

# Two Categories of Brahmins in the Early Buddhist Period

TSUCHIDA Ryūtarō

That the religion of the Buddha was sprung from an anti-Brahmanical soil and that his attitude towards the beliefs and customs of the Brahmin-class was essentially hostile or negative seems to be the view shared by most students of Buddhism who interpret the early canonical texts and expound the doctrinal matters contained in them. It is, indeed, undeniable that in numerous passages in the Pāli-canon the Buddha declares and demonstrates the invalidity of some of the basic beliefs shared by the majority of his contemporary Brahmins. It is also certain that the saṅgha and its relevant institutions the Buddha inaugurated provided his adherents with a new cult-focus, where the undisputed authority of the Brahminhood could no longer assert itself. In several discourses in the canonical works we find the claim of the Brahmins to social and spiritual superiority definitely denied by the Buddha. In any event, the uncritical over-all acceptance of the Brahmanical heritage was the last thing he had in mind. These facts, however, should not be interpreted to mean that the Buddha had no respect at all for the priestly class and its religious tradition, or that he had even the intention of abolishing the existing social structure in which the Brahmin class occupied the highest position. By his decisive act of dhammacakkhapavattana (turning of the wheel of dhamma) the Buddha opened up a new spiritual horizon, which had scarcely been anticipated by any religious group of his age. Viewed against this horizon, the entire traditional heritage inevitably had to receive quite a new countenance. So the essential concern of the Buddha, as well as his successors, with regard to the Brahmanical tradition could not be the simple choice between acceptance and rejection but the ascertainment of the significance as well as the exact position which that tradition was to receive in the new religious dimension now emerging.

In a number of modern publications on early Buddhism the Buddha's antagonism toward or disrespect for the Brahmanical tradition is simply taken for granted, as if in the Buddha's mind that tradition amounted to little more than mere rubbish to be discarded by his followers. Such an assumption derives mostly from a partial and inadequate comprehension of the Brahminhood, in which one mere aspect of it is regarded as representative of the whole. For example, the practice of the animal sacrifice seems to have acquired such a preponderance in the minds of many scholars, when they speak about the Brahmanical tradition in relation to the Buddha's teaching, that they fail to pay enough attention to several

other aspects of Brahmanical religion at the time of the rise of Buddhism. It scarcely needs to be mentioned that the immolation of living beings as ritual victims contradicts the Buddhist principle of non-injury (*avihiṃsā*). As we shall see below, in some canonical passages the Buddha explicitly points out the futility of animal sacrifice. Thus, the representation of animal sacrifice as one of the main preoccupations of average Brahmins contemporary with the Buddha inevitably leads to an oversimplified or even erroneous notion of Brahmanism as a religion essentially incompatible with the Buddhism. In reality, the practice of śrauta-sacrifices including animal rites, was by no means obligatory for every socially important Brahmin. On the contrary, it seems that, in the days of the Buddha the theory and the practice of orthodox śrauta-ritualism was in the hands of a relatively small group of specialists who represented only a part of the entire Brahminhood in that period. For the majority of Brahmins it was possible to lead their ritual life without killing any living creature.

In the canonical works we find several passages where the Brahmins assert their superiority to members of the other castes (*vaṇṇā*). For instance, a young Brahmin scholar Ambaṭṭha is so convinced of his class superiority that he even makes the bold assertion before the Buddha that *khattiyā*, *vessā* and *suddā* are nothing else but servants of a *brāhmaṇa* (*brāhmaṇasseva paricārikā*).<sup>1)</sup> For Buddhist authors such a statement was certainly not acceptable. When they enumerate the four castes, they usually begin with *khattiya-vaṇṇa*, and *brāhmaṇa-vaṇṇa* comes only second in their enumeration.<sup>2)</sup> This order remains the same, if the *vaṇṇa*-designations occur as the first member of nominal compounds, of which the second member consists in such words as *kula*, *parisā*, *maṇḍala*, *paṇḍitā*, or *mahāsālā*. In two Sutta-s in DN we find a *gāthā* ascribed to *Brahmā Saṅkumāra*, which is incorporated into the Buddha's discourses with certain Brahmins.<sup>3)</sup> In the first half of this *gāthā* it is explicitly stated that *khattiyā* stand highest among human beings.<sup>4)</sup>

No matter how Brahmins may have been ranked socially, as a whole they undoubtedly formed a distinct class, and the status of membership in that class surely carried no small significance within the society of the early Buddhist period. The unity of the Brahminhood as a *vaṇṇa* does not, of course, mean that there was no diversity within it. In surveying the numerous passages in the canon which describe the life of Brahmins we notice that there were differences among them. These differences lie primarily within the realm of attire, abode, occupation, and the means of livelihood. This outward differentiation implies the underlying differentiation in religious orientation. The religious practices of one group of Brahmins are not the same as those of another. As we shall examine below, the reaction of Brahmins to the Buddha's preaching differs according to the group within the Brahminhood to which they belong.

Most of the Brahmins who play definite roles in the canonical narratives are represented as scholars and ritualists. Generally speaking, there does not seem to be any essential difference in the understanding of Brahminhood between early

Buddhism and so-called orthodox Brahmanism, tenets of which are set forth fairly systematically in the dharma-literature.

However, it seems that there were in the Buddha's lifetime no small number of Brahmins who earned their livelihoods by those occupations which are usually supposed to be pursued by members of other castes. In the Jātaka-narratives we find several instances of Brahmins engaged in such pursuits as trade, handicrafts and hunting.<sup>5)</sup> Such instances are rare but not totally absent in the main parts of of Pāli canon. The best example would be Kasibhāradvāja,<sup>6)</sup> an inhabitant of a Brāhmin village, who leads the life of a farmer. In a Sutta contained in the Suttanipāta<sup>7)</sup> the Buddha delivers a sermon to him containing a number of expressions relating to agricultural matters.

On the other hand, there appear in the canon many Brahmins of whose social and religious background we know practically nothing. For in those cases the authors provide us with no other information than their names and homelands. Sometimes a Brahmin is even introduced into the narrative anonymously; he is then referred to merely as 'a certain Brahmin' (aññataro brāhmaṇo).

It is quite natural for a Sutta-author<sup>8)</sup> to give detailed accounts of particular Brahmins, in so far as it provides him an effective means to expound and enhance the Buddha's doctrines dealt with in the Sutta. Although the data on the Brahminhood which the canonical texts provide are not scanty, they are insufficient for us to investigate the real condition of every type of Brahmin living in the early Buddhist period. In any event, we can hardly hope to achieve on the basis of canonical materials an exact and comprehensive categorization of the Brahminhood of that period. Nevertheless, a brief survey of some canonical texts will suffice for us to establish the existence of at least two distinct groups within the Brahminhood of the early Buddhist period. Of these two, one group is that of wealthy Vedic masters living in villages and towns, including those who are called brāhmaṇamahāsālā, while the other consists of the ascetics with matted hair (jaṭilā), each living in his own hermitage (assama).

For these two groups of Brahmins, the canonical texts furnish materials sufficiently copious for us to discern both their social functions as well as their religious standpoints. And in this task we are greatly facilitated by a special feature of canonical Pāli prose. In the prose portions of the Pāli Sutta-s it is clear that authors did not always rely upon their own resources but in many cases had recourse to already existing textual materials. It is well known that these canonical authors were very fond of using formulae and stock-phrases. But their predilection for stereotypical expressions is not restricted to the components of a sentence. No small part of the textual materials which stood at their command seems to have consisted in a large number of fixed prose passages. The same prose passage describing a Brahmin may be found in several different Sutta-s, each time in connection with a different person, and sometimes even in a quite different context. In not a few instances the Sutta-authors seem to have composed their narratives about particular Brahmins by simply arranging several ready-

made prose units and redacting them with minor alterations and additions of some new material into a coherent story.

It is true that some Sutta-authors display their literary skill by giving us lively portraits of particular Brahmins, such as Ambaṭṭha, Jāṇussoṇi and Keṇiya. But in these cases the intention as well as the skill of the authors lie not in presenting the personal traits of the individual Brahmins but rather in casting into relief the essential character of a certain Brahmin-category embodied in particular personalities. Examining the portraits of these Brahmins, we realize that they seldom betray their personal peculiarities; their mental and corporal behaviours are more or less common to other members of the group to which they belong.

In the present study we will focus our attention on the two groups of Brahmins, whose mode of life is depicted in the Buddhist texts with sufficient clarity. The textual materials upon which our study is based consist mainly of Pāli canonical texts. As for the Pāli exegetical works and the Jātaka narratives, as well as the other versions of canonical texts, we do not always take them into consideration, but draw upon them only occasionally. The accounts of the Brahminhood given by the Pāli canonical texts may, if they are properly examined in corroboration with the data furnished by non-Buddhist sources, enable us to elucidate the general trends of Brahmanism in northeastern India in the period between circa the fifth and the first centuries B.C.

First we discuss wealthy Vedic teachers who live in towns and villages. In the Pāli Sutta-s some eminent Brahmins who belong to this group are referred to by a special title: brāhmaṇamahāsāla. In Vāseṭṭha-sutta (SNp 3,9; MN 2,48), 1; Tevijja-s. (DN 1,13), 2 and Subha-s. (MN 2,49), 7 five brāhmaṇamahāsālā are enumerated as follows:

Caṅkī, Tārukkha, Pokkharasāti, Jāṇussoṇi, Todeyya<sup>9)</sup> (list 1)

These passages state that these five persons once stayed at a Brahmin village (brāhmaṇagāma) in Kosala. The passages do not tell us the purpose of their stay. Probably some kind of religious assembly was held there, in which several leading Brahmins of the Kosala-country participated. The Vāseṭṭha-s. says that the village was Icchānaṅgala, while according to the Tevijja-s. it was Manasākaṭa. These five persons can be regarded as representing the Kosala-group of brāhmaṇamahāsālā.

From some Sutta-passages we can infer that Pokkharasāti was the most prominent and authoritative figure among the five Brahmins. In the Caṅkī-s. (MN 2,45) five hundred Brahmins from different countries who are staying temporarily in the village of the Brahmin Caṅkī, called Opāsāda, take issue with him for paying a visit to the Buddha, saying that, for many reasons, the visit will surely damage his reputation as a very distinguished Brahmin. One of the reasons they offer on that occasion is that Caṅkī is highly respected even by Pokkharasāti (... brāhmaṇassa Pokkharasātissa sakkato garukato mānito pūjito apacito).<sup>10)</sup>

The same discourse in the same situation is repeated in the *Soṇadaṇḍa-s.* (DN 1,4), 4 and the *Kūṭadanta-s.* (DN 1,5), 9. In these Sutta-s the great respect shown by Pokkharasāti towards *Soṇadaṇḍa* and *Kūṭadanta* is mentioned in just the same context as in the *Caṅkī-s.* Both *Soṇadaṇḍa* and *Kūṭadanta* are wealthy Brahmins: the former is said to rule over *Campā* in the *Aṅga*-country, while the latter is said to be the landlord of a Brahmin village called *Khāṇumata* located in the kingdom of *Magadha*. Apparently the authority and reputation of Pokkharasāti were not restricted to his native region of *Kosala* but extended throughout the entire Brahmin society of northeastern India. In the narratives of several Sutta-s the significant role of interlocutor of the Buddha at his sermons is assigned to some of Pokkharasāti's pupils, such as *Ambaṭṭha*, *Vāseṭṭha* and *Subha*, son of *Todeyya*.

Now in the introductory part of the *Ambaṭṭha-s.*<sup>11)</sup> we find the following passage concerning Pokkharasāti's ownership of *Ukkhaṭṭhā*, a handsome estate donated to him by *Pasenadi*, *Kosala*-king:

tena kho pana samayena brāhmaṇo < Pokkharasāti Ukkhaṭṭhaṃ ><sup>12)</sup> ajjhāvasati sattussadaṃ satīṇakaṭṭhodakaṃ sadhaññāṃ rājabhoggaṃ raññā < Pasenadinā Kosalena > dinnaṃ, rājadāyaṃ brahmadeyyaṃ (prose-unit A)

The Sutta-authors use the same prose-unit, changing only the locale and the personal names, when they identify the land which *Caṅkī*, *Lohicca*, *Soṇadaṇḍa*, *Kūṭadanta*, and *Pāyāsi* owned. *Opāsāda* and *Khāṇumata*, the estates donated by kings *Pasenadi* and *Bimbisāra* to *Caṅkī* and *Lohicca*, respectively, are explicitly identified as Brahmin villages. As for *Ukkhaṭṭhā* and *Sālavaṭikā*, estates also given by *Pasenadi* to Pokkharasāti and *Lohicca*, respectively, no mention is made of their being Brahmin villages. It is not *Ukkhaṭṭhā*, itself, but *Ichhānaṅgala*, a neighbouring village where the assembly of eminent Brahmins seems to have taken place now and then, which is designated as *brāhmaṇagāma*. In the case of *Soṇadaṇḍa* we can hardly accept the canonical account literally. According to the introductory narrative of the *Soṇadaṇḍa-s* it is *Campā* which *Bimbisāra* gave to that Brahmin. It is well known that *Campā* was the royal capital of the *Aṅga*-country—at that time it had already been conquered by the king of *Magadha*—and in this Sutta we certainly have to do with the same *Campā*, since its opening passage refers to *Gaggarā*, a celebrated lotus-pond in that city. It is almost unthinkable that such an important city as *Campā*, which is mentioned in the canonical list of *mahānagarā*,<sup>13)</sup> would have been given to a single Brahmin as a royal donation, however much respect the monarch may have had for him. Such expressions as *sattussadā*, *satīṇakaṭṭhodakā*, and *sadhaññā* make sense only when they are employed in the description of an agrarian estate. The actual estate of *Soṇadaṇḍa* seems to have been located in some rural area adjacent to the city, and it is probably due to the Sutta-author's mechanical use by rote of prose-unit A that the text implies that the whole district of *Campā* had been donated to him.

Although Wagle has already given a precise accounting of these Brahmin villages and Brahmin estates,<sup>14)</sup> the following table of the brāhmaṇagāma-s and the brahmadeyya-s mentioned in the Nikāya texts would not be entirely superfluous.

#### Kosala

- Ukkaṭṭhā (brahmadeyya)  
 donated by Pasenadi to Pokkharasāti (A)  
 DN1,3,2
- Opāsāda (brāhmaṇagāma, brahmadeyya)  
 donated by Pasenadi to Caṅkī (A)  
 MN 2,45,1
- Sālavatikā (brahmadeyya)  
 donated by Pasenadi to Lohicca (A)  
 DN1,12,1
- Setabyā (brahmadeyya)<sup>15)</sup>  
 donated by Pasenadi to Pāyāsi<sup>16)</sup> (A)  
 DN 2,10,1
- Manasākaṭa (brāhmaṇagāma)  
 assembly-place of the five brāhmaṇamahāsālā  
 DN1,13,1
- Nagaravinda (brāhmaṇagāma)  
 MN3,50,1
- Sālā (brāhmaṇagāma)  
 MN 1,41,1; 2,10,1; SN 4,47,4
- Ekasālā (brāhmaṇagāma)  
 SN 1,4,14
- Venāgapura (brāhmaṇagāma)  
 AN 3,7,3
- Veḷudvāra (brāhmaṇagāma)  
 SN 4,55,7
- Icchānaṅgala (brāhmaṇagāma)  
 assembly-place of the five brāhmaṇamahāsālā  
 DN 1,3,1; MN 1,48,1; AN 5,3,10; 6,4,12; 8,9,5

#### Magadha

- Khāṇumata (brāhmaṇagāma, brahmadeyya)  
 donated by Bimbisāra to Kūṭadanta (A)  
 DN 1,5,1
- Ambasaṇḍā (brāhmaṇagāma)  
 DN 2,8,1
- Pañcasālā (brāhmaṇagāma)  
 SN 1,4,24

Ekaṇālā (brāhmaṇagāma)  
SNp 1,4; SN 1,7,11

Aṅga  
Campā (brahmadeyya)  
donated by Bimbisāra to Soṇadaṇḍa (A)  
DN 1,4,1

Malla  
Thūṇa (brāhmaṇagāma)  
Udāna 7,9,17

(list 2)

At the time of the Buddha Bimbisāra had already annexed Aṅga to the territory of Magadha. So, the brāhmaṇagāma-s and the brahmadeyya-s mentioned in the Nikāya texts are almost all located within the two great kingdoms of Kosala and Magadha. This does not necessarily mean that there were scarcely any Brahmin estate and Brahmin village in other parts of northeastern India, but rather it suggests the close relationship of Brahmin landownership with royal power.<sup>17)</sup>

As we have already seen, not every brahmadeyya is a brāhmaṇagāma and vice versa. Some Brahmin villages likely do not owe their existence to royal patronage. On the other hand, there seem to have been the estates which were given to Brahmins, in which the greater part of the inhabitants were members of other castes.

