

## Delimitation of the *Arhat* Ideal in Early Buddhism

S.N. DUBE

Disgusted with the ills of life, the Buddha renounced the world to seek what is good, the excellent station of peace.<sup>1</sup> He finally attained Enlightenment by discovering the relatedness and contingency of all things and the ineffable peace which lies beyond.<sup>2</sup> These twin principles of *Prañītyasamutpāda* (*Pañiccasamuppāda*)<sup>3</sup> and Nirvāna (*Nibbāna*)<sup>4</sup> form the core of Buddha's philosophy. It is through their divergent interpretations that subsequent Buddhist philosophical systems have arisen. The Buddha does not seem to announce a categorically defined system. Instead he gave expression only to an inspired and inspiring wisdom using similes and parables and adapting his expression to the need of their occasion. The Buddha, in fact, allowed his words to be remembered by everyone in his own dialect,<sup>5</sup> the meaning being important not the word.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, after the passing away of the Buddha, his collected words gave rise to diverse attempts at systematizing them and, thus, many different schools and sects came into existence.

In the course of Buddhist history its missions have traversed the far corners of the earth for 'the happiness and welfare of mankind'.<sup>7</sup> As the Buddhist order (*Saṅgha*) expanded, councils claiming to be ecumenical had been held from time to time. Along side this expansion the spirit of Buddhism has been liberal and democratic and its organization highly decentralized. This has given the widest possible latitude to thought and has led to the proliferation of numerous sects and schools. Traditionally by the time of Aśoka their number had reached eighteen. There is a common ground in the traditions of the different sects in holding that the differentiation of sects had arisen early, mostly within the first two centuries of the Nirvāna era.<sup>8</sup> In the evolution of the Buddhist sects and schools it is noticed that the 'great schism' in the *Saṅgha* resulting in the rise of two sects, i.e., Theravāda and Mahāsāṅghika at the time of the Second

Buddhist Council, was followed by a series of schisms leading to the formation of various new sects. C.A.F. Rhys Davids calls the non-Theravāda schools dummies and observes that the ancient treatises on them by Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva offer us only the dry disintegrated bones of doctrines.<sup>9</sup> Yet the dummies appear to have been once alive and the dry bones clothed with flesh and blood. The records, doubtless, present a dry conspectus because they are the products of scholastic activity.

The schism between Sthaviras (*Theravāda*) and Mahāsaṅghikas was occasioned by differences over the question of the status of *Arhat* (*Arhant*). The concept of *Arhat*-ship, thus, forms a significant issue of debate amongst the early Buddhist sects. *Arhat* is the title given to the perfect man in Buddhism. The Buddhists seem to derive the term from 'ari, i.e., 'enemy' and 'han', i.e. 'to kill' and, thus, the term stands for a 'slayer of enemy', the enemy obviously being passions. Some modern scholars, however, prefer to derive this term from '*Arhati*, i.e., to be worthy of' or 'deserving' and 'worthy of worship and gifts'.<sup>10</sup> It seems that originally *Arhat* was a popular appellation given to ascetics. In Buddhism, however, it assumed a technical significance as denoting only the fully and finally emancipated saints. The Buddha is generally called an *Arhat*. In the earliest Buddhist usage, Buddhahood and *Arhat*-ship are so closely allied that it is difficult to draw any significant distinction between the two.<sup>11</sup>

The Pali canonical texts lay down in various formulae the qualities, which go to make *Arhat*-ship. An *Arhat* is described as one who is in possession of the excellent goal, free from attachment, hatred, delusion, in short, all impurities, relieved of the burden of 'five constituents' (*skandhas*), accomplished in all that is to be accomplished and devoid of any future existence.<sup>12</sup> The *Arhat* is one in whom the 'intoxicants' or 'outflows', i.e., sense desire, becoming, ignorance, wrong views are destroyed, who has lived the life, who has done his task, who has laid down his burden, who has attained salvation, etc.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, it is said that an *Arhat* is 'alone, secluded, earnest, zealous, master of himself'<sup>14</sup>. He exerted himself and realized that the circle of 'birth-and-death' (*jarā-maraṇa*) with its 'five constituents' (*skandhas*) is in constant flux. He abandoned all the defilements and won *Arhat*-ship. On becoming an *Arhat* he lost all his attachment to the world. He has obtained 'gnosis', the 'super-knowledge' and the 'powers of analytical insight'.<sup>15</sup> Thus he is supposed to be possessed of both *kṣaya-jñāna*,

