ix ff; G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, p.116ff.; D.K. Barua, An Analytical Study of Four Nikāyas, pp.13ff and 460ff. It is also interesting to note that according to Buddhaghosa's Commentary (see DPPN II, p.418, "Majjhima Nikāya"), "When the Sāsana disappears, the Majjhima predeceases the Dīgha Nikāya." See our remarks, p. 129 f. of this study.

Ānanda next appears in the Ariyapariyesana Sutta (M I 160, p.203). This Sutta is a particularly important one for, as G.C. Pande says, "[This sutta] contains the first of three closely connected biographical pieces relating to the Buddha in the [Majjhima Nikāya]." ² Ānanda's role in the Sutta is limited to its introduction. The Buddha has entered Sāvattthī for alms and, in his absence a number of bhikkhus approach Ānanda requesting that they have an opportunity to see and hear the Buddha, "It is long since we, revered Ānanda, heard a talk on dhamma face to face with the Lord" (M I 160, p.203). Ānanda informs the bhikkhus that if they go to the hermitage of the brāhmaṇa Rammaka they will likely have their request fulfilled. The Buddha returns from his alms-round in Sāvattthī and suggests to Ānanda that they "...approach the Eastern Park, the palace of Migara's mother, for the day-sojourn." Having spent most of the afternoon resting at the above location and having afterwards bathed, Ānanda says to the Buddha:

Lord, this hermitage of the brahman Rammaka is not far; the hermitage of the brahman Rammaka is lovely, Lord; the hermitage of the brahman Rammaka is beautiful, Lord. It were good, Lord, if out of compassion the Lord were to approach the hermitage of the brahman Rammaka (M I 161, p.204).

The Buddha acquiesces by silence and agrees to visit the hermitage of Rammaka wherein he delivers a discourse to the

²G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, p.123.

waiting bhikkhus who had been sent there by Ānanda.³

Once again, Ānanda's place in this Sutta is restricted to the opening scene, where he sets the stage for what is to follow - a supposed autobiographical description of the early period of the Buddha's "ariyan quest." One must view Ānanda's participation in the Sutta as primarily one of witnessing and thus being able to authenticate an important discourse of the Buddha. One may note that the brāhmaṇa Rammaka does not appear elsewhere in the Pāli Canon,⁴ and that the same information of the early period of the Buddha's "ariyan quest" is treated differently in other non-Pāli sources.⁵

³The discourse reveals the early apprenticeship of the Buddha under Ālāva-Kālāma and Uddaka Rāmaputta and how, discovering the limitations of these two teachers, the Buddha went to Urvelā, achieved enlightenment, was convinced by Sahampati to teach the dhamma, the meeting with Ājivika Upaka and the delivering of the first sermon. The Sutta closes with a discussion of sense pleasures, from which it gets the name Pāsarāsi in the Commentary. See DPPN I, pp.179-180 and MA II [160¹⁶], p.163.

⁴See DPPN II, p.717, "1. Rammaka."

⁵e.g. Mahāvastu II 115, p.111; this account has already received a great deal of elaboration when compared with the Pāli account under discussion. Also see E.H. Johnston, The Buddhacarita: or Acts of the Buddha, p.166ff; W.W. Rockhill, The Life of the Buddha, p.27ff.

If is also worth comparing the Ariyapariyesana Sutta account with that provided at Mahavagga I 1, p.1ff. It is obvious that the 'autobiographical' account, more correctly the biography of the Buddha, is independent of any particular occasion or location where it was supposedly made known to the bhikkhus. See the work of E.J. Thomas, The Life of Buddha: as Legend and History.

Some of the features of Ānanda's part in the Ariya-pariyesana Sutta are worthy of mention. First, we would draw attention to the fact that Ānanda does not accompany the Buddha on his alms-round in Sāvattthī. This suggests that Ānanda's position as the Buddha's attendant did not, as we have seen, always require his full-time participation.⁶ From a reading of the Sutta one cannot help but acquire the impression that Ānanda manipulated the meeting between the Buddha and the bhikkhus seeking audience with him. Ānanda suggests that the Buddha visit the hermitage of Rammaka because of its beauty⁷ not because he has arranged for the bhikkhus to be there (M I 161, p.204). Ānanda, having informed the Buddha of the beauty of the hermitage, suggests that the Buddha approach it "out of compassion [anukampaṃ]." The fact that the above phrase is used suggests that Ānanda's appeal is one which has individuals in mind. The Commentary (MA II [161¹⁰], p.168) supplies the object of this compassion as the "five hundred monks who wished to hear the Buddha." The mention of "five hundred monks" by the Commentary is an obvious exaggeration as the opening of the Sutta tells us nothing about the number of bhikkhus seeking the Buddha's audience,

⁶See our study, pp.104-105, fn.32.

⁷M I 161, p.204 runs, "Lord, this hermitage ... is not far; the hermitage of the brahman Rammaka is lovely ... is beautiful..." The Buddha seems to have responded, according to some sources, to the aesthetic qualities of the environment; e.g. D II 102, p.110, "How delightful a spot, Ānanda, is Vesālī, and how charming the Udena Shrine..."

nor does it hint that such a large audience is involved. In addition, the description of the Buddha's meeting with the bhikkhus suggests that the Buddha was unaware of his audience:

Then the Lord approached the hermitage of the brahman Rammaka. At that time a number of monks [sambahulā bhikkhū; this suggests a plurality - "many" - see PTSD, p.693] came to be sitting down and talking dhamma in the hermitage ... Then the Lord stood outside the porch waiting for the talk to finish (M I 161, p.204).

There is no need to press the above analysis of Ānanda's manipulation of the Buddha, if only because neither the Commentary nor the Sutta itself regards Ānanda's action as having such an intention in mind. We mention the possible interpretation of the event as manipulation because elsewhere in the Pāli Canon, for example in the case of Pajāpatī Gotamī,⁸ Ānanda supposedly compelled the Buddha to pursue a course which was later criticized. Ānanda's position in the above Sutta likely has little, if any, basis in fact, but represents, as we have indicated, an attempt to provide a seemingly historical basis for the delivery of an important piece of the Buddha's legend. Ānanda's name is a guarantee of the phrase "evaṃ me sutam" and thus another portion of buddhavaṇṇa is 'historicized'.

The Mahāgosiṅga Sutta (M I 212, p.263) informs us, "At one time the Lord was staying in a grove in the Gosiṅga sāl-wood together with many famous disciples who were elders: with the venerable Sāriputta ... Moggallāna the Great ... the venerable Kassapa the Great ... the venerable Anuruddha ...

⁸See our study, pp. 121-127.

Ānanda with other famous disciples who were elders." We have seen such lists of theras elsewhere; the above list does not, unlike other lists, mention such names as Kaccāna, Koṭṭhita, Kappina, Cunda, Upāli and Rāhula, though these bhikkhus may be subsumed under "other famous elders." Again, as indicated earlier, the list shows some hierarchy of arrangement; the Buddha's two chief disciples head the list, the head of the First Council follows after, etc.⁹ Ānanda's name appears at the end of the list of those bhikkhus who are named and, while its position indicates a comparison in status with the names preceding, Ānanda is obviously an important bhikkhu.

Sāriputta, seeing the approach of Revata and Ānanda, speaks as follows to Ānanda, "Let the venerable Ānanda come; good is the coming of the venerable Ānanda who is the Lord's attendant [upatthākassa], the Lord's companion [santikāvacarassa]" (M I 212, p.264). Having commented on the beauty of the Gosiṅga sāl-wood, Sāriputta asks Ānanda, "By what type of monk, reverend Ānanda, would the Gosiṅga sāl-wood be illuminated?"¹⁰ Ananda replies:

In this case, reverend Sāriputta, a monk to be one who has heard much [bahussuto], who masters

⁹For example, see our study, pp.89-91.

¹⁰The full statement of Sāriputta runs as follows, "Delightful, reverend Ānanda, is the Gosiṅga sāl-wood, it is a clear moonlight night, the sāl-trees are in full blossom, methinks deva-like scents are being wafted around. By what type of monk, reverend Ānanda, would the Gosiṅga sāl-wood be illuminated?" (M I 212, p.264). See also Buddhaghosa's remarks, MA II 250; Buddhaghosa draws attention to verses 98

what he has heard [sutadharo], who stores what he has heard [sutasannicayo]; those teachings which are lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely at the end, which with the spirit and the letter declare the Brahma-faring which is completely fulfilled, utterly pure -- such teachings come to be much heard by him, borne in mind, repeated out loud, pondered over in the mind, well comprehended by view; he teaches dhamma to the four assemblies with correct and fluent lines and sentences for the rooting out of (latent) propensities. By a monk of such a type, reverend Sāriputta, would the Gosiṅga sāl-wood be illuminated." (M I 212-213, pp.264-265).

Sāriputta responds to Ānanda's answer by telling Revata, "It has been explained, reverend Revata, by the venerable Ānanda, according to his own capacity [...sakaṃ patibhānaṃ]" (M I 213, p.265). Sāriputta then proceeds to ask Revata the same question as he has just asked Ānanda and likewise responds, after Revata's answer, that Revata has answered "according to his own capacity." Sāriputta also questions Anuruddha, MahāKassapa and Moggallāna respectively (M I 213, p.265ff). After Mahā Moggallāna has answered Sāriputta's question, the latter requests that Sāriputta too attempt to answer the question (M I 214-215, p.267). Having done so, Sāriputta suggests "It has been explained by all of us, your reverences, each one according to his own capacity. Let us go, your reverences, we will approach the Lord; having approached, we will tell this matter to the Lord; as the Lord explains it to us so will we remember it" (M I 215, pp.267-268).

and 99 in the Dhammapada (S. Radhakrishnan's translation, p.92), "That place is delightful where saints dwell, whether in the village or in the forest, in deep water or on dry land. Forests are delightful (to saints); where (ordinary) people find no delight there the passionless will find delight, for they do not seek for the pleasures of sense."

There are a number of important features to the above Sutta. For example, when we compare the ordering of the list of bhikkhus provided at the beginning of the Mahā Gosiṅga Sutta (M I 212, pp.263-264) with the order in which they answer Sāriputta's question, we discover the order is reversed. The list of bhikkhus which opens the Sutta starts with Sāriputta and ends with Ānanda, while the order in which Sāriputta's question is answered begins with Ānanda and ends with Sāriputta.¹¹ Both lists support the view that Ānanda, while of notable stature as a thera, is below that of the other named bhikkhus. In this regard we note how, after Sāriputta provided his answer, the next person consulted was the Buddha himself, obviously the 'highest' of them all.

Another feature of the Sutta is related to the 'fact' that each bhikkhu answers Sāriputta's question "according to his own capacity [paṭibhāna]." Thus, Ānanda's answer reflects his position as a bahussuta (M I 212-213, pp.264-265); Revata's answer emphasizes solitary meditation (M I 213, p.265); Anuruddha's answer emphasizes deva-sight (M I 213, p.265); MahāKassapa's austere living (M I 213-214, p.266) Mahā Moggallāna's abhidhamma (M I 214, pp.266-267); Sāriputta's answer that "a monk has rule over mind, he is not under mind's

¹¹It is noteworthy that Sāriputta sees Revata and Ānanda together, yet addresses his remarks to Ānanda (M I 212, p.264). If Revata's status is 'higher' than that of Ānanda, as is suggested, then one wonders why Sāriputta does not first acknowledge Revata. In addition, it is Ānanda who asks Revata to join him in going to hear Sāriputta speak on the dhamma.

rule..." (M I 214-215, p.267) and finally the answer provided by the Buddha emphasizes the determination to achieve arahant-hood (M I 219, pp.270-271).¹²

The reference above to a bhikkhu's "capacity" (paṭi-bhāna) is not to be regarded in terms of 'right' and 'wrong' but in terms of the individual achievements of the named bhikkhus, achievements which seem to be a feature of their personalities and characterizations elsewhere in the Pāli Canon.¹³ Excluding Ānanda, and leaving aside certain other difficulties,¹⁴ all the bhikkhus named in the Mahā Gosiṅga Sutta are credited with having achieved arahanthood during the Buddha's lifetime. This 'fact' may suggest that when Ānanda answered Sāriputta's question, his "capacity" as a non-arahant (the Buddha being still alive) affected the nature of his answer. Yet, on the information available, it would be wrong to assume that Ānanda's position as a bahussuta is necessarily the position of a non-arahant, for

¹²The Buddha replies, "In this connection, Sāriputta, a monk, returning from alms-gathering after the meal, sits down cross-legged, the back erect, having raised up mindfulness in front of him, and thinking: 'I will not quit this cross-legged (position) until my mind is freed from the cankers without any residuum (for rebirth) remaining.' By such a type of monk, Sāriputta, would the Gosiṅga sāl-wood be illuminated." (M I 219, p.271).

¹³See e.g. the list of attributes credited to certain bhikkhus by the Buddha at A I 23, p.16ff; also to be consulted for further references, the DPPN.

¹⁴These 'difficulties' deal, for the most part, with such questions as: Why do some bhikkhus achieve quick arahant-hoods? Is it because their arahanthoods were given them at a later date? What are we to make of the fact that some bhikkhus are only credited with arahanthood in the Commentaries? Is it, as it seems, true that there were many arahants (as the

both Ānanda and other bhikkhus continue to connect the term bahussuta to Ānanda, even after Ānanda has achieved arahant-hood.¹⁵ In addition, traditions other than the Pāli recognize the use of the term bahussuta as an important element in the characterization of Ānanda.¹⁶ While the Buddha was alive, he regarded Ānanda as chief among his disciples who were bahussutas (A I 24, p.19) in the same way as he regarded Anuruddha as chief of his disciples with deva-sight (A I 23, p.16), thus confirming the characterizations of both these bhikkhus found in the Mahā Gosiṅga Sutta. Because Ānanda's position as a bahussuta is of prime importance to his characterization in the Pāli Canon, we intend to provide a discussion of this term and its application to Ānanda at the close of this section of our study (see p.222).

In the Mahā Saccaka Sutta (M I 237, p.291) Ānanda asks the Buddha to speak "out of compassion [anukamaṃ]" to Saccaka the Nigaṇṭha because Saccaka had spoken in dispraise of the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha. Ānanda's role in the Sutta, limited to the above request, lends authority to the Sutta as buddhavacana. Since the Mahā Saccaka Sutta is one of

Pāli Canon understands the term) during the Buddha's lifetime?

¹⁵For example, Theragāthā 1021; 1026-1032; 1047-1049.

¹⁶See, for example, Jean Przyluski, Le concile de rājagṛha, pp.39, 67, 91, 102, 121, 171, 209. These accounts emphasize either Ānanda's ability as a bahussuta or describe him as possessing great knowledge (mahāpañña).

the suttas containing material on the bodhisattva period of the Buddha's life, Ānanda's presence is a desideratum.¹⁷

In the Aṭṭhakanāgara Sutta the householder Dasama of Aṭṭhaka asks Ānanda:

Now is there, revered Ānanda, any one thing pointed out by that Lord who knows, who sees, perfected one, fully Self-Awakened One, whereby if a monk dwell diligent, ardent, self-resolute, his mind, not (yet) freed, is freed; or the cankers, not (yet) completely destroyed, go to complete destruction; or he attains the matchless security from the bonds, not (yet) attained? (M I 349, p.14).

Ānanda's response (M I 350, p.15) is in the affirmative and includes mention of the four jhānas, four brahmavihāras and the first three, of the usually four, aruppas.¹⁸ The aforementioned eleven elements are called in the Sutta the "eleven openings to the treasure" (M I 352, p.17) and the "eleven doors to the deathless" (amatadvāra), and each of the elements is considered capable in itself, depending on the nature of the individual concerned, of establishing that individual in nibbāna or, after death, in the state of

¹⁷Regarding the biographical qualities of the Mahā Saccaka Sutta, see G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, p.124ff. All three of the biographical suttas to be found in the Majjhima Nikāya (i.e. the above, plus the Ariyapariyesana Sutta [M I 160, p.203ff] and the Bodhirājakumāra Sutta [M II 91, p.279ff]) have Ānanda present.

¹⁸G.C. Pande, Studies..., pp.164-165, "Sutta 52", maintains that the Sutta under discussion, "plainly belongs to an epoch when the full list of the 'aruppas' was not yet firmly established." See also A V 342, p.219ff; and M I 436, p.106.

"spontaneous uprising" (M I 350, p.15).¹⁹ The householder Dasama was so pleased with Ānanda's talk that he:

... had the Order of monks that were at Pāṭaliputta and Vesālī gathered together, with his own hand served and satisfied them with sumptuous foods, solid and soft, and presented each monk with a separate pair of cloths; to the venerable Ānanda he presented a set of three robes and had a dwelling-place that cost five hundred pieces built for the venerable Ānanda (M I 353, p.18).

Dasama singles out Ānanda, on the basis of Ānanda's dhamma-talk, as particularly deserving of praise. The fact that Ānanda shows such concern for a householder perhaps illustrates, as some bhikkhus would suggest, that Ānanda was not sufficiently concerned with his own salvation, but would rather spend time teaching dhamma.

The Sekhasutta (M I 353, p.18) informs us that the Buddha, having by his presence consecrated a new conference hall (santhāgāra) built by the Sākyans of Kapilavatthu, and having "gladdened, roused, incited, delighted the Sākyans ... with reasoned talk far into the night, addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: 'Ānanda, let there occur to you a learner's course [sekkho pātipado] for the Sākyans of Kapilavatthu; my back is aching, I will stretch it.'" Ānanda, responding to the Buddha's request, proceeds to lecture to the Sākyans of Kapilavatthu (addressing this talk to Mahānāma, the head

¹⁹G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, p.164. See also the metaphor provided by the householder Dasama (M I 352-353, pp.17-18) indicating that any one of the "openings" or "doors" is able to lead to the deathless (amata).

of the group) on the subjects of: moral habit; guarding the doors of the sense-organs; moderation in eating; concentration on vigilance; possessing the seven excellent things; and the four meditations.²⁰ At the end of Ānanda's discourse, the Buddha returns to the scene and praises Ānanda (M I 358, p.25).

The Sangīti Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya (D I 207, p.201ff) reminds us of the Sekha Sutta alluded to above, except that the Sangīti Sutta has the santhagāra located among the Mallas at Pāvā, and has Sāriputta, rather than Ānanda, deliver the discourse. In addition, the Buddha does not ask Sāriputta (in the Sangīti Sutta) to deliver a "learner's course" (sekkha pātipada) but a "religious discourse" (dhammi-katha). Thus the Buddha seems to provide Sāriputta with a greater measure of freedom regarding the choice of his subject matter than he does with Ānanda in the Sekha Sutta. More important is the fact that Sāriputta's "religious discourse" is to be directed to the bhikkhus, while Ānanda's "learner's course" is directed to Sākyans of Kapilavatthu. The difference in audiences is important

²⁰ It is interesting to note that the Pāli Canon, in a Sutta like the Anathapindikovāda Sutta (M III 258, p.309; see p. 211 of our study) maintains that some subjects are not appropriate for the householder. These 'inappropriate' subjects seem to be concerned with the higher stages of the path; for example, the four jhānas. Yet in the Sutta under discussion, Ānanda provides a talk to the Sākyans on the jhānas. The Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 104, p.112) maintains that the Buddha was interested in universalizing the Dhamma to all.

and perhaps implies that Ānanda, a non-arahant, is ultimately not suited for instructing about a 'goal' he has not yet achieved. We use the word "perhaps" because Ānanda's position as a bahussuta (dhammadhara) is an important reason for his being chosen to recite the dhamma at the First Council, a choice which was made prior to his achieving arahanthood. This indicates that Ānanda's ability regarding the buddhavacana does not rely upon his at the same time being an arahant.²¹ Thus the fact that Ānanda is asked in the Sekha Sutta to provide a "learner's course" to a group of Sākyans is no guarantee that we can assume Ānanda to be suited to teaching only this type of discourse and only to this type of audience.

In the Bahuvedaniya Sutta (M I 396, p.64) Ānanda is witness to a controversy between the venerable Udāyin and Pancakaṅga Thapati (Five-tools the carpenter) concerning the number of feelings (vedanā) spoken of by the Buddha. Ānanda reports the difference of opinion to the Buddha who reveals to Ānanda that the classifications of both bhikkhus were correct.

Ānanda, in the Mahā Mālunkya Sutta (M I 433, p.103) asks the Buddha to teach him and the other bhikkhus about the "five fetters binding to the lower shore." Ānanda suggests that if the bhikkhus hear the discourse from the Buddha, they will remember it.²²

²¹See, for example, Cullavagga XI 285, p.394; A I 24-25, pp.19-20.

²²The reference to the fact that if the Buddha

In the Cātuma Sutta Ānanda is asked by the Buddha about the reason for all the noise which he hears (M I 456, p.129). Ānanda reveals that a group of at least five hundred bhikkhus under Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna has just arrived to see the Buddha and the noise now being heard is the result of the meeting between these bhikkhus and the bhikkhus in the Buddha's camp. The Buddha asks Ānanda to summon the bhikkhus before him. Once they are assembled the Buddha, reacting to their earlier lack of self-control, asks them to depart. However, the Sākyans of Cātuma, upset by the Buddha's action, intervene on the part of the 'banished' bhikkhus, pointing out that most of the noise generated by the bhikkhus was explainable in light of the fact that they were 'new bhikkhus' (bhikkhū navā) and that it was important for such bhikkhus to see the Buddha.²³ The Sākyans of Cātuma make

provides a discourse the bhikkhus will remember it suggests the power of the buddhavaca. In this regard we can find statements like the following, "Things for us, Lord, are rooted in the Lord, have the Lord for conduit, the Lord for arbiter. It were good indeed, Lord, if the meaning of this speech of the Lord's were explained; having heard the Lord, monks would remember" (M I 310, p.372). See also: M I 317, p.379; M I 465, p.138; M III 115, p.159; A I 199, p.181; A IV 158, p.108; A IV 351, p.231 and A V 355, p.227.

²³The Mahāvagga (IV 158, p.209) informs us, "Now it was the custom for monks who had kept the rains to go and see the Lord." The Lakkhaṇa Sutta (D III 169, p.158) states, "The people love to see ... [the Buddha]; he is popular among, and beloved by bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs, lay-brethren and lay-sisters, devas and men, Asuras, Nāgas and Gandhabbas." Part of what is implied in the above quotations is that one can see in the personal appearance of the Buddha the fact of his enlightenment; for example in terms of the super-human marks of the Buddha (see the Lakkhaṇa Sutta, D III 142, p.137).

use of a number of analogies to convince the Buddha, and even Brahma Sahampati intervenes to assist them (M I 457, p.130). The Buddha then informs the bhikkhus that just as four terrors await the man who enters the water - waves, crocodiles, whirlpools and sharks, so too do four terrors await the bhikkhu - temper, gluttony, the pleasures of the senses and women (M I 459, p.132).

The Udāna (24, p.28) contains a parallel to the above Sutta except that the location is given as having taken place in Anāthpiṇḍika's arama near Sāvattthī and the noisy bhikkhus are not under Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna, but under Yasoja. Ānanda plays the same role as he does in the Cātuma Sutta and as in that Sutta, the Buddha dismisses the bhikkhus. Unlike the Cātuma Sutta, the Udāna, through Yasoja, points out that the bhikkhus were dismissed by the Buddha out of his compassion for their welfare; this is borne out by the Udāna (25, p.30) claim, "Accordingly those monks, living remote from men, energetic, ardent, with the self made strong, in that very interval of the rainy season realized all the threefold lore." The Udāna goes on to report how the Buddha, subsequently desiring to meet with the group of chastised bhikkhus, asked Ānanda to arrange a meeting. Rather than carry out the Buddha's request himself, Ānanda asks a 'certain bhikkhu' to carry the Buddha's request to the previously 'banished' bhikkhus. The 'certain bhikkhu', having mastered the iddhis, transports himself with the message of Ānanda to the group

of bhikkhus, who also by their iddhi powers return to the Buddha. When the group of bhikkhus arrive, they find the Buddha seated in samādhi and join him. Ānanda, unable to determine what is going on, keeps asking the Buddha when he is going to exchange greetings with the bhikkhus. The Buddha finally arouses himself from meditation and chastises Ānanda for not being able to realize what is going on (Udāna 26, p.30).

Looking, first, at the Udāna treatment of Ānanda, we note that Ānanda's characterization is of the 'dumb servant'. Ānanda has no powers of iddhi and is not able to determine that the Buddha and the bhikkhus are meditating. In addition, all the 'banished' bhikkhus attain arahanthood during that rainy season.

The Cātuma Sutta does not seem as fanciful as that of the Udāna, nor does Ānanda receive the harsh treatment accorded him in the latter source. The Cātuma Sutta emphasizes the importance of seeing the Buddha, especially for the 'new bhikkhus'. Interestingly, Brahmā Sahampati must be brought in to help change the Buddha's mind, just as he is reported to have originally influenced the Buddha to preach the dhamma (e.g. Mahāvagga I 5, p.7). Why the Buddha had to be persuaded to see the 'banished bhikkhus' and was persuaded in the manner indicated (i.e. with the help of the parables) is a question which the Milindapañha (209, p.301) attempts to answer:

... the Tathāgata ... is lord of the Scriptures.
It was with parables that had been first preached

by the Tathāgata himself that they conciliated him, pleased him, gained him over, and it was on being thus gained over that he signified his approval (of what they had said). It was ... as when a wife conciliates, and pleases, and gains over her husband by means of things that belong to the husband himself (Milindapañha 210, p.302).

The Cātuma Sutta, in addition to what has already been said, contains an interesting dialogue regarding the future of the Sangha when the Buddha is not present to lead it:

[The Buddha asks] "What did you, Sāriputta, think when the Order of monks was dismissed by me?"

"When the Order of monks was dismissed by the Lord, I, revered sir, thought: 'The Lord is now unconcerned, he will abide intent on abiding in ease here and now. We too, unconcerned now, will abide intent on abiding in ease here and now.'"

"Do you wait, Sāriputta ... never let such a thought arise in you again." Then the Lord addressed the venerable Moggallāna the Great, saying:

"What did you, Moggallāna, think when the Order of monks was dismissed by me?"

"When the Order of monks was dismissed by the Lord, I, revered sir, thought: 'The Lord is now unconcerned, he will abide intent on abiding in ease here and now. I and the venerable Sāriputta will now lead [pariharissāmāti] the Order of monks.'"

"It is good, Moggallāna, it is good. For either I, Moggallāna could lead the Order of monks, or Sāriputta and Moggallāna." (M I 459, pp.131-132).²⁴

The above passage is an intriguing one for, as I.B. Horner points out, "At D. ii 100, Gotama tells Ānanda that it does not occur to a Tathāgata: 'I will lead the Order of monks.' At Vin ii 188 [i.e. Cullavagga VII 188, p.264] he tells Devadatta he would not hand over (na nissajjeyyam) the Order of monks even to Sāriputta and Moggallāna."²⁵

²⁴Regarding "abiding in ease here and now," see M I 41, p.52 ff.

²⁵MLS II, p.132, fn.1.

In summation, the Cātuma Sutta presents itself as dealing with a secure period in the history of the Buddha's sāsana. There is no talk about the irreplaceability of the Buddha as confidence is expressed in the ability of Sāriputta and Moggallāna to lead the Sangha. The fact that Sāriputta is chastised by the Buddha for his thoughts about following the Buddha into 'abiding in ease here and now' is an unusual occurrence, for Sāriputta is rarely chastised by the Buddha.²⁶ The implication of the Buddha's chastisement of Sāriputta is directly connected to the need for keeping supervision over bhikkhus, especially 'new bhikkhus'. The manner in which the Buddha dismisses the noisy bhikkhus, as well as the way in which they are reinstated, presents a picture of the Buddha (as the Milindapañha suggests) as 'infinitely human'. Ānanda's participation in the events described is minimal and there is no indication of his being regarded, like Sāriputta and Moggallāna, as capable of leading the Sangha. In this regard we may add that, unlike Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna, Ānanda is not depicted here as having a body of bhikkhus under his supervision.

²⁶ It is also noteworthy that Sāriputta and not Mahā Moggallāna is the party who is chastised. In this regard, we may in passing draw attention to the fact that Ānanda is characterized, like Sāriputta, as a mahāpañña. In fact, Sāriputta is regarded as less accomplished than Mahā Moggallāna the latter of whom was noted for his powers of iddhi (A I 23, p.16); see also M I 248, pp.295-296 and the DPPN for the summaries of the lives of these two bhikkhus.

The Nalākapaṇa Sutta (M I 462, p.135) opens as follows:

Now at that time many well known young men of family had gone forth from home into homelessness through faith in the Lord: the venerable Anuruddha and the venerable Nandiya and the venerable Kimbila and the venerable Bhagu and the venerable Kuṇḍadhāna and the venerable Revata and the venerable Ānanda, and many other well known young men of family.

The above introduction reminds us of the Cullavagga passage where Ānanda's "going forth" is described (i.e. Cullavagga VII 182, p.256), where also the names of Anuruddha, Kimbila, Bhagu and Ānanda are mentioned. The names of Anuruddha, Nandiya and Kimbila are frequently linked together in the Pāli Canon (e.g. M I 206, p.257; M III 155, p.200; Mahāvagga X 350, pp.500-501).²⁷ Again, as in the lists already described, Ānanda's name appears at the end of the list. In addition, there is no mention of Upāli.

The Sandaka Sutta (M I 513, p.192) presents Ānanda in a favourable light. Ānanda decides to visit, along with a group of bhikkhus, the paribbājaka Sandaka and his group of five hundred followers. Sandaka (M I 514, p.193) recognizes Ānanda as an important member of the Buddha's following and invites him to provide a dhamma-talk belonging to his teacher (i.e. the Buddha). Thus while Ānanda may be regarded as an important bhikkhu in the Buddha's following, his value is very much connected with the person and dhamma of the Buddha himself. In response to Sandaka's request, Ānanda provides a dhamma-talk

²⁷ See also the list at Cullavagga VII 182, p.256. It is noteworthy that Upāli's name does not appear in the Nalākapaṇa Sutta's list though he is reported (see Cullavagga reference above) to have "gone forth" with many of the bhikkhus named in the Nalākapaṇa Sutta.

on the 'four ways of living a non-Brahma life' (M I 514, p.193ff).²⁸ When Ānanda has delivered the discourse and received Sandaka's praise, he goes on to discuss the 'four comfortless Brahma-farings' (M I 519, p.198) and the four jhānas (M I 521, p.201). Sandaka, obviously very impressed with Ānanda's discourse, and the Buddha's dhamma, asks Ānanda (M I 523, p.202), "How many great leaders are there in this dhamma and discipline [of the Buddha]." Ānanda replies that there are more than five hundred "great leaders" and Sandaka, so impressed with all that he has heard, has his company join the Buddha's sāsaṇa.

G.C. Pande regards the Sandaka Sutta as drawing for much of its material on the Sāmaññaphala Sutta and that the treatment of the material suggests that the Sandaka Sutta is 'late'.²⁹ It is Ānanda's ability to speak about the Buddha's dhamma in detail which persuades Sandaka to have his followers join the Buddha's sāsaṇa. We see in the Sandaka Sutta that Ānanda's position as a bahussuta is confirmed even though the term is not used.

The Ghaṭikāra Sutta (M II 45, p.243) originates with Ānanda's questioning the reason for the Buddha smiling, "Not without motive do Tathāgatas smile" (M II 45, p.243).³⁰ The Buddha goes on to relate how, at the spot which he is now

²⁸For a summary of the subject matter of this Sutta, see DPPN II, p.206.

²⁹G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, p.168.

³⁰The use of the smile as a literary device, indeed as a mannerism eliciting a request for a reason from the viewer, is familiar to us; this mannerism extends to other bhikkhus as well; see Samvutta Nikāya, II 254, p.169 where it applies to Mahā Moggallāna.

occupying, the former Buddha Kassapa instructed a Sangha of bhikkhus. The Buddha, having informed Ānanda of the reason for his smile, is asked by Ānanda to sit down upon the spot (which Ānanda has made ready by folding his outer cloak in four as a seat for the Buddha) and, like Buddha Kassapa, deliver a discourse.

The Bodhirājakumāra Sutta (M II 91, p.279) records the visit of the Buddha to Prince Bodhi in which the following incident involving Ānanda takes place:

And Prince Bodhi spoke thus to the Lord: "Revered sir, let the Lord step on the cloths, let the Wellfarer step on the cloths so that for a long time it may be for my welfare and happiness." When this had been said, the Lord was silent. And a second time ... And a third time ... Then the Lord looked towards the venerable Ānanda. And the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to Prince Bodhi: "Prince, have the cloths packed away. The Lord will not tread upon a cloth carpeting; the Tathāgata looks towards the folk that come after [pacchimam janataṃ]" (M II 92-93, p.280).³¹

The Cullavagga (V 127-128, pp.177-178) also records the above event and, as in the Bodhirājakumāra Sutta, Ānanda is the one to reply to Prince Bodhi. The commentators explain the Buddha's reluctance to step on the carpet because if he did so, the Buddha would be acknowledging that the Prince was to become a father; however, the Buddha knows that, because of Prince Bodhi's kamma from a former life, he will have no children.³² In this regard, the Cullavagga (V 128, p.178)

³¹Regarding the phrase "pacchimam jantaṃ" see I.B. Horner, BD I, p.66, fn.1.

³²This explanation is to be found in the Pāli Commentaries, see DPPN II, p.316 and fn.2 there.

maintains that the Buddha, after the Prince Bodhi incident, declared as a general rule that the bhikkhus should not tread on cloth carpeting. The commentators explain the above 'general rule' by implying that it was formulated on the basis of the possibility that bhikkhus, without knowing or being able to ascertain the kamma backgrounds of the 'parents', might mistakenly suggest that the parents would have a child. The Cullavagga (V 129, pp.178-179) supports the above explanation when it records that a certain woman who had just had a miscarriage asks the bhikkhus to step on the cloth for "good luck's sake." The bhikkhus refuse to do so and report the problem to the Buddha. However, the Buddha replies that since householders are concerned with such "good luck signs" the bhikkhus can step on their cloths. Thus, a transformation has taken place whereby stepping on cloths, originally considered a prediction of certainty of the birth of a child, is now merely a token of "good luck."

The suggestion of the sources discussed above is that the incident with Prince Bodhi provides the impetus for the Buddha to formulate a rule against stepping on carpets (cloths). It is surprising that Ānanda would have known the reason why the Buddha refused Prince Bodhi's request. In any case, the Buddha seems eventually, recognizing the "good luck" aspects, to have allowed the bhikkhus to step on carpeting.³³ Ānanda

³³See Cullavagga V 128-129, pp.178-179.

participates in the above event as the Buddha's attendant; he knows the Buddha's reasoning (perhaps the issue is supposed to have had other precedents) and becomes the Buddha's 'mouth-piece'. One cannot take Ānanda's role in the above events too seriously. Ānanda is merely the 'expedient' in helping to explain certain facets of the Buddha's behaviour much as he was used in the Sutta discussed earlier to draw attention to the Buddha's smile.

The Bāhitika Sutta (M II 112, p.296) records an encounter between Ānanda and King Pasenadi of Kosala. The King, while travelling on his elephant, asks his minister Sirivaddha whether it is the bhikkhu Ānanda whom he sees in the distance. The minister replies that it is, and when Ānanda and the King meet, the latter requests that Ānanda "out of compassion" spend some time with him. The King proceeds to question Ānanda on the conduct, speech and thought appropriate to "intelligent recluses and brahmans" (M I 113, p.298). Ānanda, having provided his answers, is praised by King Pasenadi:

It is wonderful, revered sir, it is marvellous, revered sir, how well spoken is this, revered sir, by the venerable Ānanda; and we, revered sir, are delighted and satisfied with the venerable Ānanda's well spoken words. Being thus delighted and satisfied, revered sir, with the venerable Ānanda's well spoken words, we would give a valuable elephant to the venerable Ānanda, if this, revered sir, were allowable to the venerable Ānanda, likewise a valuable horse, likewise the boon of a village ... But then we know this, revered sir: This is not allowable to the venerable Ānanda. This piece of foreign cloth, revered sir, inserted into the shaft

of a sunshade, has been sent to me by King Ājatasattu of Magadha ... let the venerable Ānanda accept it out of compassion (M II 116, pp.299-300).

Ananda informs the King that he does not need the material as he is replete with three robes. However, Pasenadi insists that Ānanda accept the gift and that Ānanda can make for himself three new robes and distribute his present three robes among the bhikkhus (M II 117, p.300). Ānanda finally accepts Pasenadi's gift and, after relating the story to the Buddha, the latter states, "Monks, it is a gain for King Pasenadi, it is well gotten by King Pasenadi that he achieved a sight of Ānanda, that he achieved a paying of homage to him."

The high regard King Pasenadi of Kosala has for the Buddha and for Ānanda is further illustrated in the Kaṇṇakatthala Sutta (M II 125, p.307). The Sutta centers around the question of whether the Buddha said (M II 126, p.309), "There is neither a recluse nor a brahman who, all-knowing, all-seeing, can claim all-embracing knowledge-and-vision -- this situation does not exist." In the course of the discussion, the King's commander-in-chief Viḍḍabha eventually enters the dialogue and Ānanda decides (M I 130, p.312), "This Viḍḍabha, the commander-in-chief, is a son of King Pasenadi; I am the Lord's son. This is a time when son might confer with son." When Ānanda is admirably able to defend the Buddha's dhmma, King Pasenadi asks the Buddha the name of the bhikkhu. The Buddha provides Ānanda's name and Pasenadi declares, "Bliss indeed,

indeed blissful! [Ānanda ... ānandarūpaṃ]" - an obvious pun on the meaning of "ānanda." The above reference to Ānanda as the "son" (putta) of the Buddha is obviously metaphoric and designed to reveal the fact that the Buddha was the 'spiritual father' of his bhikkhus; this is seen, in addition, in the 'three jewels' (teratanā) formula (i.e. Buddha, Dhamma, Sangha).

The Sāmagāma Sutta (M II 244, p.29) records, as does the Pāsādika Sutta (D III 117-118, pp.111-112) discussed earlier in our study, the disorder that followed after the death of the Jain leader Nāthaputta (see our study, p.163).

The Ānañjasappāya Sutta (M II 261, p.46) has the Buddha delivering a terse discourse on the dhamma to Ānanda and other bhikkhus. Ānanda, after questioning the Buddha on certain points of the discourse, is spoken to by the Buddha in the following manner:

Whatever, Ānanda, is to be done from compassion by a teacher seeking the welfare of disciples, this has been done by me out of compassion for you. These Ānanda, are the roots of trees, these are empty places. Meditate, Ānanda, be not slothful, be not remorseful later. This is our instruction to you (M II 265-266, p.51).

While the above exhortation is directed to Ānanda (see also M III 302, p.350), we can often find the above passage in the Pāli Suttas where the remarks are directed to the bhikkhus (e.g. M I 118, p.152; S IV 133, p.85; S IV 359, p.256; A IV 139, p.94). Thus there is no reason to assume, even in the above case where other bhikkhus are present, that the remarks of the Buddha are directed solely at Ānanda. The fact that Ānanda is not

credited with arahanthood during the Buddha's lifetime leads us to accept the above passage as a call to any bhikkhu not yet liberated. We may note again that the fact that Ānanda was the Buddha's attendant has led bhikkhus such as Nāgārjuna to conclude that Ānanda's late arahanthood is the action of a bhikkhu who placed his service to the Buddha above that of his own salvation:

... par amour pour le service du Bhagavat, Ānanda était son serviteur (upasthāyaka) et il se disait: "Si je prenais trop tôt l'état qui comporte la destruction des impuretés (āsravakṣaya), je m'éloignerais du Buddha et je ne pourrais plus être son serviteur." C'est pourquoi Ānanda, qui aurait pu devenir Arhat, avait décidé de ne pas assumer cet état.³⁴

The Gopaka-Moggallāna Sutta (M III 7, p.58) is purported to have taken place "not long after the Lord's pari-nibbāna."³⁵ The brāhmaṇa Gopaka-Moggallāna asks Ānanda (M III 8, p.58):

Is there even one monk, Ānanda, who is possessed in every way and in every part of all those things of which the good Gotama, perfected one, fully Self-Awakened One, was possessed?

Ānanda replies:

There is not even one monk, brahman, who is possessed in every way and in every part of all those things of which the Lord was possessed, perfected one, fully Self-Awakened One. For, brahman, this Lord was one to make arise a Way that had not arisen (before), to bring about a Way not brought about (before); he was a knower of the Way, an understander of the Way, skilled in the Way. But the disciples are now Way-followers following after him.

³⁴ Etienne Lamotte, translator, Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna, Tome I, p.22.

³⁵ It is interesting to note in passing that the sutta

Having answered Gopaka-Moggallāna's question, Ānanda enters into the following dialogue with the brāhmaṇa:

Is there, good Ānanda, even one monk who was designated by the good Gotama saying: 'After my passing this one will be your support [patisarāṇa], and to whom you might have recourse now?'

There is not even one monk, brahman ...

But is there even one monk, Ānanda, who is agreed upon by the Order and designated by a number of monks who are elders, saying: 'After the Lord's passing this one will be our support and to whom you might have recourse now?'

There is not even one monk, brahman ...

But as you are thus without a support, good Ānanda, what is the cause of your unity?

We, brahman, are not without support; we have a support, brahman. Dhamma is the support. (M III 9, pp.59-60).

All the information provided above suggests that the most important contribution which the Buddha made during his lifetime was to find a Way which is to be equated with "Dhamma". There is no particular individual designated as "support" in the absence of the Buddha.

D.K. Barua states, "The present sutta [i.e. the Gopaka-Moggallāna Sutta] which describes the events immediately after the demise of Gotama Buddha is indeed concerned with the discipline of the Order, i.e. Vinaya rather than with the dhamma or doctrine."³⁶ Barua's remarks obviously allude to the type of question quoted above pertaining to the "support" of the Buddha's followers after the latter's death. It is thus noteworthy that Ananda's replies to the discipline

opens with the customary "evam me sutam." Since the Buddha was by the report of the sutta dead at this time, the phrase "thus by me was heard" is best regarded as a statement of direct personal testimony on the part of Ānanda.

³⁶D.K. Barua, An Analytical Study of Four Nikāyas, p.528.

questions of Gopaka-Moggallāna lie primarily in the realm of Dhamma. In fact, Ānanda informs the brāhmaṇa that there are "ten satisfying things" and that "in whomsoever of us these things exist, him do we revere, reverence, esteem and honour and on him, revering and reverencing him do we live in dependence" (M III 11, p.61). Among the "ten satisfying things [pasādāniyā dhammā]" (M III 11, p.61) which Ānanda describes, is the following: "He is one who has heard much [bahussuto], remembers what he has heard, stores up what he has heard [sutadharo sutasannicayo]; those things which are lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle and lovely at the ending and which, with the meaning and the spirit, declare the Brahma-faring wholly fulfilled, perfectly purified, such things are much heard by him, borne in mind, familiarized by speech, pondered over in the mind, well penetrated by right view." Ultimately, however, the bhikkhu who possesses the "ten satisfying things" is none other than the arahant (though the term "arahant" is not used).³⁷ Having discoursed to Gopaka-Moggallāna, the brāhmaṇa Vassakāra, the chief minister in Magadha, appears and questions Ānanda regarding (jhāna) meditation (M III 13, p.63).

³⁷The Sutta describes the result as follows (M III 12, p.62), "By the destruction of the cankers, having realized by his own super-knowledge here and now the freedom of mind and the freedom through intuitive wisdom that are cankerless, entering thereon he abides therein."

G.C. Pande maintains:

[The Gopaka Moggallāna Sutta's] summary of the "Dhamma" appears to belong to an age when the canonized literature and with it the central doctrines of the Buddhist community had not yet attained to any great elaboration. Besides, the fact that Buddha left behind him no individual as successor could have been a curiosity only while it was yet a novelty, and it could not have remained that much longer after Buddha's death, at least in the area about Rājagaha.³⁸

The fact that the Gopaka-Moggallāna Sutta has Ānanda as the representative of the Buddha's sāsana in the period following the latter's death indicates that Ānanda was regarded with great respect. This respect would seem to stem not only from his being the companion of the Buddha, but in addition from his deep verbal knowledge of the Buddha's dhamma. While, as the above analysis suggests, the laity regarded Ānanda as the most likely 'authority', the question of Ānanda's status within the minds of the bhikkhus themselves, especially those bhikkhus with vinaya interests, is very much open to question.

In the Bahudhātuka Sutta (M III 62, p.105) Ānanda questions the Buddha on the meaning of the phrase, "Investigating the monk is wise." Among the things brought out in the discussion that follows are the facts that a man of right view cannot with murderous intent draw a Tathāgata's blood; that two Tathāgatas cannot arise simultaneously in one world system; that women cannot become Buddhas, nor for

³⁸G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, p.128.

that matter a Sakka, Māra or Brahmā (M III 65, p.108).³⁹

The Ānāpanasati Sutta (M III 78-79, p.121) provides Ānanda's name once again in a list of theras and sāvakas:

Sāriputta, the venerable Moggallāna the Great, the venerable Kassapa the Great, the venerable Kaccāyana the Great, the venerable Koṭṭhita the Great, the venerable Kappina the Great, the venerable Cunda the Great, the venerable Anuruddha, the venerable Revata, the venerable Ānanda and with other well known elders and disciples.

The order in which the bhikkhus appear in the above list shows some variation with the ordering appearing in lists already reviewed (see pp.89-91 of our study). As in the lists already examined, Ānanda's name is to be found at the close of the list. One of the interesting features of the Ānāpanasati Sutta's list is the reference to the fact that it constitutes a list of theras and sāvakas; yet to the best of our knowledge all the bhikkhus named in the list are theras.⁴⁰

In the Cūlasuññata Sutta (M III 104, p.147) Ānanda says to the Buddha:

At one time, revered sir, the Lord was staying among the Sākyans ... And while I was there, revered sir, face to face with the Lord I heard, face to face I learnt: "I, Ānanda, through abiding in (the concept of) emptiness, am now abiding in the fulness thereof." I hope that I heard this properly, revered sir, learnt it properly, attended to it properly and understood it properly.

The Buddha replies to Ānanda's question in the affirmative and proceeds to elaborate on the concept of "emptiness." Ānanda's above-quoted question is largely rhetorical and is designed

³⁹G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, p.139, (Sutta 115) classifies the sutta under discussion, on the basis of its doctrinal make-up, as "late". Ānanda's role in this sutta is rather limited to the stereotypical asking of questions at the appropriate place.

⁴⁰The resolution of this problem may be that the term

to indicate that Ānanda was present when the Buddha delivered the Sutta on "emptiness."⁴¹ In that regard, Ānanda mentions that he has "heard" and "learnt" the Buddha's remarks from a "face to face" encounter and has also attempted to "understand" what he has heard as well as to implement the 'concept of emptiness' in his living (M III 104, p.147).

The Mahāsunnata Sutta (M III 109, p.152) records that the Buddha, returning from "solitary meditation," went to visit the dwelling-place of Kālākhemaka the Sākyan and found Ānanda with other bhikkhus making up robe material in the dwelling-place of Ghaṭṭāya the Sākyan. The Buddha asks Ānanda whether there are many bhikkhus staying in the lodgings prepared by Kālākhemaka the Sākyan before he proceeds with a discourse encompassing such subjects as: the value of solitary living (M III 110, p.154); the "entering and abiding in an inward (concept of) emptiness" (M III 111, p.154); the need to avoid the talk of "ordinary folk" -- talk which does not concern itself with the goal (M III 113, p.156). At one point (M III 115, p.159) the Buddha asks Ānanda, "What do you think about this, Ānanda? From his beholding what

"sāvaka" (in spite of the PTSD, p.707, rendering as "never an arahant") may here be understood to imply merely a disciple of the Buddha, as often found in the Sanskrit literature; see also in this regard A I 23, pp.16ff., where those described as sāvakas are also arahants.

⁴¹G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, p.175, states, "The sutta implies that the final beatitude (i.e. the final 'Nihil') cannot be attained while the aspirant is yet living. Such a clear and outspoken adumbration of the esoteric aspect of the later Sūnyavāda is extremely rare in the Nikāyas." The Cūlasunnata Sutta (M III 109, p.152) does not regard the "concept of emptiness" as the exclusive property of the Buddha.

reason does a disciple regard it as fit that, even though he is being repulsed, he should follow after a teacher?"

Ānanda replies, "Things for us, revered sir, are rooted in the Lord, have the Lord for conduit, the Lord for arbiter. It were good indeed, revered sir, if this speech of the Lord's were explained; having heard it from the Lord, the monks would remember it." Ānanda's remarks are stereotypical and can be found elsewhere in the Pāli Canon.⁴²

The Buddha replies to Ānanda's remarks as follows:

Ānanda, it is not fit that a disciple should follow after a teacher if it is for the sake of an exposition of the Discourses that are in prose and in prose and verse. What is the reason for this? It is that for a long time, Ānanda, these things have been heard, borne in mind, repeated out loud, pondered over in the mind, well comprehended by (right) understanding. But, Ananda, that talk which is austere, a help to opening up the mind and which conduces to complete turning away from, to detachment, stopping, calm, super-knowledge, self-awakening and nibbana, that is to say talk about wanting little, talk about contentment, talk about aloofness, talk about ungregariousness, talk about putting forth energy, talk about moral habit, talk about concentration, talk about intuitive wisdom, talk about freedom, talk about the knowledge and vision of freedom -- it is fit, Ānanda, that a disciple, even though being repulsed, should follow after a teacher for the sake of talk like this.

The Buddha's remarks in the opening section of the above passage are perhaps 'critical' of Ānanda because, as we have already seen, Ānanda's position in the Pāli Suttas

⁴²e.g. M I 310, p.372; M I 465, p.138; A I 199, p.181; A IV 158, p.108; A IV 351, p.231; A V 355, p.227.

is closely connected to a thorough knowledge of the Buddha's dhamma.⁴³ When the Buddha talks about "wanting little" etc., he is speaking primarily about the habits of the discipline (vinaya).⁴⁴ It is not enough merely to hear the buddhavacana, one must practice it.

Malalasekera (DPPN II, p.573) summarizes the Mahā Sunnata Sutta as follows, "The Buddha knew from the number of pallets outside the cells of Kāḷāhemaka that many monks were in residence there. He therefore addressed Ānanda, telling him of the joys of tranquility and solitude. A monk should dwell apart and concentrate his heart internally and thus develop the four jhānas ... A disciple should follow his master's footsteps, not in order to obtain interpretations of canonical law, but solely to hear words which conduce to passionless, illumination, Nibbāna." The Buddha speaks of the relationship between disciple and teacher as one of "friendliness" (mitta); the Buddha will "speak ... constantly reproving, constantly cleansing" and thus help the disciple towards the goal (M III 117-118, pp.161-162).

⁴³ See our remarks below, pp. 222-261.

⁴⁴ It is perhaps wrong to bifurcate the dhamma from the discipline in the passage under discussion. The Buddha does not regard the "exposition of the Discourses..." as useless, but as preliminary to talk which is about the 'action' needed to achieve the goal and the result of such 'action' (for example, "talk about the knowledge and vision of freedom"). The fact that Ānanda's name and position within the Buddha's sāsana is rooted in his knowing of the "Discourses", etc., leads us to assume that Ānanda is being criticized in the passage under discussion. In addition,

The Mahā Sunnata Sutta discussed above illustrates the nature of the Buddha-disciple relationship; the Buddha is the 'authority' who helps the disciple conduct himself in a manner leading towards the goal (i.e. nibbāna). The fact that the commentary calls the Sutta under discussion by the alternate name Ganabheda, illustrates that the Sutta was meant to break up crowds (see DPPN II, p.573). The emphasis on 'self-cultivation' and solitary living stresses the ascetic 'tendency' in the Buddha's sāsana.

The Acchariyabhutadhamma Sutta (the "Discourse on Wonderful and Marvellous Qualities") informs us that the Buddha asks Ānanda to deliver, in detail, a discourse on the "wonderful and marvellous qualities" of the Tathāgata (M III 119, p.164). Ānanda, as in the Cūlasunnata Sutta (M III 104, p.147), emphasizes that the information he is about to relate has been learned "face to face" with the Buddha himself (M III 119, p.164). At the close of the Sutta, after Ānanda has completed his discourse, the Buddha points out some additional features which, unlike Ānanda's discourse, do not speak about the birth of the Tathāgata, but of the content of the Buddha's enlightenment. Whether the closing remarks of the Buddha are designed to reveal Ānanda as overly concerned with the 'person' of the Buddha rather than with his 'discoveries' regarding 'salvation' is a question which, though difficult to answer, is worth keeping in mind.

the Buddha's discourse to Ānanda and the other bhikkhus present is motivated by the fact that Ānanda (and the other bhikkhus) are in a communal setting, whereas the Buddha goes on to emphasize solitary living, etc.

The Ānanda Bhaddekaratta Sutta (M III 189, p.235) informs us that Ānanda, while in the Jeta Grove of Anāthapiṇḍika, "gladdened, roused, incited and delighted the monks with talk on dhamma ... and he spoke the exposition and the analysis of the Auspicious." When the Buddha returns from "solitary meditation" he asks the bhikkhus who has delivered the above discourse on the Auspicious. Learning that the discourse was delivered by Ānanda, the Buddha asks, "But how is it that you, Ānanda, gladdened, roused, incited and delighted the monks with talk on dhamma? Did you speak the exposition and the analysis of the Auspicious?" (M III 190, p.236). Ānanda responds to the Buddha's question by repeating to him the discourse which he delivered to the bhikkhus and, in return, receives the Buddha's praise (M III 191, p.236). It is difficult to know what the Buddha meant when he asked Ānanda whether he had provided the Bhaddekaratta Sutta to the bhikkhus. Are we to believe that Ānanda rarely discoursed to the bhikkhus? The fact that Ānanda had his name attached to the Bhaddekaratta Sutta (given at M III 187, p.233) suggests that he was particularly worthy to recite it. Ānanda was not the only bhikkhu to recite a sutta on the "Auspicious" as Mahā Kaccāna and Lomasakaṅgiya also provide similar discourses on the subject (see M III 192, p.237 and M III 199, p.245, respectively).

In the Lomasakaṅgiya Bhaddekaratta Sutta (M III 199, p.245) the deva Candana asks Lomasakaṅgiya (a bhikkhu) whether

he remembers "the exposition and the analysis of the Auspicious?" Lomasakaṅgiya reports to the deva that he, like the deva, does not know the "exposition and analysis" but we learn that both the deva and Lomasakaṅgiya know the verses of the "Auspicious" (M III 200, p.245). The deva informs the bhikkhu that the Buddha had lectured the verses of the "Auspicious" while the Buddha was staying among the Devas of the Thirty-Three and that Lomasakaṅgiya should learn the exposition and analysis of the "Auspicious" because they "are fundamental to the Brahma-faring" (M III 200, p.246).⁴⁵ Finally, we are told that Lomasakaṅgiya meets the Buddha and receives the information which the deva believed was "fundamental to the Brahma-faring" (M III 201, p.246).

The Majjhima Nikāya, in devoting a number of its suttas to the "Auspicious" (Bhaddekaratta) reveals the importance of these suttas. The fact that Ānanda is credited with knowing it, both in its verses and its exposition and analysis, is of some merit, revealing Ānanda to be a worthy candidate to recite the Buddha's dhamma at the First Council.

In the Mahā Kammavibhaṅga Sutta (M III 207, p.254)

⁴⁵The Sutta emphasizes the fact that one should look with equanimity at the present and not harp after the past or the future. See G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, p.141, "Suttas 131-134".

the bhikkhu Samiddhi approaches Ānanda and reveals to him the subject of a conversation which transpired between him (Samiddhi) and the wanderer Potali's son. Having heard Samiddhi, Ānanda suggests that the conversation be revealed to the Buddha. We have seen this 'type' of sutta before. Ānanda acts as a 'go-between' and reports to the Buddha conversations which he regards as needing resolution. Ānanda, in his role of 'go-between' does not reveal to the party or parties concerned the 'right' answer. In fact, one can assert with confidence that often the suttas are merely using Ānanda's name as a literary device, as a means of setting up the information which the Buddha will provide on the specific question under discussion. This, for example, seems to be the case in the Sutta at hand. Ānanda is aware of the fact that a problem exists; however, it is the Buddha himself who knows the answer (see e.g. M III 208, p.256).

The Dakkhinaṇṇavibhaṅga Sutta (M III 253, p.300) has Ānanda coming to the aid of Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī. It seems that the bhikkhunī desired to give the Buddha a "pair of new cloths ... woven ... specially for the Lord." The Buddha instructs her to give the gift to the Sangha, "If you give it to the Order I will be honoured and the Order too." However, Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī persists in her desire to have the gift accepted by the Buddha. Eventually Ānanda comes to the bhikkhunī's aid:

Revered sir, let the Lord accept the Gotamid
Mahāpajāpatī's new pair of cloths. Revered

sir, Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid has been of much service to the Lord. She is his maternal aunt, the one who brought him up, who looked after him and gave him milk, for when the Lord's own mother passed away she suckled him (M III 253, p.301).

In addition, Ānanda goes on to say:

And, revered sir, the Lord has been of much service to Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid. Revered sir, it is due to the Lord that Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid has gone to the Awakened One for refuge ... to dhamma ... to the Order for refuge. Revered sir, it is due to the Lord, that [she] refrains from onslaught on creatures, refrains from taking what has not been given, refrains from going wrongly among the sense pleasures, refrains from lying speech ... from occasions of sloth induced by intoxicants (M III 253-254, p.301).

The Buddha, having listened to Ānanda, says nothing further about Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī but goes on to relate to Ānanda a series of discourses on the "fourteen offerings graded as to individuals" (M III 254, p.302), the "seven kinds of offerings to the Order" (M III 255, p.303) and the "four purifications of offerings" (M III 256, p.304).

What interests us in the above Sutta is that Ānanda comes to the aid of Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī. This is not the first time that he has intervened to assist the bhikkhunī. We have already noted how Ānanda, through the person of Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī, was able to get women into the Sangha.⁴⁶ In fact, in both the Dakkhiṇavibhaṅga Sutta and the Cullavagga (X 253, p.354)⁴⁷ Ānanda points out to the Buddha that the bhikkhunī in question was a foster-mother to the Buddha.

⁴⁶See our study, pp. 121-127.

⁴⁷See our study, p. 122.

In the case of the Cullavagga, Ānanda's remarks about the foster-mothership of Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī seem to have affected the Buddha into eventually allowing her and women into the Sangha; in the Sutta quoted above, Ānanda's remarks have little if any effect. It seems odd that Ānanda should resort to an argument which previously resulted in his being criticized by the Buddha, for the Buddha viewed the entry of women into the Sangha as instituting a decline in the Saddhamma. It may be that the problem resolves itself by regarding the episode in the Majjhima Nikāya as earlier than that of the Cullavagga. However, the case is not clear.⁴⁸

Also of note is the fact that, in the discourse on the "fourteen offerings graded as to individuals," the Buddha lists as the first, "One gives a gift to a Tathāgata, perfected one, fully Self-Awakened One" (M III 254, p.302). Yet the Buddha requests that Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī give the gift to the Sangha. In this regard, one may note that in the list of "seven kinds of offerings to the Order" the first is, "... one gives a gift to both Orders with the Awakened One at the head" (M III 255, p.303). The commentary maintains that a gift to the Sangha (with the Buddha at its head) is the best, most meritorious gift.⁴⁹ However, the Sutta, unlike the commentary, is not as clear in its interpretation of the subject at hand.⁵⁰ It would seem as though the actions of

⁴⁸See DPPN II, p.523.

⁴⁹See I.B. Horner, MLS III, p.303, fn.5 and MA V 73.

⁵⁰Indeed it is not clear from the Sutta that giving

the Buddha in refusing to accept the bhikkhunī's gift constitutes a 'reaction' for a previous action, namely the Buddha being persuaded by Ānanda to accept women into the Sangha. The Dakkhiṇavibhaṅga Sutta shows: a) that Ānanda does not have the power over the Buddha which he seems to have had in the Cullavagga account of how women entered the Sangha; and b) that the Sangha constitutes a power to be reckoned with. That Ānanda should be so stupid as to take the side of the bhikkhunī (in light of his former effort) is ridiculous. The authors and/or compilers of the Sutta may have wanted us to believe that Ānanda was so swayed by the power of Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī (as the Buddha's foster-mother), that is by the passions, that he forgot the results of his former intervention in the bhikkhunī's behalf.

In the Anāthapiṇḍikovāda Sutta (M III 258, p.309) Ānanda accompanies Sāriputta as the latter's "attendant" (pacchāsamaṇa) to the death bed of the householder Anāthapiṇḍika. Sāriputta provides the dying Anāthapiṇḍika with a discourse not usually provided for "householders clad in white" (M III 261, p.313). The discourse which Sāriputta provides is one that "is for those that have gone forth." Anāthapiṇḍika, calmed by Sāriputta's discourse, his pain relieved, and in awareness of the benefits of what has just been told to him,

to the Sangha is more meritorious than giving to the Buddha. What is to be made of the fact that the Sutta grades individuals as well as the Sangha?

states:

Well then, revered Sāriputta, let there occur reasoned talk such as this for householders clad in white. There are, revered Sāriputta, young men of family with but little dust in their eyes who, not hearing dhamma, are declining, but they could be learners of dhamma (M III 261, p.313).