Because of epigraphical and other textual evidence we are better informed about the brahmadeya and similar institutions in later periods.<sup>18)</sup> In the period with which we are here concerned, we lack sufficient historical materials to investigate the exact legal status and actual conditions of lands granted to or inhabited by Brahmins.<sup>19),20)</sup> In any case, the Brahmins whose names are mentioned in the table above are represented in the Sutta-s as constituting, side by side with the monarchs, the uppermost stratum of the society. This prominence seems to owe itself primarily to the authority they held within the society as orthodox Vedic masters and ritual priests. At the same time it is undeniable that other secular factors, such as the extensive revenue from the lands they occupied as well as certain administrative rights attached to those lands contributed considerably to the enhancement of their social prestige.

Besides the individual Brahmins who are mentioned by name in the two lists above, the Sutta-narratives also mention the inhabitants of the Brahmin villages, called collectively brāhmaṇagahapatikā.<sup>21)</sup> It is difficult to ascertain the social class(es) which the Sutta-authors had in mind by their use of this compound. This difficulty is due, first of all, to the ambiguity which clings to the term gahapati(ka). A number of gahapati-s are assigned certain significant roles in the Sutta narratives. The authors do not always provide us with sufficient informations

about their social background of these people. Some of them, however, are called thapati (master carpenter or overseer), and some others, for example, the famous Sudatta Anāthapaṇḍika, are called seṭṭhi (chief of guild). The forms of address which the Buddha and the gahapati-s use between themselves are clearly different from those used between him and the Brahmins.

In certain enumerative passages in the Nikāya texts we find gahapati mentioned third after khattiya and brāhmaṇa. For instance, in MN 2,8,5; 25,1 we find khattiyapaṇḍitā, brāhmaṇa-p., gahapati-p. and samaṇa-p. specified as four distinct learned groups. Likewise, the eight assemblies are enumerated in DN 2,3,42; MN 1,12,11; AN 8,7,9. The first half of this list, comprised of khattiyaparisā, brāhmaṇa-p., gahapati-p. and samaṇa-p. is exactly parallel to the paṇḍita-list, while all the items which constitute the second half are divine assemblies such as cātummahārājikaparisā, tāvatimsa-p., māra-p. and brahma-p. Furthermore, in AN 6,5,10, the six categories of human beings, i.e. brāhmaṇā, khattiyā, gahapatikā, women (itthī), thieves (corā) and mendicants (samaṇā) are set forth in this order, and the Buddha defines the main concern (adhippāya), the mental application (upavicāra), the means of livelihood (adhiṭṭhānā), the object of desire (abhinivesa) and the goal of life (pariyosāna) of the people who belong to each category. As for the gahapatikā, the essential characteristics of their life are formulated by the Buddha in the following manner:

gahapatikā bhogādhippāyā paññūpavicārā sippādhiṭṭhānā kammantābhinivesā niṭṭhitakammantapariyosānā

Since the expressions bhogādhippāyā and paññūpavicārā are applicable also to the brāhmaṇā and khattiyā who are described in the preceding passages, it is kammanta (work, business) and sippa (crafts) which characterize the gahapatikā in contradistinction to the other categories. Such a state of affairs may induce us to the assumption that the term gahapati(ka) were nothing but a synonym for vessa. At least, the strong association of the term gahapati with the vessa-caste can be noticed in the Nikāya texts.<sup>22)</sup>

Etymologically gahapati is the master of a house, and there cannot be any doubt that gahapati was some kind of householder. In the Pāli canon we find at least three different terms which signify a householder, i.e. gahaṭṭha, giḥī, and gahapati. Of these gahaṭṭha and giḥī are used in contrast to paribbājaka, i.e. a homeless wanderer. On the other hand, the term gahapati cannot be applied to every householder. The application of the term seems to have been limited to those who stood in some way or another above the ordinary householders.<sup>23)</sup>

At Pārājika 4,6,61 we find the following definition of the term gahapati:

gahapati nāma yo koci agāraṃ ajjhāvasati

As Wagle has indicated correctly in commenting on this sentence,<sup>24)</sup> the

expression *agāraṃ ajjhāvasati* does not mean simply living in a house. Here the verb *ajjhāvasati* is employed rather to suggest that a *gahapati* exercises his authority over a somewhat larger property extending than his personal holdings as well as over a group of people who are economically dependant upon him. This definition of *gahapati* implies that any householder who can maintain a domestic establishment on a somewhat grander scale was entitled to be called a *gahapati*, irrespective of his caste. Now the two lists of *parisā* and *paṇḍitā*, respectively, which have been mentioned above, in which the *gahapatī* are grouped together with the *khattiyā* and *brāhmaṇā*, are in essence different from the *vaṇṇa*-list. The latter exhausts, at least theoretically, all the adult members of human society except for outcastes such as *pukkasā*, *cāṇḍālā*, and *rathakārā*, whereas the former does not encompass the entirety of society but only those social groups which appeared in some way prominent or respectable in the eyes of Indian people living in the time of the Buddha. In the case of common people belonging to the lower castes, for all practical purpose it is only those who have attained to *gahapati*-status on account of their economic prosperity who deserve to be mentioned in a list of socially prominent groups. Such a list, in which *gahapatī* comes third after *khattiyā* and *brāhmaṇā*, would seem to imply that the term *gahapati* was reserved in the canonical texts only for the affluent members of the lower castes. As for those *brāhmaṇā* and *khattiyā* who were also wealthy householders, their status as *gahapati* might easily have been outweighed in terms of social recognition by their respective caste-identity, since, for these two castes, caste membership, itself, would have sufficed to distinguish them from common people, and their other attributes would need not have always been taken into account. In the light of these considerations we might understand the rather vague treatment which *gahapatī* of *brāhmaṇa*- and *khattiya*-origin receive in the canonical texts.

In this connection the following definition of *gahapatika* which is found in *Pārājika* 4,10,81 is of some interest:

*gahapatiko nāma t̥hapetvā rājaṃ rājabhoggaṃ brāhmaṇaṃ avaseso gahapati-ko nāma*

This definition of *gahapatika*, preceded by those for the other three terms, i.e., *rājā*, *rājabhogga*, and *brāhmaṇa*, occurs in the commentary to the *Pāṭimokkha*-rule which prescribes the manner in which a robe-fund should be donated to a monk by the four kinds of lay men (*Pārājika* 4,10,80). Horner's translation of the passage runs as follows: 'A householder means: excepting the king and he who is in the king's service and the Brahmin, he who remains is called a householder.'<sup>25</sup> Here Horner has construed the word *avaseso* as a substantive. This interpretation renders the noun *gahapatiko*, which has been used for the second time in the same sentence, redundant. Rather, *avaseso* seems to be employed as an adjective modifying the subsequent noun *gahapatiko*. So we might propose the following

translation of the sentence: 'Gahapatika [here meant] is none other than the gahapatika which is left, when [we] except [from the concept] the king, the royal servant, and the brahmin.' This definition of gahapatika tacitly presupposes the possibility of the term being applied to a wealthy householder of khattiya- or brāhmaṇa-origin.

Generally speaking, the word brāhmaṇagahapatikā has hitherto been treated as a dvanda-compound by both ancient commentators and modern scholars. Indeed, in many cases, the word must be construed as denoting two distinct groups of people. For instance, brāhmaṇagahapatikā, when referring to the inhabitants of a large city such as Sāvattī can only mean Brahmins and householders. On the other hand, when the same word is used in reference to a Brahmin village it is more natural to suppose that it refers to one single group. On this point we may agree with Wagle, when he says 'in the brāhmaṇa gāmas the term brāhmaṇagahapati refers to the brāhmaṇa householders.'<sup>26)</sup> As we have already observed, the inhabitants of brāhmaṇagāma-s are, in most cases, referred to collectively as brāhmaṇagahapatikā. These people, the majority of whom must consist of Brahmin-householders, are addressed by the Buddha as gahapatayo. This mode of address sounds strange, unless the term gahapati is applicable also to a householder born to a brāhmaṇa-family. In these cases we should regard the term brāhmaṇagahapatikā as being employed in the sense of 'Brahmins who are householders'. In other word, this is a special type of kammadhāraya-compound, in which the second member has the adjectival function of qualifying the first one.<sup>27)</sup>

In the word brāhmaṇamahāsālā we see another example of this same type of kammadhāraya-compound. It literally means 'Brahmins having great halls'. In three passages in the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (10,3,3,1; 6,1,1; 6) we find Mahāsāla Jābāla as the name of a certain ritual master. This is the oldest extant occurrence of the Sanskrit word mahāsāla.. In Chāndogya-upaniṣad 5,11,1 five scholars, i.e. Prācīnāsāla Aupamyava, Satyayajña Pauluṣi, Indradyumna Bhāllaveya, Jana Śārkarākṣya, and Buḍila Āśvatarāśvi are called collectively mahāsālā[ḥ] mahāśrotriyāḥ.<sup>28)</sup> ŚB 10,6,1 and ChUp 5,11-16 are closely parallel in content and construction. It is evident that the former passage served the author of the latter passage as a textual prototype. Śaunaka, who asks Aṅgiras in Muṇḍaka-upaniṣad 1, 1,3 for supreme knowledge is also called mahāsāla. Furthermore, the same word is attested in Brahma-upaniṣad 1,<sup>29)</sup> Chāgaleya-upaniṣad 3 and in a fragment of the Vādhūlasrautasūtra.<sup>30)</sup> All these passages give us hardly a clue as to the exact connotation of the term mahāsāla used in Vedic texts.<sup>31)</sup> However, the appositional use of the two terms mahāsāla and mahāśrotriya in reference to the same person in the Chāndogya-passage is highly significant.

In the Pāli Buddhist texts it is not only brāhmaṇa but also khattiya and gahapati also which can form compound with the word mahāsāla. It is clear that the brāhmaṇamahāsālā as well as khattiya- and gahapatimahāsālā formed the uppermost stratum of their respective classes, and it goes without saying that these

people enjoyed a high level of social respect and that their status was for other members of the same class an object of envy and aspiration. These three mahāsāla-groups are mentioned side by side in several passages in the Pāli canon.

In a passage of the Bālapaṇḍita-s. (MN 3,29,16) the Buddha preaches that a wise man (paṇḍita), if he ever attains a human existence after his death, will certainly be reborn among either the khattiya-, brāhmaṇa- or gahapatimahāsālā. Here the family of these three kinds of mahāsāla-people is designated by the term uccakula. This same term uccakula is sometimes contrasted with nīcakula, which, according to AN 4,9,5, indicates such low-born and indigent people as caṇḍālā, venā, nesādā, rathakārā or pukkasā. In the Saṅkhārappatti-s. (MN 3,20) the Buddha articulates the theory that those who are endowed with faith (saddhā), good conduct (sīla), learning (suta), charity (cāga), and insight (paññā) will be reborn after death among various kinds of blessed beings and that the specific rebirth differs from person to person according to his own inner propensity (saṅkhāra). Among the blessed beings here enumerated, which mostly comprise divinity-groups such as cātummahārājikā devā, tāvatiṃsā devā, brahmā, and so forth, the khattiya-, brāhmaṇa- and gahapatimahāsālā occupy the lowest position. The same theory in a somewhat modified form is set forth in AN 8,4,4. Here, too, the mahāsāla-people are reckoned as the lowest of the felicitous beings, whose companionship (sahabyatā) can be attained by those who practice charity properly in their lifetime. In the passage of the Bālapaṇḍita-s. previously cited the Buddha describes fully one who is born to a mahāsāla-family: such a man, blessed with corporal beauty, enjoys an exquisite means of livelihood in abundance, and in this environment he can accomplish good deeds (sucaritaṃ carati) mentally, verbally and, corporally (manasā, vācā, kāyena), for which he will later be rewarded with rebirth in a heavenly world (saggo loko).

In several canonical passages a fixed set of adjectives is used to refer to mahāsāla-people: aḍḍhā mahaddhanā mahābhogā pahūtajātarūparajatā pahūta-vittūpakaraṇā pahūtdhanadhaññā.<sup>32),33)</sup> The same category of people is described in AN 8,4,5,(1) as pañcahi kāmaguṇehi samappitā samaṅgibhūtā paricārayamānā.<sup>34)</sup> The distinguishing characteristics of mahāsāla-people which are indicated by these expressions are simply material abundance and satiation of sensory desires. Thus, the term mahāsāla, as it is used in the Pāli canon does not betray any religious or ritualistic implication, but only conveys a thoroughly economic conception.

The application of this term is not restricted to rich landlords living in villages; wealthy householders who inhabit towns or large cities can also be called mahāsālā. Jāṇussoṇi, for instance, a brāhmaṇamahāsālā mentioned in list 1 above, has his permanent residence in Sāvatti. MN 1,27 (Cūlahatthipadopama-s.), 1; and 2,49 (Subha-s.), 13 relate how, one day in the early morning, he set out from the royal capital, riding in his splendid white chariot drawn by white mares.<sup>35)</sup> In DN 3,23 (Mahāpariṇibbāna-s.), 83 Ānanda tries to dissuade the Buddha from entering nibbāna in such a small town as Kusinārā, arguing that in the six large

cities (mahānagarāni) live a large number of khattiya-, brāhmaṇa- and gahapati-mahāsālā who have great faith in the Tathāgata. Further, in DN 1,5 (Kūṭadanta-s.),<sup>16</sup> we find the adjectival phrase negamā ceva jānapadā ca (both those living in towns and those in the country) in referring to brāhmaṇamahāsālā.

Now, we must bear in mind that no trace of antagonism towards mahāsāla-people is attested in the Pāli Sutta-s. It is true that several eminent Brahmins and their disciples who belonged to the mahāsāla-Brahmins are severely criticized in the Sutta-s. However, in these cases, the Buddha's criticism is directed neither against their social status as mahāsāla-householders nor against their material prosperity. As we have already observed in MN 3,20 and AN 8,4,4, the Buddha even acknowledges the possibility of one's rebirth in a mahāsāla-family as an outcome of one's good deeds in one's former existence. The affluence enjoyed by a mahāsāla is, from the Buddhist point of view, completely neutral. It may lead him to a life of extravagance and total ruin; or it may, on the contrary, provide him with a favorable ground in which to cultivate his own morality. Whether it has a positive or negative effect upon him depends solely upon the presence or absence of sincere efforts on his part for pious deeds. We find this idea succinctly formulated in SN 1,3,21 and AN 4,9,5.

Except for Brahmin-hermits, whom we shall discuss later, those Brahmins who have prominent roles in canonical narratives are mostly wealthy householders, including those who are termed mahāsālā. We have already established that both gahapati and mahāsāla as terms for influential Brahmins refer only to the economic parameter of their lives. Economic prosperity, however, forms only one of many prerequisites on which their perceived social superiority is grounded. These qualities which eminent Brahmins are supposed to possess, are stipulated in different passages of the Nikāya texts. One such instance is found in the above-cited passage of the Caṅkī-s. Here the Brahmins, who try to dissuade Caṅkī from his plan to pay homage to Gotama, a mere recluse, offer the following arguments for his unsurpassed superiority:

1. Caṅkī is of pure birth on both his paternal and maternal sides back to the seventh generation.  
... <bhavaṃ Caṅkī> ubhato sujāto mātito ca pitico ca saṃsuddhagaḥa-  
ṇiko yāva sattamā pitāmahayugā akkhitto anupakkuṭṭho jātivādena (B)
2. He is very wealthy.  
<bhavaṃ hi Caṅkī> aḍḍho mahaddhano mahābhogo (C)
3. He has a thorough knowledge of all three Vedas as well as related subjects; he is also versed in grammar, popular philosophy, and the marks of a great man.  
<bhavaṃ hi Caṅkī> tiṇṇaṃ vedānaṃ pāragū sanighaṇḍuketubhānaṃ  
sākkharappabhedānaṃ itihāsaṇcamānaṃ padako, veyyākaraṇo,  
lokāyatamahāpurisalakkhaṇesu anavayo (D)<sup>36)</sup>
4. He is beautiful in his appearance.

