ORIGIN AND NATURE OF ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHISM

K.T.S. Sarao

1

INTRODUCTION

Since times immemorial, religion has been a major motivating force and thus, human history cannot be understood without taking religion into consideration. However, it should never be forgotten that the study of religion as an academic discipline is one thing and its personal practice another. An objective academic study of religion carried many dangers with it. The biggest danger involved in such a study is that it challenges one's personal beliefs more severely than any other discipline. For most people appreciation of religious diversity becomes difficult because it contradicts the religious instruction received by them. For people experiencing such a difficulty, it may be helpful to realize that it is quite possible to appreciate one's own perspective without believing that others should also adopt it. Such an approach may be *different* but certainly not *inferior* to any other. It must never be forgotten that scholarship that values pluralism and diversity is more humane than scholarship that longs for universal agreement.

An important requirement of objective academic study of religion is that one should avoid being personal and confessional. In fact, such a study must be based on neutrality and empathy. Without neutrality and empathy, it is not possible to attain the accuracy that is so basic to academic teaching and learning. The academic study of religion helps in moderating confessional zeal. Such a study does not have anything to do with proselyting, religious instruction, or spiritual direction. As a matter of fact, the academic study of religion depends upon making a distinction between the fact that knowing about and understanding a religion is one thing and believing in it another. Acquisition of information without empathy has too often led to communal hatred, intolerance, and ethnocentric behaviour. For instance, someone who learns that in Buddhism images are often venerated in their painted or sculpted forms, without learning to understand as to why such a practice makes sense to the Buddhist, may actually do more harm than otherwise precisely because he has more facts at his disposal, but does not understand them accurately and empathically. Empathy often changes the way we think about religion. Some attitudes which one had earlier rejected may become more appealing, whereas others that had appeared quite correct may become less attractive. It is only natural that once one understands the point of view of the other, the claim that one's belief is the only truth remains no longer as attractive or compelling.

Many scholars consider neutrality and objectivity as more important than empathy in the study of religion. Though the importance of neutrality and objectivity for the academic study of religion cannot be denied, yet it would be impossible to adopt a completely value-free position. On closer examination, *objectivity* and *neutrality* simply turn out to be a propagation of the current conventions. In any case, the study of religion can never be value-free because its very existence depends on this value. Similarly, in the writing of history, it is not possible to maintain objectivity and neutrality. The preconceived notions and prejudices of the historian are bound to be interwoven into the delineation of the subject that he treats. However unscientific it might look, this has its own value and interest. It will be futile and waste of time, if the historian were to dig into the ever receding and irrevocable past, simply for the sake of the past. The historian has to evaluate the past in the light of the present as well as his own understanding of matters. Hence, it is not possible to write purely objective and impartial history. Those who claim otherwise have their own snags and tags. Anyhow it is more than obvious that any historical study should be of more than purely academic interest. Normally history is regarded as dry as dust, a jumble of dates, an unmeaning medley of wars and massacres. It should be a presentation of life, complete and whole. In lieu of

approaching history in the fashion of a colourless spectator, a good historian has to assume the responsibility of representing the people of whom he speaks and thus write history in which the masses are represented with full care.

But the job is not an easy one. Unfortunately human language is too poor to express the real nature of many things. One finds oneself too often in a situation like the fish-telling the tortoise that he must have been swimming on the land, as she has never been on land. Certain things can only be realized and cannot be told or explained, as human language and emotions are not just enough to explain them. Words are symbols representing things and ideas known to us and these symbols do not and cannot convey the true nature of even ordinary things. Thus, language is often misleading and deceptive, and such disabilities are, at least for the time being, unavoidable, the historian having to work with them. When it comes to dealing with ancient scriptures, the task of the historians becomes even more difficult. C.A.F.Rhys Davids once remarked: "I am not so optimistic as to think that a mere reading of translated scriptures in the mass is of itself, sufficient to give an adequate knowledge of 'Buddhism'. That reading will make a man familiar with what the monastic editors at different times *have come to make* of the dimly remembered, a half-forgotten mandate handed down through the ages. If he wished to get down to those mandates, if he would seek to dig up what the first Saxon probably did teach, he must do more than skim through rule after rule, *sutta* after *sutta*, poem after poem, catechism after catechism."[1] Other than the problem regarding the original doctrines, the date of the Buddha is also far from settled.[2] The Sanskrit sources and their Chinese and Tibetan versions give only a legendary account of the Buddha's career and the efforts to separate facts from legends have met with little success. In the case of the Pāli *Tipiṭaka* too, we cannot say with certainty that it represents the earliest form of Buddhism. Mere survival of the Pāli canon does not prove its antiquity and relative priority. Moreover, we cannot deny the fact that there is a long-gap between the days of the Buddha and the formation of canonical literature, that the present three-tier division is artificial, made only after the actual production of the majority of the texts concerned, and that something must have existed as the original canon before the days of Asoka which we know nothing of. It must, therefore, be admitted that the Buddhist texts and the knowledge derived from them so far, are hopelessly unable to give any definite clue to the understanding of the actual happenings of the life of the Buddha. Most of the historical material which can be extracted from our texts is in the form of stories, similes, direct verbal statements and objective statements. Very little material is in the form of direct socioeconomic description and even that is highly formalized. It is also repetitive and occurs again and again to the extent of an obsession. But an important point worth noticing here is that the very incidental nature of the textual material increases its historical value.

In this book, we have attempted to evaluate the origin and nature of Buddhism as reflected in the Pāli *Vinaya* and *Sutta Piṭaka*. Some scholars have called this form of Buddhism as *primitive Buddhism*, whereas others have called it *early Indian Buddhism*. We have called it *ancient Indian Buddhism*.

When we move from the Vedic period into the age of the Buddha, agriculture had made a steady progress, though it is difficult to perceive the role of the so-called iron technology, as much as often has been claimed.[3] The development of agriculture in the middle Gaṅga basin was mainly a rice phenomenon, since this area was eminently suited to rice cultivation, particularly due to the year long supply of water from the river Gaṅga as well as substantial amount of rains. Some scholars argue that this had far reaching consequences on the population as the increase in rice cultivation and the declining dependence upon cattle

---

[1]C.A.F. Rhys Davids, *Outlines of Buddhism: A Historical Sketch*, 1ˢᵗ Indian print, Delhi, 1978: 4.

[2]See, Chapter: 2, on the date of the Buddha.

[3]See, Chapter: 3, for details on the role of iron technology.

rearing resulted in major dietary changes.[4] In fact, there is a suggestion that a definite relationship between rice growing area and a higher rate of fertility exists, because the consumption of rice gruel allows children to be weaned earlier so that the mother becomes ready to conceive again.[5] The archaeological surveys as well as excavations also tend to prove this hypothesis. The increase in population is suggested by the substantial amount of increases in the number of settlements and their general distribution pattern[6]. Various narratives in the early Buddhist literature also speak of cities full of people jostling each other and of numerous settlements in the countryside, all of whom are an index of increases in population.[7] The kingdom of Magadha is described as consisting of as many as 80,000 *gāmas*.[8] This is obviously, a typical Buddhist exaggeration, but is a hint toward the fact that the economy could support the population as it expanded. We also hear of well-fortified cities with gates and wardens to watch over the entry and exit points.[9] Settlements were in considerable contact with each other and people are frequently described as visiting other cities on various kinds of business.[10]

A system of coinage had also come into existence.[11] The existence of monetary exchange has itself been related to the exchange of goods, i.e., barter system. As is well known, normally barter works only when exchange of goods takes place between places located geographically closer to each other. Barter and long-distance find it difficult to coexist and as a result money economy comes into existence to meet the needs of its expansion. The birth of currency released multifarious forces which led to various consequences. Apart from social instability and distress, the growth of money tends to make social thought impersonal and abstract and leads to 'reification' of social relations.[12]

The emergence of a more complex economy with a greater specialization contributed to the expansion of trade. Trade routes were established and caravan traffic made its appearance.[13] In fact the early Buddhist literature is full of instances where various towns are shown as connected to each other, falling on various trade routes. While the beginning of long distance trade made a special appearance in our period, it was to reach still greater heights in the following period. This period may basically be termed as the "take off" period. Bārāṇasī was perhaps the most important industrial and commercial centre of those early days. Bārāṇasī was reputed to be famous for cotton and silk wearing, muslin and sandal.[14] Campā, Ujjenī, Sāvatthī, Kosambī, and Vesalī were other important centres. Sea-trade became popular only in the later period, but it must have made its beginnings during this period. E.g., *Dīgha Nikāya* mentions journeys to distant lands through the sea[15] and birds are known to have been used to help in

---

[4]Trevor O. Ling, *The Buddha: Buddhist Civilization in India and Ceylon*, London: Temple Smith, 1976: 50.

[5]*Ibid*.

[6]M. Lal, *Settlement History and the Rise of Civilization in the Ganga-Yamuna Doab from 1500 BC to 300 AD*, Delhi: B.R. Publishers, 1984: 63-64.