Having delivered their exhortations to Anāthapiṇḍika, Ānanda and Sāriputta leave and the householder dies, eventually arising in the Tusita group of devas (M III 262, p.313). That night, devaputta Anāthapiṇḍika appears in the Jeta Grove before the Buddha and utters verses praising the Buddha, Dhamma and Sāriputta (M III 262, pp.313-314). When the Buddha informs the bhikkhus of his encounter with the deva, Ānanda asks the Buddha whether the deva was formerly the householder Anāthapiṇḍika. The Buddha, on this occasion, responds, "It is good, it is good, Ānanda. All that could be obtained by reasoning, Ānanda, has been obtained by you. Ānanda, that young deva was Anāthapiṇḍika."⁵¹

The Anāthapiṇḍikovāda Sutta is not the only instance in the Pāli Suttas where Anāthapiṇḍika is ill. In the Samyutta Nikāya (S V 380, p.329) it is recorded that Anāthapiṇḍika, being ill, asks, through an intermediary, that Sāriputta visit him. Sāriputta, accompanied by Ānanda as attendant (pacchāsamaṇa), goes to the householder. Sāriputta

⁵¹See also S I 55, p.80 and Mrs. Rhys Davids' remarks, KS I, p.80, fn.1.

lectures to Anāthapiṇḍika on the value of loyalty to the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha, the practice of the sīlas, etc., claiming that such would result in the alleviation of any pain (S V 381, p.330). At the same time, Sāriputta informs Anāthapiṇḍika that he does fulfil the above conditions and should dwell thoughtfully on them. No sooner has Sāriputta delivered the discourse, than Anāthapiṇḍika's pains disappear and he serves Sāriputta and Ānanda a meal (S V 384, p.331). Ānanda, seemingly impressed with what he has witnessed, goes immediately upon his return to the Buddha who inquires, "Why Ānanda, how is it that you come here at this hour?" Ānanda relates the incidents of the visit to Anāthapiṇḍika, to which the Buddha declares, "Sāriputta is a sage, Ānanda. Sāriputta is of great wisdom [mahāpañño], Ānanda, as indeed he must who can divide up the four-limbs of stream-winning in ten ways" (S V 385, p.332).

The Sutta which follows after the above in the Samyutta Nikāya (S V 385, p.332) records an incident in which Ānanda is the exhorter of Anāthapiṇḍika during the householder's illness. Ānanda points out to Anāthapiṇḍika that faith in the Buddha, Dhamma, Sangha and the sīlas ("four possessions") of the "educated ariyan disciple" will alleviate the "terror and trembling and fear of death, as to what may be hereafter." Ānanda having provided the discourse, Anāthapiṇḍika exclaims that he is no longer afraid because he possesses these "four possessions" (S V 387, p.333).

Regarding the historicity of the events described above, in particular Anāthapiṇḍika's death, there seems little agreement among the extant sources. For example, the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya maintains that Sāriputta died before Anāthapiṇḍika.⁵² This is contrary to what we are told in the Anāthapiṇḍikovāda Sutta (M III 285, p.309; see also S I 55, p.79). The fact that Ānanda accompanies Sāriputta on his visits to the householder likely illustrates, as the Pāli Canon suggests, that the two bhikkhus were good friends.⁵³ That Ānanda is described as in a "pacchā-saṃaṇa" position to Sāriputta reflects the difference in status between the two bhikkhus; in this light the PTSD (p.386) informs us regarding the above term, "a junior Wanderer or bhikkhu (Thera) who walks behind a senior (Thera) on his rounds." The seniority of Sāriputta over Ānanda is indicated in the Suttas under discussion by, for example, making the former the main interlocutor in situations where both Ānanda and Sāriputta are present and by having Ānanda, Anāthapiṇḍika and the Buddha praise Sāriputta for his actions.

When Ānanda makes his solo appearance with Anāthapiṇḍika, he is able to alleviate the latter's pain through his discourse, but it is the householder himself (unlike the situation when Sāriputta is present) who informs Ānanda that

⁵²W.W. Rockhill, The Life of the Buddha, p.111.

⁵³See DPPN I, p.257ff.

he fulfils the conditions of the discourse. In addition, when the Buddha does praise Ānanda for figuring out through "reasoning" (takka) that the deva is Anāthapiṇḍika, the praise conceals a criticism (M III 263, p.315; also S I 55, p.80). As Jayatilleke states regarding the above praise of Ānanda by the Buddha in terms of "takka", "takka was of limited value."⁵⁴ Thus perhaps we are to believe that because of Ānanda's lack of arahanthood, he was unable to "know and see" for himself that Anāthapiṇḍika was the deva. In justice to Ānanda and the text, one should note that Ānanda's "reasoning" regarding the death of Anāthapiṇḍika is based entirely on the story provided by the Buddha. Ānanda was not witness, as was the Buddha, to the encounter between the Buddha and the deva. Ānanda seems to place a great deal of weight on verbal testimony. When Anāthapiṇḍika declares (S V 387, p.333) that he fulfils the "four qualities" which Ānanda has raised in his discourse, Ānanda declares, "Well for you, housefather! Well gotten by you! You have declared the fruits of stream-winning, housefather." However, the Buddha himself also uses the phrase (as does Ānanda above) to declare of Kāḷigodhā that she has "declared the fruits of stream-winning" (S V 397, p.340) and there is little doubt that what the Buddha is saying is that Kāḷigodhā has become a stream winner (see DPPN

⁵⁴K.N. Jayatilleke, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, p.80. See also p.431.

I, p.583, "Kāligodhā"). One can, of course, suggest that the Buddha was in a better position, as an arahant and the Buddha, to 'know' what Kāligodhā had really achieved while Ānanda, as a non-arahant, was not. However, this distinction does not appear to have been the case in the Sutta under discussion where Ānanda declares the fruit of streamwinner for Anāthapiṇḍika.⁵⁵ Finally, one may note again that Anāthapiṇḍika recognizes the importance of verbal statements of the dhamma when he declares to Sāriputta (M III 261, p.313), "There are, revered Sāriputta, young men of family with but little dust in their eyes who, not hearing dhamma, are declining, but they could be learners of dhamma."

The above analysis of Ananda's position in certain of the Suttas dealing with Anāthapiṇḍika's illness makes it clear that knowledge of the Buddha's dhamma-vinaya was highly efficacious and that, in this light, Ānanda's position as a bahussuta dhammadhara is important.

Returning to the Majjhima Nikāya we find the Buddha in the Nandakovāda Sutta (M III 270, p.323) asking Ānanda whose turn it is to exhort the bhikkhunīs. Ānanda's knowledge of the matter would seem to reflect the role he performs as the Buddha's attendant, a position which required him to act as an intermediary between the Sangha and the Buddha. It was Ānanda's job to know how the Buddha's community was to be run and in so doing he must have been aware in detail of

⁵⁵Regarding Anāthapiṇḍika in the Pāli literature, see DPPN I, pp.67-72.

the Buddha's dhamma-vinaya.

The last Sutta in the Majjhima Nikāya in which Ānanda makes an appearance is the Indriyabhāvanā Sutta (M III 298, p.346). In this Sutta, the Buddha points out that the brāhmaṇa's approach to the development of the 'sense-organs' is not in keeping with the ariyan approach. Having heard the Buddha's judgment, Ānanda, in stereotypical fashion, says, "It is the right time for this, Lord, it is the right time for this, Well-farer, that the Lord should teach the incomparable development of the sense-organs (as it is) in the discipline for an ariyan. When the monks have heard the Lord, they will remember" (M III 298-299, p.347). The Buddha, having delivered the discourse requested by Ānanda, closes the Sutta with the following:

Whatever, Ānanda, is to be done out of compassion by a teacher seeking the welfare of his disciples and compassionate for them, that has been done by me for you. These, Ānanda, are the roots of trees, these are empty places. Meditate, Ānanda, do not be slothful, do not be remorseful later. This is our instruction for you (M III 302, p.350).

Since we have already discussed this stereotypical passage in an earlier section of our study, we will not repeat ourselves here.⁵⁶

This, then, concludes our study of Ānanda's place in the Majjhima Nikāya of the Pāli Canon, but, before moving on to the Samyutta Nikāya, some further remarks would seem in

⁵⁶ See our remarks, p. 196.

order.

In the Cūḷarāhulovāda Sutta (M III 277, p.328) which does not mention Ānanda, we have reference to the arahanthood of Rāhula, or to put it more correctly and in the language of the Sutta itself, reference is made to the fact that, "While [the Buddha's] exposition was being given the venerable Rāhula's mind was freed from the cankers without grasping" (M III 280, p.330). Rāhula's success in attaining the destruction of the āsavas is rooted in the Buddha's observation (while in solitary meditation), "Mature now in Rāhula are the things that bring freedom to maturity" (M III 277, pp.328-329). The Buddha's discourse to Rāhula is successful in bringing to fruition the destruction of the āsavas because Rāhula has already brought to maturity "the things that bring freedom to maturity." The implication here for Ānanda is that, because Ānanda, unlike Rāhula, has not "matured the things that bring freedom to maturity," he cannot destroy entirely the āsavas. The Pāli Canon, unlike Nāgārjuna, does not regard Ānanda's lack of arahanthood, or non-destruction of the āsavas, as the magnanimous and compassionate gesture of a man who placed service to the Buddha above cultivation of the 'goal'. One can reasonably view Ānanda's late arahanthood as the outcome of the fact that his attendance upon the Buddha did not allow him sufficient time to 'mature' in those things which would make him ripe for totally

destroying the āsavas. What surprises us is that the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Canon refused to view Ānanda's service to the Buddha as the reason (good reason) for his late arahanthood. The 'hostility' shown towards Ānanda in the Pāli Canon is, as many scholars and the occasional Buddhist have seen, strikingly incommensurate with Ānanda's characterization as: a) the Buddha's chief attendant; b) his characterization as a bahussuta dhamma-dhara; c) his recitation of the dhamma at the First Council; and d) his position as one of the patriarchs (in some of the non-Pāli sources). As we shall subsequently deal further with this question, we will not pursue the above items at this time.

What we wish to emphasize here in alluding to the Cūlarāhulovāda Sutta is that Rāhula, having 'matured' himself, becomes ripe for freedom, and having the Buddha recite a 'standard' discourse, attains release from the āsavas. Ānanda, on the other hand, who hears, supposedly more than anyone else, (and remembers) the Buddha's dhamma-vinaya, is unable within the Buddha's lifetime to acquire Rāhula's success.

There are other questions which the above Sutta raises. For example, it does not use the term "arahant." In addition, it is intriguing to note that Rāhula predeceased both Sāriputta and the Buddha (see DPPN II, p.739). One wonders whether the ascription of 'arahanthood' to the

early members of the Buddha's sāsana is a hagiographical device reflecting the developments of the arahant conception which followed after the Buddha's death. Is Przyluski correct in assuming that Ānanda's position as bahussuta was critical of the arahant conception as it was understood or came to be understood by some members of the Buddha's following after the latter's death?⁵⁷ Does the fact that the arahant conception eventually fell under severe criticism reflect the fact that much of what we assume, on the basis of the extant texts, to have been the Buddha's sāsana as practiced during his lifetime is, on the question of the nature of the arahant, open to question?⁵⁸

Some of the Suttas we have discussed (e.g. the Indriyabhāvanā Sutta, M III 298, p.346; see p.217 of our study) emphasize the fact that the Buddha regarded the solitary life of meditation as lying at the root of his praxis. This is not to say that there were not communal periods in the life of the bhikkhu (e.g. the recital of the pāṭimokkha) but that the attainment of the 'goal' was intimately bound up with individual effort. If Ānanda's position as the Buddha's attendant (upatṭhāka/aggupatṭhāka) required him, as it did, to make frequent contact with individuals seeking audience with the Buddha, this may account for the lack of time preventing Ānanda from his own

⁵⁷See our study, pp. 236-237.

⁵⁸See our study, pp. 113ff.

self-cultivation.⁵⁹ However, there are problems with the above conclusion because, as far as we know, Ānanda, like any other bhikkhu, practiced meditation.⁶⁰ In addition, it does not, as we have already indicated, make sense to conclude that Ānanda's position as the Buddha's attendant is entirely responsible for his late arahanthood. Firstly, the position of the Buddha's attendant, according to the accounts in the commentaries, was a position for which even Sāriputta and Moggallāna applied. Secondly, if Ānanda's position as the Buddha's attendant is the clue to his late arahanthood, then why would the Pāli sources not say so directly? Thirdly, anyone who has read the Pāli account of the First Council is aware of the fact that Ānanda is criticized, even after his attainment of arahanthood. We will have more to say about these points later on in our study.

⁵⁹ This position is taken up by Nāgārjuna; see pp. 197 & 453 of our study. However, Nāgārjuna provides us with additional reasons. In addition Nāgārjuna's analysis does not so much view Ānanda's 'late' arahanthood as the result of attending the Buddha, but rather of Ānanda's decision (a compassionate one at that) to postpone attaining arahanthood in order to serve the Buddha. The implication here is that Ānanda could easily have attained arahanthood.

⁶⁰ Not only did Ānanda practice meditation, but he discoursed about it as well; see e.g. M I 350, p.15ff; M I 521, p.201; M III 13, p.63ff.

Ānanda: His Position as a Bahussuta

The Buddha considered Ānanda "chief among my disciples... who are of wide knowlege [Etad aggaṃ bhikkhave mama sāvakānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ bahussutānaṃ yadidaṃ Ānando]" (A I 24, p.19). Before we examine the application of the term "bahu(s)suta" to Ānanda, some general comments about the term would seem in order.

A.G.S. Kariyawasam says of the term "bahussuta":

BAHUSSUTA (Sanskrit, bahuśruta), an adjective primarily meaning 'heard much, well-informed', 'of wide learning', etc. This was the term used in ancient India to mean a person of wide learning. The origin of the word perhaps goes to Vedic traditions, for the Vedas were regarded as divine revelations to ancient seers and hence called śruti - what is heard. Consequently, a person learned in the Vedas was called a śruta - heard or informed. However, in course of time, the term śruta was used more generally to mean a learned person. And if one could claim to be versed in all the important branches of knowledge at the time he was called a bahuśruta (well-informed) person.

Another important aspect of this term that has a historical explanation is that it also indicates the way in which learning was imparted in those days. The term was confined to mean an academic or rather religious kind of learning and did not include a knowledge of the arts and crafts which were referred to as sippa (Khp.3) ... In ancient India the scriptures, both brahmanic and Buddhist, were handed down for a very long time by oral tradition. The literary works were preserved by committing them to memory. In such circumstances it was natural that a well-learned man was called a bahuśruta. Generally speaking their reading was hearing and their writing was memorising.¹

¹A.G.S. Kariyawasam, "Bahussuta", EB II, Fascicle 4, pp.502-503. The PTSD, p.485, provides the following definition, "Bahu(s)suta having great knowledge, very learned, well

Kariyawasam goes on to say that the term "bahussuta" has taken on a "thoroughly Buddhist colouring" in the Pāli Canon, "It is only in a few instances that the Pāli Canon uses this term to mean non-religious knowledge. And even then the term cannot be completely divested of the idea of religious knowledge."²

Ānanda, as we have indicated above, was described by the Buddha as the foremost of his disciples (sāvaka) who are of "wide knowledge" (i.e. bahussuta, see A I 24, p.19). Ānanda's name is elsewhere in the Pāli Canon linked to the "bahussuta", though the special status provided him in the Anguttara Nikāya (A I 24, p.19) as 'chief' or 'foremost' among the Buddha's disciples who can be described as bahussuta is not repeated elsewhere in the Pāli Canon proper.³ When one

taught." See also, Radha Kumad Mookerji, Ancient Indian Education: Brahmanical and Buddhist, p.543ff. for an account by I-Tsing on the "guarding of monks"; W. Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, pp.288, 296; S. Dutt, Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India, p.30; and K.N. Jayatilleke, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, p.381 ff.

²A.G.S. Kariyawasam, "Bahussuta", EB II, Fascicle 4, p.503, continues, "When Ambaṭṭha is referred to as a bahussuta (D I 93), what is meant is that his learning makes him qualified to enter into a discussion with the Buddha. Being a bahussuta person is one of the many qualifications of the king Mahāvijita who is capable of getting at the true meaning of any statement. The Mātuḡama Samyutta gives 'wide-learning' as one of the five qualities due to which women will obtain birth in a good state after death (S I V 244)."

³See e.g. A III 201, p.148; A III 202, p.149; M I 210, p.268; Theragāthā verses 1019, 1021, 1026, 1027, 1030, 1031. The Theragāthā (verses 1047-1048) seems to be aware of the special qualities of Ānanda as bahussuta (dhammadhara) when (these verses are supposedly uttered by the members of the

looks to Ānanda's characterization in non-Pāli sources, one also finds him described as the 'foremost' of those who can be considered bahussuta, indicating that at one time this characterization of Ānanda was widely circulated.⁴ One may also note in passing that in addition to the term "bahussuta" the term "mahāpañña" is also used to describe Ānanda's achievements in the Buddha's sāsana.⁵

One can also find in the Pāli Canon the tendency to limit the meaning of the term "bahussuta" by making it a characterization of any thera. Thus for example, the Anguttara Nikāya (A II 22-23, pp.23-24) states in its catukka nipāta:

Now, monks, there are these four things which make the elder [thera]. What four?
Herein a monk is virtuous, perfect in the obligations, restrained with the restraint of the obligations, perfect in the practice of right behaviour, seeing

the Council) they refer to Ānanda as "guardian of the great seer's treasure ward [kosarakkho mahesino]"; see K.R. Norman's translation of the Theraḡāthā, p.96.

⁴e.g. E. Lamotte, trans., "Le concentration de la marche héroïque (Sūramgamasamādhi Sūtra), "Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, Vol. XIII, 1965, p. 238; also see E. Lamotte, trans., Le traité de la grande vertue de sagesse de Nāgārjuna, I, p.223; Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka in Indian and Chinese Texts, translated from the French by D.K. Biswas, p.27ff.; Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, pp. 39, 137, 171, 209, 225.

⁵See for example S IV 97, p.60; S IV 101, p.61; also see A I 225, p.205. Ānanda's characterization as a mahāpañña alligns Ānanda with Sāriputta who was known for his being a mahāpañña (A I 23, p.16). In addition, the various accounts of the First Council allude to Ānanda's pañña; see for example Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, pp. 67, 91, 92, 102, 121.

danger in the slightest faults. He undertakes and trains himself in the training of the precepts, he has learned, is replete with learning, is a hoard of learning [sikkhāpadesu bahussuto hoti sutadharo sutasannicayo]. Those doctrines which, lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely at the end (of life) both in the meaning and the letter of them, which preach the utterly fulfilled, the perfectly purified way of the God-life, -- such doctrines are much heard by him [bahussuta], borne in mind, repeated aloud, pondered over and well penetrated by his vision. The four stages of musing which are of the clear consciousness, which are concerned with the happy life in this very world -- these he wins easily, without effort. By the destruction of the āsavas, in this very life thoroughly understanding the heart's release, the release by wisdom [cetovimuttiṃ pannāvimuttiṃ], he realizes it, attains it and dwells therein.⁶

In the Cullavagga (IV 94-95, pp.128-129), qualification as a bahussuta is regarded as one of the ten factors needed by a bhikkhu if he is to play a part in the settling of disputes which arise among the bhikkhus.

Regarding the content and context for the use of the term "bahussuta", the Anguttara Nikāya (A II 178, p.185) records the following question asked of the Buddha, "As to the common saying: 'Widely learned, one who knows Dhamma by heart [bahussuto dhammadharo]' -- pray, lord, of what sort is one widely learned, who knows Dhamma by heart?" To this question, the Buddha replies:

Well, monk, I have taught Dhamma widely - Sutta, Geyya, Veyyakārana, Gāthā, Udāna, Itivuttaka, Jātaka, Abhutadhamma and Vedalla. Now if a monk understands the meaning and (text of) Dhamma, --

⁶See also A III 114, p.90; A IV 6, p.4.

even if it be but a stanza of four lines, -- and be set on living in accordance with Dhamma, he may be called "one widely learned, who knows Dhamma by heart [bahussuto dhammadharo]." ⁷

The above reference to "a stanza of four lines" would seem to be an accretion as the phrase is absent in other similar accounts.⁸ The above passage reminds us of the more radical statements found in such sources as the Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra which glorify the Buddha's word:

... all those Bodhisattvas Mahāsattvas who in this assembly have heard, were it but a single stanza, a single verse (or word), or who even by a single rising thought have joyfully accepted this Sūtra, to all of them ... among the four classes of my audience I predict their destiny to supreme and perfect enlightenment.⁹

In the case of the Anguttara Nikāya passage quoted above, the emphasis put on the terms "bahussuta" and "dhammadhara" is that they are best utilized to describe a bhikkhu who not only knows the dhamma but "understands the meaning and (text of) Dhamma [dhammam annāya dhammanudhamma-paṭipanno]." ¹⁰

Regarding the description of Dhamma in terms of the nine aṅga (i.e. Sutta, Geyya, etc., see p.225 above) F.L.

⁷ Regarding the nine-fold classification of the dhamma, see D.J. Kalupahna, "Aṅga (2)", EB I, Fascicle 4, pp.616-619.

⁸ For example A II 5, p.6ff.; M I 134, p.172; Puggala Paññatti, p.86 (B.C. Law's translation).

⁹ H. Kern, Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka or The Lotus of the True Law, p.213.

¹⁰ See also M I 133, p.171, partly quoted on p.241 of our study.

Woodward regards the classification as "of a far later date ... inserted by the compilers."¹¹ On the other hand, D.J. Kalupahana rejects Woodward's opinion and states, "... we see here a very old tradition, going back to the time of the Buddha, with regard to the classification of the buddhavaṇṇa, the meaning or sense of which had gone into obscurity at the time of the constitution of the canon in its present form." Kalupahana supports his position by pointing to Buddhaghosa's attempts "to include within these categories [i.e. the navāṅga] the works contained in the canon which were known to him at the time."¹²

An important viewpoint is to be seen on the question of the characterization bahussuta/dhammadhara¹³ in discussions on the decline of the Saddhamma. Thus, for example, the Anguttara Nikāya (A II 147, p.151) records as one of the four reasons for a "vanishing away of Saddhamma":

... the monks get by heart a text that is wrongly taken, with words and sense that are wrongly arranged. Now, monks, if words and sense are wrongly arranged, the meaning also is misleading.

However, even knowing correctly the buddhavaṇṇa is insufficient if the dhamma is not preached (A II 147, pp.151-152) and hence becomes another possible reason for the "vanishing away of

¹¹F.L. Woodward, GS II, p.185, fn.1.

¹²D.J. Kalupahana, "Aṅga [2]", EB I, Fascicle 4, p.616.

¹³The terms "bahussuta" and "dhammadhara" often appear together; the latter term is often contrasted with the term "vinayadhara"; see PTSD, p.338 "Dhamma-dhara" and p. 623 "Vinaya-dhara".

Saddhamma":

Then again those monks who are widely learned [bahussutā], versed in the doctrines [āgataṅgamā], who know Dhamma by heart [dhammadharā], who know Vinaya by heart [vinayadharā], who know the summaries by heart [mātikādhara], -- these do not dutifully hand on a text to another; thus, when they pass away, the text is cut down at the root, it has nothing to stand on.

It is noteworthy that Ānanda was, among other things, regarded as an important teacher of the buddhavacana (see, for example, D II 145, p.160). In addition to the above causes of the "vanishing away of Saddhamma" the Sutta notes the intractability of bhikkhus to be instructed and who backslide to the worldly life.

Leaving aside the definition of bahussuta in the above passage, one can appreciate the concerns expressed, especially if one regards them as having their origins in the period either immediately preceding, or following immediately after, the Buddha's parinibbāna. We are, in reading the above Sutta, reminded of the Buddha's statements in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 123-124, p.133ff.) regarding the "four Great Authorities" wherein the knowledge of the Suttas and Vinaya are presented as the 'touchstone' for what the Buddha has said.

However, in spite of the importance attached to knowing the Dhamma, the Pāli Canon exhibits a willingness to watch the Dhamma decline and to find its salvation in a rigorous implementation of the discipline:

Although the Suttantas and Abhidhamma be forgotten

for all time, the teaching persists while the Vinaya is not destroyed (Mahāvagga I 98-99, p.127).

In the Suttavibhaṅga (BD I [III 10], p.19), the Buddha informs Sāriputta:

Some conditions, Sāriputta, causing the cankers do not so much as appear here in the Order until the Order has attained great learning ... Hence the teachers make known the course of training for disciples, and appoint the Pāṭimokkha in order to ward off those conditions causing the cankers.

Further, the Samyutta Nikāya (S II 223-225, pp.151-152) informs us that in periods of decline in the Saddhamma, more precepts are needed.

The ability to dispense with the Suttapiṭaka and to underplay the position of the bhikkhu characterized as bahu-ssuta is also, in some sense, a willingness to dispense with Ānanda. In fact it is ironic that, as we have already noted, Ānanda is individually credited with, if not causing, then certainly accelerating the decline in the Saddhamma by gaining the admission of women into the Sangha.

As we have already indicated earlier in our study, as far as we know, the Buddha, during his lifetime, makes no reference to either a Sutta, Vinaya or Abhidhamma Piṭaka. If we take the attempts of the Pāli Canon to provide us with a history of the Buddha's sāsana seriously, then the Buddha's first reference to his enlightenment is made only in terms of Dhamma (e.g. Mahāvagga I 4-5, p.6). In addition,

some of the early conversions to the Buddha's sāsana, as described in the Mahāvagga, talk only of "dhamma".¹⁴ Also to be found in the seemingly early statements on the Buddha's sāsana is the Pāli compound, Dhammavinaya, which Oldenberg argues for as follows:

It may be objected, perhaps, that this division of Buddha's teaching into two parts presupposes too long a period for its development; this objection would perhaps be well founded, were it not for the probability that much of the preparatory work of Buddhism had already been done for it by the Brahmanical theology, and other sects which preceded it. So that, when the first Buddhist communities made their appearance, the outward religious forms for the new sect were, to a great extent, already fully developed.¹⁵

Recent study on the above question tends to support Oldenberg's position.¹⁶

If Oldenberg's conclusions are accepted and one regards the inception of the Buddha's sāsana as arriving into the Indian milieu with a basically pre-established "outward religious form" (i.e. discipline/vinaya) then during the 'early' period of the Buddha's ministry, concentration was placed on the dhamma-message of the Buddha. This aforementioned situation, as we have already indicated, is supported by the Pāli materials covering, or purporting to cover, the early period of the Buddha's ministry. The size of the dhamma literature and the growth in the Abhidhamma literature

¹⁴See our study, p.132.

¹⁵H. Oldenberg, ed., Vinaya Piṭakam I, p.xv.

¹⁶See, for example, the work of Nand Kishore Prasad, Studies in Buddhist and Jaina Monachism.

when compared with the vinaya literature, would suggest the tremendous 'interest' placed in the dhamma by some bhikkhus.

It is noteworthy that, though the term "bahussuta" occasionally is applied to the vinayadhara, it is usually found connected to the dhammadhara.¹⁷ The fact that the term "bahussuta" is used on occasion to cover the entire Dhamma and Vinaya may indicate that the references to dhammadhara and vinayadhara came into being later, when the branches of knowledge had become more highly specialized and differentiated from each other. The two terms "dhammadhara" and "vinayadhara" suggest a compartmentalization of two branches of knowledge (dhamma and vinaya) which find their 'ideal' representatives in the Pāli Canon in the persons of Ānanda and Upāli. In this regard, Ānanda and Upāli become spokesmen for their branches of knowledge at the First Council. Regarding Upāli, as we have already shown, the Pāli Canon has little to say other than to present him in a stereotypical fashion as an expert on the discipline.¹⁸ The relative lack of information on Upāli is intriguing in light of the fact that the Theravādins have chosen him as their first patriarch.¹⁹

¹⁷ See fn.12 above and A.G.S. Kariyawasam, EB II, Fascicle 4, pp.504-505.

¹⁸ See DPPN I, "1. Upāli Thera", pp.408-410. Malalasekera says (p.409), "The canon contains but few records of any discourses connected with Upāli, apart from his questions on the Vinaya."

¹⁹ See Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, p.50 ff.

The evidence available to us in the extant Buddhist sources suggests that there was, at some period in the history of the Buddha's sāsana, a tendency on the part of many bhikkhus to align themselves along lines of 'interest' roughly indicated by the preference for either the 'way of knowledge' (dhamma) or the 'way of action' (vinaya). It is not necessary to assert a rigid line of bifurcation between those expressing 'interest' in one area over the other. In fact, we know that as time went on, even the Dhamma was divided amongst some of the bhikkhus, illustrating a preference for one Nikāya over the other.²⁰ In addition, because of the many injunctions in the Pāli Canon which emphasize a balanced picture of the dhamma-vinaya, one should not imply that this 'ideal' was universally dispensed with. On the other hand, the compartmentalization of the buddhavaṇṇa into Piṭakas illustrates a 'need' to separate these branches of the Buddha's teaching.

The Mahāvagga (IV 168, p.221) records:

This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence on an Invitation day monks are speaking dhamma, those versed in the discourses are chanting a discourse, the discipline experts are propounding discipline, the talkers on dhamma are discussing dhamma, monks are quarrelling [i.e. 'disputing about points of dhamma and discipline] until the night is almost ended.

Further to what has already been said, one can mention the fact that "outward religious forms" have always appealed

²⁰ E.W. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p.24ff.

to the Indian populace who, for example, place a high price on ascetic practices as a sign of 'worthiness'. Even the Buddha first approached his quest through asceticism, and the Pāli Canon is replete with examples, both from within and without the Buddha's fold, of the power which ascetic practices, and related phenomena, continued to manifest.²¹

The dhamma embodied in the Pāli Sutta Piṭaka, unlike the material of the Vinaya Piṭaka, is often abstruse and not easily assimilated by the unintelligent. The fact that the history of Buddhist literature shows its greatest divergencies in the area of the dhamma and its interpretation suggests that it, as opposed to the discipline, was the main target for further developments in the Buddha's sāsana.²² The fact that some of the Chinese pilgrims to India reported that in certain instances bhikkhus of both Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna persuasion could be found living together, also testifies to the fact that disciplinary procedures were not always of major issue.²³

²¹The power of asceticism is well illustrated in such important conversions as that of the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa - see Mahāvagga I 26, p.35ff., where the Buddha is forced to 'outdo' the powers held by Kassapa of Urvela. This ascetic recognized that, "if the great recluse does a wonder of psychic power before the populace, [psychic powers being regarded as the outcome of ascetic practices] the great recluse's gains and honour will much increase" (Mahāvagga I 27, pp.36-37).

²²W. Pachow, A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa, p.31, states, "...it is clear that indications given in the literature of the schools prove that the cause of the schism was more on the side of doctrine than on that of disciplinary rules."

²³Samuel Beal, Si-Yu-Ki: Buddhist Records of the

Ānanda's position as a bhikkhu characterized as a bahussuta and dhammadhara seems particularly suited to a certain period of Buddhist history. We know that during the lifetime of the Buddha no record was kept of his words in any other than an oral form. It is likely that with the approach and certainly with the subsequent death of the Buddha, his followers eventually felt the need to ensure their own and their leaders' survival by recording the buddhavaṇṇa. Thus we find in the Pāli Canon and its commentaries discussions regarding authority, the fear of the decline of the Saddhamma, references to dhammadharas, vinayadharas, bhaṇakas and the Council of Rājagaha. How unique and special the buddhavaṇṇa was in the actual lifetime of the Buddha is difficult to say, though subsequent to his death the Buddha's words became almost magical. We see, for example, in the Lotus Sūtra, how even a few words of the Buddha could lead individuals to enlightenment.²⁴

Western World, Vol.I, pp.176, 207; Vol.II, pp.257, 275. The Mahāyānist acknowledged the Hīnayāna Canon, but would not accept it as the highest truth. E. Frauwallner, The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature, p.5, points out, "we know that, for example, at the time of the rise of Mahayana the followers of the new current for a long time had to adhere, from the point of view of the Vinaya, to one of the older Hinayana schools." Frauwallner's conclusion is drawn from L. de la Vallée Poussin, "Opinions sur les relations des deux Véhicules au point de vue du Vinaya", Académie Royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences morales et politiques, 5me série, T. XVI, 1930, Nos.1-2, pp.20-39.

²⁴See our study, p. 226.

John Brough, in his article, "Thus Have I Heard...", records the views of Jean Przyluski:

It has been suggested that by means of the word sutam the Buddhists (and we may add, the Jainas) intended to confer upon their own scriptures the dignity of being śruti, in emulation of the Brahmanical scriptures; and this may have played some part in establishing the usage. But the simple declaration of witness as outlined above could by itself quite adequately explain it. The undoubted power of the asseveration is amply recognized in several of the accounts of the Council of Rājagṛha, where it is stated that when Ananda said evam me sutam, his audience rose in the air and wept, marvelling that they should hear again the very words of their dead master.²⁵

Ānanda's characterization as bahussuta and as a dhammadhara, coupled with his position as the Buddha's "chief attendant" (A I 25, p.20) make him a bhikkhu of the utmost distinction. It is Ānanda's qualifications (bahussuta/dhammadhara) which make him the 'ideal' candidate to repeat the buddhavacana at the First Council. In this light, the fact that Ananda's arahanthood is described as having been achieved only at the very last moment prior to the First Council, stands out as one of the great enigmas of Buddhist hagiography.

We have already drawn attention to the fact that the

²⁵ John Brough, "Thus Have I Heard...", BSO(A)S, 13, Part II, 1950, p.425. K.N. Jayatilleke, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, pp.381-382, argues against seeing the buddhavacana as śruti. Ānanda's effect on his audience, as described by Brough above, are to be found in the First Council accounts in the Ta Tche Tou Louen, Fo pan-ni-yuan king and Pan-ni-yuan king (i.e. the Parinirvana Sūtras), as well as the Mahasaṃghika Vinaya; see pp.69-70, 84 and 210 in Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha.

Pāli Canon as a compilation, as the canon of the Theravāda, favours the Vinaya over the Suttas (Dhamma). Thus, for example, the Cullavagga (X I 286, p.396), in its version of the Council of Rājagaha, has Upāli recite the Vinaya before Ānanda recites the Dhamma, while in other accounts the order is reversed, or Upāli's name is absent, as we shall indicate further on in our study. Further, the Pāli list of patriarchs begins with Upāli and makes no mention of Ānanda, suggesting that its list is a list of vinaya-masters.²⁶

The tendency to emphasize one individual at the expense of another (e.g. Upāli at the expense of Ānanda) is also to be seen in the non-Pāli sources. In order to provide a perspective on the problem at hand, we offer the following remarks of Jean Przyluski:

A passage drawn from the Asokāvadāna enables us to specify the attitude of its author towards these great problems [i.e. the question of vinaya versus sutta interests]. Two bhikshus (mahallāka) discuss the question of the bahusruta and that of the observation of the prohibitions (śīlas). They state the following definitions: "A bhikshu who does not transgress the minor prohibitions, is called 'vanquisher of prohibitions' (jitaśīla?). He who has heard everything and who has heard without falsification (of the truth) is called '(One who has) heard much' (bahuśruta)."
Śāṇavāsa hears them and reprimands them. The definitions that he gives, contrary to those of the bhikshus,

²⁶The omission of Ānanda's name from the list of patriarchs in the Theravāda contrasts with his appearance as a patriarch in the lists of other schools. Przyluski contends that a list which contains the names of Mahākassapa and Ānanda is older than a list which does not (e.g. the Theravāda list). See Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, p.54 and also pp.50-58.

are quite original: "He who has the absolutely pure insight (dr̥iṣṭi), is said to maintain the prohibitions in all their purity (śuddhaśīladhara) ... He who acts according to that which he has heard, is called '(one who has) heard much' (bahuśruta)." (A.W. Ch. p. 16b). These formulae of Śāṇavāsa amounted to nothing but the abolition of the distinction posed by the Vinayists, the detractors of Ānanda. The Vinayists strove to set against the bahusruta, the Arhat, the accomplished saint, the strict observer of the prohibitions. Śāṇavāsa on the contrary endeavours here to make no distinction between the two notions. In less scholastic language his discourse comes to mean, "He who knows the truth acts well and reciprocally he who acts well, is a bahusruta. Ānanda, the first of the bahuśrutas is therefore at once the patron of the Sages and the Saints, of those who know and of those who observe the prohibitions in all their purity. His detractors are in the wrong in decrying his knowledge as well as his conduct." In the mouth of Śāṇavāsa, the apostle of Mathurā... the founder of the Naṭa-Bhaṭa monastery, this thesis is significant. It shows that originally the faithful of Mathurā were ardent defenders of Ānanda and that they did not admit the superiority of Discipline (Vinaya) over Dharma. It is possible to uphold this conclusion on the basis of other facts.²⁷

There are a number of points in Przyluski's remarks which deserve repetition. Firstly, the two bhikkhus polarize the position of the bahussuta against that of the bhikkhu who upholds the "minor prohibitions." The conflict here suggests a difference of opinion regarding the efficacy of the 'way of action' over the 'way of knowledge', a conflict which Śāṇavāsa attempts to undermine and rectify. The reference of Przyluski to "minor prohibitions" reminds us of the statement

²⁷ Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, p.28. The reference to "other facts" in Przyluski's remarks relates primarily to an analysis of the First Council; see his pp.28-47.

credited to Ānanda (Cullavagga XI 287, p.398) that he did not ask the Buddha which of "the lesser and minor rules of training may be abolished." The apparent disregard of Ānanda for the sikkhāpada in the Cullavagga account (XI 287, p.398) fits the 'non-adjusted' (i.e. before Sāṇavāsa's attempts at rectifying the problem) view of Ānanda as bahussuta in the Asokāvadāna account quoted above. In addition, it is Ānanda's position which is under attack in the Asokāvadāna, and the need to defend the position of the bahussuta (i.e. those so described) may indicate that it was, at the time of the avadāna, succumbing to the position of the śuddhaśīladhara.²⁸

Secondly, Przyluski states, "The Vinayist strove to set against the bahuśruta, the Arhat, the accomplished saint, the strict observer of the prohibitions." How thoughtful, how substantiated a conclusion is this remark of Przyluski's? The significant feature of Przyluski's statement is his reference to the fact that the position of the bhikkhu described as bahussuta is, from the Vinayist position, to be contrasted with that of the arahant. One wonders whether Przyluski's remark can provide assistance in explaining one

²⁸Przyluski dates the composition of the Asokāvadāna in the period 150-100 B.C.; see The Legend of Emperor Asoka, p. 172 and also pp.187-188. The Pāli Canon was put into writing in the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi (29-17 B.C.); see W. Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p.xxix. Thus we can assume that by the time the Pāli Canon was put into writing, the issues discussed in the Asokāvadāna were in circulation.

of the most enigmatic features of Ānanda's characterization, his arahanthood.

Anyone who has read the extant Pāli Canon is struck by the developments which took place in formulating the content of the arahant ideal and in the manner in which the ideal is ascribed to certain individuals, some seemingly becoming arahants with little or no effort. As we have stated earlier, we cannot undertake to examine the position of the arahant in detail, but something further to what has already been said would seem advisable at this time.²⁹

We know that the term "arahant" does not have a Buddhist origin but, as W.G. Weeraratne concludes, "the term was used to describe religious leaders who were considered to be greatly advanced spiritually, particularly of religious leaders other than orthodox brāhmins."³⁰ As time went on, the term "arahant", like so many other terms common to the Indian tradition, developed a particularly Buddhist content.³¹ To put it simply, the term "arahant" became the epithet of the accomplished bhikkhu, the title of which was applied also to the Buddha. At the same time, as we have numerous statements describing the content of the term "arahant", we also find, for example in the Pāli Suttas, problems over how the arahant state is to be acknowledged in the case of individual

²⁹See our study, pp. 113ff.

³⁰W.G. Weeraratne, "Arahant", EB II, Fascicle 1, p.41.

³¹Ibid., p.41 ff. In addition, worthy of consultation is I.B. Horner, The Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected: A Study of the Arahant.

bhikkhus. For example, the Samyutta Nikāya (S II 50, p.38) records that on one occasion Sāriputta was accused of saying that he had won "...saving knowledge [aññā]:³² -- that birth is destroyed, the divine life lived, done that which was to do, and that there is ... nothing further of these conditions." Sāriputta maintains that he did not use the above words and in answer to the Buddha's queries as to how Sāriputta would make known his winning of "saving knowledge", Sāriputta provides a number of doctrinal statements. It is not necessary here to go into the content of Sāriputta's remarks, but rather to emphasize the fact that the manner of proof is one of declaring knowledge of the doctrines peculiar to the Buddha's Magga.

Thus, T.W. Rhys Davids declares:

In the old texts, we are informed of a custom by which, when a bhikkhu thought he had attained [arahanthood], he could 'announce his knowledge,' as the phrase ran. The [Chabbisodhana Sutta, M III 29, p.81] gives the six questions which should be put to the new aspirant. If he answered these correctly, his claim should be admitted. By the time of the commentators this was obsolete. They speak of no arhats in their day; and we hear of none mentioned, in any source, as having lived later than the 3rd century of our era. The associations with the word became so high that only the heroes of old were esteemed capable of having attained it ("Arhat", ERE I, p.775).

The references above to the manner of declaring one's arahanthood, dovetail with statements in the Pāli Suttas which emphasize the centrality of the dhamma, "Dhamma is the support" (M III 9, p.60); "I [declares the Buddha] shall not die, O

³²The term "aññā" is frequently to be equated with arahanthood, see PTSD, p.14.

Evil One! until this pure religion of mine shall have become successful, prosperous, wide-spread, and popular in all its full extent -- until, in a word, it shall have been well proclaimed among men" (D II 105, p.113).

The above analysis thus emphasizes the position of the arahant in terms of knowing the Buddha's teaching, the significance of the Buddha and of Ānanda as teachers being well acknowledged in the Buddhist sources.

At the same time as presenting the above view of the arahant and his method of verifying, at least for others, his attainment, the dhamma was to be tested as well as known.³³ Thus we are able to find statements which declare that a mere verbal knowledge of the dhamma is not enough:

Herein, monks, some foolish men master dhamma: the Discourses in prose and verse, the Expositions [i.e. the navanga]... These having mastered that dhamma, do not test the meaning of these things by intuitive wisdom [paññāya]; and these things whose meaning is untested by intuitive wisdom do not become clear; they master this dhamma simply for the advantage of reproaching others and for the advantage of gossiping, and they do not arrive at that goal for the sake of which they mastered dhamma (M I 133, p.171).

These remarks of the Buddha do not avail themselves either of the term 'bahussuta' or "dhammadhara" though these terms, as we have seen, are applied to those bhikkhus who

³³ According to such suttas as the Saṅgārava Sutta (M II 211, p.400) the Buddha discovered "truths ... not heard before." This suggests that it was first of all important to know these truths. Regarding the utilization of the dhamma, see the Musīla-Nārada controversy, pp.274-283 of our study.

master the navaṅga (see A II 178, p.185; our study, pp.225-228). In the Majjhima Nikāya passage quoted above, the Buddha informs us that one must, in addition to knowing the navaṅga, have tested the meaning by "intuitive wisdom" (paññā). In this regard, it is noteworthy that the Buddha declared of Ānanda (A I 225, p.205), "Monks, Ānanda is a learner. Yet it would not be easy to find his equal in insight [paññāyā]." Elsewhere in the Pāli Canon, the Buddha refers to Ānanda as "mahāpaññā" (e.g. S IV 97, p.60; S IV 101, p.61). Interestingly, Sāriputta is also known as mahāpaññā (see, for example, S V 385, p.332); in fact, in Sāriputta's case, being mahāpaññā is his most distinctive quality (A I 23, p.16). We have seen and will continue to see the similarities between Ānanda's and Sāriputta's characterizations elsewhere in our study.³⁴

In addition, the Buddha goes on to say, in the Alagaddūpama Sutta (M I 134-135, pp.172-173) that the dhamma which he has taught is to be regarded like a raft, so that when the 'other shore' has been reached, the dhamma, like the raft is not retained. According to K.N. Jayatilleke, the 'parable of the raft' is to be understood as follows, "What is meant is that unlike the answers to the avyākata-questions (which were 'not useful' ... for salvation), the dhamma was useful for salvation and its values (though not its truth-value) lay in its utility. It ceases to have value, though

³⁴Regarding 'emancipation by paññā', see Rune Johansson, The Psychology of Nirvana, pp.85-105.

it does not cease to be true, when one has achieved one's purpose with its help by attaining salvation."³⁵ Thus, if one accepts Jayatilleke's explanation, the 'fact' that the dhamma is abandoned, like the raft, at attaining salvation, does not at the same time imply that it (the dhamma) could be dispensed with because it constituted the means for others, who had not yet attained salvation.³⁶

The parable of the raft suggests that a bhikkhu who achieves arahanthood has completed his task and will, in the future, have little to do with, for example, the teaching of the dhamma. It is difficult to find this position worked out in its details in the Pāli sources; one may note, for example, how in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 141, p.154) the Buddha informs Ānanda that it is not the business of the bhikkhus to care for the Buddha's remains. Further, Nāgārjuna makes the point, quoting Ānanda, that an arahant would not be able to attend upon the Buddha.³⁷ Finally, the criticism which the arahant conception was to succumb to in the 'late' developments in Buddhist doctrine suggests that the idea of the arahant as a selfish, self-interested individual was at the heart of the development of the bodhisattva ideal.

³⁵K.N. Jayatilleke, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, p.358.

³⁶The parable of the raft is used by the Buddha to counteract the position of those who make use of the dhamma, "for the advantage of reproaching others [or] for the advantage of gossiping" (M I 134, p.172).

³⁷See our study, pp. 197, 453.

None of the uses of the term "bahussuta" so far quoted equate a bhikkhu so qualified with being an "arahant". A.G.S. Kariyawasam contends that certain verses of Ānanda in the Theragāthā in conjunction with the remarks of the commentary "imply that the term bahussuta is used ultimately exclusively for an arahant."³⁸ In a sense Kariyawasam's remarks are a truism, for if the dhamma constitutes the 'raft' to salvation, then those who have achieved arahanthood would have utilized the raft of dhamma. This viewpoint is perhaps supported by those statements quoted above (see p.225) that the term bahussuta was ideally applied to every thera. On the other hand, the bhikkhu characterized as bahussuta seems to represent a particular class of individuals, a class of which Ananda was its foremost representative. Further, as we have indicated, the Pāli sources do not equate the bhikkhu characterized as bahussuta as necessarily at the same time an arahant. Thus, the Buddha declared Ānanda the foremost of the bhikkhus characterized as bahussuta, even though Ānanda did not achieve arahanthood during the Buddha's lifetime.

With the above analysis in mind, one might suggest that Ānanda as the foremost of the bahussuta bhikkhus, represented a particular phase in Buddhist eschatology. In this regard one can raise again the statement of Przyluski that the bahussuta position constituted an alternative to

³⁸A.G.S. Kariyawasam, "Bahussuta", EB II, Fascicle 4, p.503.

the arahant (i.e. the arahant being the successful practitioner of the sīlas). Scholars have always expressed surprise at the treatment of Ānanda's arahanthood, implying for the most part that arahanthood was denied Ānanda for reasons which are difficult to determine at this late date. It may be that, rather than seeing Ānanda's arahanthood as something denied him, one might regard his 'eventual' arahanthood as an indication that he was claimed by those who advocated that position at a time subsequent to his death. This view of Ānanda's arahanthood is, at this point in our study, merely an hypothesis worthy of consideration.

If arahanthood is, as Przyluski suggests, closely allied with the discipline, it might be useful to look at the arahant conception in the Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka. I.B. Horner, who has done the most exhaustive study to date in English of the arahant conception in the Pāli sources, declares, "There are ... but few references to the arahan as such in the Vinaya."³⁹ Horner goes on to say, "Now since the Vinaya is probably early and the arahan is not explained and described in it in such great details as in the Nikāyas, it is possible that at the time of the Vinaya the arahan concept had not attained its final form, and the beginnings of the Buddhist arahan were but emerging."⁴⁰

³⁹ I.B. Horner, The Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected: A Study of the Arahan, p.110.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p.115.

Horner is correct in pointing out that the Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka, unlike the Sutta Piṭaka, does not provide us with detailed statements on the nature and content of arahanthood. Whether Horner is correct in considering the arahant concept to show only "beginnings" in the Vinaya, is another matter. For example, the Mahākhandhaka of the Mahāvagga (I 18, p.26) has no trouble in applying the term arahant to a group of seven of the Buddha's first successful candidates. The fact that the term "arahant" does not appear as frequently, or in as much detail, in the Vinaya as in the Suttas cannot be construed as establishing the 'earliness' of the concept in the former body of literature. It is in keeping with the style and purpose of the Vinaya as largely a disciplinary tract to emphasize what is not emphasized in the Suttas, the minutiae of the disciplinary code. Regarding the origins of the Pāli Canon in Ceylon, Frauwallner states:

The works of the mother country composed in Pāli reached Ceylon in the times of Asoka at the earliest, the greater part of them only later, in all likelihood a long time afterwards. This is rather late in comparison to what we know of the date of the Skandhaka work and of the remaining earliest Buddhist literature. Already the missions of Asoka belong to a period later by more than one hundred years than the composition of the Skandhaka. Besides everything points to the fact that these works came to Ceylon already in a well established form. The late date is itself an argument in favour ... The alterations belonging to the earliest of the tradition, which subjected the texts to the most serious distortions, had already done their work on the Pāli texts before

they came to Ceylon. They are as little free⁴¹ from them as are the texts of the other schools.

In addition, Frauwallner points out, "the Buddhist literature of Ceylon, and above all the commentaries, show a strong northern influence [i.e. northern India]."⁴² In this regard, it is important to note that Przyluski concluded that the upholders of the 'way of discipline', that is those who denigrated the position of the bahussuta in the Asokāvadāna, showed "pleasure in glorifying the more northern regions [of India]."⁴³

Regarding the Pāli Vinaya, one often gains the impression that it wishes to safeguard the arahant conception; this is especially to be noticed in the fourth Pārājika (Suttavibhaṅga III 87, p.151) which declares it an offence, punishable by expulsion, to declare unjustly of oneself the state of a "furtherman" (uttarimanussadhamma). The feeling which one gathers from the fourth Pārājika is not the denial of the state of "furthermen" (or arahant) but the reluctance to make that 'goal' easy of attainment, or to discredit certain features which became attached, at least for some bhikkhus, to the state of "furthermen"; for example, the

⁴¹E. Frauwallner, The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature, pp.192-193.

⁴²Ibid., p.188.

⁴³Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, p.7.

"supernatural powers."⁴⁴ It is thus difficult to determine the Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka's attitude to arahanthood, probably because the division of the canon relegated talk about arahanthood to the Sutta and Abhidhamma Piṭakas. However, one can see in the Pāli Canon the view that in times of crisis, it is the discipline which is to be turned to.

This point of view becomes clear at some stage in the development of the Pāli Canon from a reading of the following passage which appears in the Pāli Suttas:

... the venerable Mahā-Kassapa said this to the Exalted One:--
 "What now, lord, are the conditions, what is the cause that formerly there were fewer precepts and more brethren were established as Arahants? What, lord, are the conditions, what is the cause that now-a-days there are more precepts and fewer brethren are established as Arahants?"
 "It happens thus, Kassapa. When members decrease, and the true doctrine disappears, there are more precepts and few brethren are established as Arahants...
 It is when brethren and sisters, laymen and laywomen live in irreverence and are unruly toward the Teacher ... the Norm ... the Order ... the training [sikkhāya] ... concentrative study [samādhismim] ... (S II 223-225, pp.151-152).

⁴⁴I.B. Horner, The Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected: A Study of the Arahan, p.111 ff., considers the term "uttarimanussadhamma" as a forerunner to the arahant conception. This position is, however, open to debate, as there seems to be a close connection between the use of that term and supernatural powers; see and compare BD I [III 109], p.190 with BD I [III 105], p.182. See also K.N. Jayatilleke, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, references to "uttarimanussadhamma" in his index, p.158. The tendency to view the Buddha and 'early' Buddhism as 'rational' and devoid of magic, etc., is very much open to question. See, for example, E. Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme Indien, p.x; David L. Snellgrove, "Śākyamuni's Final Nirvāṇa", BSO(A)S, Vol.XXXVI, Part 2, 1973, pp.399-411.

The foregoing passage makes it clear that there is, and should be, a connection between the decline in the Saddhamma and the advocacy of "more precepts" (sikkhāpadanī). In addition, the Samyutta passage reminds us of the statement in the Mahāvagga (I 97-98, p.127), "Although the Suttantas and Abhidhamma be forgotten, for all time, the teaching persists while Vinaya is not destroyed." Thus, while the number of arahants are less numerous in the period of decline of the Saddhamma, arahanthood is perhaps still obtainable with the help of a more rigorous implementation, as well as development, of the disciplinary code ("precepts"). Ironically, it is Ānanda, though characterized as bahussuta-dhammadhara, who is credited with helping to cause the decline in the Saddhamma (Cullavagga X 256, p.356):

If, Ānanda, women had not obtained the going forth from home into homelessness in the dhamma and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder, the Brahma-faring, Ānanda, would have lasted long, true dhamma, would have endured for a thousand years. But since, Ānanda, women have gone forth ... the Brahma-faring will not last long, true dhamma will endure only five hundred years.

It is also important to notice that the bhikkhu who asks the Buddha about the need for "more precepts" and who censures Ānanda at the First Council for causing a decline in the Saddhamma is no other than Mahākassapa, who is characterized as chief among the Buddha's disciples who "uphold minute observances of forms", (dhutavāda).⁴⁵ The

⁴⁵A I 23, p.16. See also the verses ascribed to him in the Theragāthā (1051-1090). Regarding the dhutaṅgas, see A.G.S. Kariyawasam, "Ascetic Practices", EB II, Fascicle I, p.168.

connection of MahāKassapa with the dhutaṅgas, as well as his chastisement of Ānanda for laxity in implementing the discipline (see e.g. S II 218, p.147) suggests him to be a champion of the 'way of action' (i.e. discipline, vinaya).⁴⁶

Thus, while it is difficult to link the arahant to only the 'way of action/discipline/vinaya', there is little question that the position which the Pāli Canon approves of, especially in the period following after the Buddha's parinibbāna, is the implementation of the discipline as the royal road to salvation. Jothiya Dhirasekera maintains, "... it is clear from the evidence of the Suttas that of the threefold sikkha special emphasis was laid on sīla as the foundation of all spiritual attainments."⁴⁷ What then is to be gathered from the above analysis as it relates to Ānanda's characterization as a bahussuta dhammadhara?

First, there is some difficulty in determining the chronological placement of the bahussuta characterization as an 'ideal', difficulty because the term bahussuta has a pre-Buddhistic origin.⁴⁸ In the Khaggavisāṇa Sutta of the Suttanipāta (verse 58) one reads:

One should resort to a friend who is very
learned [bahussuta], expert in the dhamma

⁴⁶MahāKassapa and Ānanda were not always on the best of terms; the former seems to have taken Ānanda to task on a number of occasions. See DPPN I, pp.258-259.

⁴⁷Jothiya Dhirasekera, Buddhist Monastic Discipline: A Study of its Origin and Development in Relation to the Sutta and Vinaya Piṭakas, University of Ceylon, Ph.D. Thesis, p.98. See also K.N. Jayatilleke, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, p.423 (paragraph 728) and p.424 (paragraph 731).

⁴⁸See our study, p.222.

[dhammadhara], who is excellent and intelligent; knowing the advantages (resulting from such an acquaintance), one should remove doubt, one should live, alone, like the horn of a rhinoceros.⁴⁹

Ria Kloppenborg, relying on the work of M. Winternitz, claims that the Khaggavisāṇa Sutta contains some of the most ancient parts of the Pāli Canon and that, "These verses once more testify to the popularity of the ascetic-and-world-abandoning way of life."⁵⁰ One has no problem in fitting the above description in the Khaggavisāṇa Sutta of the bahussuta dhammadhara into the context of 'early' Buddhism when the Buddha and his followers were just one of a number of wandering samaṇa groups.⁵¹ The fact that the above passage emphasizes the role of the "friend" characterized as bahussuta dhamma-dhara and does not mention any well-defined discipline, supports the view that at first the Buddha's dhamma was central to the life of the bhikkhu. Thus, for example, Sāriputta and Maha Moggallāna are 'converted' to the Buddha's magga as a result of hearing the bhikkhu Assaji talk about the Buddha's dhamma (Mahāvagga I 39, p.52). The commentary to the Suttanipāta verse quoted above states that bahussuta implies a twofold goal, "very learned in competency (pariyatti) with reference to the three piṭakas regarding the meaning,

⁴⁹Ria Kloppenborg, The Paccekabuddha, pp.110-111.

⁵⁰Ibid., p.11, fn.44.

⁵¹See S. Dutt, Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India, p.49ff.

without obstructions; and very learned with reference to the realization (paṭivedha) because of the fact that have been realized the Way and the fruit, the (three) knowledges (viññā) and (the remaining) higher knowledges (abhiññā)."⁵²

The reference above in the Suttanipāta Commentary (SnA 110, 28) to the "(three) knowledges (viññā)" suggests arahantship, though the term "arahant" is not used. In the commentary to the Theragāthā verses of Ānanda which describe him as bahussuta one finds a similar reference to that quoted above, "pariyatti-paṭivedha-bahusaccanam paripuriya bahussutena" (Theragāthā Atthakathā, II 1019, p.116) except that there is no expression of the phrases as in the commentary to the Suttanipāta. The Theragāthā Commentary, like that of the Suttanipāta, avoids the use of the term "arahant".⁵³ The reluctance on the part

⁵²Kloppenborg, The Paccakabuddha, p.110, fn.100. Reference in the commentary to the three piṭakas obviously reveals the 'lateness' of the commentarial elaboration.

⁵³A.G.S. Kariyawasam, "Bahussuta", EB II, Fascicle 4, p.503, states, "One of the qualifications of a good man with whom the wise should keep company is that he should be a bahussuta (Thag. v. 1019). The commentary explains the term bahussuta here as a person who is accomplished in the study of the texts and has attained insight [see the Pāli quotation in our study above]. Soon after attaining arahantship Ānanda makes an utterance of joy wherein he refers to himself as bahussuta, thereby meaning that he is accomplished in both pariyatti and paṭivedha (ibid., v. 1021). These statements imply that the term bahussuta is used ultimately exclusively for an arahant."

The conclusion reached by Kariyawasam in the above quotation is hardly informative and contradicts much of the information in the Pāli Canon; see our remarks above, p. 244.

of the Pāli Canon to provide Ānanda with arahanthood, coupled with his description as bahussuta-dhammadhara may, as has been suggested, indicate that he represented, or came to represent, another route to the 'goal', a route characterized by knowledge.⁵⁴

Further, the fact that what is presented in the Pāli sources as the 'early' period of the Buddha's ministry abounds with arahants, while what is presented as the 'later' period of his ministry shows more reluctance to provide bhikkhus with arahanthood, may indicate a more gradual approach to the 'goal' came to be taken. Thus, the Pāli Canon (for example in the first chapter of the Mahāvagga) seems to recognize a 'golden age' of many arahants followed by a series of worries, expressed while the Buddha is supposedly alive, concerning a decline in the Saddhamma and a resulting need for more disciplinary procedures as well as their enforcement. It is also likely that the hagiographers, wishing to glorify the founding members of the Buddha's following, made them all arahants. In this regard it is worth remembering that Ānanda outlived the Buddha and, as a result, his hagiographical development may have taken on a different colouring than those of bhikkhus who had predeceased the Buddha.

Even the ascription of arahanthood to Ananda at the time of the First Council does not protect him from the

⁵⁴ See our study, pp.236-237; also Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, pp.167-189; W. Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, pp.158-159. Rahula (p.159) quotes Dā p.654 and MA p.881, "There may or may not be realization (paṭivedha) and practice (paṭipatti); learning [pariyatti] is enough for the perpetuation of the Sāsana. The wise one having learned the Tripiṭaka, will fulfill even both ... Therefore the

censure of the Council regarding certain errors which Ānanda is credited with having committed. Further, the Cullavagga (XI 285, p.394) does not, in its Council account, use either of the terms bahussuta or dhammadhara in describing Ānanda's qualifications to deliver the recitation of the dhamma, though it does claim that Ānanda "has mastered much dhamma and discipline under the Lord."⁵⁵

The problem which faces one in judging the application of the terms bahussuta and dhammadhara to Ānanda in the Pāli Canon is that, unlike the case in the Aśokāvadāna (see pp.236-237 above) the terms are not regarded as, in themselves, illustrating a particular 'way' of achieving nibbāna. This is not to say that the Pāli Canon does not reveal a tension between interests in the dhamma and the vinaya, but that the position of Ānanda as a bahussuta (dhammadhara) is not a clearly defined example of a 'way', among other 'ways', to achieve nibbāna. In addition, the picture is complicated by the fact that even within the dhamma the sīlas are considered important (e.g. D I 63, p.79), though albeit as a first stage. However, it is likely that with the passing of the Buddha, more emphasis was placed on the disciplinary rules, as we shall shortly note. The point which Przyluski makes, and of which we have some illustrations of preference in the Pāli Canon, is that the position of the arahant is

Sāsana (religion) is stabilized when learning endures."