- < bhavaṃ hi Caṅkī > abhirūpo dassaniyo pāsādiko paramāya vaṇṇapokkharatāya samannāgato brahmavaṇṇī brahmavacchasī akhuddāvakaṣo dassanāya (E)
5. He leads a very moral life.  
< bhavaṃ hi Caṅkī > sīlavā vuddhasīlī vuddhasīlena samannāgato (F)
6. He is eloquent.  
< bhavaṃ hi Caṅkī > kalyāṇavāco kalyāṇavākkaṇaṇo poriyā vācāya samannāgato vissaṭṭhāya analagaḷāya atthassa viññāpaniyā (G)
7. He instructs three hundred pupils in Vedic texts.  
< bhavaṃ hi Caṅkī > bahūnaṃ ācariyapācariyo, tīṇi māṇavakasatāni mante vāceti (H)
8. He is highly respected by Pasenadi, king of Kosala.
9. He is highly esteemed by Pokkharasāti.
10. He rules over Opāsāda which was donated to him by king Pasenadi. (A)

In *Soṇadaṇḍa*-s. 4 as well as *Kūṭadanta*-s. 9 we find almost the same text in the mouths of those Brahmins who dissuade *Soṇadaṇḍa* or *Kūṭadanta* from paying homage to the Buddha. This version contains an addendum inserted between items 7 and 8 above, which refers to the old age of the respective Brahmin.

< bhavaṃ hi Soṇadaṇḍo / Kūṭadanto > jiṇṇo vuddho mahallako addhagato vayoanuppatto (I)

The other discrepancy is the textual expansion of unit—in this version by the addition of the following sentence:

bahū kho pana nānādisā nānājanapadā māṇavakā āgacchanti bhoto Soṇadaṇḍassa / Kūṭadantassa santike mantatthikā mante adhiyitukāmā

We do not find in the canonical texts any mention that *Soṇadaṇḍa* and *Kūṭadanta* were brāhmaṇamahāsālā. However, the fact that the descriptions in these texts of the lives of the two Brahmins agree closely with that of *Caṅkī* clearly demonstrates that they both belonged to the same Brahmin-category as *Caṅkī*, whose name is mentioned as one of the five brāhmaṇamahāsālā in list 1 above. Moreover, we have the enlarged version of prose-unit C, which attests to the affluence of the three eminent Brahmins, applied to the characterization of mahāsāla-householders, in general.

A shorter text in similar vein is found in *Soṇadaṇḍa*-s.12. Here the Buddha, at the beginning of his dialogue with *Soṇadaṇḍa*, asks him about the prerequisites for one to be recognized as a genuine Brahmin by one's caste-fellows. In his reply to the question the Brahmin enumerates the following five qualities (pañcaṅgāni), with which a genuine Brahmin must necessarily be endowed. Except for wisdom, which is added here as the last item, the Sutta-author makes full use of prose-units

BDEF cited above.

1. immaculateness at birth (B) 2. erudition (D)
3. beauty in appearance (E) 4. moral habits (F)
5. wisdom

paṇḍito ca hoti medhāvī paṭhamo vā dutiyo vā sujama paggaṇhantaṇaṃ  
(J)

As an example of someone who perfectly embodies all five of these qualities, *Soṇadaṇḍa* mentions a certain *Aṅgaka* who is his nephew and pupil.<sup>37)</sup> Likewise, according to *Kūṭadanta*-s.19 a certain Brahmin who served the ancient king *Mahāvijita* as his court-chaplain (*purohita*) possessed the same qualities except for beauty. From units BDFJ the version which enumerates four qualities has its origin, and the list is abridged further in AN 5,20,2 where a Brahmin called *Doṇa*, in a dialogue similar to that recorded in *Soṇadaṇḍa*-s.11 ff., mentions only immaculate birth (B) and erudition (D) as the necessary prerequisites of the genuine Brahmin. It is of no small interest that the five qualities (*vidyā-abhijana-vāg-rūpa-śīla*) with which, according to *Gautamadharmasūtra* 11,12–13, a Brahmin must be endowed to be elected as the *purohita* of a king correspond to those stipulated in units DBGEF above.

These qualities, however, are not the monopoly of Brahmins. The canonical texts tell us that certain prominent figures among the *khattiyā* were also endowed with some of the same attributes. For instance, king *Mahāvijita* is said to have possessed eight excellent qualities.<sup>38)</sup> Likewise, in the list of the five qualities (*pañca aṅgāni*), which, according to AN 5,14,4,1, an anointed *khattiya*-king (*rājā khattiyo muddhāvasitto*) had to possess, units BC about immaculate birth and wealth occur.<sup>39)</sup>

Several prose-units which have already been quoted are used even in the description of the greatness and superiority of the Buddha. *Caṅkī*, *Soṇadaṇḍa* and *Kūṭadanta*, defending their intention to show respect to the recluse *Gotama* over the protests of their fellow Brahmins, enumerate one by one his many unsurpassable attributes, including his noble birth, beauty, eloquence, and instructorship.<sup>40)</sup> Units BEGH have been incorporated into this long passage,<sup>41)</sup> while unit C has been utilized in the passage which relates his departure from his very prosperous family, with all the adjectives changed into ablative case.

It is quite natural that noble birth should be regarded as an indispensable prerequisite for membership in the upper two castes. All the lists which have been examined contain unit B, purity of blood-lineage, as the first item. Among the qualities of a genuine Brahmin, there is no doubt that Vedic erudition comes next to immaculate parentage in importance. In fact, unit D which mentions erudition, is found in every passage which enumerates the qualities of an ideal or genuine Brahmin, while, unlike unit B, it never occurs in connection with *khattiya*-s, however distinguished they may be. It is, therefore, specifically Vedic erudition which distinguishes Brahmins from other groups of human beings. Clearly, mastery of the entirety of Vedic knowledge constituted in the minds of

Sutta-authors the main qualification for a legitimate Brahmin. In the Nikāya texts unit D occurs at least in the accounts of the following Brahmins:

Ambaṭṭha (DN 1,3,3), Soṇadaṇḍa (DN 1,4,4), Aṅgaka (DN 1,4,12), Kūṭadanta (DN 1,5,8), Brahmāyu (MN 2,41,1), Assalāyana (MN 2,43,1), Caṅkī (MN 2,45,3), Uttara<sup>42)</sup> (MN 2,41,2), Saṅgārava (MN 2,50,1), Sela (MN 2,42,2), Kāpaṭika (MN 2,45,5)

(list 3)

In this list of Vedic masters we find the names of three Brahmin-landlords, i.e. Soṇadaṇḍa, Kūṭadanta and Caṅkī. Aṅgaka is the best pupil of Soṇadaṇḍa. On the other hand, Tārukkha, a mahāsāla-brahmin, has a son called Bhāradvāja, who, in certain SNp-verses, claims to have mastered all three Veda-s,<sup>43)</sup> and the teacher of Ambaṭṭha is none other than Pokkharasāti, the most prominent figure among the five brāhmaṇamahāsālā enumerated in list 1. Thus the group of wealthy Brahmin-householders (lists 1–2) and that of eminent scholars of the three Veda-s (list 3), although not quite identical, overlap to a considerable extent. This fact indicates the existence of a special class of Vedic masters living as Brahmin-landlords, who exerted great influence over the society both as cultural authorities and as agents of economic power. It is precisely this class of affluent Vedic masters to which most of the important Brahmin-figures in the canonical narratives seem to belong.

The transmission of Vedic texts is generally thought to have been performed by different families or groups of Brahmins, each belonging to a certain Vedic school or representing a special priestly office associated with a particular Veda. Indeed, references to particular śākhā-s or ārtvijya-s are not lacking in the Pāli canon; for instance, four different groups of Brahmins, i.e. addhariyā, tittiriya, chandokā and bāvharījha<sup>44)</sup> are enumerated in DN 1,13 (Tevijja-s),<sup>7,45)</sup>

Every Brahmin who has previously been mentioned must have belonged to a certain śākhā; however, our texts do not give any particular information about this. Rather, many of them are described as being profoundly versed in all three Veda-s. At least, if unit D, the recurring statement of their erudition, is to be taken literally, then we must regard them as having thoroughly mastered not only all three Veda-s but also several related branches of learning which roughly correspond to the so-called Vedāṅga-s.

In the Sutta-s the word tevijja is used as the general designation for these learned Brahmins. An attempt to define the term is found in AN 3,6,8. In this small Sutta a Brahmin named Tikaṇṇa tells the Buddha that noble birth and Vedic erudition are the prerequisites necessary for a Brahmin to be called tevijja. Here, too, the Sutta-author simply puts prose-units B and D into the mouth of Tikaṇṇa in formulating his definition of tevijja.<sup>46)</sup>

In view of the highly stereotypical style used by the Sutta-authors we can hardly answer the question, whether all the Brahmins in list 3 were really so well

versed in Vedic learning as to deserve the title *tevijja*. It should always be borne in mind that in our present study we are dealing primarily with textual materials which were produced in a milieu which lay outside of the Brahmin community. To be sure, some monks of Brahmin background must have participated as members of the early *saṅgha* in the composition and redaction of canonical texts, however, perhaps only a small number of them, as laymen, had received an orthodox Vedic education. As for these Vedic masters now under discussion, we have some reasons to suppose that they rarely entered the Buddhist order.<sup>47)</sup> The canonical accounts of the Brahminhood, therefore, are essentially based upon the observations of those who were outside the Brahmin community. They cannot offer us any adequate information on internal and technical matters of Vedic learning such as its division into schools.<sup>48)</sup> We must reckon with a similar difficulty, when we discuss the particulars of Vedic sacrifices, as they are presented in the Buddhist scriptures.

The uniform presentation of eminent Brahmins as *tevijjā* by the Sutta-authors seems to be based on some commonly accepted concept of Brahminhood. We might well imagine that these Brahmins were in the habit of publicly asserting their mastery over all branches of Vedic learning and that the Sutta-authors were gullable enough to believe them. We cannot, however, simply dismiss this canonical evidence by considering it merely to originate in the allegations of Brahmins. However generalized and exaggerated it may be this presentation may contain some historicity, and should rather be interpreted as indicating a certain trend within the Vedism current in the centuries during and after the rise of Buddhism. Probably mastery of more than one Veda had already become a matter of fact or was considered desirable among the most erudite Brahmins living in that period. This conjecture accords well—though quite loosely—with the fact that terms such as *traividya(ka)* and *caturvidya*, which are scarcely attested in the older strata of Vedic literature, occur increasingly beginning with the *Kalpasūtra*-s. In the *Dharmasūtra*-s, for instance, we find rules which presuppose the possibility that a Vedic student (*brahmacārin*) might learn not only one but all three or four Veda-s.

The social predominance of *traividya*-/*tevijja*-Brahmins which is clearly discernible in Buddhist texts is nothing more than one of the external or incidental phenomena which came to the surface as the result of a latent but fundamental change within Vedism, itself. The change, which in all probability had already set in before the rise of Buddhism, is closely bound up with the functional change of *śrauta*-ritualism in society. In short, the performance of *śrauta*-sacrifices gradually ceased to play a role as an indispensable factor for the sustenance of society approximately in the same period when the Aryan people finally took to sedantary life after the completion of their eastward expansion. The problem, whether the general decline of *śrauta*-ritualism was essentially the outcome of an inner process of the transformation which that category of Vedic ritualism was destined to undergo, as Heestermann apparently supposes,<sup>49)</sup> or

whether it was rather conditioned by external factors is very difficult to disentangle, and must be put aside for the time being. One possible factor in this crisis might perhaps be sought in the decreasing dynamism of Aryan society at large resulting from the establishment of a well-developed agricultural economy.

This does not mean that the decline of the śrauta-ritualism entailed any disregard or depreciation by the twice-born in general. On the contrary, with the eclipse of its role within the society as a whole it ascended in social prestige. The śrauta-sacrifice still continued to be practised, but now among smaller circles of experts who, in relative isolation from society, devoted themselves not only to the preservation of the ritual practices but also to the intensive cultivation of the sacrificial learning, so that śrauta-ritualism, on the whole, attained to a higher degree of specialization than ever. Along with this process of specialization, the esoteric character of śrauta-sacrifices, which was more or less inherent to them, was increasingly strengthened.

In the course of time this trend within Vedism became united with the spread of asceticism. The practice of austerities (tapas) should not necessarily be regarded as foreign to Vedic ritualism; rather, it must have been considered by ritual masters as a means of enhancing the efficacy of their sacrificial performance as well as of acquiring insight into the mystery underlying the ritual. As will be discussed below, some Brahmins who embodied the most orthodox tradition of śrauta-ritualism seem to have adopted spontaneously the life of ascetic. They lived in areas lying outside of human society but at the same time commanded the veneration of mundane people, who now looked up to them not as mere ritual masters but as sages endowed with supernatural abilities.

Among Brahmanical sources it is the Dharmasūtra-s in which we can clearly discern the alienation of the twice-born from śrauta-ritualism. Certainly, we still find there a lot of references to śrauta-sacrifices as well as to officiant priests, and from these references we can infer the high social esteem in which śrauta-ritualism was held in the period when the Sūtra-s were composed. However, the main concern of the authors of the Dharmasūtra-s no longer lies in the regular performance of solemn rites but rather in the other categories of ritual. The rituals which have now gained significance are the simple ceremonies which the twice-born householders are to practice everyday as well as those which they are to perform at several important junctures in their lifetimes. These two types of rituals, which can be designated as āhnikā- and saṃskāra-rites respectively, are broadly classifiable as gṛhya-sacrifices. It is almost certain that these rituals had been practised continually among Āryan people from remote antiquity, but it was probably not until the late Vedic period that they became so highly esteemed as is evident from the Dharmasūtra-s. What the authors of the Dharmasūtra-s have attempted is essentially the reassessment and rearrangement of the rites and customs which had been handed down to them from antiquity into the new frameworks. In constructing these new frameworks they had recourse not only to such ancient concepts as dharma and varṇa but also to new ones current in their

own times, such as āśrama and saṃskāra. As is well known, the term āśrama, in the sense of mode of life or life-stage, makes its first appearance in the Dharmasūtra-s. As for the other term saṃskāra, it is noteworthy that it is scarcely employed as the designation of the so-called rite of passage in textual sources preceding the oldest Dharmasūtra-s. In some of the older Gṛhyasūtra-s, where the rules concerning the actual performance of these rituals are laid down, we find quite a different method of classification applied to these and other domestic rites.

Among the several kinds of rituals referred to in the Dharmasūtra-s it is undoubtedly the āhnikā-rites which occupy the most important position. These rites, which every twice-born householder is prescribed to practise daily, consist mainly of saṃdhyā, tarpaṇa, snāna, and the nourishment offerings for the five different categories of beings, i.e. brahman, gods, manes, spirits, and human beings, which are called collectively the five mahāyajñā-s.<sup>50)</sup> These offerings are understood to pay off the debts (ṛṇa) which a householder owes to the said categories of beings. We find the pañca mahāyajñāḥ already in certain texts belonging to the younger stratum of the śruti-section of the Veda, i.e. ŚB 11,5,6; TA 2,10–11. The relevant rules for the concrete ritual practices are given in the Gṛhyasūtra-s. Probably at the time when these śruti-texts were being composed, the pañca mahāyajñāḥ had gradually acquired great significance such as we now observe in the Dharmasūtra-s and in subsequent related works, i.e. the Dharmasmṛti-s and the Smṛti-like chapters of the epics and Purāṇa-s. According to these texts, the daily practice of the mahāyajñā-s constituted virtually the most important part of the ritual life of the twice-born.

Sometimes the superiority of householders to those who have other modes of life is asserted on the grounds of their continual practice of mahāyajñā-s. In the following verse from the Manusmṛti, for instance, where the extolling of the mahāyajñā-s has reached the utmost magnitude, the householder is said to sustain all movable and immovable beings just by means of this daily observance of the svādhyāya (brahmayajña) and the daivakarman (devayajña).

svādhyāye nityayuktaḥ syād daive caiyeha karmaṇi /  
daivakarmaṇi yukto hi bibhartīdaṃ carācaram // Manusmṛti 3,75

Although the five mahāyajñā-s are in reality nothing more than simple food-offerings, they are called 'great sacrifices'. This appellation is due to the belief that their practice brings forth enormous merit which is not inferior even to that produced by the large-scale śrauta-sacrifices. They are considered great not on account of the means but on account of the fruits they were thought to bring forth.<sup>51)</sup> In Āpastambadharmasūtra 1,4,12,14 the life-long continual practice of the same rites is equated with the performance of sattrā, the session of soma-sacrifices. In this and other similar passages it is with reference to the established authority of the śrauta-ritualism that the excellence of particular daily-rites is advocated.