[7]D.II.130.

[8]GS.I.64.

[9]A.III.234f.

[10]*Pācittiya*.136.

[11]M.III.163; A.I.250.

[12]G.C. Pande, *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*, Allahabad: University of Allahabad, 1957: 314.

[13]*Mv*.224; *Pārājika*.294.

[14]A.IV.281; V.61f; *Mv*.VIII.i.29.

[15]D.I.228.

locating land on voyages.[16] We also hear of a "strong ship, provided with oars and rudder."[17] At the time of the Buddha "the tradesman who goes about the country with his caravan is in fact a typical figure in our narratives and according to the statements, in these caravans the traffic cannot be small, either with regard to the distance traversed or with regard to the wares carried."[18] Furthermore, the plentifulness of great waterways in northern India allows us to assume an early development of internal maritime trade.[19] Various corporate organizations of trade had also come into existence and are proved by the use of terms like *saṃgha*, *gaṇa*, *seṇi* and *pūga*.[20] Guilds performed various types of important functions including as varied activities as functioning as arbitrators to settle disputes between members and their wives.[21] Settlements based on various kinds of occupations had also come into existence.[22] The isolation of crafts and professions and their concentration in fixed areas, gave birth to the medley of castes and sub-castes which formerly a more or less priestly hypothesis, now began to harden into rigid social partitions on the basis of occupations tightened with the bonds of heredity, endogamy and exogamy, rules of the table etc.[23] The corporate unity, combined with localization of industry, tended toward a narrowness and exclusivism whose price India has had to pay heavily and is still doing so. The localization of crafts was also due to the policy of segregation adopted by the higher castes or the king with regard to the people following the *hīnasippas*.[24] But side by side, one group of people was also cutting against this tendency toward narrowness and exclusiveness and it was the group of people who were traders and travelled far and wide with their caravans.

Other concomitants of an expanding economy also began to make their appearance, and some of these features were used by the Buddha as similes. They include debt, interest, mortgage and usury.[25] There are several references to metallurgy,[26] the construction of permanent structures[27] and a very wide range of other goods. Textiles of both cotton and silk,[28] leatherwork,[29] fine pottery,[30] ivory work,[31] and wooden work[32] etc. all figure in early Buddhist literature. The increase in the production of material goods was reflected in the numerous rules that made their appearance in the Vinaya *Piṭaka* about the articles of

---

[16]GS.III.261f.

[17]Sn.52.

[18]R. Fick, *Social Organization in North-East India in Buddha's Time*, tr. S.K. Mitra, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1920: 272.

[19]*Ibid*:270.

[20]Pācittiya.302.

[21]Vin.IV.226.

[22]For instance, there are references to a village of reed-makers (*naḷakāragāma*) near Sāvatthi (M.II.205), and another village of salt-makers (*loṇakāragāma*) near Kosambī (Vin.I.350; A.II.182).

[23]A.N. Bose, *The Social and Rural Economy of North-East India*, vol. 1, Calcutta, 1942: 86.

[24]*Ibid*.II.459.

[25]A.I.197; II.86; III.65ff.

[26]*Cv*.225; A.II.286.

[27]*Cv*.239f.

[28]*Pārājika*.321.

[29]*Mv*.204ff.

[30]*Pārājika*.348.

[31]*Ibid*.221.

[32]M.II.371.

possession permitted for the *bhikkhus*.[33] A natural outcome of this growing complexity of the economy was expressed in the degree of specialization which became apparent during this period. The *Samaññaphala Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* lists a number of occupations that are commonly pursued.[34] There are 25 such occupations listed by the king and these include a wide range of specialized skills. The city produced its own social stratification, where the *seṭṭhi* was the most powerful and *seṇi* was the institutional base. *Vaṇṇa* ranking of the vessa being third in the social hierarchy was quite irksome to him, especially when the trader had access to a lot of wealth. According to brāhmaṇical terms power was connected with landownership and although now forbidden to the *seṭṭhi*, land was by no means his primary source of wealth.[35] Up to a point there was a distinction between the urban and the rural elite the *seṭṭhi* and the khattiya- because they derived their income from different sources. But some of the khattiyas who owned estates, were also town-dwellers, and thus, formed another group alongside the traders and the merchants.[36] The growing complexity of the economy as it expanded was naturally expressed through the emergence of a more stratified society. While most of the land may have been in the hands of peasant-proprietors, some large units of land had made an appearance. The most striking example is that of brāhmaṇa Kasi Bhāradvāja of Ekanāṭā village who is said to have employed 500 ploughs.[37] The period also marked the beginning of hired labour and early Pāli texts frequently mention *dāsā-kammakārā-porisā* (those who laboured for others)[38] who appeared to be employed within the household, as well as in working the land.[39] On the basis of the existence of terms like *vetan* and *vaitanika* in Paṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, it has been suggested that the emergence of wage labour made its beginning during the Buddha's time.[40]

The term *daḷidda* appears frequently in the early Buddhist literature to denote extremely poor people who led a miserable and deprived existence, and were "needy, without enough to eat or drink, without even a covering for the back."[41] In contrast, there were people who led a very comfortable or even luxurious existence, possessing gold, silver, grain, beautiful houses, carriages[42] and had servants to work for them.[43] In this way, the society at the time of the Buddha showed the same sort of contrasts and discrepancies as in modem days. The rich rode on elephants, horses and in chariots and lived with lordly ease, whereas the poor struggled to eke out a meagre livelihood from the capricious powers of nature[44] as well as against the state. The *Aṅguttara Nikāya* speaks of a poor man who would have to go to jail for nonpayment of debt, whereas another person could escape the same fate because of his wealth.[45] "The bliss of debtlessness" is seen as one of the four kinds of bliss to be won by a householder.[46] "Poverty, debt,

---

[33] *Cv*.195ff.

[34] D.I.52.

[35] R. Thapar, *Ancient Indian Social History: Some Interpretations*, New Delhi: Sangam Publishers, 1978: 44.

[36] *Ibid*.

[37] Sn.11-12.

[38] *Ibid*.12.

[39] *Pacittiya*.108; S.I.94.

[40] V.S. Aggarwal, *India, as Known to Pāṇinī,* Lucknow: University of Lucknow, 1953.

[41] MLS.III.215.

[42] M.III.248; S.III.155; D.I.51, 222.

[43] *Cv*.249.

[44] L. Barnett, *Antiquities of India: An Account of the History and Culture of Ancient Hindustan*, London: Philip Lee Warner, 1913: 17.

[45] A.I.232.

[46] GS.II.77.

borrowing, being pressed, beset and bound, are all woes for the worldly wanton."[47] Loans were very common and debt often runs through the life of the borrower and is inherited by his heirs (*peṭṭikam iṇaṃ*).[48] Famines were not uncommon and a substantial portion of population must have already turned into wage labourers, hired labourers, forced labourers as well as slaves. We come across individuals who had been deprived of their freedom as a judicial punishment[49] or had to submit to the position of slavery because they could not pay back what they had borrowed.[50] For the first time the four *vaṇṇas* were defined, so that those who were concerned with the extraction of surplus were categorized as higher *vaṇṇas* and those who were engaged in primary production as lower *yaṇṇas*. As peasants, herders and traders, the vessas became the principal taxpayers, and as slaves and hired labourers, the suddas became the primary suppliers of labour power.[51] The control of labour power and organization of the system of taxation and unilateral gifts was done in such a manner by the upper two *vaṇṇas* that the suddas had to work as labourers, and the main body of the peasantry, the vessas had to husband their sources to meet the ever-increasing demands of the state and the priestly class.[52] Kings also spared no effort in exploiting the common man.[53] The sharp differentiation between the ruler and the ruled, the oppressor and the oppressed, must have created the beginnings of social tensions. The *Vinaya Piṭaka* refers to the *dāsā-kammakārā* of the Sākyans attacking their masters' womenfolk as an act of revenge while the Sākyan women were alone in the woods.[54] The recognition of exploitation had also emerged. According to the *Dīgha Nikāya*, a *dāsī* called Kālī was physically attacked by her mistress despite the fact that she was meek, submissive and a hard-working woman.[55] The category of the *dāsā-kammakārā-porisā* formed the lowest strata in the society in the context of economic differentiation. As we pointed out earlier, land which seems to have been mainly in the possession of peasant proprietors, had become the chief means of subsistence of people and the early Pāli texts testify the fact that possessions now mainly consisted of *khetta* (fields) and *vatthu* (property) which were considered to be matters of concern.[56] Now the criterion of wealth came to be associated more with land and money and less with cattle, which had been the measure of riches in earlier Vedic period.[57] A certain minimum of capital in the form of bullocks for ploughing, the basic requirements of farming and perhaps a rush for getting hold of land made it imperative for many to sell their labour to provide a subsistence for themselves. In other words, the times of the Buddha were a period of expanding material culture, with far wider trade relations than in the previous period and much greater amenities of life for the wealthy, though town proletariat had arisen which was perhaps much poorer than the humble tribesmen of olden time. A great change had taken place by now in the structure of life and society in India. The rather optimistic view of Rhys Davids that the

---

[47]GS.III.250.