⁵⁵See Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, pp.39, 137, 171, 209, 225, 229.

intricately connected (i.e. in the Asokāvadāna discussion) with successful practice of the sīlas and conversely only the arahant can practice the sīlas as they should (ideally) be practiced.

The bhikkhu Śāṇavāsa, who in the Aśokāvadāna attempts to demolish with his "quite original" definition the distinction posed between the bahussuta and sīladharas, is none other than the individual to whom, according to some traditions, Ānanda passed on the dhamma.⁵⁶ The fact that Śāṇavāsa, while favouring the position of Ānanda, was forced to defend the bahussuta position, implies that Ānanda's position was under attack. Why there developed, in the 'history' of Buddhism as we know it, a 'split' whereby one body of 'tradition' was favoured over another is a subject worthy of an entire separate study; however, some observations are useful at this time.

Certainly a major factor creating a basis for division among the Buddha's followers was the death of the Buddha as authority. With the Buddha's death, the position of authority became the buddhavacana and/or those theras who had been considered worthy of respect while the Buddha was still alive. Thus the Pāli Canon (D II 123, p.133) reports that the Buddha spoke of "four Great Authorities", (1) things

⁵⁶Lama Chimpa and Alaka Chattopadhyaya, trans., Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India, pp.24-26; also fn. 24, p.24 and pp.358-361.

reported as heard from the mouth of the Buddha himself;
 (2) from a company of the brethren with their elders and
 leaders; (3) from many elders of the Sangha, deeply read,
 holding the faith as handed down by tradition, versed in
 the truths, etc., and (4) from a brother, deeply read,
 holding the faith as handed down by tradition, etc. Yet,
 in all four of the above "authorities" the Buddha stated,
 "Without praise and without scorn every word and syllable
 should be carefully understood and then put beside the
 Suttas and compared with the Vinaya." The fact that the
 ultimate authority is to rest with the Suttas and Vinaya
 and that what is reported as buddhavaṇṇa should agree in
 both these bodies of tradition is an obvious 'future' area
 of debate. In addition, the fact that there is no
 reference in the "four great authorities" to the ultimate
 authority being the Buddha himself (i.e. considered still
 living) and that the Suttas, as opposed to the Dhamma, and
 along with the Vinaya is to constitute the authority,
 suggests that we are dealing here, at least in intention
 if not in fact, with a period following after the Buddha's
parinibbāna.

The Buddha of the Pāli Canon also said (D II 104,
 p.112) that he would not attain parinibbāna until "the
 brethren and sisters of the Order, and until the lay-
 disciples of either sex shall have become true hearers,
 wise and well trained, ready and learned, carrying the

doctrinal books in their memory ... walking according to the precepts ... preach it ... [and] spread the wonder-working truth abroad."

The above quotations from the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta of the Pāli Canon make it clear that the buddhavaṇṇa as (first) embodied in the oral tradition was to constitute the authority par excellence. In this atmosphere it is easy to see how attention would eventually have been directed towards making sure that the buddhavaṇṇa was remembered, and remembered correctly.⁵⁷ It is unlikely that any single bhikkhu could have remembered everything that the Buddha said, though in this light the names of Ānanda and Upāli (as dharmadhara and vinayadhara respectively) have been chosen to shine out. We know, on the basis of a careful reading of both Pāli and non-Pāli Buddhist sources, that the person named Ānanda, the Buddha's attendant, is a more convincing candidate for mastering the remembering of the buddhavaṇṇa. The fact that the term bahussuta attaches itself to Ānanda likely suggests, in light of the mystery surrounding Upāli, that Ānanda was, at one time, regarded as the most knowledgeable, although not necessarily the most important, bhikkhu. The use of the terms dharmadhara and vinayadhara seemingly belongs to a later stage, when these two areas of the buddhavaṇṇa became more differentiated,

⁵⁷It is unlikely that there would have been sufficient urgency soon after the Buddha's death to necessitate the immediate holding of the recitation of the buddhavaṇṇa. See Charles S. Prebish, "A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils," JAS, XXXIII, No.2, p.245.

and therefore the establishment of two separate authorities, Ānanda and Upāli, is an attempt on the part of those who favoured action over doctrine to reduce the role of Ānanda.

The hostility shown Ānanda in the Cullavagga account of the First Council, particularly as it shows him uninterested in certain areas of the vinaya (e.g. the question of the "precepts") suggests that he is an 'opponent'. If we take the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta at face value, then we know that the Buddha would have objected to a division among his followers centering on the choice of concentrating either on the area of the Dhamma (Suttas) or the Vinaya. The Buddha (D II 100, p.107) supposedly said that no particular bhikkhu was to be regarded as leading the Sangha, that is of taking over the position which the Buddha, as authority, had occupied. The Buddha also told the bhikkhus that they should concentrate on being 'lamps unto themselves' and not look for refuge to anyone other than themselves. What we see in the Pāli First Council account, which we will examine in detail later, is already the beginning of the development of a system of patriarchy, a system which is also perhaps illustrated by the statements which called Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna the Buddha's chief disciples (e.g. Mahāvagga I 42, p.55).⁵⁸

By the time of the Buddha's death, both Sāriputta

⁵⁸In this regard, see the remarks in the Dhammapada Commentary, trans. E.W. Burlingame, Buddhist Legends, Part I, pp.203-204.

and Mahā Moggallāna were already dead and, if other bhikkhus were ever considered for the post of "authority", then Ānanda would have been one of the likely candidates. In fact, some Buddhist accounts do choose him as patriarch after Mahākassapa.⁵⁹

How and, more importantly, why was it necessary to choose between the Dhamma and the Vinaya as a 'way' of salvation? Firstly, we should point out, as we have already suggested, that to suppose a rigid bifurcation between these two areas is a mistake, if only because the 'early' schools had both a dhamma and vinaya section to their canons of buddhavaṇṇa. One must see the impetus to choose to concentrate on one area in preference to another as a sign of the inclinations of particular bhikkhus, coupled with the historical situations in which they found themselves. We will not go into this subject in detail, but some basic information gleaned from the Pāli Canon would illustrate the point. For example, there is the well-known case of Devadatta whose opinions regarding the nature of the Buddha's vinaya threatened the Buddha's sāsana during the latter's lifetime. In the case of Devadatta, the emphasis rested with the complaint that the Buddha's approach to the discipline was not strict enough.⁶⁰ One also sees this concern with matters of discipline illustrated in the person

⁵⁹ See Lama Chimpa and Alaka Chattopadhyaya, Tāranātha's History of Buddhism, p. 355ff., and E. Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme Indien, pp. 226-232.

⁶⁰ For a summary, see DPPN I, p. 1106ff.

of MahāKassapa.⁶¹ There is also the case of Subhadda who, upon the death of the Buddha, declared that the bhikkhus could now do as they liked (D II 162, p.184).⁶² Subhadda's position, in contrast with that of Devadatta, was that the discipline was too demanding while the Buddha was alive, and this suggests a tendency on the part of some bhikkhus to relax their discipline after the Buddha's death.

E. Frauwallner says regarding the above area of our concern:

Indeed, every foundation of a new community reposed upon the transmission and application of the monastic rules. On the other side, it is not to be taken for granted that a highly developed dogmatic or philosophical teaching of a certain tendency was necessarily handed over at the same time. Further the Vinaya must have received a particular elaboration probably only in such cases when the community developed a strong particular life of its own. The necessary conditions for this were found above all in the religious centres which showed more lively activity, and also in faraway mission territories, which naturally had to rely upon a flourishing spiritual life in their own midst. On the contrary, the formation of dogmatic schools took place as a rule inside communities already existing; and it is much to be questioned whether their diffusion followed the same lines as formerly the foundations of the communities. Such school formations did not necessarily imply a modification of the Vinaya, although it is possible that strongly individualized schools tried to characterize themselves also by external peculiarities in the application of the Vinaya rules. The diffusion and development of the Vinaya and the rise of dogmatic schools rest thus upon completely different bases and proceed upon diverging lines.⁶³

⁶¹See our study, pp.249-250, and the summary in DPPN II, pp.476-483.

⁶²See DPPN II, p.1231, "5. Subhadda."

⁶³E. Frauwallner, The Earliest Vinaya..., p.6.

We will not here debate the merits or demerits of Frauwallner's working hypothesis.⁶⁴ We have already pointed out that as the vinaya represents the "outward" features of the Buddha's sāsaṇa, it is easy to see how this 'feature would have encouraged some bhikkhus to centre their interests in disciplinary procedures. One can assume that at the time of the death of the Buddha the "outward" features of the Buddha's teachings would have been important points of evaluation by many members of the laity.⁶⁵ One also notes in this regard (D II 157-158, p.177) the emotion (i.e. lack of control) exhibited by Ānanda upon the Buddha's death.

In summary, the position of Ānanda as bahussuta seems to have roots in the period during which the Buddha was still alive and reflects the position that the distinguishing feature of the Buddha's early ministry rested with what set his sāsaṇa apart from those of other members of the wandering communities - Dhamma. One can also point out as a general tendency that the 'way of knowledge', the mastering of the Dhamma, was not an approach which suited the disposition of every bhikkhu and that some bhikkhus may have preferred to concentrate on the disciplinary features of the Buddha's sāsaṇa.

⁶⁴ Those interested in Frauwallner's approach and results, see E. Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme indien, pp. 195-197 and Charles E. Prebish, "Theories Concerning the Skandhaka: An Appraisal," JAS XXXII, No.4, August 1973, pp.669-678.

⁶⁵ I.B. Horner, BD I, p.xxix states, "Historically, the success of the Early Buddhist experiment in monasticism must be in great part attributed to the wisdom of constantly considering the susceptibilities and criticisms of the laity."

The Samyutta Nikāya¹

On one occasion, while at Sāvattthī, the Buddha asked Ānanda whether he approved of Sāriputta (S I 63, p.87).

Ānanda replied as follows:

... but who, lord, that is not childish, or corrupt, or stupid, or of perverted mind would not approve of the venerable Sāriputta? Wise, lord, is the venerable Sāriputta! comprehensive and manifold is his wisdom, joyous and swift is his wisdom! sharp and fastidious is his wisdom! Small in his desires, lord, and contented is the venerable Sāriputta! Loving seclusion and detachment is he! Of rampant energy is the venerable Sāriputta! A preacher (insistent), accepting advice, a critic, a scourge of evil is the venerable Sāriputta (S I 63, pp.87-88).

That Ānanda should praise Sāriputta as above is in keeping with the position of the Pāli Suttas that Sāriputta was noted for his wisdom, and reflects the fact that Ānanda and Sāriputta were good friends.² As we have already noted, Ānanda, like

¹Regarding the structure of the Samyutta Nikāya, see e.g.: M. Léon Feer, ed., The Samyutta-Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka, I, pp.vii-xvi; G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, pp.180-229; D.K. Barua, Analytical Study of Four Nikāyas, pp.539-545; M. Winternitz, A History of Indian Literature, II, pp.54-60; plus the "editorial notes" of F.L. Woodward in his translation, The Book of the Kindred Sayings, Parts II-V.

²Regarding the characterization of Sāriputta as a mahāpañña, see A I 23, p.16; also M III 25, pp.78-79; see also André Migot, Un grand disciple du buddha: Sāriputra, pp.462-474. On the nature of the friendship between Ānanda and Sāriputta, see the summary in DPPN I, pp.257-258.

Sariputta, was credited for his great knowledge.³ In fact, Ānanda and Sāriputta were, perhaps, more alike than even the Pāli Canon's hagiographers were willing to acknowledge.⁴

On another occasion while at Sāvattthī the Buddha related to King Pasenadi of Kosala (depicted as just having returned from private meditation) a conversation that had transpired with Ānanda wherein the latter stated, "About the half, lord, of this life in religion consists in righteous friendship, righteous intimacy, righteous association" (S I 87, p.113). The Buddha replied to Ānanda on that occasion as follows, "Not so, Ānanda! verily not so, Ānanda! Verily the whole of this life in religion consists in righteous friendship, righteous intimacy, righteous association. For a bhikkhu, Ānanda, who is a friend of righteousness, we expect that he will develop and expand the Ariyan eightfold path of one who is a friend, an intimate, an associate of that which is righteous." The Sāvatthappakāsinī, the commentary to the Samyutta Nikāya, maintains that Ānanda made the statement (quoted above) in order to test his own knowledge and that his remarks suggested a bifurcation between "good friends and the shaping of individual character," a bifurcation to which the Buddha objected.⁵ While the exchange

³See our study, 242.

⁴See André Migot, Un grand disciple du buddha: Sāriputra, pp.535-536.

⁵Mrs. Rhys Davids, KS I, p.113, fn.2, regards this Sutta as an interpolation.

between the Buddha and Ānanda is meant to elucidate the subject at hand, it also elucidates the shortcomings of Ānanda, in spite of the opinions of the commentary.⁶

The Samyutta Nikāya (S I 157-158, pp.196-198), like the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 157-158, pp.175-177), records the verses supposedly uttered by Ānanda on the death of the Buddha. As we shall treat the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta in a separate section of our study, we will not comment on the Samyutta's rendering here.⁷

Ānanda, with a bhikkhu named Vaṅgīsa as his attendant (pacchāsamaṇa), goes into Sāvatthī for alms (S I 188, pp.238-239). Vaṅgīsa asks whether Ānanda can help him control his senses:

My senses with passion burn, my heart's aflame.
Thou of the Gotamas, compassion take!
'T were well to tell how I may quench (the fire)
(S I 188, p.239).

In response to Vaṅgīsa's request, Ānanda provides the bhikkhu with a discourse in verse which includes talk on the control of looking, the contemplation of that which is not beautiful, and the development of the signless. It is interesting to note that in the verse of Vaṅgīsa, Ānanda is alluded to as "thou of the Gotamas." While the term/word "gotama" refers to the clan-name of the Buddha and the Sākyans, the word is

⁶ Compare the Sutta at hand with parallel versions at S V 2-4, pp.2-3. It will be noticed that Sāriputta does not make Ānanda's mistake.

⁷ See our study, pp.375ff.

occasionally used in a metaphoric sense to imply one who follows the Buddha.⁸ However, since according to the Pāli sources Ānanda was the Buddha's first cousin, Vaṅgīsa's above remarks are likely to be an allusion to the genealogical connection of Ānanda to the Buddha. This is not the place to investigate the Buddha's genealogy, but it is likely that the genealogical connection of Ānanda to the Buddha is one of the elements contributing to Ānanda's characterization in the Buddhist sources.⁹ Thus, for example, in the Cullavagga account of Ānanda's entry into the Buddha's following, Upāli is allowed to "go forth" first and "thus will the Sākyan pride be humbled in us Sākyans" (Cullavagga VII 182, p.257).¹⁰

Ānanda's next appearance in the Samyutta Nikāya (S I 199-200, p.254) tells us that a deva recognizing that Ānanda was too busy "imparting matters to the laity" stated:

Thou who has plunged in leafy lair of trees,
Suffering Nibbāna in thy heart to sink,
Study, thou Gotamid, and dally not!
What will this babble-babble do for thee?

The Samyutta Nikāya goes on to tell us that Ānanda, hearing the above, was "agitated by that deva, was greatly moved."

⁸K.R. Norman, Elders' Verses I, p.144, note 91.

⁹Regarding Ānanda's genealogy as recorded in the Buddhist sources, see, "Ānanda (6)", EB I, Fascicle 4, p.529.

¹⁰See our study, pp.92ff. and the Bāhiraṇidāna (Smp. I 7, p.6).

The Pāli Commentary to the above incident informs us that these events took place after the Buddha's death and the deva criticizes Ānanda for spending his time relating the events of the Buddha's parinibbāna rather than attaining his arahanthood. The Commentary also informs us that Ānanda at that time carried with him the bowl and robe (patta-civāra) of the Buddha.¹¹

The deva's description of Ānanda in the above passage, added to the remarks of the Commentary, suggest that Ānanda, according to some members of the Buddha's following, was too attached to the person of the Buddha (note Ānanda's possession of the bowl and robe of the Buddha) and spent too much time with the laity.

The Theragāthā (verse 119) also records the verse spoken above by the deva, but places it in the mouth of Vajjiputta. While the Theragāthā verse does not say so, Dhammapāla's comments make it clear that Ānanda is the individual to whom Vajjiputta is directing his remarks:

... shortly after the Master had passed away, Vajjiputta formed an agreement with the chief Theras to preserve the Dhamma intact, and travelled with them from place to place. One day he saw the Venerable Ānanda, who was still a student only, surrounded by a large congregation teaching them the Norm. And to call forth endeavour in him to reach the higher Paths, he uttered this verse ... [quoted above, p.265].
Hearing this and speech of others, dispelling poisonous odours, Ānanda grew agitated, and most of the night walked to and fro meditating. Then

¹¹F.L. Woodward, ed., Saratthappakāsinī I, IX 5, p.292; Compare this with the account in the Bahiraṇidāna (Smp.I 8,p.7).

with insight worked up, he entered his dwelling,
and in the act of lying down on his couch, he
won arahantship.¹²

A major difference between the Samyutta Nikāya's rendering of the situation of the verse being uttered to Ānanda and that provided in Dhammapāla's Paramahadīpanī) is that in the former the verse is uttered by a deva while in the latter it is uttered by a bhikkhu named Vajjiputta. The importance of this difference is seen when one turns to non-Pāli sources.

In two recensions of the Asokāvadāna preserved in the Chinese (i.e. the A-yu wang-chaun and A-yu wang-ching) we find reference to the important part played by Vajjiputta (Vṛjiputra) in Ānanda's arahant-hood. Both of the above sources describe Vajjiputta as having Ānanda as his upajjhāya (preceptor). Vajjiputta, noting that Ānanda has not yet attained arahant-hood and that the First Council is soon to be held utters the following to Ananda:¹³

A-yu wang-chaun

Il te faut aller sous
un arbre
et produire la pensée du
nirvāṇa
O Gautama! Assieds-toi en
dhyāna
Avant peu tu réaliseras
le nirvāṇa.

A-yu wang-ching

Dans la calme, assis sous
un arbre,
en état de nirvṛti tu
réaliseras le nirvāṇa.
O Gautama! entre dans
l'extase.
N'aie pas de distraction.
Avant long temps tu
obtiendras la nirvṛti
qui est la Lois pure du
nirvāṇa.

¹²Mrs. Rhys Davids, PEB II, pp.106-107.

¹³Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, p.35. See also regarding these two sources the article of Kao Kuan-ju, "Aśokāvadāna", EB II, Fascicle 2, pp.198-200.

The Mahīsāsaka Vinaya informs us that a bhikkhu from Vṛji, noting that Ānanda was still a learner (sekkha) who does not separate himself from the noise of the crowds, hoped to inspire Ānanda to attain his arahanthood by reciting the following verse:¹⁴

Dans un lieu paisible,
assieds-toi sous un arbre,
l'esprit fixé sur le nirvāṇa
médite sans distraction
A quoi bon les long discours?

In addition the Mahīsāsaka Vinaya informs us that other bhikkhus in addition to Vajjiputta pointed out to Ānanda that he should 'do what was still to be done' if he was to participate at the assembly.¹⁵ This reference to the exhortation of others reminds us of Dhammapāla's account (see p.266 of our study).

The Dharmagupta Vinaya records that a bhikkhu Vajjiputta (Vṛjiputra), noticing through his supernatural abilities that Ānanda had not yet attained arahanthood though he was spending his time surrounded by bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs, lay disciples male and female, kings, ministers, etc., decided to inspire Ānanda with the following verse:¹⁶

Tranquillement installé
dans la solitude,
Sous un arbre, médite sur
le nirvāṇa
Assis dans la méditation,
n'aie pas de distractions
A quoi bon les long
discours?

¹⁴ Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, p.139.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp.138-139.

¹⁶ Ibid., p.174.

Hearing the above verse Ānanda "ressentit du dégoût et de l'aversion" and attained the state of the arahant.¹⁷

The Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya records the following:

Then Anuruddha said to Ānanda, "Go, Ānanda, and destroy every particle of the passions, become an arahant, and then, but only then, thou mayest enter the synod.

... Now Ānanda's attendant at that time was the venerable Vrijiputra (or an ayuchmat of Vrijian descent), and he expounded the law to the four-fold assembly while Ānanda diligently applied himself (to cast off all sin [sic]). But when Vrijiputra looked, by means of the mental abstraction of samadhi, he found out that Ānanda was not yet freed from all passions, So he went to him and said:

Gautama, be thou, not heedless;
Keep near a tree in the dark, and on nirvāṇa
Fix thy mind; transport thyself into dhyāna
And ere long thou shalt find the abode of peace!¹⁸

The Kia-yeh-kie-ching (Sūtra on Kāśyapa's Collection of the Tripitaka) is regarded by Jean Przyluski as the earliest account of the First Council preserved in Chinese. The Sūtra was supposedly translated by the Parthian Che-kao towards 150 A.D. and, as in previous accounts quoted, contains a reference to the exhortations of the disciple (of Ānanda?) Vrijiputra as instrumental in helping Ānanda (after the chastisement of Kāśyapa) to acquire arahanthood.¹⁹ Przyluski, believing that the gāthās of the above source

¹⁷ Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, p.175.

¹⁸ W.W. Rockhill, The Life of the Buddha, p.155.

¹⁹ Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, p.31.

constitute a unit (in spite of interpolations which they contain) apart from the prose text, contends that this 'gāthā-text' is earlier than the prose embellishments around the verses which tend to limit Ānanda's position in the events they describe:²⁰

It seems that our gāthās go back to an epoch during which the detractors of Ānanda had not yet set up against him the bill of indictment, which appears in different forms in all the subsequent accounts of the Council. In those distant days he was to everybody the 'great sage', the confidant of the Master, against whom none had the courage to raise his voice. The doctrine of the Buddha was at that time an indivisible whole which Ānanda alone knew thoroughly and which, it was supposed, he had been charged to expound in full before members of the Council. As yet none had thought of associating Upāli with him for the recitation of the teachings on Discipline (Vinaya) or of separating the Dharma from the Vinaya; still less had one the audacity to set the two saints, as well as those elements of the doctrine, against each other.²¹

We shall return to Przyluski's intriguing remarks later in our study. What we wish to point out at this time is that, if Przyluski is correct in his assumptions regarding the gāthā sections of the Kia-yeh-kie-ching, then we should note that those sections make no reference to any Vajjiputta as instrumental in exhorting Ānanda to attain arahanthood, nor do they even mention Ānanda's arahanthood as a prerequisite to reciting the entire buddhavacana before the Council.

²⁰ Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, pp.32ff.

²¹ Ibid., p.39.

Returning to the Pāli sources, it is important to notice that the Cullavagga (XI 286, pp.395-396) account of Ānanda's arahanthood makes no reference to any Vajjiputta. Are we to assume, as the evidence suggests, that Dhammapāla's account of the affair, namely providing a place for Vajjiputta in Ānanda's arahanthood, is the result of his awareness of other accounts in circulation by the time he came to write his commentary? In addition, why did the Samyutta Nikāya (S I 199-200, p.254; see our study, p.265) choose to place the exhortation to Ānanda in the mouth of a deva if Vajjiputta was the one who uttered the verse?

Regarding the latter question, it is intriguing to note that the Theragāthā (verse 62) makes reference to another Vajjiputta, who, according to Dhammapāla's commentary on the verse, was himself goaded on to arahantship by a "woodland sprite" (devatā).²² Malalasekera suggests that there may be some confusion between the two Vajjiputtas mentioned in the Pāli sources.²³ The fact that the Pāli sources do not hesitate to have bhikkhus, even the Buddha, exhorted by devas, would suggest that an exhortation of Ānanda by a deva is not unusual. In fact, if one examines the section in the Samyutta Nikāya in which Ānanda's exhortation takes place (beginning at S I 197, p.250), one discovers that other individuals were also exhorted by devas.

²²Mrs. Rhys Davids, PEB II, p.63.

²³DPPN II ["I. Vajjiputta"], p.811, fn.3.

The fact that Vajjiputta's role in Ānanda's arahant-hood is treated so variously, and is, in some accounts, entirely absent, leads us to suspect the method, if not subject, of Ānanda's arahanthood.²⁴ André Bareau, on the basis of comparative study, in fact regards the withholding of Ānanda's arahanthood and its subsequent resolution as "pure invention."²⁵

Returning to the Samyutta Nikāya (S II 34, p.29), one finds Ānanda reporting to the Buddha the discourse delivered by Sāriputta to the "heretical wanderers." The Buddha informs Ānanda that he, under similar circumstances, had told the wanderers exactly what Sāriputta had just stated. Ānanda, hearing the Buddha utter the statement "that ill comes to pass through a cause," replies, "Wonderful, lord, marvellous how the whole matter will have been said in one clause. If this matter were spoken in detail, it were deep and it would seem deep" (S II 36, p.29). The Buddha, in response to Ānanda's remarks, states, "Well then, Ānanda, let just that reveal itself to you now" (S II 36, p.29). Ānanda, taking his cue from the Buddha, proceeds to list eight elements in the 'chain of causation' (i.e. paṭiccasamuppāda): old age (jarāmaraṇa), birth (jāti), becoming (bhava),

²⁴Regarding the extant accounts of Ānanda's arahanthood, see André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, pp.8-9, and his references to Jean Przyluski's Le concile de Rajagrha. Also our study, pp.450ff.

²⁵André Bareau, Les premiers conciles..., p.13.

grasping (upādāna), craving (taṇhā), feeling (vedanā) and the six spheres of sense (saḷāyatana).

Ānanda's place in the above Sutta is largely stereotypical. Ānanda as the intermediary between the community of bhikkhus and the Buddha (as authority) reports on what Sāriputta told the heretical wanderers and the Buddha approves claiming that he had said the same thing on another occasion. This latter bit of information attests to the fact that the Buddha is the ultimate authority of the dhmma. What is unusual in the Sutta is the fact that Ānanda should remark, "Wonderful, lord, marvellous how the whole matter will have been said in one clause..." Ānanda, who has just heard Sāriputta's discourse and who has even repeated it to the Buddha, yet remarks on the "one clause" when the Buddha himself states it. This may be explained as merely a literary convention (oral convention) and/or find its resolution in Ānanda's request that, "if this matter were spoken in detail, it were deep and it would seem deep," something which Sāriputta's discussion, as far as we can tell, did not contain. Yet surprisingly the Buddha does not provide the "details" but asks Ānanda to make them known, which the latter successfully does. In this way the Sutta shows Ānanda's respect and knowledge of the dhmma, even if it obviously is somewhat contrived.²⁶

²⁶Regarding this Sutta and its parallels elsewhere in the Pāli Suttas, see our discussion above, pp.141-147.

Ānanda's position in the Sutta (S II 37, p.30) which follows after the one which has just concerned us (S II 36, p.29) is very similar and so we will not repeat ourselves here.

When the Buddha (S II 107, p.75) is dissatisfied with a bhikkhu's discussion of "inward handling" (antara sammasati), Ānanda asks the Buddha to provide the bhikkhus with a suitable discourse on that matter, "Now is the time, Exalted One, now is the time, Blessed One, for the Exalted One to speak of the inward handling, when they have heard the Exalted One, the brethren will bear it in mind." The words of Ānanda, presented in a stereotypical form, emphasize the importance of the Buddha and his words as the 'origin' of the sāsana.

On one occasion, the bhikkhus Musīla, Saviṭṭha, Nārada and Ānanda were together at Kosambī in the Ghositārāma (S II 115, p.81). Saviṭṭha asked Musīla:

Apart, friend Musīla, from your belief, apart from your inclination, apart from hearsay, apart from reflection on, and approval of an opinion, has the venerable Musīla as his very own the knowledge that decay-and-death is conditioned by birth?

Musīla replies that he both "knows" and "sees" ("aham etaṃ jānāmi aham etaṃ passāmi"). Saviṭṭha goes on to ask Musīla similar questions regarding other 'links' in the 'causal chain' to which Musīla answers as above, claiming that he both "knows" and "sees". Saviṭṭha, having listened to

Musīla's responses declares, "Well then, the venerable Musīla is Arahant, for whom the intoxicants are perished." Musīla, in affirmation, responds with silence. Then Nārada, having heard the above exchange of information, asks Savat̐thi to put the same questions (as were put to Musīla) to him. While Nārada answers the questions in a manner similar to Musīla, he is unable, in contrast to Musīla, to declare himself an arahant (S II 116-117, pp.82-93).

After the above dialogue has taken place, Ānanda asks Savit̐tha, "Holding this view you do, friend Savit̐tha, what say you to the venerable Nārada?" Savit̐tha responds, "Holding the view I do, friend Ānanda, I say nothing that is not lovely and good of the venerable Nārada" (S II 117, p.83).

While the role of Ānanda in the above Sutta is rather limited, the subject matter of the Sutta is important to our understanding of Ānanda's place in the Pāli Canon. Though Nārada answers Savit̐tha's questions in a manner similar to Musīla, Nārada does not claim arahanthood. Nārada explains the difference as follows:

It is just as if, friend, there were in the jungle-path a well, and neither rope nor drawer of water. And a man should come by foredone with heat, far gone with heat, weary, trembling, athirst. He should look down into the well. Verily in him would be the knowledge:-- Water! -- yet would he not be in a position to touch it. Even so, friend, I have well seen by right insight as it really is [yathā bhūtaṃ sammapaññāya sudiṭṭham] the ceasing of becoming is Nibbāna, and yet I am not Arahant for whom the intoxicants are perished (S II 117, p.83).

Nārada's analogy makes the point that merely knowing and seeing is not, for him, to be equated with actually possessing. Thus Louis de la Vallée Poussin summarizes the Sutta as follows, "Le Musīlasūtra (ou Musīla, Samyutta, II, 115...) montre que, d'après Saviṭṭha, Musīla (un 'saint sec'...) est un Arhat; mais que Nārada, qui possède les mêmes savoirs que Musīla, ne se considère pas comme Arhat parce que le contact avec le Nirvāṇa (qu'on obtient dans la nirodhasamāpatti) lui manque."²⁷

The positions which Musīla and Nārada represent are to be seen as contrasting ways of attaining arahant-hood and nibbāna, the former representing the 'way of knowledge' and the latter the 'way of action'.²⁸ The fact that Nārada has the last word and that his position is supported by Saviṭṭha suggests that Nārada's 'way' is

²⁷ Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "Musīla et Nārada: Le Chemin du Nirvāṇa," Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques, Vol.5-6, 1936-37, p.218.

²⁸ Poussin distinguishes the ways as between "prajñā ... la connaissance purement intellectuelle" (see his passage quoted on p.280 of our study) and that of entering "dans les recueils (ou 'délivrances' vimokṣa) supérieurs, du plan de la non-matière (ārūpya).". He also uses the term "dhyāna" to describe the method of the latter 'way'. In addition, in the opening of Poussin's article (see fn.27 above and p.189 of the article), the two 'ways' are distinguished as "rationalisme" and "mystique." We have chosen to distinguish the 'ways' in terms of the 'way of knowledge' and the 'way of action'. Nārada, who represents the 'way of action' does not consider "right insight [sammapaññā]" as sufficient to lead one to arahant-hood (although Musīla does). Nārada, as his analogy between nibbāna and the water and the well indicates, implies that some 'action' must be taken to make 'contact' between the

more acceptable to the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Canon.²⁹

The characterization of Ānanda as bahussuta as well as mahāpaṇṇā, links him to the 'way of knowledge', though in Ānanda's case this stature does not lead him to be called an arahant; rather, Ānanda is made to undergo the 'way of action' before his arahanthood is established (Cullavagga XI 285, p.396).

Returning to the Samyutta Nikāya (S II 119, p.84), when Susīma, a paribbājaka, asks to join the Buddha's following in order to steal the Buddha's dhamma, it is to Ānanda that he makes the request. Susīma assumes that once in possession of the Buddha's dhamma, "Thus shall we become honoured, revered, beloved, ministered unto and reverently welcomed, and we shall obtain supplies of the requisites for clothing, sustenance, lodging and medicaments."

Ānanda informs the Buddha of Susīma's desire to live the religious life under the Buddha and, in reply, the Buddha tells Ānanda to ordain Susīma (S II 120, p.85). The Sutta informs us:

Now at that time many brethren in the Order declared Añña (with the confession):-- We know that perished is birth. Lived is the divine life. Done is what has to be done. There is nothing further in these conditions.

'bucket' (i.e. himself) and the 'water' (i.e. nibbāna); 'action' is best described as successful practice, particularly in meditation.

²⁹This is clear from the presentation of Ānanda in the Pāli Canon where his characterization as bahussuta/dhammadhara/mahāpaṇṇā is insufficient to qualify him as an arahant.

Susīma (S II 121, p.85) goes to the bhikkhus who had declared aññā (as above) and asks them whether one "thus knowing, thus seeing" enjoys "mystic power" (iddhividdhā). The bhikkhus respond to this, and other related questions, in the negative, pointing out that they have been "freed by insight" (paññāvimutta) and thus do not possess the iddhividdhā (S II 123, p.88).

Susīma asks the bhikkhus to expound on the meaning of "freed by insight" but to no avail. Susīma then seeks out the Buddha and reports on what has just transpired. The Buddha states, "First, Susīma, (comes) knowledge of the law of cause (and effect), afterwards (comes) knowledge about Nibbāna" (S II 124, p.88). When Susīma informs the Buddha that he does not understand the meaning of the Buddha's remarks, the Buddha proceeds to discourse at length. After each point in the Buddha's discourse, he asks Susīma whether he understands ("seest thou this?") and in each case Susīma answers in the affirmative. Having completed his discourse, the Buddha asks Susīma whether "thus knowing, thus seeing" he enjoys the iddhividdhā (S II 126, p.90). Susīma, overcome with grief, admits the real (original) purpose for his admission to the Buddha's following and asks, on the basis of his confession, for the right to remain in the Buddha's following. The Buddha, recognizing the genuineness of Susīma's confession, permits him to remain in his following.

Ānanda's role in the above Sutta is rather limited.

Ānanda is taken in by Susīma's false intentions and is the bhikkhu who is chosen by the Buddha to ordain Susīma.

Buddhaghosa, in his Commentary, justifies the Buddha's position in the affair with Susīma by pointing out that the Buddha was aware of Susīma's intentions and ordained him in order to teach him a lesson.³⁰ In fact, in the Sutta itself, even the brethren who answer Susīma's questions in the negative are seemingly aware of the fact that Susīma is up to mischief. Thus, when Susīma asks the bhikkhus the meaning of "freed by insight", they respond (S II 124, p.88), "Whether you know it, friend Susīma, or whether you do not know it, we have been freed by insight." It is only Ānanda who is taken in by Susīma's supposedly noble intentions.

There are a number of interesting doctrinal elements in the above Sutta which are worthy of consideration. The Sutta (see above, p.277) informs us that a particular form of confession was "at that time" being used to declare aññā. The reference to "at that time" indicates that, by the time this sutta was officially authored and/or compiled (i.e. at the First Council), such manner of confession was no longer in vogue. It is not easy to evaluate the meaning of the above remarks, other than to point out that verification of aññā (arahanthood) must have been a problem for many bhikkhus (see e.g. A III 359, p.255).

³⁰ F.L. Woodward, KS II, p.85, fn.1.

Of particular interest to our study is the reference in the Sutta to the fact that those bhikkhus who declared aññā (in the "at that time" method) were "freed by insight" (paññāvimmuta) and thus did not possess the iddhividdhā. To be "freed by insight" is to be 'freed by knowledge' and the fact that the bhikkhus so freed did not possess the iddhividdhā suggests that the 'way of knowledge' was not as rewarding as the 'way of action'. After all, Susīma's intention in joining the Buddha's ranks was to win those iddhividdhā in order that he and his followers might gain the support which supposedly the Buddha and his followers had at that time because of the abilities of the Buddha and his bhikkhus in the iddhividdhā. Louis de la Vallée Poussin comments on the above Sutta as follows:

Il y a des Arhats délivrés par la prajñā, par la connaissance purement intellectuelle. Ces saints ne sont pas entrés dans les recueils (ou "délivrances", vimokṣa) supérieurs, du plan de la non-matière (ārūpya). Ils ne possèdent pas non plus les cinq premiers "pouvoirs merveilleux" ou abhiññās, mais ils possèdent le sixième qui constitue la qualité de saint: le savoir de la disparition des vices (āsravakṣaya). -- Or, d'après la scolastique pâlie ou sarvastivādin, les cinq abhiññās peuvent être obtenues par l'ascète entré en dhyāna (Kosa, viii, 105), et on peut croire que tous les ascètes entrés en dhyāna ne se refusent pas le bénéfice des abhiññās: tel est du moins, comme on verra, la pensée de Harivarman qui conclut que les Arhats du Susīma sont devenus Arhats sans entrer en dhyāna -- La dernière partie du Sūtra (Susīma devient lui-même Arhat lorsque Bhagavat lui a expliqué la production en raison des causes), justifie cette opinion.³¹

³¹ Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "Musīla et Nārada...", p.202.

Elsewhere in the Pāli Canon the Buddha says to

Sāriputta:

There is naught, Sāriputta, for which I blame these five hundred brethren, in deed or word. Of these brethren, sixty have threefold lore, sixty have sixfold supernormal knowledge [chaḷabhiññā], sixty are emancipated in both ways, and the others are emancipated by insight (alone) [paññāvimuttā] (S I 191, p.243).³²

The Buddha's above remarks attest to the fact that the majority of the five hundred bhikkhus were freed by "insight (alone)". One may also note that the Buddha regarded Sariputta (A I 23, p.16) as, "Chief among those of great wisdom [mahāpaññānaṃ]"³³... [and Mahā Moggallāna as] Chief among those of supernormal powers [iddhimantānaṃ]."

When we recall the fact that Sāriputta and Moggallāna were the Buddha's chief disciples, it is noteworthy that one is distinguished by his "knowledge" and the other by his "supernormal powers" (implying the 'way of action'). If Sāriputta was "freed through knowledge", then why was not Ānanda, who was also described by the Buddha as mahāpaññā,

³² Regarding the person who is paññāvimuttā, Rune Johansson says (The Psychology of Nirvana, p.89), "A person who is paññā-vimutto is, therefore, a person who has not meditated and has no super knowledge but is still an arahant." See for further details Johansson's chapter on the "Ways to Nibbāna", pp.85-105.

The Puggala-Paññātti (B.C. Law, trans., Designation of Human Types, p.100) says of a person "emancipated by way of insight", "Here a certain person, without himself experiencing the eight stages of emancipation [i.e. vimokkhas] but having perceived them through insight, has his sinful tendencies completely destroyed."

³³ Even in the Sutta under discussion (S I 191, p.242), the Buddha declares of Sāriputta, "Wise art thou, Sāriputta, comprehensive and manifold is thy wisdom, joyous and swift is thy wisdom, sharp and fastidious is thy wisdom."

not similarly freed?³⁴

The discussion centering around the positions of Musīla and Nārada (see our study, pp. 274ff.) makes it clear as Louis de la Vallée Poussin has indicated, that at least two positions are taken towards achieving the goal of arahant-hood; one position emphasizes the intellectual approach where knowledge (paññā) of the buddhavaṇṇa is paramount, while the other approach emphasizes disciplinary procedures having its roots in practices such as concentration (samādhi) and meditation (jhāna).³⁵

³⁴Ānanda is described as "mahāpaññā" at, e.g. S IV 97, p.60; S IV 101, p.61. There is some difficulty in determining whether the compilers of the Pāli Canon were willing to grant Sāriputta arahant-hood solely on the basis of his knowledge. Thus the Commentary to the Mālunkya(putta) Sutta (see I.B. Horner, MLS II, p.107, fn.1) tries to show that Sāriputta practiced the vimokkhas; however this contradicts the meaning of the use of the term "paññāvimuttā" (see fn.32 above). We may note that Mahā Moggallāna (who is described as ceto-vimutta) attained his arahantship through meditation (see DPPN II, p.542) while Sāriputta attained his arahant-hood after hearing a Sutta (DPPN II, p.1109). The use of the term "cetovimutti" clearly suggests meditative practice - see Rune Johansson, The Psychology of Nirvāna, p.90. Finally, we may note (see DPPN for summaries of those involved) that Ānanda's relationship to Sāriputta was closer than his relationship to Mahā Moggallāna.

Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "Musīla et Nārada...", p.198, fn.2, draws attention to the following remarks of Harivarman (Chap.184), "En raison de l'érudition (bāhuśrutya), Sāriputta, etc., sont nommés 'grands savants' (mahājñānin). Si l'érudition fait que la pensée se concentre aisément, pourquoi Ānanda n'obtint-il pas d'abord, dans la dernière nuit, la délivrance? -- Ānanda obtint la délivrance avant sa tête touchât l'oreiller..."

³⁵See our study, p.280.

Although one can find in the Pāli Canon attempts to merge the above two positions, the Theravāda 'school' favours the 'way of action'.³⁶ Ānanda's 'problem' (as the Theravāda of the Pāli Canon sees it) is that though he was of great knowledge (mahāpaññā/bahussuta/dhammadhara) he was lacking in discipline. Thus the Cullavagga (XI 286, p.396) informs us that Ānanda, in order to attain arahanthood, "passed much of that night in mindfulness as to body." The Ta Tche Tou Louen is even more explicit:

Pendant la nuit, il s'assit en dhyāna ..., marcha de long en large et, anxieux et zélé, demanda la Voie. La sagesse [paññā] d'Ānanda était grande, mais son pouvoir de contemplation ... (samadhi) était faible. C'est pourquoi il n'obtint pas aussitôt la Voie. Si (son pouvoir) de contemplation eût été égal à sa sagesse, il aurait vite obtenu (la Voie).³⁷

The Samyutta Nikāya (S II 155, p.108) reports that on one occasion the venerable Sāriputta, Mahā Moggallāna, Mahā Kassapa, Anuruddha, Puṇṇa Mantānī's son, Upāli, Ānanda, Devadatta and followers of these bhikkhus were walking about in front of the Buddha. The Buddha (S II 155-156, pp.108-109) commented at that time on how Sāriputta and his followers were of "great wisdom" (mahāpaññā); Mahā Moggallāna and his followers were of "great potency" (mahiddhikā); Kassapa and his followers of "stricter observances" (dhutavāda);

³⁶ There is no need to justify this statement here as we have drawn attention to this fact throughout our study. Regarding the merging of the two positions, see Rune Johansson, The Psychology of Nirvāṇa, pp.85-105; also Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "Musīla et Nārada...", pp.189-222.

³⁷ Jean Przyluski, Le concile..., p.67; also Poussin, "Musīla et Nārada", p.198.

Anuruddha and the bhikkhus under him as possessors of "deva sight" (dibbacakkhākā); Puṇṇa Mantānī's son and his group of "righteous converse" (dhammakathikā); Upāli and his followers "knowing the Vinaya by heart" (vinayadhara); Ānanda and his party as having "learnt much" (bahussutā) and, finally, Devadatta and followers having "evil wants" (pāpicchā).

The attributing of specific abilities to particular bhikkhus is found throughout the Pāli Canon (see e.g. A I 23, p.16). The fact that the description provided by the above Sutta extends the abilities of the important bhikkhus as also extending to their followers, would indicate, if we take the Sutta seriously, that not only was there some choice in whom a bhikkhu would choose to 'emulate' but that such choices were also motivated by those areas of accomplishment which bhikkhus, like Ānanda as bahussuta, were credited with having achieved. The reference to Upāli in the above Sutta is a relatively rare occurrence, because his name does not appear very often in the Pāli Suttas. In addition, Upāli is credited as a vinayadhara, while Ānanda is described as bahussuta, not as dhammadhara as is often the case when Ānanda and Upāli are spoken of together. As we indicated in our section on the bahussuta, it is likely that the term "bahussuta" was originally coined to imply a knowledge of the dhamma-vinaya and that, at some later date, the terms "dhammadhara" ("suttadhara") and "vinayadhara" came into vogue to indicate a specialization within the context of the buddhavacana.

The Samyutta Nikāya (S II 203, p.137) reports that when the Buddha suggested to Mahā Kassapa that he "exhort" and provide the bhikkhus with a dhamma-talk, the latter reported:

Just now, lord, it is difficult to speak to the brethren. They are in a state that makes it difficult to speak to them. They are intractable, they pay no deference to instruction. For instance, lord, I saw Bhaṇḍa the brother who is the colleague of Ānanda, and Abhiñjika, who is the colleague of Anuruddha out-talking each other thus:-- Come, brother, which will speak the more? which will speak the better? which will speak the longer?

It is noteworthy that the names Bhaṇḍa and Abhiñjika do not appear elsewhere in the Pāli Canon and that they are described as sharing 'dwellings' with Ānanda and Anuruddha respectively ("saddhivihāra" being translated by F.L. Woodward as "colleague"). In addition, the Commentary states, "Why [Mahā Kassapa] not Sāriputta or Moggallāna [to exhort the bhikkhus]? He [the Buddha] knew they would not survive him."³⁸ Woodward comments on these remarks of Buddhaghosa, "It seems more probable, from Kassapa's (and hence from the Master's) advanced age, that the 'great twin brethren' had already passed away."³⁹ More important, we contend, is the fact that the two misbehaving bhikkhus are linked to Ānanda and Anuruddha. In this manner the Sutta is likely aiming at deflating Ānanda's and Anuruddha's positions, perhaps as

³⁸F.L. Woodward, KS II, p.137, fn.2.

³⁹Ibid., p.137, fn.2.

a reflection of the place Mahā Kassapa held (or was to hold) at the First Council. In this light one can find parallel Suttas to those mentioning the "colleagues" of Ānanda and Anuruddha but which contain no reference to Ānanda or Anuruddha or to anyone associated with them (see S II 205, p.139; S II 208, p.140).

If the discussion above indicates an indirect 'put-down' of Ānanda, a number of the other Samyutta Nikāya Suttas are more direct. For example, (S II 214-217, pp.145-146) we find Ānanda asking Mahā Kassapa to come with him to visit the bhikkhunīs. Mahā Kassapa replies to Ānanda's request, "Go thou, friend Ānanda, thou art a man of many duties, of much work." Mahā Kassapa's remarks, according to the Commentary, indicate that Ānanda at that time was performing the function of comforting the congregations mourning the death of the Buddha.⁴⁰ Ānanda persists in his request that Mahā Kassapa accompany him to visit the bhikkhunīs and the latter finally acquiesces to do so. In the visiting of the bhikkhunīs, it is Mahā Kassapa who takes the lead, Ānanda being described as "walking as attendant [pacchāsamaṇena] behind" Mahā Kassapa (S II 215, p.145). Mahā Kassapa and not Ānanda provides the discourse to the bhikkhunīs and, after Mahā Kassapa has left, Thullatissā asks, "What! does Father Mahā-

⁴⁰F.L. Woodward, KS II, p.145, fn.2.

Kassapa deem he is to speak doctrine in the presence of Father Ānanda the learned sage [vedehamunino]? . It is as if the needle-pedlar were to deem he could sell a needle to the needlemaker!" (S II 215, p.145). Mahā Kassapa, learning of Thullatissā's remarks, turns to Ānanda and asks whether it is Ānanda or himself who is to be considered the needlemaker. Ānanda replies, "Be indulgent, your reverence, women are foolish." However, Mahā Kassapa is not satisfied with that response and persists, "Come, come, friend Ānanda, let not the Order inquire further of thee. As to this what thinkest thou, friend Ānanda? Was it thou whom the Exalted One brought before the Order, saying:-- I, brethren, according as I desire, (can) attain to and abide in First Jhana; Ānanda too, brethren, can so attain and abide?" Mahā Kassapa continues to question Ānanda regarding the other jhānas and the six super-knowledges; in each case Ānanda admits to his inability to accomplish that which is recognized to be the case for Mahā Kassapa. With Ānanda's confession in mind, Mahā Kassapa states, "It were as easy, friend, to imagine that an elephant seven to eight cubits high could be hidden under a young palmleaf, as to imagine that the six Super-knowledges of me could be hidden!" Finally the Sutta points out that 'justice' was done because Thullatissā "fell away from the holy life" (S II 217, p.146).

The summary provided above clearly illustrates the need to diminish the position of Ānanda and to assert the

'visible' superiority of Mahā Kassapa. Mahā Kassapa is not content with Ānanda's response that "women are foolish" and insists on settling the matter because, according to the Commentary, he did not wish there to be any suspicions about a possible liaison between Ānanda and Thullatissā.⁴¹ In order to 'prove' his case, the Sutta informs us that Thullatissā was unsuccessful in the life of the brahmacāriyan.⁴² However, the fact that Thullatissā was evoked to make her remarks on the grounds that Ānanda was a "learned sage" (vedhamuni) and that Mahā Kassapa should chastise Ānanda in terms of his (Mahā Kassapa's) abilities in the jhānas and "Super-knowledges" is of interest. We have here a clear example of how the position of the bhikkhu (Mahā Kassapa) who is proficient in the jhānas (e.g. cetovimutti) is above the bhikkhu characterized as vedhamuni (Ānanda). That a female (bhikkhunī) would side with Ānanda suggests, perhaps, how little women were suited to the way of life founded by the Buddha. Finally we may note that Ānanda addresses Mahā Kassapa as "bhante" while the latter addresses Ānanda as "āvuso", thus again indicating Mahā Kassapa's superiority.

The 'debate' discussed above is continued in the Sutta which follows. There (S II 217-222, pp.146-150) we learn that "as many as thirty brethren, followers of Ānanda, and for the most part youths, had renounced the training

⁴¹F. L. Woodward, KS II, p.146, fn.1.

⁴²This remark, appearing as it does at the close of the Sutta, sounds like a rationalization; a justification for her support of Ānanda over Mahā Kassapa.

[sikkham paccakkhāya], and turned to low things." Ānanda returns to Bamboo grove at the Squirrel's Feeding-ground (at Rājagaha) to have Mahā Kassapa ask him about the Buddha's rule that only three bhikkhus should attend a meal at a layman's house (S II 218, p.147). The implication of Mahā Kassapa's remarks is that the above disciplinary rule has been broken by Ānanda and his followers, and he tells Ānanda:

... why on earth dost thou, friend Ānanda, tour about with these young brethren who have the gates of their senses unguarded, who are without moderation in their food, who are not devoted to vigils? Corn-trampler methinks art thou! Despoiler of the families methinks art thou! Thy following, friend Ānanda, is breaking up. Thy youngsters, friend, are melting away! This boy does not know his own measure!

Ānanda, replying to the last remark of Mahā Kassapa, states, "Surely my head is growing grey hairs, your reverence, and yet we are not vexed at the venerable Mahā Kassapa even at this time of day calling us 'boy'." Once again, as in the Sutta discussed above, Thullatissā makes an appearance. The bhikkhuni hears about what has taken place and says, "What now! does Father Mahā Kassapa, who was once a heretical teacher, deem that he can chide Father Ānanda the learned sage [vedehamuni], calling him 'boy'?" (S II 219, p.148). Mahā Kassapa, learning of Thullatissā's remarks, points out that his teacher was the Buddha himself and he goes on to describe how he first met the Buddha and entered his following and how on the eighth day after entering the Buddha's sāsana there arose in him "assurance of salvation" (S II 221,

p.149). The Sutta goes on to describe how, on another occasion, Mahā Kassapa and the Buddha had exchanged robes and how that event led him to conclude (S II 221-222, pp. 149-150), "Verily friend, if one might speak truly of me, truly might he say that here is a very son of the Exalted One, born of his mouth, born of the Norm, created by the Norm, heir of the Norm, who has received from him his rough cast-off rag-robes." Mahā Kassapa then goes on in a manner similar to the previous Sutta (though in more detail) to list his abilities in the jhānas and the Super-knowledges, pointing out, by the use of the same metaphor as in the last Sutta, that his abilities are readily visible to all. Finally, we are again reminded that Thullatissā "fell away from the holy life" (S II 222, p.150).

The last-mentioned Sutta, in its variety of subject matters and manner of exposition, is replete with accretions. Let us examine the Sutta in detail. Ānanda, described as "making a tour ... with a great company of brethren" has "thirty brethren ... for the most part youths [renounce] the training and [turn] to low things." If we accept the Sutta at face value, then we see Ānanda, as we have done previously, as having a following of his own. The Commentary informs us that, as in the previous Sutta, the period dealt with is after the death of the Buddha and that Ānanda, out of his close ties with the Buddha, has possession

of the Buddha's bowl and robe.⁴³ The reference to the fact that most of the brethren (as many as thirty) who had "renounced the training" were youths may conceal a justification for their turning to "low things" (i.e. they were young and inexperienced in the Buddha's sāsana) and/or point to the inability of Ānanda to control their actions. In addition, one wonders whether the reference to "youths" is also meant to imply that many of the bhikkhus who followed Ānanda were new members and not those bhikkhus who had been of long standing in the Buddha's following while he was alive.

Mahā Kassapa's chastisement of Ānanda and his young followers refers to their having "renounced the training" (sikkha paccakkhāti), having the "gates of their senses unguarded", "without moderation in their food", all of which speak to the discipline of these young brethren. When Maha Kassapa refers to Ananda as a "boy" (kumāra), Ānanda first points out that he has grey hairs on his head (i.e. he is not a young man) and secondly that he is not bothered by the remark. It is difficult to understand what the intention is here. Perhaps, Ānanda is taking the remark of Mahā Kassapa as a compliment? Unlike the previous Sutta, Ānanda is not made to acknowledge the superiority of Mahā Kassapa openly. In fact, Mahā Kassapa

⁴³F.L. Woodward, KS II, p.146, fn.2.

takes the offensive (upon hearing of Thullatissā's remarks) and launches into a long discourse on how he entered the Buddha's following, exchanged robes with him, and was now master of the jhānas and the Super-knowledges. Mahā Kassapa is concerned with Thullatissā's charge that he was once "a heretical teacher" and Mahā Kassapa attempts to answer that charge by illustrating the closeness of his relationship with the Buddha, going so far as to say that "one might speak truly of me ... here is a very son of the Exalted One, born of his mouth, born of the Norm, created by the Norm, heir of the Norm" (S II 221, pp.149-150). The above statement is stereotypical and appears elsewhere in the Pāli Suttas (e.g. D III 84, p.81; M III 29, p.81), and Ānanda also refers to himself as the "lord's son" (M II 130, p.312). However, Ānanda's blood ties with the Buddha were closer than those of Mahā Kassapa (where none existed) and it is possible that this became a factor in the problem of how to choose a successor after the Buddha's death. The reference to the exchange of robes is intriguing,⁴⁴ especially if one considers, accepting the remarks of the Commentary, that Ānanda is reported to have in his possession, at the time of this Sutta, the robe and bowl of the Buddha.

One can find parallels to the above Sutta in the non-Pāli sources. For example, the Mahāvastu (III 47,

⁴⁴This reference to Mahā Kassapa possessing the Buddha's robe seems to have been a sign of the place he was to hold at the First Council; see DPPN pp.477-478; especially fn.6, p.478.

p.45) also records the above Sutta, although in an expanded form, claiming in its conclusion, "The depraved nun Sthūla-nanda uncovered herself before the venerable Mahā-Kāśyapa, and immediately she died" (Mahāvastu III 56, p.56). It is also interesting to note that the Samyutta Nikāya (S II 221, p.149) states that Mahā Kassapa, after eight days in the Buddha's following, became 'assured of salvation'.

Malalasekera interprets this to imply that Mahā Kassapa became an arahant (see DPPN II, p.478). The Mahāvastu (III 53, p.53) states, "So, O venerable Ānanda, when I had been given this exhortation by the Exalted One, for eight days I was a probationer student, and on the ninth day I attained perfect knowledge [Ājñā]" (i.e. arahanthood).

We have drawn attention to Mahā Kassapa's easy attainment of arahanthood because it compares radically with Ānanda's attainment of the same goal. Mahā Kassapa, according to the Pāli account, accomplishes the goal of arahanthood only eight days after entering the Buddha's following; Ānanda, however, takes more than twenty-five years to achieve the same. Interestingly, the account of Mahā Kassapa's entry into the Buddha's following and his attainment of arahanthood is revealed, according to the Commentary, in a period following after the Buddha's death. Ānanda's arahanthood is both achieved and revealed to the reader of the Cullavagga as having taken place in the period following the Buddha's death.

The fact that the Commentary (SA II 130) indicates that the events of the Sutta took place after the Buddha's death, that the Sutta attests to the superiority of Mahā Kassapa over Ānanda and alludes to Mahā Kassapa possessing the Buddha's robe (which according to the Commentary Ānanda likewise possesses) would seem to indicate that the Sutta, and the Commentary, wants to pave the way for Mahā Kassapa (not Ānanda) to head the First Council.

Returning to the Samyutta Nikāya (S II 238-239, pp.161-162), one finds Ānanda in conversation with the Buddha regarding "gains, favours and flattery" as dangers. On another occasion (S II 274-275, pp.185-186) Sāriputta informs the bhikkhus that there is nothing in the world which, if changed, would cause him sorrow, thus implying that he, as an arahant, is unaffected by change. Ānanda replies, "But the Master, friend Sāriputta -- would not a changing, a becoming otherwise in him give rise in you to grief, lamenting, suffering, sorrow, despair?" Sāriputta answers Ānanda's question as follows:

Not even a changing, a becoming otherwise in him, friend Ānanda. Nevertheless I should (feel) thus:- 'O may not the mighty one, O may not the Master so gifted, so wonderful be taken from us! Verily if the Exalted One may abide yet a long while with us, out of love to the world, it would be for the weal, the happiness of devas and men!

Ānanda's response to Sāriputta's statement is:

Surely long time have notions of 'I' and 'mine' and insidious conceits been rooted out from the venerable Sāriputta! On that account is it that

for the venerable Sāriputta a changing, a becoming otherwise even in the Master would not give rise to grief, lamenting, suffering, sorrow, despair.

There is, as F.L. Woodward points out (KS II, p.185, fn.4), a problem with Feer's edition of the Pāli text of the Sutta under discussion. Feer's edition places the passage quoted above (i.e. the one beginning, "not even a changing...") in the mouth of Sāriputta, while Woodward changes the speaker from Sāriputta to Ānanda:

I have ventured to place this sentence in Sāriputta's mouth, changing, in the Feer edition, "Sāriputta" to Ānanda. It is unlikely S. would have kept silence; moreover the wish expressed by S. is precisely that which A. was later on to utter too late. See Dialogues ii, 111.

Without having the Mss. available from which Feer derived his edition of this Sutta, it is impossible to decide the issue. We should point out that Woodward's argument that the wish to have the Buddha live on is more understandable placed in Sāriputta's mouth, because Ānanda would utter it too late, is not to be regarded as a sufficient reason for placing the passage in Sāriputta's mouth. Ānanda did not utter the wish to have the Buddha live on in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta, not out of choice, but because he at that time was under the spell of Māra. In this regard the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II, 155, p.121) informs us that once free of Māra's spell, Ānanda actually asked the Buddha to extend his life. In spite of Ānanda's remarks, the desire to have the Buddha extend his life would seem to show attachment to the "notions

of 'I' and 'mine'" something which Ānanda asserts Sāriputta is supposed to have freed himself from.⁴⁵ However, placing the passage stating the desire to extend the Buddha's life in the mouth of Sāriputta helps to condemn Ānanda, because if Sāriputta, supposedly an arahant, wished for the Buddha to live on, then Ānanda should have done the same when he was provided with the opportunity to say so. This indictment of Ānanda's 'subsequent' action in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta also helps the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Canon to show that, in spite of any similarities between Ānanda and Sāriputta, Ānanda was, unlike Sāriputta, not an arahant.

While at Sāvattthī on one occasion, Ānanda questioned the Buddha on what "natural states" were supposed to have ceased when the phrase "Ceasing! Ceasing!" was uttered (S III 24-25, pp.23-24). The Buddha replied that such a statement recognized the ceasing of the Khandhas. On other occasions in Sāvattthī the Buddha asked Ānanda questions on the dhmma (S III 37-40, pp.34-36) and in all cases Ānanda answered successfully and received the Buddha's praise. Ananda's ability to answer the questions as they should be

⁴⁵It is likely that the desire to have the Buddha extend his life was regarded as a compassionate gesture for others and thus perhaps did not entail "notions of 'I' and 'mine'". If such notions had been attached to the extension of the Buddha's life, we might have expected the Buddha himself to have said so. The fact that the Buddha tells Māra that he refuses to die until his doctrine is known by all (D II 104, p.112) would confirm the above analysis.

answered reflects his detailed knowledge and understanding of the buddhavacana.

