

A critical evaluation of ethical aspect of Buddhist Sanskrit literature

Ven. Padalangala Rewatha (Royal Pandith, B.A. Hons, M.A.)

Monastic Teacher Bodhiraja Bhikkhu Training Centre, Embilipitiya, Sri Lanka.

E-mail:- rewathapada@yahoo.com E-mail:- rewathapada@yahoo.com T.P. +94 711834021

Chapter 1

Origin and diffusion of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature

1.1 Introduction

The Pāli language developed within Theravādins as their literary Language in vast range. But Pāli was not the only area which contributed to the flowering of the Buddhist tradition. The vast amount of Pāli texts, canonical and non-canonical, is the contribution of only one major branch, doubtless one of the most ancient and orthodox branches of Buddhism. Apart from the Theravādins several sects who pertain to Nikāya Buddhism and later developed Buddhist Schools until Mahāyāna included with it, have produced their own literary works, whose language is mixed Sanskrit.¹ First time the language of the scriptures of the Northern Buddhists- such as the *Mahāvastu*, the *Lalitavistara*, and the *Divyāvadāna* etc., was known as Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit by Franklin Edgerton in his *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary* (1953). Before Edgerton the language was known as Buddhist Sanskrit.

According to scholars the Sanskrit language which found in Buddhist literature wholly not same and there can be seen varieties in usage. It has corroborated by L.M. Joshi,

“The Buddhist intellectuals of ancient India contributed not only to what are now called Buddhist Sanskrit and its varieties but also to what is called Pāṇinian or Classical Sanskrit. Thus while we have the *Avadānas* and Mahāyāna *sūtra* in a Sanskrit peculiar to the Buddhist tradition, we also have such texts as the *Madhyamakāśāstra*, the *Jātakamālā*

¹ Nariman, J.k. *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd, 1919, p. 3.

and the *Tattvasamgraha*, to mention only three out of numerous texts, in classical Sanskrit. The Sanskrit of the Buddhist *tantras* and *sādhana*s presents yet another category of language.”²

As a literary language the Sanskrit usage in Buddhist literature not poor, according to its varieties in usage the Sanskrit language has run vast role in Buddhist literature.

The Sanskrit language usage in Buddhist literature later became very popular and within Sanskrit language Buddhist literature developed in vast range, especially in Mahāyāna.

“In the North and North-West of India there were great centers of learning, such as the universities of Nālandā and Takṣasilā (Taxila) where for hundreds of years not only all branches of secular knowledge, especially medicine, but also the philosophical and theological literature of the Buddhist were cultivated with great zeal. Indian Pandits went thence to Tibet and China, learned Tibetan and Chinese, and translated Sanskrit works into these languages. Chinese pilgrims like Hsuan-Tsang learnt Sanskrit at Nālanda, and translated Buddhist texts into Chinese.”³

According to above discussion to develop Buddhist literature in Sanskrit most influenced by Mahāyāna Buddhism.

1.2 Origin Background of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature

When we attempt to find the origin background of Buddhist Sanskrit literature we have to probe the first schism among the disciples of the Buddha because particular schism in line with influenced to above matter. This background has introduced by J.K. Nariman, according to him, several sects have developed their own literary productions, the language of which is partly Sanskrit and partly a dialect which we may call the mid-Indian and which is given the designation of mixed Sanskrit by Senart. Of this Sanskrit literature there have remained to us

² Joshi, L. M. *Aspects of Buddhism in Indian History*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1973, p.19.

³ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, II. India: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1933, p.217-218.

many voluminous books and fragments of several others while many are known to us only through Tibetan and Chinese translations. The major portion of this literature, in pure and mixed Sanskrit, which we for brevity's sake call Buddhist Sanskrit literature, belongs either to the school known as that of the Mahāyāna or has been more or less influenced by the latter. For an appreciation, therefore, of this literature it is necessary in the first place to make a few observations on the schism in Buddhism which divided it early into two schools, the Mahāyāna and the Srāvakayāna.⁴

According to scholars the schism first time appeared among the disciples after Second Buddhist council which performed at Vaiśālī and before Third Buddhist council was convened by the Mauryan king Aśoka at Pāṭaliputra. There are various historical records with regard to the schism belong to various schools. One history which preserves some ancient and authentic records, the *Dīpavamsa* of the Sthaviravāda school, states that after the Vaiśālī affair the monks of Vṛji were not reconciled to the decision of the assembly and held a new 'rehearsal' which they called the 'Great Rehearsal' (*Mahāsaṅgīti*), at which they altered the *Tripiṭaka* to suit their own views and added new texts. Thus a schismatic school arose.⁵

1.2.1 Second Buddhist Council

According to the sources, the Second Council was held a hundred years after the Buddha's death during the reign of King Kalaśoka. According to the Chapter on the Council of Seven Hundred of the Pāli *Vinaya*⁶, seven hundred elders discussed the ten items in accordance with the *vinaya*. Thus, their meeting is called a council on *vinaya* (*vinaya-saṅgīti*). No mention is made in the Pāli *Vinaya* of the compilation of the *Sūtra-piṭaka* or *Vinaya-piṭaka* after the

⁴ Nariman, J.k. *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*, p. 3.

⁵ Warder, A.K. *Indian Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd, 1970, p.207.

⁶ *sattasatikakandaka*

investigation of the ten points was concluded. In contrast, according to the Sri Lankan chronicles, the *Dīpavaṃsa*⁷ and *Mahāvaṃsa*⁸, after the dispute over the ten items was concluded, the seven hundred elders with Revata as their leader held a council on doctrine that required eight months to complete. This is called the Second Council in the Theravada tradition.

According to Pāli sources the ten disputed practices and the rules violated by Vṛji monks which caused to council as follows:

1. Carrying salt in an animal horn-violated a rule against the storing of food
2. Taking food when the shadow on the sundial is two fingers past noon-violated a rule against eating after noon
3. After eating, traveling to another village to eat another meal the same day-violating the rule against overeating
4. Holding several fortnightly assemblies within the same boundaries (*sīmā*)-violated procedures requiring all monks within the *simā* to attend the same fortnightly assembly
5. Confirming an ecclesiastical act in an incomplete assembly and obtaining approval from absent monks afterward-violated the rules of procedure at monastic meetings
6. Citing habitual practice as the authority for violations of monastic procedures-violated the rules of procedure
7. Drinking milk whey after meals-violated the rule against eating special food when one was not sick
8. Drinking unfermented wine-violated the rule against drinking intoxicating beverages
9. Using a mat with fringes-violated the rule concerning the measurements of rugs

⁷ *Dīpavaṃsa*. v. 43

⁸ *Tato so revatatthero, saddhammaṭṭhitiyā ciraṃ; Kāretuṃ dhammasaṃgītiṃ, sabbabhikkhusamūhato. Mahāvaṃsa.*, iv, 61.