[48]GS.III.54, 83; SBE.XVII.118.

[49]Vin.I.191.

[50]R. Thapar, *Op. Cit*.: 43.

[51]R.S. Sharma, *Material Culture and Social Formation in Ancient India*, first edition, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1983, paperback reprint, Madras: Macmillan, 1992: 108f.

[52]*Ibid*.9.

[53]GS.IV.188.

[54]*Pacittiya*.244.

[55]M.I.167f.

[56]Sn.43.

[57]R. Thapar, *Op. Cit*.43.

time of Gotama Buddha was a time of great prosperity for the lower orders,[58] does not appear to be correct.[59] It seems rich farmers often made huge profits through money lending and the use of various shady methods.[60] It is, of course, the small farmer who ran into debt in times of scarcity and sometimes losing his plot whether under extortion or from want; turned into a destitute vagrant and offered himself for hire in the richman's land.[61] Keith correctly points out that during this period the peasant working in his own field was being substituted by the land owner cultivating his estate by means of slaves.[62]

In the later Vedic period, the most important social force was the growing caste consolidation based on hereditary allocation of power, status and esteem. By the time of the Buddha arrogance of higher castes had definitely assumed a special pitch. By the end of the Vedic period, economy, and polity had developed and so had warfare, thus, expediting concentration of political power. The brāhmaṇas responded to the new affluence of their princely clients by elaborating more costly and ostentatious rituals. This speculation was greatly magnified by the time of the Buddha. New fundamental assumptions, such as the motion of recurrent death (*punar-mṛtyu*), made their fateful appearance and responses to them stimulated and broadened the religious horizons in northern India. Immortality became an object of repeated speculation as an escape from the *saṃsāra* (world system) no longer deemed as satisfying as in the early Vedic world view. The times were ripe for major changes. The objective of Vedic sacrifices had been to please the gods and so to obtain health, wealth, fertility, long life and glorious victory. Vedism declared that the broad earth is a good place, on which one wishes to live a full portion of one hundred years. Hunger, disease and death are menaces, but the gods prevail over demons; and goodmen- the strong, the noble and the generous- prevail over the bad ones. The Vedic hymns do not show much dread of the after life, seen as a ritually achieved testimony for the righteous in a heaven of the deceased fathers. While the gods to whom the hymns of the *Ṛg Veda* are addressed did not become the objects of popular veneration, the early Vedic poets had provided north Indian thought with some powerful speculative images, particularly in the hymns composed in the *Ṛg Veda*'s latest period. One such image, for instance, is the twelve-spoked wheel of time or life.[63] Thus, the age of the Buddha becomes one of the most pivotal epochs in Indian history. It marked the shift from tribal oligarchies to centralized monarchies and empires, growth of urbanization, growth of trade, increasing craft specialization, beginning of a monetary sector in the economy, development of bureaucratic institutions and emergence of specially two new classes: the rich merchants and the professionals or royal advisers.[64] Some thinkers started questioning the significance of performing ever bigger and more complex sacrifices, prompting them to seek the key to efficacious rites in knowledge of their meaning, By the end of the Vedic period, brāhmaṇical thinkers in the *Upaniṣads* among other seers and ascetics, were deprecating ritual action and extolling the power of the thought.[65] In this way, new problems were posed, not only by the current changes and innovations, but also by the failure of the old authority, both temporal and spiritual. As the increased momentum of human invention was shattering the traditional points of view, so time worn traditions had to be either discarded or overhauled. Man everywhere was beginning consciously to grapple with the fundamental problems of the

---

[58]T.W. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1903: 49ff.

[59]A.N. Bose, *Op. Cit*.I.424ff.

[60]*Ibid*.37.

[61]*Ibid*.

[62]E.J. Rapson, *Cambridge History of India*, vol. 1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922: 114f.

[63]RV.I.164.

[64]R.H. Robinson, *The Buddhist Religion: A Historical Introduction*, 2nd edition, California, 1976: 12.

[65]*Ibid*.75.

meaning and purpose of life and society. Even within the religion of Brāhmaṇas there was a growing cleavage of ideas about fundamental values of life.[66] Early Buddhist literature is full of statements which point toward some sort of alienation and fear of impermanence which had started creeping into the minds of people:

> "The world is unstable (*upanīyati*)… The world is no refuge, no guard… The world is not one's own, one must go leaving everything… The world lacks and is unsatisfied."[67]
>
>> "As all earthen vessels made by the potter end in being broken, so is the life of the mortals… Without a cause and unknown is the life of the mortals in this world, troubled and brief, and combined with pain… Whatever is there of feeling, perception, the habitual tendencies, consciousness… (are)… impermanent, suffering… a disease, an imposthune, a dart, a misfortune, an affliction, as other, as decay, empty, not self."[68]

In this way, the world (*saṃsāra*) is seen as replete with "old age and decay, sorrow and grief, woe, lamentation and despair… (symptoms)… of this whole mass of ill."[69] The fear of old age and death is depicted as a major concern of the age of the Buddha, something which was looming large in the minds of the people.[70]

> "Shame on thee, wretched age!
> Age that maketh colour fade!
> The pleasing appearance of man
> By age is trampled down.
> Tho' one should live a hundred years,
> Nonetheless he is consigned to death.
> Death passeth nothing by,
> But trampleth everything."[71]
>> "There is no one subject to death but fears, falling a-trembling at the thought of death."[72]
> "The ending of one's days means that neither mother, nor father nor other kinsfolk, will see him anymore, nor will he ever again see them… No body has passed beyond the reach of the death."[73]
> "There is no escaping death for all that is born."[74]

One could observe much more degree of corrosion in various other spheres of life than the earlier period. The judicial system was not sound and efficient, but corrupted and exploited to a large extent. Judgements were almost invariably associated with bribery. It is rather strange to note that there was no orderly or systematic course in which the cases were decided, and the frequent mention of the upsetting of a bad judgement of one by others- like *senāpati*, the prince, the *purohita* and even an ascetic, who happened to

---

[66]G.C. Pande, *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*, Allahabad: University of Allahabad, 1957: 317.

[67]Sn.261ff.

[68]*Ibid*.105.

[69]KS.III.15.

[70]KS.V.350.

[71]KS.V.192.

[72]GS.II.180.

[73]DB.II.21.

[74]DB.II.277.

come upon the scene and to whom the party which lead its cause appealed for redress- is, to say the least, surprising; and bribery is seen as an important means of influence used by various types of people.[75] Even punishments were extremely cruel and barbarous that must have been meted out to the people.[76]

The ruthlessness and crookedness of the times can be gauged from the fact that prostitutes were often used to revive the fortunes of various towns so that they could attract people and business.[77] In the towns and cities, men of many tribes rubbed shoulders together, uprooted from their lands and separated from their own clansmen. New groups of merchants and skilled craftsmen were gaining in wealth and affluence. Their values were not those of the Vedic priesthood and aristocracy and they no doubt demanded innovations in the field of religion.[78]

In most parts of the Gaṅgā valley, ambitious kings had virtually eliminated the tribal institutions which had prevailed in earlier times, only here and there to north of the Gaṅgā did the old oligarchies survive. The confederation of the Vajjians, the most important of these republics, was still, apparently a force to be reckoned with, but there is a good indication that its assembly, the governing body of the confederate tribes, was rapidly becoming inadequate to cope up with new situations and the tribal structure was undergoing great strain.[79] Armed conflicts gradually made the Indians aware of the reality of military and economic factors. Eventually, the fortunes of war were no longer regarded as the verdicts of divine judgement but as a logical consequence of the degree of weakness or strength of each adversary and relationship based on money and power became the fundamental principal of the age of the Buddha. *Good men* found themselves without a place, property and lives were insecure and future more uncertain and probably worse than in the past, in this increasingly centralized society ruled by money and force.[80] The brāhmaṇical tradition with its archaicness had little to offer in a contest in economic power, political craft and administrative efficiency and both its rituals and its philosophy seemed irrelevant.[81] In this way, intellectual and spiritual changes and by their side important economic and political changes that occurred, must have produced a sense of social distress and awakened the spirit of questioning.[82]

The religious milieu of post-Vedic period was distinctive for a proliferation of many sects in the middle Gaṅgā basin. This was a unique feature of this period, unmatched in later years for its sheer dimensions, which spanned a wide range of ideas from annihilationism (*ucchedavāda*) to eternalism (*sāsvatvḍa*) and from the fatalism of the Ājīvikās to the materialism of the Cārvākas. The Buddhist texts make frequent references to the other sects (*añña tiṭṭhiyas*) and the *Brahmajāla Sutta* mentions 62 such sects.[83] The Jain sources also corroborate the existence of numerous sects. Different and often conflicting ideas preached by them must have confused the minds of the people. They did not know whether salvation lay in "unrestrained individualistic self-indulgence or in equally individualistic but preposterous ascetic

---

[75]GS.III.99.