In examining the rules found in the Dharma-literature, we notice that, as time went by, their religious focus became gradually introspective and their concern for ethical considerations increased. We are easily tempted to ascribe this trend simply to the influence which ascetics exerted on the life of householders. The existence of such an influence is not to be denied. But the householders for their part had ample spiritual resources on which they could construct their own moral code. The role played by householders in the development of Brahmanical ethics does not seem to have been sufficiently estimated by modern scholars. They are inclined to underrate the creative ability of householders, representing them mostly as people who were anxious only about their class-interests or at best as mere passive recipients and mediocre adapters of the religious and ethical ideas previously cultivated by ascetics and renouncers. It seems more likely that the introspective, moralistic tendency among householders was brought about by the social and ritual conditions in which they found themselves after the general eclipse of śrauta-ritualism within the society. A society, in which śrauta-sacrifices could no longer operate as its integrative factor inevitably had to lose its own dynamism. Because the reciprocity between members of society, which had previously been ritually effected, decreased as a result of this decline of śrauta-ritualism as an integrative social factor, each householder had to rely more seriously than ever before upon himself as an individual, and his personal responsibility for his own religious welfare increased correspondingly. The āhnika-rites which now occupied a position of centrality in the religious life of householders did not usually require the presence of any priest as mediator between them and the beings to be worshipped. The domain of their ritual activities became, as it were, more self-sufficient and, at the same time, more closed than before. Under these circumstances it is quite natural that the religious concerns of householders should be gradually directed inward, and their mental life should become, if not more meditative, at least more contemplative than it had been in a previous age. At this inner crisis some people, stricken with pessimism, gave up their family life and, in quest of their individual liberation, devoted themselves to the ascetic and meditative practices which had already begun to flourish, while those who remained at home cultivated the ethics relating to house-life, partially relying upon ideas borrowed from renouncers, but essentially depending on their own traditions as well as the wide experience which they had gained in their commitment to worldly affairs.

The corpus of the Veda is indissolubly connected with śrauta-ritualism. The greater part at least of the śruti-section would appear to have been compiled for the practical purpose of performing śrauta-sacrifices. When śrauta-ritualism gradually lost its actuality in the life of the average twice-born, Vedic learning also had to change its orientation. The separation of Vedic learning from ritual practice, however, had no negative effect up on the authority of the Veda and Vedic scholars. It helped Vedic learning to become, as it were, more self-existent and introversive. The study of the Veda now was made into something to be

practised essentially for its own sake, and more stress was laid on erudition, itself, than on its ritual application.

Under such circumstances it was those who were qualified as snātaka who now came to prominence in twice-born society. Snātaka means literally one who has performed the ceremony of ablution. A Vedic student who has completed his study has to undergo this ceremony immediately before his return to his paternal home (samāvartana). The observances (vratāni) to be kept by a snātaka are stipulated in some Gṛhyasūtra-s and every important Dharmaśāstra work. There are some ambiguities as to the exact usage of the term. Although it is usually understood to denote a twice-born who stands in the intermediary stage between the completion of Vedic study and the foundation of a family by marriage, it seems to have also been employed as the title for any married householder who has ever passed through the life-stage of brahmacārin up to the final snāna-ceremony. The origin of brahmacarya as the institution for Vedic study undoubtedly goes back to a remote age. The ceremonial ablution on the completion of that study must also have been an ancient custom.<sup>52)</sup> We might, therefore, assume that in an even older period, when Vedic learning was still inseparably connected with śrauta-ritualism, almost every brahmin being active as either a sacrificial priest or a master of sacred texts, would have lived at some time as a brahmacārin and as a snātaka. However, it seems that such a Brahmin owed his social distinction primarily to his status as a learned and experienced ritualist, and not particularly to his snātaka-hood. Probably in that period snātaka-hood as such constituted merely one of several conditions requisite for a Brahmin to attain special prominence in society.

Although the word snātaka is already attested in a few Brāhmaṇa- and Āraṇyaka-passages,<sup>53)</sup> these do not give us any exact information about the social rank of a snātaka. In the Buddhist canonical texts the word n(a)hātaka, i.e. the Pāli equivalent for snātaka, does not occur very frequently. But when we examine the contexts in which the word is employed, we can grasp the significance which the concept had already acquired in the early Buddhist period. In Theragāthā 219–221 an elder named Aṅgaṇikabhāradvāja, looking back on his past life, confesses that he became worthy to be called a genuine brāhmaṇa only after his conversion to the Buddha's teaching. The text of the last verse runs:

brahmabandhu pure āsiṃ idāni khomhi brāhmaṇo /  
tevijjo nhātako camhi sottiyo camhi vedagū ti // 221

It is worth noting that the word brāhmaṇa occurs here in juxtaposition with four nouns which all concern not the priestly but the scholarly aspects of brahminhood. In the Sabhiya-s., a text contained in SNp, the following etymological explanation of nahātaka<sup>54)</sup> is given by the Buddha:

Niṇhāya sabbapāpakāni ajjhataṃ bahiddhā ca sabbaloke

devamanussesu kappiyesu kappan n'eti, tam āhu nahātako ti // (SN 521)  
This verse is found among those which expound a number of religious terms including Brahmanical ones such as brahmā, sottiya, and vedagū. In MN 1,39 (Mahāassapura-s.) 26–29 and AN 7,9,3–6 we find similar prose definitions of brāhmaṇa, nhātaka, vedagū and, sottiya.

Needless to say, all the Brahmanical terms utilized in these passages have undergone a semantic transformation reflecting a Buddhist point of view. They have been intentionally reinterpreted to denote those who have attained perfection of inner purity and spiritual freedom. This fact indicates the very prominent position which Brahmin-scholars who were labelled with these terms occupied in the society of the period when these texts were composed. In the case of nahātaka, the association of this term, in the minds of those who composed these texts, with religious and social distinction must have been so strong that they did not hesitate to appropriate it to describe the spiritual perfection of their own saints. So, in the following half-verse of the Āṭṭānāṭṭiya-s. (DN 3,9) the nahātaka is even employed like an adjective to qualify Vessabhu, a former Buddha.

Vessabhussa ca namatthu nahātakassa tapassino // 3

Furthermore, the same word is used for the awakened one (buddha) in one of those verses of the Dhammapada in which the Buddha expounds the prerequisites for a true Brahmin:

usabhaṃ pavaraṃ viraṃ mahesiṃ vijiṭvinaṃ /  
anejaṃ nahātaṃ buddhaṃ tam ahaṃ brūmi brāhmaṇaṃ // 422<sup>55)</sup>

A somewhat broader connotation of the Brahmanical term snātaka underlies the usage of the Pāli equivalent n(a)hātaka. For the application of the word snātaka need not always be confined to those who remain in the intermediary stage between brahmacārin and gṛhastha. Whether they were already married or not, every twice-born who had once finished the regular course of Vedic study terminating with the ceremony of the final bath might have been called a snātaka. Employed in this sense, the word snātaka becomes a virtual synonym of other words denoting a Vedic scholar such as śrotriya and traividya. In Dharma-texts the precepts pertaining to Vedic study are formulated in such a manner as to give us the impression that every male twice-born was obliged to go through the brahmacārin and snātaka stages before his marriage. There is, however, little doubt that only a small part of the entire twice-born population was actually in a position to pursue such a long scholarly career. Those who were qualified as snātaka apparently constituted the upper intellectual class of Vedic authorities within the Brahmin caste, and common Brahmins, as well as the members of the other two castes, seem to have been virtually excluded from the regular course of Vedic study prescribed in the Dharmasūtra-s. On the basis of these observations

we may assume that the Dharma-texts acquired their original form just within this subset of Vedic authorities who were *snātaka*-householders.

It is into the same social group—or perhaps one of its subgroups—that the Brahmins mentioned above in list 3 should be classified. They were not restricted to religious and scholarly occupations; as wealthy householders they must have also been involved, at least to some extent, in mundane affairs. For example, they had to administer their large households and landed estates. We have some reason to assume that some of them served in royal courts as chaplains (*purohita*), counsels, or even as ministers. As for religious activities, their duties included the performance of several kinds of ritual. One should not suppose that they were already completely estranged from the *śrauta*-ritualism. One landlord-Brahmin, *Kūṭadanta*, figures in the *Sutta* of the same name as a highly specialized officiant of the *mahāyañña* i.e. the *śrauta*-sacrifice par excellence.<sup>56)</sup> However, based on the accounts of these Brahmins in the *Sutta*-s, we cannot conclude that the performance of *śrauta*-sacrifices still constituted an indispensable part of their religious life. The general picture of Brahmins which emerges from these accounts is not one of sacrificial priests but one of scholars—or, in some cases, students—of exceptional erudition. As we have already observed, in the recurring prose-unit D most of these Brahmins are designated as masters of all three *Veda*-s (*tevijjā*), for some of them the expression *ācariyapācariyo* ‘teacher of teachers’ is employed. Even in the case of *Kūṭadanta*, his mastery of the *mahāyañña* is not alluded to anywhere in DN 1,5,9 where his excellent qualities are enumerated. In the *Subha*-s the discussion between the young Brahmin and the Buddha centers around the concept of the five *brāhmaṇadhammā*, which consist of truthfulness (*sacca*), austerities (*tapa*), purity in sexual life (*brahmacariya*), erudition (*ajjhena*) and charity (*cāga*). In this enumeration, too, the notion of a Brahmin as a sacrificial priest is totally absent. Each of the concepts enumerated here as one of the *brāhmaṇadhammā* is as old as Vedic culture, itself. However, placed together in this list, they seem to reflect the introspective tendency of the Brahmins of the later period who strove to realize these *dhammā* for the cultivation of their own individual existences.

In the *Sutta*-s now currently under discussion the words *brahmacārī* and *nahātaka* do not occur, but the use of the term *tevijja* as well as the contents of unit D presuppose the most orthodox career of Vedic study the Brahmins might possess. In these *Sutta*-s the term which corresponds to a *brahmacārī* in the sense of a Vedic student is *māṇava*(ka). Several Brahmins are therein described as attended by hundreds of *māṇavā*, while *māṇavā* such as *Subha* and *Ambaṭṭha* are represented as being equal to their teachers in their mastery of the entirety of Vedic learning. It is of no small interest that the expression *nahātakasatāni* occurs in connection with some *brāhmaṇamahāsālā* in DN 2,6 (*Mahāgovinda*-s.) 23.

In some canonical texts there occurs a special prose unit which gives the names of certain ancient sages (*pubbakā isayo*), to whom the authorship of the sacred texts (*mantā*) being recited and transmitted is ascribed. The text of that

unit runs as follows:

... ye pi kho te brāhmaṇānaṃ pubbakā isayo mantānaṃ kattāro mantānaṃ pavattāro yesam idaṃ etarahi brāhmaṇā porāṇaṃ mantapadaṃ gītaṃ pavuttaṃ sannihitaṃ tad anugāyanti tad anubhāsanti bhāsitaṃ anubhāsanti vācitaṃ anuvācenti seyyathidaṃ—

Atthako Vāmako Vāmadevo Vessāmitto Yamataggi Aṅgīraso Bhāradvājo Vāsettho Kassapo Bhagu (K)

Among the ten names listed here only Vāmaka is somewhat obscure, while the other nine are all vernacular forms of the names of those celebrated seers to whom the authorship of several Vedic hymns or even of some particular books of the Ṛgveda are traditionally ascribed. Most probably the list of ten *isi-s* contained in unit K once existed as an independant mnemonic formulae, which was of current usage among certain—not exclusively Buddhist—circles. In fact, we find the same list incorporated into a different context in AN 7,5,9,6, in which a brief reference is made to the *mahāyaññāni* which were performed by the ten ancient seers. The author of unit K appears to have taken the list over from his textual repertoire in order to make it the basis of his own composition. Unit K is found at least in the following passages of the Pāli canon.

Vinaya-Mahāvagga 6,23,42

DN 1,3 (Ambaṭṭha-s.), 32–33

DN 1,13 (Tevijja-s.), 7,9,15,19,23

MN 2,45 (Caṅkī-s.), 6, MN 2,49 (Sela-s.), 5

AN 5,20 (Doṇabrāhmaṇa-s.), 2,8

In the Mahāvagga passage we read that the ten seers abstained from eating at night and at other improper times just as the Buddha did. This practice of the ancient sages occurs to Keṇiya the ascetic, when he pays a visit to the Buddha. Keṇiya, therefore, does not take any food but only some beverages to serve him. In the AN-sutta the interesting theory of the five categories of Brahmins is attributed to these same seers. By the long discourse in the Ambaṭṭha-s. the Buddha finally convinces the young Brahmin who is learned in the entire Veda that he does not resemble the ancient sages in any way, reminding him of their frugal lifestyle which has nothing in common with the extravagance in which he and his teacher, Pokkharasāti, indulge. On the other hand, these same seers stand in a somewhat unfavorable light in the Tevijja-s., in which the Buddha discusses with two Brahmin youths, Vāsettha and Bhāradvāja, the problem of who knows the right way leading to the companionship of the god Brahmā (*brahmasahavyatā*). In conclusion, the Buddha declares that all those Brahmins who are supposed to be *tevijjā* are not able to indicate the way to attain that companionship, because none of them has ever advanced far enough in his religious practices to have any real experience of seeing the god face to face. According to this Sutta, it was none other than the ten ancient seers who constituted the first

generation of vain and ignorant Brahmins, and their ignorance has been inherited by their successors up to the generation, to which the so-called *tevijja*-Brahmins, including *Tārukka* and *Pokkharasāti*, the teachers of both youths belong. This state of affairs is compared by the Buddha to a procession of the blind (*andhaveṇi*), each of whom relies in vain upon another. The same simile also occurs in the *Caṅkī-s.* and *Subhasutta*, where the Buddha uses the same argument to repudiate the claim to superiority which the Brahmins make, as in the *Tevijja-s.* In doing so, he throws into relief the fundamental ignorance of the entire Brahminhood, including the ten ancient seers. Thus, the treatment of the seers varies according to the text into which prose-unit K is incorporated. This unit, as such, does not imply any kind of prejudgement of the seers, but merely contains the factual statement that they are the prototype of the Brahminhood, and the authors of the *mantā* which the Brahmins transmit as their sacred texts. Now, the authors of texts such as the *Mahāvagga* and *Ambaṭṭha-s.*, and *Doṇabrāhmaṇa-s.* place unit K into the narrative contexts where it is implicit that a universal degeneration of the Brahminhood has once taken place.<sup>57)</sup> Consequently, in these texts the ancient seers, whose simple, blameless lifestyle is put into clear contrast with the depravity and extravagance of present-day Brahmins, are accorded a certain authoritative position. On the other hand, in the narratives of the *Tevijja-s.* and the other two *Sutta-s* containing the simile of the *andhaveṇi*, no qualitative distinction is made between the ancient *isi-s* and contemporary Brahmins. They are both equally represented as ignorant and self-conceited people comparable to the blind. The reference to the ten seers turns out to be little more than one of the narrative devices which the *Sutta*-redactors employ in order to advance their arguments effectively. Except for the passages under discussion, we find in the Pāli canon practically no particular description of the Vedic seers as a group. In view of this state of affairs we may assume that the early Buddhist authors had neither a definite conception nor a concrete image of the ancient Brahmins who belonged to the category of Vedic *ṛṣi*.

The more lengthy *Sutta-s*, in *DN* and *MN*, in which the Buddha and a Brahmin figure prominently include a full accounts of the circumstances under which the Brahmin decides to interview with the Buddha. In most of these *Sutta-s* what arouses his curiosity to visit *samaṇo Gotamo*, who just happens to be staying nearby, is the Buddha's reputation (*kittisaddo*) as the completely awakened one. We must pay full attention to the fact that, in some *Sutta-s*, e.g. *DN* 1, 3 (*Ambaṭṭha-s.*), the curiosity of Brahmins is associated with their interest in the thirty-two characteristics (*dvāṭiṃsalakkhaṇāni*), with which, according to their own tradition, a great man (*mahāpuriso*) is endowed. In these *Sutta-s* the Brahmins' confirmation of the actual presence of these marks on the Buddha acts as the most decisive factor in their embracing his teaching.