Once, when the Buddha was staying near Kosambī, "he took bowl and robe, and without calling his attendants [upatthake] or giving notice to the Order of brethren, alone and unattended, went forth a-wandering" (S III 94-95, pp.80-81). After some time had passed, a bhikkhu informed Ānanda of the Buddha's actions. Ānanda informed the bhikkhu that such actions on the part of the Buddha expressed a wish on his part to be alone. Soon after the above conversation had taken place, a group of bhikkhus approached Ānanda, saying, "'Tis a long time, friend Ānanda, since we had pious talk face to face with the Exalted One. We desire ... to hear pious talk face to face with the Exalted One." Having heard the request of these bhikkhus, Ānanda brought them to the Buddha who was seated beneath a "lucky sāl-tree." Rather than what one might have expected as a response to this interruption, the Buddha provides the bhikkhus with a talk on dhamma and shows no signs of being disturbed by the sudden appearance of Ānanda and the bhikkhus.

The Commentary elaborates on the above account and links the Buddha's leaving the bhikkhus to dwell alone to disorders among them. This resulted in the Buddha going to the jungle, where he was waited on by an elephant. Ānanda is finally asked to intercede on behalf of the bhikkhus in an

attempt to have the Buddha return to the community.⁴⁶ One of the interesting features in the above Sutta is the reference to "attendants" (uppatthake) in the plural. The fact that Ānanda is accorded a place of significance, inasmuch as it is he who is approached when the bhikkhus wish to see the Buddha and who actually decides to seek him out (Ānanda even knows where the Buddha is), does not militate against the Buddha having a number of attendants. The mentioning of plural attendants confirms the fact that, while Ānanda may have been the most important of the Buddha's attendants (i.e. his 'private secretary') there were other bhikkhus who attended to the Buddha as well. The fact that the Buddha is not disturbed by Ānanda's appearance before him suggests that the latter possessed the various qualities necessary to fulfil the office of attendant to the Buddha.

The Samyutta Nikāya (S III 105-106, p.89) records the indebtedness of Ānanda to Puṇṇa, the son of Mantānī, "When I heard the Norm-teaching of the venerable Puṇṇa, Mantānī's son, I fully understood the Norm [dhammo abhisameto]." The instruction which Puṇṇa provided to Ānanda and to other "novices" (navakas) with Ānanda at the time of his assistance, was a discourse emphasizing the fact that, "Owing to a cause

⁴⁶F.L. Woodward, KS III, p.80, fn.2. Also E.W. Burlingame, Buddhist Legends, I [57-63], pp.176-178. According to this account, the disorders amongst the bhikkhus resulted from a conflict between a "student of the Discipline" and "a preacher of the Law." See also M I 320, p.383 and M III 152, p.197 (Upakkilesasutta).

comes the conceit 'I am' ... not without a cause." Puṇṇa's discourse took the form of discussing the "conceit 'I am'" in terms of the khandhas. The Commentary interprets Ānanda's statement that, after he heard Puṇṇa's discourse he "fully understood the Norm [dhammo abhisameto]" as resulting in Ānanda becoming a stream-winner.⁴⁷

The term "abhisameta" does not appear frequently in the Pāli Suttas. The PTSD (p.71) translates the term "abhisameta" as "completely grasped or realized, understood, mastered." However, the term does not have, as far as we can ascertain, any direct connection to arahanthood. The Samyutta Nikāya (S V 128, p.109) records that Prince Abhaya, son of King Bimbisāra, having heard and questioned the Buddha on the Norm declared that he had "fully grasped the Norm [Dhammo ca me abhisameto]." Elsewhere (S V 440-441, p.372) the term "abhisameta" appears in the sentence, "At the end of a hundred years you shall comprehend [abhisamessasi] the four Ariyan truths hitherto not comprehended."

Puṇṇa-Mantānīputta, according to the Pāli Sources (see A I 23, p.17 and S II 156, p.109) was noted for his teaching of the dhamma and is thus to be regarded as a 'suitable' teacher for Ānanda. It is interesting to note once again that, unlike Ānanda, Puṇṇa did not take very long to achieve his arahanthood.⁴⁸

⁴⁷F.L. Woodward, KS III, p.89, fn.3.

⁴⁸See DPPN II, pp.222-223; Mahāvastu III 377, p.373ff.

When the bhikkhu Channa ⁴⁹ (S III 132-135, pp.111-114) desires to be taught the dhamma so that he "may see the Norm," he first approaches some elder bhikkhus who, though instructing him, leave him unsatisfied. Having failed to "see the Norm," Channa turns to Ānanda, for Ānanda was "one praised by the Master and honoured by intelligent co-mates of the righteous life" (S III 133, pp.112-113). Channa seeks Ānanda out as a teacher and, as a result of the latter's teaching, proclaims, "Hearing this Norm-teaching from the venerable Ānanda I am firmly established in the Norm [dhammo abhisameto]" (S III 135, p.114). Thus, the above Sutta, once again expresses the fact that Ānanda was both respected and acknowledged as a knower of the buddhavacana; regarding the buddhavacana, Ānanda points out to Channa, "From the very lips of the Exalted One, friend Channa, from his very lips as he taught brother Kaccānagotta, I heard this..." (S III 134, p.113).

Ānanda (S III 187-188, p.154) asks the Buddha to "teach [him] a doctrine, hearing which from the Exalted One, [he] might dwell remote, strenuous, ardent and intent." The Buddha, in answer to Ānanda's request, lectured to him on the doctrine of anicca. Whether this Sutta wishes to suggest, as Ānanda's request would seem to indicate, that Ānanda was having difficulties in pursuing the life of 'self-cultivation' is not clear.

⁴⁹Regarding which Channa is the one under discussion, see F.L. Woodward, KS III, p.111, fn.1.

The Samyutta Nikāya (S III 235-238, pp.186-189) contains a series of Suttas in which Ānanda questions Sāriputta on the "clear and transparent colour of [Sāriputta's] face." This reference to complexion is met with often in the Pāli Canon and is meant to indicate that something significant has happened to the individual with "transparent colour," almost always of 'spiritual' significance. Thus, each time Ānanda draws attention to Sāriputta's complexion, Sāriputta provides Ananda with an explanation in terms of his practicing the jhānas.⁵⁰

The Salāyatana Vagga of the Samyutta Nikāya records in its opening Suttas a number of conversations between Ānanda and the Buddha regarding points of doctrine. Ānanda questions the Buddha on such subjects as the world (loka) (S IV 53, pp.28-29), the "void" (suñña) (S IV 54, p.29), and "teaching in brief" (S IV 54-55, p.29).

Later in the above vagga (S IV 93, p.57), a group of bhikkhus are provided with the following terse discourse by the Buddha:

I declare, brethren, that the end of the world
is not to be learned, seen, gone to, by going
to world's end. I declare not, brethren,
that an end of Ill can be made without going
to world's end.

⁵⁰ One might note in passing that Sāriputta's abilities in the jhānas expressed here were not shared by Ānanda. Further, as we have indicated, Sāriputta was known primarily for his "great knowledge" and was regarded as having been freed through knowledge (paññāvimutti); see I.B. Horner, MLS II, p.107, fn.1.

The bhikkhus, unable to understand the meaning of the Buddha's remarks, turn to Ānanda, "There is this venerable Ānanda, one praised by the Master and honoured by intelligent co-mates of the righteous life. The venerable Ānanda is capable of expounding in detail the meaning of this pronouncement made in brief by the Exalted One" (S IV 93, p.58). Approached by the brethren, Ānanda points out, in deference to the Buddha, "Though you had the Master face to face you passed over that Exalted One, and think that I am the one to be questioned on this matter" (S IV 94, p.58). The bhikkhus reiterate their request to have Ānanda expand on the Buddha's remarks and Ānanda provides the bhikkhus with the needed explanation. Ānanda, having completed his discourse, suggests to the bhikkhus that, if they wish, they should ask the Buddha to respond to the question they have just put to him, "according as the Exalted One explains it you so do ye bear it in mind" (S IV 96, p.59). The bhikkhus report what has transpired to the Buddha, including Ānanda's answer to their question and, in reply, the Buddha states, "A sage, brethren, is Ānanda; of great wisdom [mahāpaṇṇo], brethren, is Ānanda. If ye were to put me this question, I should explain it even as Ānanda explained it to you. This is the meaning of that thing, and so do ye bear it in mind" (S IV 97, p.61).

The above summary points out that Ānanda was recognized as an authority on the buddhavacana, though he, as the

Sutta indicates, acknowledged the Buddha as the authority par excellence. The Buddha recognizes Ānanda's abilities and thus refers to him as "a sage ... of great wisdom." A Sutta similar to the above is found at S IV 97-101, pp.60-61, and we will not repeat ourselves here as the significant details of Ānanda's place in this Sutta are exactly those already described.

Ānanda's ability to expound the Buddha's doctrine is illustrated in a number of suttas. Thus (S IV 113-114, p.71), when the householder Ghosita has questions about the "diversity in elements" he seeks out Ānanda. Ānanda responds by providing Ghosita with the details, pointing out, for example, how, "When the elements of eye and objects that are pleasing and eye-conscious occur together ... owing to the pleasurable contact there arises pleasure feeling." Ānanda then goes on to discuss the eye and the other senses' interaction with pleasant, unpleasant and neutral objects. Similarly, when the bhikkhus Kāmabhū and Udāyin (S IV 165-166, p.102 and S IV 166-168, pp.102-104, respectively) have questions on the dhamma, it is to Ānanda that they address their questions. It should be noted that Ānanda was not the only bhikkhu who was approached to answer questions posed by the bhikkhus and lay-disciples, though in the suttas under discussion (the Pannāsamcatuttham of the Salāyatana Saṃyuttam - S IV 84-141, pp.51-90), only Ānanda receives the unrestrained praise of the Buddha.

When the paribbājaka Vacchagotta is unable to get an answer from the Buddha about the existence or non-existence of the "self" and leaves, Ānanda asks the Buddha to explain the reasons for his not replying to Vacchagotta's questions. The Buddha points out how, in not replying to Vacchagotta, he followed the best course (S IV 400-401, pp.281-282).

It is reported (S V 2-3, pp.2-3; see also S I 87-91, pp.111-115) that on one occasion Ānanda said to the Buddha, "The half of the holy life, lord, it is friendship with what is lovely, association with what is lovely, intimacy with what is lovely!" The Buddha replied that Ānanda was wrong because it is the whole, not the half, of the holy life which is associated with the lovely. The Buddha points out that a bhikkhu who "is a friend, an associate, an intimate of what is lovely we may expect ... that he will develop the Ariyan eightfold way, that he will make much of the Ariyan eightfold way" (S V 2, p.2). On the other hand, Sāriputta in the Sutta following the above (S V 3-4, p.3), claims, unlike Ānanda and in accordance with the Buddha's own view, that the "whole of the holy life ... consists in friendship, in association with what is lovely." The Commentary⁵¹ points out that Ānanda's error is the result of the fact that he was only a sekha (learner)⁵² whereas Sāriputta as an adept (arahant) would not make the error.⁵³

⁵¹F.L. Woodward, KS V, p.3, fn.2.

⁵²Regarding the term "sekha", see PTSD, "sekha", p.722.

⁵³One might question whether certain features of the

Ānanda (S V 4, p.4) witnesses brāhmaṇa Jānussoṇi driving out of Sāvattthī "in his car, drawn by white mares" and hears the remarks of the populace, upon their seeing Jānussoṇi, that the brāhmaṇa's "car" is the "best of cars." Ānanda reports what he has seen and heard to the Buddha, whereupon the Buddha, taking up the statement "best of cars" applies it (at the suggestion of Ānanda)⁵⁴ to the Buddha's dhamma-vinaya, indicating that the "Ariyan eight-fold way" is the "best of cars, Norm-car, unsurpassed for its conquest in the fight."

While staying at Pāṭaliputta, the bhikkhu Bhadda⁵⁵ asks Ānanda as to the content of the "unrighteous life." Ānanda replies that the "unrighteous life" is none other than the "wrong eightfold way" (S V 16, pp.15-16). Ānanda, as a corollary to the above Sutta, also explains to Bhadda the content of the "righteous life" as consisting in the practice of the "eightfold way" (S V 16-17, p.15; see also S V 171-172, pp.151-152).

arahant were part of the 'early' tradition; see e.g. Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rajagrha, p.276; André Migot, Un grand disciple du buddha: Sāriputra, pp.535-536.

⁵⁴ Ānanda asks, "Pray, lord, can one point out the best of cars in this Norm and discipline?"

⁵⁵ Regarding Bhadda, see DPPN II, p.348. It is interesting to draw attention to the possibility that this Bhadda may be the one whom Ānanda supposedly instructed and who shortly after, as a result of Ānanda's instruction, became an arahant; see "2.Bhadda Thera" and "3.Bhadda Thera" in DPPN. Once again we are, perhaps, witness to Ānanda's great knowledge which, though capable of leading others to arahanthood, does not lead Ānanda himself to that goal.

Ānanda next appears in the Samyutta Nikāya (S V 152 p.136) in an episode which is found, virtually verbatim, in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 99, p.106) and for this reason we will not take up the subject matter of this Sutta here.⁵⁶

On one of Ānanda's visits to a settlement of bhikkhunīs (S V 154, p.134) he is informed by the bhikkhunīs that some of their 'sisters' are "well established in the four stations of mindfulness, and ... have [thus] attained to greater excellence of comprehension than before." Ānanda expresses his pleasure at their success, provides them with a discourse, then returns to report on the events of his day to the Buddha. The Buddha, upon hearing Ānanda's report, praises what has transpired and provides Ānanda with a discourse on the "four stations of mindfulness" concluding with, "Whatsoever, Ānanda, should be done by a teacher who seeks the welfare of his disciples, in compassion, feeling compassion, have I done that for you. Here, Ānanda, are the roots of trees. Here are empty places. Do ye meditate. Be not remiss. Be not remorseful hereafter. This is our instruction to you" (S V 157, pp.136-137). Regarding the latter remarks of the Buddha, we have already earlier in our study shown that these remarks are not directed specifically at Ananda.⁵⁷

⁵⁶See our study, pp. 381ff.

⁵⁷See our study, p.196.

The above Sutta indicates that Ānanda spent time answering questions and discoursing with the bhikkhunīs. That the Buddha would choose to lecture to Ānanda on the "four stations of mindfulness" is odd inasmuch as Ānanda's conversation with the bhikkhunīs suggests that he is conversant with the details of the doctrine.⁵⁸ Thus it is likely that, even though Ānanda seems to be the only bhikkhu present during the Buddha's discourse on the "four stations of mindfulness", other bhikkhus were also present. The probable presence of other bhikkhus at the Buddha's discourse is confirmed by the Buddha's closing remarks, which, though addressed to Ānanda, are addressed in the plural (evidence of verbs, etc.). The fact that remarks are addressed to the person of Ānanda is likely a method of ensuring the discourse as authentic, allowing Ānanda to report the events at a later date. In the sense in which Ānanda's duty is linked to preserving the buddhavaṇṇa, a certain usefulness is gained by keeping him unenlightened for, as a sekha, he would need to be taught. However, it should be noted that even supposed arahants like Sāriputta are known (reported) to have questioned the Buddha on matters of doctrine (e.g. S V 158, p.137).

⁵⁸In this regard it is interesting to note Ānanda's remarks that by practicing the stations of mindfulness, one may "attain to greater excellence of comprehension than before." (S V 155, p.135). This, in light of the Buddha's recommendations at the close of the Sutta, that Ānanda (and the bhikkhus) meditate may be intended to suggest that even though Ānanda is a mahāpañña, he should practice the stations of mindfulness.

The Samyutta Nikāya (S V 161-163, pp.140-143) informs us that, upon the death of Sāriputta, Cunda, who was Sāriputta's "attendant" (upaṭṭhāka) at the time, went to Ānanda and declared, "Sir, the venerable Sāriputta has passed away. Here are his bowl and outer robe. (This water-strainer holds his relics)" (S V 162, p.141). Ānanda suggests that they inform the Buddha of Sāriputta's death, which they do. In describing the events, Ānanda states, "Indeed, lord, thereat my body was as if drugged. My bearings were confused. The teachings were not clear to me when I heard the words 'the venerable Sāriputta has passed away'" (S V 162, pp.141-142). The Buddha, in order to calm Ānanda, asks whether Sāriputta in dying has taken with him 'the constituents of virtue, concentration, wisdom, release, or knowing and seeing'. Ānanda replies in the negative, but points out that Sāriputta "... was to me an adviser, one who was well grounded. He was an instructor, one who could arouse, incite and gladden. He was unwearied in teaching the Norm. He was the patron of those who lived the righteous life along with him. We bear in mind that essence of the Norm, that patronage of the Norm possessed by the venerable Sāriputta, lord" (S V 162, p.142). The Buddha (S V 162-163, pp.142-143) in response to Ānanda's remarks points out the impermanence of all things and tells Ānanda, "do ye abide grounded on self, self-refuged, taking refuge in none other ... grounded on the Norm, taking refuge in the Norm, having none other refuge." This "refuge" is accomplished by con-

templating the body, feelings, mind, etc., as transient and the Buddha concludes his remarks thus:

Whoso, Ānanda, either now or when I have passed away shall abide grounded on self, self-refuged, taking refuge in none other; grounded on the Norm, with the Norm for refuge, taking refuge in none other; grounded on the Norm, with the Norm for refuge, taking refuge in none other, -- they, Ānanda, shall be my monks, they shall be atop of the gloom; that is, they who are anxious to learn [sikkhākamma].⁶⁰

The treatment of Sāriputta's death in the above Sutta raises a number of questions. Why, for example, did not Cunda⁶¹ report the news of Sāriputta's death directly to the Buddha? Are we to assume that the news was reported to Ānanda because he was the Buddha's attendant or because he was the close friend of Sāriputta? Why did Ānanda not show distress when he first heard of Sāriputta's death from Cunda? Generally speaking, very little is known about the details of Sāriputta's death. One notes, for example, that the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta which supposedly covers the period in which Sāriputta's death occurred says nothing about it.⁶²

The report of Ānanda to the Buddha about his feelings

⁶⁰The term "sikkhākamma" is perhaps best translated as "anxious to train" (see PTSD, p.708). One wonders whether this term is used by the authors and/or compilers to counter balance the rest of the passage which speaks only of dhamma.

⁶¹Cunda was no stranger to the Buddha as he is elsewhere described in the Pāli Canon as the Buddha's attendant, see DPPN I, pp.877-878, "2. Cunda".

⁶²See E.J. Thomas's remarks, The Life of Buddha, pp.140-142. Regarding Sāriputta, see the study of André Migot, Un grand disciple du buddha: Sāriputra.

on hearing of Sāriputta's death, reminds us of Ānanda's reaction to the parinibbāna of the Buddha (D II 144, pp.158-159; also D II 158, p.177). The fact that the Sutta under discussion does not reveal Ānanda's reaction to the news brought by Cunda until the former meets with the Buddha is to be regarded with suspicion. Further, the stereotyped reaction of the Buddha to the news of Sāriputta's death, stressing the impermanence of all things (S V 163, p.143), is reminiscent of Anuruddha's remarks at the death of the Buddha (D II 158, p.177). Indeed, the Buddha's reaction to Sāriputta's death is the accepted, orthodox and 'doctrinal' response to any death, yet the Pāli Canon elsewhere exhibits a somewhat more 'human' response by the Buddha to the loss of Sāriputta (as well as that of Moggallāna). Thus (S V 164, p.144) the Buddha states, "Monks, truly this company seems empty. Now that Sāriputta and Moggallāna have passed away my company is empty of them. It is indifferent as to that quarter in which Sāriputta and Moggallāna are dwelling. Monks, whosoever in past times have been Arahants, fully Enlightened Ones,-- each one of those Exalted Ones had such a noble pair of disciples as were Sāriputta and Moggallāna to me."⁶³ At the same time the above Sutta records the eulogy of the Buddha for his two chief disciples, "A marvel

⁶³ See also D II 3, p.6ff, where former Buddhas are described as having had a chief pair of disciples.

it is, monks, in the Tathāgata! For though such a pair of disciples has passed away, there is in the Tathāgata no sorrow or lamenting." By making the latter remark, the Sutta provides the final judgment on the attitude to the death of the two bhikkhus, the 'ideal' (orthodox) doctrinal response.

It does not seem unreasonable that even the Buddha should lament (as he does above) the loss of his two chief disciples. Yet, on the other hand, control of feelings, passions and desires is intrinsic to the Buddha's path as it is unfolded in the extant Pāli Suttas. It is possible that the deaths of Sāriputta, Moggallāna and the Buddha instilled great anxiety in the monastic community and that the threat of loss of control became a very real and important problem. Thus, one may expect that some adherence to what was (or what became) the 'official party line' was needed beyond what had been the case prior to the Buddha's death. The fact that the Suttas and commentaries of the Pāli Canon inform us that Ānanda was visibly and audibly distressed at the time of the Buddha's death seems to have contributed largely to his subsequent denigration. As the evidence of our study suggests, developments in the Buddha's sāsana in the post-parinibbāna period regarded the emotional responses and concerns of Ānanda at the death of the Buddha as incommensurate with new standards of decorum which developed for the bhikkhu. Thus in the light of an already established tradition regarding Ānanda's characterization at the time of the parinibbāna, the new developments forced the later authors and compilers of the Pāli Canon to denigrate Ānanda.

Returning to the Samyutta Nikāya (S V 172-173, p.151) Bhadda asks Ānanda for the purpose of the "virtuous habits" (sīlāni). Ānanda points out that the "virtuous habits" are the outcome of practising the "four stations of mindfulness."

On the same occasion bhikkhu Bhadda asks Ānanda, "Pray, friend Ānanda, what is the condition, what is the cause, why, when the Tathāgata has finally passed away, the good Norm does not last long?" (S V 172, pp.151-152). Ānanda answers Bhadda claiming that such is the result when the "four stations of mindfulness" are not cultivated. We see here an emphasis on the need for 'practical' rather than mere 'learning' procedures after the Buddha's death.

When the housefather Sirivaḍḍha takes ill (S V 176-177, pp.155-156), he sends for Ānanda. In order to assist the housefather in his time of illness, Ānanda provides him with a talk on the "four stations of mindfulness." Sirivaḍḍha, having listened to Ānanda's discourse, points out that he has cultivated the "four stations of mindfulness" and moreover has abandoned "the five fetters of the lower sort." Ānanda, hearing the householder's declaration, states, "Good for you, housefather! Well gotten by you, housefather! You have declared the fruits of not returning, housefather!" A further similar account to the above, except with the householder Mānadiṇṇa substituted for Sirivaḍḍha, occurs in the Sutta following the above (S V 178, pp.156-157).

It is noteworthy that the declarations of the householders in the above accounts that they have destroyed the "five lower fetters" (pañcorambhāgiyāni saṃyojanāni) result in Ānanda stating that they have "declared the fruits of not returning" (anāgāmin). Ānanda's statement not only implies that the householders have spoken what is the situation of the individual who has achieved the "fruit of non returning" but that they have actually attained to that state. The Commentary remains silent on the matter, but Malalasekera (DPPN II, p.116, "13. Sirivaḍḍha") clearly indicates that the state of anāgāmin was attained. If Ānanda is the verifier of these householders' achievements, we are not told how he knew that they had actually acquired the "fruit of non returning."⁶⁴

Ānanda, recognizing a change in the Buddha's features, states (S V 216-217, pp.191-192), "It is a strange thing, lord! It is a wonder, lord, how the skin of the Exalted One is no longer clear and translucent, and how all his limbs are slack and wrinkled, his body bend forward, and a change is to be seen in his sense-faculties of eye, ear, nose, tongue and body!" The Buddha replies that such is the result of old age and, in verse, states:

Shame on thee, miserable age!
Age that maketh colour fade!
The pleasing image of a man
By age is trampled down.

⁶⁴As we indicated earlier, there is a problem, at least for those who read the Buddhist sources, about how various individuals (e.g. bhikkhus) made known the 'fact' of their success in the Buddha's sāsaṇa.

Tho' one should live a hundred years,
 Natheless he is consigned to death.
 Death passeth nothing by,
 But trampleth everything.
 (S v 217, p.192).

The remarkably human interchange between the Buddha and Ānanda in the above Sutta is unusual in the Pāli Suttas. The fact that it is Ānanda who notices the changes in the Buddha's appearance may reflect the attempt of the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Canon to reveal Ānanda as overly concerned with the changes in the Buddha. On the other hand, the fact that the Buddha, while accepting the inevitability of death, bemoans "miserable age" seems to make of the dialogue an interchange between master and pupil on a human level often absent from the suttas. The above description, for example, contrasts sharply with those suttas which speak of the Buddha possessing 'the Marks of a Great Man' (mahā purisa lakkhaṇa).

The fact that the remarks of the Buddha are preserved in verse may indicate that it is part of an 'early' account on the subject. There seems to be little, if any, doubt that by the time the Pāli Canon was put into writing, the view of the Buddha as a man like any other man had receded far into the background, except for the odd account such as we have just seen. In the light of new developments, the depiction of Ānanda as a more compassionate human being may not have warranted him being seen as an arahant.

Ānanda's next appearance in the Samyutta Nikāya

(S V 258, p.23) reveals him under the spell of Māra, being unable to tell the Buddha to extend the period of his life. Because this issue repeats itself in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (see D II 102, p.110), we will consider it when discussing that Sutta.⁶⁵

When the brāhmaṇa Uṇṇābha (S V 271-273, pp.243-245) questions Ānanda on the purpose of living the "holy life" under the Buddha, Ānanda is so masterful in answering the brāhmaṇa's questions, that the latter decides to become a follower of the Buddha.

Ānanda (S V 282-284, pp.252-253) questions the Buddha about the Buddha's abilities in "psychic powers" (iddhis) and as to whether the Buddha understands how to reach the Brahma world in both his "mind-body" (manomayakāya) and "physical body" (catumahābhūta kāya). The Buddha replies that he is capable of doing both of the above. The Samyutta Nikāya (S V 286, p.255) records a number of other suttas which have Ānanda and the Buddha discussing "psychic powers" in stereotypical terms common to the Pāli Canon. Thus we will not discuss the details here.

Particular attention seems to have gone into the Pāli Suttas to ensure that Ānanda appears devoid of "psychic powers". The Pāli commentaries have attributed some powers of iddhi to Ānanda, but have restricted these to the period

⁶⁵ See our study, p.390.

of Ānanda's appearance at the First Council and as a sign of his arahanthood. Thus the Bāhiranidāna (Smp. I 13, pp.10-11) states regarding Ānanda's appearance at the Council, "Then displaying his supernatural power he [Ānanda, after attaining arahanthood] dived into the earth and showed himself in his own seat. But some say that he came through the air and sat down." In the Cullavagga (XI 285, p.396) account, there is no reference at all to any 'supernatural' entrance by Ānanda to the First Council.

One may explain this lacuna in Ānanda's characterization as a result of the fact that he did not practice sufficiently those procedures (i.e. jhānas) which would lead to proficiency in the "psychic powers". Further, Ānanda was known, characterized as bahussuta and mahāpaññā and thus his enlightenment would likely have been one through knowledge (paññāvimutti) as was that of Sāriputta. On the other hand, a bhikkhu like Mahā Moggallāna, who practiced the jhānas, etc., achieved his enlightenment through their practice and was known as "cetovimutti" ("freed through mind"), a freedom which brought with it proficiency in the psychic powers.⁶⁶

The Buddha (S V 320, p.283), having provided the

⁶⁶One could also be freed in both of these ways as, for example, would be the case with the Buddha who has no limitations. See Rune Johansson, The Psychology of Nirvana, pp.85-105, and I.B. Horner, MLS II, p.107, fn.1. Regarding Ānanda's arahanthood, it seems to have been accomplished through meditation (see our study, p.454). However, not all the extant accounts provide Ānanda with success in the iddhis as a result.

bhikkhus with a discourse on the "unlovely" (asubha), expresses his wish to dwell in solitude for the half-month, "Monks, I wish to dwell in solitude for the half-month. I am not to be visited by anyone save by the single one who brings my food." When the Buddha returns from his retreat, he remarks to Ānanda that the "order of monks seems diminished." Ānanda replies that such indeed is the case, for it seems that the bhikkhus took the Buddha's discourse on the "unlovely" so much to heart that many committed suicide. The Buddha, as a curative to the situation, provided the bhikkhus with a discourse on breathing (ānāpāna) as a prevention against suicide when concentrating on the "unlovely".

The place of suicide in Buddhism is a subject worthy of study, but beyond the scope of this thesis.⁶⁷ The above Sutta emphasizes a number of important tendencies. Firstly, it shows that ascetic practices, for example suicide and solitary retreats, were appealing to some of the bhikkhus. Secondly, the importance of the Buddha as authority and leader is brought out, for it is in his absence that the suicides took place. The Sutta was most likely originated to deal with the problem of suicide. The fact that there is no direct reference to Ānanda as the bhikkhu who will attend upon the Buddha during his retreat (i.e. to bring

⁶⁷Regarding the subject, see Upendra Thakur, The History of Suicide in India.

his meals) is also noteworthy. This, once again, supports the view that other bhikkhus than Ānanda were also delegated to serve in attendance upon the Buddha. The fact that the Buddha directs his concern about the diminished size of the Sangha to Ānanda, illustrates that the latter was of some importance at the time and/or that Ānanda's name is placed there to invest the Sutta with 'authority'. In spite of Ananda's observations about the suicides in the community, he does not intervene.

When Kimbilā is unable to answer the Buddha's question as to the merits of the "practice of intent concentration on in-breathing and out-breathing" it is Ānanda who declares that it is appropriate for the Buddha to provide a discourse on that subject at this time (S V 323-324, p.286). Later in the Samyutta Nikāya (S V 328, p.291) Ānanda is shown in conversation with the Buddha regarding such matters as "concentration on in-breathing and out-breathing", "the four arisings of mindfulness", "the seven limbs of wisdom" and "complete knowledge and release." In addition, Ānanda (S V 346-347, pp.301-302) questions Sāriputta on the use of the term "stream winning." On other occasions the reverse takes place and it is Sāriputta who questions Ānanda (S V 362-364, pp.316-317).⁶⁸

⁶⁸Sāriputta also consults with the Buddha on the subject (S V 347-348, p.302). It is difficult to evaluate the meaning of having Sāriputta at one time discourse to Ānanda on the subject of stream-winning, but on another

The Samyutta Nikāya (S V 356-360, pp.311-314) records a number of instances when Ānanda questions the Buddha on the destiny of bhikkhus, bhikkhunīs and lay disciples who had recently died. Ānanda's persistent questioning cause the Buddha to state:

... if, when each one dies, you come and ask me about the matter, it is troublesome to the Tathāgata. Wherefore, Ānanda, I will teach you a Norm-teaching called 'The Mirror of the Norm,' possessing which the Ariyan disciple may, if he please, proclaim himself thus: 'Cut off for me is Purgatory ... Stream-winner am I ...' And of what sort, Ānanda, is that Norm-teaching called 'Mirror of the Norm,' possessed of which the Ariyan disciple can so proclaim himself? Herein, Ānanda, the Ariyan disciple is blessed with unwavering loyalty to the Buddha ... the Norm ... the Order, and he is blessed with virtues dear to the Ariyans, virtues unbroken ... that conduce to concentration of mind (S V 357, pp.312-313).

The Buddha's answer to Ānanda's persistent questioning is, in many ways, not an answer at all. When Ānanda questions the Buddha about the destiny of certain individuals, the Buddha is able to answer with certainty. In addition, the so-called "Mirror of the Norm" (dhammādāsa) speaks only of the "stream-winner" while the Buddha is able to tell Ānanda of the destinies of individuals who achieve the states of arahant, never-returner and once-returner. The Suttas under discussion are highly contrived; for example, it is noteworthy that the individuals whose destiny Ānanda seeks

occasion to have the situation reversed. Are we to regard the questioning of Ānanda by Sāriputta as a sign of Ānanda's knowledge on the subject, or as Sāriputta checking on Ānanda's knowledge as a 'teacher' might? (see our study, p.308). Is it conceivable that Ānanda would have something to teach Sāriputta?

do not, for the most part, appear elsewhere in the Pāli Canon (see their names in DPPN). In addition, the destinies of Sālha, Nandā, Sudatta and Sujātā are, respectively, arahant, never-returner, once-returner and stream-winner (S V 357, p.312), suggesting that the aim of the Sutta is to illustrate not historical but soteriological information. At any rate, the Suttas make it clear that Ānanda is to be regarded as a pest and that his abilities concerning the question at hand are minimal.⁶⁹

When Sāriputta (S V 381, p.329) goes to visit Anāthapiṇḍika when the latter is taken ill, Ānanda goes with him as his attendant (pacchāsamaṇa). When Sāriputta learns that Anāthapiṇḍika is in great pain, he informs him that if he were to think about his loyalty to the Buddha, his pains would "in a moment" be allayed. Sāriputta repeats the above remarks regarding loyalty to the Dhamma, Sangha, Ariyan virtues and the eightfold path, indicating in each case that Anāthapiṇḍika is, in fact, loyal to each. As a result of these reminders, Anāthapiṇḍika's pains abate and he serves Sāriputta and Ānanda a meal (S V 381-384, pp.330-331). Ānanda, upon returning from the visit to Anāthapiṇḍika, goes immediately to inform the Buddha of

⁶⁹A parallel to the suttas under discussion can be found at D II 91, p.98. See also F.L. Woodward's remarks KS V, p.312, fn.1.

what he has witnessed. In fact, Ānanda seems to have caught the Buddha at an inappropriate time since the latter states, "Why, Ānanda, how is it that you are here at this hour?" (S V 385, p.332).⁷⁰ Ānanda, having revealed the above incident, is informed by the Buddha, "Sāriputta is a sage, Ānanda. Sāriputta is of great wisdom, Ānanda, as indeed he must be who can divide up the four limbs of stream-winning in ten ways."

The reference to Sāriputta as a "sage ... of great wisdom" is a phrase which has also been applied to Ānanda (e.g. S IV 97, p.60; S IV 101, p.61). In a sutta such as the above, where Ānanda and Sāriputta appear together, the tendency is to place the latter in the spotlight. Thus Ānanda is merely the passive witness to the events, the attendant of Sāriputta, and it is Ānanda who, unable to restrain himself, disturbs the Buddha at an inopportune hour. The fact that the Buddha does not chastise Ānanda at length suggests that the Buddha accepts Ānanda's impulsiveness.

In the Sutta which follows after the above (S V 385-387, pp.332-333) it is Ānanda, not Sāriputta, who visits Anāthapiṇḍika in his illness. When Ānanda learns that Anāthapiṇḍika is in pain, he provides him with a discourse similar to that provided by Sāriputta in the Sutta just discussed. However, unlike the previous Sutta,

⁷⁰ See F.L. Woodward, KS V, p.332, fn.1.

in which Sāriputta informs Anāthapiṇḍika that he fulfils the conditions brought out in the discourse, it is Anāthapiṇḍika himself who states, "I am not afraid, master Ānanda! How could I be afraid? I have unwavering loyalty to the Buddha, the Norm and the Order. Moreover, master Ānanda, as to those obligations binding on the housefather, pointed out by the Exalted One, I see not a single one of them which is broken in me" (S V 387, p.333). Ānanda replies, "Well for you, housefather! Well gotten by you! You have declared the fruits of stream-winning, housefather." One can see in the above version of the Sutta (which seems to be a variation on the previous one centering on Sāriputta) that Ānanda does not receive the treatment which was accorded Sāriputta when he alleviated Anāthapiṇḍika's distress. Further, Anāthapiṇḍika does not seem so helpless in the Sutta involving only Ānanda as he did when Sāriputta was present. These differences would seem to be the work of the hagiographers.

In Ānanda's last participation in the suttas of the Samyutta Nikāya (S V 453-454, pp.381-382), Ānanda, while out begging in Vesālī, witnesses the ability of a group of Licchavi youths to shoot their arrows through a small keyhole. When Ānanda, upon his return, informs the Buddha of what he has seen, the latter informs Ānanda that to penetrate the meaning of the four noble truths is more difficult. The Buddha advises Ānanda to make the "effort to realize" (yoga

karaṇīya) the truths. The implication here, in addition to upholding the power inherent in successfully achieving perfection in the Buddha's dhamma, is the suggestion that Ānanda has not yet achieved his own arahanthood.

The Anguttara Nikāya¹

We have already, earlier in our study, drawn attention to the fact that Ānanda's name appears in an Anguttara Nikāya list (i.e. A I 24-25, pp.19-20) of "pre-eminent bhikkhus [sāvakanāṃ bhikkhūnaṃ]." Ānanda is described in the list as follows:

Monks, chief among my disciples, monks who are of wide knowledge [bahussutānaṃ], is Ānanda.
... of retentive memory [satimantānaṃ], is Ānanda.
... of good behaviour [gatimantānaṃ], is Ānanda.
... who are resolute [dhitimantānaṃ], is Ānanda.
... personal attendants [upatṭhākānaṃ], is Ānanda.

It is difficult to ascertain the logic used in ordering the bhikkhus who appear in the list of the "pre-eminent ones." The list starts with Aññā Kondañña who is described as chief among the Buddha's disciples who are "of long standing", then moves to Sāriputta,² Mahā Moggallāna,³ Mahā Kassapa,⁴ Anuruddha,⁵ etc. (A I 23, p.16). However,

¹Regarding the Anguttara Nikāya, see e.g. the various introductions by Mrs. Rhys Davids in F.L. Woodward and E.M. Hare's translation of the Anguttara Nikāya, The Book of Gradual Sayings, I-V; of particular interest is II, pp.xiii-xiv. Also to be consulted: G.C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, pp.230-247; D.K. Barua, An Analytical Study of Four Nikāyas, pp.575-596; M. Winternitz, A History of Indian Literature, II, p.60 ff.

²"Chief among those of great wisdom [mahāpaññaṇaṃ]"

³"Chief ... of supernatural powers [iddhimantānaṃ]"

⁴"Chief ... who uphold minute observance of forms [dhutavādānaṃ]"

⁵Chief of my disciples who are monks, among those who are clairvoyant [dibbacakkhukānaṃ]."

after Anuruddha, assuming the above list to be one of seniority, the method behind the ordering is difficult to discover. It is possible that as time went on, "merit" vied with "seniority" in listing the "pre-eminent ones." Of all the descriptions provided, that of Ānanda is the longest. Upāli's name also appears in the list (after that of Ānanda) where he is described merely, as elsewhere, as chief among the Buddha's disciples "who know the disciplinary rules by heart" (A I 25, p.20).

Regarding the series of epithets applied to Ānanda in the above list, we are already familiar with Ānanda's characterization as "bahussuta" and "upaṭṭhāka."⁶ In addition, the reference to Ānanda's "retentive memory" (satimant)⁷ reinforces his qualification as bahussuta. The terms, "sati", "gati" and "dhiti" can also be found together in such sentences as the following (M I 82-83, p.109):

Sāriputta, I might have four disciples here, each of a hundred years' life-span, living a hundred years, and possessed of the utmost mindfulness [satiyā], and attentiveness [gatiyā], and resolute energy [dhitiyā], and with the utmost lucidity of wisdom. As Sāriputta, a skilled archer, deft, trained, a marksman, may with ease wing a slender shaft across a palm-tree's shadow, so are these of extreme mindfulness [adhimattasatimanto], of extreme attentiveness [adhimattagatimanto], of extreme resolute energy [adhimattadhiti], and with the utmost lucidity of wisdom [paññāveyyatiyena].⁸

⁶See our study, e.g. pp. 98ff., 148ff., 222ff.

⁷The PTSD, p.672, says of "satimant": "Satimant (adj) ... mindful, thoughtful, pensive." It is likely that the term implies more than mere 'memory' but also suggests powers of intellection; see PTSD, p.672, "Sati."

⁸Unfortunately this description is not repeated else-

It is of note that the ordering of the terms in the above passage is the same as their occurrence in the passage devoted to Ānanda.⁹ The list of 'pre-eminent ones' in the cases of the bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs is, to the best of our knowledge¹⁰ a list of arahants. The list is interested in characterizing each of the bhikkhus (theras) in terms of some distinguishing feature, an effort being made to avoid-over-lap in the specific attributes attributed, in particular, to the bhikkhus.¹¹

where in the Pāli Canon. The context in which it is used in this Sutta (i.e. M I 82-83, pp.109-110) is to show that even if these "four disciples" continued to question the Buddha without stopping, they would not be able to exhaust the dhamma (knowledge) of the Buddha. Thus, the description of the "four disciples" is primarily used here in a literary context designed to glorify the Buddha. However, the fact that only "four disciples" are so described, suggests that the stage of their development was indeed high, high enough to contrast with the 'development' of the Buddha. See M I 175, p.221 and M II 209, p.397, where it is stated, "But who am I, sir, that I should know whether the recluse Gotama has lucidity of wisdom [paññāveyyattiyam]? Surely only one like him could know whether the recluse Gotama has lucidity of wisdom?"

⁹One would even have no problem in applying the characterization "utmost lucidity of wisdom" to Ānanda, who was known as mahāpaññā.

¹⁰See the DPPN for consultation. A check of most of the names in the list of "pre-eminent ones" (including the therī) indicates that they are all, except for Ānanda, attributed with arahanthood achieved during the Buddha's lifetime. In fact, many seem to have achieved arahanthood shortly after joining the Sangha.

¹¹The list of therīs is, in its opening section, modelled on the therā list; the bhikkhunī of longest standing appears first, then the two chief female disciples (see their summaries in the DPPN) appear next. Interestingly, the two bhikkhunīs who follow the bhikkhunī of "long standing" are, like Sāriputta and Moggallāna, noted for, respectively, "great wisdom" and "supernormal powers."

Once again, we draw the reader's attention to the question of why if Ānanda is not an arahant, his name should appear amongst those who are? The number of attributes attributed to Ānanda (supposedly by the Buddha), plus the fact that Ānanda's name precedes that of Upāli, suggests that Ānanda is highly regarded.

The Anguttara Nikāya (A I 57, p.52) records in stereotypical fashion a conversation between the Buddha and Ānanda on "immorality in deed, word and thought." Elsewhere (A I 132, p.115), Ānanda asks the Buddha whether "a monk can acquire such concentration that in this body, together with its consciousness, he has no notion of 'I' or 'mine', or any tendency to vain conceit." The Buddha answers Ānanda's question in the affirmative, eventually directing his attention to the Pārāyana Puṇṇakapaṇha Sutta.¹²

The brāhmaṇa Saṅgārava (A I 168-173, pp.151-156) informs the Buddha that the brāhmaṇa is more important than the paribbājaka, because the former not only performs sacrifices for himself but causes others to do the same. The implication here is that the paribbājaka (implying those who follow the Buddha) is concerned with leading only himself to nibbāna. The Buddha corrects Saṅgārava's judgment and induces the brāhmaṇa to acknowledge the fact that the Buddha's path leads not only the individual but also others to nibbāna.

¹²This reference to a sutta by name is an unusual feature not often found in the Pāli Canon.

Thus the Buddha's followers are not selfishly concerned, as Saṅgārava believed, with only their own individual salvation. The Buddha having corrected Saṅgārava's view, Ānanda suddenly appears and asks the brāhmaṇa which way he considers to be the simpler and more fruitful -- the way of sacrifice or the way of the Buddha (A I 169, p.152). Though Ānanda puts the question to Saṅgārava three times, the latter avoids answering Ānanda's question. Finally the Buddha intervenes and, by way of manipulating the conversation, induces the brāhmaṇa to become a lay-follower of the Buddha (A I 173, p.156).

The Commentary to one of the suttas of the Samyutta Nikāya (i.e. S I 182, p.231) mentions a Saṅgārava who is a friend of Ānanda's, and how on the occasion of that Sutta, Ānanda was anxious to have "this wretch (varāko) who, for all our friendship has contracted wrong views, from becoming a hell-filler; moreover he has a circle of friends, and hundreds may follow if he is converted." However, it is difficult to ascertain, as Malalasekera points out, which Saṅgārava is intended.¹³

The accusation brought by Saṅgārava against the Buddha and his followers is worthy of note. Saṅgārava criticizes the Buddha and his followers for the fact that they are concerned only with their own personal salvation. In contrast, Saṅgārava (a brāhmaṇa) upholds the sacrifice

¹³See DPPN II, pp.984-985, "Saṅgārava" and fn.6.

as efficacious not only for the individual, but for many. One wonders if one sees here a criticism of the arahant as a finished product with nothing more to do; this latter view of the arahant belongs to the later stages of the doctrine. Perhaps as an illustration of this 'lateness" the Sutta records that (A I 170, p.153) in the past, when bhikkhus were fewer in number, those who possessed the "supernormal powers were more numerous," thus hinting at a decline.

Ānanda's part in the Sutta is difficult to determine. What purpose is there in asking which of the two ways (sacrifice or the Buddha's Path) is "simpler ... less troublesome [and] of greater fruit"? The answer is perhaps to be found in the fact that this phrasing appears also in the Kūṭadanta Sutta (D II 143, p.181) where, in talking about sacrifice, the Buddha suggests his alternatives in the same terms as those here attributed to Ānanda.

The Anguttara Nikāya includes in its "Book of Threes" an Ānanda vagga (A I 215-228, pp.195-208) in which the person of Ānanda is central. This vagga records a number of conversations between Ānanda and paribbājakas, lay followers and the Buddha. Thus (A I 215, p.195) the paribbājaka Channa questions Ānanda on the abandoning of passion (rāga), malice (dosa) and delusion (moha). Ānanda points out that the above elements can be eliminated through the practice of the Ariyan eightfold way (ariya aṭṭhangika magga). On another occasion (A I 217, p.196) Ānanda is questioned by a house-

father follower of an ascetic mendicant as to whose doctrine was well taught. Ānanda informs, and convinces, the housefather that the doctrine which makes for the abandoning of rāja, dosa and moha is the doctrine which is well taught. The housefather, overcome with joy at Ānanda's discourse, seeks entry as a lay-follower in the Buddha's dhamma (A I 219, p.198).

When Mahānāma the Sākyan (A I 219, p.198) approaches the Buddha with a question on the dhamma, Ānanda, concerned with the fact that the Buddha has just recovered from an illness, takes the Sākyan aside. Ānanda provides Mahānāma with a discourse on the learner's morality, concentration and insight (sīla, samādhi and paññā) as a preliminary to answering the question which Mahānāma had asked of the Buddha.¹⁴ In addition to the doctrinal information provided, this Sutta reveals Ānanda's concern for the person of the Buddha in the period following shortly after the latter's illness.

While Ānanda (A I 220, p.200) is staying near Vesālī, the Licchavīs Abhaya and Paṇḍitakumāraka come to visit him. The two Licchavīs have come to find out the views of the Buddha (through the person of Ānanda) to the claims made by the ascetic Nāthaputta. Ānanda lectures them on the Buddha's sāsana, after which Paṇḍitakumāraka says to his friend (A I 221, p.201), "Well, Abhaya my good fellow! Do you approve of the venerable Ānanda's good words as well spoken?"

¹⁴The question which Mahānāma puts to the Buddha is whether concentration (samādhi) came before knowledge (paññā) or after knowledge.

Abhaya replies (A I 221-222, p.202), "Yes, indeed, my dear fellow! How could I fail to do so? Why! If anyone did not approve of them, his head would split asunder."

Following after the above Sutta, Ānanda appears in a series of dialogues with the Buddha. Thus (A I 222-223, pp.202-203) Ānanda is lectured to by the Buddha regarding loyalty to the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha. On another occasion (A I 223-224, pp.203-204) Ānanda asks the Buddha about the saying, "Becoming, becoming."

When Ānanda (A I 225, pp.204-205) answers the Buddha's question on kamma correctly, the Buddha proclaims, after Ānanda has left, "Monks, Ānanda is a learner [sekho]. Yet it would not be easy to find his equal in insight [paññāvā]." The fact that the Buddha refers to Ānanda as a "learner" (sekha) suggests that, in spite of his great "insight", Ānanda has something more to accomplish to achieve arahanthood.¹⁵

Ānanda (A I 225-226, pp.205-206) questions the Buddha on "scents", wondering if there is any scent "whose savour spreads with the wind, against the wind and both ways alike." The Buddha responds to Ānanda's question in terms of dhamma, pointing out that the "savour of the saint [sappuriso] goes

¹⁵ Ānanda refers to himself as a sekha at D II 143, p.158. See, however, the analysis of André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha..., Tome II, p.54 ff. To claim, in this Anguttara Nikāya passage, that Ānanda is both a sekha and a bhikkhu whose "insight" (paññā) is "hard to equal" seems unusual when 'freedom through knowledge' (paññāvimutti) is a recognized way to arahanthood and nibbāna in the Pāli Suttas.

everywhere." In regard to the term "sappurisa", it is interesting to note that the term is used elsewhere in the Pāli Canon to describe Ānanda.¹⁶

Ānanda (A I 226, p.206) asks the Buddha how far he can make his voice heard. The Buddha responds (A I 227-228, p.207) that there is no limit to his range. Ānanda, impressed by the Buddha's remark, says to Udāyi, who is present, "It is indeed a gain for me! Well gotten indeed by me it is that my teacher [i.e. the Buddha] is of such mighty power and majesty!" (A I 228, p.208). Udāyi questions the meaning of Ānanda's remark, "What is it to you, friend Ānanda, that your teacher should be of such mighty power and majesty?" The Buddha then responds by stating:

Say not so, Udāyin! Say not so, Udāyin! If Ānanda were to make an end without attaining perfect freedom from passion, yet by virtue of his heart of faith [cittappasādena] he would seven times win rule among the Devas, seven times would rule this Rose-Apple Land. Howbeit, Udāyin, in this very life Ānanda shall attain to the final passing away (A I 228, p.208).

The above speech by the Buddha indicates that even if Ānanda did not, which he will, achieve nibbāna in this life, he would for seven times be a ruler among devas and men. However, the Buddha maintains that Ānanda will in his own lifetime attain nibbāna. The emphasis on Ānanda's "heart [mind] of faith" (cittappasāda) is noteworthy. Without going into great detail, this reference to "citta-

¹⁶ See our study, p.24.

ppasāda" is not a reference to "faith" as 'something which may eventually be proved', but, as Jayatilleke indicates, "... cetaso pasada- is 'mental appreciation' or the 'intellectual joy' resulting from intelligent study and a clarification of one's thought."¹⁷ Thus Ānanda's cittappasāda, at least as the Buddha interprets it, is not a mere adoration of the person of the Buddha, but a 'state' of mind wherein, through 'intelligent study and a clarification of one's thought', an understanding, a confirming, of the significance of the Buddha and his teaching is reached.¹⁸ The reference to Ānanda's attainment of nibbāna is unusual in light of the fact that such a reference does not repeat itself elsewhere in the Pāli Canon.¹⁹

The need to predict Ānanda's arahanthood, to place such a prediction in the mouth of the Buddha, is perhaps an illustration of the fact that Ānanda's 'original' characterization in the oral tradition could not stand up to a 'new'

¹⁷K.N. Jayatilleke, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, p.386.

¹⁸Ibid.; see the discussion of the question of "faith" in Jayatilleke, pp.382-401, plus see his index.

¹⁹See D II 144, p.159, where an excellent opportunity to state the prediction of Ānanda's arahanthood occurs. In the situation described in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta, the Buddha only states, "Be earnest in effort, and you too shall soon be free from the Intoxications"; the Buddha thus informs Ānanda of the possibility, but is not as definite as in the Anguttara passage alluded to above. In addition, when the status of Ānanda comes up as a subject of conversation in the period preceding the First Council (Cullavagga XI 285, p.394), no one makes reference to the Buddha's remarks about the certainty of Ānanda's arahanthood.

view of the arahant. However, the importance of Ānanda could not be denied and thus his arahanthood, as 'newly' understood, was postponed until Ānanda could bring himself up to par with that 'new' view of the arahant. That Ānanda's 'original' status could not be dismissed is illustrated throughout the Pāli Canon and culminates here in the Buddha actually predicting Ānanda's arahanthood. In this way, the tradition was able to resolve both the problem of Ānanda's 'limitations' and the question of his importance to the Buddhist tradition.

It is worth examining the remarks which led up to the Buddha's rebuttal of Udāyi. Ānanda's praise of the Buddha is linked to the fact that the Buddha claims he can make his voice heard in any of the "world-systems" (A I 228, p.207). The reference in the Sutta under discussion to the "thrice-a-thousand Mighty Thousandfold World-System" suggests that the Sutta is 'late', at least as regards its cosmological conceptions.²⁰ Udāyi's reaction to Ānanda's praise of the Buddha in terms of the Buddha's ability to make his voice heard in unlimited world-systems, coupled with Ānanda's remarks that such a person is his teacher, is, according to the Sutta, misunderstood by Udāyi. Udāyi reacts against what he feels are Ānanda's emotional outpourings over his having the person of the Buddha as his teacher. This understanding of Udāyi's criticism is clear

²⁰ See Teresina Rowell, "The Background and Early Use of the Buddha-Ksetra Concept", The Eastern Buddhist, VI, 3, July 1934, p.219.

from the reaction of the Buddha who draws attention to Ānanda's "heart [mind] of faith" (cittappasāda). By using the term "[cittap]pasāda" as opposed to, for example, the term "saddhā", the Buddha informs Udāyi that Ānanda's praise of the Buddha is a significant achievement; it is an achievement so significant that it is capable of winning for Ānanda rule over devas and men (A I 228, p.208). Then, as if to quell all doubts, the Buddha informs Udāyi that Ānanda will "in this very life ... attain to the final passing away" (nibbāna).

However, in spite of all that has just been said, there remains some problem in just how one is to understand Ānanda's "heart of faith." One notes that in the Buddha's remarks to Udāyi he says, "If Ānanda were to make an end without attaining perfect freedom from passion [avīta-rāga], yet by virtue of his heart of faith..." (A I 228, p.208). The Buddha's remarks suggest that Ānanda's "heart of faith" is within the 'jurisdiction' of 'passion' (vīta rāga). This is not surprising, since only the arahant is completely free from passion. The fact still remains that the "heart of faith" is significant, though its exact parameters are difficult to determine. We will return again to the above issue later on in our study.

Ānanda's first appearance in the Catukka Nipāta of the Anguttara Nikāya occurs at a time when the Buddha's parinibbāna is near at hand (A II 79-80, pp.88-89). Though

the Sutta is included in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (see D II 154, p.172), because of its relevance to the subject matter just considered, we will, at least partially, examine it at this time.

The Buddha asks the bhikkhus whether they have (before he dies) any "doubt or misgiving as to the Buddha or Dhamma or Order or the Way or the Practice (going to the Way)." When, after the Buddha proclaims the above statement for a second and a third time, he receives no answer, Ānanda states that it is "wonderful" and "marvellous" that no misgivings or doubts exist among the bhikkhus (A II 80, p.89). The Buddha replies:

You, Ānanda, speak out of faith [pasāda], but the Tathāgata has knowledge [ñāṇam] therein. There is indeed in this order of monks no doubt or misgiving in a single monk as to the Buddha, the Order, Dhamma, the Way, or the Practice. Of these five hundred monks here, Ānanda, the most backward is a Stream-winner, one saved from the Downfall, assured, bound for enlightenment.

What concerns us in the above passage is the distinction which the Buddha draws between pasāda and ñāṇa. The implication here, as throughout the Pāli Canon, is that ñāṇa is superior to pasāda.²¹

We have already seen a number of terms attached to Ānanda's abilities. In the Samyutta Nikāya (S I 56, p.80) we were informed, "... so far [Ānanda] as anything can be ascertained by inference [i.e. takka: 'reasoning'],²² thou

²¹See K.N. Jayatilleke, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, p.398, section 673.

²²See also M III 263, p.315. Regarding "takka", see PTSD, p.292.

has ascertained it." In the Anguttara Nikāya (A I 225, p.205) the Buddha states, "Monks, Ānanda is a learner. Yet it would not be easy to find his equal in insight [paññāyā]." However, in the Samyutta Nikāya we find Ānanda described (without reference to his being a sekha) as a mahāpañña (S IV 97, p.60; S IV 101, p.61), a term which is also applied to Sāriputta (S V 385, p.332; A I 23, p.16). In each of the above characterizations of Ānanda, his limitations are alluded to. Thus, for example, while Ānanda possesses "insight" he is still a "learner". The 'strengths' of Ānanda can only be brought out against a background of his limitations.

The limitations of Ānanda in the above Sutta in which the Buddha distinguishes the fact that Ānanda speaks out of "faith" (pasāda) while the Buddha speaks out of "knowledge" (ñāṇa), has perhaps its parallel in a Sutta involving Sāriputta (S V 159, p.138; also D II 82, p.87 and D III 99, p.95).

Sāriputta (S V 159, p.138) states, "Lord, I have such faith (pasanna) in the Exalted One! There never was, methinks, nor shall be, nor is there now existing anyone, whether recluse or brahmin, who is greater or more accomplished, that is, in higher wisdom!" The Buddha responds, "Splendid indeed, Sāriputta, is your bull-like utterance! You have laid hold of certainty." The Buddha, in order to make clear the source of Sāriputta's 'knowledge', asks Sariputta if he has "seen mind to mind [cetasā cetoparicca]" with past

future or present arahants so as to have verified what he has just proclaimed of the Buddha. Sāriputta replies, "I only infer from my knowledge which is in accordance with the Norm" (S V 160, p.139). Sāriputta illustrates what he means by a parable. Sāriputta describes a situation where a warden is in charge of a walled-in border town which has only one entrance. The warden knows that whoever enters the town must do so through the single entrance available. In the same manner, Sāriputta knows that whoever will achieve "perfect wisdom" (sambodhi) must do so by utilizing the door of dhamma which the Buddha has made known. Sāriputta, having provided the above explanation, is praised by the Buddha who informs Sāriputta that he should teach his "Norm-teaching" to bhikkhus, bhikkhunīs, male and female disciples and "whatsoever silly fellows have any doubt or perplexity about the Tathāgata."

It is difficult to fully interpret the above Sutta.

André Bareau explains Sāriputta's actions as follows:

Le sage disciple avoue franchement ne pas posséder les connaissances précisées ci-dessus, mais il affirme connaître toutefois la conséquence logique de la doctrine (dhammanvaya), la celle du Buddha présent et de tous les Buddha passés et futurs comme il l'explique à l'aide d'une parabole ... En somme, l'auteur de cet épisode a saisi l'occasion du passage du Bienheureux à Nālandā pour souligner, grâce aux éloges du Buddha, la profonde sagesse de Sāriputta, le plus illustre enfant du pays aux yeux des bouddhistes, et pour faire exprimer par celui-ci cette vérité fondamentale que les qualités essentielles des Buddha de tous les temps sont liées intrinsèquement à

leur doctrine.²³

It would seem, then, that Sāriputta's view of the Buddha, which the Buddha himself acknowledges as a "certainty", is a 'logical inference' derived from Sāriputta's own knowledge of the Buddha's doctrine. In this way the characterization of Sāriputta as a mahāpaṇṇā is upheld.

The fact that Sāriputta opens his remarks by expressing his "faith" (i.e. pasanna) in the Buddha reminds us of Ānanda's characterization by the Buddha (see our study p.332 above) that Ānanda's "heart of faith" (cittappasāda) is sufficient to win for him rule among devas and men, and that Ānanda's conclusion that the Sangha of bhikkhus is without doubt (which the Buddha confirms as a certainty) is spoken out of Ānanda's faith (pasāda).

It is not our intention here, nor is it an easy matter, to resolve all of the ramifications of the key terms utilized above.²⁴ We wish to point out certain similarities

²³André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha, Tome I, p.44. Bareau's analysis relates to the account of Sāriputta's remarks in the MPNS version (D II, 82-84, pp.87-89). It is useful to compare Bareau's translation of Sāriputta's parable with those of Rhys Davids and Woodward, who seem to have mistranslated a section of the parable. See also the version of the Sutta under discussion in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 82-84, pp.87-89) which omits the closing section found in the Samyutta account; also the remarks of the translators, DB II, p.87, fn. 2 and fn.3; p.89, fn.1.

²⁴The interested reader should consult Jayatilleke, who, if anything, illustrates the different views on the question at hand. See our fn.18 above.

in the characterizations of Ānanda and Sāriputta. Further one may ask, regarding Sāriputta's involvement in the above Sutta, whether he is there to be considered an arahant. When the Buddha proclaims that Sāriputta's evaluation is a "certainty", which Sāriputta cannot know (at least as the Buddha does), do we see here a distinction between the capacities of Sāriputta and the Buddha? The Pāli Canon, as we have already pointed out, distinguishes between "ways of attaining nibbāna," claiming that, for example, "freedom through knowledge" (paññāvimutti) does not produce proficiency in the 'supernormal powers.' Thus the 'limitation' in the above case of Sāriputta may reflect the manner of his having attained arahantship.²⁵

Returning to the Catukka Nipāta (A II 82-83, pp.92-93), Ānanda asks the Buddha, "Pray, lord, what is the reason, what is the cause why womenfolk neither sit in a court (of justice), nor embark on business, nor reach the essence of the deed?" The Buddha replies, "Womenfolk are uncontrolled ... envious ... greedy ... [and] weak in wisdom, Ānanda." The fact that it is Ānanda who asks the above question and that it is the Buddha who answers it seems to be a deliberate attempt on the part of the authors and/or compilers of the Sutta to indicate that Ānanda should have known better than

²⁵See Rune Johansson, The Psychology of Nirvāna, p.89, "A person who is paññā-vimutto is, therefore, a person who has not meditated and has no super knowledge but is still an arahant."

to help women gain entrance to the Buddha's following (see Cullavagga XI 289, p.401).