[76]Some of the punishments and the ways they were meted out are mentioned at GS.I.42f; II.126; D.I.276; M.I.87; A.II.122.

[77]SBE.XVII.172.

[78]A.L. Basham, "The Background to the Rise of Buddhism," A.K. Narain (ed), *Studies in History of Buddhism*, Delhi, 1980: 16.

[79]*Ibid*.16.

[80]A.K. Warder, *Indian Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970: 30f.

[81]*Ibid*.29.

[82]G.C. Pande, *Op. Cit*.: 310f.

[83]D.I.34.

punishment of the body."[84] The people, generally poor, were bound to become more and more pessimistic and weary of finding the correct path to happiness. In the richer stratum of the society, the king and his kinsmen were not reconciled to the higher social and spiritual position of the brāhmaṇa parasites. Siddhattha Gotama himself being a prince must have been aware of this feeling. The major disagreement of the *titthiyas* with the brāhmaṇas was that the later were strongly identified with the ritual of the sacrifices[85] and the sacrificial cult, though mildly, had already begun to encounter opposition. Various *Upaniṣads* pointed out that the sacrifices may have some validity but they cannot save a man from death.[86] The old ritualistic religion was not wholly satisfactory as an explanation of the cosmos, and the speculative search for a first principle, which was indeed as old as the later strata of the *Ṛg Veda*, was hence intensified by ties *Upaniṣadic* seers. New proposals and doctrines were put forward, based on the supernatural insight gained from penance and meditation.[87]

Resentment began against the claim of the brāhmaṇas to a special knowledge of the revealed heredity in their caste.[88] The brāhmaṇas were unable to resist the increasing materialistic orientation of the society. They had converted the simple sacrificial ritual into an elaborate and cruel one, involving the slaughter of numerous animals, as a means of gaining great wealth and possessions for themselves.[89] This gave the brāhmaṇas their image in the early Buddhist literature as exploiters who had shown weakness for money and women.[90] They were accused of having deviated from the ideal of the seers of the olden days by falling a prey to the increasingly materialistic tendencies of society such as wealth, land, possessions, honour and fame.[91] Rising pretensions of some of the brāhmaṇas who controlled large tracts of land, must have also posed some sort of threat to the tillers. It was the peasant alone, and not the big landowners or brāhmaṇas, who paid the king levy in grain and that is why the king is called the *devourer of the peasants.*[92] As we have pointed out earlier, it must be remembered that the political set up clearly favoured the enhancement of power and social position of the king, his kinsmen and retainers, who formed the khattiya element.[93] All the brāhmaṇas may not have been in a happy position, yet the spiritual supremacy of the brāhmaṇas over others was recognized and they, serving as priests of the kings or of the villages and localities,[94] formed together with the khattiyas the upper strata of the society.[95] It appears that although in contemporary religious life, the brāhmaṇas were superior to others, many of them had to depend upon kings and rich persons to sustain themselves. The kings, though very powerful, still belonged to the second and the first caste. The rich merchants or well-to-do peasants were materially influential and superior, but had to remain content with a social position much inferior to that of the comparatively poor brāhmaṇas. The financial position of the impoverished freeman, including hired-labourers, was hardly better than

---

[84]D.D. Kosambi, *The Culture and Civilization of Ancient India*: Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1950: 104f.

[85]U. Chakravarti, *The Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism*, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1987: 77.

[86]*The Bṛhadārṇyaka Upaniṣad*.III.8, 10; *the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*.I.2*, 7-11; the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*.II.5.

[87]A.L. Basham, *Op. Cit.*: 15.

[88]A.K. Warder, *Op. Cit.*: 51.

[89]U. Chakravarti, *Op. Cit.*: 68.

[90]DB.II.276.

[91]U. Chakravarti, *Op. Cit.*: 126.

[92]R.S. Sharma, *IHR*, II (i): 8f.

[93]B.N. Mukherjee,*The Genesis of Buddhism: Its Social Content*, vol. 1, Calcutta, 1976: 18.

[94]E.J. Rapson, *Op. Cit.*: 126f.

[95]B.N. Mukherjee, *Op. Cit.*: 18.

slaves, many of whom were gradually acquiring the position of the serfs.[96] As also we pointed out earlier, the economic disparity must have created a crisis in the society and the religious life must have felt the impact. Rituals and sacrifices had grown to a very large proportion to the obvious advantage of the brāhmaṇas, most of whom found employment, received fees and became "the receivers of gifts."[97]

But economic necessities cut across caste divisions. All brāhmaṇas naturally could not, (in fact, it was not possible for them to) derive a livelihood through parasitical means. Though society had received various sociological jolts and then it was not only that many new castes and groups of people had came into existence, even the original four castes naturally could not remain within the spheres of activity which had been carved out for them. For example, various types of people of "low or serf breeds, outcasts, aboriginals"[98] are mentioned in the early Buddhist literature and the criticism of the brāhmaṇical position in the *Vāseṭṭha Sutta*[99] as well as at many other places clearly implies that the brāhmaṇas followed the pursuits of agriculturists (*kassakā*),[100] tradesmen (*vaṇijā*),[101] soldiers (*yodhājīvā*),[102] sacrificers (*yājakā*),[103] and landlords (*rājaññā*)[104] as various means of livelihood. The brāhmaṇas, secular as well as religious, earned their livelihood by such low pursuits as those of apothecaries, druggists, physicians, soothsayers, surgeons, fortune-tellers, palmists, fore-tellers, interpreters of dreams and omens, calendar-makers, astrologers, appraisers, priests, occultists and sorcerers, selectors of lucky sites for the erection of homesteads and buildings and edifices, architects, collectors of alms by diverse tricks and clever devices, storytellers and ballad-reciters, landlords, traders, cattle-breeders, fowlers, matchmakers, and messengers.[105] In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* a brāhmaṇa is depicted as have grown worse than a dog in five ways: womanizers, indulging in sexual activities out of season, indulging in flesh trade, working as hoarders and fifthly, gluttons.[106] In this way, although they belonged to a religious order, stood for the highest ideal and were expected to live up to that ideal, in practice most of them appeared as hoarders of wealth and as persons who cared to live the aristocratic life of luxury and pleasure and ease and to witness and take part in all worldly amusements, games and sports, feasts and festivities.[107]

The reasons for the changes in the life styles of the brāhmaṇas were purely economic. The leading members of the brāhmaṇical group were shrewdly enough using the existing caste system to their own benefit, in accordance with their own vision of society and the laws enunciated on caste, because as long as the brāhmaṇas could maintain their position as the pre-eminent, which they did by appropriating the administrative, educational and religious functions, their ascendancy was assured. To perpetuate this ascendancy of theirs, they worked out the complicated and, what seemed to them almost foolproof concept

---

[96]E.J. Rapson, *Op. Cit.*: 129; A.N. Bose, *Op. Cit.*I: 424, 431.

[97]AB.VII.29.

[98]GS.I.145; II.157; SBE.XIII.261.

[99]DB.I.6f.

[100]Sn.12.

[101]Sn.11f.

[102]B.C. Law, *India as Described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism*, Delhi, 1950: 152.

[103]*Ibid*.

[104]SBE.X.ii.12.

[105]B.C. Law, *Op. Cit.*: 151f.

[106]GS.III.161f.

[107]DB.I.6f.

of drama.[108] But, as we pointed out, the actual working of the society was not strictly in accordance with this plan and the economic necessities, for instance, could lead to changes in the status of a particular caste. The objection of the heterodox group was not to the system, but basically to the brāhmaṇical position and interpretation of it, because the system perhaps still was socioeconomically workable.[109]

Siddhattha Gotama's own experience of worldly ills cannot be dismissed lightly. As an open minded young man, he must have been influenced by most of the ills and problems of his days, despite his princely background. Buddhism had its origins in the strong personality of its founder. It goes without saying that Buddhist scholasticism was not elaborated in a single day and that India was not suddenly covered with *thūpas*, *cetiyas*, *ārāmas*, and *vihāras*. But to present early Buddhism as a simple spiritual confraternity, in which regard for the Master took the place of doctrine would be an exaggeration.

---

[108]R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit.*: 108.

[109]R. Thapar, *Op. Cit.*: 35.

2

PROBLEMS OF CHRONOLOGY

THE DATE OF THE BUDDHA

Chronology is one of the most besetting problems in ancient Indian history. The available sources are insufficient for the reconstruction of exact chronological information before Alexander's campaign. Though there is general agreement that the Buddha lived for 80 years,[1] but precisely when, is hard to point out without drawing criticism. Innate inconsistencies in the traditional Buddhist chronology have been suggested from time to time.[2] Though now most scholars hypothesize that the Buddha died around the year 400 BCE or so and not much before that,[3] yet a new and critical study of the sources relating to the date of the Buddha, and their interpretation is unavoidable for pursuing any research related to the date of the Buddha.