A few Brahmins, such as *Ambaṭṭha*, show disrespect for the Buddha, when they first meet him.<sup>58)</sup> These instances are rather exceptional. Most Brahmins do not begrudge him the respect which they are wont to show their social equals. As

mentioned above, some mahāsāla-Brahmins, e.g. Caṅkī, held samaṇo Gotamo in very high regard even before becoming acquainted with him personally. Sammodaniyā kathā (pleasant talk) is the style of greeting which they exchange with the Buddha before beginning their discourses, and in these discourses they address the Buddha by his gotta-name Gotama. As Wagle points out in his work,<sup>59)</sup> all these things indicate the equality of status which Brahmins assumed in their relations to the Buddha.

Within the scope of our present study we cannot examine the doctrinal topics which the Buddha and his Brahmin visitors discussed in the Sutta-s. In the course of their dialogues the conceit, ignorance, vanity, self-complacency, and unjustifiable sense of class superiority of the Brahmins as well as their blind obeisance to traditional authority come to light and are relentlessly shattered by the Buddha. On the other hand, the Buddha seldom categorically denies the social institutions and religious ideas current among the Brahmin householders. What he severely criticizes is their external extravagance and their mental attitude rather than the traditional concepts to which they adhere. It is well known that in dealing with such Brahmanical concepts as tapa, vijjācaraṇa, yañña, and brāhmaṇa, the Buddha does not discard them as such but gives them different connotations so as to incorporate them into his own scheme of dhamma. Even in these cases of Buddhist reinterpretation, the concepts seem to still retain some validity within their older Brahmanical understanding. They are not completely repudiated but are granted certain subordinate positions within the range of Buddhist ideas, in so far as they do not contradict them principally.

For instance, the position of the early Buddhists with respect to Brahmanical tradition is well illustrated, in the Kūṭadanta-s, which contains a long dialogue between the Buddha and the Brahmin Kūṭanda. Here the Buddha condemns the performance of mahāyañña which involves the slaughter of animals as well as the harassment of the common people. What he advocates at the conclusion of this discourse as the most praiseworthy sacrifice bears no relation to Vedic ritualism at all, but consists in the regular regimen of Buddhist practices, i.e. the noble eight-fold path and the four kinds of meditation. On the other hand, at the end of the Jātaka-like section of the same Sutta, where he narrates the story of the mahāyañña he once carried out as a purohita on behalf of the ancient king Mahāvijita, he admits the efficacy of this type of Brahmanical sacrifice, which does not entail the injury of any living being but is performed only with plants and dairy products.<sup>60)</sup> The Buddha concedes, as it were, a middle position to this unbloody sacrifice; he says to Kūṭadanta, recollecting his former deeds, that whoever may have performed this kind of sacrifice or officiated at it as the priest would have been reborn in the heavenly world.

From the accounts of this and other Sutta-s we ascertain that the Buddha did not condemn all Vedic sacrifices but only those which conflicted with the principle of non-injury (avihiṃsā). He had no intention of abolishing unbloody śrauta-rites such as agghuttha / agnihotra and shared a belief in the efficacy of simple daily

ceremonies and other gr̥hya-rites. This attitude is usually explained as one example of the tolerance shown by the Buddhists towards other religions. It does not, however, seem that the Buddha merely tolerated them as the harmless residue of obsolete religious customs. More probably he regarded these rites, provided they were practised with genuine piety, as one of the necessary elements of the household life of his lay adherents, and it is just this piety which he wished to plant by his discourses in the minds of Brahmin householders.

Now, the mode of religious life of Brahmin householders seems to have furnished a ground which was not unfavorable for the cultivation of Buddhist piety. For most of the tevijja-Brahmins, whose main activities in the religious domain lay in the study and transmission of the Veda, for its own sake, as well as in the practice of simple rites, the performance of large-scale śrauta-sacrifices was no longer obligatory. They had, therefore, no great difficulty in accepting the principle of avihimsā. In spite of their haughtiness and vanity, which are expressed in the Sutta-s, they seem to have been genuinely concerned about ethical issues. The goal for which Brahmin-scholars strove in this life was to become 'one endowed with learning and virtuous conduct' (vijjācaraṇasampanno). In order to become lay followers of the Buddha they had neither to effect a drastic change in their ritual and scholarly life nor to abandon their caste-identity and social status as wealthy householders; but they had only to give up some of their blameworthy mental attitudes, in such a manner as to orientate themselves correctly to the acceptance of buddhadhamma. As for ahimsā, its complete or partial acceptance<sup>61)</sup> seems to have already taken fairly firm root among Brahmins living at the time of the rise of Buddhism. For Brahmins the idea of non-injury was probably not borrowed from some heterodox movement. Rather, it seems to have originated from the religious thought underlying Vedic ritualism itself.<sup>62),63)</sup> These circumstances no doubt made it easy for Brahmins to embrace the teaching of the Buddha and to enrich their own heritage by the incorporation of Buddhist ideas.

According to the Sutta-narratives, most of the eminent householder Brahmins took refuge in the three jewels at the end of their dialogues with the Buddha and became his lay followers. Some of them, for example Jāṇussoṇi, are represented as having become enthusiastic admirers of the Buddha after their conversions. The Sela-s.<sup>64)</sup> relates that the tevijja-Brahmin of the same name left his home to enter the Buddhist order as a monk and, after having received the regular ordination, attained the status of an arahant. This case is, however, quite exceptional. Other eminent Brahmin householders remained at home as upāsaka-s after their conversions and apparently continued to practise their previous occupations as Vedic teachers and wealthy landlords. Even after their conversions they seem to have kept a certain distance from the Buddhist order and its tonsured mendicants. This delicate situation, in which tevijja-Brahmins found themselves after their conversions is illustrated at the end of the Soṇadaṇḍa-s. Here Soṇadaṇḍa tells frankly to the Buddha that he will surely incur

the reproach of the (Brahmin) assembly,<sup>65)</sup> if he is seen by its members saluting the Buddha in such a respectful—and, in their eyes, quite humiliating—manner, as his upāsaka-s are wont to do. He then asks the Buddha for permission to replace it with the simple mode of salutation with folded hands, in case they meet in public.<sup>66)</sup>

In the longer Sutta-s in DN and MN, the course of events, beginning with an eminent Brahmin householder who hears about the Buddha by reputation and ending with his conversion, follows, more or less, a similar outline, although particular details may differ remarkably from text to text. These narratives do not have so much the character of historical records as that of the literary frameworks, into which different doctrinal materials can be incorporated as the main theme of each particular Sutta. There must, indeed, have been some historical events underlying these accounts, but the Sutta-redactors seem to have used them only as material for the fabrication of their own stories. So, in perusing the Nikāya texts, we notice that the conversion of one and the same Brahmin may take place on several different occasions. For instance, the conversion of Jāṇussoṇi, a brāhmaṇamahāsāla, is narrated in at least six different Sutta-s, i.e. MN 1,4; 1,27; AN 3,6,9; 4,19,4; 8,5,10; 7,5,7. In these Sutta-s the same Brahmin is persuaded to become an upāsaka each time by a different sermon of the Buddha. Such a state of affairs warns us against using the canonical narratives as the historical sources without due critical considerations.

The essentially unhistorical character of the events narrated in the Sutta-prose does not, of course, mean that the narratives are unreliable for our present study. For we can feel confident that the actual social and religious conditions of the Brahminhood in the early Buddhist period are reflected with a fairly high level of fidelity in those prose-units to which the Sutta-redactors had recourse in composing their narratives. At least they enable us to know how the wealthy Brahmin householders appeared in the eyes of the members of the early Buddhist saṅgha. In many cases what each Sutta-redactor did in narrating the events culminating in the conversion of an eminent Brahmin was only to select from his repertoire of prose-units those which served his own purpose and to arrange them with some editorial changes and additions. From among the numerous prose-units which seem to have stood at the disposal of the Sutta-redactors we quote finally the one which contains the formula of confession which a Brahmin householder uttered, when he became a lay adherent of the Buddha:

esāhaṃ, bho Gotama, bhavantaṃ Gotamaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāmi dhammaṃ ca  
bhikkhusaṅghaṃ ca. upāsakaṃ maṃ bhavaṃ Gotamo dhāretu ajjatagge  
pāṇupetaṃ saraṇaṃ gatam (L)

The occurrence of unit L is by no means restricted to passages in which Brahmins become Buddhist converts. The same unit is also found in passages which relate how non-Brahmins such as royal princes, merchants, farmers, and adherents of

heretical sects attained upāsaka-hood. In these cases, however, the expressions bhavaṃ Gotamo, bhavaṃ Gotamaṃ and bho Gotamo which are used in the text just quoted have been replaced almost without exception by more respectful appellations of the Buddha, i.e. bhagavaṃ, bhagavā, and bhante respectively. It is well known that the Buddha's gotta-name Gotama is used by still unconverted Brahmins and ascetics, when they converse with him on an equal footing.<sup>67)</sup> The fact that Brahmin householders retain the use of the Buddha's gotta-name even in the formula of confession of upāsaka-hood may be interpreted as an indication that they are withholding themselves psychologically from complete surrender to the new religious world manifested by the Buddha.

Vedic scholars who were living as rich householders were not the only representatives of orthodox Vedism in the early Buddhist period. There was also another class of Brahmins who were in no way inferior to Brahmin householders as upholders of the Vedic tradition, but who had quite a different mode of life. In the canonical Pāli texts they are represented as ascetics with matted hair (jaṭilā), whose abodes are identified as hermitages (assama). In these texts they are not always specifically called Brahmins; it was certainly possible for twice-borns of the other two castes to adopt the same mode of ascetic life. But those jaṭila-ascetics who figure prominently in canonical narratives, undoubtedly belonged to the caste of ritual priests, because of their close association with the practice of mahāyāna.

In the two great epics, Purāṇa-s, and in classical kāvya-works, the term āśrama, the Sanskrit equivalent of assama, occurs most frequently to denote a hermitage which Brahmanical ascetics living outside the purview of normal human society. The ample data furnished by these works enable us to draw a tentative rough-sketch of the life in an āśrama. In contrast to homeless renouncers (parivrājakāḥ), who had to live on the food gathered from begging, these hermits subsisted mainly on gleanings (uñchā) and on gathering such natural products as fruits, bulbs and wild cereals which were growing on uncultivated lands. Many of them had matted hair (jaṭā), and their garments were made of animal skins (ajina) or tree-barks (valkala). Many led chaste and solitary lives, but others lived with consorts and begat offspring even in the hermitage. Celibacy was certainly not a required prerequisite of every hermit, although conjugal life seems to have been subject to strict restrictions and regulations. What characterized the religious life of hermits was undoubtedly the practice of austerities (tapas) and meditation (dhyāna). Adepts in these practices were believed to possess several supernatural abilities and profound wisdom unattainable by ordinary people. The practice of tapas and dhyāna, however, were not the sole activities of these hermits. Every day they had to perform several religious ceremonies, including ablution and the recitation of sacred texts. Now and then, hermits would go to the courts of royal princes to officiate in the performance of Vedic rituals, including large-scaled śrauta-sacrifices. Furthermore, some Vedic masters chose hermitages as the place

for their scholarly and pedagogical activities. In such cases an āśrama must have been populated by a relatively large number of people consisting of a teacher, his fellow scholars, his pupils and, perhaps, his own family. The seclusion of hermits from society does not necessarily mean that they were excluded from it. They were highly venerated by twice-born society at large, who occasionally would visit them, either simply to pay homage, or to ask for instruction in religious or even worldly matters. The hermits, for their part, regarded it as one of their important religious duties to entertain these visitors as well as fellow-ascetics and even non-Brahmanical renouncers who happened to drop by. In this way their contact with the society was duly maintained, and the resulting intercourse and communication between different spheres of Brahmanism—or even between Brahmanism and non-Brahmanical religions—must have made a considerable contribution to the efflorescence of the classical Indian culture in its various aspects.

The Brahmins who are mentioned in the epics, Purāṇa-s, and later literary works as residents of āśramas include a number of celebrated ṛṣi-s, Vasiṣṭha, Atri, Viśvāmitra, Kaṇva, Vālmiki, Ṛṣyaśṛṅga, and many others. It would not be going too far to say that almost all the eminent ṛṣi-s, including those who are supposed to be the seers of sacred texts or the founders of particular Vedic schools, are represented in these works as hermits, each living in his own āśrama. This fact is of the utmost significance for us, because we can deduce from it that, in the period when the great epics were in a gradual process of formation, those Brahmins who, as the direct carnal and spiritual descendants of the ancient ṛṣi-s, embodied in themselves the most orthodox tradition of Vedism had adopted the life of hermits in āśramas. Evidently these Brahmin hermits formed a minority among their caste-fellows. Their number was even smaller than that of the affluent Brahmin householders discussed above; in the sacerdotal hierarchy, however, they seem to have occupied a still more elevated position than the Vedic masters living as mahāśāla-Brahmins. Some outstanding examples among these hermits were not only respected as preceptors but also almost worshiped as divine beings. It is specifically these secluded Brahmin sages who held sway over the entirety of twice-born society as its most authoritative religious and cultural leaders.

In the well-known scheme of Megasthenes, who divided Indian society into seven classes,<sup>68)</sup> the first is that of 'philosophers'.<sup>70)</sup> According to a fragment of Megasthenes which has been preserved in the work of Arrian,<sup>69)</sup> these philosophers were ritualists who usually led an ascetic life.<sup>71)</sup> Megasthenes says that they were first in social rank but the smallest in number. It seems that this class of 'philosophers' roughly coincides with that of the Brahmin hermits now under discussion.<sup>72)</sup>

The āśrama and those who inhabited it have hardly ever been the subject of a special investigation. One difficulty in such an investigation lies in the lack of any systematical treatment of the āśrama-hermits in the extant textual sources. Curiously enough, the Dharmasūtra-s and the early Dharmasmṛti-s are—except

for some aphorisms in the *Āpastambadharmasūtra*<sup>73)</sup>—almost completely silent about this very important Brahmanical institution.<sup>74)</sup> In the older Vedic literature the word *āśrama* in the sense of a hermitage seldom occurs. Virtually the only example of the word in a śruti-text is an *āśrama* called *Vasiṣṭhaśilā* in *Gopathabrāhmaṇa* 1,2,8. Therefore, the informations about this institution which is provided by non-Brahmanical sources is all the more valuable. Except for the fragments of Megasthenes referred to above, the Pāli texts are to be reckoned as the only material on this subject, since they, alone, contain accounts of Brahmin hermits in sufficient detail to give us some sort of clear idea as to how these people were viewed by those who lived outside of the Brahmanical community. It lies beyond the scope and purpose of our present study to undertake a comprehensive and detailed investigation into the Brahmanical hermitage. Such an investigation would have to be preceded, in any case, by a careful analysis of all the relevant passages in the epic literature, a task which would need to be carried out in its own right. Here, we must confine ourselves to the examination of some Buddhist texts, in which those hermits called *jaṭilā* figure prominently. Such an examination will at least enable us to ascertain the existence of Brahmanical hermits in the early Buddhist period. It will also help us to elucidate certain distinctive features of their lifestyle as well as their attitude towards early Buddhism.

Among Buddhist texts the customs and behaviours of Brahmin hermits are nowhere better attested than in the *Pārāyaṇavagga* of SNp. The main part of this *Vagga*, which was composed entirely in verse (SNp 976–1149), consists of the Buddha's dialogues with sixteen Brahmin students (*māṇavā*) from South India (*Dakkhināpatha*).<sup>75)</sup> In the so-called *Vatthugāthā* which precedes these dialogues<sup>76)</sup> the circumstances under which their teacher *Bāvāri*<sup>77)</sup> decided to send his pupils to the Buddha, who were then residing in the rock-shrine (*pāsāṇaka cetiya*) near *Rājagaha*, are narrated in detail.