10. Accepting gold and silver-violated the rule prohibiting monks from receiving gold and silver

Although another account of Sarvāstivādin has presented different matter which caused to the schism the five points of doctrine advanced by Mahādeva may have added to the controversy surrounding the first schism. Mahādeva taught that

(1) *arhats* may be sexually tempted,

(2) *arhats* have a residue of ignorance,

(3) *arhats* may have doubts,

(4) *arhats* may attain enlightenment through the help of others, and

(5) the path is attained with an exclamatory remark.

The five points indicate that Mahādeva had a low opinion of the enlightenment of *arhats*.⁹ These five points are included in *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* of Vasumitra and *Mahāvibhāṣā*; these accounts pertain to Sarvāstivāda School, as well as the *Kathāvatthu* of the Theravāda School.¹⁰

In discussing the basic schism, the extent of Buddhism's spread in India and the difficulties in communication between areas of India must be taken into account. The schism probably did not occur over a period of days or months. Consequently, scholars cannot determine exactly when it occurred or at what point it was completed. However, the schism clearly did occur a little more than a century after the Buddha's death.¹¹ However the most probable date is thus sometime after Vaiśālī and sometime before the period of Aśoka Maurya, and there is in fact an account of the first schism which gives just such a date, namely the tradition of the

⁹ Akira, Hirakava. *A History of Indian Buddhism (From Sakyamuni to Early Mahayana)*. The University Press of Hawaii, 1990, p. 80-82.

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 82.

¹¹ Ibid, p. 82.

Sammitīya School recorded by Bhavya (Bhāvaviveka). This account places the even in 349 B.C., during the reigns of Nanda and Mahāpadma.¹²

1.2.2 The Development of the Buddhist Order

After schism the major community of Buddhist Saṅgha first time divided into two groups. According to Akira Hirakava for this schism and wide separating of community, the second Buddhist council was directly affected.

“The controversy over the ten points of *vinaya* arose, and the elders met in Vaiśālī to deliberate over the disputes and resolve them. Many monks did not submit to the council's decision, however, and the dispute later became a cause for the schism that resulted in the Sthavira and Mahāsaṅghika schools.”¹³

Nalinaksha Dutt demonstrates this ground as,

“Some of the Vaiśālīan monks separated themselves from the Saṅgha of the Elders or the Orthodox, the Theras or Sthaviras, and organized a new one of their own, calling it a Mahāsaṅgha, from which they came to be known as Mahāsaṅghikas.”¹⁴

In this ground of separating of Saṅgha has further explained by Akira Hirakava as,

“The schism, often called the basic schism (Ch. *ken-pen fen-lieh*), resulted in the formation of two schools: the Mahāsaṅghika, whose monks refused to accept the conservative ruling of the committee of eight monks, and the Sthaviravāda (P. Theravada), whose monks agreed with the conservative ruling. The name Mahāsaṅghika means "great assembly" and suggests that many monks belonged to the liberal faction.”¹⁵

After second Buddhist council until third Buddhist council during that period the major community of Buddhist Saṅgha divided to eighteen sub-groups. First time major community

¹² Warder, A.K. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 207-208.

¹³ Akira, Hirakava. *A History of Indian Buddhism*, p. 93.

¹⁴ Dutt, Nalinaksha. *Buddhist Sects in India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd, 1978, p. 32.

¹⁵ Akira, Hirakava. *A History of Indian Buddhism*, p. 81-82.

divided into two groups and later these two groups separated to eighteen groups. Nalinaksha Dutt further explains it as,

“From this time the cleavage in the Saṅgha became wider and wider, ultimately giving rise to as many as eighteen or more sub-sects. The Thera or Sthaviravādins were split up into eleven sects and remained as Hīnayānic throughout their existence while the Mahāsaṅghikas became divided into seven sub-sects, gradually gave up their Hīnayānic doctrines and paved the way for the appearance of Mahāyānism.”¹⁶

In the Pāli chronicle sources such as *Dīpavaṃsa* and *Mahāvāṃsa* and other sources pertain to other various traditions in Buddhist have been given different account and names of Buddhist sects. Here we try to get a clear seeing of Buddhist schools by following all these sources and modern opinions which are given by modern scholars with regard to this matter. According to them the development of Buddhist schools can be arrange in briefly following way.

After Mahāsaṅghikas separated from the major community from them there arose two other schools such as the Gokulikas and the Ekabbhohārikas. Gokulikas also were subjected to be divided into two more schools namely, the Paññattivādins and the Bahulikas or Bahussutikas. The Cetiyaṇvādins were also reckoned as another branch off from the school of the Mahāsaṅghikas, thus there appeared six schools or sects together with the Mahāsaṅghikas, quite against the Theravādins or Sthaviravādins.

Sthaviravādins who are considered as the descendants from the original Saṅgha were subjected to more divisions than the Mahāsaṅghikas. On the course of time, Sthaviravāda gave rise to eleven sub-schools. Mahinsāsakas and the Vajjiputtakas are said to be first two divisions arose from the Sthaviravādins. Dhammuttariyas, Bhadrāyānikas, Channāgārikas and Sammitiyyas are the four other schools categorized as sub-schools of the Vajjiputtakas. Mahinsāsakas, later split up into two school namely, the Sabbatthivādins and the Dhammaguttikas. After from

¹⁶ Nalinaksha Dutt. *Buddhist Sects in India*, p. 32.

Sabbatthivādins, kassapikas came into existence, and again Sankāntikas from the Kassapikas came into existence. Suttavādins is also another branch separated from Sankāntikas. Thus, falling off from the Sthaviravādins, there arose eleven schools. In this way at the time of third Buddhist council there were twelve sects together with sthaviravāda as against the Mahāsaṅghika and its sub-schools.¹⁷

Above classification within a limit under eighteen Buddhist schools but some scholars do not accept above classification, Edward Conze in his book of *Buddhism – A Short History* mention as,

“The Buddhist community did not remain united for long and soon fell apart into a number of sects. Indian Buddhist tradition generally speaks of “eighteen” such sects, but that is a mere traditional number and in fact more than thirty are known to us, at least by name.”¹⁸

After third Buddhist Council there appeared more Buddhist sects and they existed some period of time finally they disappeared. Among those sects only four Buddhist sects developed with their viewpoints as philosophical schools, among those four philosophical schools two schools disappeared, two schools exist they recognize as Mahayana Buddhism.

1.2.3 The Role of Sanskrit in the Buddhist Schools

After found Buddhist manuscripts and documents which written by Sanskrit from Central Asia the scholars have present various opinions with regard particular matter. This background has discussed by B.N. Puri,

“The role of Sanskrit in the propagation and preservation of Buddhism and its canonical works can well be ascertained from the finds of Central Asia Buddhist manuscripts and documents in this language in different parts of that region. It is not connected with any particular Buddhist school, like the association of Pāli with the Theravādins and their

¹⁷ Akira, Hirakava. *A History of Indian Buddhism*, p. 105-117

¹⁸ Conze, Edward. *Buddhism – A Short History*. England: Oneworld Publication, 1993, p.16-17.

canonical works, but it is patronized by the Sarvāstivādins, Mahāsaṅghikas as well as the Dharmaguptikas.”¹⁹

According to above explanation some Buddhist school has used Sanskrit as their literary language, but it is not clear to understand how usage Sanskrit by all schools which mentioned. But it was no doubt the Sarvāstivādin school of the Srāvakayāna who usage Sanskrit because according to more confidential evidence this school had a Sanskrit cannon of its own.