Several methods have been used for calculating the date of the Buddha. But most of them are unreliable, especially those which either depend on very late materials or are of dubious nature in one way or the other. Here we propose to discuss only the most important hypotheses. However, before moving to the real issue, it is important to note that the dates of the accession of both Candagutta and Asoka are inextricably linked to the date of the Buddha. Therefore, these two dates need to be determined before any work can be done on the date of the Buddha. It is more or less certain that Candagutta started to rule in the year c.317 BCE, though some scholars have put it a little earlier.[4] "The murder of Poros by Endamos, and his retirement from India in 317 BCE are significant indications. The breaking out of the Indian revolt headed by Candagutta does not appear to be possible before this date."[5] Therefore it "is impossible to reckon with an acknowledged dominion of Candagutta before 317 BCE, though his subversive attempts to overthrow the Nandas and to get their kingdom of Magadha may go back to 325 BCE."[6] On the basis of the names of various Greek kings mentioned in the 13th Rock Edict, the date of Asoka's accession may be put in c.268 BCE and the consecration (*abhiseka*), which took place in the fourth year of his reign (i.e. after 3 years) in c.265 BCE.

The sources used for the study of the date of the Buddha may broadly be divided into two categories depending upon whether they support the so-called *Long Chronology* or the *Short*

---

[1]However, it may not necessarily be a true number. The human tendency at rounding off numbers cannot be ruled out entirely.

[2]Ē. Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śaka Era*, tr.Sara Webb-Boin, Louvain-la-Neuve: Insitut Orientaliste, 1988:13-14 (originally published as *Histoire du bouddhisme indien: Des origenes à l'ére śaka, Louvain: Bibliothêque du Muséon,* 1959:14-15); T.W. Rhys Davids, "The Early History of the Buddhists," E.J. Rapson (ed), *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. 1, Cambridge, 1922: 171-197; H. Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, Strassburg: Grundriß der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, III, Band 8 Heft,1896; G.C. Mendis,"The Chronology of the Early Pāli Chronicle of Ceylon," *University of Ceylon Review*, 5, No.1, 1947: 39-54; E.J. Thomas, "Theravādin and Sarvāstivādin dates of the Nirvāṇa," in D.R. Bhandarkar *et al* (ed), *B.C. Law Volume,* vol. 2, Poona, 1946: 18-22; H. Bechert, "The Date of the Buddha Reconsidered," *Indologica Taurinensia*, 10, 1982: 29-36; "A Remark on the Problem of the Date of Mahāvīra," *Indologica Taurinensia*, 11, 1983: 287-290; (ed), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha/ Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*, 2 vols, 3 Folge, nos. 189, 194, Göttingen: Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 1991, 1992; (ed),*When Did the Buddha Live?*, Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series No. 165, Delhi, Sri Satguru Publications: 1995.

[3]See, for details, H. Bechert (ed), *Op*. Cit., 1991, 1992, 1995.

[4]See, for example, a good case made for the year 321 BCE in R. Thapar, *Aśoka and the Decline of the Mauryas,* Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1960:12-16.

[5]N.K. Bhattasali, "Mauryan Chronology and Connected Problems," *JRAS*, Part II, 1932: 283.

[6]O. Stein, "The Coronation of Candragupta Maurya," *Archiv Orientalni*, vol. 1,1932: 368.

Chronology. These chronologies are based mainly on the Southern and Northern Buddhist legends respectively. The Southern Buddhist legends contained in the Sri Lankan tradition place the consecration of Asoka 218 years after the Mahāparinibbāna of the Buddha.[7] As compared to this, the Northern Buddhist legends place Asoka's consecration 100 or 110 years after the Buddha's death. The best survey of the arguments which led scholars to believe that the calculation of the date of the Buddha should be based on the Long Chronology is found in André Bareau's research paper published in 1953.[8] The Southern Buddhists initially had adopted 544-543 BCE as the date of the Buddha's death. But this was *corrected* by Geiger and others, who pointed out that 60 years extra had been added into the chronology of the kings of Sri Lanka.[9] The cornerstone of the Long Chronology is the number 218. In this regard the *Dīpavaṃsa* says that

> *dve satāni ca vassāni aṭṭhārasa vassāni ca*
> *sambuddhe parinibbute abhisitto Piyadassano.*|[10]

> (218 years after the Sambuddha had attained
> Parinibbāna, Piyadassana (Asoka) was consecrated.)

And the *Mahāvaṃsa* says that

> *Jinanibbāṇato pacchā purā tassebhisekato*
> *Saṭṭhārasaṃ vassasatadvaṃ eyaṃ vijāniyaṃ*[11]

> (After the Conqueror's Nibbāna and before his (Asoka's) consecration there were 218 years,
> this should be known.)

We are told that the unrest that led to the Third Council arose at the Asokārāma in Pāṭaliputta 236 years after the death of the Buddha[12] and that this council was completed in Asoka's 17th year.[13] This also places the *Mahāparinibbāna* 218 years before the consecration of Asoka.[14] Since, the basis of the dates of the various Greek kings mentioned in Asoka's 13th Rock Edict, the date of Asoka's accession can be calculated to within very arrow limits, at around 268 BCE; the Buddha's death may be computed as follows:

Asoka ascended the throne =	c.268 BCE
Asoka's consecration took place (268-3) =	c.265 BCE… (1)
Asoka's consecration took place =	218 years AB… (2)
Death of the Buddha took place (218+265) =	c.483 BCE[15]

---

[7]The *Dīpavaṃsa (VI.1, 19-20);* the *Mahāvaṃsa* (V.21) and the Pāli version of the *Samantapāsādikā* (I.41, 1.25).

[8]A. Bareau, "La date du nirvāṇa," *Journal Asiatique*, Vol. 241, 1953: 27-62.

[9]See W. Geiger, "Introduction" to *The Mahāvaṃsa or the Great Chronicle of Ceylon*, London, PTS: 1908, 1912: xxv-xxvi; G.C. Mendis 1947: 39-54.

[10]*Dīp*.VI.1.

[11]Mhv.V.21.

[12]Dīp.VII.37, 44ff; Mhv.V.21.

[13]Mhv.V.280.

[14]Dīp.VI.1; Mhv.V.21.

[15]But if the 3 years above are not accounted for, in that case the death of the Buddha is put in the year 218+268= c.486 BCE. It may also be interesting to note that the length of Bindusāra's reign in the Sri Lankan Tradition is given as 28 years, as against 25 of the *Purāṇas*. In all probability this was due to the fact that the Sri Lankan Tradition included the three years of Asoka before his consecration in the reign of Bindusāra. But the total length of Asoka's reign was not changed likewise in these records.

In support of the Long Chronology, it is pointed out that the so-called *History of Khotan* places the reign of Dhammasoka in 234 BE, which is said to be not very different from the Long Chronology's 218 BE.[16] We are told that this chronology also appears to be supported by the events of contemporary political history. Ajātasattu was on the throne until 24 years after the Buddha's death[17] and then, they say, at least 78 years elapsed between the foundation of the Nanda dynasty and the consecration of Asoka[18] though Purāṇic sources mention much more than 78 years. The followers of the Long Chronology also point out that the lists of Magadhan kings in different sources, though showing discrepancies on many points, are nevertheless unanimous in placing several kings between Ajātasattu and Candagutta. Among them is Udāyin who shifted his capital from Rājagaha to Pāṭaliputta. They further point out that if we adopt the Short Chronology, the Nanda dynasty appears to have been founded just after the reign of Ajātasattu. But on the other hand, it may be pointed out that the *Purāṇas* give false information at some places. Pradyotas who ruled from Avanti are placed at Magadha. But most historians agree that this Avanti line of dynasty has somehow or the other been inserted into the Magadhan line of dynasties.[19]

One of the main arguments for the validity of Geiger's chronological calculations was a theory proposed by D.M.Z. Wickremasinghe that a chronology starting from 483 BCE as the date of the Buddha's death was known and used in Sri Lanka until the beginning of the 11th century and that the *Buddhavarṣa* of 544 BCE was generally accepted at a later date.[20] However, Wickremasinghe's theory which was based on wrong presuppositions has been refuted repeatedly.[21] It is important to note that while the Corrected Long Chronology is quite reliable from king Duṭṭhagāmaṇī onwards, information on the earlier period was derived from oral tradition, and the chronological calculations were based on rough estimates made by the authors of the earliest Sri Lankan historiography which forms the basis of the now existing sources. Hence there is no substantial evidence in favour of the Corrected Long Chronology.[22] It may, therefore, be said that there is no trace of a chronology starting with 483 BCE or 486 BCE in any document of ancient Southern Tradition. These eras are the inventions of much later scholarship. V.A. Smith found the Sri Lankan chronology prior to 160 BCE as absolutely and completely rejected, as being not merely of doubtful authority but positively false in its principal propositions.[23] The tradition for the period from Vijaya to Devānaṃpiyatissa, appears suspicious on the simple ground that Vijaya's arrival in Sri Lanka is dated on the same day as the death of the Buddha.[24] Besides, there are the round numbers for the length of the simple reigns which have in themselves the appearance of a set scheme and a positive impossibility in respect of the last two kings of that period, Paṇḍukābhaya and Muṭasiva.[25] Here the former is made to live 107 years and the latter despite his becoming king much past his prime, still reigns 60 years.[26] It appears that "certain names and events in the tradition may indeed be maintained, but the last reigns were lengthened in order to

---

[16]A. Bareau, *Op. Cit,* 1953: 51

[17]Dīp.III.60.