i.e., the knowledge that he has no more *kleśas* and *anutpādajñāna*, i.e., the knowledge that he will have no more rebirth.<sup>16</sup> An *Arhat* has, thus, acquired the clear vision of the origin and destruction of things, got rid of all doubts (*kañkhā*) about the Buddha, *Dhamma* and *Saṅgha*, non-existence of soul and the theory of causation. He has seen things for himself unaided by others.<sup>17</sup> This, in short, is the image of an *Arhat* which the early Buddhists, especially the Theravādins, cherished and commended.

The ideal of early Buddhism may, in fact, be described aptly as consisting of the attainment of *Arhattva* and Nirvana. With the attainment of *Arhat*-ship one reaches the climax of his career. The Buddha himself was described as an *Arhat* and so were his early disciples who became *Arhat* within a short time.<sup>18</sup> One might say that early Buddhism was a process and system of training in perfectibility of which the culmination was a spiritual status technically termed *Arhat*-ship, exemplified by the personality of the Buddha himself. The doctrine that leads to *Arhat*-ship is designed as 'the doctrine of *Arhat*'.<sup>19</sup> The earliest usage does not distinguish *Arhat* from Buddha just as the Jains did not distinguish *Arhat* from Jina. This earliest usage is not distinctively Buddhist either. Within Buddhism, however, a distinction between a mere *Arhat* and a Buddha emerged quite early.<sup>20</sup>

Gradually the ideal of *Arhat*-ship was diluted and delimited. Within a century or so of the passing away of Lord Buddha, there emerged several significant disputes over the concept of *Arhat*-ship and the quality of perfection attained in it. It is borne out by the account of *Kathāvatthu*<sup>21</sup> that a variety of such views, which came to be held by a section of early Buddhists, postulated clear possibilities of imperfections in the state of *Arhat*-ship. It is interesting to note that some of these so-called heterodox views are also recorded in the accounts of Vasumitra,<sup>22</sup> Bhavya<sup>23</sup> and Vinītadeva<sup>24</sup> and mentioned as the five points of Mahādeva, finally leading to the great schism in the Buddhist order and its division into the first two sects, viz. Theravāda and Mahāsaṅghika.<sup>25</sup> Occasionally, the *Abhidharmakośa* provides valuable insight into them.<sup>26</sup> At least four of the five points of Mahādeva appear to render a direct blow to the orthodox conception of *Arhat*-ship as it appears in the *Nikāyas* and other Pali texts.

Vasumitra's treatise enumerates the failings thus: <sup>27</sup>

- (1) The *Arhat* can be tempted by others.
- (2) He still has ignorance.

- (3) He still has doubt.
- (4) He gains knowledge through the help of others.

The corresponding heterodox views on *Arhat*-ship as enumerated in the *Kathāvattu* are:

- (1) *Arhat* has impure discharge, i.e., he may be subject to unconscious temptations.<sup>28</sup>
- (2) He may lack knowledge., i.e, one may be an *Arhat* and not know it.<sup>29</sup>
- (3) He may have doubt on matters of doctrine.<sup>30</sup>
- (4) *Arhat* is excelled by others.<sup>31</sup>