1.2.4 Mahāsaṅghikas and their Literature Background

According to scholars the Mahāsaṅghikas had complete cannon of their own in its three divisions like the Theravādins and the Sarvāstivādins.²⁰ In the *Dīpavaṃsa* it is stated that the Mahāsaṅghikas propounded new doctrines contrary to the established ones.²¹ At the *Mahāsaṅgīti* held by them at Pāṭaliputra they made alterations in the *Sūtra* and *Vinaya Piṭakas*, as also in their arrangement and interpretation.²² References to the cannon of the Mahāsaṅghikas are found in the inscriptions discovered at Amarāvātī and Nāgarjunakonda.²³

Among the eight Buddhist school The Sthaviravāda, Mahāsaṅghika, Sammitīya and Sarvāstivāda are very important because when they written down their scriptures they were used four different languages, Paisācī (of which Pāli is evidently a dialect) by the Sthaviravāda School, Prākṛit by the Mahāsaṅghikas, Apabhramsa by the Sammitīyas and Sanskrit by the Sarvāstivādins. In fact this certainly represents only a later situation because the currency of written manuscripts seems to have encouraged whatever trends existed towards the study of texts as opposed to the practice of their teaching. Some records are confirmed for the Sthaviravāda at

¹⁹ Puri. B.N. *Buddhism in Central Asia*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1987. p. 188.

²⁰ Nalinaksha Dutt. *Buddhist Sects in India*, p. 59

²¹ *Dīpavaṃsa*, ch. iv

²² *Dīpavaṃsa*, v. 32-38

²³ Nalinaksha Dutt. *Buddhist Sects in India*, p. 59.

least by their histories written in Ceylon, which state that their *Tripitaka* was written down in the 1st century B.C.²⁴ According to above citation the language of Mahāsaṅghika's *Piṭaka* was Prākṛit. But the language of *Mahāvastu* is mixed Sanskrit, what belong to Lokottaravādins which sub-school of Mahāsaṅghikas.

The Mahāsaṅghika School first time sub-divided into two groups. The earlier group comprised the original Mahāsaṅghikas, Ekavyavahārikas and Caityakas or Lokottaravādins. Here very important school is Lokottaravādins, that is, those according to whose doctrine the Buddhas are supra-mundane or *Lokottara* and are only externally connected with worldly existence.²⁵ The Lokottaravādin group centered in the North (Mathura), preferred Sanskrit as their canonical language. The Lokottaravādins developed leanings towards Mahāyānism, and in fact prepared the ground for the advent of the Mahāyāna School.²⁶

1.2.5 Buddhist Sanskrit Canon First Time Appeared

The *Mahāvastu* is the first volume of the *Vinaya Piṭaka* of the Lokottaravādins, a branch of the Mahāsaṅghikas. In this book has given an account of the Buddha's life and his formation of the first Saṅgha. According to Dutt apart from a few rules relating to ordination, *Mahāvastu* has nothing to do with the disciplinary matters.²⁷ Winternitz thinks that its date of composition should be placed between the 2nd century B.C and the 4th century A.D.²⁸ Here the important of the *Mahāvastu* is the language which has written it. The language of the *Mahāvastu*, especially

²⁴ See Warder, A.K. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 282-283

²⁵ Ibid, p. 11.

²⁶ Nalinaksha Dutt. *Buddhist Sects in India*, p. 64.

²⁷ Ibid, p. 61.

²⁸ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, II. India: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1933, p.239.

of its poetry portion, is mixed Sanskrit and which may well be called Prākṛit or quasi-Sanskrit and pure Sanskrit.²⁹

When we attempt to find what are the earlier Buddhist Sanskrit texts in literature it is not easy like searching Pāli cannon. Some scholars said, first time Sanskrit language³⁰ used by Mūlasarvāstivādins, who later converted to Mahāyāna, to establish their doctrine in the society. J.k. Nariman adduce name of books as Sanskrit Buddhist cannon which belong to origin period of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature.

“Of these Sanskrit cannon no complete copy is to be found. We know it only from larger or smaller fragments of its *Udāna-varga*, *Dharmapada*, *Ekottarāgama* and *Madhyamāgama* which have been discovered from the xylographs and manuscripts recovered from Eastern Turkistan by Stein, Grunwedel and Le Coq”³¹

Further discussion, Buddhist *Sūtras* in Sanskrit inscribed on bricks have been found by V.A. Smith and W. Hoey in the ruins of Gopalpur along with inscriptions ranging between 250 and 400 A.D. To the *Vinayapiṭaka* of the same canon belongs probably also the fragment of a ritual for the initiation of monks written in Sanskrit which was found in Nepal by Bendall as well as the *Prātimokhasūtra* which is inferred from one Tibetan and four Chinese translations.³² All these cannon which founded pertain to Mūlasarvāstivādins, but before the mixed Sanskrit as a language used by Lokottaravādins which sub-group of Mahāsaṅghikas to explain their teaching. Unfortunately we don't have the cannon of Lokottaravādins which wrote in mixed Sanskrit only we have Chinese translations and re-translated to Sanskrit from Chinese.

All above discussion with regard to origin background of Buddhist Sanskrit literature here it tried to get a clear knowledge about particular matter but there are various opinions given

²⁹ Nalinaksha Dutt. *Buddhist Sects in India*, p. 61.

³⁰ The language of which is partly Sanskrit and partly a dialect which we may call the mid-Indian and which is given the designation of “mixed Sanskrit”

³¹ Nariman, J.k. *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*, p. 7.

³² Ibid, p. 8.

by modern scholars. Some scholars accept the origin point of Buddhist Sanskrit literature can see in origin period of development of Buddhist sectarianism, some scholars accept it pertain to later period. Unfortunately we don't have clear evidences to prove who and when used first time Buddhist Sanskrit as their literary Language.

1.3 Diffusion of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature

Development of Buddhist sectarianism among the Saṅgha how much influenced to origin of Buddhist Sanskrit literature same way particular matter influenced to diffusion of Buddhist Sanskrit literature. Several sects have developed their own literary productions, the language of which is partly Sanskrit and partly a dialect which we may call the mid-Indian and which is given the designation of mixed Sanskrit by Senart. Of this Sanskrit literature there have remained to us many voluminous books and fragments of several others while many are known to us only through Tibetan and Chinese translations. The major portion of this literature, in pure and mixed Sanskrit, which we for brevity's sake call Buddhist Sanskrit literature, belongs either to the school known as that of the Mahāyāna or has been more or less influenced by the latter.³³

The developments of Buddhist Sanskrit literature more influenced by Mahāyāna Buddhism but with regard to this matter we cannot say that influence only pertain to Mahāyāna. With regard to this circumstance some Sthaviravāda branch which later developed in own doctrines also influenced. This matter has been mentioned by J.K. Nariman as following,

“The Sanskrit Literature in Buddhism, however, is by no means exclusively Mahāyānist. Before all the widely spread sect of the Sarvāstivādins, which belonged to the Hīnayāna and which is indicated by its designation of positivists, possessed a canon of its own and a rich literature in Sanskrit”.³⁴

³³ Nariman, J.k. *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*, p. 3.