[18]Mhv.V.15-22.

[19]*Cambridge History of India*, vol. 1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922:277.

[20]D.M.Z. Wickremasinghe, "Kiribat-Vehera Pillar Inscription," *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, I, 1904-12: 153-161.

[21]E. Hultzsch, "Contributions to Singhalese Chronology," *JRAS*,1913: 517-531; G.C. Mendis, "The Chronology of the Early Pāli Chronicle of Ceylon," *University of Ceylon Review*, 5, No.1 1947: 39-54; S. Paranavitana, "New Light on the Buddhist Era in Ceylon and Early Sinhalese Chronology," *University of Ceylon Review*, 18,1960: 129-155.

[22]H. Bechert, "The Date of the Buddha Reconsidered," *Indologica Taurinensia*, 10, 1982: 34f.

[23]V.A. Smith, *Aśoka: The Buddhist Emperor of India*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901: 57.

[24]Mhv.VI.47. At Dīp.IX.21-22 it is stated that he landed at the time of the death of the Buddha.

[25]W. Geiger , *Op. Cit*, 1912, 12.

[26]*Ibid.*

make Vijaya and the Buddha contemporaries."[27] It may be noted that the Southern Tradition appears to have been built and completed by its authors with certain notions in mind. 218 does not appear to have formed a part of the initial process i.e. of the original text on which the two chronicles are based. The *Dīpavaṃsa* has gaps here and there, which are filled up in the *Mahāvaṃsa* through the addition and inflation of the periods of reign of various kings. For instance, in the *Dīpavaṃsa,* the Buddha is quoted as saying:

> *parinibbute catumāse hessati paṭhamasaṃgaho|*
> *tato paraṃ vassasate vassān' aṭṭhārasāni ca*
> *tatiyo saṃgaho hoto pavattatthāya sāsanaṃ|*
> *imasmiṃ Jambudīpamhi bhavissati mahīpati*
> *mahāpuñño tejavanto Asokadhammo 'ti vissuto|*[28]

> "On the fourth month of my *Parinibbāna* the First Council will be held. A hundred and eighteen years later the Third Council will take place for the sake of the propagation of the Faith. Then there will be a ruler over this Jambudīpa, a highly virtuous, glorious monarch known as Asokadhamma."

H. Oldenberg pointed out that here the Third Council presupposes the Second Council and suggested that some statements of the Second Council must have dropped out.[29] According to him, the first and second lines of verse 25 originally belonged to separate verses. Here, says he, statements about the Second Council and the mention of its taking place 100 years after the death of the Buddha, have dropped out. Thus, 118 years later i.e., after the Second Council, he makes us believe, the Third Council took place. The prophesy following the legend of the Second Council[30] that after "118 years, a certain *Bhikkhu*… Moggaliputta (Tissa)… At that time the ruler of Pāṭaliputta was Asoka"[31] points that the Second Council took place 118 years before the Third, though it could also mean that the Buddha died 118 years before the Third Council.

One important reason which perhaps led to the popularity of the Long Chronology is the fact that instead of the suspicious number of 100 in the Short Chronology, the Long Chronology has the exact number of 218. But this does not necessarily mean that 218 is a true number just because it does not appear to be rounded off. It is also important to note that the weakness of the Long Chronology is that the oldest source that it is found in,[32] was written two or three centuries later than those in which the Short Chronology appears. It must be admitted that the longer the interval between the time of the happenings and the time of their being recorded, the greater the possibility of an objective error.

The Short Chronology is based on the testimony of the Indian sources *(Vinaya Piṭaka)* and their Chinese and Tibetan translations. In all the recensions of the *Vinaya Piṭaka*,[33] it is pointed out that the Buddha died 100 or 110 years before the consecration of Asoka. In other words, the *Mahāparinibbāna* should be dated in the year c.368 BCE or c.378 BCE. The Northern Tradition does not mention the Third Council for the fact that it had occurred after the schism and hence the other sects do not mention it as they were unaware of it. Those scholars who do not accept the Northern Tradition say that it is a contradiction to place Dhammāsoka's consecration and the Council of Vesālī

---

[27]*Ibid.*

[28]Dīp.I.24-26.

[29]H. Oldenberg, *The Buddha*, first edition: 1879, reprint, Delhi, 1971: 119 fn 1.

[30]Dīp.V.16-29.

[31]*Ibid*. 55-59.

[32]The *Dīpavaṃsa* (4-5th centuries AD).

[33]Which originate from one source.

in the same year.[34] But those following this tradition say that such a thing could not be out of place considering the importance of such an occasion.[35] But numeral 100 is often used in the sense of a large number, without any precise value and mostly as a rounded off number.[36] But it may be pointed out that though 218 is not a rounded off number, it may not be acceptable on various other grounds. For instance, as pointed out earlier, it may have been inflated through additions to an originally much smaller number so that credence could be given to various personalities as well as events. Rock Edict XIII of Asoka mentions Tambapaṇṇi (Sri Lanka) as one of the countries to which he dispatched missionaries. Since this edict belongs to the 13th year of Asoka's reign, there appears to be an error in the Southern Tradition which puts the conversion as late as the 18th year. The Sri Lankan historiography actually may be seen as politically motivated "in order to serve for the legitimation of the claim of the Sinhalese to be the Buddha's elected people... which has misled scholars into the belief that it represents reliable historical information... (which actually)... is a purely mythological construction without any historical foundation."[37] Therefore, the Long Chronology must have been developed in an attempt to adjust the traditional Short Chronology to the particular needs of the Sri Lankan historiography. Matters are made further difficult for the Long Chronology by the fact that the Sri Lankan sources are not in complete harmony amongst themselves. Actually if one were to look at the whole issue dispassionately, it appears that the adherents of the Corrected Long Chronology made "use of very complicated and artificial arguments in their attempt to work out a coherent chronological system."[38]

The theory of 100 years is widespread throughout the world. The Tibetan sources place Asoka 100-160 years after the Buddha's death.[39] Tāranātha says that the Tibetan *Vinaya* gives 110 AB as one of the dates for Asoka.[40] Similarly, the Chinese *Tripiṭaka* gives 116, 118, 130 and 218 AB as the dates for Asoka.[41] The last mentioned date, however, is found apparently only in the Chinese *Sudaśana-vibhāṣā Vinaya,* which is a translation of Buddhaghosa's *Samantapāsādikā.*[42] In Vasumitra's account also Asoka is placed about 100 year after the death of the Buddha.[43] According to Hsüan-tsang (Xuan Zang), at the time of his death, the Buddha had said that "A hundred years hence there shall be a King Asoka."[44] Furthermore, we are told that king Asoka had a half-brother called Mahinda[45] who is known as a relative of Asoka Moriya. At another place Asoka is given as the great-grandson of Bimbisāra[46] i.e. grandson of Ajātasattu. But as Asoka was actually Candagutta's grandson, the picture appears somewhat contradictory. But there is no reason to believe that the king in that case was Kāḷāsoka[47] as the description of Asoka matches in so many ways with Asoka Moriya. Still at another place, Hsüan-tsang points out that:

---

[34]A. Bareau, *Op. Cit*, 1953: 27-29.

[35]H. Bechert, *Op. Cit*, 1982: 35.

[36]See M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, s.v. *Śata*.

[37]H. Bechert, *Op. Cit*, 1982: 35.

[38]*Ibid*.

[39]See, W. Geiger, *Op. Cit*, 1912: lxi.

[40]*Ibid*.

[41]*Ibid*.

[42]*Ibid*.

[43]Quoted at *Ibid*.

[44]S. Beal, *Si-yu-ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World*, vol. 2, London: Trübner & Co.1906: 90.

[45]*Ibid:* 91ff.

[46]*Ibid*: 85.

[47]As H. Oldenberg would have us believe (See Vin.I.SBE.*Introduction*. xxiii.fn).