*Bāvāri*'s lifestyle, which is described in the opening part of the *gāthā*, is of the greatest interest for us. *Bāvāri* was not a native of the South; rather his homeland apparently was *Kosala*. After having emigrated to the South from a beautiful city of that country (976 ab), he established his hermitage on the banks of the *Godāvāri* near *Āḷaka* in *Assaka* territory (977 a–c).<sup>78)</sup> There he leads the life of a hermit, subsisting on gleanings (*uñcha*) and the gathering of fruit (*phala*) (977 d). He is well-versed in the sacred texts (*mantapāragū*) (976 d), and also in the *śrauta*-rituals. Once he performed a *mahāyañña* for a large village near his hermitage (978). Soon after his return to the hermitage (*assama*) a wretched Brahmin approached him, and, apparently calculating on the sacrificial fee *Bāvāri* would have received from the village, begged him for five hundred (pieces of gold) (979–980). *Bāvāri*, after receiving him cordially, told him that he no longer had any such amount of gold in his possession, because he had given away to others as much as he could (981–982). The Brahmin did not give up, but went so far as to utter a curse upon *Bāvāri*, that his head might split into seven pieces on

the seventh day, if he did not give him the money (983). This fearful curse caused Bāvāri a lot of distress and grief, although even in this frame of mind he still delighted in meditation (jhāna) (985). Seeing Bāvāri sunk in despair, a benevolent deity approached and consoled him (986–987). In ensuing dialogue (987–990), the deity told Bāvāri about the Buddha's attainment of supreme enlightenment and urged him to visit the Buddha (991–993). At these words Bāvāri rejoiced greatly (994) and finally decided to send his best pupils to the Buddha (998).

The life of Bāvāri as it is described in these SNp-verses coincides essentially with that of Brahmin-ṛṣi-s who appear in the epics and other Brahmanical works of the post-Vedic period. Unlike the *samaṇā* and *paribbājakā* Bāvāri did not rely upon others for his livelihood. Except for sacrificial fees, he did not receive anything from others. His external appearance also must have been that of a Brahmin-ṛṣi; for all of his pupils whom he sent to the Buddha are described as having matted hair and wearing animal skins (*jaṭājinadharā*) (*loloc*). He was a Brahmin who was profoundly versed in Vedic texts, and the following *gāthā* which have been put into the mouth of the Buddha describe Bāvāri's erudition in some detail, and also refer to his role as a great preceptor and to certain corporal characteristics with which he was endowed:

Viṣaṃvassasataṃ āyu, so ca gottena Bāvāri,  
 tūṇ', assa lakkhaṇā gatte, tīṇṇaṃ vedanā pāragū, (1019)  
 lakkhaṇe itihāse ca sanighaṇḍusakeṭubhe,  
 pañca satāni vāceti, saddhamme pāramaṇ gate (1020)

In these *gāthā* the three successive *pāda*-s 1019d–1020ab are particularly interesting, because, in the expressions which they contain, we can recognize the elements underlying prose-unit D which recurs in passages describing the erudition of eminent Brahmins who lead a secular life. Although most of Bāvāri's life was dedicated to meditation and ascetic practices, like several prominent *ṛṣi*-s in the epics, he still retained the office of sacrificial priest and sometimes even fulfilled it in the performance of a *mahāyañña*. He did not live entirely alone, but together with at least a number of pupils. One *gāthā* (1009) tells us that some of Bāvāri's eminent pupils were, themselves, scholars of world-wide reputation and adepts in meditation, each having his own followers (*paccekagaṇiṇo*). Although the text does not specifically designate Bāvāri as an *isī*, he undoubtedly belonged to that category of Brahmin hermits who continued to practise the Vedic tradition in its most orthodox form.

In the case of *Keṇiya*, whom we take as our second example of a hermit-ritualist living in an *assama*, his characteristics as a member of this Brahmin category are not so apparent as in the case of Bāvāri in the *Pārāyaṇavagga*. However, by carefully analyzing the relevant passages, we can recognize that his lifestyle essentially does not differ from Bāvāri's. As mentioned above, *Keṇiya* appears in a passage of the *Mahāvagga* as a *jaṭila*-ascetic who

wished to serve the Buddha food and drink. A similar story is narrated more fully in the long introductory prose section preceding the gāthā of the Sela-s. Furthermore, the Apadāna-verses which are ascribed to the venerable Sela contain this same story, wherein Keṇiya is designated as a tāpasa.<sup>79)</sup>

According to the Sela-s narrative, Keṇiya once paid homage to the Buddha on his arrival in the city of Apāṇa and, after some religious conversation with him, invited him and his entire retinue of monks to eat the next day. After returning to his hermitage, he summoned his friends and servants (mittāmaccā) as well as his relatives and kinsmen (nātisālohitā), and ordered them to prepare for the feast. Sela, his respected friend, who happened to enter the assama with his three hundred māṇavā, is very surprised by the general commotion in it and utters the following question: kiṃ nu bhoto Keṇiyassa āvāho vā bhavissati vivāho vā bhavissati, mahāyañño vā paccupaṭṭhito, rājā vā Māgadha Seniyo Bimbisāro nimantito svātanāya saddhiṃ bālakāyenā ti.<sup>80)</sup> “Is a wedding (of a son) or a wedding (of a daughter) of the venerable Keṇiya to take place? Or is the great sacrifice drawing near? Or has Bimbisāra, the king of Magadha, been invited for tomorrow together with his army?” In his reply to Sela’s question Keṇiya deliberately given the term mahāyañña a semantic twist, applying it not to a śrauta-sacrifice but to the very act of entertaining the Buddha which he is in the process of preparing. This shift of meaning, which the term mahāyañña momentarily undergoes, should not affect in any way our understanding of Keṇiya as an expert in śrauta-ritualism. His status as such is implicit in Sela’s question. By means of the same question some other aspects of Keṇiya’s life come to light. As already mentioned, the hermitage was open to various kinds of visitors, including royal personages and members of different religious groups. On these visits the hermits would receive their visitors with hospitality and share their frugal provisions with their guests. It is, indeed, questionable whether it was possible for a hermit like Keṇiya to have such a positive attitude about the world from which he had retired as to invite a king and his retinue to his dwelling. But the entertainment of a royal prince, itself, was quite a natural event to take place now and then in a hermitage. The reference in Sela’s question to a wedding of Keṇiya’s child should not be dismissed as a haphazard insertion. Asceticism did not always mean total celibacy. The existence of ṛṣi-s who lived as the ascetics in āśramas with their consorts and offspring is attested in several episodes in the epic and Purānic literature. In the case of Keṇiya we certainly have to do with an example of such married hermits.

On the other hand, we must admit that the Keṇya depicted in the Sela-s exhibits several features which do not fit with the image of a hermit. For instance, one who was capable of giving a feast for one thousand two hundred and fifty monks all at the same time<sup>81)</sup> could hardly have been found even among the mahāsāla-Brahmins, to say anything of the hermits. In such passages in the Sela-s we certainly have to do with the narrator’s exaggeration—or even caricaturization—which blurs to no small extent the essential difference between Keṇiya and

those wealthy Brahmins living in villages. The distortion apparently derives from the Sutta-redactor, whose immediate concern was not with the faithful portrayal of a Brahmin hermit. Buddhaghosa also fails to recognize the difference, for he calls both Bāvāri and Keṇiya brāhmaṇamahāsālā.

The earliest Buddhist saṅgha appears to have among its member a large number of mendicants who had once been jaṭila-ascetics. Among them the most distinguished were no doubt the three Kassapa-brothers, each called according to the locality of his assama: Uruvela- Nadī- and Gayā-kassapa. The story of their conversion is narrated in its entirety in Mahāvagga 1,14–15. According to the narrative, Uruvela-kassapa lived as the leader of five hundred jaṭila-ascetics,<sup>82)</sup> while Nadī- and Gayā-kassapa lived as the leaders of three hundred and two hundred ascetics, respectively. Although jaṭila is the designation constantly applied to each of the brothers in the prose section, we can ascertain from a verse in the metrical section of the story (1,14,39) that they were Brahmins by birth.

After his stay at Isipatana Migadāya the Buddha came directly to Uruvelā in order to visit the assama of the eldest Kassapa which was located there. The latter allowed the Buddha to lodge in his cottage for sacred fires (agyagāra), which, at that time, was inhabited by a fierce serpent.<sup>83)</sup> The Buddha subdued the serpent by his psychic powers and then stayed in a grove nearby, performing a miracle every day, until the ascetic, deeply impressed by his supernatural abilities, asked him for ordination. Then the Buddha urged Kassapa to consult with his fellow ascetics. After their consultation Kassapa and all five hundred jaṭilā cut off their matted hair and threw it, together with their baggage on the carrying poles and their utensils for fire-sacrifices, into the river (. . . te jaṭilā kesamissaṃ jaṭāmissaṃ khārakhājamissaṃ agghittamissaṃ udake pavāhetvā . . .).<sup>84)</sup> The other two brothers soon followed the example of Uruvela-kassapa, and thus, the one thousand jaṭilā abandoned their life in the assama and entered into the Buddhist order.<sup>85)</sup>

As already mentioned, the subsistence of a jaṭila was self-sufficient, while a paribbājaka relied on others for his livelihood. A jaṭila usually led a sedantary life in his hermitage, while a paribbājaka had primarily no fixed abode but wandered from one locality to another. In some cases even paribbājakā may have had some place of assembly for periodic stays. Such a place is designated in Pāli texts as an ārāma but never as an assama, the term which is applied there exclusively to the abode of a jaṭila. Both paribbājakā and jaṭilā were devoted to asceticism and meditation. While the former maintained strict celibacy as homeless renouncers, some ascetics of the latter category continued their family lives even in the hermitage. The paribbājakā were people who had renounced ritualistic activities, and many belonged to non-Brahmanical religious sects. On the other hand, the jaṭilā still continued to perform Vedic sacrifices as well as to study and teach Vedic texts in their hermitages.<sup>86)</sup> The animal skins which the jaṭilā wore as their garments indicate their close association with Vedic ritualism.

Until now the essential difference between jaṭilā and paribbājakā does not

seem to have been sufficiently recognized by modern scholars, who tend to class them both indiscriminately under the rubric of 'ascetics' which is too general.<sup>87)</sup> All the more noteworthy is the small article by C.S. Upasak,<sup>88)</sup> who, in describing the lifestyle of the Kassapa-brothers and other jaṭila-ascetics, points out the important role which they played within the early Buddhist saṅgha. Upasak's representation of the jaṭila-ascetics as fire-worshippers is somewhat misleading.<sup>89)</sup> The erection of a fire-cottage, called agnyagāra or agniśālā, was indispensable for every twice-born who was called an āhitāgni and was entitled to perform śrauta-sacrifices. In this cottage altars were constructed for the three sacred fires. These sacred fires which the jaṭila-ascetics were constantly tending as well as the agghutta which they performed daily in the agyagāra might perhaps have given the appearance to the outsiders, as if they were some sectarian people devoted to some special fire-cult.<sup>90)</sup> In reality, these practices constituted nothing else but the fundamental component of the ritual life of these ascetics. So, in Theragāthā 341ab Nadī-kassapa recollects that he formerly performed various kinds of sacrifices (yajim uccāvace yaññe) beside agghutta. The sphere of activity within which the jaṭila-ascetics were able to give full rein to their expertise as ritualists, was that of the large scale, more elaborate śrauta-sacrifices, designated collectively as mahāyañña. The high social prestige which they enjoyed in Brahmanical India was due not in the least to the ritual function they fulfilled as practitioners of mahāyañña. According to Mahāvagga 1,14,43, when Uruvela-kassapa was about to begin his performance of mahāyañña, the entire population of Aṅga and Magadha bringing abundant solid and soft food wanted to attend (kevalakappā ca Aṅgamāgadhā pahūtaṃ khādanīyaṃ bhojanīyaṃ ādāya abhikkamitukāmā honti). Furthermore, when soon after the Buddha was staying at Rājagaha with a thousand former ascetics as his disciples, king Bimbisāra came to pay homage to him. According to Mahāvagga 1,16,55–56 the twelve myriad Brahmins and householders of the Magadha-country who were following the king could not discern between the Buddha and Uruvela-kassapa which was the teacher of the other, untill, after some dialogue in verse, Kassapa saluted the Buddha, declaring himself to be the Buddha's disciple. As Upasak correctly points out,<sup>91)</sup> the large number of Magadha people had originally come not to pay respect to the Buddha but to Uruvela-kassapa.

Towards the end of his long discourse with Ambaṭṭha the Buddha mentions the four categories of recluses and Brahmins who have not yet attained perfection of wisdom and conduct (anuttarā vijjācaraṇasampadā):

1. a recluse or Brahmin who goes into the depth of the forest, with his yoke on his shoulder, thinking "Henceforth I will live on the fruits which have fallen of themselves."  
samaṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā . . . khārividham ādāya araññāyatanam ajjhogāhati—'pavattaphalabhojāno bhavissāmī' ti
2. a recluse or Brahmin who goes into the depth of the forest with a hoe and

- a basket, thinking “Henceforth I will live only on bulbs, roots, and fruits.”  
 samaṇo vā brāhmaṇo . . . kudālapīṭakam ādāya araṇṇavanamaṃ ajjhogahati  
 —‘kandamūlaphalabhojano bhavissāmī’ ti
3. a recluse or a Brahmin who builds himself a fire-shrine on the outskirts of some village or some town and dwells there tending the sacred fires.  
 samaṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā . . . gāmasāmantamaṃ vā nigamasāmantamaṃ vā  
 agyagāraṃ karitvā aggiṃ paricaranto acchati.
  4. a recluse or Brahmin who builds himself a four-doored cottage at a crossing where four highways meet and dwells there, thinking “Whosoever shall pass here, whether he be recluse or Brahmin, from any of the four directions, I will entertain him according to my ability and power”.  
 samaṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā . . . cātumahāpathe catudvāraṃ agāraṃ karitvā  
 acchati—‘yo imāhi catūhi disāhi āgamissati samaṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā tam  
 ahaṃ yathāsatti yathābalaṃ paṭipūjessāmī’

(Ambaṭṭha-s. 27)

Except for the final section concerning with a peculiar type of ascetics who erects his residence in the middle of a crossroad, the text would seem to describe some different categories of ascetics who live in an assama, although the word assama does not actually occur. The modes of subsistence ascribed to the first two categories of hermits correspond to that of ascetics living in an assama. On the other hand, the samaṇa-brāhmaṇā belonging to the third category seem to be those hermit-ritualists who establish their assama in a place near the boundaries of a village. In the case of Bāvari SNp 978 suggests that his assama also lay in the vicinity of a large village. The ascetics who follow one of these four life styles which have been designated by the Buddha as cattāri apāyamukhāni (the four leakages), are represented as those who have deviated from the right path to the perfection of wisdom and conduct. In the course of this dialogue it turns out that the extravagant life of Ambaṭṭha and his teacher, Pokkharasāti, is even worse than these apāyamukhāni, let alone the vijjācaranaṣampannā. Quite naturally, non-Buddhist ascetics do not receive fully favorable treatment in the canonical texts. From the Buddhist viewpoint they are after all pitiable people who vainly afflict themselves with the wrong practices, which never lead them on the path to the religious goal for which they strive. In principle, one cannot except Brahmanical hermits from the ascetics whom the early Buddhists have treated in this manner. Indeed, we find occasional references in canonical texts to these hermits, where the futility of their religious practices, such as the fire-service, is alluded to. But the attitude of these canonical authors towards Brahmanical hermits is not entirely denigrating. As we have just observed, in the Ambaṭṭha-s., at least they are more highly esteemed than mahāsāla-Brahmins.

In SN we find two short fables about Brahmanical sages (isayo), who dwell in huts of leaves (paṇṇakuṭī) in a hermitage (assama) lying in a forest or on sea-shore. Curiously enough, these two fables scarcely reveal any trace of

Buddhist influence. The first tale (SN 1,11,9) relates the visit of the god Sakka to the hermitage and the verses which were exchanged between the god and the sages, while, in the second (SN 1,11,10), it is narrated how the sages put a curse on the Asura-king Sambara. The sages, who figure in both these stories as powerful and respectable persons, are even described there as people of good conduct who observe a virtuous way of life (*silavanto kalyāṇadhammā*).