³⁴ Ibid, p. 6.

Winternitz also has been mention above matter as,

“Buddhist Sanskrit literature by no means exclusively Mahāyānic. There are also a number of important Hīnayāna texts, which are exclusively written in pure and mixed Sanskrit.”³⁵

Therefore under this title further we have to discuss in two ways how developed Buddhist Sanskrit literature with influence of Srāvakayāna and How developed Buddhist Sanskrit literature with influence of Mahāyāna.

1.3.1 Development of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature with Influence of Srāvakayāna

Development of Nikāya Buddhism under eighteen Buddhist school, according to sources that development pertain to some kind of period, that period has mentioned as one hundred years, during second Buddhist council and third Buddhist council. With regard to development of Buddhist order later schism among the Buddhist Saṅgha which pertained to Buddhist groups in Sthaviravāda lineage is very important. According to source³⁶ divisions in the Sthavira lineage began occurring during the third century after the Buddha's death. The later schisms in the schools of the Theravāda (Sthavira) lineage begin with the formation of the Mahinsāsaka (Mahīsāsaka) and Vajjiputtaka (Vātsīputrīya) schools out of the Theravada School. Next, four schools-the Dhammuttarīya (Dharmottarīya), Bhadrayānika (Bhadrayanīya), Chandāgārika (Sannāgārika), and Sammitīya (Sammatiya) -arose out of the Vajjiputtaka School. The Sabbatthivāda (Sarvāstivāda) and Dhammaguttika (Dharmaguptaka) schools were then formed out of the Mahinsāsaka (Mahīsāsaka) School.³⁷

³⁵ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II. p. 222.

³⁶ *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*

³⁷ Akira, Hirakava. *A History of Indian Buddhism*, p. 110-115.

During King Aśoka's reign, Buddhism had spread through India and it continued to develop. Some Buddhist school became to very strong more than other school. Therefore during this time some school gradually disappeared and some school developed and they became more powerful with patronage of king. In general, however, the Mahāsaṅghika tradition was weaker than the Sthavira tradition. The names of many schools belonging to the Sthavira tradition, such as the Sarvāstivādin, Theravāda, and Sammatīya, are well known. According to some sources, the dispute over the five issues that Mahādeva raised occurred during Asoka's reign. After the *Sthavira* monks were defeated in the debate by the greater number of Mahāsaṅghika monks and expelled from the Kukkuṭārāma monastery (established in Pataliputra by Aśoka), they went to Kashmir. Upagupta established Buddhism in Mathura, and Madhyantika established it in Kashmir. These traditions agree with the fact that Kashmir later became a stronghold of the Sarvāstivādin School. The great wealth the Sarvāstivādins accumulated in Kashmir enabled the school to develop a detailed *abhidharma* philosophy.³⁸

1.3.2 The Sarvāstivāda School

According to Pāli tradition The Mahīsāsakas were the earliest to secede from the Theravāda among its sub-sects. The Dharmaguptikas, Sabbatthivādins. Kassapikas, Sankāntikas, and Suttavādins appeared as sub-sects from Mahīsāsakas. According to above mention out of the Mahīsāsakas developed the Sabbatthivādins (Sarvāstivādins) and gradually the other schools. But Vasumitra argue Sarvāstivāda branched off first from the Sthaviravāda, and from the later appeared the Mahīsāsaka, Kāsyapiyās and Sankrāntivādins.³⁹

³⁸ Akira, Hirakava. *A History of Indian Buddhism*, p. 119.

³⁹ Nalinaksha Dutt. *Buddhist Sects in India*, p. 61.

“In the history of the secession of school, it has been shown that the Sarvāstivādins belonged to the orthodox group, which is why there are many points of agreement between the Theravāda and Sarvāstivāda doctrines.”⁴⁰

During the reign of Asoka, the Sarvāstivādins had two centers; one at Mathurā and the other at Kāśmīr.⁴¹ With the patronage of king Kaniṣka (1st century A.D.) the Sarvāstivāda School developed in India remained as the most powerful and influential school in North-Western India from around the beginning of the Christian era to about the 7th century A.D., initially established in Mathura and expanding in the north where Kāśmīra became their center of orthodoxy.⁴²

1.3.3 Forth Buddhist Council

The Kusāna emperor Kaniṣka I (78-102 A.D.) became a patron of Buddhism and of the Sarvāstivāda School in particular and the forth Buddhist council held at Kāśmīr under patronage of this emperor. Vasumitra, the great Buddhist philosopher, was the president of the council. Aśvaghosha, another great Buddhist philosopher acted as the Vice-president of the council⁴³ and at this council, Buddhist texts of Sūtra, *Vinaya* and *Abhidharma* were ordered to be engraved on sheet of Copper and deposited inside *stūpa* which led to emergent of later Tantrayāna. Sarvāstivādins took active parts in this council and did a splendid job for the reconciliation of the conflicting opinions of the different sects and for the settlement of the texts of the canonical literature.⁴⁴

1.3.4 The Language of Sarvāstivādins

⁴⁰ Ibid

⁴¹ Gunaratne Panabokke. *Histry of the Buddhist Sangha in India and Sri Lanka*. Sri Lanka: University of Kelaniya, 1993, p. 64.

⁴² K.L.Dhammajoti. *Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma*. Sri Lanka: Centre for Buddhist studies, 2002, p. 37.

⁴³ Hazra Kanailal. *Royal patronage of Buddhism in ancient India*. Delhi: D.K. Publications, 1984, p. 144.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 144.

According to scholars the language of Sarvāstivādins is grammatical Sanskrit, not mixed Sanskrit. It has showed by Dutt,

“The Tibetan traditions corroborated by the recent finds of manuscripts in Eastern Turkestan and Gilgit leave no room for doubt about the fact that the Sarvāstivādins adopted grammatical Sanskrit (and not mixed Sanskrit) as the medium of their literature and that they possessed a complete canon of their own in three divisions *Sūtra*, *Vinaya* and *Abhidharma*.”⁴⁵

According to Dutt, Sarvāstivādins used grammatical Sanskrit as their literary language and they established *Tripiṭaka* in this language.

1.3.5 Development of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature within Sarvāstivādins

Buddhist Sanskrit literature is developed within Sarvāstivādins and with their work in Buddhist literature. According to Winternitz Sarvāstivādins take first place among the Buddhist sects of Srāvakayāna with regard to the particular subject which development of Buddhist Sanskrit literature. Winternitz emphasize that Sarvāstivādins which especially in Kāśmīr and Gandhāra and spread thence to Central Asia, Tibet and China, had a Sanskrit Cannon of its own. Further explain by him,

“Though no complete copy of this canon has come down to us, we know it firstly, from many fragments, large and small, which have been discovered among the manuscripts and block-prints brought from Eastern Turkestan by M.A. (Sir Aurel) Stein, A. Grunwedel, A. von. Le Coq, P. Pelliot, and other; further from quotations in other Buddhist Sanskrit texts (like *Mahāvastu*, *Divyāvadāna* and *Lalitavistara*) and finally from Chinese and Tibetan Translations.”⁴⁶

The Sarvāstivādins had own completed *Tripiṭaka* (*Sūtra*, *Vinaya*, *Abhidharma*) which written in Sanskrit Language, and same to Sthaviravāda *Tripiṭaka*. The *Sūtra-piṭaka* of the Sarvāstivāda was divided into *Āgamas* corresponding to *Nikāyas* of the Pāli school. There were

⁴⁵ Nalinaksha Dutt. *Buddhist Sects in India*, p. 136.