> The different schools calculate variously from the death of the Buddha. Some say it is 1200 years and more since then. Others say, 1300 or more. Others say, 1500 or More. Others say that 900 years have passed, but not 1000 since the nirvāṇa.[48]

The various dates here recorded would correspond with 552 BCE, 652 BCE, 852 BCE and a date between 252 BCE and 352 BCE. By the last date Hsüan-tsang probably means to place the death of the Buddha a hundred years before Asoka. The Council of Vesālī's date as 100 years after the *Mahāparinibbāna* in the *Vinaya* of the Theravādins, the Mahīsāsakas, the Dharmaguptakas and the Haimavatas and as 110 years in the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and the Sarvāstivādins had a common origin and "we may quite justifiably be sceptical about the precision of the two numbers thus given."[49] But as there is always a tendency to exaggerate and give round numbers, the figure 100 may be interpreted as a rough and round number, which is used to denote a rather lengthy period of time. "In placing the council of Vaiśālī 100 or 110 years after the Parinirvāṇa, the authors of those accounts certainly did not make use of reliable and scrupulously preserved documents and traditions, a minute examination and critical consideration of which would have allowed them to fix such a date. Not only did they have but a very vague idea of the time that had passed between the passing of the Blessed One and the Second Council, but also they did not know as to how many decades separated the latter event from their period."[50] The Council of Vesālī took place in all probability about 62 yeas after the *Mahāparinibbāna* of the Buddha.[51] Because of this, in turn the fact that Sāṇavāsī, one of the great authorities of this convocation was a personal pupil of Ānanda, becomes credible. Invariably, the Buddhist texts appear to exaggerate numbers and in all Indian religions there is always a tendency to claim an antiquity for a religious leader. Of course, as a counter-argument one may say that the legend-teller monks of Madhurā fabricated the short period to bring Upagupta, a contemporary of Asoka, closer to the Buddha in time.

    W. Geiger's discussion of the chronology of the Buddha appears to have been extremely influential in the acceptance of the Long Chronology as against the Short Chronology.[52] Other scholars like André Bareau[53] and P.H.L. Eggermont[54] followed suit and, thus, the Long Chronology became the basis for the date of the Buddha. However, the biggest justification for the Long Chronology came in the shape of the *Dotted Record*, contained in the *Li-tai san-pao chi* written by Fei-Chang-fang in 597 AD. In this text we are told that according to Saṃghabhadra

> "there is a tradition which had been handed down from teacher to teacher for generations, viz., after the passing away of the Buddha, Upāli collected the Vinaya and observed the Pavāraṇā on the 15th of the 7th Moon of the same year. Having offered flowers and incense to the Vinaya on that occasion, he marked a dot (on a record) and placed it close to the Vinaya text. Thereafter this was repeated every year. When Upāli was about to depart from this world, he handed it over to his disciple Dāsaka… Dāsaka to Sonaka… to Siggava… to Moggalīputta Tissa… to Candavajjī. In this manner the teachers in turn handed it down to the present master of *Tripiṭaka*. This Master brought the *Vinaya-piṭaka* to Canton. When he…

---

[48]S. Beal, *Op. Cit*. II.1906: 33.

[49]A. Bareau, "The Problem Posed by the Date of the Buddha's Parinirvāṇa," H. Bechert, *Op. Cit*, 1995: 212.

[50]*Ibid*, 212-13.

[51]See Appendix-I.

[52]W. Geiger, *Op. Cit*,1912.

[53]A. Bareau, *Op. Cit.,* 1953.But now André Bareau has revised his position and believes that "In placing the Parinirvāṇa of the Blessed One around 400, with a margin of twenty years added or deduced from this date, we would probably not be very far the historical truth, which unfortunately remains inaccessible to us with more precision." (A. Bareau, "The Problem Posed by the Date of the Buddha's Parinirvāṇa," Heinz Bechert (ed), *Op. Cit*., 1995: 211-219).

[54]P.H.L. Eggermont, *The Chronology of the Reign of Asoka Moriya*, Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1956.

decided to return to his (native land)… (he)… handed over the *Vinaya-piṭaka* to his disciple Saṃghabhadra… Having observed the *Pavāraṇā* and offered flowers and incense to the *Pavāraṇā* at midnight (on the 15th) of the 7th Moon, in the 7th year of Yung-ming (489 AD), he added a dot (to the Record) as a traditional practice. The total amounted to 975 dots in that year. A dot is counted as a year."[55]

On the above basis, thus, we get:

> The Buddha's death   =   489 CE-975 =   486 BCE
> Asoka's consecration =   486 BCE-218 =   268 BCE

Hence, as per this record, the *Mahāparinibbāna* of the Buddha took place in the year 486 BCE.[56] But Pachow was of the opinion that possibly three extra dots had been inadvertently added, the actual number of dots in the year 489 CE should have been 972 and not 975. Thus, the actual date of the *Mahāparinibbāna* should be 489 CE-972 = 483 BCE.[57]

But this tradition known from the Chinese sources is apparently not of an independent origin.[58] It appears thus, that the *dot* is a later invention to dignify the Vinaya. Moreover, the very way in which it was preserved, handed down from generation to generation, and carried from one country to another, appears rather mysterious and suspicious. We cannot but express doubts concerning its authenticity. Most importantly, the Sri Lankan chronicles and the *Samantapāsādikā* speak of the transmission of the *Vinaya* by the teachers initiated by Upāli, but in them we do not come across any reference, whatsoever, to the practice of adding dots to a record every year after the Rainy Retreat (*vassāvāsa*). Such being the case, it is difficult to believe that the Dotted Record was initiated by Upāli and handed down in succession by the *Vinaya* teachers.[59] Moreover, if there was really a *Record* initiated by Upāli, when Mahinda, the sixth teacher of the *Vinaya* succession, came to Sri Lanka, he should have brought it with him, and continued to add dots each year throughout his life. If so, such a Record would have been safely preserved in Sri Lanka as a sacred object like the Bo-tree, or the Tooth Relic. But this was not known to writers of either the Pāli or the Sri Lankan texts, nor was it noted in the *Travels of Fa-hsien*, when Fa-hsien (Faxian) visited Sri Lanka in the beginning of the 5th century. Thus, one may pose the question whether Mahinda really brought such a thing to Sri Lanka.[60] In case such a thing did not exist in Sri Lanka, then one may ask as to how and from where did it come to China. In any case, as no written record of the *Vinaya* existed till the time of Duṭṭhagāmaṇī in the first century BCE, it is difficult to accept the authenticity of this tradition. Moreover, "the process of adding one dot at the end of every year during 975 years is extremely precarious."[61]

The Long Chronology has also been supported on the basis of the so-called agreement of this chronology with the Jaina Chronology as well as the *Purāṇas*. But the *Purāṇas* show so many disagreements amongst themselves that they are not really reliable for calculating the date of the Buddha. The Pāli Canon points out clearly that the Buddha and the Mahāvīra were contemporaries.

---

[55]Translation at W. Pachow, "A Study of the Dotted Record," *JAOS*, vol. 83 (3): 342-45.

[56]See, for details, W. Pachow , *Op. Cit.*: 344-45.

[57]*Ibid*: 345.

[58]It has been maintained by A. Bareau that this tradition initially originated in Sri Lanka and hence cannot be used reliably (A. Bareau ,*Op. Cit.,* 1953: 53). This fact was also pointed out earlier by J. Takakusu, "Pāli Elements in Chinese Buddhism: A Translation of Buddhaghosa's *Samantapāsādikā*, a Commentary on the *Vinaya*, Found in the Chinese *Tripiṭaka*," JRAS, 1896: 436ff.

[59]W. Pachow, *Op. Cit*, 1965: 346.

[60]*Ibid*.

[61]F. Max Müller, "The True Date of Buddha's Death," *The Academy*, 1 March 1884, No. 617: 153.

Since an apparently independent, although late, Jaina tradition states that the death of the Mahāvīra took place 155 years before the accession of Candagutta,[62] and since the accession of Candagutta can be dated in the year c.317 BCE, Mahāvīra Jain's death may be put in the year 317 + 155 = c.472 BCE. But here the main difficulty is that the same Pāli source places Mahāvīra Jain's death before that of the Buddha.[63] Two separate answers have been provided for this *inconsistency*. Firstly, the Buddhist sources were confused by there being two places called Pāvā, and were probably also confused by the relative dating.[64] Secondly, the Southern Buddhists knew little about other sects and it was Ājīvika leader Makkhali Gosāla who had died before the Buddha.[65] The problems created by other dates given for the death of Mahāvīra Jain e.g. the traditional Śvetāmbara Jaina date of 527 BCE and the Digāmbara date of 605 BCE, have never been taken very seriously, as these dates themselves appear unacceptable. In any case, the most important reason for not using the Jaina chronology for dating the Buddha is that the Jaina chronology itself is dependent on certain Buddhist traditions, notably the Sri Lankan tradition.[66] Thus, despite the fact that the two teachers were contemporaries, it is difficult to accept the Jaina Chronology for its inherent snags.

Some scholars from time to time have supported the Long Chronology on the basis of three Asokan edicts of Sāhasārām, Rūpanāth and Bairāṭ which refer to the figure 256. This figure has been interpreted by these scholars to mean a time span of 256 years between the installation of these inscriptions and the *Mahāparinibbāna*.[67] An attempt has also been made by scholars to present a date akin to Short Chronology on the basis of these inscriptions. E.g T.W. Rhys Davids provided "426 BCE, or perhaps a few years later" as the date of the *Mahāparinibbāna* by pointing out that the number 256 represents the time-span between the installation of these inscriptions and the abandonment of home by the Buddha.[68] However, some scholars have not even accepted these inscriptions as those of Asoka.[69] There are others who point out that these inscriptions do not say as much as it has been made out. E.g. Hermann Oldenberg pointed out that not only that the inscriptions contain no word for years, they also do not refer to the Buddha but to 256 beings.[70]

The tradition of Long Chronology cannot be traced with confidence beyond the middle of the eleventh century,[71] and, as we shall see in the following pages, it is incompatible with the chronology of the kings of Magadha.