While the *Kathāvattu-Atthakathā* attributes these new assertions to the Pūrvaśailas (*Pubbaseliya*) and Aparāśailas (*Aparaseliya*),<sup>32</sup> Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva attribute some of these to the Mahāsaṅghikas in general and their sub-sects, i.e., Ekavyavahārikas, Lokottaravādins, and Kaukkutikas in particular as also to some of the Theravāda sects.<sup>33</sup> It is interesting that even the *Kathāvattu-Atthakathā* attributes some of these assertions to certain offshoots of the Theravāda sect. For example, the thesis 'that an *Arhat* can fall away from *Arhat*-ship'<sup>34</sup> was held, according to Buddhaghosa, by the Sammatīyas, Vajjiputtīyas, Sabbatthivādins and some of the Mahāsaṅghikas.<sup>35</sup>

The so-called heterodox movement against the ideal of *Arhat*-ship was disputed and criticized at length by the Theravādins. They defended the status of *Arhat* and his attainments with equal vehemence. The *Kathāvattu* picks up the above four points, alongwith various other assertions denigrating *Arhat*-ship, discusses them in considerable detail and finally claims to establish their untenability. For example, on the alleged fallibility of *Arhat*, the Theravādins observe that the thesis must also imply: (a) that he may fall away everywhere, (b) at all times, (c) that all *Arhats* are liable to fall away, and (d) that an *Arhat* is liable to fall away not only from *Arhat*-ship, but from all the four 'Path-fruitions'.<sup>36</sup> The proponents of the thesis do not, however, admit the possibility of universal retrogression. They concede that the *Arhat* retrogresses only upto the '*sotāpattiphala*', and that the retrogression occurs only in the sphere of *kāmaloka* and not in the two higher spheres, viz., *rūpa* and *arūpa*. And this retrogression too is confined only to the *mudindriya* or *samaya-vimutta Arhats*.<sup>37</sup>

It is in this strain that the Theravādins categorically reject the thesis about the possibility of falling away of an emancipated one, even

such, who attained this only occasionally in meditation. Still less can he fall away from *Arhat*-ship, because, as suggested by some, he might have calumniated a saint in some previous birth. They also deny that the gods of the Māra group can impose physical impurities upon an *Arhat*. He has acquired complete knowledge and hence cannot have any doubt or be surpassed by others in knowledge. He has cast aside every fetter of ignorance and doubt in attaining his end. Nevertheless, he is human and hence the thesis that he is entirely free in every regard from any association with the four 'intoxicants' (*āsavas*) cannot be sustained for the simple reason that his body and sense organs cannot be considered absolutely uncontaminated by these 'intoxicants'. The only things which are really free from any connection with the 'intoxicants' are the 'Paths', their 'Fruits', 'Nirvana' and 'the factors leading to insight'. Similarly, though an *Arhat* is indifferent to sense impressions, his indifference is manifested under human conditions; he cannot attend to more than one sense impression or idea at the same time, for his consciousness is essentially momentary. Moreover the progress to *Arhat*-ship must be carried out in strict accordance with the stages laid down. It is, therefore, wrong to assume that the attainment of *Arhat*-ship means the simultaneous destruction of all fetters. In the first three stages, five of the fetters are cast away; in the last, the aspirant rids himself of the desire for rebirth either in the *rūpa-loka* or *arūpa-loka*, conceit, distraction and ignorance. It is also wrong to associate an *Arhat*'s insight to a learner. Similarly, no one can attain to *Arhat*-ship unless he has laid aside the life of a layman. It is also impossible for an embryo to become an *Arhat* at the moment of rebirth. Nor by offering gifts, paying homage to the shrines and so on does an *Arhat* become subject to a process of accumulating merit. If he could win merit he could also win demerit, which is absurd. Nor is it true to say that he cannot have an untimely death for he has to experience the results of all his former actions as was opined by some, since the liability to accidents cannot be wholly ruled out. It is also denied that he possesses consciousness subject to moral distinctions at the time of his death. Nor is it right to say that an *Arhat* attains the completion of existence while in the imperturbable absorption of meditation.<sup>38</sup>

An analysis of the unpalatable new assertions about *Arhat*-ship might suggest that some of the theses may have their genesis in observed failings, e.g., (1) the idea of *Arhat* may not be so attractive as that of the Buddha. A comparison between the two would highlight the limitations of the former. (2) There is some reason to

postulate a psychological hostility arising from institutional and historical reasons. (3) Some of the theses suggest actually observed failings and limitations. (4) There is also room for divergent interpretation in the canonical statements on *Arhat*-ship.