⁴⁶ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II. p. 222-223

four *Āgamas* called *Dīrgha*, *Madhyama*, *Samyukta* and *Ekottara*. In the *Kośa* there is reference to the *Ksudraka*, which implies by the existence of a *Ksudrakāgama* too. But in the *Divyāvadāna* (pp. 17, 331, 333) and elsewhere the *Āgamas* are referred to as *Āgamacatustayam*. In the Nāgarjunakonda inscription also, four *Āgamas* are mentioned and not five.⁴⁷

In the *Vinaya Piṭaka* of Sarvāstivādins the principal text was the *Daśādhya-vinaya*. The other texts in *Vinaya Piṭaka* of Sarvāstivādins can be found in the catalogues of Chinese canonical literature. Dutt⁴⁸ quotes following titles of *Vinaya* texts from Nanjio's Catalogue, (i) *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-māṭṛka*, (ii) *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-vibhāṣā*, (iii) *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-sangraha*, (iv) *Daśādhya-vinaya-nidāna*, (v) *Daśādhya-vinaya-bhikṣu-prātimokṣa*, (vi) *Daśādhya-vinaya-bhikṣunī-prātimokṣa*, (vii) *Daśādhya-vinaya or Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Sarvāstivādins are also called Vaibhāṣikas. In their *Abhidharma* there are seven texts. For the each text the author has been given, they are ascribed to the disciples of the Buddha. Although the number is similar to Theravada *Abhidhamma*, the contents of those seven texts differ from that of Theravāda teachings. The 7 texts are:

(i) *Jñāna-prasthāna-śāstra* of Ārya Kātyāyanī-putra, (ii) *Prakaranapāda-śāstra* of Sthavira Vasumitra, (iii) *Vijñānakāya* of Sthavira Devaśarma, (iv) *Dharmaskandha-śāstra* of Ārya Sāriputra, (v) *Prajñapti-śāstra* of Ārya Maudgalyāyana, (vi) *Dhātukāya* of Pūrṇa, and (vii) *Sangīti-paryāya* of Mahākausthila.

All literature of the Sarvāstivādins is fairly comprehensive. At the fourth Buddhist council Sarvāstivādins wrote *Vibhāṣā* as commentaries for their primary books. "During the session of the council, they composed 1, 00,000 stanzas of *Upadeśa-śāstra* explanatory of the

⁴⁷ Nalinaksha Dutt. *Buddhist Sects in India*, p. 137-140.

⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 140

canonical *sūtras*, 1, 00,000 stanzas of *Vinaya-vibhāṣā-śāstras* explanatory of the *Vinaya* and 1, 00,000 stanzas of *Abhidharma-vibhāṣā-śāstras* explanatory of the *Abhidharma*.⁴⁹

As a one Buddhist School, the Sarvāstivādins has done vast role for development of Buddhist Sanskrit literature and their role pertain in the major ground of particular literature which developed under Srāvakayāna. Not only Sarvāstivāda but also number of another Buddhist Schools which pertain to Srāvakayāna branch and further development of Nikāya Buddhism also caused to development of Buddhist Sanskrit literature. Mahīśāsakas, Kāśyapīyās, Mūlasarvāstivādins, and Sautrāntikās are can be categorize in particular matter. Among those Buddhist sects Mūlasarvāstivādins which later separated from Sarvāstivādins and who later caused to appear Tantrayāna, are very prominent.

1.3.6 Aśvaghoṣa and His Works

Aśvaghoṣa is regarded as one of the most prominent poets in Sanskrit literature.⁵⁰ Modern scholars have acquainted that Aśvaghoṣa was the most prominent predecessor of Kālidāsa, and he was the creator of epic, dramatic and lyrical compositions.⁵¹ The traditions embodied in the Chinese and Tibetan sources agree in asserting that Aśvaghoṣa was a contemporary of king Kaniṣka (2nd century A.D.)⁵² Aśvaghoṣa was one of Brāhmin family, and had enjoyed a thorough Brāhmanical education before he went over to Buddhism. As a Buddhist he probably associated himself first with the Sarvāstivāda School, but laid great stress on the *Buddha-Bhakti* and thus prepared Mahāyāna.

⁴⁹ Hazra Kanailal. *Royal patronage of Buddhism in ancient India*. p. 144

⁵⁰ Hajime Nakamura. *Indian Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd, 1987. p. 133

⁵¹ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 246

⁵² According to Chinese sources, Aśvaghoṣa was the spiritual counselor and Caraka was the medical adviser of king Kaniṣka .

Aśvaghōṣa's works, which have been found in the Buddhist Sanskrit literature, his best known work is his epic poem *Buddhacarita* ("Life of the Buddha"). This is the first known complete biography of the Buddha, from his birth to the *parinirvāṇa*.⁵³ His other works are *Saundarānanda* describes how the extremely worldly Nanda was induced to become a monk by the Buddha, and *Sūtrāṅkārā* which was translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva in about 405 A.D., was ascribed by Chinese authors to Aśvaghōṣa.⁵⁴ *Śāriputra-prakaraṇa* – This drama treats the conversion of Śāriputra and his friend Maudgalyāyana.⁵⁵ *Gandistotra-gāthā* – This poem is well known for its beauty of style and contents.⁵⁶ The *Rāstrapāla-nāṭaka*, the *Gurusevādharmapañcāśadgāthā* or the *Gurupañcāśikā*, the *Vajrayānamūlāpattisamgraha*, the *Vajrasūci*, the *Stūlāpatti*, the *Daśakiusālakarmapathah*, the *Sadgatikārikā*, the *Nairātmya-pariprcchā*, the *Tridandamālā*, were also, maybe spuriously, ascribed to Aśvaghōṣa.⁵⁷

1.3.7 Development of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature with Influence of Mahāyāna

First time major community divided in to two groups as a result of schism and step by step they developed as many groups finally all these groups divided into two major groups as Srāvakayāna and Mahāyāna. After schism first time appeared Mahāsaṅghikas and regularly they sub divided to seven groups finally Lokottaravādins which sub-group of Mahāsaṅghikas returned to Mahāyāna. Same way Sthaviravādins also sub-divided to eleven groups among those eleven groups Sarvāstivādins later turned to Mahāyāna. This point is further discussed by Akira Hirakava in his book of *A History of Indian Buddhism* as following,

⁵³Warder, A.K. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 324.

⁵⁴ Hajime Nakamura. *Indian Buddhism*, p.134.

⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 134.

⁵⁶ Ibid, p 134.

⁵⁷ Ibid, p. 135.

“Many modern scholars have maintained the view that Mahāyāna Buddhism developed out of the Mahāsaṅghika School. But since the Mahāsaṅghika School continued to exist long after Mahāyāna Buddhism arose, the rise of Mahāyāna cannot be explained simply as the transformation of the Mahāsaṅghikas into Mahāyānists. While it is true that the many similarities between Mahāsaṅghika and Mahāyāna doctrines prove that the Mahāsaṅghika School did influence Mahāyāna Buddhism, teachings from the Sarvāstivādin, Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, and Theravāda schools were also incorporated into Mahāyāna Buddhism. The doctrines of the Sarvāstivāda School in particular were often mentioned in Mahāyāna texts, and Sammatīya teachings also were influential. The relation between Nikāya Buddhism and Mahāyāna Buddhism clearly is not a simple one”.⁵⁸

1.3.8 Influence of Srāvakayāna to Development of Mahāyāna Literature

When we attempt to find literary development of Mahāyāna Buddhism in Sanskrit, we can see how influence of Srāvakayāna works in Sanskrit regarding their literature, with regard to particular object. Before discussed the *Mahāvastu* which pertain to Srāvakayāna and the *Vinaya* text of Lokottaravādins, who sub-group of Mahāsaṅghikas, Winternitz further discuss with regard to particular matter as,

“And although the *Mahāvastu* belongs to the Srāvakayāna and contains much that could likewise occur – or even actually occurs- in the Pāli texts of the Theravādins, still it also contains something that makes it come closer to the Mahāyāna. The reason for many such traits is probably that the conception of Buddha prevalent among the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Lokottaravādins does actually represent a transition to the Mahāyāna.”⁵⁹

Otherwise Sarvāstivādins and their literature also influenced to developed Buddhist Sanskrit literature of Mahāyāna. “The Mahāsaṅghikas may have been the forerunners of Mahāyāna but it is clear that the Sarvāstivādins contributed much to the growth of Mahāyāna in one way or the other.”⁶⁰ According to scholars the Sarvāstivādins texts can be found in not only India but also Tibet and China.⁶¹ The main texts of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, who later translated

⁵⁸ Akira, Hirakava. *A History of Indian Buddhism*, p. 260.

⁵⁹ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 236.

⁶⁰ Nalinaksha Dutt. *Buddhist Sects in India*, p. 243.

⁶¹ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 222.

to Mahāyāna, were translated from Sanskrit into Chinese by the Chinese pilgrim I-tsing in the years 700- 712 A.D.⁶² In this way Buddhist Sanskrit canon which belong to Srāvakayāna later belong to Mahāyāna. Some Mahāyāna ideas which included in Srāvakayāna texts later developed and this development caused to particular matter.

1.3.9 The *Lalitavistara*

According to details which discussed above while the *Mahāvastu* belonging to Srāvakayāna although it has assimilated some of the Mahāyāna features, the *Lalitavistara* is considered as one of the holiest text of the Mahāyāna. Although the work originally contained the description of Buddha's life for the Sarvāstivādins belonging to the Srāvakayāna.⁶³ But the *Lalitavistara* describes itself as a *Vaipulyasūtra* ("elaborate teaching text") - a common term for Mahāyāna *Sūtras*- and exhibition all features of a Mahāyāna *Sūtra*.⁶⁴ According to scholars the *Lalitavistara* is a redaction of an older Srāvakayāna text expanded and embellished in the sense of the Mahāyāna.⁶⁵ The *Lalitavistara* according to nature of the text, it is not a single work of one author but is an anonymous compilation in which very old and very young fragment stand in juxtaposition. The book moreover consist, according to its form, of unequal sections, a continuous narrative in Sanskrit prose and numerous, often extensive, metrical pieces in "Mixed Sanskrit".⁶⁶

1.3.10 The *Avadāna* Literature

⁶² Ibid. p. 223.

⁶³ Nariman, J.k. *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*, p. 19

⁶⁴ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 238.

⁶⁵ Nariman, J.k. *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*, p. 19

⁶⁶ Nariman, J.k. *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*, p. 24-25

With regard to development of Sanskrit Buddhist literature the *Avadāna* literature takes very important place. According to scholars the *Avadāna* texts like both books of Buddhist story literature which *Avadāna* and *Jātaka*, the *Avadāna* texts also stand, so to say, with one foot in the Srāvakayāna and the other in the Mahāyāna literature.⁶⁷ The earlier works belong entirely to the Srāvakayāna literature, and the others in the Mahāyāna are completely Mahāyānistic, although they expound Buddha worship.⁶⁸ This point has discussed by J.K. Nariman,

“The *Jātakamālā* is also called *Bodhisattva-avadānamālā*, for *Bodhisattva Avadāna* is synonymous with *Jātaka*. The *Jātakās* are consequently nothing but *Avadānas* having the Bodhisattva for their hero. Consequently works like the *Sūtrāṅkārā* and the *Jātakamālā* have much in common with the texts of the *Avadāna* literature. On the other hand numerous *Jātakas* are to be found in the collection of *Avadānas*.”⁶⁹

In the *Avadāna* literature of Mahāyāna there are can be found many text. All texts are going to mention in briefly as following.

The *Avadāna-śaṭaka* is a work of the first variety which is most probably the most ancient of its kind. It is a collection of a hundred *avadāna* legends.⁷⁰ The *Divyāvadāna* is a later collection than the *Avadāna-Śaṭaka*, but it also includes some very old texts.⁷¹ The *Kalpadrūmāvadānamālā*, the *Ratnāvadānamālā* and the *Aśokāvadānamālā* are poetical versions of *Avadānas*, partly selected systematically from the *Avadāna-Śaṭaka*, partly taken from other sources. The *Dvāviṃśatyavadāna*, the *Bhadrakalpāvadāna*, the *Vratāvadānamālā* and the *Vicitrakarnikāvadāna*, all these works are belong to *Avadāna* literature and so far accessible only in a few manuscript. Others are known only through the Tibetan and Chinese translation.⁷²

⁶⁷ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II. p. 266.

⁶⁸ Hajime Nakamura. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 137.

⁶⁹ Nariman, J.k. *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*, p. 45.

⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 46.

⁷¹ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II. P. 273.

⁷² Ibid, P. 279-282.

1.3.11 The Mahāyāna Sūtras

In the Mahāyāna literature the Mahāyāna sūtras are belonged in vast range and it has been developed within long period of time. The basic material for the critical studies of the sūtras of Mahāyāna Buddhism is their Sanskrit originals. Up to the present a fairly large number of these have been discovered. According to scholars many of these can be compared with Chinese translations. Among Chinese translation, Kumārajīva, Paramārtha and Hsuan-tsang were probably most important.⁷³

In the beginning, various Buddhist sūtras appeared in Prākṛit or in the language of Central Asia. Modern scholars have been discussed the background of translation of Mahāyāna sūtras from Prākṛit to Sanskrit. According to scholars with regarding this matter the Nālanda University is very important.