The Anguttara Nikāya (A II 132, pp.135-136), as does the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 145, p.159), records the "four wonderful, marvellous things" about Ānanda:

If a company of monks comes to visit Ānanda, they are delighted at the sight of him. Then if Ānanda speaks Dhamma, they are delighted with what he says. Dissatisfied is the company of monks when Ānanda becomes silent.

The above information is repeated regarding the bhikkhunīs, laymen (upāsakas) and laywomen (upāsikās) F.L. Woodward points out that the commentary to this Sutta attempts to limit the scope of Ānanda's dhamma-talks.²⁶ We will have more to say about this characterization of Ānanda when we examine the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta.²⁷

When a certain bhikkhunī is ill (A II 144-146, pp.147-150), supposedly feigning illness because she is enamoured of

²⁶F.L. Woodward, GS II, p.136, fn.1. The commentary here does not allow that Ānanda preached dhamma (as doctrine) to these people, but suggests that he "asked about their health, whether they were attending to their exercises and were dutiful to their superiors. Speaking to women, he asks whether they are observing the eight ordnances for behaviour towards monks. To layfold, not 'Does your head ache? Are your children and wives well,' but, 'Do you keep the precepts? Do you feed holy men?' This attempt to limit Ānanda's dhamma-talks, obviously is intended to depreciate Ānanda. Not only are there plenty of examples in the Pāli Canon of Ānanda's ability to provide such talks, but the Buddha himself on occasion asks Ānanda to do so. Finally, Ānanda's position at the First Council, his characterization as a bahussuta and mahāpañña, militate against the views of the commentary.

²⁷See our study, pp.421ff.

Ānanda,²⁸ Ānanda visits her out of compassion. Ānanda provides the bhikkhunī with a discourse on the body and the bhikkhunī, apparently overcome with the merits of Ānanda's talk, admits her foolishness and repents.²⁹ The allusion to the fact that the bhikkhunī was enamoured of Ānanda, a charge which has been suggested on other occasions in the Pāli Canon, may suggest that Ānanda was a handsome man and/or that because of Ānanda's position with the Buddha, his attention was highly coveted.³⁰

Once, when Ānanda was staying at Kosambī in the Ghositārāma (A II 156-157, pp.162-163), he informed a group of bhikkhus, "Reverend sirs, when anyone, be it monk or nun, proclaims in my presence that he has attained arahantship, all such do so by virtue of four factors or one of these four."³¹ One wonders why a bhikkhu or bhikkhunī would choose to proclaim his or her arahanthood before Ānanda. Are we to regard this talk of Ānanda's to the bhikkhus on the subject of proclaiming arahanthood mere verbal reporting?

²⁸F.L. Woodward, GS II, p.147, fn.4.

²⁹Ānanda is seemingly aware of the bhikkhunī's designs on him; see F.L. Woodward, GS II, p.148, fn.2.

³⁰See EB I, Fascicle 4, p.534.

³¹In brief, these four ways are described as (1) a bhikkhu develops insight preceded by calm; (2) a bhikkhu develops calm preceded by insight; (3) a bhikkhu develops calm-and-insight coupled; and (4) a bhikkhu's mind is utterly cleared of perplexities about dhamma.

Is Ānanda (i.e. the Sutta) suggesting that arahanthood is demonstrated by one of the four (or all four) ways? One can do little with such questions on the basis of the information provided in the Sutta. One can only repeat again that Ānanda's position in the Buddhist tradition is bound up with his knowledge of the buddhavaṇṇa.

Ānanda (A II 162, p.169) asks Mahā Koṭṭhita about the "six spheres of contact" shortly after Mahā Koṭṭhita has asked the same question of Sāriputta. The order in which this information on the "six spheres of contact" is passed on reflects the status of the three bhikkhus; Sāriputta is at one end, Mahā Koṭṭhita in the middle and Ānanda is at the other end.³²

On another occasion (A II 167, pp.173-174) Ānanda approaches Sāriputta with the question, "What is the reason, what is the cause why certain beings in this world are not fully set free in this life?" Sāriputta provides Ānanda with an answer centering on "perception" (saññā).

While at Sāpūga (A II 194-196, pp.204-207) Ānanda is approached by a large number of Sāpūgyans (of the Koliyan clan) to whom he provides a talk on the "four factors of exertion for utter purification."³³ F.L. Woodward draws attention to the fact that it is unusual "... to treat a

³²See e.g. A I 24, p.19, where Koṭṭhita's name immediately precedes that of Ānanda.

³³The four factors are titled (A II 193-194, p.205), "The factor of exertion for the utter purification of morals, of thought, of view, and the factor of exertion for the utter purity of release." See the text for details.

general audience of laymen to a discourse on the higher mental training." Woodward's remarks are directed to the fact that, for example, Ānanda talks about the jhānas. Woodward, drawing on Mrs. Rhys Davids, suggests that perhaps the "jhāna[s] ... had come to be regarded purely as mind-practice" (whatever that means?).³⁴

Regarding the above 'problem', one may note that the Buddha in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 104, p.112) declared:

I shall not die, O Evil One! until the brethren and sisters of the Order, and until the lay disciples of either sex shall have become true hearers, wise and well trained, ready and learned, carrying the doctrinal books [sic] in their memory.

Thus, at least in the above Sutta, the remarks of the Buddha suggest that the buddhavacana was open to all.³⁵

Another example of a bhikkhu discoursing to the laity on the "higher mental training" is provided by the Anāthapiṇḍikovāda Sutta (M III 261, p.313) where Anāthapiṇḍika remarks about a talk provided by Sāriputta (wherein the jhānas are described), "I have never yet heard reasoned talk such as this." The reply to Anāthapiṇḍika suggests that he is correct, "Reasoned talk such as this, householder, does not (usually) occur for householders clad in white. It is for those that have gone forth." Anāthapiṇḍika then informs

³⁴F.L. Woodward, GS II, p.205, fn.2.

³⁵See also I.B. Horner's remarks, MLS III, p.313, fn.1.

Sāriputta, "Well then ... let there occur reasoned talk such as this for householders clad in white. There are, revered Sāriputta, young men of family with but little dust in their eyes who, not hearing dhamma, are declining, but they could be learners of dhamma."³⁶

The view that the dhamma should not be taught to the laity is attested to in the Vinaya (e.g. Pācittiya IV 14, p. 190). The decision to 'restrict' the hearing of the dhamma (i.e. in its entirety) to members of the bhikkhus is motivated not out of a sense of secrecy,³⁷ but is to be explained in terms of the position that the higher stages of the Buddha's path were suited only for those who undertook the homeless way of life. There was no need to inform the laity about the details of meditational practice because they had neither the time nor discipline. In fact, the suggestion (as in the Pācittiya section referred to above) is that it could be harmful to repeat in detail the dhamma to the laity for, to do so might confuse and incur their rancour to the detriment of their assistance to the Sangha.

There is little questioning the fact that the Buddha's discoveries were regarded as complex and best suited for the intelligent; however, at the same time, as the Anāthapiṇḍika episode alluded to above suggests, there were intelligent individuals amongst the laity who could benefit from hearing the buddhavaṇṇa in all its detail. If one accepts that

³⁶ See Mahāvagga, I 4, p.6ff.

³⁷ See the source and our fn.33 above.

the 'goal' can be reached through 'knowledge' (paññā), then hearing the dhamma in detail is a desideratum for those who are capable of understanding it. If the 'goal' can also be reached by way of the jhānas (and their related practice) then one may regard this approach in particular as more suited to those who have undertaken the homeless way of life. Since the Pāli Canon and the school which it represents are primarily vinaya-like in orientation, we should not be surprised to find the 'way of action' (i.e. the route to the goal by way of meditation, etc.) at odds with the 'way of knowledge.'³⁸

Returning to the Anguttara Nikāya (A II 239-240, pp.243-245), we learn that the bhikkhu Bāhiya, "who live[d] along with Anuruddha" (i.e. in the same vihara), had started a dispute which threatened to divide the Sangha. The Buddha asks Ānanda if the dispute has, as yet, been settled and Ānanda replies that Anuruddha, in fear of possibly causing a sanghabheda, has chosen not to speak to Bāhiya. The Buddha asks Ānanda (A II 239, p.244), "But, Ānanda, when did Anuruddha ever interfere in disputes amid the Order? Is it not yourself, Ānanda, and Sāriputta and Moggallāna who settle whatsoever disputes may arise?"

The reference by the Buddha to the fact that Anuruddha was not one to settle disputes is perhaps grounded in the fact

³⁸It is noteworthy that in the Anāthapindikovāda Sutta it is Sāriputta as a representative of the 'way of knowledge' who informs Anāthapiṇḍika about the higher stages of the path. See also our study, pp.344ff.

that Anuruddha was of "a retiring nature."³⁹ On the other hand, according to the Buddha, it was Ānanda, Sāriputta and Moggallāna who were to settle whatever disputes arose. The linking of Ānanda's name with those of Sāriputta and Moggallāna is, if taken seriously, highly significant. When we remember that Sāriputta and Moggallāna were regarded as the Buddha's 'chief disciples' and that their deaths preceded the Buddha's death, the fact that Ānanda's name is mentioned with the two 'chief disciples' is important. Does the above reference suggest that Ānanda was the most likely bhikkhu to lead the Sangha (in spite of statements against a successor) after the Buddha's death? If Anuruddha is not 'suited' to settling disputes, then he is likely not suited to 'lead' the Sangha either, for disputes and the threat of sanghabheda were, according to the Pāli Canon, something to be avoided. Anuruddha exemplifies the type of bhikkhu who is entirely interested in his own self cultivation, while Ānanda, Sāriputta and Moggallāna are concerned with more than their own achievements; their concerns extend to all those who follow in the Buddha's way.

If Anuruddha was not suited to the settling of disputes, then why is he given such a prominent place in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 156-163, pp.174-186), a place which is only to be usurped when Mahā Kassapa appears on the scene. Are we perhaps to assume that the naming by

³⁹ e.g. A I 23, p.16; see also DPPN I, p.85ff.

the Buddha of Sāriputta, Mahā Moggallāna and Ānanda as settlers of disputes, rather than Anuruddha, is intended to uphold the superiority of Anuruddha as the 'finished' arahant with nothing more to accomplish? One notes in this regard that in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 159, p.179), Anuruddha delegates to Ānanda the duty of revealing the death of the Buddha to the people of Kusinara. Yet there seems little doubt that the Pāli tradition regarded Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna not only as the Buddha's chief disciples, but as Anuruddha's superiors.

If one examines the many lists of theras provided in the Pāli Canon, one can see that, unlike the cases of Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna whose names usually head the lists of theras (see also A I 88, p.79), Anuruddha's name does not always appear in the same position; often he is relegated to a position near the bottom of these lists (e.g. A III 298, p.214).⁴⁰ This suggests that Anuruddha's rise to power was likely a later development, and that the deaths of Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna facilitated it.

The case is not so clear with regard to Ānanda's relationship to Anuruddha, both of whom, according to the Cullavagga (X II 180-183, pp.256-257), "went forth" at roughly the same time. However, there is little doubt that the consensus position of the hagiographers of the Pāli sources is to see Anuruddha as Ānanda's superior, as the

⁴⁰ See our study, pp.89-91.

Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta indicates.

The Pañcaka and Chakka Nipātas of the Anguttara Nikāya have much to say about Ānanda. Thus Ānanda is shown (A III 132-134, pp.102-103) questioning the Buddha on "to what extent ... the Order of monks, as they live, live comfortably?" On another occasion while at Andhakavinda (A III 138-139, pp.106-107) the Buddha informs Ānanda of the five factors needed to be cultivated by novices.

While staying near Kosambī (A III 184, pp.135-136) the Buddha points out to Ānanda that it is not easy to teach dhamma to the laity and that five factors should be implemented, "Teach others Dhamma, thinking: I will talk a talk on the gradual; teach others Dhamma thinking: I will talk a talk with the way in view; teach others Dhamma, thinking: I will talk a talk out of kindness; teach others Dhamma, thinking: I will talk a talk not as a means for gain; teach others Dhamma, thinking: I will talk a talk not to my own hurt nor to others."

When (A III 192-196, pp.141-144) the bhikkhu Udāyi (i.e. Lāḷudāyī)⁴¹ contradicts Sāriputta regarding the results to be expected in the Buddha's praxis, Sāriputta is upset because no bhikkhu comes to his defence. The Buddha who is present at the time addresses himself to Ānanda (A 194, p.143) saying, "Is it possible, Ānanda, that you can look on with indifference at an elder monk being vexed? Verily, Ānanda,

⁴¹See E.M. Hare, GS III, p.142, fn.2 and DPPN I, p.376, "4. Udāyī."

compassion grows not from (suffering) an elder monk to be vexed." The Buddha then addresses the bhikkhus informing them that Sāriputta had been correct in his speech to Udāyi. After the Buddha has left the scene, Ānanda approaches Upavāna to inform the latter of what has just transpired and to let him know that the Buddha is likely to bring the matter up to his attention shortly. That evening the Buddha (A III 195, pp.143-144) provides Upavāna with a talk on the five qualities a thera possesses in order to become "pious, loved, respected and what he ought to become." These five qualities of the thera are that, "... he is virtuous... is learned [bahussuto] ... has a pleasant voice, a good enunciation ... at will ... attains to the four states of musing [jhāna]... and by destroying the cankers ... enters and abides in the emancipation of the heart, the emancipation of insight."

The above Sutta, like the Sutta recently discussed (i.e. A II 239-240, pp.243-245; see our study, pp.346ff.) accords Ānanda an important place in settling disputes. Thus when no bhikkhu comes to Sāriputta's aid in his disagreement with Udāyi, the Buddha says to Ānanda (A III 194, p. 143), "Is it possible, Ānanda, that you can look on with indifference at an elder monk being vexed?" The Pāli Commentary⁴² maintains that the Buddha addressed his remarks to Ānanda because he was the "store-keeper of Dhamma."

⁴²E.M. Hare, GS III, p.143, fn.2.

Further, according to the Commentary⁴³ the bhikkhu Upavāna was at that time the personal attendant of the Buddha. The Commentary, as we have indicated above, separates the role of Ānanda as "store-keeper of the Dhamma" from his position as 'personal attendant to the Buddha'. According to the Commentary, the fact that the Buddha addresses his disapproval to Ānanda suggests that Ānanda should (as "store-keeper of the Dhamma") have known that Sāriputta was correct and Udāyi wrong. Interestingly Ānanda makes no response to the Buddha's remarks but subsequently informs Upavāna (not present at the time of the Buddha's remarks to Ānanda) that (A III 195, p.143), "Just now, venerable Upavāna, some (monks) were vexing the elder monk and we never protested unto them. Therefore wonder not, venerable sir, should the Exalted One, after coming from seclusion, bring the matter up and relate the whole affair to the venerable Upavāna. Already even fearfulness is come upon us." Malalasekera (DPPN I, pp.399-400) explains the above remarks of Ānanda to Upavāna as follows, "Ānanda seeks Upavāna and tells him that he was too timid to interfere, and if the Buddha referred to the matter again, would Upavāna undertake to answer?"

This reference to "fearfulness" in the remarks of Ānanda and Malalasekera's analysis that Ānanda "was too timid to interfere" seem inadequate to explain Ānanda's silence .

⁴³E.M. Hare, GS III, p.143, fn.2.

Ānanda would have been aware of Sāriputta's status with the Buddha, Sāriputta's status as an arahant (a status which Udāyi lacks), and further, Ānanda's knowledge of the dhmma should have made it easy for him to come to Sāriputta's aid. The mention of "fearfulness" (or "timidity" - sārajja) by Ānanda is designed as a lead up to the Buddha's discourse to Upavāna on the five qualities which make for an elder (A III 195, pp.143-144). We can assert this with confidence because in a previous Anguttara Nikāya sutta (A III 127, p.97) "fearfulness" is similarly used without any mention of the Udāyi/Sāriputta debate. Further, on another occasion (A III 322, p.227), Ānanda is able to rouse Udāyi when the latter refuses to answer the Buddha's question. The Buddha points out at that time, "I knew, Ānanda, this foolish fellow, Udāyin, did not live intent on higher thought."

The fact that the Sutta chooses Ānanda as the person to be addressed by the Buddha is, in spite of the negative aspects of the Buddha's address, illustrative of the important position of Ānanda in the minds of many of the Buddha's followers. In addition, when the Buddha addresses Upavāna, he makes no reference to the debate that took place between Udāyi and Sāriputta.

Ānanda's position as bahussuta finds strong support in the Anguttara Nikāya. When Ānanda (A III 201, pp.147-148) approaches Sāriputta with the question, "How far, reverend Sāriputta, does a monk come speedily to know aptness

in things so that his grasp is a good grasp; so that he grasps much and forgets not what he has grasped?", Sāriputta answers, "I know the venerable Ānanda has heard much [bahussuto]; let the venerable Ānanda throw light upon the matter." Ānanda, responding to Sāriputta's request, states, "Take the case, reverend Sāriputta, of a monk who is apt at meanings, apt at Dhamma, apt at letters, apt at language, apt at orderly sequence -- thus far ... a monk comes speedily to know aptness in things [etc.]." Having heard Ānanda's reply, Sāriputta declares that Ānanda himself fulfils the five things just mentioned (A III 201, p.148). E.M. Hare states, regarding Ānanda's talk, "There is a suggestion in these five terms of literary preoccupation; an attention to the formulated mandates, rather than to their meaning, that argues a later compilation."⁴⁴ Hare's remarks may support a view that Ānanda's position as bahussuta developed or was enlarged upon after the Buddha's death. The fact that Ānanda is asked to answer a question which he originally posed to Sāriputta suggests that the Sutta is designed to glorify Ānanda's position as bahussuta. This is clear from the praise heaped on Ānanda by Sāriputta after Ānanda has given his talk.

When the bhikkhu Bhaddaji (A III 202-203, pp.148-149) answers a question put to him by Ānanda, Ānanda responds (A III 148, p.149), "This is but the way of the many folk,

⁴⁴E.M. Hare, GS III, p.148, fn.4.

this (talk) of the venerable Bhaddaji." Hearing this, Bhaddaji states, "The venerable Ānanda has heard much [bahussuto]; let the venerable Ānanda throw light upon the matter!" Ānanda then provides Bhaddaji with a discourse emphasizing not the way "of the many folk" but the Buddha's teachings.

When the Buddha suddenly smiles ... Ānanda (A III 214, p.158) stereotypically asks the reason, "Not for nothing do Tathāgatas smile."⁴⁵ The Buddha points out that at the location where they now stand there was once a "rich and flourishing city ... and by the city ... there dwelt the Exalted One, Kassapa, arahant, fully enlightened; and Gavesin was a lay disciple." The Buddha then goes on to relate what transpired between Kassapa and Gavesin.

When (A III 298-299, pp.214-216) a group of novices sleep beyond sunrise, the Buddha points out to them that the following theras do not show such poor discipline: Sāriputta, Mahā Moggallāna, Mahā Kassapa, Mahā Kaccāna, Mahā Koṭṭhita, Mahā Cunda, Mahā Kappina, Anuruddha, Revata, Ānanda.

On one occasion the Buddha (A III 322-325, pp.227-229) asks Udāyi (Lāludāyi)⁴⁶ "How many states are there, Udāyin, of ever minding?" When Udāyi fails to answer the Buddha, even though the latter puts the question to him three times, Ānanda informs Udāyi that he must say something.

⁴⁵ See E.M. Hare, GS III, p.158, fn.1.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p.227, fn.3.

Udāyi attempts an answer, but it is obviously unsatisfactory and the Buddha states to Ānanda (A III 323, p.227), "I knew, Ānanda, this foolish fellow, Udāyin, did not live intent on higher thought. How many states of ever-minding are there, Ānanda?" Ānanda points out that there are five states and proceeds to elaborate on each. At the conclusion of Ānanda's talk, the Buddha praises him (A III 325, p.229) and points out a sixth state which should also be considered.

The above Sutta, meant to point out a sixth state of ever-minding, also illustrates Ānanda's knowledge of the dhamma. The fact that Ānanda prods Udāyi to respond contrasts with his inability to choose Sāriputta's side in a debate between the latter and Udāyi (see A III 192-196, pp.141-144; also our study, pp.349-352). If, as the Buddha indicates here, Udāyi's attention to the Buddha's sāsana was limited, one would expect Ānanda too might be aware of Udāyi's limitations, for Ānanda is characterized in the Pāli Canon as an intimate of the Buddha. Further, the fact that the Pāli Commentary refers to Udāyi as "foolish Udāyin" (Lāḷudāyi)⁴⁷ suggests that there was a certain 'public' quality to Udāyi which made his foolishness apparent.

One might be tempted to explain Ānanda's reluctance to choose sides in the Udāyi/Sāriputta debate mentioned earlier as illustrating that at that time Ānanda (supposedly

⁴⁷E.M. Hare, GS III, p.227, fn.3.

not yet the Buddha's chief attendant) was unaware of Udāyi's "foolish" qualities. However, even at the time of the Sāriputta/Udāyi debate, the Buddha considered Udāyi a "fool" (A III 194, p.143). Rather than viewing the two Suttas in time sequence, it is more advantageous to point out that in both Udāyi is "foolish" while Ānanda, though treated as important, is perhaps also maligned. In the Sāriputta/Udāyi debate, Ānanda fails to choose a side, while in the above Sutta, Ānanda names only five stages, the Buddha providing the sixth. The fact that Ānanda is praised by the Buddha for his five stage delivery and that the Sutta appears in the Āghāta vagga of the Anguttara Nikāya suggests that the incident, at one level, is designed to introduce a sixth stage. Thus one may likely view the place of Ānanda in the second of the two Suttas as perhaps not intended to criticize Ānanda.

The Anguttara Nikāya (A III 344-345, p.243) records, as we have seen elsewhere (e.g. M I 161, p.204; see also A III 402, p.286), that on occasion Ānanda bathed with the Buddha.

Ānanda (A III 347, p.246)⁴⁸ goes to visit the lay disciple Migasālā who asks Ānanda why it is that both Pūraṇa and Isidatta were reborn (after their deaths) in the Tusita heaven as "once-returners" when the former, unlike the latter, lived the "godly life" (brahmacārī). Ānanda replies to

⁴⁸See also A V 137, p.94ff.

Migasālā that such is indeed the case ("Even, sister, as the Exalted One has said"). Ananda returns and informs the Buddha of what has transpired between himself and Migasālā whereupon the Buddha states (A III 349, p.247), "But, Ānanda, who is the lay-disciple, Migasālā -- a foolish, frail, motherly body with but mother-wit -- to understand the diversity in the person of a man?" The Buddha goes on to provide Ānanda with a discourse on six types of persons to be found in the world. The Buddha points out that only he, or one like him, can measure the measure of persons (A III 348, p.248), "Wherefore, Ānanda, be no measurer of persons; measure not the measure of persons; verily, Ānanda, he digs a pit for himself who measures the measure of persons. I alone, Ānanda, can measure their measure -- or one like me."

It seems out of keeping with the nature of the Buddha's characterization in the Pāli Canon to reveal so much hostility towards Migasālā. After all Migasālā's question is worth asking, especially when it is the Buddha himself who made known the destinies of Pūraṇa (Migasālā's father) and Isidatta (her uncle). The supposed explanation for the Buddha's coarse treatment of Migasālā is rooted in the position that to concern oneself with the "measure of persons" is to "dig a pit" for oneself. In short, the Buddha maintains that only a Buddha ("or one like me") is capable of "measuring" individuals as to their future destinies.

The Commentary⁴⁹ to the above Sutta contends that Ānanda answered Migasālā's question as he did because he was ignorant of the answer. Ānanda's ignorance of the answer is rooted in the fact that he was not like the Buddha. It is difficult to know what the Sutta has in mind when it declares, "I alone, Ānanda, can measure their measure -- or one like me [the italics are ours]." Since one of the features of the arahant was knowledge of the rebirths of others⁵⁰ one assumes that the reference to "one like me" is to be equated with the arahant. Since Ānanda is not considered an arahant at the time of this Sutta, he cannot know how the Buddha is able to "measure the measure of persons." The Buddha, in his discourse to Ānanda on the "six persons found in the world" helps Ānanda to appreciate the subtleties involved in "measuring the measure of persons" but the actual ability to perform such "measuring" is another matter.⁵¹

Ānanda (A III 361-362, pp.256-258) asks Sāriputta, "How, reverend Sāriputta, may a monk learn new doctrine and doctrines learnt remain unconfused, and old doctrines, to which erstwhile he was mentally atuned, remain in use and he gets to know something not known?" Sāriputta replies,

⁴⁹E.M. Hare, GS III, p.246, fn.7.

⁵⁰The second of the tisso vijjā; see EB II, Fascicle 1, p.42; Jayatilleke, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, pp. 440ff. & Rune Johansson, The Psychology of Nirvana, pp.20, 41,89.

⁵¹See also a parallel, and expanded, sutta to the one being discussed at A V 137-144, pp.94-98.

"The venerable Ānanda is very learned [bahussuto]; let the venerable one illuminate this" (A III 361, p.257). Ānanda reveals to Sāriputta the following:

Consider, reverend Sāriputta, a monk who masters Dhamma: the sayings, psalms, catechisms, songs, solemnities, speeches, birth stories, marvels and runes -- as learnt, as mastered, he teaches others Dhamma in detail; as learnt, as mastered, he makes others say it in detail; as learnt, as mastered, he makes other repeat it in detail; as learnt, as mastered, he ever reflects, ever ponders over it in his heart, mindfully he pores on it. Where-soever abide elders, learned [bahussutā] in traditional lore, Dhamma-minders [dhammadharā], discipline-minders [vinayadharā], epitomists [matikādhara], there he spends Was [i.e. the rainy season]; and visiting them from time to time, questions and inquires of them: "This talk, sir, what, verily, is its aim?" -- and their reverences disclose the undisclosed, make, as it were, a causeway where there is none, drive away doubt concerning many perplexing things.

Sāriputta (A III 362, p.258) praises Ānanda for his explanation and points out that the above description is, in fact, descriptive of Ānanda.

Ānanda's characterization in the above Sutta is that of the bhikkhu who is bahussuta and no less a bhikkhu than Sāriputta is used to make Ānanda's qualifications known. It is noteworthy that the term "bahussuta" extends not only to cover "Dhamma-minders" (dhammadharā), but the "vinaya-minders" (vinayadharā) and "epitomists" (matikadharā). The position of the bhikkhu characterized as bahussuta is that of a teacher, the Sutta suggesting that spending the rainy season in the company of a learned bhikkhu is a good idea.

In addition, as the description of the role of the learned (bahussuta) bhikkhu indicates, the teacher passes on more than mere verbal knowledge. The bhikkhu who is bahussuta has done more than merely memorize the dhamma-vinaya, he has thought about it and understands its significance and thus is fit to teach it.

In another sutta (A II 185-187, pp.193-196) we are informed of the "four advantages to be looked for from the frequent verbal practice of teachings heard with the ear, from considering them in the mind, from thoroughly penetrating them by view." Regarding the first advantage (A II 185, pp.193-194), "Herein a monk masters Dhamma, to wit: Sutta, Geyya, Veyyākaraṇa and the rest. Those teachings heard with the ear, often practised verbally, considered by the mind, are thoroughly penetrated by view. He making an end with memory confused is reborn in a certain company of devas. There the happy ones recite to him Dhamma-verses. Slow to arise in him, monks, is memory, but that very quickly reaches excellence."

In the second advantage (A II 185, p.194) a bhikkhu is reborn in the company of devas, but rather than the devas reciting the dhamma to the bhikkhu, "some monk who has more-power, one who has won mastery of mind, is teaching Dhamma to a company of devas." Hearing the teaching, the bhikkhu reborn in the company of devas comes to have excellent memory of the dhamma.

In the third advantage (A II 186, pp.194-195) it is neither the "company of devas" nor the bhikkhu "who has more-power" who instructs but a single deva. Again, through hearing the deva, the bhikkhu reborn in the company of devas attains excellent memory of the dhamma.

Finally, in the fourth advantage (A II 186-187, pp.195-196) the teaching is learnt (i.e. memory becomes excellent) by the bhikkhu overhearing "someone apparitionally reborn (there) ... reviving the memory of some other one apparitionally reborn."

The four advantages are rooted in the fact that, prior to rebirth in the deva world, the bhikkhu in question has had knowledge of the dhamma. The implication of the sutta is that when in the deva world, the bhikkhu re-hears the dhamma, "that being very quickly reaches excellence." From F.L. Woodward's translation one gathers that it is only "memory" (satuppāda) which is made "excellent", however the Commentary (AA III, p.170) explains the meaning of that "excellence" as "nibbānagāmi hoti." Thus, knowledge of the buddhavaṇṇa is linked eventually to nibbāna.⁵²

When the bhikkhu Phagga (A III 379, p.270) takes ill, Ānanda asks the Buddha to visit him. Phagga informs the Buddha at length regarding his pains and the latter, in order to calm them, provides Phagga with a talk on the

⁵²The fact that knowledge of the buddhavaṇṇa is 'linked' to nibbāna is not surprising. The important question is how to understand the 'linkage'.

dhamma. Soon after the Buddha's departure, Phaggunā dies and (A III 380, p.271), "... at the time of his death his faculties were completely purified." When Ānanda informs the Buddha of the above fact, the Buddha states (A III 381, p.271), "But why, Ānanda, should not the faculties of the monk, Phaggunā, have been completely purified? The monk's mind, Ānanda, had not been wholly freed from the five lower fetters; but when he heard that Dhamma teaching, his mind was wholly freed." The Buddha then informs Ānanda (A III 381-383, pp.271-272) that there are six advantages "in hearing Dhamma in time, in testing its goodness in time":

Consider, Ānanda, the monk whose mind is not wholly freed from the five lower fetters, but, when dying, is able to see the Tathāgata: the Tathāgata teaches him Dhamma, lovely in the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely in the end, its goodness, its significance; and makes known the godly life, wholly fulfilled, perfectly pure. When he has heard that Dhamma teaching, his mind is wholly freed from the five lower fetters. This, Ānanda, is the first advantage in hearing Dhamma in time.

The second advantage is like the first, except that it is a disciple of the Buddha who teaches the dhamma. The third advantage has the bhikkhu, "... though not able to see the Tathāgata or his disciple, continues to reflect in mind on Dhamma, as heard, as learnt, ponders on it, ponders over it. Then his mind is wholly freed." In the fourth through the sixth advantages, it is not the "five lower fetters" which are the concern, but that the "mind is not wholly freed in respect of the complete destruction of the root (of becoming)."

The above Sutta clearly attests to the power of hearing the dhamma, in particular, at the time of death. The fact that the dhamma has the power to affect the future rebirth or establish arahanthood (the destruction of the root of becoming) of the individual, even at the time of death, attests to the fact that knowledge of the dhamma is powerful. R.C. Amore, writing on the subject of the "moment of death", states:

Folk belief in India and in other areas looked upon the state of one's mind at the moment of death as especially relevant in determining one's destiny after death... Similarly, Indian Buddhists preferred to die in a state of mind characterized by peaceful reflection on the spiritual qualities of the Buddha, Dharma, or Sangha ... When properly practiced, the hour of death was to be a time for further purifying the mind and not a last-minute repentance, but through the centuries the moment of death was sometimes emphasized above all else. A number of textual passages in the later layers of the canon reveal the belief that one's consciousness at the moment of death was of critical importance.⁵³

Amore's analysis emphasizes the importance of hearing the dhamma at the time of death. However, it is not only this 'last opportunity' to hear the dhamma which is efficacious, but any opportunity to do so.⁵⁴

Returning to the Anguttara Nikāya (A III 383, p.273) when Ānanda reports to the Buddha on the "six breeds" of

⁵³Frederick H. Holck, ed., Death and Eastern Thought, pp.137-138.

⁵⁴See e.g. our study, pp.225-226, 228, 250-251, 373-374.

Pūraṇa Kassapa wherein individuals are listed according to colour (black through to white), the Buddha rejects Kassapa's scheme for his own. Thus, where Pūraṇa Kassapa declared that all "mutton-butchers, pork-butchers, fowlers, hunters..." are of the "black breed", the Buddha declared that these individuals were not necessarily the 'lowest' type; rather it is the actions (kamma) of each individual which will determine his or her future.

On one occasion (A III 402, p.286) a certain bhikkhu approached Ānanda with the question, "...was it after concentrating his whole mind that Devadatta was declared by the Exalted One: 'Gone wayward, hell-bound for a kalpa, unpardonable is Devadatta' -- or was it from some deva-source (he learnt it)?" Ānanda replied that (A III 402, p.287), "It was even as the Exalted One has declared." Ānanda stereotypically reports the subject of his conversation with the bhikkhu to the Buddha who replies, "Either, Ānanda, that monk must be new, not long gone forth, or if an elder, a witless one. How, when I have definitely declared it, can there be an alternative? I know not another person of whom this was declared by me, after full concentration, save Devadatta." The Buddha then goes on to tell Ānanda how "by mind compassing mind [cetasa ceto paricca]" he is able to know the future of the individual concerned.

There are a number of important features to the above sutta. One of the questions which is alluded to

above is whether the Buddha was able, through his own powers, to ascertain the future of Devadatta or whether the devas assisted him. This is not the first occasion wherein the Buddha's powers were questioned, and the possible help of the devas alluded to.⁵⁵ However, in this case the Buddha was able "by mind compassing mind" to discover the truth about Devadatta, as indeed he can do for other individuals.⁵⁶ Ānanda's answer to the bhikkhu (i.e. "It was even as the Exalted One has declared") reflects the fact that Ānanda has no means of answering the question, other than to declare that the Buddha 'speaks the truth'.⁵⁷ In this way the Sutta makes it clear that Ānanda did not have the power to "compass mind by mind." We may again draw attention to the fact that Sāriputta is described as not being able by "mind encompass mind" to know the karmic make-up of others (S V 159, p.139).⁵⁸ This seems unusual if we accept the claim that Sāriputta became an arahant at an early date.⁵⁹ Further, if one of the qualities of arahantship was the knowledge to determine the destinies of others,⁶⁰ what does this lacuna

⁵⁵See e.g. D II 8, p.6; D II 53, p.41.

⁵⁶This ideally seems to be part of the accoutrement of any arahant; see fn.50 above.

⁵⁷See also A III 348, p.246 and E.M. Hare, GS II, p.246, fn.7.

⁵⁸See also our study, pp.337ff.

⁵⁹According to the commentaries, Sāriputta attained arahantship within three weeks of joining the Buddha's following. See DPPN II, p.1109.

⁶⁰The so-called dibba-cakkhu of the tevijjā; see EB

on the part of Sāriputta imply? One may note, in this regard, beyond what has already been said, the following remarks of Malalasekera (DPPN II, p.1109, fn.7), "... knowledge of the thoughts and inclinations of people were beyond Sāriputta (DhA iii; J i 82)." On the other hand, Mahā Moggallāna does not have Sāriputta's limitation (see e.g. S II 273, p.184; S II 275, p.186; also DPPN II, p.546). Once again we see that Sāriputta and Ānanda have similarities in their characterizations.

Turning to the Sattaka, Atthaka and Navaka Nipātas of the Anguttara Nikāya, Ānanda (A IV 37-38, pp.21-22)⁶¹ asks the Buddha, "Is it possible, lord, in the Dhamma-discipline to call a monk praiseworthy just on the score of years." The Buddha replies (A IV 38, p.22), "No, Ānanda, it is not possible ... I, who have experienced the matter, have taught that there are seven grounds for praise ...

II, Fascicle 1, p.42; M I 279-280, pp.332-333. It is possible that the dibba cakkhu powers of the arahant (of the tevijjā) apply only to individuals who have already died so that individuals still alive can perhaps not be similarly 'read'; see Nyanatiloka, Buddhist Dictionary, p.3, #4. Regardless, Malalasekera in his comments (quoted in the study above) makes it clear that Sāriputta's powers to read other people's thoughts were, like Ānanda's, non-existent.

⁶¹ See also A IV 34, p.20 ff., where a similar situation is described of Sāriputta.

Herein, Ānanda, a monk has faith, is conscientious, afraid of blame, has heard much [bahussuto], is energetic, mindful [satimā] and wise [paññavā]." Many of these terms, as we have noted, are terms which apply to Ānanda.⁶² This would suggest that seniority alone was not a criterion on which the status of a bhikkhu was evaluated, but that the 'merit' of a bhikkhu was also considered.

When the brāhmaṇa Uggatasarīra (A IV 41, p.24) tells the Buddha that he has heard that "the laying of the fire and the setting up of the pillar are very fruitful," the Buddha agrees that he too has heard that. Uggatasarīra repeats the claim to the Buddha hoping to get the Buddha to agree on the efficaciousness of sacrifice. When the brāhmaṇa proclaims that he and the Buddha agree on the matter, Ānanda informs Uggatasarīra that he should, instead of the above statement he has made to the Buddha, ask the Buddha, "I am indeed anxious, lord, to lay the fire, to set up the pillar ... let the Exalted One counsel me." Once Uggatasarīra has re-formulated his question, the Buddha answers, interpreting sacrifice in terms of his own dhamma.

Once,⁶³ while the Buddha was staying at the Gabled Hall in Mahāvana near Vesālī, Ānanda (A IV 279, p.186) asked

⁶²See our study, e.g. pp.302, 324ff.

⁶³We have omitted discussing A IV 274, p.181, because we discussed it earlier, see our study, pp.121ff. Also omitted is the reference to Ānanda at A IV 374, p.248; see E.M. Hare, GS IV, p.248, fn.2.

the Buddha, "Lord, how many qualities must a monk have to be considered the spiritual adviser of nuns?" The Buddha replies that eight qualities are needed:

Herein, Ānanda, a monk is virtuous ... he undertakes and trains himself in the precepts. He is learned [bahussuto] ... the doctrines he has fully understood in theory. To him both Obligations have been properly and fully handed down, sectioned, regulated and resolved into sutta and into detail. He has a pleasant voice, his enunciation is good, his speech is urbane, distinct, free from hoarseness and informative. He is able to instruct, rouse, and gladden the Order of the nuns with religious discourse. Generally, he is dear to and liked by the nuns. Previous to his taking this Exalted One as his authority for going forth, for donning the yellow robe, he has been guilty of no serious crime. He has been ordained twenty years or more.

Ānanda (A IV 426-427, p.286), while staying in the Ghositārāma at Kosambi, addresses the bhikkhus on how wonderful it was that the Buddha found the way to nibbāna. Ānanda then goes on to describe the goal⁶⁴ and his description causes Udāyi⁶⁵ to ask about the plausibility of his description. Ānanda justifies his remarks by pointing out to Udāyi the various states reached in jhāna (meditation). Ānanda (A IV 427-428, p.287) goes on to tell the bhikkhus how he at one time revealed to the bhikkhuni Jaṭilāgāha in answer to her question regarding

⁶⁴A IV 426, p.286, "There will be just the eye, but no sensing of objects and the sphere thereof...the ear, but no sensing of sounds ... the nose, but no sensing of smells ... the tongue, but no sensing of tastes ... the body, but no sensing of touch."

⁶⁵i.e Kāludāyin; see E.M. Hare, GS IV, p.286, fn.4.

the "fruit" of a state of samādhi (which he describes), "... this concentration, sister, is said, by the Exalted One, to have gnosis as its fruit." In this manner Ānanda adds support to what he has just discussed with Udāyi.

The above Sutta indicates, as we have seen elsewhere, that Ānanda was at least attributed with verbal knowledge of the stages and states of samādhi and the jhānas.

The Buddha (A IV 438, p.293) informs Ānanda that he is going to Mahāvana for the noonday rest and wishes Ānanda to wait for him. While waiting for the Buddha's return, Ānanda is approached by the householder Tapussa who informs Ānanda (A IV 439, pp.293-294), "We householders ... are pleasure seekers ... and, being so, it seems a real precipice to us, this giving up of all [i.e. pabbajjā]; yet I've heard, reverend sir, that in this Dhamma-discipline the heart of every young monk leaps up at this giving up, becomes calm." Ānanda, upon hearing Tapussa, suggests that, "this, indeed, is a topic for a talk" and suggests they seek out the Buddha. When Ānanda finds the Buddha and reports on his conversation with Tapussa, the Buddha agrees with what has so far been stated and proceeds to inform Ānanda and Tapussa how he came to find peace.

When (A IV 449-451, pp.295-296) the bhikkhu Udāyi (Kāludāyi)⁶⁶ asks Ānanda to explain the meaning of a verse uttered by a deva, Ānanda provides the explanation.

⁶⁶see E.M. Hare, GS IV, p.286, fn.4.

The Dasaka Nipāta of the Anguttara Nikāya opens (A V 1, p.1) with Ānanda asking the Buddha, "Pray, sir, what is the object, what is the profit of good conduct [sīlāni]?" The Buddha, in answering Ānanda's question, proceeds in a step by step fashion, showing how "good conduct leads gradually up to the summit."

On another occasion (A V 7-8, pp.6-7) Ānanda questions the Buddha on the subject of "concentration" (samādhi), as he also did of Sāriputta (A V 8, p.7). The Buddha (A V 36, p.26) declares to Ananda:

Whatsoever things, Ānanda, conduce to realizing the truth of this or that statement of doctrine, confidently do I claim, after thorough comprehension of it, to teach dhamma about them in such a way that, when proficient, a man shall know of the real that it is, of the unreal that it is not ... For there is the possibility of his knowing or seeing or realizing that which can be known, seen or realized. This, Ānanda, is knowledge unsurpassable, the knowledge of this or that thing as it really is.

Having informed Ānanda as above, the Buddha then goes on to provide a lecture on the "ten Wayfarer's powers of the Wayfarer" (A V 37-38, p.26).

The Dasaka Nipāta of the Anguttara Nikāya (A V 70-74, pp.50-54; also A V 77-79, p.55) contains a series of suttas in which Upāli, stereotypically, questions the Buddha on elements of the discipline. It is interesting to note that among the suttas dealing with Upāli, one also finds suttas in which it is Ānanda who asks questions on the vinaya. Thus, Ānanda, like Upāli, questions the Buddha on

schism in the Sangha (A V 75, p.54; also A V 76, p.54). Further, on the same subject, the Buddha informs Ānanda that those who create a schism in the Sangha get demerit lasting for an aeon in purgatory, while those who keep the Sangha harmonious get Brahma-merit and for an aeon "rejoice in heaven" (A V 75-77, p.54). Ānanda's participation in the suttas alluded to above, helps to support the view that he (like Upāli) was concerned with and knew the vinaya.

When the bhikkhu Girimānanda takes ill (A V 108, p.74), Ānanda requests that the Buddha visit the sick bhikkhu. The Buddha replies, "If you, Ānanda, were to visit with the monk Girimānanda and recite to him the Ten Ideas, there are grounds for supposing that when he hears them the sickness will be allayed there and then." Ānanda (A V 112, p.77), "having got by heart [from hearing the Buddha] these Ten Ideas ... visited the venerable Girimānanda and recited them." No sooner did the bhikkhu hear the "Ten Ideas" than his illness was allayed.⁶⁷ This Sutta emphasizes, as we have noted on other occasions, the power of the buddhavacana, as well as Ānanda's memory.

⁶⁷These ten ideas are, "The idea of permanence, of not self, of the foul, of the disadvantage, abandoning, revulsion, fading, distaste for all the world, of impermanence in all compounds, of concentration on in-breathing and out-breathing." See the Sutta for details of each of these.

Ānanda's next appearance (A V 137, p.94) repeats a situation which we discussed in our analysis of Ānanda's place in a previous section of the Anguttara Nikāya, namely Ānanda's conversations with the female disciple Migasālā.⁶⁸

The Buddha (A V 152-154, pp.103-104) informs Ānanda, "Ānanda, there is no possibility that a monk who is an unbeliever should reach increase, growth and maturity in this dhamma-discipline ... [if] that one ... is immoral ... of little learning ... of foul speech ... [has] wicked friends ... indolent ... muddle-headed discontented ... of wicked desires."

When (A V 193, p.133) the Buddha refuses to provide satisfactory answers to the paribbājaka Uttiya's questions, Ānanda, fearing that Uttiya would think that the Buddha was unable to answer his questions, rectifies the situation.⁶⁹

When Ānanda (A V 196, p.135) is questioned by the paribbājaka Kokanuda regarding the 'inexpressibles' (avyākatas; see e.g. M I 426, p.97), Ānanda points out that he chooses not to answer the questions because to do so "is going-to-

⁶⁸See A III 347, p.246. Also see our study, pp.356-358. The two suttas are similar, except that the A V version provides a list of "ten persons entering the world" while the A III version lists only six.

⁶⁹The Buddha refuses to answer Uttiya's questions because they are not concerned with the goal. Ānanda makes this point clear to Uttiya.

view" and not conducive to the 'religious life' (A V 197-198, p.136). When Kokanuda learns that he is talking to Ānanda, he states (A V 198, p.137), "What! I have been talking with his worship the great teacher and knew not it was the venerable Ānanda! Had I been aware of its being the venerable Ānanda, I would not have said thus much. So let the venerable Ānanda pardon me."

This suggests that Ānanda's name and his position as a "great teacher" (mahācariya) were well known. In addition, Ānanda points out to Kokanuda (A V 198, p.136), "As regards going-to-view ... as regards fixing on view, relying on view, as regards obsession by view, rising up from view and rooting up view ... in all that I am one who knows, who sees." In this regard, it is significant to note that "views" (diṭṭhi) is one of the "obsessions" (āsavā) and that Ānanda's claim to have 'risen up from and rooted up' "views" speaks to his characterization as mahāpaṇṇā.

Ānanda (A V 225, p.156) is sought out by a group of bhikkhus in order to have him elaborate on what the Buddha has revealed to them concisely. Ānanda (A V 226-227, p.157) first points out to the bhikkhus that they should have asked the Buddha because the Buddha is the 'source' of the dhamma. Having acknowledged the importance of the Buddha, Ānanda eventually answers the bhikkhus' question. When the bhikkhus inform the Buddha of what has transpired, the latter states, "A sage is Ānanda, of great wisdom [mahāpaṇṇo] is Ānanda,

monks. If you had come to me and asked me the meaning of this, I should have explained it even so myself, even as it is explained by Ānanda" (A V 229, p.159).

Later in the Anguttara Nikāya (A V 318, p.202)⁷⁰ Ānanda questions the Buddha on certain aspects of samādhi and subsequently expresses his approval of Sāriputta (A V 319, p.203) who had answered Ānanda's question as did the Buddha. Ānanda points out (A V 320, p.203) how wonderful it is that both the explanations of the Master and the disciple agree. Whether these conversations are intended to suggest that Ānanda's knowledge of samādhi was minimal is difficult to say. Ānanda's last appearance in the Anguttara Nikāya (A V 341-347, pp.219-224) has already been discussed earlier in our study.⁷¹

⁷⁰ See also a similar discussion of samādhi between Ānanda and the Buddha at A V 321-322, p.204.

⁷¹ See M I 350, p.14 and our study, p.181.

ĀNANDA: HIS PLACE IN THE MAHĀ PARINIBBĀNA SUTTA¹

The Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta² (D II 72-168, pp.78-191) is, along with the so-called First Council account,³ a key document for understanding Ānanda's characterization in the Pāli Canon.

While most of the MPNS can be found elsewhere in the Pāli Canon,⁴ the MPNS as a compilation represents the attempt to describe the last months of the Buddha's active ministry and his parinibbāna. The MPNS can be viewed as the last opportunity while the Buddha is still alive for the buddha-vacana to be recited as well as to be altered. The MPNS also preserves the place occupied by important bhikkhus (like Ānanda) during this all-important period. This is not to say that the MPNS did not undergo growth and alteration over time,⁵ but that it presents an all-important hagiographical

¹Hereinafter referred to as MPNS. Regarding our reasons for placing the MPNS in a separate section, see our study, pp.17-18.

²The Pāli MPNS is only one of a number of extant accounts of this period of Buddhism; see André Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha dans les sūtrapitāka et les vinayapitāka anciens..., Tome I & II; see especially Tome I, pp.1-4.

³See our study, p.442.

⁴For a list, see T.W. and C.A.F. Rhys Davids, DB II, p.72. We shall note the parallels on occasion; however the interested reader should see the Rhys Davids lists.

⁵For example, see the work of André Bareau, fn.2 above.

opportunity to depict the key bhikkhus at the time of the Buddha's death. The Pāli MPNS is one of a number of suttas and extant sources dealing with the same situations which have been preserved⁶ and it is to Ānanda's place in the Pāli version of the MPNS that we now turn.

The first reference to Ānanda in the MPNS (D II 73, p.79; see also A IV 18, p.12) describes him as "... standing behind the Exalted One, and fanning him."⁷ On that occasion the Buddha informs Ānanda (D II 74, p.80) that as long as the Vajjians continue to follow the "conditions of welfare" which the Buddha has taught them (D II 75, p.80) they will not be overcome by the King of Magadha.⁸ The Buddha (D II 76, p.81) then tells Ānanda to "... assemble in the Service Hall such of the brethren as live in the neighbourhood of Rājagaha." Ānanda having fulfilled the Buddha's request, the Buddha then discourses to the bhikkhus on "seven conditions [necessary for] the welfare of a [i.e. the Buddha's] community" (D II 76, p.82). These seven conditions parallel the seven conditions which the Buddha had taught the Vajjians and, as in the latter case, guarantee the prosperity of the bhikkhus if those

⁶ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, pp.1-4.

⁷ There is no reason for assuming that Ānanda was solely responsible for fanning (not to mention attending upon) the Buddha; see e.g. D II 138, p.151 where Upavāna is described as fanning the Buddha. Also see our study, pp.148-155.

⁸ King Ajātasattu had sent his brāhmaṇa minister Vassakāra to enquire whether the Buddha felt he would be successful in attacking the Vajjians (D II 72, p.78).

conditions are followed.⁹

The Buddha, having discoursed to the bhikkhus on a variety of subjects, informs Ānanda (D II 81, p.86) that they should go on to Ambalaṭṭhikā. The Sutta informs us that the Buddha and Ānanda were accompanied by a "large company of the brethren" and that in Ambalaṭṭhikā the Buddha stayed in the King's house and discoursed to the bhikkhus on sīla, samādhi and paññā.

⁹ Compare D II 73, p.79 with D II 76, p.82. The seven conditions which are conducive to the welfare of a community in their application to the bhikkhus are (D II 76-77, p.82), "[1] So long ... as the brethren foregather oft, and frequent the formal meetings of their Order -- [2] so long as they meet together in concord, and rise in concord, and carry out in concord the duties of the Order -- [3] so long as the brethren shall establish nothing that has not already been prescribed, and abrogate nothing that has been already established, and act in accordance with the rules of order as now laid down -- [4] so long as the brethren honour and esteem and revere and support the elders of experience and long standing, the fathers and leaders of the Order, and hold it a point of duty to hearken to their words -- [5] so long as the brethren fall not under the influence of that craving which, springing up within them, would give rise to renewed existence -- [6] so long as the brethren delight in a life of solitude -- [7] so long as the brethren so train their minds in self-possession that good men among their fellow-disciples shall come to them, and those who have come shall dwell at ease -- so long may the brethren be expected, not to decline, but to prosper."

For a discussion of the above seven conditions and a comparison in the extant literature, see André Bareau, Recherches ..., Tome I, pp.26-39.

Having stayed at Ambalaṭṭhikā for as long as the Buddha felt fit, the Buddha (D II 81, p.87) tells Ānanda that they should now go on to Nālandā. Again, as in the above case, the Sutta informs us that Ānanda and the Buddha were accompanied by "a great company of the brethren."

The moving from place to place by the Buddha, the suggestion to Ānanda to do so, and the fact that they were accompanied by "a large company of the brethren" is a pattern which is preserved virtually throughout the MPNS. This method of description shows that the Buddha and his community were still very much peripatetic and that Ānanda occupies the place as the Buddha's personal attendant. One may note in passing that the places to which the Buddha travelled, as well as the reference to the large group of followers which accompanied him, is treated differently in other extant versions of the MPNS.¹⁰

The above evidence provides grounds for assuming that the request of the Buddha to move on to another location is, leaving historicity aside, a method used by the compilers of the MPNS to weld together the various suttas (often found elsewhere in the Pāli Canon) into a seemingly logical whole.

Having stayed in Nālandā for as long as the Buddha thought fit, the group (along with Ānanda) moved on to Pāṭaligāma (D II 84, p.90; see also Udāna VIII vi, 85, p.104

¹⁰ See André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome I, pp.49-56.

and Mahāvagga VI 225, p.308). It is interesting to note in the Udāna and Mahāvagga parallels to the section of the MPNS being discussed that the Buddha is described in the Udāna account as having been among the Magadhese and in the Mahāvagga account as having been in Rājagaha. In addition, in the Udāna account the Buddha is described as being accompanied by "together with a great company of brethren" (no mention is made of Ānanda), while in the Mahāvagga account twelve hundred and fifty bhikkhus are alluded to (also there is no mention of Ānanda).¹¹ While in Pāṭaligāma the Buddha lectures to the lay disciples and predicts to Ānanda (D II 87, p.92) that Pāṭaligāma will become the chief city Pāṭaliputta "a centre for the interchange of all kinds of wares."¹² The Buddha also states (D II 88, p.92) regarding Pāṭaliputta, "But three dangers will hang over Pāṭaliputta, that of fire, that of water, and that of dissension among friends." The Rhys Davids comment on the Buddha's prediction as follows:

This paragraph is of importance to the orthodox Buddhist as proving the Buddha's power of prophecy and the authority of Buddhist scriptures. To those who conclude that such a passage must have been written after the event that is prophesied (if any), it may be valuable evidence of the age both of the Vinaya and of this Mahā Parinibbāna Suttanta.¹³

¹¹ Mahāvagga VI 226, p.309.

¹² The Buddha prefaces his discussion by pointing out that the location where the ministers of Magadha are building their fort is haunted by thousands of devatās. The Buddha purports this situation as an inauspicious sign.

¹³ DB II, p.92, fn.3. André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, p.61, states, "... on peut en déduire que la version

From Pāṭaligāma, Ānanda, the Buddha and the group of brethren move on to Koṭigāma (D II 90, p.96).¹⁴ While at Koṭigāma, the Buddha discourses to the bhikkhus on the ariya-saccas (Ariyan Truths), sīla, samādhi and paññā (D II 90, p.96).

From Koṭigāma the group proceeds to Nāḍika (D II 91, p.97) where Ānanda questions the Buddha on the destinies of various individuals who have died.¹⁵ In addition, while at Nāḍika the Buddha once again (D II 94, p.100) discourses to the bhikkhus on sīla, samādhi and paññā.

Having spent time in Nāḍika, the Buddha suggests to Ānanda (D II 94, p.100) that they should go on to Vesālī. At Vesālī, the Buddha discourses to the bhikkhus on being "mindful and self-possessed"¹⁶ (see also S IV 210, p.142), and the incident with the courtesan Ambapālī takes place (D II 95, p.102; see also Mahāvagga VI 231, p.315). Also at Vesālī the Buddha (D II 98, p.105) discourses to the bhikkhus on sīla, samādhi and paññā.¹⁷

primitive de celui-ci fut composée à une époque où croyait communément que le Bienheureux possédait de tels pouvoirs surnaturels et les utilisait souvent. Cela concorde avec le but du récit, qui est de faire prédire au Buddha la gloire future de Pāṭaliputra, ce qui n'a pu germer dans l'esprit des auteurs qu'à l'époque où cette ville était devenue la capitale du puissant royaume de Magadha, probablement même au début de la dynastie des Maurya."

¹⁴See also S V 431, p.365; Mahāvagga VI 230, p.314 and Nettipakaraṇa 166.

¹⁵See also S V 356, p.311 and our discussion, p.319; André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, pp.85-93.

¹⁶See T.W. & C.A.F. Rhys Davids, DB II, p.101, fn.2.

¹⁷The Mahāvagga (VI 233, pp.317-318) account does not

From Vesālī the group goes on to Beluva (D II 98, p.105).¹⁸ Reaching Beluva, the Buddha informs the bhikkhus (D II 98-99, p.106),¹⁹ "... do you take up your abode round about Vesālī, each according to the place where his friends, acquaintances and intimates may live, for the retreat in the rainy season ... I shall enter [with Ānanda] upon the rainy season here at Beluva."²⁰

The MPNS (D II 99, p.106) informs us that the Buddha having entered upon the rainy season, "... there fell upon him a dire sickness, and sharp pains came upon him, even unto death." The thought then occurred to the Buddha, "It would not be right for me to pass away without addressing the disciples, without taking leave of the Order. Let me

mention the Buddha's discourse to the bhikkhus on sīla, samādhi and paññā. It would seem as though the frequent references made to sīla, samādhi and paññā are an attempt to weld the MPNS together, i.e. to help effect a smooth transition from one section to another so as to provide a unity to the pieces which make up the MPNS, pieces which are frequently found elsewhere in the Pāli Canon. See fn.4 above.

¹⁸See T.W. & C.A.F. Rhys Davids, DB II, p.105, fn.2. and S V 152, p.130.

¹⁹Also S V 152, p.130.

²⁰The description here of the bhikkhus being dispersed reflects a period when the bhikkhus had no fixed residences and would seem to contradict the impression given elsewhere (e.g. see fn.9 above for the "seven conditions" of welfare conducive to the Sangha). See also the remarks of André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, p.138.

now, by a strong effort of the will, bend this sickness down again, and keep my hold on life till the allotted time be come." A short time later, the Buddha begins to recover and Ānanda informs the Buddha (D II 99, p.107), "I have beheld, lord, how the Exalted One was in health, and I have beheld how the Exalted One had to suffer. And though at the sight of the sickness of the Exalted One my body became weak as a creeper, and the horizon became dim to me, and my faculties were no longer clear, yet notwithstanding I took some little comfort from the thought that the Exalted One would not pass away until at least he had left instructions as touching the Order."

The Buddha's response to Ānanda is well worth quoting in full:

What, then, Ānanda? Does the Order expect that of me? I have preached the truth without making any distinction between exoteric and esoteric doctrine; for in respect of the truths, Ānanda, the Tathāgata has no such thing as the closed fist of a teacher, who keeps some things back. Surely, Ānanda, should there be any one who harbours the thought, 'It is I who will lead the brotherhood', or, 'The Order is dependent upon me,' it is he who should lay down instructions in any matter concerning the Order. Now the Tathāgata, Ānanda, thinks not that it is he who should lead the brotherhood, or that the Order is dependent upon him. Why then should he leave instructions in any matter concerning the Order? I too, O Ānanda, am now grown old, and full of years, my journey is drawing to its close, I have reached my sum of days, I am turning eighty years of age; and just as a worn-out cart, Ānanda can be kept going only with the help of thongs, so, methinks, the body of the Tathāgata can only be kept going by bandaging it up. It is only, Ānanda, when the Tathāgata, by ceasing to attend to

any outward thing, becomes plunged by the cessation of any separate sensation in that concentration of heart which is concerned with no material object -- it is only then that the body of the Tathāgata is at ease.

Therefore, O Ānanda, be ye lamps unto yourselves. Be ye a refuge to yourselves. Betake yourselves to no external refuge. Hold fast to the Truth as a lamp. Hold fast as a refuge to the Truth. Look not for refuge to any one besides yourselves. And how, Ānanda, is a brother to be a lamp unto himself, a refuge to himself, betaking himself to no external refuge, holding fast to the Truth as a lamp, holding fast as refuge to the Truth, looking not for refuge to any one besides himself?

Herein, O mendicants, a brother continues, as to the body, so to look upon the body that he remains strenuous, self-possessed, and mindful, having overcome both the hankering and the dejection common in the world. [And in the same way] as to feelings ... moods ... ideas ...

And whosoever, Ānanda, either now or after I am dead, shall be a lamp unto themselves, and a refuge unto themselves, shall betake themselves to no external refuge, but holding fast to the Truth as their lamp, and holding fast as their refuge to the Truth, shall look not for refuge to anyone besides themselves -- it is they among my bhikkhus, who shall reach the very topmost Height! -- but they must be anxious to learn (D II 100, pp.107-108).²¹

The above section of the MPNS, describing what took place at Beluva, is primarily concerned with the future of the Buddha's sāsana after the Buddha's parinibbāna.