According to the Pali tradition, the Second Buddhist Council<sup>39</sup> was held at Vaiśālī to discuss the ten practices of the Vajjian monks for which not only recognition was categorically refused but these acts were unanimously declared to be un-Vinayic. From the metaphysical point of view, the acts of the Vajjians hardly appear significant. But they do indicate a more liberal attitude on the part of eastern monks in general and Vajjians in particular. A people thoroughly imbued in democratic traditions, they were unlikely to submit to the exclusive powers and privileges claimed by the *Arhats* and, thus, 'the real point at issue was the rights of the individual, as well as, those of the provincial communities as against the prescriptions of a centralized hierarchy'.<sup>40</sup> Undoubtedly as the Vajjian monks' liberal views were not acceptable to the orthodox elders, they must have been severely impeached by the latter as indicated by the details of the Second Council. Discomfited, thus, in the Council, the eastern monks seem to have started, as a reaction, their campaign against the very same *Arhats* by calling in question their claims and authority and seeking to propound their fallibility. In order to uphold their views and innovations with regard to the *Vinaya* and *Dhamma* they organized at Pataliputra a separate council called *Mahāsaṅgha* or *Mahāsaṅgīti* without making any discrimination of *Arhat* and non-*Arhat*. In view of the high number of attendance at the *Mahāsaṅgīti*, which is given as 10,000,<sup>41</sup> it seems likely that no such discrimination was really made. In this council the Vajjian monks are supposed to have carried out things according to their own wishes. They altered the course of the *sutras* in the *Vinaya* and the five *Nikāyas*, removed some of them and interpolated new ones. It is also added that they refused to accept the authenticity of *Parivāra*, *Paṭisaṃbidāmagga*, *Niddesa*, certain *Jātakas* and six texts of the *Abhidhamma*.<sup>42</sup> It is difficult to assume, however, that all these texts had really been compiled by that time. Nevertheless, the *Mahāsaṅgīti* of Pāṭaliputra seems to have formalized the division of the original order into two sects. On the one hand was the large bulk of eastern monks with its strongholds at Vaiśālī and Pāṭaliputra and, on the other, was the section of western monks with their chief centers at Kauśāmbī, Avanti and Mathurā, a group in which the influence of the old Sthaviras was predominant.

The other tradition on the Second Buddhist Council, preserved by Vasumitra and followed by Bhavya and Vinītadeva, in fact, clearly asserts that the first breach in the *Saṅgha* resulted from the 'Five Points of Mahādeva'.<sup>43</sup> The first four propositions of Mahādeva, as noted above, relate to *Arhat* of whom a startling conception is put forth. It is gathered from the *Abhidharma-mahā-vibhāsālun* (chapter 99)<sup>44</sup> that Mahādeva was a Brāhmin from Mathurā and he received his ordination at *Kukkuṭārāma* in Pāṭaliputra. His zeal and abilities crowned him with the headship of the *Saṅgha* there. With the help of the ruling king, who was his friend and patron, Mahādeva succeeded in ousting the senior monks from that monastery. Thereupon he started propagating his five propositions. These points clearly indicated that the *Arhats* were not all fully perfect persons as was the view of orthodox Theravādins, and that the *Arhats* had a few limitations. Such stipulations naturally gave rise to a serious dispute leading ultimately to the first schism in the Buddhist *Saṅgha* and the emergence of the two sects, Mahāsaṅghika and Theravāda. The points raised by Mahādeva are evidently suggestive of a critical attitude of the emerging sect towards the elders who claimed *Arhat*-ship to be the highest attainment. It is likely, therefore, that the Vajjians, having suffered a defeat in the Second Council, launched a counter-attack against the conservatives and the prevalence of 'bogus *Arhats*' among the latter provided them a favourable issue of criticism. In Mahādeva they seem to have found an able leader and champion of their viewpoint. Minayeff has observed that the Buddhist *Saṅgha* was undergoing a state of demoralization about the time of the Second Council.<sup>45</sup>