“About the time when Buddhism was studied at Nālanda University, in the sixth century, they had been rewritten in Sanskrit, though there remain in these Sanskrit versions traces of Prākṛit colloquialism.”⁷⁴

According to Hajime Nakamura, this change to Sanskrit from Prākṛit was caused before or during the Gupta Dynasty in 320 A.D., which adopted Sanskrit as the official language.⁷⁵

1.3.11.1 Main Mahāyāna Sūtras

The Buddhist Sanskrit literature which mentioned so far belongs to the borderland which forms the transition between Srāvakayāna and Mahāyāna Buddhism. According to scholars the Mahāyāna Sūtras which going to mention here can be categorize as the works which belong

⁷³ Hajime Nakamura. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 154.

⁷⁴ Hajime Nakamura. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 155.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 155-156.

entirely to the Mahāyāna.⁷⁶ In the Mahāyāna Sūtra literature the basic, oldest, most famous and most representative text is the *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, of which there are several versions, large (the biggest is said to be in one hundred thousand śloka), medium and small (the smallest being of one śloka only).⁷⁷ In the Mahāyāna Sūtra literature there can be seen the main nine texts have been categorized under title of *Nava-Darmas*. The titles of these nine books are:

(i) *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñā-Pāramitā*, (ii) *Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka*, (iii) *Lalitā-Vistara*, (iv) *Lankāvatāra* or *Saddharma-Lankāvatāra*, (v) *Suvarṇa-Prabhāsa*, (vi) *Gaṇḍavyūha*, (vii) *Tathāgataguhyaka* or *Tathāgataguna-jñāna*, (viii) *Samādhirāja* and (ix) *Daśabhūmiśvara*.⁷⁸

At the present day also all these books are held in great honor in Nepal, and all these works are also called “*Vaipulya-Sūtras*.”⁷⁹ There is evidence of that fact that the *Prajñā-Pāramitās* belong to the earliest Mahāyāna-Sūtras. In the *Prajñā-Pāramitā* literature the following have come down to us in Sanskrit: *Śatasāhasrikā-Prajñā-Pāramitā* (100,000 Śloka), *Pañcaviṃśati-sāhasrikā-Prajñā-Pāramitā* (25,000 Śloka), *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñā-Pāramitā* (8,000 Śloka), *Sārdhadvai-sāhasrikā-Prajñā-Pāramitā* (2,500 Śloka), *Saptaśatikā-Prajñā-Pāramitā* (700 Śloka), the *Vajracchedikā-Prajñā-Pāramitā*, *Alpākṣarā-Prajñā-Pāramitā* and *Prajñā-Pāramitā-Hṛdaya-Sūtra*.⁸⁰ The *Prajñā-Pāramitā* was already translated into Chinese as early as 179 A.D. The *Prajñā-Pāramitās* appear to have originated in the South, and afterwards spread to the East and the North.⁸¹

1.3.11.2 Other Mahāyāna Sūtras

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 283.

⁷⁷ Goyal. S.R. *A History of Indian Buddhism*. Jodhpur: Kusumanjali Prakashan, 1932. p. 236.

⁷⁸ Ibid, p. 236.

⁷⁹ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 283.

⁸⁰ Ibid, p. 303-304.

⁸¹ Ibid, p. 301.

Mahāyāna *sūtras* began their steady growth in the first century B.C. and they reached their fullest splendor by the seventh or eighth century A.D.⁸² By influence of the Philosophical traditions of the Mahāyāna later developed the Mahāyāna *sūtras* in vast range. The main Mahāyāna *sūtras* have been categorized under the title of *Nava-Dharmas*, which mentioned above, and other Mahāyāna *sūtras* have been categorized under few titles according to teachings which included in the *sūtras* of Mahāyāna.

(i) The *Sūtras* which introduce meditation-

Especially in the Yogācāra School has been discussed meditation, the Meditation *sūtras* of Mahāyāna seen to have originated from among them. Following *sūtras* can categorize under particular matter.

The *Yogācārabhūmi-sūtra*, the *Dharmatara-dhyāna-sūtra*, the *Pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthitasamādhi-sūtra*, the *Pratyutpanna-samādhi-sūtra*, the *Samādhirāja* or the *Samādhirāja-candrapradīpa-sūtra*, The *Śūrangama-samādhi-sūtra*, the *Atyāya-jñāna-sūtra*, the *Vajrasamādhi-sūtra*,

(ii) The *Sūtrās* which introduce transmigration-

In the Mahāyāna there are some *sūtras* describing the process of transmigration of living beings. Following *sūtras* can categorize under above matter.

The *Kṣudraka-sūtra*, the *Saddharma-smṛty-upasthāna-sūtra*, the *Dharma-śarīra-sūtra*, the *Śālistamba-sūtra*, the *Pratītyasamutpādādivibhanganirdeśanāma-sūtra*,

⁸² Hajime Nakamura. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 153-154.

(iii) The *Sūtras* which introduce Buddhas and Bodhisattvas –

In Mahāyāna, Buddhas came to be regarded as more superhuman and more divine than in Conservative Buddhism, although physical and spiritual features of Buddhas were retained. Following *sūtras* are introduced particular matter. the *Kusuma-saṅcaya-sūtra*, the *Ratnajāti-paripṛcchā-sūtra*, the *Ratnacandra-paripṛcchā-sūtra*, the *Badrakalpa-samādhi-sūtra*, the *Akṣobhya-vyuha-sūtra*, the *Karunā-pundarika-sūtra*, the *Sukhāvātīvyūha-sūtra*, the *Amitāyurdhyāna-sūtra*, the *Tathāgatagarbha-sūtra*, the *Aparimitāyurjñāna-sūtra*, the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* the *Buddhāvatamsaka-sūtra*, the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*, the *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra*, the *Mahāsannipāta sūtra*.

(iv) The *Sūtras* which introduce discipline.

In some Mahāyāna *sūtras* Buddhist ethical practices to be observed by monks and nuns, laymen and lay women were described. Following *sūtras* are prominent particular matter. The *Dharmavinayasamādhi-sūtra*, the *Kuśala-mūlasaṅgraha-sūtra*, the *Tathāgata-guhyakośa-sūtra*, the *Bodhisattvapṛātimokṣa-sūtra*, the *Śrīmālādevī-sūtra*, the *Brahmajāla-sūtra*,⁸³

1.3.12 The Other Texts which have Written by Great Philosophers of Mahāyāna

Another way the Mahāyāna works that immediately follow are those of Nāgarjuna, Āryadeva, Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, etc. The Nāgarjuna, Asaṅga and Vasubandhu wrote bulky commentaries on the *Prajñā-Pāramitās*, which have, however, only come down to us in the Chinese *Tripiṭaka* and in the Tibetan Tanjur.⁸⁴ The Nāgarjuna (c.150-250 A.D.⁸⁵) is the elaborator of one of the most important school of the Mahāyāna, namely the Mādhyamika School and he is

⁸³ See Hajime Nakamura. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 149-234

⁸⁴ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 311.