According to the Sutta, the Buddha takes ill after having dispersed the bhikkhus, leaving only Ānanda by the

²¹See also S V 152, p.130. F.L. Woodward, KS V, p.133, fn.4, says of the closing line of the section quoted, (i.e. "... but they must be anxious to learn"), "This phrase in brackets, Professor Rhys Davids remarks, seems to have been added afterwards. [The Commentary], however, has it in the paraphrase." One should note that the fact that the Commentary has it in the paraphrase does not imply that it is not a later accretion. Further, the Pāli term translated as "learn" is "sikkhā" and while it can mean "study" it is closely connected with the discipline (See PTSD, p.708). In light of the fact that most of the Buddha's remarks preceding

Buddha's side.²² The Buddha (D II 99, p.106) has the thought, "It would not be right for me to pass away without addressing the disciples, without taking leave of the Order." With this thought in mind the Buddha encourages himself to recover from his illness. We are then informed that not long after the Buddha has recovered from his illness, Ānanda reveals to the Buddha that the latter's illness had caused him much trepidation,²³ and that he (D II 99, p.107) "... took some little comfort from the thought that the Exalted One would not pass away until he had left instructions as touching the Order."

One wonders why, in light of the Buddha's decision to address the bhikkhu Sangha before his parinibbāna, the Buddha reacts so strongly to Ananda's request (or hope) that the Buddha 'leave instructions as touching the Order'? There are a number of factors to consider in the above question.

While the Buddha's decision to address the bhikkhus one more time is similar to Ānanda's hope that the Buddha will 'leave instructions as touching the Order', there is a difference. The Buddha's decision to address the bhikkhus

the "sikkhā" comment emphasize the dhamma, the emphasis at the close on the "training/discipline" would seem like an afterthought.

²² See the remarks of André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, p.139 for slight variations in the other extant versions.

²³ See also Ānanda's reaction to Sāriputta's death, S V 153, pp.131-132.

one more time seems to be a compassionate way for the Buddha to say goodbye to the bhikkhus. On the other hand, Ānanda's hope (or request) asks that the Buddha 'leave instructions as touching the Order.' Perhaps with this distinction in mind the Buddha responds as we have quoted above (see pp.382-383).

In addition to what has already been stated, there are a number of other factors to be considered. In light of developments which took place in the buddhalogical conception, developments which are to be found to some degree in the MPNS,²⁴ the authors and/or compilers of the MPNS would have been reluctant to have the Buddha die alone at Beluva,²⁵ even if Ānanda was by his side. Thus we may note that when the Buddha does die (later in the MPNS), his audience is extremely large and diverse.²⁶ The presentation of the Buddha in the section of the MPNS under discussion is that of a man, worn out, ready for death, keeping himself

²⁴For example, the fact (D II 103, p.110) that the Buddha can extend his life or (D II 89, p.94) can cross the Ganges (in front of an audience) without any visible means of support.

²⁵See André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, p.138. One may note that the authors and/or compilers of the MPNS were upset with the fact that the Buddha chose to die in Kusinārā and thus, through the mouth of the Buddha, indicated that the location was once (and hence still is) auspicious (D II 147, p.161).

²⁶For example, D II 157, p.175ff.

alive with great difficulty.²⁷ Under these circumstances the Buddha's sharp reply to Ānanda's hope (or request) would seem understandable.

The Buddha maintains that he has provided the bhikkhus with what is his to give (i.e. the dhamma), that this message should be the refuge of the bhikkhus, that the bhikkhus should not seek out leaders but work each for his own salvation. One may note in passing that not all of the extant accounts of the MPNS have Ānanda treated as in the Pāli account.²⁸ Central to the rebuttal of Ānanda by the Buddha is the emphasis to be placed on the Buddha's message and not on the person of the Buddha, an emphasis which comes to fruition at the First Council when the buddhavaṇṇa is recited.

One may also indicate that the Buddha's remarks to Ānanda indicating that everything that has to be said has already been said to the bhikkhus is contradicted later in the MPNS. Thus, for example, the Buddha informs Ānanda (D II 154, p.171) that the modes of address between the

²⁷"I too, O Ānanda, am now grown old, and full of years, my journey is drawing to its close, I have reached my sum of days, I am turning eighty years of age, and just as a worn-out cart, Ananda, can be kept going only with the help of thongs, so, methinks, the body of the Tathāgata can only be kept going by bandaging it up. It is only, Ānanda, when the Tathāgata, by ceasing to attend to any outward thing, becomes plunged by the cessation of any separate sensation in that concentration of heart which is concerned with no material object -- it is only then that the body of the Tathāgata is at ease (D II 100, pp.107-108).

²⁸André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome I, pp.142-144 points out that there are two traditions among the extant

bhikkhus should be altered after his death and that if the Sangha wishes it may abolish (again after the Buddha's death) the "lesser and minor precepts." Obviously the MPNS as a compilation combines a number of the 'old' and the 'new' aspects of the tradition in what is only seemingly a historical presentation of the last days of the Buddha. The authors and/or compilers of the MPNS, in assembling the MPNS of pieces which are, for the most part, found elsewhere in the Pāli Canon, have avoided (under the pressure of 'tradition')²⁹ altering the separate accounts so as to make the MPNS a logically consistent whole.

The Buddha's remarks to Ānanda emphasize 'self-perfection' and 'personal salvation'. In a sense this emphasis is surprising for one thinks of the Buddha as primarily a teacher, as indeed one does of such bhikkhus as Sāriputta, Mahā Moggallāna and Ānanda.³⁰ In this regard,

sources. One accords with the Pāli account that the Buddha starts out by first refusing to give instructions to the Sangha, while the second tradition emphasizes that the Sangha put the dhamma of the Buddha into practice.

²⁹By 'tradition' we mean that by the time of the Buddha's death, or shortly thereafter, there already existed a core of Buddhist oral tradition which had become fairly well fixed in content.

³⁰This 'teaching' aspect can be seen in the Buddha's remarks (D II 119, p.127), "Therefore, O brethren -- ye to whom the truths I have perceived have been made known by me -- having thoroughly made yourselves master of them, practice them, meditate upon them, and spread them abroad; in order that pure religion may last long and be perpetuated, in order that it may continue to be for the good and happiness of the great multitudes, out of pity for the world, to the good and gain and the weal of gods and men!" See also D II 104, p. 112 and Mahāvagga I 5, pp.7-8.

we may note that bhikkhus such as Mahā Kassapa and Anuruddha, bhikkhus who are described as coming to power in the period under discussion, are, unlike Ānanda and the others named above, retiring in nature and more inclined towards considering solitary living and meditation as the royal road to enlightenment.

The Buddha's remarks to Ānanda during the former's illness emphasize the meditative aspects of the teaching (D II 100, pp.107-108), "It is only, Ānanda, when the Tathāgata, by ceasing to attend to any outward thing, becomes plunged by the cessation of any separate sensation in that concentration of heart [ceto-samādhiṃ] which is concerned with no material object -- it is only then that the body of the Tathāgata is at ease." One may note that the Pāli Canon, in dealing with illness and the discomfort of the body, often utilizes the hearing of the buddhavaṇṇa as a way of relieving pain.³¹

The Buddha, in the section under discussion, also informs Ānanda and the bhikkhus³² (D II 100, p.108) about the need to remain strenuous, self-possessed and mindful

³¹For example, M III 259, p.310ff.

³²The sudden reference to "bhikkhus" other than Ānanda is noteworthy (D II 100, p.108). See the parallel versions, S V 164-165, p.145 and S III 42, p.37, where bhikkhus are present, and compare with S V 154, p.133 and S V 163, p.143 where Ānanda is addressed. It may be that the reference to bhikkhus in the MPNS is the result of the compilers' poor editing of their final compilations.

towards the body (kāya), feelings (vedana), thoughts (citta) and "ideas" (dhamma); in short, the four applications of mindfulness.³³ Commenting upon this advice of the Buddha in the parallel accounts of the Pāli MPNS, André Bareau states, "Le pāli, le sanskrit et le chinois A précisent que ceux qui suivront ces conseils seront les vrais disciples du Buddha, les meilleurs de ses Auditeurs (śrāvaka). Ces précisions ont évidemment pour d'attribuer une importance essentielle à ce type de méditation, qui fut et demeure certes l'un des plus recommandés par le Bouddhisme indien. Elles ont probablement été ajoutées par des moines appartenant à un groupe qui était spécialisé dans la pratique et la diffusion de ces quatre bases de l'attention."³⁴

The emphasis in the above analysis on the meditative aspects of the dhamma in the Pāli account of the last days of the Buddha's ministry is significant if one considers Ānanda as a representative of perfection through knowledge (paññā). As we stated on other occasions, the emphasis on distinguishing between the meditative and the intellectual approaches is not to say that both were not in operation at the same time or even in the same individual (e.g. ubhata-bhāga-vimutti). However we want to indicate that there are good reasons, as we have seen, to believe that the tendency to

³³For a detailed exposition, see M I 55, p.70.

³⁴André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, p.146.

emphasize one 'way' over the other 'way' (i.e. the 'way of meditation/action' and the 'way of knowledge')³⁵ seems to be an issue bearing on the characterization of Ānanda in the Pāli Canon.

On one occasion (D II 102, p.110) after the Buddha has returned from Vesālī, the Buddha informs Ānanda that they will spend the day at the Cāpāla cetiya ("shrine"). After the Buddha has praised the location and the other cetiyas nearby, he informs Ānanda, "Ānanda, whosoever has developed, practiced, dwelt on, expanded and ascended to the very heights of the four paths to Iddhi, and so mastered them as to be able to use them as a vehicle, and as a basis, he, should he desire it, could remain in the same birth for an aeon or for that portion of the aeon which had yet to run. Now the Tathāgata has thoroughly practised and developed them ... and he could, therefore, should he desire it, live on yet" (D II 103, pp.110-111).

The MPNS then informs us that, even with the suggestion of the Buddha before him, Ānanda does not request that the Buddha extend his life, "So far was his heart possessed by the Evil One [yathā taṃ Mārena pariyuṭṭhitacitto]" (D II 103-104, p.111). The Buddha repeats his above remarks to Ānanda twice more, but to no avail, so that he finally informs Ānanda, "You may leave me, Ānanda, awhile, and do whatsoever now seemeth to thee fit" (D II 104, p.112).

35

See our study, pp. 222-261.

The failure of Ānanda to request that the Buddha should extend his life became a criticism from which Ānanda would not escape. Thus at the First Council (Cullavagga XI 288, p.401) Ānanda, though by then (in the Pāli account) an arahant, did not escape the censure of the bhikkhus for having failed to request that the Buddha extend his life.

We see in the above characterization of Ānanda the (successful) attempt by the authors and/or compilers of the MPNS to explain away, in light of developments in the buddhalogical conception, the inability of the Buddha, despite all his powers, to extend his lifetime. There are a number of points concerning the above episode, in which Ānanda is central, which should be noted.

Before commenting on what the Buddha said to Ānanda, one should draw attention to the fact that it is to Ānanda that the Buddha says it. If, as the MPNS indicates, the Buddha wished to extend his life out of compassion for his followers, then why did he single out Ānanda to make the request to? Why, especially after Ānanda failed to answer the Buddha, did the Buddha not repeat his request to another (important) bhikkhu or group of bhikkhus? One may attempt to answer these questions by pointing out that only Ānanda was present at the time. Or, that as Ānanda was an important thera (perhaps the most important after Sāriputta's and Mahā Moggallāna's deaths) it was fitting that the suggestion be made to Ānanda. Later in the MPNS we learn that the Buddha

had suggested that he could extend his life on at least four previous occasions (D II 115, p.122). Furthermore, these suggestions had also all been made to Ānanda and on none of those occasions did the Buddha think to consult with other members of his following.

The authors and/or compilers of the MPNS were thus able to denigrate Ānanda and, at the same time, explain why the Buddha, in spite of all his powers, did not extend his life. Ānanda's position as the Buddha's attendant made him a likely candidate on which to hang the Buddha's "shortcomings", "shortcomings" which appeared, for the most part, at a time subsequent to his death in light of developments in the buddhalogical conception.

Turning to the subject of the ability of the Buddha to extend his life, André Bareau rightly remarks that at no other place in the extant Suttapitakas, nor for that matter in the extant Abhidhammas, can we find a single reference to the ability of the "four paths to Iddhi" to extend one's life.³⁶ Further, the very idea of extending one's life in the grand manner of the MPNS contradicts the position of the Buddha that it was the nature of all component things to decay (e.g. D II 118, p.126; D II 120, p.128). To proclaim that life could be extended is to contradict the doctrine of anicca (i.e. impermanence, transience).

³⁶ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, pp.152-153. See also for a general discussion of the matter, Padmanabh S. Jani, "Buddha's Prolongation of Life," BSO(A)S, No.21, 1958, pp.546-552.

The compilers of the MPNS and/or its authors were obviously aware, in light of Ānanda's love of the Buddha, that Ānanda would never have refused to ask the Buddha to extend his life if such a situation were feasible. Thus, in order to rectify this situation, Ānanda's possession by Māra was employed to explain why Ānanda could not tell the Buddha to extend his life. Are we not correct to assume that the Buddha would have been aware of Ānanda's possession by Māra, or at least have regarded Ānanda's silence on the matter as an indication that something was wrong? Perhaps, with this problem in mind the MPNS informs us that the Buddha had made the same suggestion of extending his life on four previous occasions (D II 115, p.122). One may add that the view of the Buddha as capable of extending his life jars with the picture presented earlier in the MPNS of the Buddha as an old man.³⁷

The possession of Ānanda by Māra also functions to account for the otherwise sudden appearance of Māra before the Buddha where he appeals to the Buddha to attain the parinibbāna immediately (D II 104, p.112). Interestingly, the Buddha makes no reference to Ānanda's silence on the question of extending his (i.e. the Buddha's) life, nor for that matter does Māra. The Buddha's reply to Māra indicates that the parinibbāna is to be postponed in order that the

³⁷See fn.27 above.

buddhavaṇṇa shall become 'popular', knowable to all (D II 104, p.112). In fact, this response of the Buddha to the request of Māra has its precedent in the attempt by Māra, at the time of the Buddha's enlightenment, to have the Buddha die (attain parinibbāna) before the buddhavaṇṇa becomes known (D II 112, p.120).³⁸ When Māra (D II 105, p.113) points out to the Buddha that the buddhavaṇṇa has indeed become known, it is then, and only then, that the Buddha declares (D II 106, p.113), "At the end of three months from this time the Tathāgata will pass away."

The above analysis points out that there are two reasons for the premature death of the Buddha. One reason emphasizes the failure of Ananda to take up the opportunity provided by the Buddha, while the other reason emphasizes the fulfilled 'promise' of the Buddha to Māra that he would attain parinibbāna only when the buddhavaṇṇa was known to all.

Before closing the above discussion, it is advantageous to discuss the section in the MPNS where the subject of the Buddha's prolongation of life is again mentioned (D II 112, p.120). In this section of the MPNS the Buddha first informs Ānanda of Māra's visit at the time of his enlightenment and explains that the Buddha responded on that occasion by emphasizing that he wished to make the buddhavaṇṇa univer-

³⁸ See also the remarks of André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, pp.155-156.

sally known. The Buddha then relates (D II 113-114, p.121) how again "to-day" Māra had visited the Buddha with the same request as that he made upon the Buddha's enlightenment and the Buddha goes on to say that he has decided to attain the parinibbāna three months hence. At that point Ānanda says, "Vouchsafe, lord, to remain during the aeon: live on through the kalpa, O Exalted One! for the good and the happiness of the great multitudes, out of pity for the world, for the good and gain and the weal of gods and men!" (D II 155, p.121). The Buddha responds to Ānanda's request by pointing out that Ānanda has had such an opportunity to have the Buddha extend his life, but did not take advantage of it. Further, as we have already indicated, the Buddha points out (D II 115, p.122) that Ānanda has had at least four previous opportunities to have the Buddha extend his life. The Buddha concludes (D II 118, p.125), "Thine, therefore, O Ānanda, is the fault, thine is the offence!" This clear indictment of Ānanda by the Buddha would have its repercussions at the First Council where Ānanda would again be charged with having failed to have the Buddha extend his life.

It is noteworthy that in the above account Ānanda makes no reply, although when Ānanda is accused of the above offence at the First Council, he proclaims that not only was he under the spell of Māra, but he does not consider his actions as an offence of "wrong-doing" (Cullavagga XI 288, p.401).

Finally, we should point out that following directly upon the above account (i.e. the account where Ānanda asks the Buddha to extend his life), one finds the following:

But now, Ānanda, have I not formerly declared to you that it is in the very nature of all things, near and dear unto us, that we must divide ourselves from them, leave them, sever ourselves from them? How, then, Ānanda, can this be possible -- whereas anything whatever born, brought into being, and organized, contains within itself the inherent necessity of dissolution -- how then can this be possible that such a being should not be dissolved? No such condition can exist! And that which, Ānanda, has been relinquished, cast away, renounced, rejected, and abandoned by the Tathāgata -- the remaining sum of life surrendered by him -- verily with regard to that the word has gone forth from the Tathāgata, saying: -- 'The passing away of the Tathāgata shall take place before long. At the end of three months from this time the Tathāgata will die!' That the Tathāgata for the sake of the living should repent him again of that saying -- this can no wise be (D II 118-119, p.126).

André Bareau points out that it is only in the Pāli MPNS that one finds the above quotation, as well as the section which precedes it, wherein the Buddha informs Ānanda that he has had four previous opportunities to ask the Buddha to extend his life.³⁹

Both Bareau and the Rhys Davids⁴⁰ point out that the passage, which we have quoted above, seems to contradict what went previously. If it is in the nature of all things that we separate ourselves from them, then it is improper to expect that the Buddha should extend his life. It is probable that the Buddha's response, emphasizing that it is

³⁹ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, pp.194-196, Section "XII".

⁴⁰ T.W. & C.A.F. Rhys Davids, DB II, p.126, fn.1.; Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, p.195.

in the nature of all things that we must separate ourselves from them, was the 'original' (earliest known) response to the question of the Buddha's death. The fact that only the Pāli MPNS preserves the section under discussion (i.e. D II 115-119, pp.121-126) would make it difficult to evaluate if we did not have the same thought expressed elsewhere in the MPNS and the Pāli Canon. To close this section of the discussion, we should draw attention to the fact that when the Buddha talks to Ānanda regarding the previous occasions on which the Buddha mentioned his ability to extend his life (D II 115, p.122), the Buddha states, "If thou shouldst then have so besought the Tathāgata, the Tathāgata might have rejected the appeal even to the second time, but the third time he would have granted it." Bareau says of this response by the Buddha, "Le pāli est le seul à imaginer ce qui serait arrivé si Ānanda avait saisi le sens de l'invitation du Buddha, et il en profite pour attribuer alors au Bienheureux une attitude capricieuse, celle d'une coquette qui aime à se faire prier! Par contre, il n'explique pas pourquoi Ānanda ne doit plus renouveler sa demande faite au Buddha de demeurer en vie, comme si c'était là un nouveau caprice."⁴¹

Regarding Bareau's comments, one may suggest that the so-called capricious response of the Buddha is perhaps a stage in the development of the conception that the Buddha

⁴¹André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, p.189.

could have avoided a premature death. That is, if one leaves aside for the moment the Māra-Buddha exchange, one can envisage the situation in which Ānanda, out of his deep love for the Buddha, might have requested that it would be wonderful if the Buddha could live on. The Buddha would then have responded that such was indeed impossible as it is in the nature of all things to die. However, the authors and/or compilers (in light of developments in the conception of the nature of the Buddha) may have taken up Ānanda's request in a serious manner, emphasizing that if Ānanda had only persisted to a third time, his request (and their aim) would have been fulfilled.

In summation, one can conclude that the view that the Buddha could prolong his life is a development which is not part of the 'early' tradition but which developed after the death of the Buddha and in a period when the nature of the Buddha was undergoing development along docetic lines. Further, the implication that Ānanda was responsible for the premature death of the Buddha is merely a fabrication designed to both explain the disappearance of the Buddha and to denigrate Ānanda. The wish to denigrate Ānanda is perhaps emphasized in the Pāli account where, unlike in the other extant accounts, Ānanda is informed that he had previous opportunities to the one at the Cāpāla cetiya to request the Buddha to live on.

Returning to the MPNS, one may note that interspersed

between the two accounts of Ānanda's failure to have the Buddha extend his life, the Buddha lectures to Ānanda on the eight proximate and remote causes of earthquakes (D II 107, p.114), the eight assemblies (D II 109, p.117), the "eight positions of Mastery (over the delusion arising from the apparent permanence of external things)" (D II 110, p.118), and the "eight stages of deliverance" (D II 112, p.119).

Before moving on, it is worth noting the reason provided by the Buddha (to Māra) to explain his refusal to prematurely attain the parinibbāna:

I shall not die, O Evil One! until the brethren and the sisters of the Order, and until the lay-disciples of either sex shall have become true hearers, wise and well trained, ready and learned [bahussutā], carrying the doctrinal books in their memory, masters of the lesser corollaries that follow from the large doctrine, correct in life, walking according to the precepts -- until they, having thus themselves learned the doctrine, shall be able to tell others of it, preach it, make it known, establish it, open it, minutely explain it and make it clear -- until they, when others start vain doctrine easy to be refuted by the truth, shall be able in refuting it, to spread the wonder-working truth abroad! (D II 104, p.112).

Further the Buddha states, "I shall not die, O Evil One! until this pure religion of mine shall have become successful, prosperous, wide-spread and popular in all its full extent -- until, in a word, it shall have been well proclaimed among men" (D II 105, p.113).

The fact that the death of the Buddha is postponed

for the above reasons, attests to the power and the need of the buddhavaṇṇa to be known if the Buddha's sāsana is to survive. This spreading of the buddhavaṇṇa is not only for the benefit of the bhikkhus, but for the bhikkhunis, upāsakās and upāsikās. The emphasis on making the buddhavaṇṇa known to all is incommensurate with much of the Pāli Canon which addresses itself primarily to the bhikkhus. While it is difficult to conclude that this tendency to make the buddhavaṇṇa universally known was part of 'early' Buddhism, there is no question that subsequently to the death of the Buddha, preservation of his message became a major issue, an issue solved by the First Council, where the buddhavaṇṇa was recited orally.

Ria Kloppenborg, as we have already noted, says of the Buddha's decision to teach the dhamma, "The fact that the Buddha actually proclaimed the Dhamma is difficult to explain against the background of the ascetic tradition of individualism, as this has found a place in the Theravāda scriptures. Most accounts invoke the divine interference of Brahma and Indra to make it clear that this decision was a very special one indeed."⁴² On the other hand, Trevor Ling explains the intervention of the gods in the Buddha's decision to teach as follows, "The intention of this story may have been to show that even the gods were dependent on the eternal dhamma which the Buddha had perceived, and were

⁴²Ria Kloppenborg, The Paccekabuddha, p.7.

therefore subordinate both to the dhamma and to him who was its bearer. The story has the effect, too, of showing that the relationship between the Buddha and the gods of popular belief was one of tolerant co-existence."⁴³ Ling further points out that most of the Buddha's public activity (relying on the locations provided in the Pāli Canon) took place in urban centers, "... the vast collection of discourses of the Buddha in the Pāli canon ... were delivered in two major cities, Rajagriha and Shravasti."⁴⁴

To rely, as Ling does, on the locations provided by the Pāli Canon as the basis of his position is, to some degree, similar to the Buddha informing Ānanda that the location of his death, though seemingly insignificant, was once (and by implication still is) important (see D II 146, p. 161). That is, it seems clear that it was the intention of the authors and/or compilers to have the location of the Buddha's death, as well as the locations where he gave his discourses, as places which were, or became, important. As we stated earlier, a reading of the Pāli Sutta and Vinaya Piṭakas leaves the impression that, in spite of the locations wherein the suttas are set, the Buddha's audience was primarily made up of his fellow bhikkhus. If the Buddha lectured to other individuals, then one must say that, for the most part, they were members of other religious sects

⁴³Trevor Ling, The Buddha, p.97.

⁴⁴Ibid., p.100.

who, because of the similarity of their vocation to that of the bhikkhus, could possibly understand the Buddha's message.

The suggestion in the MPNS that the buddhavaacana should become known to all, seems to be better attributed to the later rather than the early period of the Buddha's active ministry, if, indeed, anything on this scale did occur within the Buddha's lifetime. One sees the desire to extend the buddhavaacana in the evidence left behind by Asoka and indeed the developments which Buddhism underwent in the period following the Buddha's death attest to Buddhism's reaction to 'popular' need.⁴⁵ Thus the eventual criticism of the arahant ideal as egotistical and the advocacy of the bodhisattva ideal in its place suggests a broadening of the base of those who were considered capable of practising the Buddha's way.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ See R.C. Mitra, The Decline of Buddhism in India, e.g. pp.150-155.

⁴⁶ The above analysis regarding the make-up and extent of the Buddha's audience is tentative, designed to introduce the problem and make some attempt at resolution. The subject, however, is worthy of further study which cannot be undertaken here. It would seem that the Buddha's followers (i.e. particularly the bhikkhus) were drawn from the, "upper strata of society ... For Buddhism is an aristocratic doctrine of deliverance, making high ethical and intellectual demands." See J.W. de Jong, "The Background of Early Buddhism," Indogaku Bukkyogaku, Vol.12, 1964, p.426. See also Y.Mishra, An Early History of Vaisali, pp.157-183; Narendra Wagle, Society at the Time of the Buddha, e.g. p.5.

The remarks of deJong and the other studies alluded to above would confirm the position that cities were an important source of converts; the actual extent of the Buddha's teaching to the mass of people which occupied the urban areas still remains a subject worthy of further study.

Ānanda seems to have been an ideal candidate to help effect the spreading of the buddhavaṇṇa, for he was characterized as bahussuta and thus had the necessary credentials. Further, leaving aside the question of the historicity of the account, Ānanda is credited with gaining the admittance of women into the Saṅgha, which reveals that Ānanda 'felt' that the buddhavaṇṇa should be extended to individuals other than the bhikkhus.

Returning to the MPNS (D II 119, p.126), the Buddha informs Ananda that they should go on to Mahāvana to the Kuṭāgāra sālā. Once there, the Buddha asks Ānanda to assemble in the Service Hall the bhikkhus who reside in the neighbourhood of Vesālī. Once the bhikkhus are assembled, the Buddha states, "Therefore, O brethren - ye to whom the truths I have perceived have been made known by me -- having thoroughly made yourselves master of them, practice them, meditate upon them, and spread them abroad; in order that pure religion may last long and be perpetuated, in order that it may continue to be for the good and happiness of the great multitudes." The Buddha then (D II 120, p.128) enumerates the truths he has taught,⁴⁷ and informs the bhikkhus that they should 'work out their salvation with diligence'.⁴⁸

The Buddha (D II 122, p.131) returns from alms gathering in Vesālī and informs Ānanda that this has been

⁴⁷ In addition to the text, see also the remarks of the Rhys Davids, DB II, p.128, fn.2.

⁴⁸ See also S V 163, p.145.

the last time he will see that city. Ānanda typically responds, "even so, lord," and the Buddha, Ānanda and a large company of bhikkhus set out for Bhaṇḍagāma. There (D II 123, p.131) the Buddha lectures to the bhikkhus⁴⁹ before proceeding in turn to lecture at Hatthigāma, Ambagāma, Jambuḡāma and Bhoganagara.⁵⁰

At the Ānanda Cetiya at Bhoganagara, the Buddha provides the bhikkhus with a discourse on the "four Great Authorities." These "Great Authorities" are (D II 124-126, pp.133-136) to be regarded as the way of ascertaining the truth or falsity of what is claimed to be the buddhavacana. They are: (1) the (reported) word of the Buddha from one who claims to have himself heard the Buddha, (2) the report of a "company of the brethren with their elders and leaders," (3) the report of "many elders, of the Order, deeply read [bahu-ssutā], holding the faith as handed down by tradition, versed in the truths, versed in the regulations of the Order, versed in the summaries of the doctrines and the law" and (4) the same as #3 except that for "many elders" is substituted a (single) bhikkhu.

In every one of the four cases, one finds the ultimate authority to be the Suttas and Vinaya, "The word spoken,

⁴⁹The Buddha lectured to the bhikkhus on, "The noble conduct of life, the noble earnestness in meditation, the noble kind of wisdom, and the noble salvation of freedom."

⁵⁰At these locations the Buddha delivered similar lectures to the bhikkhus as he had done at Bhaṇḍagāma; see fn.45 above.

brethren, by that brother should neither be received with praise nor treated with scorn. Without praise and without scorn every word and syllable should be carefully understood and then put beside the Suttas and compared with the Vinaya. If when so compared they do not harmonize with the Suttas, and do not fit in with the rules of the Order, then you may come to the conclusion: 'Verily, this is not the word of the Exalted One, and has been wrongly grasped by that brother ... you should reject it. But if they harmonize ... [you should accept it as buddhavaṇṇa]."

André Bareau describes the above account as follows, "Cette précision, cette clarté et cette logique rigoureuse dans l'exposé et le classement des cas envisagés sont caractéristiques des maîtres légistes bouddhiques, de ceux auxquels on doit ces merveilleux recueils de droit canonique que sont les Vinayaṇṇa. Il n'y a guère à douter que tout cet épisode n'est qu'un morceau de vinaya, ou plutôt de ce qu'on pourrait appeler d'une façon barbare 'para-vinaya' car on ne le trouve que dans un seul Vinayaṇṇa."⁵¹

Regardless of whether one accepts Bareau's remarks, the need to mention the "four Great Authorities" indicates that the Buddha's sāsaṇa was to have its roots in the buddhavaṇṇa and that there was obviously a great deal of concern about ensuring that the buddhavaṇṇa was correctly⁵²

⁵¹ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, pp.228-229.

⁵² That is depending to some degree on the Buddhist 'school' concerned.

remembered.⁵³

In addition to the above lecture on the "four Great Authorities," the Buddha also lectured to the bhikkhus on sīla, samādhī and paññā (D II 126, p.126) before deciding to move on, with Ānanda and "a great company of the brethren," to Pāvā. While at Pāvā (D II 126, p.137) the Buddha stayed at the Mango Grove of Cunda the "worker in metals" (kammāraputta) and, on that occasion Cunda fed the Buddha the "truffles" which made him extremely ill (D II 127-128, pp.138-139).⁵⁴

From Pāvā, the Buddha informed Ānanda that they should go on to Kusinārā (D II 128, p.139). It is interesting to note that in this case we have no reference to any group of bhikkhus accompanying the Buddha and Ānanda. Arriving at Kusinārā, the Buddha expresses his tiredness, asks Ānanda to prepare him a seat beneath a tree and requests a drink.⁵⁵

⁵³ Bareau's remarks would, to us, seem well warranted. One may note further that the "four Great Authorities" talks about Sutta and Vinaya rather than Dhamma and Vinaya and thus may allude to the two piṭakas, both of which were unknown in the Buddha's lifetime. In fact the insistence on the sutta and vinaya as ultimate authorities rather than the person of the Buddha (or at least mention of the word of the Buddha himself as a fifth authority) would indicate that the four authorities developed in particular as a consequence of the Buddha's death.

⁵⁴ On the question of the Buddha's illness, see E. Lamotte, tr., L'enseignement de Vimalakīrti, pp.416-420; E.J. Thomas, "Buddha's Last Meal," Indian Culture, Vol.XV, Nos.1-4, July 1948-June 1949, pp.1-3; Arthur Waley, "Did Buddha die of eating Pork?" Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques, Vol.1, 1932, pp.343-354.

⁵⁵ The Pāli account, unlike some of the other extant

Since a caravan of five hundred carts had just crossed the river, Ānanda, rather than provide the Buddha with a drink of muddy water, suggests that they move on down the river to find a clear spot where the Buddha can drink and bathe (D II 129, p.139). The Buddha reiterates his request for a drink and, once again, Ānanda proposes that they move on. However, on the third request of the Buddha, Ānanda acquiesces and, in so doing, discovers that the stream is suddenly free of all turbidity. Ānanda returns with the water stating to the Buddha, "How wonderful, how marvellous is the great might and power of the Tathāgata! For this streamlet which, stirred up by the wheels, was but just now become shallow and was flowing foul and turbid, now, as I come up to it, is flowing clear" (D II 129, pp.140-141).

Ānanda's involvement in the refusal to provide the Buddha with a drink is an obvious attempt to denigrate Ānanda. This is clear when, in some of the accounts of the First Council (though not in the Cullavagga account) Ānanda is made to acknowledge his "wrong-doing" in not having provided the Buddha with a drink of water on the above occasion. It is interesting to note that according to the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin account, Ānanda actually gave the

versions of the trip to Kusinārā, does not make it clear that the Buddha's desire to sit down is directly linked to the meal he ate at Cunda, the 'worker in metals.' See André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, pp.276-277.

Buddha muddy water to drink and was chastised at the First Council for doing so.⁵⁶ What seems to have happened is that a simple event of providing a drink for the Buddha has been transformed into a denigration of Ānanda and an illustration of the Buddha's 'magical' powers.

Following immediately on the above episode, we learn that Pukkusa, a young Mallian and a disciple of Alāra Kālāma, spots the Buddha seated beneath the tree and approaches him in order to tell him how wonderful it is that the Buddha should pass his time "in a state of mind so calm" (D II 130, p.141). Pukkusa goes on to inform the Buddha how, on one occasion, Alāra Kālāma was able to achieve such a state of calm that he did not hear a caravan of five hundred carts pass by.

After Pukkusa has related the exploits of Alāra Kālāma, the Buddha goes on to reveal how his abilities far exceed those attributed to Alāra Kālāma (D II 131, p.142). Pukkusa, won over by the Buddha's abilities, requests a member of his company to bring him "a pair of robes of cloth of gold, burnished and ready for wear" (D II 133, p.144). When Pukkusa offers them to the Buddha, the Buddha accepts them on the condition that one of the robes is provided to Ānanda.

⁵⁶See Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "The Buddhist Councils," The Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXXVII, 1908, pp.4-5. See also André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome 1, pp.280-281.

After Pukkusa has been provided with a discourse by the Buddha and has departed, Ānanda remarks (D II 133, p.145) that when the robes⁵⁷ of Pukkusa were placed on the Buddha, they seemed to lose their splendor. Further Ānanda remarks, "How wonderful a thing is it, lord, and how marvellous, that the colour of the skin of the Exalted One should be so clear,

⁵⁷How the Buddha comes to be wearing both robes after he has just informed Pukkusa to place one of the robes on Ānanda we are not told. The fact that Ānanda accepts the robe goes against the conditions Ānanda required when taking up the position as permanent attendant to the Buddha (AA I 292). At that time Ānanda requested that no choice food or garment be given him by the Buddha so that no one could charge that Ānanda had taken up the position of permanent attendant for personal gain.

Malalasekera (DPPN I, p.250, fn.6) says that Buddhaghosa explains the contradiction by "saying that Ānanda's period of service had now come to an end, and also he wished to be free from the accusation that even after having served the Buddha for twenty five years, the Buddha had never made him any gift. It is further stated that Ānanda offered the robe to the Buddha later (DA, ii, 570)." Buddhaghosa's remarks sound like a rationalization after the fact. For example, we are nowhere informed in the MPNS that Ānanda's attendanceship of the Buddha has come to its end.

However, as we have indicated, the incident involving Upavāna (D II 139-140, p.151), see also our study, pp.148ff. suggests that there are grounds for assuming that Ānanda was not the constant attendant to the Buddha, that on occasion other bhikkhus assisted the Buddha. Still, the general position of the Pāli MPNS and indeed its parallels in the extant Buddhist sources is that Ānanda accompanied the Buddha as his attendant during the last months preceding the parinibbāna.

in response the Buddha informs
 on occasions when the colour of
 becomes clear and exceeding bright;"
 Ānanda, on which a Tathāgata attains
 perfect insight, and [the other is] on
 he passes finally away ... And now
 : third watch of the night, in the
 nārā ... the utter passing away of the
 Tathāgata will take place" (D II 134, p.146). Ānanda,
 surprisingly without any signs of sorrow, replies, "even
 so, Lord."

When next we hear of Ānanda, the Buddha (D II 135,
 p.147) is informing him that Cunda should not, because he
 had served the Buddha his last meal preceding the pari-
nibbāna, be blamed for the death of the Buddha. In fact,
 the Buddha indicates that much merit is to be gained by
 Cunda for having served the Buddha his last meal.⁵⁸

The Buddha, having informed Ānanda of the appropriate
 attitude to be taken toward Cunda, sets out with Ānanda and

⁵⁸ It is obvious that the authors and/or compilers of
 the MPNS were reluctant to admit that the Buddha's death was
 perhaps the result of food poisoning. This is made clear
 earlier in the MPNS when the Buddha states (DN II 127, p.138),
 "I see no one, Chunda, on earth nor in Māra's heaven, nor in
 Brahma's heaven, no one among Samanas and Brahmanas, among
 gods, and men, by whom, when he has eat it [i.e. the truffles],
 that food can be properly assimilated, save by the Tathāgata."
 See also fn. 54 above.

a "great company of bhikkhus" to the Sāla Grove of the Mallas at Kusinārā (D II 137, p.149). Arriving at the Upavattana, the Buddha informs Ānanda, "Spread over for me, I pray you, Ānanda, the couch with its head to the north, between twin Sāla trees. I am weary, Ānanda, and would lie down."

The MPNS informs us that at that time the Sāla trees came into bloom, even though it was out of season, and that the flowers dropped over the body of the Buddha "out of reverence for the successor of the Buddhas of old." In addition "heavenly music" and "heavenly songs" were heard out of reverence for the Buddha (D II 137-138, pp.149-150).

The Buddha informs Ānanda regarding the above miraculous events, "Now it is not thus, Ānanda, that the Tathāgata is rightly honoured, revered, venerated, held sacred or revered. But the brother or the sister, the devout man or the devout woman, who continually fulfils all the greater and lesser duties, who is correct in life, walking according to the precepts ... Therefore, O Ānanda, be ye constant in the fulfilment of the greater and of the lesser duties, and be ye correct in life, walking according to the precepts; and thus Ānanda should it be taught" (D II 138, pp.150-151).⁵⁹ These supposed remarks of the Buddha represent an attempt of the more orthodox bhikkhus to de-emphasize the cult of the Buddha.

⁵⁹ From the English translation one gets the impression that the passage is being addressed solely to the discipline. It would seem, on the basis of the Pāli, that the doctrine (dhamma) is here being emphasized; see the Pāli text and "dhamma" and "anudhamma" in the PTSD, pp.337-338.

Following after the above discussion of the proper way to do reverence to the Buddha is the incident involving Upavāna (D II 139, p.151). We have already discussed this incident in detail earlier in our study and thus will not repeat the entire argument here.⁶⁰

One feature worth noting regarding the above incident is that the MPNS distinguishes between two types of devatās who are anxious to see the Buddha. One group (D II 139-140, p.152) falls prostrate on the ground and weeps at the prospect of the Buddha's death while the other group (D II 140, p.153) is described as "free from passion ... calm and self-possessed, mindful of the saying which begins:-- 'Impermanent indeed are all component things ...'." This distinction between the groups of devatās is paralleled in the reactions which the bhikkhus themselves will have at the death of the Buddha (e.g. D II 157-158, p.177). Further, Ānanda, as we shall shortly see, is regarded as like the first group of devatās who are unable to control their feelings.

Ānanda points out to the Buddha that in the past, after the passing of the rainy season, the bhikkhus used to come to visit the Buddha, but that after the Buddha's death, "... we shall not be able to receive those very reverend brethren to audience, and to wait upon the Exalted One" (D II 141, p.153; see also Mahāvagga IV 158, p.209).

⁶⁰ See our study, pp. 148-155 and fn.57 above.

The Buddha responds to the above by pointing out that there are four places, "... which the believing clansman should visit with feelings of reverence": (1) the birthplace of the Buddha, (2) the place where the Buddha attained his enlightenment, (3) where the Buddha first began to teach, and (4) where the Buddha attained the parinibbāna. The Buddha further points out (D II 141, p.154), "... they, Ānanda, who shall die while they, with believing heart [pasanna citta], are journeying on such pilgrimage [these include not only the laity but bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs], shall be reborn after death, when the body shall dissolve, in the happy realms of heaven."

We have here another example (see our study, pp.332-335) of the conception of the "believing heart" (pasanna citta). In the case at hand, the Buddha informs Ānanda that if any individual (including bhikkhus) dies while on a pilgrimage to the four worthy locations,⁶¹ he will, if he possesses a "believing heart",⁶² be reborn "in the happy realms of heaven."

The use of "pasanna citta" in the above situation suggests that at least the context in which the term is used

⁶¹Or, as a result of visiting these locations, upon their death, having a "believing heart" they will be reborn in the "happy realms of heaven." See André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.31.

⁶²Bareau translates the term as "une pensée de foi sereine," Ibid., p.31. The PTSD, p.267, Section "i", translates, "a heart ready and prepared for truth, an open and receptive mind."

is 'late', reflecting the development of the cult of the Buddha. The fact that bhikkhus are included in the cult is significant. In this regard, Jothiya Dhirasekera maintains:

We are all aware of the fact that the spiritual earnestness of early Buddhist monasticism soon receded into the background. In its place, the slower process of perfection through samsaric evolution, subject to birth in good and evil states (sugati and duggati) came to the fore and gained prominence. This tended, to a certain degree, even to secularize the monastic ideal. The reward for the religious life of the monk differed from that of the layman only in the matter of degree. They both shared a life of bliss in heaven, the monk excelling the layman with regard to his complexion, glory and lifespan.⁶³

The question remains as to whether the use of the term "pasanna citta" is in itself 'late' and need apply to a cult of the Buddha. If the answer to this question is "yes", then the reference to Ānanda's "heart of faith" (A I 228, p.208; see also our study, p.332) as capable of winning for him rule among devas and men⁶⁴ is also 'late', as indeed would be the prediction made by the Buddha of Ānanda's nibbāna in the Anguttara Nikāya. If the last statement is true, then we may view the whole subject of Ānanda's status as a sekha (non-arahant) as a later development, a creation of the hagiographers who preserved for us his place in the sources under discussion.

⁶³ Jothiya Dhirasekera, Buddhist Monastic Discipline, p.6.

⁶⁴ The terms used in the MPNS and the Anguttara Nikāya (A I 228, p.208) are, respectively, "pasanna citta" and "cittappasāda".

After the Buddha has provided Ānanda with the four places of pilgrimage, Ānanda suddenly asks the Buddha, "How are we to conduct ourselves, lord, with regard to womankind?" (D II 141, p.154). The Buddha responds by pointing out that they should, if at all possible, not be seen or talked to and that if this cannot be avoided, one should "keep wide awake" when dealing with them. As we have indicated in our discussions of the Vinaya Piṭaka, women were regarded as an hindrance to the monastic way of life. Further, in the account of the First Council (Cullavagga XI 288, p.400), Ānanda is regarded as the one responsible for gaining the admission of women into the Sangha and is accused of allowing women to be the first to honour the Buddha's body, in so doing 'defiling' the Buddha's body with their tears. Ānanda, as the above section of the MPNS suggests, should have known better.

Ānanda, having asked the Buddha about women, then asks what should be done with the remains of the Tathāgata. The Buddha responds, "Hinder not yourselves, Ānanda, by honouring the remains of the Tathāgata. Be zealous, I beseech you, Ānanda, in your own behalf! Devote yourselves to your own good! Be earnest, be zealous, be intent on your own good! There are wise men, Ānanda, among the nobles and among the brahmins, among the heads of houses, who are firm

believers in the Tathāgata; and they will do honour to the remains of the Tathagata" (D II 141, p.154).

In spite of the Buddha's reply, Ānanda again asks the Buddha what should be done with the remains of the Tathāgata (D II 142, p.155). On this occasion the Buddha, rather than reaffirming that the treatment of his remains should not be the concern of the bhikkhus, proceeds to provide Ānanda with the necessary details. André Bareau, in studying the above subject in the extant Buddhist sources, states:

Par conséquent, toutes nos sources sont bien d'accord ... les funérailles du Buddha sont le devoir des laïques et non des moines, qui n'ont pas à s'en soucier. Malgré les quelques variantes de forme que nous avons relevées ci-dessus, il ne fait aucun doute que cette unanimité prouve la fidélité à la version commune, donc à une ancienne tradition bien établie. Il est donc certain que les religieux des premiers âges du Bouddhisme devaient se tenir à l'écart de toute manifestation de culte funéraire, même rendu à leur maître vénéré, le Bienheureux lui-même, et s'en tenir à leurs propres tâches, à savoir la progression sur la Voie de la délivrance et la prédication. Le culte du Buddha et de ses reliques, du moins les formes extérieures de ce culte, durent être d'abord réservées aux dévots laïques. Du reste, la plupart des récits qui prônent de telles manifestations de vénération promettent aux fidèles des avantages qui ne sont vraiment séduisants que pour les laïques, à savoir la renaissance parmi les dieux et l'acquisition de ces biens que les gens du monde recherchent avec tant de fièvre mais auxquels les religieux doivent renoncer.⁶⁵

As a corollary to the above, David L. Snellgrove maintains:

There is no reference in the earliest known traditions to staid philosophically-minded disciples simply honouring the tomb of a revered religious master, who has left the world forever. There is certainly reference to all the complex

⁶⁵ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.37.

last rites as the proper responsibility of the layfolk rather than the monks, but we know from the evidence of inscriptions and scriptures that even in the earliest period the cult of the relic-containing stūpa was by no means left to the layfolk, and all the accounts of the extraordinary cult were recorded, recited, and finally written down by monks. There is no over-all account of Sākyamuni's final nirvāṇa which is not heavy with mythological significance. Apart from this cult, which identified him effectively as a Buddha, like the Buddhas of former times, Sākyamuni would probably remain quite unknown to us. It was precisely because of the faith that he instilled, that subsequent efforts were made to reconstruct important parts of his life. But these attempts were not made before the actual events were forgotten, or were so interpreted in accordance with mythical beliefs as to submerge almost entirely the historical person.

It is true that his subsequent followers included a number, certainly a minority, of philosophizing contemplatives, who were suspicious of excessive religious enthusiasm, but it is significant that they have preserved no tradition of a plausible historical figure. Their Buddha remains still the great miracle-working and omniscient sage. They may argue that since he has passed into final nirvāṇa, he can no longer give help to his followers in the realm of saṃsara, and many of the more rational philosophical sayings that they attribute to him, may well represent a reliable tradition of some of his actual teachings. But of the events of his life they record nothing which does not correspond with the presumably earlier mythological and legendary conceptions.⁶⁶

Snellgrove's above remarks are indeed intriguing in that they do justice to the extant Buddhist sources as we have them preserved. It is obvious to the reader of the MPNS that Ānanda's characterization in this Sutta (if not in the Pāli Canon generally) finds some of its roots in the conclusions brought forward by Bareau and Snellgrove.

⁶⁶David L. Snellgrove, "Sākyamuni's Final Nirvāṇa," BSO(A)S, XXXVI, Part 2, 1973, pp.410-411.

Ānanda's position as the (permanent) attendant to the Buddha necessitates that he have frequent contact not only with members of the Buddha's following (who have left the household life) but with householders as well. Ānanda is thus the representative of both the bhikkhus (and bhikkhunīs) and the laity. Thus, while the Buddha informs us, through Ānanda's questioning, that the remains of the Tathāgata should be the concern of the "nobles" (khattiyas), brāhmaṇas, etc., all the same the Buddha responds to Ānanda's question and actually provides the necessary details (D II 141-142, pp.154-156). The above conclusion is confirmed because the MPNS does not take it for granted that the khattiyas, etc., will know what to do with the remains of the Buddha. Thus the MPNS tells us that the Mallas of Kusinārā eventually consulted with Ānanda about what should be done with the Tathāgata's remains (D II 161, p.182).

The treatment of the Buddha's remains included the erecting of a thupa to the Buddha at the meeting of four cross roads, "And whosoever shall there place garlands or perfumes or paint, or make salutation there, or become in its presence calm in heart -- that shall long be to them for a profit and a joy" (D II 142, p.156).⁶⁷ In addition, the Buddha informs Ānanda that like a Tathāgata, the paccekabuddha, "true hearer" (sāvaka) and "king of kings" (rājā cakkavati) are also worthy of a thupa.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Compare D II 138, p.150 where veneration of the Buddha is de-emphasized.

⁶⁸ Doing pūja ('worship') at a thupa of a Buddha, etc.,

Following the above episode, the MPNS suddenly informs us that Ānanda goes into the Vihāra⁶⁹ and experiences the thought, "Alas! I remain still a learner [sekha], one who has yet to work out his own perfection. And the Master is about to pass away from me -- he who is so kind" (D II 143, pp.158-159). When the Buddha notices Ānanda is absent from the group of bhikkhus assembled before him, an unnamed bhikkhu informs the Buddha about the thoughts of Ānanda quoted above. The Buddha requests a "certain brother" to call Ānanda at the Buddha's request and, in Ānanda's presence, the Buddha declares:

Enough Ānanda! Do not let yourself be troubled; do not weep! Have I not already, on former occasions, told you that it is in the very nature of all things most near and dear unto us that we must divide ourselves from them ... For a long time, Ānanda have you been very near to me by acts of love, kind and good, that never varies, and is beyond all measure. For a long time, Ānanda, have you been very near to me by words of love ... by thoughts of love, kind and good ... You have done well ... Be earnest in effort, and you too shall soon be free from the Intoxications (D II 144, pp.158-159).

The lack of logical connection between the discussion of how the remains of the Buddha are to be treated and the

is regarded as a way to foster rebirth in the heavens (D II 142-143, pp.156-157). On this subject, see Akira Hirakawa, "The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relationship to the Worship of Stupas," The Toyo Bunko, No.22, 1963, pp.102-106; also see David L. Snellgrove, "Sākyamuni's Final Nirvāṇa," pp.409-411, part of which is quoted in our study above, pp.416-417.

⁶⁹The break in continuity between the discussion of the Buddha on those deserving a thupa and the now entering of Ānanda into the Vihāra has been noted by the Rhys Davids, DB II, p.157, fn.2, and André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.54.

sudden 'breakdown' of Ānanda, likely indicates, as André Bareau concludes, that the latter episode was inserted into the MPNS from an independent source.⁷⁰

Ananda expresses sorrow over the fact that: (1) he is still only a "learner" ("sekha", i.e. not an arahant) and (2) the Buddha "who is so kind" is about to die. The Buddha's response to Ananda's concerns concentrates on the second of the above considerations, leaving the first concern of Ānanda to his closing remarks. André Bareau, in comparing seven extant versions of the above event, concludes that the "primitive version" of the lamentations of Ānanda was concerned with the impending death of the Buddha and not with Ānanda's lack of arahanthood.⁷¹ In light of the fact that the Buddha (in the Pāli account) responds first and at length to the second of Ānanda's concerns, Bareau's position is probably correct.

Bareau suggests further that a likely reason for including the statement of Ānanda's concern over his lack of arahanthood in the above accounts rests with the interpretations of the authors and/or compilers of the MPNS of Ānanda's response to the coming death of the Buddha.⁷² That is, the authors and/or compilers of the MPNS felt the need to interpret or re-interpret the 'fact' that Ānanda,

⁷⁰ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.54.

⁷¹ Ibid., p.65.

⁷² Ibid., p.56.

perhaps the Buddha's rightful heir, was greatly distressed at the impending death of the Buddha and showed that distress. This view finds support in the fact that not all of the extant versions examined by Bareau in his study mention Ānanda's concern with his lack of arahanthood, though all of them mention Ānanda's distress at the coming death of the Buddha.⁷³ Further, Bareau suggests that Ānanda's distress at the inevitable death of the Buddha is also likely the origin of the discussion of Ānanda's arahanthood at the time of the First Council.⁷⁴

The Buddha's response to Ānanda's lamentations emphasizes the devotion of Ānanda to the Buddha not only in terms of Ānanda's attendanceship on the Buddha, but in deep friendship, "For a long time, Ānanda, have you been very near to me by acts of love, kind and good, that never varies, and is beyond all measure" (D II 145, p.159).

The Buddha then addresses the bhikkhus as follows:

Whosoever, brethren, have been Able Awakened Ones through the long ages of the past they also had servitors just as devoted to those Exalted Ones as Ānanda has been to me.
He is a clever man, brethren, is Ānanda, and wise.
He knows when it is the right time for the brethren or for the sisters of the Order, for devout men and devout women, for a king, or for a king's ministers, or for other teachers or for their disciples, to come and visit the Tathāgata.
Brethren, there are these four wonderful and marvellous qualities in Ānanda. Which are the four?

⁷³ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.56. See as an example the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin version; W.W. Rockhill, The Life of the Buddha, pp.135-136.

⁷⁴ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.56.

If, brethren, a number of the brethren of the Order should come to visit Ānanda, they are filled with joy on beholding him; and if Ānanda should then preach the truth to them, they are filled with joy at the discourse; while the company of brethren is ill at ease, brethren, when Ānanda is silent.

If brethren, a number of the sisters of the Order, ... or of devout men, ... or of devout women, should come to visit Ānanda... [repeats as in the case of the bhikkhus above] (D II 144-145, pp.159-160).

In addition to describing the "four wonderful and marvellous qualities in Ānanda", the Buddha also comments on the "four wonderful and marvellous qualities in a king of kings [raññe cakkavattimhi]" which parallel those qualities which Ānanda possesses (D II 145, p.160).

Previous to mentioning the four significant qualities of Ānanda, the Buddha (see the quotation above) comments on Ānanda's service as the personal attendant of the Tathāgata, knowing, for example, the appropriate time for bhikkhus to visit with the Buddha. Further, the Buddha alludes to the fact that Ānanda's attendanceship of the Buddha is 'archetypal' having its parallel in the attendants of previous Buddhas (D II 144, p.159; also see for previous Buddhas and their attendants D II 2-8, pp.6-7). The "four wonderful and marvellous qualities in Ānanda" also appear in the Anguttara Nikāya (A II 132, p.136), except that there the preamble regarding Ānanda's attendanceship of the Buddha which appears in the MPNS account is absent. The fact that the four special qualities of Ānanda appear in the Anguttara Nikāya

separated from the remarks regarding his attendanceship of the Buddha with its archetypal patterning is interesting. Do we see in the differences between these two accounts the attempt of the authors and/or compilers of the MPNS to limit Ānanda's powers by pointing out that his attendanceship was like any other attendanceship of previous Buddhas?

The four qualities in Ānanda which the Buddha goes on to relate and to contrast with those of the "king of kings" suggest that Ānanda is here being described as much more than merely the attendant of the Buddha. In fact, there is not even a single reference to Ānanda's attendanceship on the Buddha. The number "four" in the account is derived by referring to the four audiences which are concerned: the bhikkhus, bhikkhunīs, upāsakas and upāsikās. In each case, the Buddha's remarks emphasize the joy of seeing Ānanda, Ānanda's ability to discourse on the dhamma, and the fact that his silence brings discomfort to those in his presence.

The fact that Ānanda's qualities are contrasted with those of the "king of kings" is highly significant in that it points to Ānanda's prestige.⁷⁵ When, for example, one remembers that in the more fully developed biographies of the Buddha the position of the "king of kings" is contrasted with that of becoming a Buddha, the comparison of Ānanda

⁷⁵ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, pp.66-71.

with the "king of kings" (and vice versa) is indeed a prestigious comparison.⁷⁶ Interestingly André Bareau remarks that Ānanda, in the section under discussion, seems very much like another Sāriputta.⁷⁷

Following the above account, we have the section in the MPNS already discussed earlier in our study,⁷⁸ wherein Ānanda entreats the Buddha not to die "in this little wattle-and-daub town, in this town in the midst of the jungle" (D II 147, p.161). As we stated before, the remarks regarding the death place of the Buddha reflect the fact that subsequent to the Buddha's death, the insignificance of the place of his parinibbāna disturbed many of the authors and/or compilers of the Pāli Canon.

The Buddha having provided a discourse to Ānanda on the former significance of the death location of the Buddha (hence its present significance), informs Ānanda that he should enter Kusinārā to inform the people there of the Buddha's parinibbāna that evening. The Buddha also suggests that visiting the Tathāgata in these final hours is to be regarded as an important occasion (D II 147, p.162). The

⁷⁶See, for example, the account from the Nidānakathā in E.J. Thomas, The Life of Buddha, p.31.

⁷⁷André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.70. In this regard, it is interesting to note, as we have done previously, that Sāriputta and Ānanda were good friends, both were recognized for their great knowledge and that upon Sāriputta's death, his robe and bowl were brought first to Ānanda (S V 161, p.141).

⁷⁸See our study, pp.155-162.

Mallas of Kusinārā, hearing the news of the coming death of the Buddha,⁷⁹ "... some of them wept, dishevelled their hair, and stretched forth their arms and wept, fell prostrate on the ground and rolled to and fro in anguish at the thought:- 'Too soon will the Exalted One die! Too soon will the Happy One pass away! Full soon will the Light of the world vanish away!'" (D II 148, p.163). The response of some of the Mallas described above reminds us of the description of the response that the bhikkhus who were not arahants would have (see D II 157-158, p.177).

The involvement of the Mallas of Kusinārā in the pre-parinibbāna period, took the form of their being divided into family groups and being introduced by Ānanda to the Buddha one individual at a time (D II 148, pp.163-164). André Bareau rightly concludes that this approach to the impending death of the Buddha reflects the concerns of the hagiographers, as did the discussion regarding the location of the Buddha's death, that the parinibbāna be a momentous event.

Following the above events in the MPNS, we are given the description of the paribbājaka Subhadda's entry into the Buddha's following. Subhadda, having heard the news that the Buddha was about to die, and recognizing the fact that Tathāgatas do not often appear in the world, seeks

⁷⁹ Ānanda is described as being accompanied into Kusinārā "attended by another member of the Order" (D II 147, p.162).

out Ānanda and says, "Now a certain feeling of uncertainty has sprung up in my mind; and this faith have I in the Samaṇa Gotama, that he, methinks, is able so to present the truth that I might get rid of this feeling of uncertainty. O that I, even I, Ānanda, might be allowed to see the Samaṇa Gotama" (D II 149, pp.164-165). When Ananda replies that he thinks that a visit from Subhadda would be unwise because of the extremely weak condition of the Buddha, Subhadda repeats his request (D II 150, p.165). The Buddha overhears Subhadda's request and says, "It is enough, Ānanda! Do not keep out Subhadda. Subhadda, Ānanda, may be allowed to see the Tathāgata. Whatever Subhadda may ask of me, he will ask from a desire for knowledge, and not to annoy me. And whatever I may say in answer to his questions, that he will quickly understand" (D II 150, p.165).

André Bareau comments on the place of Subhadda

(Subhadra in the Sanskrit) as follows:

Le nom Subhadra, signifiant "Très heureux", convient fort bien à ce religieux qui a la chance d'être le dernier homme converti par le Buddha en personne, de sorte qu'on peut le considérer comme choisi par les hagiographes en raison de ce fait; il faut cependant reconnaître qu'il est très courant dans l'onomastique indienne, bouddhique en particulier, vraisemblablement à cause de son sens auspiceux. Subhadra n'apparaît qu'en cet épisode et le suivant dans la tradition pseudo-historique du Bouddhisme; ignoré avant la nuit du Parinirvāṇa, ce qu'explique son caractère hétérodoxe, il disparaît aussitôt après, le très grand âge qui lui attribue la quasi totalité de nos textes en donnant une raison valable; ce personnage essentiellement épisodique, pourtant un nom assez commun mais dont le sens lui convient

très bien, paraît donc avoir été inventé pour les seuls besoins du récit. La dernière conversion opérée par le Buddha est un fait historique puisqu'il y eut évidemment un homme à qui le Bienheureux prêcha la loi, mais on n'en avait presque certainement gardé aucun souvenir. A partir de ce thème simple, on a imaginé l'heureux homme ayant bénéficié de cette chance extrême et les autres éléments de l'épisode.⁸⁰

One may note in passing that Ānanda's 'mistake' regarding the admission of Subhadda into the Buddha's presence contradicts the claim seen earlier in the MPNS that Ānanda knows the right time for allowing people to visit with the Buddha (see D II 145-146, p.159 and our p. 421 above). Bareau is correct in pointing out the importance to be attached to the last member to join the Buddha's following prior to the parinibbāna and, with this in mind, one notes that the usual four month probationary period is waived for Subhadda who, soon after being ordained, becomes an arahant (D II 152-153, pp.168-169).⁸¹

Following the ordination of Subhadda, the MPNS relates a number of short discourses directed by the Buddha to Ānanda. The first of these discourses runs as follows:

It may be, Ānanda, that in some of you the thought may arise, 'The word of the master is ended, we have no teacher more!' But it is not thus, Ānanda, that you should regard it. The Truths, and the Rules of

⁸⁰ André Bareau, *Recherches...*, Tome II, pp.92-93.

⁸¹ Ānanda performs the pabbajjā ("going forth") while the Buddha performs the 'higher ordination' (upasam-padā). See the remarks of the translators, the Rhys Davids, DB II, p.169, fn.2.

the Order, which I have set forth and laid down for you all, let them, after I am gone, be the Teacher to you (D II 154, p.171).