Thus, it appears that within a century of the passing away of Lord Buddha, the *Arhat* ideal of the original teaching tended to give rise, within a monastic system, to a kind of soteriological individualism. At the hands of some orthodox sects, especially the Theravādins, the ideal received an individualistic twist. They strenuously emphasized that *Arhat*-ship is the only goal of salvation and freedom from suffering. One might say that the Theravādins tried to faithfully adhere to the moral, monastic and disciplinary life of early Buddhism. It does not, however, mean that the Theravāda standpoint thoroughly represents the spirit of original Buddhism or that the entire Buddhism is comprised in the Pali canon as was the accepted belief of the older generation of Buddhist scholars. Thus, the purely individualistic attempts of the Theravādins to pursue the threefold development of '*śīla*, '*samādhi*' and '*prajñā*' (*paññā*) with the consequent attainment

of *Arhat*-ship could well be deemed inadequate from the point of view of the average mass of mankind. On the other hand, for the spiritually more ambitious the ideal of *Arhat*-ship would appear pale beside the glory of the Buddha and may well lead them, through this comparison, to look at *Arhat*-ship with critical eyes. The individualistic tendency of the Theravāda, therefore, provoked protests from others in the Buddhist community and contributed by way of a reaction in a significant measure towards the growth of heretical and unwholesome notions about the idea.

From the debates on the issue, as recorded in the *Kathāvattu*, it seems that there was something inherent in the oldest tradition itself which enabled the growth of heterodox views and subsequent controversies on *Arhat*-ship. For example, in the relationship between the conceptions of Buddhahood and *Arhat*-ship, there are some enigmatic passages in the canonical literature the testimony of which makes it difficult to draw any distinction between the two. For example, it was asserted that 'Every Buddha was an *Arhat*. Every *Arhat* was Buddha'.<sup>46</sup> The Buddha himself is habitually called an *Arhat*. At one place it is said: 'Let us ask Gotam, the awakened one, who has passed beyond anger and fear....'<sup>47</sup> But the same adjectives, as we find here, are used elsewhere for an *Arhat*.<sup>48</sup> Similarly in a long description of the Buddha,<sup>49</sup> all the epithets used for him are generally found applied to one or other of his disciples. *Arhat* is, in fact, one of the oft-used titles for the Buddha but it was not an exclusive title and all those, who, as a result of his teaching, came to realize the Truth, are said to have become *Arhats*, the number amounting to as many as sixty-one.<sup>50</sup> In the third *dhyāna* which denotes the final stage of 'worldly' wisdom, just before the 'Path' is reached the equanimity of the *Arhat* who 'never abandons his natural state of purity' when presented with desirable or undesirable objects is similar to the equanimity of a Buddha which is often lauded in the scriptures. It is said that the equanimity of Buddhas and *Arhats* is unaffected by the reception his teachings may receive, and they feel no joy when it is accepted, no displeasure when it is rejected<sup>51</sup> but remain unmoved and fully mindful. The teacher never called himself a Buddha as distinct from an *Arhat*. When addressed as Buddha or spoken of as such by his disciples, it is always doubtful whether anything more is meant than an enlightened *Arhat*. In the oldest documents the two conceptions seem to be still in a state of fusion. In fact, the word *Arhat* has been used in early texts without any great precision. It may be an epithet of the Buddha, or a name for the eighth of the 'holy persons', the one who has won final sanctification. That person



is sometimes distinguished from the Pratyekabuddhas. At other times, however, the *Arhat* is either a disciple (*śrāvaka*) who must 'hear' from a Tathāgata, or a Pratyekabuddha.<sup>52</sup>