Among those Brahmins who are designated as *jaṭilā* it was no doubt Bāvāri and his disciples who were most highly esteemed by the early Buddhists. In the *Vatthugāthā* the Buddha reveals to Bāvāri's pupils that their master is endowed with three of the thirty-two marks which distinguish the body of a *mahāpurisa* (SNp 1022). The main part of the *Pārāyanavagga* consists of the questions which Bāvāri's sixteen pupils put to the Buddha and the answers the Buddha gave to each of them. Each of the Buddha's interlocutors exhibits sincerity, keen insight, a quick understanding, which manifests itself above all in a talent for the precise formulation of a problem. These questions, which are all concerned with special topics of a highly philosophical nature, also testify to the interlocutors' considerable, intellectual prowess. Mutual respect and a peaceful atmosphere prevail in these dialogues, and the harsh sarcastic tone which is not uncommon in the Buddha's conversations with affluent Brahmin householders does not appear here at all. These facts indicate that some groups of *jaṭila*-Brahmins, such as the one grouped around Bāvāri were highly advanced in their scholarly and meditational careers even by Buddhist standards. Of course, the Buddhists could not extend full affirmation to their religious thoughts and practices. In canonical passages concerned with Brahmanical asceticism we occasionally find an implicit or explicit criticism of it. On the other hand, early Buddhists seem to have regarded these Brahmins as inferior in stature to their own saints only by a small degree, as if they were fully capable of embracing the true dhamma, if only some proper spiritual guidance were granted to them.

It is difficult to explain why the early Buddhists came to have such an amicable attitude towards the *jaṭila*-Brahmins living in *assama-s*. One factor might have been the personal career of the Buddha, himself. In *Aśvaghoṣa's Buddhacarita*<sup>92)</sup> an entire chapter (*sarga* 7) is devoted to describing the *āśrama* which prince *Sarvasiddhārtha* entered shortly after dismissing his charioteer.<sup>93)</sup> Apparently he did not stay even one night in this abode of *jaṭila*-ascetics; however, his conversations there are filled with fraternal respect.<sup>94)</sup> And it was specifically at the kind suggestion of those ascetics that the prince then proceeded to the hermitage of the sage *Arāḍa*.<sup>95)</sup> *Arāḍa* and *Udraka*, called *Ālāra Kālāma* and *Uddaka Rāmaputta*, respectively, in the Pāli texts, are well known as the two great adepts in meditational practice whom the Buddha is said to have once had as his teachers. Within the Pāli canon it is MN 1,26 (*Ariyapariyesana-s.*), 8–13; 1,36 (*Mahāsaccaka-s.*), 9–14; 2,35 (*Bodhirājakumāra-s.*), 5,6; and 2,50 (*Saṅgārava-s.*), 4–5 which give full accounts of the spiritual stages attained by both these sages. These Pāli texts, however, provide little information on their lifestyles. They do

not make any reference to assama, although, according to the work of Aśvaghāṣa, each of the sages lived in his own āśrama.<sup>96)</sup> In this respect the reference to Bharauḍu Kālāma in AN 3,14,4 is very interesting. According to this short Sutta he was a former co-disciple (*purāṇasabrahmacārī*) of the Buddha<sup>97)</sup> and had his own assama near Kapilavatthu, where the Buddha once spent a night through the mediation of Mahānāma, a Sakya nobleman. Probably both Ālāra and Uddaka were highly venerated at that time as eminent Brahmanical hermits. In the passages just cited it is related how the Buddha took leave of both sages, realizing that their doctrine and practice would not help him to attain final liberation. It is, nevertheless, certain that he had quite a high regard for his former teachers even after his enlightenment. According to Mahāvagga 1,6,10, when the Buddha decided, at the entreaty of the god Brahmā Sahampati, to promulgate his dhamma, he thought that Ālāra and, then, Uddaka were the most fit to hear his teaching, because they were both 'learned, experienced, wise and for a long time . . . had little dust in their eyes'<sup>98)</sup> (*paṇḍito vyatto medhāvī dīgharattaṃ apparajak-khajātiko*). Broadly speaking, as assama-dwellers they would seem to have both belonged to the same category of Brahmins as Bāvari and the Kassapa brothers, although we do not find any textual reference to their ritual activities. The meditational stage attained by Ālāra is called *ākiñcaññāyatana*. This stage is later found incorporated as the third *arūpa*-world in the cosmology of monastic Buddhism. This term reminds us of *ākiñcañña* which is referred to in a SNp-verse (976c) as the aim pursued by Bāvari in his religious practices. It might perhaps be possible to suppose that *ākiñcañña* was once the common goal for certain groups of Brahmanical ascetics.<sup>99)</sup>

Another Brahmanical sage who played quite an important role in the biography of the Buddha was Asita, also called Kaṇhasiri. In the introductory *Vatthugāthā* to the *Nālaka*-s. contained in SNp, which narrates Nālaka's visit to Siddhodana's residence on the occasion of the birth of the future Buddha, the sage is represented as a Brahmanical ascetic with matted hair (SNp 689ab: . . . *jaṭī Kaṇhasirivhayo isi*).<sup>100)</sup>

According to the Mahāvagga the number of *jaṭila*-ascetics who entered the Buddhist order together with the Kassapa-brothers was one thousand. We must reckon with the possibility that this number is an exaggeration or a manifestation of the stereotypical style of canonical authors. What is of interest here is not the number, itself, but rather its proportion to the entire *bhikkhusaṅgha*, which within the general scheme of the canonical narratives consisted of one thousand two hundred and fifty mendicants. We do not know whether the followers of the Kassapa-brothers really constituted as great a part of the entirety of the *bhikkhusaṅgha* as four-fifths. However, this statement of the Vinaya renders it highly probable that a considerable part of the *saṅgha* was comprised of former Brahmanical ascetics. Indeed, in AN 1,14,6, we find the statement of the Buddha that Uruvela-kassapa was the foremost among those who had a large host of following (*mahāparisānam*).<sup>101)</sup>

In the Vinaya-rules for ordination (*upasampadā*) we notice a certain preferential treatment towards the former Brahmanical ascetics. According to one Vinaya-rule,<sup>102)</sup> if a former member of a heretical sect (*aññatitthiyapubbo*) wishes to become a disciple of the Buddha, he has to serve a certain period of probation (*parivāsa*), before he receives full ordination. In *Mahāvagga* 1,30,87 the Buddha stipulates that fire-worshipping ascetics with matted hair (*aggikā jaṭṭakā*) are to be exempted from this probation, because they subscribe to the efficacy of deeds (*kammavādino kiriyavādino*).<sup>103)</sup> In this respect Brahmanical ascetics enjoyed the same privileged status as those members of the Sākya-race who had belonged to heretical sects. They, likewise, were not required to undergo a probation in order to become full members of the Buddhist order. It is not certain what the terms *kammavādī* and *kiriyavādī* mean exactly in this context.<sup>104)</sup> In any event, the passage in which they both occur, suggests that Brahmanical asceticism had some doctrinal or practical aspects which early Buddhists could view affirmatively.<sup>105)</sup>

As we have already noted, the affluent influential Vedic masters who were living in towns and villages did not abandon their worldly lifestyle even when they took refuge in the Buddha's teaching. In canonical texts we find quite a few examples of Brahmins of this category becoming Buddhist mendicants. In this respect the Brahmins who were living as *jaṭṭa*-ascetics were in marked contrast to worldly Brahmins. As for Bāvari's disciples, as well as the Kassapa-brothers and their fellow-ascetics, among whom there must have been many Brahmins, their entrance into the Buddhist order is stated to have taken place almost simultaneously with their conversion.

According to canonical narratives such prominent *jaṭṭa*-ascetics as Bāvari and the Kassapa-brothers were experts on *mahāyañña*. As already pointed out, the term denotes *śrauta*-sacrifices on a grand scale. In fact, its Sanskrit equivalent, *mahāyajña*, is found in some passages of the *Mahābhārata* in reference to *āsvamedha*.<sup>106)</sup> Five kinds of sacrificial rites, including *assamedha*, are specified as *mahāyaññā* in the first of those verses which occur both in AN 4,4,9,3 and SN 1,3,9:

assamedhaṃ purisamedhaṃ sammāpāsaṃ vājapeyyaṃ niraggaḷaṃ /<sup>107)</sup>  
[*mahāyaññā*] (lacking in some versions of SN) mahārambhā (v.e.-*rabbhā*) na  
te honti mahapphalā //

This same list constitutes the latter half of the *tuṭṭhubha-jagatī*-verse found in AN 8.1.1:<sup>108)</sup>

ye sattasaṇḍaṃ pathaviṃ vijetvā rājīsayo yajamānānupariyagā /  
assamedhaṃ purisamedhaṃ sammāpāsaṃ vājapeyyaṃ niraggaḷaṃ //

This Sutta extolls the cultivation of friendliness (*mettā*), contrasting its fruitfull-

ness with the futility of sacrificial performances. The same five rites are enumerated in the following verse of the *Brāhmaṇadhammika-s.*, which tells how the invention of these great sacrifices caused the degeneration of the ancient Brahmin-hood:<sup>109)</sup>

Tato ca rājā saññatto brāhmaṇehi rathesabho  
 assamedhaṃ purisamedhaṃ sammāpāsaṃ vācapeyyaṃ niraggalaṃ  
 ete yāge yajitvāna brāhmaṇāṃ adā dhanaṃ / (SNp 303)

The metrical structure of these verses clearly shows that the stereotypical enumeration of these five rites was originally an independent formula in prose just like that of the ten sages contained in unit K.<sup>110)</sup> In both AN 4,4,9 and SN there are mentioned two overall categories i.e. *sārambha-* (or *mahārambha-*)*yañña*<sup>111)</sup> and *nirārambhayañña*, based on whether they entail the immolation of animals (*ārambha*) as the essential element, or not. In both of these Sutta-s the Buddha repudiates sacrifices of the *ārambha*-category but commends those bloodless *nirārambha*-sacrifices, declaring that they are fruitful and conducive to welfare. Here the same sacrificial scheme which underlies the longer accounts in DN 1,51 (*Kūṭadanta-s.*) is given a more precise formulation by the use of the term *ārambha*, which does not occur anywhere in the DN-Sutta. The two concepts *mahāyañña* and *sārambhayañña* do not entirely overlap. In the *Kūṭadanta-s.* the large-scale sacrifice which the ancient monarch performed without shedding the blood of any animal is also designated as a *mahāyañña*. For many Sutta-authors, however, *mahāyañña* seems to have meant a large-scale sacrifice characterized by *ārambha*. At least in the verse in AN 4,4,9 quoted above the *mahāyañña* and *mahārambhayañña* are used synonymously.

Canonical texts seldom describe particular details of a *mahāyañña*-performance. It is highly doubtful whether these Buddhist authors had any exact knowledge about the *śrauta*-sacrifices which are collectively called *mahāyañña* in their works. According to the passage in the *Kūṭadanta-s.* which describes a *mahāyañña*-performance, the animals to be sacrificed consist of bulls, calves, female calves, sheep, and goats, one herd of each species amounting to seven thousand head.<sup>112)</sup> The actual performance of a Vedic animal sacrifice (*paśubandha*), even if it lasted for many days, did not require such an extraordinarily large number of victims. Certainly, Buddhist canonical authors were entirely cognizant of the religious authority and social prestige of *śrauta*-sacrifices, with which they always had to contend, when they confronted their Brahmin contemporaries. On the other hand, they seem to have had little opportunity to observe an actual performance of a large-scale *śrauta*-sacrifice.<sup>113)</sup> In the descriptions of a *mahāyañña* in such canonical passages we have to reckon with a combination of the prejudice of Buddhist authors together with a little bit of reality. This might also support the thesis that *śrauta*-ritualism had already receded from a prominent position in the religious activities of the twice-born in the early

Buddhist period.

From this study we can ascertain a paradoxical state of affairs: On the one hand, a large number of jaṭila-ascetics, who were actively engaged in the practice of mahāyañña, about which the Buddha would on occasion express a negative judgement, quite willingly entered the monastic order upon their conversion to the Buddha's teaching. On the other hand, most Brahmin householders, in whose lives śrauta-ritualism no longer played a central role, tended to remain laymen outside of the monastic order, no matter how impressed they might have been by the Buddha's preaching. We have noted above that the general condition of religious life for Brahmin householders at the time of the rise of Buddhism predisposed them to accept the Buddhist teaching.<sup>114</sup> At the same time this same predisposition restrained them from adopting the homeless lifestyle of Buddhist mendicants. Because the Buddha would seem to have given his tacit consent to a continuation of their religious lifestyle, albeit with some modification, few of them would have been motivated to venture outside of the sphere in which their own traditional values predominated. However, the jaṭila-ascetics who were converted to the Buddha's teaching must have found it fairly difficult to continue their former lifestyle, which was strongly bound up with the practice of mahāyañña. Their encounter with the buddhadhamma must have been a rather critical event which caused them to call into question the value and significance of their own religious life in its entirety. At this crisis many of them must have decided to abandon all of their ritual activities and surrender themselves to the Buddha. Their relative freedom from worldly attachment as well as their spiritual maturity perhaps helped them to take this decisive step.

Most of the Brahmins whose life styles we have examined in this study are closely associated with the orthodox tradition of the Vedic scholarship. In Buddhist canonical texts they are represented as profoundly versed in the Vedic learning; and the continuous transmission of the sacred texts appears to have constituted one of their most important tasks. Even in the case of fire-worshippers such as the Kassapa-brothers whose connection with Vedic scholarship is not set forth explicitly in these texts, their status as mahāyañña-specialists, itself, presupposes their complete mastery of Vedic texts. The term which can most properly be applied to all these Brahmins might be śrotriya, although its Pāli equivalent sottiya does not occur so frequently in canonical texts. The important fact which has come to light as a result of our study is that, at the time of the rise of Buddhism, the class of śrotriya-Brahmins had split into two distinct groups, each having quite a different lifestyle. The greater part of the śrotriya-Brahmins led the lives of wealthy householders called in Pāli canonical texts brāhmaṇagahapati-kā or brāhmaṇamahāsālā, and they exerted even an economic and political influence on society. Although they were not totally alienated from the practice of śrauta-ritualism, the central component of their religious activities had shifted to simpler kinds of Vedic rituals and the study and transmission, for their own sake, of Vedic texts. On the other hand, some of the śrotriya-Brahmins who adhered to

the most orthodox tradition of śrauta-ritualism gave up their involvement in secular affairs but continued, as hermit-ritualists, not only to practice austerities and meditation, but also to perform sacrifices and pursue Vedic study. In canonical texts they are represented as jaṭila-ascetics living in assama-s. Generally speaking, the Buddha seems to have been on friendly terms with these Brahmin ascetics. Examining the relevant passages in Pāli-canon, we notice that they are more highly regarded by Buddhist authors than any other non-Buddhist religious group of the time. This fact should always be kept in mind, when we discuss various problems concerning the relation of early Buddhism to the Brahmanical tradition. At least, it requires us to reconsider or revise the prevailing view that Buddhism was an anti-Brahmanical religion.<sup>115)</sup>

### Notes

- 1) Ambaṭṭha-s. (DN 1,3), 13.
- 2) Cf. T. W. Rhys-Davids, *Buddhist India* (London 1902), p. 60–61.
- 3) DN 1, 3 (Ambaṭṭha-s.), 24; DN 3,4 (Agañña-s.), 7. Cf. U. Schneider, "Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Agañña-Suttanta" (IJ, 1, 1957), p. 274 ff.
- 4) khattiyo setṭho janetasmim ye gottapaṭisārino /  
Quotations of Pāli texts are made from the Nālandā edition, if not otherwise identified.
- 5) Cf. R. Fick, *Die Soziale Gliederung im Nordöstlichen Indien zu Buddhas Zeit* (Kiel 1897, Graz 1974), p. 156–162; Rhys-Davids, p. 56–57.
- 6) Cf. N. Wagle, *Society at the Time of the Buddha* (Bombay 1963), p. 150; Fick, p. 156–157, n.1.
- 7) SNp 1,4 (Kasibhāradvāja-s.). SN 1,7,1 is the same text, although its prose-section contains some minor discrepancies from the SNp-version.
- 8) It is well known, that many Sutta-s—at least the longer ones contained in DN and MN—acquired their present form as a result of various kinds of editorial activity. In the present article a discrimination is not always made between the two terms Sutta-author and Sutta-redactor.
- 9) Here, by Todeyya we must understand the father of a young Brahmin named Subha. That their family belonged to Bhāradvāja-gotta can be inferred from a dialogue in the Subha-s (MN 2,49,13). However, Todeyya originally was not a personal name but the designation of a particular Brahmin group. According to Buddhaghosa, the designation derives from a village name, Tudigāma. Wagle says that "a brāhmaṇa who goes to another village is known as the brāhmaṇa of a certain village". (p. 18). There is a reference to an assembly of some Todeyya-Brahmins in AN 4,19,7,3. According to SN 4,35,133,136, a mango-grove (ambavana) in Kāmaṇḍā was owned by a Todeyya, while the one located in Caṇḍalakappa is said in MN 2,50 (Saṅgārava-s.), 1 to have collectively belonged to some Todeyya-Brahmins .
- 10) Caṅki-s. 3.
- 11) Ambaṭṭha-s. 2.
- 12) The words in brackets can be replaced by others according to the context into which the prose-unit is incorporated.
- 13) See e.g. DN 2,3,83.
- 14) Wagle, p. 18–19.
- 15) Setabyā, itself, is designated as a city (nagara). The estate of Pāyāsi seems to have been located, like that of Soṇaṇḍa, in some suburban area of a large city.
- 16) There is some doubt as to the caste to which Pāyāsi belonged. In the Pāyāsirājañña-s. (DN 2,10) he is always addressed as rājañña. The Sanskrit word rājanya is well attested as a synonym for kṣatriya. The term rājañña, however, seldom denotes a caste in Pāli-texts, but seems to indicate a certain category of royal servant. Probably Pāyāsi was a Brahmin who ruled over an estate