⁸⁵ Hajime Nakamura. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 235.

the author of the *Mādyamika-Kārikās* which present in a systematic manner the *Sūnyatāvāda* which is taught in the Mahāyāna *Sūtras*. The other works probably his are: the *Yuktiśataka*, the *Śūnyatā-Saptati*, the *Pratītya-Samutpādahrdaya*, the *Mahāyāna Vimsaka*, the *Vigraha-vyāvartanī*, the *Dharma-Sangraha*, the *Ratnāvalī* and the *Suhrllekha*.⁸⁶ Among these the *Ratnāvalī* and the *Suhrllekha*, Letter to a Friend, are an epistle to the Sātavāhana emperor, expounding traditional Buddhist morality in no way different from that we have found in the *Tripiṭaka*.⁸⁷

Āryadeva (170-270 A.D.) who was the most famous disciple of Nāgārjuna and his works are as follows; the *Śata-śāstra*, the *Catuhśataka*, the *Akṣara-śataka*, the *Mahāpuruṣa-śataka*, the *Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa*, and the following four books, existing in Tibetan alone, are traditionally ascribed to Āryadeva, are the *Jñānāsārasamuccaya*, the *Skalitapramathanayuktihetusiddhi*, the *Madhyamakabhramaghāta*, the *Āryaprajñāpāramitāmahāparipṛccha*.⁸⁸

Maitreya or Maitreya-nātha (c.270-350 A.D.) who was the elaborator of Yogācāra School and he also later identified with Maitreya-Bodhisattva, the future Buddha. Asaṅga heartily venerated his teacher Maitreya who was respectfully called Maitreya-Bodhisattva. As for Maitreya's works, the Chinese tradition enumerates the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the *Yogavibhāga*, the *Mahāyāna-sūtrāṅkāra*, the *Madhyāntavibhāga*, and the *Vajracchedikāvyaṅkyā*, while the Tibetan tradition has the *Mahāyāna-sūtrāṅkāra*, the *Madhyāntavibhāga*, the *Abhisamayāṅkāra*, the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga* and the *Uttaratantra*.⁸⁹ These five are well known among the Tibetan scholars.

⁸⁶ See Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, P. 329-336.

⁸⁷ Warder, A.K. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 357.

⁸⁸ See Hajime Nakamura. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 244-245.

⁸⁹ Hajime Nakamura. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 256.

Asaṅga or Āryasaṅga expounded the *Vijñānavāda* systematically, and he was born about or after the year 290 A.D. in Puruṣapura and died about 360 A.D.⁹⁰ The following books are ascribed to him. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, the *Vajracchedikāvyākhyā* (a commentary on the *Vajracchedikāsūtra*), the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*.⁹¹ Vasubandhu (320-400 A.D.) who was the younger brother of Asaṅga⁹² and he was one of the most prominent philosopher in the history of Buddhist literature. His chief work, the *Abhidharmakośa* has not come down in the Sanskrit and its auto commentary is available in Sanskrit now. The *Abhidharmakośa-kārika*, the *Gāthā-Saṃgraha*, the *Paramārtha-Saptati*, the *Pañcaskandha-Prakarana*, the *Vyākhyāyukti*, the *Karma-Siddhi-Prakarana*, and the *Pratītya-Samutpāda-Sūtra* these are the other works of Vasubandhu.⁹³

Furthermore in the Buddhist Sanskrit literature it can see many authors belong to philosophical school such as Mādhyamika and Yogācāra have been written many books to explain their views. Buddhapālita and Bhāvaviveka (Bhavya) who belong to Mādhyamika School and wrote commentaries on their works lived and worked at the beginning of the 5th century A.D. In the 5th century A.D. there lived Sthiramati was a disciple of Dignāga (Diñnāga) who belongs to Yogācāra School. Sthiramati wrote a commentary on the *Kāśyapa-Parivarta*, and on Vasubandhu's *Trimśikā* these are available in Sanskrit. Also he wrote a commentary on *Abhidharmakośa* of Vasubandhu available only Tibetan translation. Another author Dharmapāla wrote a commentary on the *Vijñaptimātratā-Siddhi*. The greatest and most independent thinker among the successors of Vasubandhu is Dignāga, the founder of Buddhist logic, only a single one of Dignāga's works, the *Nyāyapraveśa* has come down in Sanskrit. The principal works of

⁹⁰ Warder, A.K. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 414.

⁹¹ See Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p.339-343.

⁹² Warder, A.K. *Indian Buddhism*, p. 414.

⁹³ See Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 343-348.

his successor Dharmakīrti, the *Nyāyabindu*, has come down to us in Sanskrit.⁹⁴ Dharmakīrti wrote seven books on Buddhist logic including *Nyāyabindu*. The other books are the *Pramāṇavartikā*, the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, the *Hetubindu*, the *Vādanyāya*, the *Sambandhāparikṣā*, the *Santāntarasiddhi*. Among these books the *Vādanyāya* and *Santāntarasiddhi* are available in Tibetan translation.

Candragomi who as a grammarian, philosopher and poet and belongs to Yogācāra School enjoyed high renown in the Buddhist Literary. Of his poetical works we have only a religious poem in the form of a letter to his pupil, the *Sīśyalekhā-Dharma-Kāvya*.⁹⁵ The most prominent among the later teachers of Mahāyāna Buddhism, who also distinguished himself as a poet, is Śāntideva, who probably lived in the 7th century A.D.⁹⁶ Tāranātha ascribes to him the works *Śikṣā-Samuccaya*, *Sūtra-Samuccaya* and *Bodhicaryāvatāra*.⁹⁷

Śāntarakṣita was one of the most important and pivotal thinkers in the history of Indian and Tibetan Buddhist philosophy and the Professor of Nālandā University. He was born during the reign of Gopāla (660-705 A.D) the founder of the famous Pāla dynasty of Bengal and died at the time of Dharmapāla who ascended the throne in 765 A.D.⁹⁸ Śāntarakṣita was the author of several philosophical and logical works. In the Tibetan Tanjur a number of works are attributed to him among which the *Vādanyāyavṛttivipaṇcitārtha* and *Tattvasaṃgraha* deserve special mention.⁹⁹ The first work is a commentary on the *Vādanyāna* of Dharmakīrti the Sanskrit original of this work is lost Tibetan translation still exist. The most famous book of Śāntarakṣita's is *Tattvasaṃgraha* compendium Indian philosophy systems, non-Buddhists and

⁹⁴ Ibid, 348-352.

⁹⁵ Nariman, J.k. *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*, p. 100.

⁹⁶ Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 353.

⁹⁷ Nariman, J.k. *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*, p. 100-101.

⁹⁸ Blumenthal, James (2008). "Śāntarakṣita", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2008 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.). - <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/saantarak-sita/>

⁹⁹ Ibid

Buddhists. His disciple Kamalasīla (740-795 A.D)¹⁰⁰ wrote commentaries on both books are available in Sanskrit, and Tibetan translation. Both went to Tibet, Kamalasīla wrote two books at Tibet, *Bhāvanākrama* and *Madhyamāloka*, all these are available in Sanskrit and Tibetan translation.

¹⁰⁰Ibid