However, it cannot be maintained with certitude that the ideal of *Arhat* was synonymous with Buddhahood and that no distinction was made between the two in early canonical works. The view inevitably implies equality between the teacher and his disciples which would have been difficult to sustain for the Buddhist community as the Buddha being their teacher was such an exalted figure. We come across such passages in the early texts where the difference between the two concepts may be brought out clearly. Attention may be drawn to a dialogue between Sāriputta and the Buddha.<sup>53</sup> Sāriputta here confesses that he has no knowledge of the able and 'awakened ones' that have been and are to come, as also, of the present times. Sāriputta was one of the greatest direct disciples of the Buddha and yet his figure, as compared to the Buddha, is completely dwarfed by his confession. It was logical to assume that a Buddha would possess a number of additional qualities of perfection as compared to an *Arhat*.<sup>54</sup> There is an illuminating incident referred to in the *Sputārthā* on the *Abhidharmakośa* where it is shown that the Buddha surpasses all his disciples which enables him to become the universal teacher or saviour.<sup>55</sup> Further, the theory of a number of successive Buddhas<sup>56</sup> presupposes the conception of a Buddha as a different and more exalted personage than an *Arhat*. In a famous dialogue, Lord Buddha is reported to have said that he is neither a man (*manussa*), nor a *gandharva* (*gandhabba*) nor a *yaksa* (*yakkha*) nor even a *deva* or *brahma*, but a Buddha.<sup>57</sup> In fact, the Buddhist Theravada tradition itself speaks of three kinds of saints (*ārya*, i.e., persons having won the Path) as being 'adepts', or 'enlightened', or as 'having' Nirvana. They are the *Arhats*, Pratyekabuddhas and Buddhas. Vasubandhu points out<sup>58</sup> that the Lord Buddha alone has destroyed ignorance in its entirety, and is wholly free from that which prevents us from seeing things as they are. The *Arhats* and Pratyekabuddhas have freed themselves from the delusion which is soiled by the defilements; but in them the ignorance which is unsoiled by the defilements continues to operate. They do not know the special attributes of a Buddha, nor objects which are very distant in time or space, nor the infinite complexity of things. The *Arhat* is content to know everything which concerns him personally, the Pratyekabuddha in addition knows conditioned co-production, but still the bulk of the universe lies beyond him. The distinction between

an *Arhat* and a Buddha is made evidently clear in the works of Mahāyāna where it is said that *Arhats* who are perfect *śrāvakas*, get rid of only *kleśāvaraṇa*, i.e., the veil of impurities consisting of *rāga*, *doṣa*, *sīlabbataparāmāsa*, and *vicikicchā* but not of *jñeyāvaraṇa*, i.e., the veil which conceals the Truth – the veil which can only be removed by realizing the *Dharma-sūnyatā* or *Tathatā*. It is the Buddha alone, who, being perfectly emancipated has both *kleśāvaraṇa* and *jñeyāvaraṇa* removed.<sup>59</sup> It is interesting that the Theravādins, though they desperately try to defend the cherished status and image of *Arhat*-ship, themselves have to grant ultimately that the *bodhi* attained by an *Arhat* is characterized by the knowledge of the four paths (*catumaggañāṇa*) and not omniscience (*sabbaññutañāṇa*) which is the *bodhi* of the Buddhas.<sup>60</sup> It is plausible, therefore, that the basic difference in the two conceptions inherent in the *Nikayās* was brought to the fore in the course of time, and led to two parallel developments in a new direction in the history of Buddhism. One led to a gradual decline in the ideal of *Arhat*-ship and the other towards eventual deification of the Buddha.