The Buddha's remarks make it plain that the Dhamma and Vinaya should become the 'teacher' to the bhikkhus after the death of the Tathāgata. This discourse to Ānanda sets the stage for the recitation of the dhamma and the vinaya at the Council of Rājagaha.⁸²

Further the Buddha informs Ānanda:

Ānanda, when I am gone address not one another in the way in which the brethren have heretofore addressed each other -- with the epithet that is, of 'Avuso' (Friend). A younger brother may be addressed by an elder with his name, or his family name, or the title 'Friend'. But an Elder should be addressed by a younger brother as 'Sir' or as 'Venerable Sir' [i.e. bhante or āyasmā] (D II 154, p.171).

The 'lateness' of the above injunction is apparent in that it is to come into operation after the Buddha's parinibbāna. There are thus good reasons to assume that the above system of naming reflects a period when the Sangha had become relatively complex and sufficiently large in number to warrant a protocol distinguishing junior from senior bhikkhus.⁸³

⁸²One may note in passing that according to the Cullavagga (XI 284-285, p.394) the need to hold a recitation of the dhamma and vinaya are the results of Subhadda's remarks regarding the fact that now that they are free of the Buddha, the bhikkhus may do as they please. While the commentators distinguish between Subhadda the last convert and Subhadda the bhikkhu who causes dissension in the Sangha, the fact that they both have the same name is intriguing (see DPPN II, pp.1231-1232).

⁸³See Narendra Wagle, Society at the Time of the Buddha, pp.57-59.

Next, the Buddha tells Ānanda, "When I am gone, Ānanda, let the Order, if it should so wish, abolish all the lesser and minor precepts" (D II 154, p.171). The fact that this statement is made to Ānanda alone is brought forward in the Cullavagga (XI 287-288, pp.398-401) account of the First Council; for, when Ānanda mentions what the Buddha had said to him regarding the "lesser and minor precepts" the bhikkhus ask for the details. Since Ānanda cannot supply these details, the bhikkhus take him to task for not having asked the specifics of which rules in particular the Buddha had in mind.

André Bareau points out that the discourse to Ānanda by the Buddha regarding the "lesser and minor precepts" is not found in all of the versions of the MPNS and is best considered an interpolation. In addition, in some of the extant accounts of the MPNS the Buddha addresses his remarks regarding the "lesser and minor precepts" not to Ānanda alone, but to a body of five hundred bhikkhus, many of whom are supposedly more advanced than Ānanda; and as in the Pāli case, in which Ānanda is central, the bhikkhus (many of whom are arahants) also fail to ask the Buddha for the details.⁸⁴

One must conclude that, at some point after the Buddha's death, a controversy arose regarding certain of the disciplinary rules existing at the time and/or in their implementation.

⁸⁴André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, pp.137-140.

In order to do justice to the situation, the hagiographers of some of the extant sources invented a situation in which they acknowledged the fact that changes had been suggested as a possibility, but that Ānanda had failed to get the details from the Buddha. Indeed one has no difficulty in understanding that, as time went on, there must have been the need to modify, drop and introduce new disciplinary rules into the code of discipline for the bhikkhus. Equally, one may assume that there were 'orthodox' bhikkhus (e.g. in the Pāli case) who felt that little if any change should be made in the existing Vinaya; by using Ānanda, they were able to both acknowledge the need for change, and at the same time avoid it. The fact that the authors and/or compilers had to take the route of acknowledging that the Buddha had suggested as a possibility (to Ānanda and/or the bhikkhus) that changes could be made in the existing rules likely attests to the nature of an 'oral tradition'; it seems probable that there were at least a number of 'oral traditions' in circulation out of which the authors and/or compilers of the extant sources had to choose. In this regard, the Cullavagga (XI 290, p.402) records that when Purāṇa arrived after the recitation of the dhamma and vinaya (at the First Council) and was asked to "submit [himself] to this chanting," he replied, "... in that way that I heard it in the Lord's presence, that I received it in his presence, in that same way will I bear it in mind." Thus, the authors and/or

compilers of the MPNS were, in responding to the tradition that the Buddha had actually suggested that the "lesser and minor precepts" could be abolished, merely responding to one of the traditional oral accounts circulating at the time. The fact that, for example, in the Pāli case it is Ānanda who is blamed, indicates that by the time the MPNS (i.e. the Pāli version) was compiled in its final form, Ānanda had become the easy and ideal peg on which to hang all problems having an integral connection with the Buddha.

Finally, there are a number of common sense arguments which militate against taking the issue of the "lesser and minor precepts" as an event likely to have occurred during the Buddha's lifetime. Firstly, why should the Buddha (in the Pāli account) address his remarks regarding the precepts only to Ānanda? Why, for example, was Upāli not involved as an obvious choice? Secondly, how do we understand the apparent light-heartedness which the Buddha takes toward the issue of the precepts? Thirdly, how are we to view the Buddha's suggestion that changes in the discipline may take place with the statements made earlier in the MPNS that the Buddha "in respect of the truths ... has no such thing as the closed fist of a teacher, who keeps some things back ... why then should he leave instructions in any matter concerning the Order?" (D II 100, p.107). Finally, as we have just noted, the Buddha stated, "The Truths, and the

Rules of the Order, which I have set forth and laid down for you all [our italics], let them, after I am gone, be the Teacher to you" (D II 154, p.171). It is thus totally out of character that the Buddha, at the moment of his death, should suddenly suggest the abolition of the "lesser and minor precepts," precepts which, according to the Cullavagga (XI 287-288, pp.398-400), none of the bhikkhus could even agree upon in definition.

The last of the short discourses delivered to Ānanda by the Buddha is as follows:

When I am gone, Ānanda, let the higher penalty be imposed on brother Channa.
'But what, lord, is the higher penalty?'
Let Channa say whatever he may like, Ānanda, the brethren should neither speak to him, nor exhort him, nor admonish him (D II 154, pp.171-172).

The details behind the imposition of the "higher penalty" upon Channa are provided in the Pāli Commentaries and, to some extent, in the Cullavagga of the First Council.⁸⁵ Bareau indicates in a number of his studies that the incident involving Channa is an interpolation.⁸⁶

The next discourse of the Buddha in the MPNS is addressed to the bhikkhus:

It may be, brethren, that there may be doubt or misgiving in the mind of some brother as to the Buddha, or the doctrine, or the path, or the method. Inquire brethren freely. Do not have to reproach yourselves afterwards with the thought: 'Our teacher was face to face with us, and we could not bring ourselves to inquire of the Exalted One when we were face to face with him' (D II 154-155, p.172).

⁸⁵ See the DPPN I, pp.923-923, "3. Channa"; also Cullavagga XI 290-292, pp.402-405.

⁸⁶ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, pp.132-135; see also his Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, pp.25-26.

After the Buddha has repeated the above for a second and a third time without receiving an answer, Ānanda responds:

How wonderful a thing it is, lord, and how marvellous! Verily I believe that in this whole assembly of the brethren there is not one brother who has any doubt or misgiving as to the Buddha, or the doctrine, or the path, or the method (D II 155, p.173).

To which the Buddha replies:

It is out of the fullness of faith [pasāda] that thou has spoken, Ānanda! But, Ānanda, the Tathāgata knows for certain [naṇam] that in this whole assembly of the brethren there is not one brother who has any doubt or misgiving ... For even the most backward, Ānanda, of all these five hundred brethren has become converted ... is assured of hereafter attaining to the Enlightenment [of arahantship] (D II 155, p.173).

We have already seen and discussed the above Sutta as it appeared in the Anguttara Nikāya (A II 79-80, pp.88-89).⁸⁷ Further to what we have already said when discussing the above Sutta earlier in our study, we may note that in the context in which we have the Sutta in the MPNS, it functions to assure the listener that, at the time of the Buddha's parinibbāna, there were no doubts regarding the Buddha, his Way, etc.⁸⁸ However, in spite of the Buddha's assurances that all the bhikkhus are without doubts or misgivings, we are to learn that, soon after the Buddha's parinibbāna, Subhadda, a bhikkhu, declared:

Enough, sirs! Weep not, neither lament! We are well rid of the great Saṃaṇa. We used to be annoyed by being told:-- 'This beseems you, this beseems you not.' But now we shall be able to do whatever we like... (D II 162, p.184).

⁸⁷ See our study, pp.336ff.

⁸⁸ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.147.

Before the Buddha attains the parinibbāna, he once again informs the bhikkhus, "Decay is inherent in all component things! Work out your salvation with diligence!" (D II 156, p.173). Then the Buddha, having given his last message to the bhikkhus, enters the various stages of meditation (jhāna). At one point Ānanda, mistaking the deep stages of meditation for death, exclaims, "O my lord, O Anuruddha, the Exalted One is dead!" Anuruddha responds, "Nay! brother Ānanda, the Exalted One is not dead. He has entered into that state in which both sensations and ideas have ceased to be!" (D II 156, p.174). André Bareau comments on the substance of the above exchange as follows:

Les allusions à cette erreur sont dispersées dans les ouvrages canoniques et post-canoniques du Bouddhisme ancien; il semble qu'elle ait pris naissance dans des sectes hétérodoxes dont les ascètes prétendaient entrer dans le Parinirvāṇa alors qu'ils n'atteignaient que le recueillement de cessation; elle paraît avoir été partagée par certains moines bouddhiques abusés par la ressemblance entre les deux phénomènes. Cependant, il y avait entre ces derniers une différence capitale, essentielle même, qui aurait dû leur éviter cette confusion, en effet, le recueillement n'était qu'un état temporaire, pendant lequel on demeurait en vie et d'où l'on ressortait, tandis que le Parinirvāṇa était un état définitif, que l'on n'atteignait qu'au moment de la mort et d'où l'on ne revenait pas. Par conséquent, la possibilité de retomber dans un état psychique normal et de retourner à la vie ordinaire permettait de distinguer le premier du second.⁸⁹

In addition to the technical remarks of Bareau, the error of Ānanda, his mistaking the meditative state for death,

⁸⁹ André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.154.

reflects Ānanda's lack of knowledge in the meditative sphere, a lack which is not shared by Anuruddha.

At the death (parinibbāna) of the Buddha, a number of verses are uttered; those which are attributed to the bhikkhus are presented by Anuruddha and Ānanda (D II 157, pp.176-177).

Anuruddha's verses are as follows:

When he who from all craving want was free,
Who to Nirvana's tranquil state had reached,
When the great sage finished his span of life,
No gasping struggle vexed that steadfast heart!

All resolute, and with unshaken mind,
He calmly triumphed o'er the pain of death.
E'en as a bright flame dies away, so was
The last emancipation of his heart (D II 157, p.176).

Following immediately after Anuruddha's verses, Ānanda declares:

Then was there terror!
Then stood the hair on end!
When he endowed with every grace --
The supreme Buddha -- died!

The above verses are also recorded in the Samyutta Nikāya (S I 158-159, pp.197-198), except that the order of their recitation is reversed; Ānanda recites his single verse before Anuruddha recites his two verses. One may further note that in the Samyutta Nikāya account, there is no mention of Ānanda mistaking the meditative state of the Buddha for death; in fact the entire incident is omitted in any form. The account of the Buddha's death in the Samyutta Nikāya would seem, in its simplicity, to be an earlier account

than that provided us in the parallel account in the MPNS.

Are we to assume that the order in which the verses are uttered at the time of the Buddha's death is meant to reflect the status of those individuals concerned?

Przyluski's answer is 'yes'. Further, Przyluski contends that the fact that Ānanda speaks before Anuruddha in the Samyutta Nikāya account (an account perhaps to be regarded as 'earlier' than the one provided in the MPNS) suggests that at the time Ānanda was still regarded as the more venerable of the two:

Qu'on se reporte aux stances du Parinirvāṇa dans les deux Suttas palis [i.e. the account in the MPNS and that in the Samyutta Nikāya]. On constate que les personnages s'y présentent dans un ordre tout différent. Le Bhikṣu anonyme a disparu [he is present in our versions]; Brahma chante d'abord; puis vient Sakra. Ici les chanteurs sont rangés dans l'ordre d'importance décroissante. Dans ces conditions, lequel des deux disciples va chanter le premier? Les théologiens, imbus des nouvelles doctrines sur l'excellence de l'Arhat, voulaient sans doute que ce fût Anuruddha, tandis que les conservateurs, respectueux des vieilles traditions, voulaient que ce fût Ānanda. Les stances du Samyutta pali montrent la tradition, encore puissante, maintenant Ānanda au premier rang des disciples; dans les stances du Mahāparinibbāna, au contraire, on voit le triomphe des novateurs⁹⁰ qui réussissent à repousser Ānanda au second plan.

The difference in the status of Anuruddha (an arahant) and Ānanda (a learner, sekha) is supposedly revealed in the

⁹⁰ Jean Przyluski, "Le parinirvāṇa et les funérailles du buddha," JA, mai-juin 1918, p.525. For the entire discussion, see pp.485-526. See also the remarks of André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.165, fn.1.

nature of the verses spoken by each of these bhikkhus at the parinibbāna of the Buddha. Anuruddha's two verses (see p.436 above) emphasize the calmness and effectiveness of the Buddha in achieving the parinibbāna, while Ānanda's verse speaks not of the Buddha's success but of the fear and terror which the Buddha's death engendered in the minds of those he left behind. The 'emotional' response of Ānanda is to be regarded as illustrating that he was not an arahant. Thus, for example, the Theragāthā, wherein the single verse uttered by Ānanda at the time of the Buddha's death is also preserved,⁹¹ offers another verse uttered by Ānanda immediately preceding the one quoted above (see p.436):

I am a learner, who still has something to do,
not having attained mental perfection; and the
quenching (has occurred) of the teacher who was
sympathetic to me.⁹²

Following Ānanda's verse in the MPNS indicating the unhappiness released at the death of the Buddha, we learn that as a result of the parinibbāna many bhikkhus broke down and wept, but that those bhikkhus who were "free from the passions [the arahants] bore their grief collected and composed at the thought: 'Impermanent are all component things! How is it possible that [they should not be dissolved]?' " (D II 157-158, p.177).⁹³

⁹¹Theragāthā, verse 1046; in Norman's translation, p.96.

⁹²Ibid., verse 1045 (p.96).

⁹³The bracketed information is provided by the translator, supposedly on the basis of the account which follows immediately after, wherein Anuruddha repeats the pertinent information. However, this is only partly true, for the term "arahant" does not appear in any of the accounts which

Anuruddha reminds the distraught bhikkhus that the Buddha had informed them that it was in the nature of things that one must eventually separate oneself from that which is most near and dear (D II 158, p.177). Further, Anuruddha warns the bhikkhus that the devatās ("spirits") will reproach them if they do not recover their composure.⁹⁴

Ānanda questions Anuruddha as to what kind of devatās the latter has in mind and, in response, Anuruddha informs Ānanda that there are "spirits in the sky" and "on the earth" who, like the bhikkhus who are not "free from passions," are also weeping, but that those devatās who are "free from passion ... [are] calm and self-possessed, mindful of the saying which begins: 'Impermanent indeed are all component things...' (D II 158, pp.178-179).

Anuruddha and Ānanda spend the rest of the evening in discourse and then Anuruddha informs Ānanda, "Go now, brother [āvuso] Ānanda, into Kusinārā and inform the Mallas of Kusinārā, saying:-- 'The Exalted One ... is dead; do, then, whatever seemeth to you fit!' Even so, lord [bhante] said the venerable Ānanda ..." (D II 158, p.179).⁹⁵

follow. To describe those bhikkhus who were "free from the passions" as "arahants" would necessitate the same attribution being applied to the devatās in the parallel passages (D II 140, p.153; D II 158, pp.178-179). The problem seems to have caught the eyes of the authors and/or compilers of the MPNS at D II 159-160, pp.179-180, where the passage is altered.

⁹⁴This view of the devatās suggests that they were a force to be reckoned with, as we also see at the time of the Buddha's funeral (D II 160, p.181).

⁹⁵The terms of address (i.e. "āvuso" and "bhante")

Ānanda goes to the council hall of the Mallas of Kusinārā and provides them with the message of Anuruddha quoted above. Many of the Mallas are distraught at the news, but they gather themselves together to carry out the Buddha's funeral (D II 158-159, pp.179-180).⁹⁶

Ānanda's last appearance in the MPNS has him being consulted by the Mallas of Kusinārā concerning the proper manner to treat the remains of the Buddha. Ānanda, drawing on the knowledge he gained from the Buddha's own mouth on the subject, provides the Mallas with the needed directions (D II 160, pp.182-183; also see D II 141-142, pp.154-156).

As our study concerns itself with the Pāli MPNS we have avoided drawing detailed comparisons between the Pāli MPNS and its extant parallels in the non-Pāli sources of Buddhist literature. However some comparative work would seem to be warranted at this point. This comparative analysis is undertaken primarily to reveal to the reader the nature of Buddhist literature by examining the variations in which events which are central to Ānanda's characterization are depicted.

make it clear that Anuruddha is Ānanda's senior; see pp.33-34 of our study. The reference to do "whatever seemeth ... fit" likely pertains to the funeral of the Buddha, implying that it should not be placed in the hands of the bhikkhus; see also D II 141, pp.154-155.

⁹⁶When Ānanda informs the Mallas of Kusinārā of the Buddha's death, they are seemingly all "grieved, and sad, and afflicted at heart..." although only some of them weep and cry out in the manner of the bhikkhus who had not yet been freed from the passions (D II 159, p.179).

Taking, for example, the issue of Anuruddha's part in consoling the bhikkhus after the Buddha's death, one finds in the version provided by the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivāda that Anuruddha is himself shaken by the death of the Buddha and asks Ānanda to do the consoling.⁹⁷ Similarly, one can even find an account in which the verse attributed to Ānanda in the Pāli MPNS is attributed to Anuruddha.⁹⁸ Further, there are versions in which other verses are attributed to Ānanda (verses not ascribed to him in the Pāli account) which reveal Ānanda to be a master of ceremonies at the death of the Buddha.⁹⁹

The Pāli version of the MPNS wants us to consider the shock implied in Ānanda's verse as suggesting that Ānanda was not yet an arahant. On the other hand it seems to us only natural that the death of the Buddha would have pained the individuals who had been close to him. If the death of the Buddha merely reflects something which is in the nature of things, why did the authors and/or compilers of the MPNS so embellish it?

⁹⁷David L. Snellgrove, "Sākyamuni's Final Nirvāṇa," BSO(A)S, Vol.XXXVI, Part II, 1973, p.405. See also André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, pp.171-174.

⁹⁸This is to be found in the Avadāna Śataka; M. Léon Feer, Annales du Musée Guimet, XVIII, p.431. See also, Jean Przyluski, "Le parinirvāṇa et les funérailles du buddha," JA, mai-juin, 1918, p.508, and the remarks of André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.165, fn.1.

⁹⁹See the discussion in Jean Przyluski, "Le parinirvāṇa...", pp.485-526 and André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, pp.157-171.

If Ānanda was so totally distraught at the death of the Buddha, why would Anuruddha choose him to inform the Mallas of Kusinārā? Perhaps we are to understand Ānanda's position as 'intermediary' between the bhikkhus (like Anuruddha) and the laity as a continuation of the job he held as the attendant to the Buddha. Or do we see in Anuruddha's use of Ānanda as the informer of the Buddha's death merely the reflection of the fact that, as an arahant, Anuruddha should not concern himself with the dead body of the Buddha (see D II 141, p.154). Yet, if arahants were not to involve themselves with the remains of the Buddha, why was it necessary to maintain that the funeral pyre would not light until Mahā Kassapa appeared? (D II 163, p.185).

The MPNS paves the way for the Council of Rājagaha by both mentioning the disturbing remarks of Subhadda which threaten to cause dissension in the Sangha (D II 162, p.184) and by pointing to Mahā Kassapa as the bhikkhu most likely to take the place of the Buddha.

Mahā Kassapa's status is revealed to us in the MPNS by having the devatās refuse to allow the Buddha's funeral pyre to light until Mahā Kassapa and the five hundred bhikkhus under him have paid their respects to the Buddha (D II 184, p.187). Snellgrove rightly remarks that this incident is designed to establish the authority of Mahā Kassapa over Ānanda.¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰See David L. Snellgrove, "Sākyamuni's Final Nirvana," p.406.

TIME: 1:30 p.m.

PLACE: UH 317

All are we

ĀNANDA: HIS PLACE AT THE C

There are many aspects of Council" which, while intriguing a are beyond the scope of our study. primarily is the hagiographical pr in the Cullavagga account of the ' (pañcasatikkhanda), and it is to turn.

The Cullavagga takes as its recitation of the Dhamma and Vinaya, the remarks made by Subhadda just after the Buddha's death:

Then at that time, your reverences, one named Subhadda, who had gone forth when old, was sitting in that assembly. Then, your reverences, Subhadda who had gone forth when old spoke thus to the monks: "Enough, your reverences, do not grieve, do not lament, we are well rid of this great recluse. We were

¹There are some grounds to believe that at one time the MPNS and the account of the Councils formed one continuous narrative. See E. Frauwallner, The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature, pp.42-43. See also the discussion in Charles S. Prebish, "A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils," JAS XXXIII, No.2, Feb.1974, pp.239-240.

²Regarding the First Council we recommend the following sources and studies: Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha; André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques; Charles S. Prebish, "A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils," JAS XXXIII, No.2, Feb.1974, pp.239-254; Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "The Buddhist Councils," The Indian Antiquary, XXXVII, 1908, pp.1-18.

worried when he said: 'This is allowable to you, this is not allowable to you.' But now we will be able to do as we like and we won't do what we don't like." (Cullavagga XI 284-285, p.394).³

Mahā Kassapa's response to Subhadda's remarks was to call for a recitation of the Dhamma and Vinaya:

Come, let us, your reverences, chant dhamma and discipline before what is not dhamma shines out and dhamma is withheld, before what is not discipline shines out and discipline is withheld, before those who speak what is not-dhamma become strong and those who speak dhamma become feeble, before those who speak what is not discipline become strong and those who speak discipline become feeble (Cullavagga XI 285, p.394).⁴

The Bāhiranidāna, Buddhaghosa's introduction to the Samantapāsādikā (Smp. I 4, p.4), contains a more detailed account of the First Council,⁵ in which, in addition to Subhadda's remarks, one also finds expressed the fear that

³Regarding Subhadda, see T.W. and C.A.F. Rhys Davids, DB II, p.184, fn.1; I.B. Horner, BD V, p.394, fn.1; and DPPN, p.1231, "5. Subhadda". It is also of interest to compare the Subhadda incident in the Cullavagga account with that recorded in the MPNS (D II 162, p.184). In the MPNS account the remarks of Subhadda seem to be an interpolation, as they are sandwiched in between the news of the Ajivaka to Mahā Kassapa that the Buddha is dead, which caused some of the bhikkhus to weep and resulted in the advice of Mahā Kassapa that the bhikkhus should cease to weep and remember that it is in the nature of things that we have to eventually separate ourselves from them. See André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, pp.223-230.

⁴This speech is also used in the account of the Second Council (see Cullavagga XIII 299, p.414). Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhique, p.28, comments on the fact that the account of the First Council often seems to have been inspired by the account of the Second Council.

⁵This account is obviously later than that of the Cullavagga and represents the Mahāvihāra tradition; see N.A. Jayawickrama, The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna, p.xv.

without the Buddha the bhikkhus would "form factions."

Further, Buddhaghosa reports (Smp. I 6, pp.4-5) that Mahā Kassapa said, "Let us, friends, rehearse the Dhamma and the Vinaya: in the past what was contrary to the Dhamma and the Vinaya prevailed, the Dhamma and Vinaya were disregarded; those who held views contrary to the Dhamma and Vinaya held sway while those who professed the Dhamma and Vinaya were powerless."

Bareau does not believe it likely that there could have been, historically speaking, much concern with dissident members of the Buddha's following in the period following immediately after the death of the Buddha, certainly not a threat which would necessitate the holding of a Council.⁶ In fact, we might note that there is much debate over the historicity of the First Council among Buddhist scholars, many of whom, including the author of this study, believe the First Council to have been a popular, though basically a fictional, creation of those who preserved for us the buddhavaṇṇa.⁷

Returning to the Cullavagga account, Mahā Kassapa⁸

⁶André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, pp.28-29.

⁷In this regard see Charles S. Prebish, "A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils," pp.239-246.

⁸Mahā Kassapa is here regarded as the leader of the bhikkhus. The MPNS shows the importance of Mahā Kassapa when it tells us that the Buddha's funeral pyre would not light until he arrived (D II 163-164, pp.185-186). Mahā

having suggested the need for a recitation of the dhamma and vinaya, is requested by the bhikkhus present that he should select those who are to participate in the recitation of the buddhavacana. At their request, Mahā Kassapa chooses four hundred and ninety-nine bhikkhus⁹ who are at that time arahants, at which the bhikkhus point out:

Honoured sir, this Ānanda, although he is still a learner [sekho], could not be one to follow a wrong course through desire, anger, delusion, fear; and he has mastered much dhamma and discipline under the Lord. Well now, honoured sir, let the elder select the venerable Ānanda as well (Cullavagga XI 285, p.394).

The Bāhiranidāna (Smp. I 6-7, pp.5-6) goes beyond the Cullavagga account, claiming that Mahā Kassapa deliberately chose only four hundred and ninety-nine bhikkhus so as to make room for Ānanda, realizing that it would be impossible to

Kassapa's status is clearly indicated in the Bāhiranidāna (Smp. I 5, p.4) where we are informed that the Buddha told Mahā Kassapa that he could wear the Buddha's robes and that the Buddha had declared Mahā Kassapa equal to him in the "transcendental attainments." Mahā Kassapa asks rhetorically, "Has not the Exalted One conferred upon me this unique honour of considering me as the protector of the lineage of His Good Teaching even as a king would his own son as the perpetuator of his dynasty by conferring upon him his armour and regal splendor?"

The above suggestion of Mahā Kassapa as 'patriarch' contravenes the Buddha's injunction in the MPNS (D II 100, p.108) against such a situation.

Regarding Mahā Kassapa's status, see also S II 208-225, pp.140-152, especially S II 221-222, pp.149-150, where the accruing of the Buddha's robe to Mahā Kassapa is mentioned. One may note, in this regard, that Ānanda (D II 133, pp.144-145) is given one of the robes which Pukkusa has presented to the Buddha. The Bāhiranidāna (Smp. I 8, p.70) describes Ānanda before the convening of the Council as "... taking with him the bowl and robe of the Exalted One and being attended by a company of bhikkhus [going] on a missionary tour in the direction of Sāvattī."

⁹ See also Smp. I 6, pp.4-5.

hold a successful recitation of the buddhavacana without him. However, Mahā Kassapa could not himself select Ānanda for, if he had done so, he might have incurred the criticism of other bhikkhus who might feel that Mahā Kassapa's choice reflected the fact that Ānanda was born of the Sākya clan and was the cousin of the Buddha.¹⁰ Thus the Bāhiranidāna informs us that Mahā Kassapa abdicated the responsibility of choosing Ānanda so as to avoid any criticism, allowing the bhikkhus themselves to choose Ānanda, which they did.

In both the Cullavagga and the Bāhiranidāna the fact that Ānanda is still a learner (sekha), does not bar him from actually being chosen as a member of the Council, the implication being that his knowledge of the dhamma and vinaya of the Buddha was so extensive that he would have to be present at the Council if it was to be successful. Before moving on, it might be interesting to note some of the other extant accounts describing Ānanda being chosen to attend the Council.

¹⁰This reference to favouritism on the basis of familial relationship can also be found in the "going forth" of Ānanda and the other Sākyans when Upāli is allowed to "go forth" before them in order to humble the Sākya pride; see Cullavagga VII 183, p.257. See also our study, p.92.

The Vinaya of the Mahāsaṃghika records that when Mahā Kassapa referred to Ānanda as a "mangy jackal", Ānanda had the following thought, "Le Bhagavat est entré dans le parinirvāṇa. Voici que je désire justement rejoindre (Kāśyapa). Pourquoi me considérer et fit encore cette réflexion: 'Le Grand Kāśyapa connaît bien ma parenté et mon nom. C'est justement parce que mes liens ne sont pas encore détruit qu'il a prononcé ces paroles;" Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, p.208.

The Sarvāstivādin Vinaya account has Mahā Kassapa recommending Ānanda on the basis that the Buddha had declared Ānanda to be the foremost of those who had heard much (bahu-ssuta).¹¹ The Dharmaguptaka Vinaya has the assembly propose that Ānanda be chosen as a Council member, but Mahā Kassapa objects because Ānanda is still a learner and therefore capable of following a wrong course because he is still under the spell of the four passions. Thus the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya contradicts the Cullavagga in claiming that Ānanda was still under the spell of the four agatis. However, when the assembly pleads Ānanda's case, pointing out that Ānanda had been the Buddha's constant companion and had heard and understood in all its details the Buddha's teachings, Mahā Kassapa acquiesces to the bhikkhus' wishes to include Ānanda.¹²

The Haimavata (in the P'i-ni mou louen) has a similar account to that in the Dharmaguptaka, except that Mahā Kassapa demands that the bhikkhus authorize Ānanda's acceptance as a Council member.¹³

¹¹ André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, p.8; also Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, p.225.

¹² Ibid., Bareau, p.8; Przyluski, pp.171-172. The Vinaya of the Dharmagupta states, regarding the Council members, "... il faut maintenant choisir et désigner des bhikṣu ayant beaucoup entendu (bahuśruta), sages et qui soient arhat" (Przyluski, p.171). The implication here is that one may be bahussuta, though not necessarily an arahant.

¹³ Ibid., Bareau, p.8; Przyluski, pp.171-172.

The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya has the assembly of bhikkhus recommend Ānanda on the basis of his having been the Buddha's attendant and also on his having heard much (bahussuta). Mahā Kassapa refuses to allow Ānanda to attend the Council because he is still a learner under the spell of the four agatis: desire, hatred, delusion and fear.¹⁴

The Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya is even more hostile to Ānanda than the previous account (i.e. the Mahīśāsaka) in having Mahā Kassapa compare Ānanda to a "mangy jackal."¹⁵ In this account, Ānanda is recommended by a single bhikkhu who describes Ānanda as the Buddha's attendant who has received the doctrine from the mouth of the Buddha himself. However, Ānanda is only accepted as a member of the Council once he has attained arahanthood.¹⁶

There are other accounts of the Council of Rājagaha, but the above examples should give the reader some idea of the variations in the extant sources.¹⁷

All the accounts, no matter how Mahā Kassapa treats Ānanda, recognize the fact that Ānanda has knowledge of the buddhavaṇṇa, a knowledge which makes of him an important

¹⁴ André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, p.8; Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, p.137. Ānanda is accepted as a Council member in this account only after he has attained arahanthood. It is also interesting to note that the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya speaks of the Council as an assembly of the Vinaya; see Przyluski, p.137 and his fn.1.

¹⁵ Ibid., Bareau, p.8; Przyluski, p.208.

¹⁶ Ibid., Przyluski, pp.207-208; see also p.209 where Ānanda is described as bahussuta.

¹⁷ For more details, see Przyluski.

candidate for any recitation of the buddhavacana. All the above accounts, except the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya which accepts Ānanda outright as a Council member, draw attention to Ānanda's lack of arahanthood, although in the majority of the cases we have cited Ānanda's lack of arahanthood does not prevent him from being chosen as a Council member.

The information available to us through the above accounts suggests that Ānanda's characterization as bahussuta, a characterization which makes him an 'ideal' Council member and which is, to some degree at least, the outcome of his attendanceship of the Buddha, does not in any way imply that arahanthood is a concomitant feature of Ānanda's characterization as bahussuta.

It is also of note that in none of the accounts so far discussed does Ānanda feel it necessary to explain his lack of arahanthood to Mahā Kassapa or the assembly of other bhikkhus. An exception to this rule is to be found in a commentary, the Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra of Nāgārjuna, which we have already alluded to in our study. In this commentarial account Nāgārjuna quotes the following thoughts and words of Ānanda on his being refused membership in the Council:

Alors Ānanda pleura de honte et fit cette réflexion: "Pendant vingt-cinq ans j'ai accompagné le Bhagavat; je l'ai servi; j'étais à sa disposition. Je n'ai point encore enduré une si grande douleur. Le Buddha était vraiment vénérable, miséricordieux et patient." Ayant fait cette réflexion, il dit au Grand Kāśyapa: "J'en avais le pouvoir et

la force et, à la longue, j'aurais pu trouver la Voie, mais les Arhat, dans la loi du Buddha, ne peuvent servir personne, être à la disposition de personne, ni exécuter des ordres. C'est pour cette raison que je suis resté dans une condition inférieure et que mes liens ne sont pas entièrement rompus."¹⁸

Ānanda's response suggests that the arahants were selfish and that they, unlike Ānanda, did no service for others.

Returning to the Cullavagga account, the bhikkhus decide to hold the Council at Rājagaha because alms and lodgings are plentiful in that area. Further, it is decided that other bhikkhus should not spend the rains retreat in Rājagaha so as not to confuse the proceedings. Arriving in Rājagaha, some bhikkhus have the following thought:

Now, repairs to broken and dilapidated parts were praised by the Lord. Come, let us during the first month make repairs to the broken and dilapidated parts: having assembled in the middle month, we will chant dhamma and discipline (Cullavagga XI 285-286, pp.394-395).¹⁹

In the next scene in the Cullavagga, it is suddenly the evening before the convening of the Council and we are informed that Ānanda has the following thoughts (Cullavagga XI 286, pp.395-396):

Then the venerable Ānanda, thinking: "To-morrow is the assembly. Now it is not suitable in me that I, being (only) a learner, should go to the assembly," and having passed much of the night in mindfulness as to body, when the night was nearly spent thinking: "I will lie down," he

¹⁸Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, p.62. Nāgārjuna goes on to record how Mahā Kassapa, having heard Ānanda's complaint, goes on to list other faults of Ānanda. See also Etienne Lamotte, trans., Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna, Tome I, p.223.

¹⁹See also Smp. I 7-8, p.7 and 9-10, p.8.

inclined his body, but (before) his head had touched the mattress and while his feet were free from the ground - in that interval his mind was freed from the cankers with no residuum (for rebirth) remaining. Then the venerable Ānanda, being a perfected one [arahant], went to the assembly.

The Bāhiraṇidāna (Smp. I 11-13, pp.9-11) expands on the above account in having other bhikkhus inform Ānanda that he is still a learner and should strive to become an arahant. Ānanda attains arahanthood much as in the Cullavagga account, though his entry to the Council is described as follows, "Then displaying his supernatural power he [Ānanda] dived into the earth and showed himself in his own seat. But some say that he came through the air and sat down" (Smp. I 13, pp.10-11).²⁰

It is interesting again to provide some of the other accounts of Ānanda's arahanthood taken from the non-Pāli sources. The Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins does not even raise the issue of Ānanda's arahanthood.²¹

The Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, while similar to the Cullavagga account, is much elaborated and in particular makes use of a bhikkhu named Vṛjiputra who, by reciting some verses to Ānanda, exhorts him to achieve his arahanthood.²²

²⁰ According to ThagA II 130, it was a Brahma of the Suddhāvāsa who informed the Council of Ānanda's arahanthood. See DPPN I, p.269, fn.88.

²¹ André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, p.8; also Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, p.225. Regarding the Sarvāstivādin attitude to Ānanda, see Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, e.g. pp. 29, 39-40.

²² Ibid., Bareau, p.8; Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, pp.173-176. Regarding Vṛjiputra, see our study, pp.267ff.

The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya depicts Ānanda, after Mahā Kassapa's refusal to have him at the Council, as preaching to the four assemblies of the faithful and states that a bhikkhu from Vṛji and other bhikkhus exhorted Ānanda to achieve his arahanthood. Once Ānanda had become an arahant, the bhikkhu from Vṛji informed Mahā Kassapa and suggested that Ānanda be authorized to attend the Council (i.e. "parmi ceux qui vont rassembler le Vinaya").²³

The Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya maintains that a deva reminds Ānanda of the fact that Mahā Kassapa had called him a "mangy jackal" and when Ānanda wonders about why Mahā Kassapa has described him in this way, he realizes that it was to encourage Ānanda to attain his arahanthood.²⁴ With this in mind, Ānanda decides to become an arahant and does so, arriving at the Council by flying through the air.²⁵ The Haimavata does not record the incident at all.²⁶

Nāgārjuna in his Mahāprajñāpāramitā Śāstra takes up the issue of Ananda's arahanthood and explains it as follows. Firstly, Ananda had taken a vow (pranidhāna) to become the

²³ Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, pp.138-140. André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, pp.8-9.

²⁴ Ibid.; Przyluski, p.208, "Le Grand Kāśyapa connaît bien ma parenté et mon nom. C'est justement parce que mes liens ne sont pas encore détruits qu'il a prononcé ces paroles." See also p.209 where Mahā Kassapa acknowledges Ananda's interpretation.

²⁵ Ibid., Bareau, p.9 and Przyluski, pp.208-209.

²⁶ Ibid., Bareau, p.9 and Przyluski, pp.172-176.

foremost of those who had heard (bahussuta); further, Nāgārjuna points out that those who had achieved arahanthood would have no need to do anything or serve anyone. Secondly, Ānanda who had heard, retained, recited and meditated on all sorts of suttas had, as a result, vast wisdom, but his concentration of thought (cittasamgraha) was mediocre. Thirdly, Ānanda, out of his love of service to the Buddha, realized that if he attained arahanthood too early, he could not serve the Buddha. Fourthly, all the elements of location, time and individuals had not yet united for a recitation of the buddhavacana to take place, thus Ānanda postponed his arahanthood until the following three conditions were fulfilled: the death of the Buddha; the selection of the Council; and the exhortation of Vṛjiputra. Finally as a fifth reason Nāgārjuna points out that Ānanda, because of his disgust (saṃvega) for the things of the world, is in no way comparable to other men. Ānanda had been, for generation after generation, a member of a royal line, handsome and his merits were immense. A close relative of the Buddha, he accompanied him always as his attendant, having no doubts about his ability to attain arahanthood when the time was right.²⁷

Nāgārjuna's reasons, so it would seem, represent a summary of positions current during his day. Basically, they constitute a defence of Ānanda's late arahanthood, tending

²⁷ Etienne Lamotte, Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna, Tome I, pp.223-225.

to view it as a magnanimous and altruistic gesture on the part of Ānanda to attend the Buddha, to become the foremost of those who had heard (bahussuta) the buddhavaṇṇa in order that the Buddha's doctrine would not be lost.

What, then, can we surmise about Ānanda's arahant-hood from the above accounts? Firstly, those accounts which discuss the problem of Ānanda's arahant-hood all claim that eventually Ānanda achieved the goal. In fact, from the descriptions we are given, Ānanda was in actuality able to achieve his arahant-hood very quickly once it had become, or was made known to him as, an important issue. Secondly, while in some accounts (e.g. the Mahīśāsaka and Mahāsaṅghika) Ānanda's lack of arahant-hood did not allow him access to the Council, in others (e.g. those of the Theravāda and the Dharmagupta) Ānanda was accepted to the Council regardless of the fact that he had not attained the goal. Thirdly, in all the cases Ānanda's eventual arahant-hood is attained through the practice of meditation,²⁸ thereby confirming the position of Nāgārjuna that Ānanda, who was great in wisdom (pañña) was inexperienced in samādhi.²⁹ Fourthly, we may conclude that

²⁸In the majority of cases, including the Cullavagga account to the Kaṇva smṛtyupasthāna; see Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "The Buddhist Councils," p.3, fn.11.

²⁹See our study, p.453 above and Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, p.67.

the feature which lay at the heart of Ānanda's participation at the Council was not his arahanthood but his knowledge of the buddhavaṇṇa which, according to some accounts, went beyond merely a reciting of the five Nikāyas.³⁰ Rather than pursue Ānanda's arahanthood further at this time, let us return to the Cullavagga account of the Council of Rājagaha.³¹

Once Ānanda's arahanthood has been asserted, the Cullavagga (XI 286, p.396) informs us that Mahā Kassapa said to the assembled bhikkhus, "If it seems right to the Order, I could question Upāli on the discipline." When no objection is raised, Mahā Kassapa proceeds to question Upāli until the latter has supposedly dealt with the entire body of the discipline for both the bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs (Cullavagga XI 286-287, pp.396-397).³²

³⁰See Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, pp. 103-104, 117, 192-193, 229.

³¹For a further discussion of Ānanda's level of success in the Buddha's sāsaṇa, see our study, pp.92ff.

³²According to the Cullavagga account, Mahā Kassapa questions Upāli in the following manner, "Then the venerable Kassapa the Great spoke thus to the venerable Upāli: 'Where, reverend Upāli [āvuso], was the first offence involving defeat [parājikam] laid down?' 'At Vesālī, honoured sir [bhante].' 'Regarding whom?' 'Regarding Sudinna the Kalandaka.' 'On what subject?' 'On sexual intercourse.' Then the venerable Kassapa the Great questioned the venerable Upāli as to the subject of the first offence involving defeat and he questioned him as to its provenance and he questioned him as to the individual ... as to what was laid down... what was further laid down ... what was an offence ... what was no offence."

It will be seen that we are not treated to the details of Upāli's recitation. The Cullavagga goes on to mention the second, third and fourth parājikas as in the first quoted above

The Bāhiraṇidāna (Smp. I 13, p.11) provides the following account of the choice of Upāli to recite the Vinaya:

When the Venerable One [Ānanda] was thus seated, the Elder Mahākassapa addressed the monks, "Friends, what shall we rehearse first, the Dhamma or the Vinaya?" The monks replied, "Sir, Mahākassapa, the Vinaya is the very life of the Dispensation of the Enlightened One: so long as the Vinaya endures, the Dispensation endures, therefore let us rehearse the Vinaya first."

"Placing whom in charge?"

"The venerable Upāli."

"Is not Ānanda competent?"

"It is not that he is not competent, but the Perfectly Enlightened One, while he was living, considered the venerable Upāli as the most pre-eminent in connexion with the learning of the Vinaya... ."

The Bāhiraṇidāna account has gone beyond the simple account provided in the Cullavagga by pointing out that the Vinaya should be recited first because "the Vinaya is the very life of the Dispensation of the Exalted One." N.A. Jayawickrama comments on this position as follows:

Even as early as the time of the finalizing of the Cullavagga account of the Council, the Vinaya appears to have been considered more important than the Dhamma though it is not explicitly stated there. This seems to be a special development in the Theravāda with its emphasis on paṭipatti [i.e. 'way', method, conduct, practice, performance, behaviour..., "PTSD, p.396], and whenever pariyatti [i.e. "2. accomplishment in the Scriptures, study (learning by heart) of the holy texts..., "PTSD, p.432] gains precedence over paṭipatti, a period of decay in the Sāsana is generally reflected as may be seen from its subsequent history in Ceylon.³³

before it concludes by saying that, "In this same way he questioned him about both the disciplines [i.e. bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs]"; see Cullavagga XI 286-287, pp.396-397. As the terms of address indicate, Mahā Kassapa is to be regarded as Upāli's senior.

³³ N.A. Jayawickrama, The Inception of Discipline and

It is worth mentioning the "subsequent" situation in Ceylon alluded to in Jayawickrama's remarks above. The following picture is provided by W. Rahula:

After the famine, at a conference of several hundreds of monks held at a monastery ... a new question was raised - a question that was never raised before: What is the basis of the Sāsana - learning or practice [AA, p.5]? We all know that according to the original teaching of the Buddha the practice of the dhamma (paṭipatti) is of greater importance than mere learning (pariyatti). Yet a difference of opinion regarding this fundamental idea seems to have arisen in the minds of the theras. There were two schools of opinion on the matter: the Paṃsukūlikas maintained that practice was the basis of the Sāsana, but the Dhammakathikas held that learning was the basis ... Ultimately ... the Dhammakathikas were victorious [AA, pp.52-53]. Following this decision, the Commentary on the Anguttara nikāya records: "Even if there be a hundred or a thousand bhikkhus practising vipassanā (meditation), there will be no realization of the Noble path if there is no learning (doctrine - pariyatti) [AA, p.53]."³⁴

The events described above are supposed to have taken place in the latter part of the first century B.C. in the period when the Pāli Canon was set down in writing.³⁵ Further, as Rahula's references to the Pāli Commentaries (i.e. the Manorathapūraṇī) suggest, the commentators, in particular

the Vinaya Nidāna, p.98, "13 Section 1".

³⁴W. Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, pp.158-159. The references in square brackets are to the author's footnotes which we have placed into the body of his remarks.

³⁵Ibid., p.158, fn.1; also p.xxix ff.

Buddhaghosa whose compilations were made in the fifth century A.D., knew of the debates between the upholders of "practice" and those of "learning". The above information reminds us of our earlier remarks regarding the bahussuta characterization of Ānanda in the Aśokāvadāna.³⁶

For the most part, the terms "paṭipatti" and "pariyatti" are to be found in the commentarial literature and rarely, for example, do we find the term "bahussuta" connected only to "pariyatti", although on rare occasions it is (e.g. SnA 110). In general the Pāli commentaries seem to regard the terms "paṭipatti" and "pariyatti" as going together in relationship to the characterization "bahussuta".³⁷ Still, the fact that the Theravāda Canon as a compilation upholds the importance of the Vinaya over the Suttas (dhamma) and forces Ānanda to take second place to Upāli in the recitation of the buddha-vacana at the Council suggests that something akin to what is discussed above by Rahula was in mind when the hagiographers 'fixed' Ānanda's characterization in the Pāli Canon.

The Bāhiranidāna account of the First Council, part of which we have quoted (see p.456 above), suggests that Ānanda, like Upāli, was competent to recite the Vinaya, but

³⁶ See our study, pp.236-237.

³⁷ See our study, pp.251-252; see also pp.253-254, fn.54. Also see PTSD, "pariyatti" p.432 and Nyanatiloka, Buddhist Dictionary, p.127 "pariyatti" and p.140 "paṭivedha".

because the Buddha, "while he was living," had considered Upāli a vinayadhara, the latter was chosen (on the authority of the Buddha) to recite the Vinaya. One wonders why the Bāhīranidāna wished to assert the competency of Ānanda to recite the Vinaya. This may be explained by the possibility that, by the time Buddhaghosa came to write his commentaries, the hagiographical attitudes toward Ānanda had changed and thus the Bāhīranidāna could inform us of Ānanda's competency in vinaya matters and of his having made his arahanthood apparent to the members of the Council through magical means.³⁸

Returning to the Cullavagga (XI 287, pp.397-398), Upāli having completed his recitation of the Vinaya, Mahā Kassapa suggests that Ānanda should now be questioned on the Dhamma. Mahā Kassapa begins by asking Ānanda where the

³⁸Whether this "change" was the result of the fact that other hagiographical accounts of Ānanda were well known by Buddhaghosa's time is difficult to say. In this vein, it is interesting to quote the remarks of Minayett in Louis de la Vallée Poussin's article, "The Buddhist Councils," The Indian Antiquary, XXXVII, 1908, p.10. The remarks relate to how Ānanda, an arahant, could be chastized by the bhikkhus regarding the five acts of wrong doing, "Ānanda had already become an impeccable saint, that is, an arhat, and yet he submits to a trial; the assembly calls upon him to do penitence for sins; Buddhaghosa in his account of the First Council has left aside all this episode. Perhaps he thought it would scandalize the faithful to read of the sins of an Arhat, impeccable according to the later dogmas... ."

Brahmajāla was spoken and, having received Ānanda's answer on this and other questions relating to the Brahmajāla, moves on to the Sāmaññaphala. After Ānanda has responded to Mahā Kassapa's questions on the Sāmaññaphala, the Cullavagga (XI 287, p.398) concludes, "In this same way he [Mahā Kassapa] questioned him [Ānanda] about the five Nikāyas."³⁹

Buddhaghosa (Smp. I 16, p.14) explains that the five Nikāyas are the Dīgha, Majjhima, Samyutta, Anguttara and Khuddaka Nikāyas. Further, Buddhaghosa (Smp. I 27, pp.24-25) says that the Khuddaka Nikāya "means the rest of the sayings of the Buddha excluding the four Nikāyas." Thus, according to Buddhaghosa's classification, the Vinaya is part of the Khuddaka Nikāya. This inclusion of the Vinaya in the Khuddaka

³⁹The questioning of Ānanda by Mahā Kassapa in the case of the Brahmajāla runs as follows (Cullavagga XI 287, p.398):

"Where, reverend [āvuso] Ānanda, was the Brahmajāla spoken?"

"Honoured sir [bhante], between Rājagaha and Nālandā in the royal rest-house at Āmbalaṭṭhika."

"With whom?"

"Suppiya the wanderer and Brahmadatta the brahman youth." Then the venerable Kassapa the Great questioned the venerable Ānanda as to the provenance of the Brahmajāla and he questioned him as to the individual(s).

The Cullavagga account mentions only two suttas by name, the Brahmajāla and the Sāmaññaphala. Other extant accounts of the Council of Rājagaha do not always concur with the Cullavagga account in either naming the suttas or, if they are named, having their names agree with those named in the Cullavagga account. See Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, e.g. p.146 (the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya version) and p.230 (the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya version).

Nikāya perhaps explains Buddhaghosa's remarks (Smp. I 16, p.14), "The venerable Elder Upāli explained the Vinaya therein [the Khuddaka Nikāya] and the Elder Ānanda the remaining sections of the Khuddakanikāya and the four Nikāyas."

Without wishing to enter too deeply into the quagmire of the history of the growth of the Pāli Canon as a collection divided into three piṭakas, some general observations regarding Buddhaghosa's remarks quoted above would seem warranted at this time. The desire to have Ānanda recite the Khuddaka Nikāya represents, according to N.A. Jayawickrama, an attempt to include the Abhidhamma in the recitation of Ānanda and thereby be able to assert that all three piṭakas were recited at the First Council.⁴⁰ Further, the fact that the vinaya is included in the Khuddaka Nikāya suggests that "the nucleus of both Vinaya and the Abhidhamma [is to be found] in the Khuddaka."⁴¹

The result of the above analysis is to conclude that the division of the Dhamma-Vinaya (taken as a whole) into five Nikāyas (wherein the Khuddaka is considered to contain both the Vinaya and the Abhidhamma) is a stage of development prior to the division of the buddhavaṇṇa into three piṭakas.

⁴⁰N.A. Jayawickrama, The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna, pp.99-100, "15:9", and the above author's "Buddhaghosa and the Traditional Classification of the Pāli Canon," UCR XVII, Nos. 1 & 2, 1959, pp.8-11.

⁴¹Ibid., "Buddhaghosa and the Traditional....," p.8.

Jayawickrama states:

This division of the whole of the canonical texts into five Nikāyas is not an exclusive peculiarity of the Sinhalese Theravādin School. In fact it goes back a long way and was in use on the continent in the 2nd century before our era. The inscriptions of Bhārhut (Luders' List, 867) and Sāncī (idem, 299) call pacanekāyika or pacanekayika the monks conversant with the whole of the canonical texts....

The very nature of the Khuddaka permitted the entry of all works outside the four major Nikāyas into it, and served a useful purpose in providing a home. The internal evidence from all these works (outside the four major Nikāyas) points to their gradual growth in course of time. Scholastic activity among members of the Saṅgha was at its highest during the first few centuries after the Rājagaha Council. Members of the Saṅgha living in the large monastic institutions began examining and analysing the Pāvācana and made numerous compilations rearranging the Buddha's Dhamma. Both the Vinaya and the Abhidhamma are products of such scholarly activity; and among this category should also be included the majority of the works comprising the extant Khuddaka Nikāya.

As the original Khuddaka Nikāya grew in bulk it was considered to be unwieldy. Hence the formation of two other collections, the Vinaya Piṭaka and Abhidhamma Piṭaka.⁴²

One may conclude that, if the above analysis is correct, as it seems to be, then the fact that the Cullavagga attributes to Ānanda the recitation of the "five Nikāyas" is, historically speaking, an accretion. Further, what are we to make of Buddhaghosa's remarks that the Khuddaka Nikāya contained the Vinaya and hence the need to assert that Upāli recited the

⁴²N.A. Jayawickrama, "Buddhaghosa and the Traditional Classification of the Pāli Canon," p.10. See also Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, pp.333-365.

vinaya sections in the Khuddaka Nikāya? How do Buddhaghosa's commentarial remarks relate to the Cullavagga account?

It would seem that Buddhaghosa's analysis, in particular his remarks regarding the Khuddaka Nikāya containing the vinaya, is best understood as Buddhaghosa's conveying to his readers an earlier account of the formation of the Pāli Canon. After all, Buddhaghosa was aware of the division of the Pāli Canon into three piṭakas. However, Buddhaghosa, in providing us with an earlier 'system' of dividing the buddhavaṇa into five nikāyas in which the vinaya is contained in the fifth nikāya (Khuddaka Nikāya), suggests, in light of the historical evidence brought out above, that the ascription of the five nikāyas to Ānanda in the Cullavagga account is certainly an accretion which worked its way into an earlier version of the account of the Council of Rājagaha.⁴³

We may note in passing that the extant accounts of the Council of Rājagaha show a great deal of variation in the treatment of the recitation of the buddhavaṇa.⁴⁴ Thus,

⁴³ It should be noted that the historicity of the First Council is itself a debated subject; many scholars proclaim the Council to be a fiction. See André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, pp.27-30; Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, p.v and Charles S. Prebish, "A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils," pp.245-246 and also pp.239-240.

⁴⁴ See Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha and André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, p.9. Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, p.30, makes the point that the "different redactions [of the Council of Rājagaha] do not permit themselves to be traced back to a unique type." Przyluski suggests that those who would undertake the above project would perhaps be wise to concentrate on the "formal distinctions" in the extant Council accounts. By "formal

for example, some of the Council accounts have Ānanda recite before Upāli, while others reverse the order.⁴⁵ Further, other accounts have Ānanda reciting the entire buddhavaṇṇa.⁴⁶ Przyluski contends that the variations in the manner in which Ānanda participates in the accounts of the Council suggest or indicate the attitude of that school to the 'person' of Ānanda.

distinctions" Przyluski means, for example, making a distinction between verse and prose sections, which he regards as "extreme types." Further Przyluski contends that, "Transition from one type to the other of these extreme types is definitely indicated by those redactions in which the gāthās are more or less numerous." Without going into the details here (see pp.30-31 of Przyluski's study) Przyluski posits as an hypothesis that the gāthā portions of some of the First Council accounts may be 'earlier' than the prose sections which surround them. Then, drawing on the Kāśyapaparivartasūtra (see p.31 and p.49, fn.7 of Przyluski's study) which Przyluski contends is the earliest Council account in Chinese (translated into Chinese towards 150 A.D.), by isolating the gāthā sections from the prose, Przyluski produces what he considers to be a relatively early account of the First Council, an account which has only praise for Ānanda's position and recitation of the buddhavaṇṇa and which does not mention his lack of arahanthood nor any of the other faults appearing in other Council accounts; see Przyluski's entire section on the above subject, pp.26-49.

⁴⁵ André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, p.22, provides a summary which can be schematized as follows: Ānanda recites before Upāli in the Mahāsaṃghika and the Mūlasarvāstivādin; in the Theravāda, Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka and Sarvāstivādin, Upāli recites before Ānanda.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p.22. Bareau points out that in all of the "paracanonical" texts, it is Ānanda who starts the recitation of the Canon and in the majority of these sources he recites the entire Canon without there being any mention of intervention by Upāli. See Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, pp. 20, 104.

Translated into hagiographical terms, Przyluski remarks as follows:

In giving precedence to Upāli over Ānanda, the redactor of the Pāli Chullavagga or a late compiler has only expressed his desire to indicate the excellence of the Vinaya, which in other respects appears consistent with the general tendencies of the Sthaviravādins. The Mūla-sarvāstivādins on the contrary recognize the preeminence of the Sūtras over the Vinaya and that of Ānanda over Upāli.⁴⁷

Returning to the Cullavagga account, we are informed that immediately after Ānanda has delivered his recitation of the five Nikāyas, he informs the bhikkhus (Cullavagga XI 287, p.398), "The Lord, honoured sirs, spoke thus to me at the time of his attaining nibbāna: 'If the Order, Ānanda, after my death is willing, the lesser and minor rules of training may be abolished.'" The bhikkhus ask Ānanda whether he had on that occasion asked the Buddha which rules the Buddha considered "the lesser and minor rules of training"? When Ānanda answers in the negative, a debate breaks out among the bhikkhus as to which rules the Buddha could have meant as the "lesser and minor rules" (Cullavagga XI 287-288, pp.398-399). Eventually Mahā Kassapa points out that if the bhikkhus were to effect any changes in the

⁴⁷ Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, p.29. Regarding the "Mūlasarvāstivādins", see Przyluski, "Le nord-ouest de l'Inde dans le vinaya des Mūla-sarvāstivādin et les textes apparentés," Journal Asiatique, Nov-Déc. 1914, pp.493-568. See also Etienne Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme indien, pp.149-150.

disciplinary procedures so soon after the Buddha's parinibbāna, the householders would be suspicious. Rather than endanger the Sangha's reputation, Mahā Kassapa recommends that no changes be made in the existing disciplinary code (Cullavagga XI 288, pp.399-400). Further, as a result of Mahā Kassapa's decision, the bhikkhus inform Ānanda that he has committed an offence of "wrong-doing" in not having asked the Buddha for the necessary information regarding the "lesser and minor rules of training" (Cullavagga XI 289, pp.399-400). Ānanda responds to the bhikkhus' charge as follows, "I, honoured sirs, out of unmindfulness, did not ask the Lord ... I do not see that as an offence of wrong doing, yet even out of faith in the venerable ones I confess that as an offence of wrong-doing" (Cullavagga XI 288-289, p.400). No sooner has Ānanda admitted his "unmindfulness" than other charges are brought against him:

This too is an offence of wrong-doing for you, reverend Ānanda, in that you sewed the Lord's cloth for the rains having stepped on it. Confess that offence of wrong-doing. But [says Ānanda] I, honoured sirs, not out of disrespect, sewed the Lord's cloth ... I do not see ... but even out of faith in the venerable ones I confess that as an offence of wrong-doing.

This too is an offence of wrong-doing for you, reverend Ānanda, in that you had the Lord's body first of all honoured by women; because these were weeping, the Lord's body was defiled by tears. Confess that offence of wrong-doing. But [says Ānanda] I, honoured sirs, thinking: 'Do not let these be (here) at a wrong time,' had the Lord's body honoured first of all by women. I do not see that as an offence of wrong-doing ... but even out of faith...

This too is an offence of wrong-doing for you... did not ask the Lord, saying: 'let the Lord remain for a (full) lifespan for the welfare of the manyfolk...' Confess that offence of wrong-doing.

But [says Ānanda] I, honoured sirs, because my mind was obsessed with Mara, did not ask the Buddha ... I do not see ... out of faith ...

This too is an offence of wrong-doing for you, reverend Ānanda, in that you made an effort for the going forth of women in the dhamma and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder. Confess that offence of wrong-doing.

But [says Ānanda] I, honoured sirs, made an effort for the going forth of women in the dhamma and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder thinking: 'This Gotamid, Pajapati the Great, is the Lord's aunt, foster-mother, nurse, giver of milk, for when the Lord's mother passed away, she suckled him.' I do not see that as an offence of wrong-doing, but even out of faith in the venerable ones I confess that as an offence of wrong-doing. (Cullavagga XI 288-289, pp.400-401).

The above scene, as Bareau suggests, is particularly difficult to interpret.⁴⁸ One of the significant features of the so-called "trial" of Ānanda in the Cullavagga account of the First Council is that, unlike other Council accounts, the scene in question falls after Ānanda's recitation.⁴⁹ The placement of the "trial" scene has brought forth a number of scholarly interpretations.

The fact that some of the extant accounts of the First Council have placed the scene describing Ānanda's 'errors' before the recitation of the buddhavaṇṇa has been explained

⁴⁸ André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, p.14.

⁴⁹ A list of where Ānanda's "trial" is placed in the extant Council accounts can be had by examining the discussion of the subject provided by Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, pp.276-277.

as a way of illustrating that membership in the Council should be restricted to those who were 'pure', and/or to encourage Ananda to attain his arahanthood before joining the Council.⁵⁰ On the other hand, placing the scene in question after the Council is seen by some scholars as an illustration of the pravāraṇā ceremony wherein the bhikkhus, at the close of the rains retreat (which roughly coincides with the close of the First Council), were to confess or to make known their transgressions.⁵¹ The fact that by the close of the Council Ānanda, according to the Cullavagga, was an arahant does not militate against having Ānanda confess his faults, "Every fault, once committed, must find its disciplinary sanctions without taking account of the point as to whether the guilty person has in the meantime attained to some degree of spiritual perfection."⁵² The aforementioned remark of H. Oldenberg is challenged, most delightfully, by Louis de la Vallée Poussin as follows:

I am not, alas! at home ... in the disciplinary procedures of the Vinaya: I may say, almost without affectation, that I have studied chiefly the eleventh chapter of the Culla[vagga]. Fortune wills that I find in it an important detail relative to the problem which occupies us: we know that Channa, when Ānanda informed him of the "boycotting" pronounced against him by the Buddha, fell into such repentance that he at once became Arhat. Thereupon

⁵⁰ See Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, pp.276-277.