- donated by the king as a reward for his services at the royal court. Cf. Fick, p. 100, n. 2.
- 17) Cf. Wagle, p. 18.
  - 18) Cf. D. C. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary* (Delhi 1966), p. 60–61.
  - 19) In Kauṭilya's *Arthasāstra* (ed. Kangle) 2,1,7; 20,20; 3,10,9 we find references to brahmadeya and brahmadeyika.
  - 20) As for the tax-exemption of a śrottriya, see *Āpastambadharmasūtra* 2,10,26,10; *Vasiṣṭhadharmasūtra* 19,23; *Manusmṛti* 7,133.
  - 21) Except that in the passages describing Ukkaṭṭhā there is no mention of brāhmaṇagahapatikā. Instead, Pokkharasāti is represented in *Ambaṭṭha-s.* 36 as being attended by a multitude of Brahmins (brāhmaṇaṇa).
  - 22) Judging from the following statement, Fick probably supposes that most of the gahapati belonged to the vessa-caste: 'Wir werden nicht fehlgehen, wenn wir in diesen gahapati zum Theil die gentry des Landes, den niederen grundbesitzenden Adel sehen, im Gegensatz zu dem Adel, der mit dem Fürstenhause verwandt ist, den khattiya, zum Theil die den Patriziern der Reichs- und Handelsstädte des Mittelalters zu vergleichenden vornehmen und reichen Bürgerfamilien der grossen Städte' (Fick, p. 164).
  - 23) According to Fick (p. 164), a gahapati was as a rule, a landowner or a merchant distinguished by his noble birth and wealth. It is, however, doubtful whether nobility of birth was a prerequisite condition for a householder to be considered a gahapati.
  - 24) See Wagle, p. 151.
  - 25) I. B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*. Vol. II. London 1969. p. 67.
  - 26) See Wagle, chap. II., n. 67 (p. 165).
  - 27) Another example in Pāli of a nominal compound which should be analysed differently according to the context is ācariyapācariya. The plural appears to be used as a kind of so-called reduplicative compound in the sense of 'teacher upon teacher', while the singular should be analysed as a tappurisa-like compound meaning 'teacher of teachers', when it occurs in the prose-unit H (see p. 13) as a singular.
  - 28) The same expression is found in *ChUp* 6,4,5.
  - 29) A verse similar to *MuṇḍUp* 1,1,3.
  - 30) W. Caland, *Eine vierte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra*. AO VI, p. 206.
  - 31) Śāṅkara has simply glossed this word with mahāgrhastha.
  - 32) The first half of this passage is essentially the same as prose-unit C.
  - 33) SN 1,3,3,(7); 1,3,7,(18–19); AN 4,9,5. In MN 3,29,16; and SN 1,3,21 (57–58) we find exactly the same words in the loc.sg.n., referring to three kinds of mahāsālakula.
  - 34) The actual form of the words found in the AN-passage is not nom. but acc.pl.masc.
  - 35) Cf. also SN 4,45,4(4).
  - 36) *Bhadrabāhu's Kalpasūtra* 1,9 contains a passage describing the extensive learning of young Mahāvira. This passage closely resembles our prose-unit D both in content and wording.
  - 37) *Soṇadaṇḍa-s.* 17.
  - 38) *Kūṭadanta-s.* 18.
  - 39) In these lists of the virtues of royal princes wisdom also constitutes an item. In these cases, however, the second half of unit J: pathamo vā dutiyo vā sujāṃ paggaṇhantānam is omitted because of its ritual association and is replaced by an expression which is more suitable for a khattiya.
  - 40) *Caṅki-s.* 4, *Soṇadaṇḍa-s.* 6, *Kūṭadanta-s.* 10.
  - 41) Unit H can only be properly used to describe Brahmin teachers who transmit Vedic texts to their pupils. Terms such as māṇavaka and mantā are not at all consonant with the image of the Buddha as a leader of mendicants. Here we see another example of the mechanical use by rote of existing textual materials by canonical authors.
  - 42) Uttara is a disciple of Brahmāyu.
  - 43) *SNp* (ed. D. Andersen & H. Smith, London 1965) 595 (*Vāsetṭha-s.*),
  - 44) This reading in the Nālandā edition, which somehow may correspond to the Sanskrit form

bahvṛcāḥ, is uncertain. Another reading, brahmacariyā, found in the PTS edition is no doubt secondary.

- 45) Cf. Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna (Divyāvadāna, ed. P. L. Vaidya), p. 329–330.
- 46) AN 3,6,9 has almost the same content. Here the interlocutor of the Buddha is Jāṇussoṇi.
- 47) See below p. 26.
- 48) This fact also explains the rare occurrence, if not total absence, of Upaniṣadic concepts in the Buddhist canon.
- 49) Cf. J. C. Heesterman, "Brahmin, Ritual and Renouncer". WZKSO, 8, 1964.
- 50) In the case of brahmayajña the nourishment which is offered to the ṛṣi-s or to brahman, itself, consists in the mantra-s which are recited.
- 51) Cf. Ch. Malamoud. Le Svādhyāya. Récitation Personnelle du Veda. Taittiriya-Āraṇyaka Libre II. Paris 1977. p. 77.
- 52) As for the snātaka of the older period, see J. C. Heesterman, "The Return of the Vedic Scholar". Pratiḍānam (The Hague/Paris 1968), p. 436–447.
- 53) Cf. P. V. Kane. History of Dharmasāstra. Vol. II, Part I (Second Edition Poona 1974), p. 406–407.
- 54) Cf. K. R. Norman, "Four Etymologies from the Sabhiya-sutta" p. 406. Buddhist Studies in honour of Walpola Rahula. London Nimamsa 1980.
- 55) SNp 620–647 are identical to DhP 396–423. The Vāsetṭha-s. in SNp, where these verses occur, is also contained in MN.
- 56) In the Nikāya-s we find occasional references to matters related to śrauta-ritualism in connection with non-ascetic Brahmins. The most interesting text in this regard is the Sundarikabhāradvāja-s. which is included in the Mahāvagga of SNp and its parallel SN 1,7,9 (Sundarika-s.). In this text, which refers to aggihutta and pūralāsa, a Brahmin has a discussion with the Buddha about the remnants of his sacrifice. Cf. also MN 2,25 (Māgaṇḍiya-s.), 1.
- 57) The degeneration of the Brahminhood which has been brought on by the institution of animal sacrifices in the reign of the ancient king Okkāka is narrated in full in the Brāhmaṇadhammika-s. (SNp 2,7).
- 58) Ambaṭṭha-s. 8.
- 59) Wagle, p. 45 ff.
- 60) Kūṭadanta-s. 23–25; sappitelanavanitadadhimadhuphāpitenā ceva so yañño niṭṭhānam agamāsi. We find similar expressions in a verse of the Brāhmaṇadhammika-s. (SNp 295).
- 61) Perhaps there were some Brahmins who still occasionally performed in animal-sacrifices, but otherwise abstained totally from injuring living beings.
- 62) Cf. H.-P. Schmidt, "The Origin of Ahimsā". Mélanges d'Indianisme à la Mémoire de L. Renou (Paris 1968), p. 649 ff.
- 63) In SN 1.7.5 a Brahmin called Ahimsakabhāradvāja is mentioned, who is said to have been devoted to the observance of ahimsā even before his conversion to the Buddha's teaching.
- 64) SNp 3,7; MN 2,42.
- 65) The word used here is parisā. In this context perhaps it refers to some kind of assembly presided over by eminent Brahmins.
- 66) Soṇadaṇḍa-s. 22.
- 67) Cf. Wagle, p. 47.
- 68) E. A. Schwanbeck, Megasthenes Indica (Bonn 1846, Amsterdam 1966), Fragm. XXXII [Arrian] and Fragm. XXXIII [Strabo].
- 69) Cf. Arrian, Der Alexanderzug/Indische Geschichte, herausgegeben u. übersetzt v. G. Wirth u.O.v. Himüber, p. 637–639, 1115–1118.
- 70) These 'philosophers' are called philósophoi by Strabo, while Arrian designates them—perhaps mistakenly—as sophistai.
- 71) The passage in Megasthenes' account of the 'philosophers' which describes their asceticism is lacking in the fragment preserved in Strabo's work.
- 72) For the present we will not go into a number of difficult problems connected with the

Magasthenes-fragments and their account of the seven classes, but merely allude to the possible identity of the people they call 'philosophers' with the śrauta-ritualists represented in Buddhist texts as jaṭilā.

- 73) Āpastambadharmasūtra 2,9,22,7ff.
- 74) A few sporadic references to āśrama in the sense of a hermitage are found in the Dharmasūtra-s. E.g. Vasīṣṭhadharmasūtra 9,7; Baudhāyanadharmasūtra 3,3,20.
- 75) Some textual disorder is noticeable in the main part of the Pārāyaṇavagga. Cf. T. Vetter, "Some remarks on older parts of the Suttanipāta" (Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka ed. by D. R. Ruegg and L. Schmidhausen. Leiden 1991), p. 38ff.
- 76) The Vatthugāthā seem to have been added only later to the main part of the Pārāyaṇavagga, one of the oldest components of SNp, because these gāthā are not commented upon in the Cullaniddeśa. Cf. K. R. Norman, Pāli Literature. Wiesbaden 1983, p. 69,86.
- 77) Bāvāri is a gotta-name (see SNp 1019). The nominative form which is attested for it in the text is Bāvārī. The final syllable appears to have been lengthened for metrical reasons.
- 78) These two verses suggest that Brahmin hermits played some significant role in the spread of the Brahmanical culture into South India.
- 79) Apadāna 40,2,208–303.
- 80) SNp (ed. by D. Andersen and H. Smith. London 1965), p. 105; MN 2,42,3.
- 81) SNp, p. 104.
- 82) ... pañcannaṃ jaṭilasatānaṃ nāyako hoti, vināyako aggo pamukho pāmukkho (Mahāvagga 1,14,37). In the Brahmanical texts the "abbot" of a large āśrama, where a number of ascetics live together, is sometimes called kulapati. Cf. R. K. Mookerji, Ancient Indian Education (Brahmanical and Buddhist) (London 1951), p. 334.
- 83) The same cottage is denoted by the term aggisāla in a passage in the metrical portion (Mahāvagga 1,14,39); sace te Kassapa agaru viharesu ajiṇho aggisālamhī ti (v.l. aggisaraṇamhī ti). The presence of agnisāla or agnyagāra in an āśrama is referred to also in Brahmanical texts. E.g. Mahābhārata 1,64,17.
- 84) Mahāvagga 1,14,52.
- 85) In the Theragāthā we find verses ascribed to the three Kassapa-brothers, i.e. 375–380 (Uruvela-k.), 340–344 (Nadī-k.), 345–349 (Gayā-k.).
- 86) In the Mahābhāṣya ad Pāṇini 1,2,32 we find the compound jaṭilādhyāyaka.
- 87) On the distinction between Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical ascetics, cf. G. C. Pande, Studies in the Origins of Buddhism (Allahabad 1957), p. 328–329.
- 88) C. S. Upasak, "The Role of Uruvela Kassapa in the Spread of Buddhism". Studies in Pali and Buddhism. A Memorial Volume in Honor of Bhikkh Jagadish Kashyap. ed. by K. A. K. Narain. Delhi 1979.
- 89) Upasak, p. 376.
- 90) Needless to say, non-ascetic Brahmins could also have fire-cottages. To mention only one example, it is related in MN 2,25 (Māgaṇḍiya-s.), 1 that the Buddha once resided in the agyagāra of a Brahmin living in a town (nigama) of the Kuru-country.
- 91) Upasak, p. 372.
- 92) Ed. by E. H. Johnston. Lahore 1936.
- 93) Cf. also Divyāvādāna (ed. Cowell), p. 392 and Lalitavistara (ed. Lefmann), p. 238.
- 94) Interestingly enough, some ascetics called cakradharāḥ are said to have lived in hermitages together with their wives. See Buddhacarita 7,3.
- 95) Buddhacarita 7,54–55.
- 96) In Divyāvādāna 27 (Kuṇḍālāvādāna), 14 the abode of both ṛṣi-s is referred to as tapovana.
- 97) According to Buddhaghosa, both the Buddha and Bharauḍu Kālāma were once disciples of Āḷāra Kālāma.
- 98) Horner, The Book of Discipline. Vol. IV, p. 10.
- 99) The term ākiṇcaṇṇa occurs twice in the main part of the Pārāyaṇavagga (SNp 1070, 1115) as well as in AN 4,19,5,4.

- 100) Cf. *Buddhacarita* 14,106.
- 101) Cf. *Upasak*, p. 373.
- 102) *Mahāvagga* 1,30,86.
- 103) *Mahāvagga* 1,38,87,; ye te, bhikkhave, aggikā jaṭilakā, te āgatā upasampādetabbā, na tesam parivāso dātabbo. taṃ kissa hetu ? kammavādino ete, bhikkhave, kiriyavādino, sace, bhikkhave, jātiyā Sākiyo aññatitthiyapubbo āgacchati, so āgato upasampādetabbo, na tassa parivāso dātabbo, imināhaṃ, bhikkhave, āveṇiyam parihāraṃ dammī ti.
- 104) Horner's translation of the relevant passage: 'These . . . affirm deeds, they affirm what ought to be done' (*The Book of Discipline* Vol. IV, p. 89). is not satisfactory.
- 105) We cannot agree with *Upasak* (p. 373), when he suggests that the special treatment of jaṭila-converts was a concession which the Buddha made on account of the great number to which they amounted.
- 106) E.g. *Mahābhārata* 12,260,37c.
- 107) H. Falk made a careful investigation of all five rituals—especially of the two obscure ones, sammāpāsa and niraggala—and tried to elucidate their cultural background, as well as their relation to the early Buddhists. See H. Falk, "Vedische Opfer im Pāli-Kanon". *Bulletin d'Etudes Indiennes*, No. 6, 1988, p. 225–254.
- 108) The entire metrical portion of AN 8,1,1 is also found in *Itivuttaka* 1,27.
- 109) The word mahāyañña is not found in this Sutta or in AN 8,1,1.
- 110) In a prose passage of the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna* (*Divyāvadāna*, ed. Vaidya, p. 330) we find the Sanskrit equivalents of the names of all five sacrifices.
- 111) The expression sārambhaṃ yaññaṃ is found only in the prose part of AN 4,4,9, and in SN 1,3,9, while the terms mahārambhā and nirārambhā occur in the metrical part which is common to both AN 4,4,8 and SN 1,3,9.
- 112) *Kūṭadanta-s.* Cf. AN 7,5,4.
- 113) Falk seems to conclude from his study that the early Buddhists were not entirely unfamiliar with the details of śrauta-sacrifices. However, *Jātaka-verses* and the commentarial works of Buddhaghosa require of us a different treatment than the principal canonical texts. As for the list of the five rites, we need not regard it as originating among the Buddhists. It seems more likely that the list was current among several different circles in northeastern India as an independent prose formula.
- 114) Cf. *Pande*, p. 316.
- 115) The Pāli canon contains only a few texts which are definitely anti-Brahmanical in character and content. Indeed, stories such as the *Dasabrāhmaṇajātaka* (Fausboll 495) and the *Bhūridattajātaka* (543) are characterized by a radical denial of Brahmanical values and a strong antipathy against the Brahminhood in general. These texts should be regarded as representing only an exceptional or a peripheral tendency which existed among the early Buddhists.