There appears to have been a close inter-relationship between the two tendencies. Generally the same group of sects, which carried on the anti-*Arhat* campaign, led *pari passu* a movement seeking to establish the transcendentality of the Buddha.<sup>61</sup> A process was, thus, set moving under which the life of the Master formed the edifice and the rival sects provided the material for the superstructure. Consequently, while the orthodox Theravādins adhered strictly to the realistic view of the person of their Teacher, the heterodox radicals proceeded boldly to idealize and eventually deify Him.

#### NOTES AND REFERENCE

1. 'Kimkusalagavesī anuttaraṃ santivarapadaṃ pariyesamāno', cf. *Majjhima Nikāya*, *Pāsarāsi sutta*; *Buddhacarita*, V. 14.
2. *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, II, pp. 105-106. Citations are from Nalanda edition of Pali texts except where otherwise specified.
3. On *Prañītyasamutpāda* see, David J. Kalupahana, *Causality: The Central Philosophy of Buddhism*, Honolulu, 1975, pp. 54 ff.; see also G.C. Pande, *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism* (3rd ed.), Delhi, 1983, pp. 406 ff.
4. On *Nirvāna* see T.I. Stcherbatsky, *The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāna*, Leningrad, 1927; see also 'G.C. Pande, op. cit., pp. 443 ff.
5. *Cullavagga*, pp. 228-29: 'anujānāmi, bhikkhave, sakāya niruttiyā buddhavacanaṃ pariāpunituṃ'.

6. 'Arhaḥ pratiśaraṇaṃ na vyañjanaṃ'.
7. *Mahāvagga* p.23: 'caratha, bhikkhave, cārikaṃ bahujanahitāya bahujanasukhāya lokanukampāya atthāya hitāya sukhāya deva-manussanaṃ'.
8. cf., *Dīpavaṃsa*, V 39 ff; *Mahāvāṃsa*, V 3 f f ; J. Masuda, "Origin and Doctrines of Early Indian Buddhist Schools", *Asia Major*, II, 1.925, pp. 14-18; A. Bareau, "Trois Traite sur les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Vehicule," *Journal Asiatique*, Tomme, CCLIV, 1956, II Partie, p. 167 f., 172 f., 192.
9. cf., *Points of Controversy* London, 1960 Prefatory Notes, pp.XXXII ff., see also S.N. Dube, *Cross Currents in Early Buddhism*, Delhi 1980, pp. 37 ff.
10. Rhys Davids and Stede, *Pali English Dictionary*, Pt. I, p.76, s.v. Arhati; see also E. Conze, *Buddhism, its Essence and Development*, London, 1951, p. 93.
11. *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Pt.III, *Pathikasutta*, Introduction, p. 6.
12. *Dīgha Nikāya*, III, pp.66, 76; *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, pp.7, 94; *Samyutta Nikāya*, I, p.70, IV, pp.142-43, 258; *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, I, p. 33; *Itivuttaka*, p. 208.
13. cf., *Cullavagga*, pp.18, 34-35, 202; *Dīgha Nikāya*, I, pp.149, 168; *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, p.184; *Samyutta Nikāya*, I, p.141, II, pp. 44, 70, 81-82, 103, 204, III, pp. 20, 41, 52; *Aṅguttara Nikāya* I, p.152, II, p. 225.
14. *Dīgha Nikāya*, I, p.149, II, p.118; cf. *Samyutta Nikāya*, I, pp.141, 161; *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, I, p. 263.
15. *Avadāna Śataka*, Ed., J.S. Speyer, St. Petersburg, 1919, II 348.
16. N. Dutt, *Early Monastic Buddhism*, Vol.II, Calcutta, 1945, p.204; cf. J. Masuda, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
17. See, *Kathāvatthu*, pp.174 ff.
18. *Cullavagga*, p. 18.
19. See, *Sutta Nipāta*, p. 296.
20. cf., David J. Kalupahana, *op. cit.*, p. 155.
21. cf., S.N. Dube, "The Date of Kathāvatthu", *East and West*, (New Series), Vol.22, Nos.1-2, March-June, 1972, pp. 79-86.
22. J. Masuda, *op. cit.*, pp. 24,36,38,52.
23. A. Bareau, *op. cit.*, pp. 174, 179.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 194.
25. cf., Lois de la Vallee Poussin, "The Five Points of Mahādeva", *JRAS*, 1910, pp.414 ff; E. Lamotte, "Buddhist Controversy Over the Five Propositions", *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XXXII, Nos.2-3, 1956, pp. 146-62.
26. cf. *Abhidharmakośa*, II, p. 210.
27. A. Bareau, *op. cit.*, 1956, p.172.
28. cf., *Kathavātthu*, II, 1.
29. *Ibid.*, II, 2.