⁵¹ See the fourth Khandhaka of the Mahāvagga (IV 157, p.209); also Jean Przyluski, Le concile..., pp.257-278; André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, pp.14-15.

⁵² The remarks of H. Oldenberg are quoted in Louis de

... he goes to implore Ānanda to remove the excommunication [what right does Ānanda possess to take away an excommunication pronounced by the Buddha and approved by the Sangha?]: he is then of the same opinion as Prof. Oldenberg. A fault committed before the acquisition of the "Arhatship" must find its disciplinary sanction. Ānanda who, we believe, understands the matter better than anyone, answers him in suitable words: "From the very moment, friend Channa, that you acquired the quality of Arhat, from that moment penance ceased." -- "Whatever he may say, no one will speak to him, will exhort or admonish him" thus had the Buddha spoken on his death-bed concerning Channa. But by the fact that one becomes Arhat, the penance falls to the ground, although it had been pronounced as decisive. -- It is true that the Vinaya knows nothing of this penance styled "of Brahma," and that in consequence familiarity with the Vinayas is here without importance.⁵³

Thus Poussin suggests, through the episode of Ānanda's relations with Channa (Cullavagga XI 292, p.405), that in spite of Oldenberg's opinion expressed above, the arahanthood of Channa frees him of the need for penance. This might then imply that Ānanda, being an arahant by the time the charges are made against him, like Channa has no need to confess. However, such is not the case in the Cullavagga account. Ānanda, after each of the accusations, states, "I do not see that as an offence of wrong-doing, yet even out of faith in the venerable ones, I confess that as an offence of wrong-doing."⁵⁴

la Vallée Poussin, "The Buddhist Councils," The Indian Antiquary, XXXVII, 1908, p.10.

⁵³Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "The Buddhist Councils," p.10. The sentence, [what right...] is to be found in Poussin's footnotes, but we have inserted it into the body of his remarks. See also Cullavagga XI 292, p.405 and D II 154, pp.171-172 regarding the excommunication of Channa.

⁵⁴See Cullavagga XI 289, pp.400-401.

Ananda's remark seems to express the fact that he is unable to see the "wrong-doing" of which he is accused but rather than cause dissension in the Sangha, he admits "out of faith" (saddhā) in the judgment of his accusers. The Mahāvagga (X 339-340, p.486) regards the confession "out of faith" as an action to prevent disruption in the Sangha.⁵⁵

Why should Ānanda, an arahant, have to make a confession "out of faith"? It is possible that we see here in Ānanda's treatment a more 'primitive' view of the arahant who, unlike the 'later' view of the arahant, was not infallible.⁵⁶ Leaving aside such difficult questions, let us turn to the actual accusations made against Ānanda.

There seems little doubt that the central accusation, the most important of the five made against Ānanda,⁵⁷ is that Ānanda failed to ask the Buddha what he considered to be the

⁵⁵The Mahāvagga X 339, p.486 informs us regarding the accusers, "It is impossible for them, because of me [the one who makes the confession "out of faith"] or because of anyone else, to follow a wrong course through desire, through hatred, through stupidity, through fear." It is interesting to note that the Cullavagga characterizes Ānanda in the same words before he attains his arahanthood (see Cullavagga XI 285, p.394). Regarding Ānanda's responses to his accusers in other extant versions of the Council accounts, see André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, pp.10-12 and his footnotes to Przyluski's Le concile de Rājagṛha.

⁵⁶Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, p.276. Also André Migot, Un grand disciple du Buddha: Śāriputra, p.535, Section "IV".

⁵⁷Ānanda was accused of a varying number of offences. See André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, pp.9-10, and his footnotes to the accounts in Przyluski's Le concile de Rājagṛha.

"lesser and minor rules of training." We consider the aforementioned accusation to be the central accusation for a number of reasons. It receives the lengthiest treatment of any of the accusations in the Cullavagga account. It is the only accusation which creates a dialogue amongst the bhikkhus, eventually requiring Mahā Kassapa's intervention. Further, both the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 162, p.184) and the Cullavagga (XI 284-285, p.394) mention the remarks of Subhadda that now that the Buddha is dead the bhikkhus can do as they wish, thus suggesting that the disciplinary rules were, according to some bhikkhus, too stringent. Mahā Kassapa, in the Cullavagga (XI 285, p.394) account, suggests that a recitation of the dhamma and vinaya take place immediately after the Subhadda incident is reported. Finally, we have the appearance of Pūraṇa (Cullavagga XI 289-290, pp.401-402) who asserts that even though the bhikkhus have just recited the dhamma and discipline, he (Pūraṇa), having himself heard the buddhavaṇṇa from the Buddha, prefers to remember it as he heard it from the Buddha's mouth, rather than endorse the Council's rendering. This suggests that central to the account of the First Council is the question of what is to be regarded as the buddhavaṇṇa. Of all the five offences brought out against Ānanda, only the first is related directly to the buddhavaṇṇa.

Regarding the "lesser and minor rules of training," the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta (D II 154, p.171) has the Buddha

instruct Ānanda, "When I am gone, Ānanda, let the Order, if it should so wish, abolish all the lesser and minor precepts." Ānanda responds with absolute silence and the Buddha proceeds, also without comment, to inform Ānanda about imposing the "higher penalty" on Channa. To assume that the Buddha's remarks have any historicity, one would have to explain the following.⁵⁸ How are we to judge the Buddha's remarks in light of the fact that, earlier in the MPNS (D II 100, pp.107-108), the Buddha insisted that he had nothing further to provide to the bhikkhus; that he had no further instructions in any matter concerning the Sangha? Why did the Buddha not bring up the issue of dropping the "lesser and minor precepts" to the bhikkhus generally rather than only to Ānanda? In this regard, we may note, in passing, that in at least one account of the above events, other bhikkhus than Ānanda were also present.⁵⁹ Why does the Buddha not convey his information on the "lesser and minor precepts" to Upāli whose name, by the way, does not even appear in the MPNS? For that matter, why does Upāli not enter into the discussion of the "lesser and

⁵⁸We have already commented upon this question in our discussion of the MPNS; see our study, pp. 429-432. However, it is useful to repeat ourselves here. See also the remarks of Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "The Buddhist Councils," p.14 ff.

⁵⁹See André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, p.139.

minor precepts" when the subject is introduced at the First Council? His qualifications as a vinayadhara would certainly have been of assistance. Further, why was there no consensus on the meaning of the phrase "lesser and minor precepts"? Is it likely, as the Buddha is characterized in the Pāli sources, that he would be so casual as to recommend the dropping of disciplinary rules that were not well known and definable to the bhikkhus? Why does Ānanda wait until after he has recited the dhamma before he informs the members of the Council of the Buddha's remarks? Why did Ānanda not bring up the discussion of the "lesser and minor precepts" during Upāli's recitation of the discipline? Finally, if Ānanda recited the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta, or at least those portions which related to the period prior to the Buddha's parinibbāna, why was there no discussion of the "lesser and minor precepts" at the time of Ānanda's recitation? This may find its explanation in the fact that, according to the structure of Ānanda's recitation, he did so only under the direction of Mahā Kassapa who initiated the subjects to be discussed.⁶⁰

Obviously, the authors and/or compilers of the Cullavagga and MPNS accounts placed the remarks retroactively into the mouths of Ānanda and the Buddha in order to deal with a problem which had risen subsequent to the Buddha's death. That Ānanda is censured for his actions regarding

⁶⁰ See our study, pp.459-460 and fn.39, p.460.

the "lesser and minor precepts" reflects a decision of the hagiographers of the Cullavagga account who chose Mahā Kassapa's position (or the position which was attributed to him by his followers) over that of Ānanda (or the position which was attributed to him by his followers).⁶¹

One may look at the other accusations brought against Ānanda in a similar light. In particular, the accusation that Ānanda failed to request the Buddha to extend his life seems, as we have already indicated, designed to explain the premature death of the Buddha.⁶² The accusation that Ānanda allowed women to honour the body of the Buddha first and that women "defiled" the Buddha's body with their tears seems to go hand in hand with the accusation that Ānanda was responsible for gaining the admission of women into the Sangha.⁶³ The accusation that Ānanda "sewed the Lord's cloth for the rains after having stepped on it" is, in its simplicity, difficult to place in a position of importance.

The "trial" of Ānanda is, as we have indicated, difficult to decipher. If we return, for a moment, to the fact that

⁶¹André Bareau, Recherches..., p.140, states, "Il faudrait plutôt y voir le reflet de conflits tardifs entre lointains disciples d'Ānanda et de Mahākāśyapa ou, plus exactement, entre deux groupes de moines ayant choisi l'un ou l'autre pour patrons."

⁶²See our study, pp.390-398.

⁶³Ibid., pp.121ff. We may note that the reference to Ānanda allowing women to view the body of the Buddha first is not recorded in the Pāli MPNS.

Ānanda accepts the censure of the bhikkhus "out of faith," then Ānanda's decision to do so suggests that he had a difference of opinion with the bhikkhus who were censuring him. This is clear from the Mahāvagga's discussion of the "out of faith" procedure which is designed to avoid fermenting a schism in the Sangha.⁶⁴ One may have here, in the response of Ānanda to his critics, a reference to a debate which at some point ensued between Ānanda and Mahā Kassapa and/or between their followers, likely over the enforcement of disciplinary procedures. It is interesting to recall that Ānanda was known for his erudition, hence his characterization as bahussuta, while Mahā Kassapa was known for his practice of the dutāṅga and the sīlas. Further, Ānanda's name is particularly affiliated with the suttas, while one can assume that Mahā Kassapa's name would be linked to the vinaya. These facts give support to the hypothesis that Ānanda and Mahā Kassapa, or more likely their representatives, might have been involved in the debate, a debate which was, according to the Theravāda Pāli Canon, settled amicably on the side of Mahā Kassapa. Beyond this analysis it is difficult to go.⁶⁵

⁶⁴See our study, p.470 and fn.55 there.

⁶⁵See André Migot, Un grand disciple du Buddha: Śāriputra, pp.539-540. Migot, drawing on Przyluski's work, contends, "... il semble bien que ces deux tendances [i.e. those represented by the 'way of learning' (bahussuta) and the 'way of practice' (i.e. sīla)] par ces deux grands saints [i.e. Ānanda and Mahā Kassapa respectively] se soient succédé dans le temps et dans l'espace, et qu'elles correspondent chacune à l'une des deux grandes périodes du Bouddhisme primitif. On peut le schématiser ainsi: 1^o Période de Rājagṛha = Ānanda = śruta; 2^o Période de Vaisālī = Mahā Kassapa et Anuruddha = sīla."

One final point. The appearance of Pūraṇa and his following of at least five hundred bhikkhus (Cullavagga XI 289-290, pp.401-402) who refuse to authorize the dhamma and vinaya just chanted by the bhikkhus under Mahā Kassapa testifies not only to the need to have an authorized account of the buddhavacana, but to the fact that there were likely divergencies of opinion over what is to be regarded as buddhavacana. Thus Pūraṇa states (Cullavagga XI 290, p.402), "Your reverences, well chanted by the elders are dhamma and discipline, but in that way that I heard it in the Lord's presence, that I received it in his presence, in that same way will I bear it in mind."

Returning to the Cullavagga account, we have Ānanda inform the bhikkhus that the Buddha had told him, "... Ānanda, after I am gone, let the Order enjoin the higher penalty [brahmadāṇḍa] for the monk Channa" (Cullavagga XI 280, p.402). The bhikkhus ask Ānanda whether the Buddha had informed him as to what the "higher penalty" consisted of. Ānanda affirms that he did ask this of the Buddha who had stated, "Ānanda, Channa may say whatever he likes to the monks, but the monk Channa must neither be spoken to nor exhorted nor instructed by monks." The bhikkhus then inform Ānanda that he should carry out the Buddha's wishes. Ānanda, however, points out that Channa is "fierce and rough" to which the bhikkhus reply that Ānanda should take with him a group of bhikkhus.

Ānanda, taking the advice of the bhikkhus, proceeds

together with a group of at least five hundred bhikkhus, to the Ghositārāma to see Channa. While en route to Channa, Ānanda sits beneath a tree not far from King Udena's "pleasure grove" and is visited there by a group of the king's concubines who praise Ānanda as their "teacher" (ācariya). Ānanda provides the women with a talk on the dhamma and they provide Ānanda with a gift of five hundred "inner robes" (Cullavagga XI 290-291, pp.402-403).

When King Udena learns that his concubines have provided Ānanda with five hundred "inner robes" he asks, "How can this recluse Ānanda accept so many robes? Will the recluse Ānanda set up trade in woven cloth or will he offer (them) for sale in a shop?" (Cullavagga XI 291, p.403). The king eventually questions Ānanda respectfully as to what Ānanda could want with so many robes. Ānanda is able to convince the king of his good intentions regarding the five hundred robes so that the king, in respect, provides Ānanda with an additional five hundred "woven cloths" (Cullavagga XI 291-292, p.404).

After the above digression, the Cullavagga informs us that Ānanda makes contact with the bhikkhu Channa at the Ghositārāma. Ānanda informs Channa of the "higher penalty" imposed upon him and explains it to him, as he did earlier to the bhikkhus. Channa is so upset at the penalty that he faints. The text then informs us:

Then the venerable Channa, being troubled about the higher penalty, being ashamed of it, loathing

it, dwelling alone, aloof, zealous, ardent, self resolute ... became another of the perfected ones. Then the venerable Channa, having attained perfection, approached the venerable Ānanda; having approached he spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda: "Honoured Ānanda, now revoke the higher penalty for me." [Ānanda replies], "From the moment that you, reverend Channa, realized perfection, from that moment the higher penalty was revoked for you." (Cullavagga XI 292, p.405).

This ends the Cullavagga account of the First Council except for the fact that the text informs us that because five hundred bhikkhus participated in the "chanting of the discipline" (vinayasamgīti) it should be called "that of the Five Hundred" (Cullavagga XI 292, p.405).

Let us now return to analyze the above information. The "higher penalty" (brahmadāṇḍa) is not known to the Vinaya and this explains why the Cullavagga informs us that Ānanda asked the Buddha for the details (see Cullavagga XI 290, p.402; also D II 154, pp.171-172). We are not told in either the Cullavagga or the MPNS why Channa has been singled out by the Buddha, but it seems to have been either because Channa took the side of the bhikkhunīs in a dispute with the bhikkhus and/or because he had repeatedly abused Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna.⁶⁶

The incident involving Ānanda and Channa is only to be found in two of the Council accounts, namely that of the Theravāda and that of the Mahīśāsaka. André Bareau points

⁶⁶ See I.B. Horner, BD V, p.402, fn.3 for references; also see DPPN I, "Channa 3", pp.923-924.

out the following aspects in the Channa episode:

Ce récit fut probablement inventé par la communauté des Mahīśāsaka - Theravādin de Kausāmbī, dans le but de donner une base canonique à la procédure du brahmadanḍa. Le nom sanskrit du moine, Caṇḍa, qui signifie violent, cruel, n'était sans doute, dans ce récit primitif, qu'une épithète ou, tout au plus, un sobriquet. La précision donnée par les Theravādin selon laquelle Channa résidait au Ghoshārāma de Kosāmbī semble indiquer que leur secte possédait dans cette ville un monastère de ce nom au moment où leur récit fut élaboré, c'est-à-dire vers le II^e siècle avant notre ère.⁶⁷

One may note in passing that, in the case of the Buddha's command that the "higher penalty" be enacted on Channa, Ānanda actually asks the Buddha to explain what he means by the phrase "higher penalty." However, in the case of the "lesser and minor rules of training," Ānanda fails to ask the Buddha for details. The difference in the treatment of these two items reflects the different intentions of the authors and/or compilers of the events in question. In the case of the "lesser and minor rules of training," the authors and/or compilers of the event wanted to avoid clarifying the content of these 'rules' so as to be able to avoid changing the existing body of disciplinary procedures. The fact that the question of the "lesser and minor rules of training" is raised testifies to, as we suggested, a debate which likely took place amongst the

⁶⁷ André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, p.26. Regarding the MPNS (D II 154, pp.171-172) and its parallel versions on the injunction of the Buddha to Ānanda to carry out the "higher penalty" on Channa, see André Bareau, Recherches..., Tome II, pp.132-135.

Buddha's following at some time subsequent to his death. In the case of the brahmadāṇḍa (i.e. "higher penalty"), Ānanda is made to ask for the details of such a penalty because it was the aim of the authors and/or compilers of this event to introduce as buddhavaṇṇa this new type of disciplinary procedure to come into effect, as the Buddha himself says, after his death (D II 154, pp.171-172). Thus, when Ānanda informs the bhikkhus at the First Council of the Buddha's wishes regarding the enactment of the higher penalty on Channa, Ānanda is asked to provide the bhikkhus with the meaning of such a penalty, implying that such a penalty is not known to the bhikkhus. In both the "lesser and minor rules of training" and the "brahmadāṇḍa", Ānanda is regarded as the sole individual with knowledge of the details of these items. In the case of the "lesser and minor rules of training," Ānanda fails to pass the knowledge test, because it is to the benefit of the authors and/or compilers or the school(s) which they represent to have Ānanda fail. On the other hand, in the case of the "brahmadāṇḍa", the intention is to have the "higher penalty" introduced as a disciplinary procedure and hence Ānanda is knowledgeable of the details.

Both of the above events testify to the position of importance of Ānanda; for in both cases the bhikkhus accept Ānanda's remarks on both the "lesser and minor rules of training" and the "brahmadāṇḍa" as buddhavaṇṇa. This

acceptance of anything that Ānanda says, regardless of its historical veracity, or its lack of it, testifies to Ānanda's position as an authority on the buddhavaṇṇa, a feature in his characterization which could not be denied.

The only remaining item of note in the Cullavagga account of the First Council,⁶⁸ is the fact that the closing remarks of the Chapter speak of the Council as a "chanting of [only] the discipline" (Cullavagga XI 292, p.405):

Now because five hundred monks - not one more,
not one less - were at this chanting of the
discipline, this chanting of the discipline is
in consequence called "that of the Five Hundred."

This reference to the recitation at the Council as being a "chanting of the discipline" (vinayasamgīti) is somewhat unusual when both the dhamma and vinaya were recited at the First Council. In this regard it is interesting to draw attention to the fact that the account of the Second Council, the Council of Vesālī, has only the vinaya recited and concludes as follows:

Now because seven hundred monks - not one less
and not one more - were at this chanting of the
discipline [vinayasamgīti], this chanting of the
discipline is called "that of the Seven Hundred"
(Cullavagga XII 307, p.429).

The similarity between the closings of the First and Second Councils, especially regarding the remarks in the case of the First Council where the closing only mentions the vinayasamgīti

⁶⁸Regarding the details of the enactment of the brahma-
daṇḍa on Channa and its bearing on Ānanda's "trial", see the
interesting analysis of Louis de la Vallée Poussin in our study,
pp.468-469.

may indicate, as some scholars have maintained, that the First Council account has been modelled on that of the Second Council.⁶⁹

One may note further regarding the vinaya-like quality of the First Council that the structure in which Mahā Kassapa leads and questions Upāli and Ānanda reflects an interest in judicial procedures. In this regard, André Bareau states, "Le style des diverses descriptions trahit en effet [in the case of the Theravāda] des préoccupations juridiques ou rituelles, ce qui n'a rien d'étonnant si l'on songe que les récits des vinaya furent élaborés par les maîtres de la discipline, les gardiens du droit canon et des rites."⁷⁰

Finally, as a supplementary note, we may draw attention to the fact that it is only in the Mahāśāṅghika Vinaya account of the First Council that Ānanda and Upāli recite their respective areas of knowledge in the buddhavacana without direction from Mahā Kassapa. Further, only in this account do we have mentioned, as part of the Council account, that the phrase "evaṃ me suttam" was used.⁷¹ However, as we have indicated in our study,⁷² the Buddhist tradition generally

⁶⁹See Charles S. Prebish, "A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils," pp.245-246. The Mnemonic device at the end of the Council account (i.e. the Uddāna) states, "He [Mahā Kassapa] asked Upāli about discipline and the wise [pāṇḍita] Ānanda about the Suttantas" (Cullavagga XI 293, p.406).

⁷⁰André Bareau, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, p.23.

⁷¹Ibid., p.23. Also Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛha, pp.211ff. See our study, pp.136-137.

⁷²See our study, pp.135-137. Regarding the phrase, "evaṃ me suttam" and its attribution to Ānanda, see Etienne Lamotte, Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna, Tome I, pp.80-114.

assigns the phrase "evaṃ me suttam" to Ānanda, and this is true of the Theravāda as well as the other Buddhist Schools.⁷³

There is no purpose in trying to ascertain the historicity of the ascription of the phrase "evaṃ me suttam" to Ānanda. It is improbable, to say the least, that Ānanda would have repeated at the First Council the five Nikāyas as we have them now extant, all of which, as we have indicated, do not always begin with the phrase "evaṃ me suttam." The fact that the Pāli Commentaries tell us that Ānanda and his pupils were assigned the custody of the Dīgha Nikāya after the First Council is of note.⁷⁴ The Dīgha Nikāya is likely to be regarded as the most important of the Nikāyas, especially as it contains the MPNS. Buddhaghosa informs us that when the sāsana disappears, the order in which the Nikāyas will do so is: the Anguttara first, then the Samvutta, followed by the Majjhima and finally the last to go will be the Dīgha Nikāya (MA II 881).⁷⁵ The fact that Ānanda's name is linked in particular to the Dīgha Nikaya attests, in light of what has just been stated regarding the disappearance of the sāsana, to the fact that there was a strong, and likely 'early', tradition linking Ānanda's name to the buddhavacana. The use of the term "bahussuta" to characterize Ānanda attests to a likely 'early' recognition of Ānanda's knowledge, since this term is more inclusive than

⁷³ See e.g. DA I 2; MA I 2; SA I 4ff.; AAI 4ff.

⁷⁴ DA I 15; also our study, pp.129-130.

⁷⁵ Also DPPN I, p.21, "Anguttara Nikāya" and II, p.418, "Majjhima Nikāya."

such terms as "dhammadhara" and "vinayadhara." Thus we may conclude that Ānanda's knowledge of the buddhavacana was a leading element in his subsequent hagiographical characterization. We have noted, albeit in a commentary, that Buddhaghosa even separates Ānanda's position as the Buddha's attendant from his primary position as a "store-keeper of the Dhamma."⁷⁶

⁷⁶See our study, pp.350-351.

CONCLUSION

The detailed description and analysis of Ānanda's characterization in the Pāli Canon of the Theravāda undertaken in the body of our study does not easily lend itself to simple conclusions. We do not, therefore, intend here in our conclusion to utilize all of the information which our study has brought forth, but rather to concentrate on certain hagiographical features which we consider to be central elements in the characterization of Ānanda in the sources we have utilized.

Schematized, Ānanda's position in the Buddha's following runs as follows. Ānanda joins the Buddha's following along with a group of other Sākyans (e.g. Anuruddha and Devadatta) and Upāli, their barber. At some point after Ānanda's "going forth", he, according to the Pāli Commentaries, is chosen by the Buddha to become his permanent attendant, a position which he occupies for some twenty-five years, until the Buddha's parinibbāna. In general, Ānanda's attendanceship of the Buddha is a successful one, except for a number of significant "wrong-doings" which Ānanda commits, for the most part during the closing months of the Buddha's active ministry. During the entire period of Ānanda's attendanceship of the Buddha, Ānanda remains a sekha (learner)

although, with the death of the Buddha and the impetus provided by the First Council, Ānanda achieves his arahant-hood on the eve of the day when the buddhavaṇṇa is to be recited. At the First Council Ānanda is chosen to recite (or be questioned on) the five Nikāyas, under the direction of Mahā Kassapa. After Ānanda has fulfilled the above obligation, a number of charges are laid against him and he, "out of faith" accepts the judgment of his accusers and admits his faults. Ānanda then proceeds to perform the brahmadāṇḍa penalty on Channa in fulfilment of the Buddha's injunction. Beyond this point, the Pāli Canon has nothing more to say about Ānanda; nowhere, for example, in the Pāli Canon proper do we have a reference to Ānanda's death or a reference to his being a Buddhist patriarch.

The above schematic is the basic framework of Ānanda's place in the Pāli Canon, in particular in the sources we have studied, and it is not necessarily, as we have indicated, to be regarded as historically true.¹ Let us now turn to some of the important issues which have shaped Ānanda's character-

¹For example, we have the problem of the historicity of the account of the First Council, see our study, pp.444, 463. There is also some difficulty in determining just when and with whom Ānanda entered the Buddha's following, see our study, pp.92-120. Further, the question of the length and nature of Ānanda's attendanceship of the Buddha is also difficult to ascertain, see our study, e.g. pp. 104-110, 152-154

ization in the Pāli Canon.

One of the important features in the hagiographical presentation of Ānanda in the Pāli Canon has been the tendency of the Theravāda to emphasize the disciplinary (vinaya) aspects of the Buddha's sāsana and to underplay the doctrinal (dhamma) side of the buddhavaṇṇa. Thus, for example, we have noted the mnemonic device at the close of the first chapter of the Mahāvagga:

Although the Suttantas and Abhidhamma
be forgotten, for all time
the teaching persists while Vinaya is not
destroyed.²

Statements like the above, coupled with the fact that Upāli's position as a vinayadhara is placed above Ānanda's position as a dhammadhara (for example when Upāli recites before Ānanda at the Council of Rājagaha), suggest that the Pāli Canon as the body of literature representative of the Theravāda wished to emphasize the disciplinary aspects of the Buddha's teaching.³ Ānanda, at least in the eyes of the Theravāda, represents the 'learning' (dhamma/sutta) aspect of the buddhavaṇṇa. Thus, Ānanda was interested in learning, in the details of the buddhavaṇṇa (hence his characterization as bahussuta and mahāpaṇṇā),⁴ and in spreading the knowledge of the buddhavaṇṇa. Ānanda's success in gaining the

²Mahāvagga I 98-99, p.127. See also our study, pp.68-71.

³See our study, pp.68-71, 76, 131-132.

⁴Ibid., pp. 85, 176ff, 222-261, 283-284, 302-303, 324ff., 352-353, 358-359, 373, 452-453.

admission of women into the Sangha represents an attempt to spread the Buddha's teachings beyond the audience of the bhikkhus. Upon gaining the admission of women into the Sangha, Ānanda is charged, by no less a person than the Buddha, with having in so doing instituted a decline in the Saddhamma,⁵ a decline which interestingly requires the employment of a more stringent application and development of the disciplinary procedures.⁶ In fact, disciplinary procedures are structures even regarded as the necessary corrective to a growth in knowledge of the doctrine.⁷ Further, when lists of patriarchs were eventually drawn up, the Pāli works began their lists with Upāli,⁸ while other schools, which tended to uphold the importance of the doctrine (suttas), included Ānanda in their lists of patriarchs, usually after Mahā Kassapa. Przyluski contends that those lists of patriarchs which include the names of Mahā Kassapa and Ānanda are likely older than those utilizing the name of Upāli and omitting that of Mahā Kassapa.⁹

228. ⁵See our study, pp. 122ff., 467ff.; however, see pp.227-

⁶Ibid., pp.248ff.

⁷Ibid., p.229.

⁸See Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, pp.50-58; Lama Chimpa and Alaka Chattopadhyaya, Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India, pp.358-361; also see T.W. Rhys Davids and Herman Oldenberg, Vinaya Texts, I, pp.178-179, fn.2.

⁹Jean Przyluski, Ibid., p.54.

The information can be summarized as follows:

... while the lists of the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas begin with Upāli and Dasaka, those of the Sarvāstivādins begin with Mahākāśyapa and Ānanda. Przyluski (p.54) argues that of these two lists, the second is earlier, because all the accounts of the First Council - inclusive of those of the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas - mention Kāśyapa and not Upāli as presiding over the Council. Thus, the first tendency to formulate a definite list of patriarchs manifests itself among the Sarvāstivādins.¹⁰

One may note in passing that Upāli's name does not even appear in the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta where one would expect all of the important bhikkhus to make their entrances. The tendency to uphold the superiority of Upāli over Ānanda reflects a choice which may be seen as a relatively late addition to the hagiographical characterization of Ānanda. As a corollary, one may add that the Pāli Canon also upholds the superiority of Mahā Kassapa over that of Ānanda; the former bhikkhu, as we have indicated, was regarded, like Upāli, as a champion of the disciplinary approach.¹¹

It is most important that we realize that the Theravāda, when they formulated their canon, were unable to dispense entirely with the characterization of Ānanda which the various oral traditions had passed down since the time of the Buddha. Because schools like the Theravāda, indeed all the early Buddhist schools, could not entirely

¹⁰Lama Chimpa and Alaka Chattopadhyaya, Tāranātha's History..., p.359.

¹¹See our study, pp. 178, 285-292, 324, 475.

re-characterize Ānanda because of the inherited body of tradition upon which they had to draw, one can find in their canons materials on Ānanda which are not always suited to their needs. Because of the reliance of these Buddhist Schools on the inherited body of tradition, we are also able to find parallel accounts in their extant literatures. At the same time we must remember that it is also possible that, as a result of a long oral tradition, certain features, for example in Ānanda's characterization, were altered and passed down in a form which supplanted an earlier characterization. Regardless, the inability to entirely transform a core of the tradition current when the various Buddhist schools came to compile their canons seems to have resulted in their characterizations of Ānanda appearing as a camouflage; that is, the Buddhist schools have had to characterize Ānanda in the light of their concerns, while at the same time giving credence to the fount of tradition in circulation regarding Ānanda. This situation explains why one can find within the body of a single school a tremendous unevenness in Ānanda's characterization, in which Ānanda seems to alternate between being the most likely and the least likely successor to the Buddha.

Let us now turn to the question of Ānanda's late arahanthood. An extremely important point is that it is difficult to know when and how (and what was intended in the application of) the term "arahant" came into being to

describe those bhikkhus who were successful in the Buddha's sāsana. That is, there is great difficulty in determining the historical introduction and content of the term "arahant" during the Buddha's lifetime.¹² Turning, however, to the hagiographical characterization of Ānanda, we know that Ānanda's late arahanthood takes place against a background of often very quickly, and seemingly easily, achieved arahanthoods. In particular, Ānanda is the only bhikkhu of distinction in the Buddha's Sangha to have taken so long to attain his arahanthood. Undoubtedly Ānanda's late arahanthood reflects a change which took place in the nature of the arahant. The fact that Nāgārjuna had to devote space to discussing Ānanda's late arahanthood and to providing a rationale for it attests to its peculiarity.¹³ Nāgārjuna accepted the traditional account that Ānanda's arahanthood was late, then sought to explain it. The Theravāda, like other schools who have made mention of Ānanda's late arahanthood, seem to have based their position on the fact that there were elements in Ānanda's characterization which militated against them accepting Ānanda as an arahant. These features seem to be rooted in the fact that Ānanda was presented in the body of tradition which came down from the time of the Buddha as more mere man than saint. One of the particular characteristics pointed out by the Theravāda

¹²See our study, p.113ff.

¹³Ibid., pp.452-453.

tradition was the fact that Ānanda was distressed by the deaths of Sāriputta and the Buddha. It is likely that there were other features of a similar nature which perhaps gave rise or contributed to the accusations made against Ānanda at the Council of Rājagaha. In any event, it is this strain of simple humanity in Ānanda's inherited characterization which seems to have resulted in his late arahanthood.¹⁴ That this interpretation of Ānanda is late is perhaps attested to by the fact that Ānanda, according to the Theravāda account, only achieves his arahanthood at the last possible moment on the eve of the Council of Rājagaha, beyond which point the Pāli Canon makes no reference to Ānanda's life or death. Ānanda's arahanthood seems to have come his way as a grudging concession by the authors and/or compilers of the account in question because they recognized that Ānanda's inherited characterization marked him off, in spite of all their objections, as of great importance. Ānanda's importance is rooted not merely in his attendance on the Buddha, but more specifically in his knowledge of the buddhavaṇṇa which no council account could deny.¹⁵ This universally recognized attribute of Ānanda, his profound knowledge of the buddhavaṇṇa, could not adequately be accepted by the time the Pāli Canon was compiled as genuine without also attributing arahanthood to him. Thus, in

¹⁴ See our study, pp. 308ff., 419ff., 452-453; see also Étienne Lamotte, Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna, Tome I, p.99.

¹⁵ See our study, pp.445ff.

the case of the Cullavagga account of the First Council, although Ānanda is accepted as a council member in spite of the fact that he is not yet an arahant, when he comes to actually participate in the council, his arahanthood has been acquired.

Another feature which we have noted which suggests that Ānanda's original status was at a subsequent time reinterpreted is the fact that he often appears like a second Śāriputta.¹⁶ As André Migot points out, "La renommée d'Ānanda avait vivace dans ces milieux dont la mentalité était plus proche de la sienne que celle de Śāriputra, le métaphysicien, tel qu'il nous est présenté dans le Canon pāli. Il est d'ailleurs possible que le vrai Śāriputra ait été plus près du coeur du peuple que le Śāriputra canonique; certaines textes le montrent comme un être profondément bon, compatissant et humain, et cela expliquerait bien l'adoration véritable dont il a été l'objet de la part certains."¹⁷ One may also note that even the Buddha himself often has this humane depiction. The fact that Śāriputta escaped what Ānanda did not (i.e. a negative characterization) is perhaps explained by the fact that Śāriputta (as also Mahā Moggallāna) did not outlive the Buddha. Thus Śāriputta's characterization as

¹⁶See our study, e.g., pp.282, fn.34; 321; 337; 366.

¹⁷André Migot, Un grand disciple du buddha: Śāriputra, p.535.

one of the Buddha's chief disciples necessitated that he fit into the picture of the arahant as it came to be understood. There are some misgivings on the part of the author with respect to the above explanation of the difference in the treatment accorded Sāriputta and Ānanda in the Pāli Canon. Why should the fact that Sāriputta died a few months before the Buddha did make so big a difference in the way he was preserved in the oral tradition? André Migot suggests that Ānanda may perhaps be even more ancient than Sāriputta and this fact may help to explain the differences in their treatments. For, if Ānanda was the more ancient, then his characterization, which later would be regarded in a negative light, had more time to solidify than did that of Sāriputta. Further, the fact that Ānanda is credited with having been the Buddha's personal attendant would also have contributed to the fossilization of his characterization during the lifetime of the Buddha.

Ānanda's characterization as bahussuta is acknowledged by virtually all of the Buddhist schools and seems, in particular, to be linked to the fact that Ānanda was extremely knowledgeable as regards the buddhavaṇa.¹⁸ It is, as we have indicated, difficult to decide on all of the ramifications involved in applying this term to Ānanda. There is also some question as to the 'power' of the buddhavaṇa which seems,

¹⁸ See our study, pp.445ff.

for example, to have been very efficacious at the time of death. What seems certain is that in the subsequent history of Buddhism, subsequent at least to the death of the Buddha,¹⁹ bhikkhus, in organizing themselves in schools, tended in their canons to use particular Buddhist personalities as rallying points and as hagiographical reflections of what they considered to be the goal for the bhikkhu. Geographic considerations seem to have been relevant here; Przyluski suggests, for example, "originally the faithful of Mathura were ardent defenders of Ānanda and that they did not admit the superiority of Discipline (Vinaya) over Dharma." André Migot, drawing on the work of Przyluski, points out that one can see a number of great periods in "primitive Buddhism." A first period had its center in Rājagaha with Ānanda as bahussuta as its figurehead, while the second period was centered in Vesālī and had Mahā Kassapa and Anuruddha as sīladharas as figureheads. Migot also points to a third period centering in Kausambi and having Sāriputta, characterized in terms of "paññā", for its figurehead. We do not intend to examine Migot's views here, but there seems to be little doubt that the Buddhist schools, or groups of bhikkhus, historically

¹⁹Even within the Pāli Canon we have references to bhikkhus having specialized interests, sometimes divided along the lines of discipline (vinaya/practice) and learning (dhamma/sutta); see our study, p.232; see also pp.456ff.

tended to specialize their interests.²⁰

Migot is, as far as we have seen, correct in seeing Ānanda's characterization as bahussuta as an early one.²¹ Indeed it makes good sense to think that the Buddha's early ministry concentrated on making known the dhamma.²² In this light, Ānanda could take a position of prominence. One would have to regard the view of Ānanda as a bhikkhu unable to achieve his arahanthood as either reflecting the fact that subsequently the nature of the arahant conception was altered, or as reflecting the fact that arahanthood was not the goal of 'primitive' Buddhism. Beyond this analysis it is difficult to venture since, as we stated in our Introduction, the materials available to us, as they relate to the characterization of Ānanda, are primarily hagiographical.

Another important element in Ānanda's characterization is the 'fact' that he was regarded as the permanent attendant of the Buddha during at least the last years of the Buddha's active ministry. It is difficult to decide on the historical content of Ānanda's attendanceship of the Buddha, a service which often appears to have been shared with other bhikkhus. One notes also, for example, that when the Buddha talks about the "four wonderful and marvellous qualities of Ānanda,"

²⁰ See our study, e.g. pp.236-237. Jean Przyluski, The Legend of Emperor Asoka, pp.26-47 & 167-189; Lama Chimpa and Alaka Chattopadhyaya, Taranātha's History of Buddhism in India, pp.355-361; André Bareau, Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule.

²¹ See our study, pp.222ff; 483-484.

²² Ibid., e.g. pp.131-132.

Ānanda's attendanceship is not one of these qualities.²³

Ānanda's attendanceship of the Buddha, like his characterization as bahussuta, is attested to in virtually all the extant sources and seems to have particular value in the development of the cult of the Buddha. In this regard, we have noted how Ānanda was used to bring out the significance of the death location of the Buddha and the fact that the Buddha could have extended his life.²⁴ The fact that the Pāli Commentaries suggest that the Buddha himself chose Ānanda, even though there were contenders like Sāriputta and Mahā Moggallāna, attests to the significance of the position, which even the chief disciples wanted.²⁵

However, in spite of the illustrious position Ānanda held as permanent attendant to the Buddha, he seems to have succumbed to developments which took place in the conception of the arahant.

In summation, we reiterate that Ānanda's characterisation in the Pāli Canon of the Theravāda, in particular in the sources we have utilized, presents a picture of Ānanda which, while acknowledging the common source or pool of information on Ānanda, presents a picture of him which is a hagiographical production. This picture of Ānanda reflects the 'ideals' of the Theravāda school which, as we have seen,

²³See our study, pp.421ff.

²⁴Ibid., pp.390-400.

²⁵Ibid., pp.155-162.

are particularly vinaya-centered and interested in the arahant, or that type of arahant who is an example par excellence of the bhikkhu who is entirely in control of his faculties and shows little if any concern with the world outside of himself. In this light, the subsequent attack on the nature of the arahant in the history of Buddhism is, in some minor sense, a vindication of the importance of Ānanda who, by that time, had succumbed to the arahant conception current when the Buddhist sources were finally compiled as we have them today.

I. Pāli and Sanskrit Texts

Carpenter, J. Estlin, ed., The Dīgha Nikāya, Vol.III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1960.

Chalmers, Robert, ed., The Majjhima-Nikāya, Vol.II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1960.

_____, The Majjhima-Nikāya, Vol.III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1960.

Cowell, Edward B. and Robert A. Neil, eds., The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends, Amsterdam, Oriental Press NV, 1970.

Feer, M. Léon, ed., The Samyutta-Nikāya of the Sutta-Pitaka: Part I. Saṅgātha-Vagga, London, Pāli Text Society, 1960.

_____, Samyutta-Nikāya: Part II Nidāna-Vagga, London, Pāli Text Society, 1970.

_____, Samyutta-Nikāya: Part III Khandha-Vagga, London, Pāli Text Society, 1960.

_____, Samyutta-Nikāya: Part IV Saṅgāyatana-Vagga, London, Pāli Text Society, 1960.

_____, Samyutta-Nikāya: Part V Mahā-Vagga, London, London, Pāli Text Society, 1960.

Hardy, E., ed., The Aṅguttara-Nikāya: Part III Pañcaka-Nipāta, and Chakka-Nipāta, London, Pāli Text Society, 1958.

_____, The Aṅguttara-Nikāya: Part IV Sattaka-Nipāta, Atthaka-Nipāta, and Navaka-Nipāta, London, Pāli Text Society, 1958.

_____, The Aṅguttara-Nikāya: Part V Dasaka-Nipāta and Ekādasaka-Nipāta, London, Pāli Text Society, 1958.

Horner, I.B., ed., Papañcasūdanī Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosācariya, Part III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1933.

_____, Papañcasūdanī Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosācariya, Part IV, London, Pāli Text Society, 1937.

_____, Papañcasūdanī Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosācariya, Part V, London, Pāli Text Society, 1938.

- Hunt, Mabel, ed., Anguttara-Nikāya: Vol.VI Indexes, revised and edited by C.A.F. Rhys Davids, London, Pāli Text Society, 1960.
- Kopp, Herman, ed., Manorathapūranī: Commentary on the Anguttara Nikāya, Vol.III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1936.
- _____, Manorathapūranī: Commentary on the Anguttara Nikāya, Vol.IV, London, Pāli Text Society, 1956.
- Morris, Rev. Richard, ed., The Aṅguttara-Nikāya: Part I: Ekanipāṭa, Dukanipāṭa, and Tikanipāṭa, revised by A.K. Warder, London, Pāli Text Society, 1961.
- _____, The Aṅguttara-Nikāya: Part II Catukka Nipāṭa, London, Pāli Text Society, 1955.
- Oldenberg, Herman and Richard Pischel, eds., The Thera and Therī-Gāthā, London, Pāli Text Society, 1966.
- _____, ed., The Vinaya Pitakam, Vol.I: The Mahāvagga, London, Pāli Text Society, 1964.
- _____, The Vinaya Pitakam, Vol.II: The Cullavagga, London, Pāli Text Society, 1964.
- _____, The Vinaya Pitakam, Vol.III: The Suttavibhanga, First Part (Pārājika, Saṃghādisesa, Aniyata, Nissaggiya), London, Pāli Text Society, 1964.
- _____, The Vinaya Pitakam, Vol.IV: The Suttavibhanga, Second Part, London, Pāli Text Society, 1964.
- _____, The Vinaya Pitakam, Part V: The Parivāra, London, Pāli Text Society, 1964.
- Rhys Davids, Mrs. [C.A.F.], ed., Samyutta-Nikāya: Vol VI Indexes, London, Pāli Text Society, 1960.
- Rhys Davids, T.W. and J. Estlin Carpenter, eds., The Dīgha Nikāya, Vol.I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1967.
- _____, The Dīgha Nikāya, Vol.II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1966.
- _____, The Sumaṅgala-Vilāsini, Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya, Part I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1968.

Stede, W., ed., The Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīgha-Nikāya, Part II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1971.

_____, The Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīgha-Nikāya, Part III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1971.

Steinthal, Paul, ed., Udāna, London, Oxford University Press, 1948.

Takakusu, J. and Makoto Nagi, eds., Samantapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka, Vol.I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1924.

_____, Samantapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka, Vol.II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1927.

_____, Samantapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka, Vol.III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1930.

_____, Samantapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka, Vol.IV, London, Pāli Text Society, 1934.

_____, Samantapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka, Vol.V, London, Pāli Text Society, 1938.

_____, Samantapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka, Vol.VI, Colombo, Pāli Text Society, 1947.

Trenckner, V., ed., The Majjhima-Nikāya, Vol.I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1964.

Walleser, Max, ed., Manorathapūranī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Aṅguttara Nikāya, Vol.I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1924.

_____ and Herman Kopp, eds., Manorathapūranī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Aṅguttara Nikāya, Vol.II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1930.

Woods, J.H. and D. Kosambi, eds., Papañcasūdanī Majjhimanikāya-tthakathā of Buddhaghosacāriya, Part I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1922.

Woods, J.H. and D. Kosambi, eds., Papañcasūdanī Majjhima-nikāyaṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosa, Part II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1928.

Woodward, F.L., ed., Paramattha-Dīpanī Theragāthā-Atthakathā: The Commentary of Dhammapālacariya, Vol.III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1959.

_____, Sāratha-Ppakāsinī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Samyutta-Nikāya, Vol.I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1929.

_____, Sāratha-Ppakāsinī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Samyutta-Nikāya, Vol.II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1932.

_____, Sāratha-Ppakāsinī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Samyutta-Nikāya, Vol.III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1937.

II. Primary Sources in Translation

- Beal, Samuel, trans., Si-Yu-Ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World, Delhi, Oriental Book Reprint Corp., 1969.
- Burlingame, Eugene Watson, trans., Buddhist Legends, Parts I, II and III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1969.
- Chalmers, Robert, trans., The Jātaka: or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births, Vol.I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1973.
- Chimpa, Lama and Alaka Chattopadhyaya, trans., Taranātha's History of Buddhism in India, Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, ed., Simla, Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1970.
- Cowell, E.B. and W.H.D. Rouse, trans., The Jātaka: or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births, Vol.VI, London, Pāli Text Society, 1973.
- Fausböll, V., trans., The Sutta-Nipāta: A Collection of Discourses, Vol.X, Part II of The Sacred Books of the East, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1965.
- Feer, Léon, trans., Avadāna-sataka: Cent légends (bouddhiques), (Annales du Musée Guimet T XVIII), Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1891.
- Francis, H.T. and R.A. Neil, trans., The Jātaka: or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births, Vol.III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1973.
- _____, trans., The Jātaka: or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births, Vol.V, London, Pāli Text Society, 1973.
- Hare, E.M., trans., Gradual Sayings: Anguttara-Nikāya, Vol.III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1961.
- _____, Gradual Sayings: Anguttara-Nikāya, Vol.IV, London, Pāli Text Society, 1965.
- Horner, I.B., trans., The Book of the Discipline, Vol.I: Suttavibhaṅga, London, Pāli Text Society, 1949.
- _____, The Book of the Discipline, Vol.II: Suttavibhaṅga, London, Pāli Text Society, 1957.
- _____, The Book of the Discipline, Vol.III: Suttavibhaṅga, London, Pāli Text Society, 1957.

- Horner, I.B., trans., The Book of the Discipline, Vol.IV: (Mahāvagga), London, Pāli Text Society, 1962.
- _____, The Book of the Discipline, Vol.V: Cullavagga, London, Pāli Text Society, 1963
- _____, The Middle Length Sayings: Majjhima-Nikāya, Vol.I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1954.
- _____, The Middle Length Sayings: Majjhima-Nikāya, Vol.II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1970.
- _____, The Middle Length Sayings: Majjhima-Nikāya, Vol.III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1967.
- Jayawickrama, N.A., trans., The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna: Being a Translation and Edition of of the Bāhiranidāna of Buddhaghosa's Samantapāsādikā, the Vinaya Commentary, London, Luzac & Co. Ltd. (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol.XXI), 1962.
- Johnston, E.H., trans., The Buddhacarita: or Acts of the Buddha, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1972.
- Jones, J.J., trans., The Mahāvastu, Vol.I, London, Pāli Text Society (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol.XVI), 1973.
- _____, The Mahāvastu, Vol.II, London, Luzac & Co. Ltd. (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol.XVIII), 1952.
- _____, The Mahāvastu, Vol.III, London, Luzac & Co. Ltd. (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol.XIX), 1956.
- Kern, H., trans., Saddharma-Puṇḍarika: or the Lotus of the True Law, Oxford, Clarendon Press (Sacred Books of the East, Vol.XXI), 1884.
- Lamotte, Etienne Lamotte, trans., Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra), Tome I, Louvain, Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste (Bibliothèque du Muséon, Volume 18), 1966.
- Law, Bimala Charan, trans., Designation of Human Types (Puggala-Pannatti), London, Pāli Text Society, 1969.
- Norman, K.R., trans., The Elders' Verses I: Theragāthā, London, Pāli Text Society, 1969.
- Radhakrishnan, S., trans., The Dhammapada, London, Oxford University Press, 1958.

Rhys Davids, Mrs. [C.A.F.], trans., Kindred Sayings: Samyutta-Nikāya, Part I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1971.

_____, assisted by F.L. Woodward, trans., Kindred Sayings: Samyutta-Nikāya, Part II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1952.

_____, trans., Psalms of the Early Buddhists: I-Psalms of the Sisters, II-Psalms of the Brethren, London, Pāli Text Society, 1964.

Rhys Davids, T.W., trans., Dialogues of the Buddha, Part I, London, Luzac & Co. Ltd. (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol.II), 1969.

_____ and C.A.F., trans., Dialogues of the Buddha, Part III, London, Pāli Text Society, 1971.

_____, trans., The Questions of King Milinda, Part I, Oxford, Clarendon Press (Sacred Books of the East, Vol.XXXV), 1890.

_____, The Questions of King Milinda, Part II, Oxford, Clarendon Press (Sacred Books of the East, Vol.XXXVI), 1894.

_____, and Herman Oldenberg, trans., Vinaya Texts, Part I, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1974.

_____, Vinaya Texts, Part II, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1968.

_____, Vinaya Texts, Part III, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1969.

Rockhill, W. Woodville, trans., The Life of the Buddha: and the Early History of his Order, a translation of the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya, London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1884.

Rouse, W.H.D., trans., The Jātaka: or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births, Vol.II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1973.

_____, The Jātaka: or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births, Vol.IV, London, Pāli Text Society, 1973.

Woodward, F.L. trans., Gradual Sayings: Anguttara-Nikāya, Vol. I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1970.

_____, Gradual Sayings: Anguttara-Nikāya, Vol. II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1962.

Woodward, F.L., trans., Gradual Sayings: Anguttara-Nikāya,
Vol.V, London, Pāli Text Society, 1972.

_____, Kindred Sayings: Samyutta-Nikāya,
Part III, Mrs. Rhys Davids, ed., London, Pāli Text
Society, 1954.

_____, Kindred Sayings: Samyutta-Nikāya,
Part IV, London, Pāli Text Society, 1956.

_____, Kindred Sayings: Samyutta Nikāya,
Part V, London, Pāli Text Society, 1965.

_____, The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli
Canon: Part II Udāna: Verses of Uplift and Itivuttaka:
As It Was Said, London, Oxford University Press, 1948.

III. Secondary Sources

- Adikaram, E.W., Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, Colombo, M.D. Gunasena & Co. Ltd., 1953.
- Banerjee, Anukul Chandra, Sarvāstivāda Literature, Calcutta, Calcutta Oriental Press, 1957.
- Bareau, André, Les premiers conciles bouddhiques, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, (Annales du Musée Guimet Bibliothèque d'études, Tome LX^e), 1955.
- _____, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha dans les sūtrapitāka et les vinayapitāka anciens: II Les derniers mois, le parinirvāna et les funérailles, Tomes I & II, Paris, Ecole française d'extrême-orient (Volume LXXVII), Tome I (1970), Tome II (1971).
- _____, Recherches sur la biographie du buddha dans les sūtrapitāka et les vinayapitāka anciens: de la quête de l'éveil à la conversion de Śāriputra et de Maudgalyāyana, Paris, Ecole française d'extrême-orient (Publications de l'école française d'extrême-orient, Vol.LIIII), 1963.
- _____, Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule, Paris, Ecole française d'extrême-orient (Publications de l'école française d'extrême-orient, Vol.XXXVIII), 1955.
- Barua, Dipak Kumar, An Analytical Study of Four Mikāyas, Calcutta, Rabindra Bharati University, 1971.
- Basham, A.L., History and Doctrine of the Ājīvikas, London, Luzac & Company Ltd., 1951.
- Chaudhury, Binayendra Nath, Buddhist Centres in Ancient India, Calcutta, Sanskrit College (Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series No. LXX), 1969.
- Conze, Edward, Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies, London, Bruno Cassirer, 1967.
- Dhirasekera, Jothiya, Buddhist Monastic Discipline: A Study of its Origins and Development in Relation to the Sutta and Vinaya Piṭakas, PhD Thesis submitted to the University of Ceylon, 1964.
- Dutt, Sukumar, Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India, London, George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1962.

- Dutt, Sukumar, Early Buddhist Monachism, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1960.
- Frauwallner, E., The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature, Roma (Serie Orientale Roma VIII), 1956.
- Holck, Frederick H., ed., Death and Eastern Thought: Understanding Death in Eastern Religions and Philosophies, Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1974.
- Horner, I.B., The Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected: A Study of the Arahan, London, Williams & Norgate Ltd., 1936.
- Jayatilleke, K.N., Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1963.
- Johansson, Rune E.A., The Psychology of Nirvana, London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1969.
- Kalupahana, David J., Causality: The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, Honolulu, The University Press of Hawaii, 1975.
- Kloppenborg, Ria, The Paccekabuddha: A Buddhist Ascetic, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1974.
- Lamotte, Etienne, Histoire du bouddhisme indien: Des origines à l'ère Saka, Louvain, Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste (Bibliothèque du Muséon, Volume 43), 1967.
- Law, Bimala Churn, Geography of Early Buddhism, London, Keegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1932.
- Ling, Trevor, The Buddha, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973.
- Migot, André, Un grand disciple du buddha: Sāriputra, Paris, Ecole française d'extrême-orient (Extrait du bulletin - Tome XLVI, Fasc.2), Librairie d'amérique et d'orient, adrien-maisonneuve, 1954.
- Mishra, Yogendra, An Early History of Vaisālī, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1962.
- Misra, G.S.P., The Age of Vinaya, New Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal, 1972.
- Mitra, R.C., The Decline of Buddhism in India, Birbhum, Visua-Bharati, 1954.

- Mookerji, Radha Kumud, Ancient Indian Education: Brahmanical and Buddhist, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1974.
- Ñāṇamoli, Thera, The Patimokka, Bangkok, The Social Science Association, Press of Thailand, 1966.
- Pachow, W., A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa, Santiniketan, Sino-Indian Cultural Society, 1955.
- Pande, Govind Chandra, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1974.
- Prasad, Nand Kishore, Studies in Buddhist and Jaina Monachism, Bihar, Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology and Ahimsa, 1972.
- Przyluski, Jean, Le concile de Rājagṛha: Introduction a l'histoire des canons et des sectes bouddhiques, Paris, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1926.
- _____, The Legend of Emperor Asoka in Indian and Chinese Texts, trans. and with additional notes and comments by Dilip Kumar Biswas, Calcutta, Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1967.
- Rahula, W., History of Buddhism in Ceylon, Colombo, M.D. Gunasena & Co. Ltd., 1966.
- Sangharakshita, Bhikshu, The Three Jewels: An Introduction to Buddhism, London, Rider, 1967.
- Shastri, Ajay Mitra, An Outline of Early Buddhism, Varanasi, Indological Book House, 1965.
- Thakur, Upendra, The History of Suicide in India, Delhi, Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, 1963.
- Thomas, E.J., The Life of Buddha: as Legend and History, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1960.
- Vansina, Jan, Oral Tradition: A Study of Historical Methodology, trans., H.M. Wright, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.
- Wagle, Narendra, Society at the Time of the Buddha, Bombay, Popular Prakashan, 1966.
- Warder, A.K., Indian Buddhism, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.
- Winternitz, Moriz, A History of Indian Literature, Vol.II, Calcutta, University of Calcutta, 1933.

IV. Articles

- Bapat, P.V., "The Srāmanaphala-Sūtra and its Different Versions in Buddhist Literature," Indian Culture, Vol.XV, Nos.1-4, July 48-June 49, pp.107-114.
- Baura, P.L., "The Doctrine of Caste in Early Buddhism," Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan, Vol.IV, 1959, pp.134-156.
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K., "Indian Architectural Terms," Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol.XLVIII, 1928, pp.250-275.
- de Jong, J.W., "The Background of Early Buddhism," Indogaku Bukkyogaku, Vol.12, 1964
- Hirakawa, Akira, "The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relationship to the Worship of Stupas," The Toyo Bunko, No.22, 1963, pp.57-106.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S., "Buddha's Prolongation of Life," Bulletin of the London School of Oriental and African Studies, No.21, 1958, pp.546-552.
- Jayawickrama, N.A., "Buddhaghosa and the Traditional Classification of the Pāli Canon," University of Ceylon Review, Vol.XVII, Nos. 1 & 2, Jan-April, 1959, pp.1-17.
- Kalupahana, D.J., "Aṅga (2)," Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Vol.I, Fascicle 4, Ceylon, Government of Ceylon, 1965, pp.616-619.
- Karundasa, Y., "Bodhipakkhiya-dhamma," Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Vol.III, Fascicle 2, Ceylon, Government of Ceylon, 1972, pp.209-212.
- Kao, Kuan-ju, "Asokāvadana," Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Vol.II, Fascicle 2, Ceylon, Government of Ceylon, 1967, pp.198-200.
- Kariyawasam, A.G.S., "Bahussuta," Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Vol.II, Fascicle 4, Ceylon, Government of Ceylon, 1968, pp.502-505.
- _____, "Ascetic Practices," Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Vol.II, Fascicle 1, Ceylon, Government of Ceylon, 1966, pp.161-168.

- Lamotte, E., "La concentration de la marche héroïque (Sūrangamasamādhi Sūtra)," Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, Vol.XIII, 1965, pp. 1-308.
- Law, B.C., "Data from the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya of the Sutta Piṭaka," Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, N.S. XXI, 1925, pp.107-121.
- Lévi, Sylvain, "Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques," Journal Asiatique, mai-juin 1915, pp.401-447.
- Malalasekera, G.P., "Arahant," Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Vol.II, Fascicle 1, Ceylon, Government of Ceylon, 1966, pp.46-48.
- Poussin, Louis de la Vallée, "The Buddhist Councils," The Indian Antiquary, Vol.XXXVII, Jan. 1908, pp.1-18.
- _____, "Musīla et Nārada: le chemin du nirvana," Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, Vol.5-6, 1936-1937, pp.189-222.
- Prebish, Charles S., "The Prātimokṣa Puzzle: Fact versus Fantasy," Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol.94, No.2, April-June, 1974, pp.168-176.
- _____, "A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils," Journal of Asian Studies, Vol.XXXIII, No.2, Feb., 1974, pp.239-254.
- _____, "Theories Concerning the Skandhaka: An Appraisal," Journal of Asian Studies, Vol.XXXII, No.4, August 1973, pp.669-678.
- Przyluski, Jean, "Le nord-ouest de l'inde dans le vinaya des Mūla-Sarvāstivādin," Journal Asiatique, nov.-déc.1914, pp.493-568.
- _____, "Le parinirvāṇa et les funérailles du buddha," Journal Asiatique, Série XI, Tome XI, mai-juin 1918, pp.485-526; Série XI, Tome XII, nov.-déc. 1918, pp.401-456; Série XI, Tome XIII, mai-juin 1919, pp.365-430; Série XI, Tome XV, jan.-mars, 1920, pp.5-54.
- Rhys Davids, C.A.F., "The Relations Between Early Buddhism and Brahmanism," Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. 10, 1934, pp.274-287.

- Rhys Davids, T.W., "Devadatta," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol.IV, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1911, pp.675-677.
- Rowell, Teresina, "The Background and Early Use of the Buddha-Ksetra Concept," The Eastern Buddhist, Vol.VI, 3, July 1934, pp.199-246, Vol.VI, 4, March 1935, pp.379-431.
- Schopen, Gregory, "The Atthakavagga (Sn.766-975) as a Text-source for Pre-formularized Buddhism: Preliminary Studies. I. The Chronological Place of the Atthakavagga in Nikaya Literature," Hamilton, McMaster University, unpublished paper, 1972.
- Snellgrove, David L., "Sākyamuni's Final Nirvāṇa," Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, Vol. XXXVI, Part 2, 1973, pp.399-411.
- Trautman, Thomas R., "Consanguineous Marriage in Pāli Literature," Journal of the American Oriental Society, 1973, pp.158-180.
- Wayman, Alex, "Buddhist Dependent Origination," History of Religion, Vol.10, No.3, Feb.1971, pp.185-203.
- Weeraratne, W.G., "Arahant," Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Vol.II, Fascicle 1, Ceylon, Government of Ceylon, 1966, pp.41-46.
- Witanachchi, C., "Ānanda (6)," Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Vol.I, Fascicle 4, Ceylon, Government of Ceylon, 1965, pp.529-536.

V. Works of Reference

Buddhadatta, A.P., Concise Pāli-English Dictionary, Colombo, U. Chandradas de Silva, 1968.

Hare, E.M., ed., Pāli Tipitakam Concordance, Part I, London, Pāli Text Society, 1952.

_____ and K.R. Norman, eds., Pāli Tipitakam Concordance, Vol.II, Parts 1-3 ed. E.M. Hare, Parts 4-9 ed. K.R. Norman, London, Pāli Text Society, 1973.

Malalasekera, G.P., Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names, Vols. I and II, London, Pāli Text Society, 1960.

Monier-Williams, Sir Monier, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1970.

Nyanatiloka, Buddhist Dictionary: Manual of Buddhist Terms and Doctrines, Colombo, Frewin & Co. Ltd., 1972.

Rhys Davids, T.W. and William Stede, eds., The Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary, London, Pāli Text Society, 1966.