30. *Ibid.*, II, 3.
31. *Ibid.*, II, 4.
32. See, *Kathāvatthu-Aṭṭhakathā* (PTS ed.), pp. 24 ff.
33. J. Masuda, op. cit., pp.24, 36, 38, 52; A. Barea, op. cit., 1956, pp. 174, 179, 194.
34. *Kathāvatthu*, I, 2.
35. *Kathāvatthu-Aṭṭhakathā*, p.35.
36. See *Kathāvatthu*, pp. 71 ff.
37. *Kathāvatthu-Aṭṭhakathā*, pp. 36-37.
38. For discussions on these points see S.N. Dube, *Cross Currents in Early Buddhism*, pp. 97 ff.
39. On the second Buddhist Council, see G.C. Pande, *Bauddha Dharma Ke Vikas Ka itihasa* 3rd ed. Lucknow, 1990, pp.169-175; N. Dutt, *Early Monastic Buddhism*, II, pp.31-46; Rockhill, *Life of the Buddha and the Early History of His Order*, London, 1907, pp.171-80; E. Obermiller, *Bu-ston-History of Buddhism in India and Tibet*, PT.II Heidelberg, 1932, pp. 96 ff - J. Masuda, op. cit. 14 ff.; A. Barea, "Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Vehicule", *Bulletin de l'École Francaise d'Extrême Orient*, Saigon, 1955; Lois de la Vallee Poussin, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. IV, s.v. Councils; *Indian Antiquary*, Vol.XXXVII, pp.86 ff.
40. C.A.F. Rhys Davids, *Sakya*, London, 1931, p.355; G.C.Pande, *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*, pp. 559-60.
41. *Dīpavaṃsa*, V. 30.
42. *Ibid.*, V. 37-38.
43. A. Barea, op. cit., 1956, p. 192.
44. cf., Thomas Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Delhi, 1961, I, pp. 267-68.
45. J.F. Minayeff, *Recherches sur le Bouddhisme*, Paris, 1894, p. 207.
46. cf., *Samyutta Nikāya*, II, pp. 309 ff.
47. *Sutta Nipāta*, p. 309.
48. cf., *Itivuttaka*, p. 228.
49. cf., *Sutta Nipāta*, pp. 353 ff.
50. *Mahāvagga*, pp. 18-23.
51. *Abhidharmakośa*, VII 76-7.
52. E. Conze, *Buddhist Thought in India*, London, 1962, p. 89.
53. *Dīgha Nikāya*, II, pp. 65 ff.
54. *Ibid*, II, pp. 8 ff.
55. *Sputārthābhīdharmakośa-vyākhyā* Ed., U.Wogihara, Tokyo, 1930-36, p. 5
56. cf., *Dīgha Nikāya*, II *Mahāpadānasutta*; *Khuddaka Nikāya*, *Buddhavaṃsa*.
57. *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, p. 41.
58. *Abhidharmakośa*, I 2; cf., E. Conze, op. cit., p. 166-73.
59. See N. Dutt, *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relations to*

*Hinayāna*, London, 1930, pp.35 ff.; T.R.V. Murti, *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism* 2nd ed., London, 1960, pp. 286 ff.

- 60. See *Kathāvattu-Atthakathā*, p. 76.
- 61. cf., S.N. Dube, *Cross Currents in Early Buddhism*, pp. 90 ff.