E.J. Thomas[72] was of the view that the relevant passages in the *Dīpavaṃsa* (I.24-25 and V.55-59) actually point to the existence of the original Short Chronology which failed to be assimilated in the Long Chronology of the final version of the *Dīpavaṃsa*. The first passage prophesies that the first council shall take place four months after the Mahāparinibbāna of the Buddha, and the second 100 years thereafter. In three of the four manuscripts of the *Dīpavaṃsa*, the term *dve* (two) has been inserted before *vassasate* (100 years) and in two of the three only subsequently. The second passage prophesies that "in the future, in 100 years (after the Buddha) at the time of Asoka in Pāṭaliputta, Tissa

[62]The *Pariśiṣṭaparvan*.VIII.339.

[63]D.III.209f.

[64]"Introduction" to H. Jacobi (ed), *Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu*, Leipzig, 1879: 21.

[65]A.L. Basham,*History and Doctrine of the Ājivikās*, London: Luzac & Co. Ltd., 1951: 75.

[66]A. Bareau, *Op. Cit*, 1953: 56.

[67]G. Bühler, "Three New Edicts of Aśoka," *Indian Antiquary*, 6, 1877: 149-160.

[68]T.W. Rhys Davids, "The New Asoka Inscriptions," *The Academy*, XII, 14 July 1877: 37.

[69]R. Pischel, "The Asokan Incriptions," *The Academy*, XII, 11 August 1977: 145.

[70]Hermann Oldenberg, "Die Datierung der neuen angeblichen Asoka-Inschriften," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 35, 1881: 472-476.

[71]M. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. 2, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1933: 597.

[72]E.J. Thomas, "Theravādin and Sarvāstivādin dates of the Nirvāṇa," in D.R. Bhandarkar *et al* (ed), *B.C. Law Volume*, vol. 2, Poona, 1946: 18-22.

would rout the heretics."

To sum up the argument thus far, it may be said that there is no special reason on the basis of which one of these two chronologies may be accepted in preference to the other.

Two important reasons, however, appear to favour a younger date for the Buddha. They are the archaeological considerations and the lists of the patriarchs (*ācariyaparamparā*). The archaeological records in the Gaṅgā valley show that (perhaps with the exception of Kosambī) even by c.450 BCE, the new urban settlements were indeed not those cities which we may expect after reading early Buddhist literature. Extensive use of baked bricks for construction, well-developed sanitation system etc. are not found in the excavations till later times. In early Buddhist literature the existence of prosperous and fully developed urban centres is taken for granted. Though the roots of the Gaṅgā Urbanization may be traced back to about 500 BCE or so, the archaeological records clearly suggest that the sort of urban centres that are talked about in the earliest Buddhist texts could not have come into existence before the end of the fifth century BCE. Critics of this argument may say that such references are later interpolations or that certain portions of the Canon are altogether late compositions. But such a criticism will appear to be of a superficial nature because the whole material milieu reflected in early Buddhist literature is urban. Wherever we may look, Pāli *Tipiṭaka* reflects a city culture and a faith laden with munificence by the city folks that included kings, their ministers and business magnates. As many as 173 urban centres (some undeniably being mythical or late) are mentioned in the first two *piṭakas* and are evenly spread out in these texts.[73] Here an argument may be made that perhaps the whole of Buddhist literature was planted on to various urban settlements for prestige or other reasons, because terms associated with village (*gāma*), such as *gāmadhamma*[74] (vile conduct) and *gāmakathā*[75] (village-talk, included in the list of foolish talks)are frowned upon in Buddhist literature. But it will be impossible to accept such an argument. It is not only the urban settlements, but so much else which goes into making an urban civilization that is reflected everywhere in early Buddhist literature. Long distance trade, money economy, financial transactions, interest, usury, mortgage, developed state and its paraphernalia, prostitution and many other characteristics clearly point to the existence of a fully grown urbanization in Buddhist literature.[76] If we carry our scepticism to such an extent that we give credit to the authors of Buddhist texts of master-minding such a phenomenal forgery, then there is nothing to stop us from going back to the days of considering the founder himself a mythical figure. It is also difficult to imagine that may be the Buddha lived in a rural society and his faith lay dormant till merchants and business magnates brought new life to it in the days of the newly sprung up Gaṅgā Urbanization. The reason is simple. There is so much urbane that is part and parcel of the life and activities of Gotama Buddha, it would be hard to imagine him living in a pre-urban society.

A part of the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta*[77] which mentions six *mahānagaras* i.e. cosmopolitan cities is dated as forming part of the earliest Buddhist literature.[78] These big cities were Campā,

[73] See, K.T.S. Sarao, "Urban Centres Reflected in Early Buddhist Literature," a paper presented at the *8th Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Berkeley, USA, 8 August-11 August 1987; "Who and What Originated Earliest Buddhism?," a paper presented at the *Seventh World Sanskrit Conference*, Leiden, Holland, 23 August- 29 August 1987 and later published as "Background to the Origin of Earliest Buddhism," *Indologica Taurinensia*, 15-16, 1989-90: 305-318; *Urban Centres and Urbanization as Reflected in the Pāli Vinaya and Sutta Piṭakas*, Ph.D. Thesis Submitted to the University of Cambridge, 1989 and later published under the same title, Delhi: Vidyanidhi, 1990. About 80 of these urban centres have been identified.

[74] D.I.4; A.I.211; J.II.180; VvA.11; DA.I.72.At J.II.180. *Gāmadhamma* is equated with *vasaladhamma*.

[75] Sn.922.

[76] For various specialist categories of urban centres, see K.T.S. Sarao, *Op. Cit*, 1987, 1989.

[77] D.II.146.

[78] G.C. Pande, *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*, Allahabad: University of Allahabad, 1957: 98; M. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, tr. S. Ketkar & H. Kuhn, vol. 1, Calcutta: University of Calcutta,1933: 39.

Rājagaha, Sāvatthī, Kosambī, Sāketa, and Bārāṇasī. When one looks at the scanty evidence so far provided by the excavators of these cities one clearly has the temptation of agreeing with the Short Chronology.

Problems regarding the identification of Sāketa are still numerous. Some say that it was the same as Ayodhyā, whereas others think it to be a completely different settlement. If one were to identify Sāketa with Ayodhyā, then in the seventh-sixth centuries BCE it could scarcely have been more than a wattle-and-daub settlement.[79] If the archaeological evidence is to be believed, the massive fortification wall over here is more likely to belong to the earlier part of the Moriyan period. Except a terracotta ring-well (Śuṅga period) no other drainage or soakage system has been found to have existed here.

At Rājgīr (ancient Rājagaha)[80] the earliest fortification, made of mud with a moat around it, cannot be dated with any certainty prior to the fifth century BCE. Even though most of the important localities like the Sattapaṇṇiguhā and the Gijjhakūṭa associated with the Buddha have been localized since long, no Buddhist remains for the earlier periods have been discovered. Of the several large elliptical halls made of rubble in mud-mortar, the largest one, for which no date has been given, may at the most be placed in the Moriyan period. Though special attention has been paid to the defence and habitation areas of this settlement, no old date could be proved anywhere. The existing radiocarbon dates lie at 245 ± 105, 260 ± 100 and 265 ± 105 BCE for habitation and defence. According to various calculations the wall from New Rājagaha, allegedly of Ajātasattu's time, had been built between c.400 and c.300 BCE. As it remains unexplained whether some of the associated wares found together with the NBPW have an earlier origin, the time of the rise of Rājagaha can at best be pushed up to 500 BCE after these results. Whatever may come, Rājagaha certainly belongs to the category of younger cities of India.

At Saheṭh-Maheṭh (ancient Sāvatthī)[81] the earliest parts of the massive fortification with successive phases of construction are difficult to date prior to c.400 BCE. Brick (undefined) structures appear only after c.275 BCE. Prior to the Moriyan period nothing related to drainage or soakage system can be found at Sāvatthī. This settlement does not appear to be older than the sixth century BCE.[82]

At Rājghāṭ (ancient Bārāṇasī)[83] remains of mud structures are available from about the sixth-fifth centuries BCE to the fourth-third centuries BCE. If we are to believe the excavations then prior to the Moriyan period this settlement was not a considerable urban centre. Actually the major urban phase at Rājghāṭ belongs to the post-Moriyan period.

---

[79]See , *IAR* 1955-56: 71; 1969-70: 40-41; 1976-77: 52-53.

[80]A. Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey Reports*, 1871, 1873 & 1878; T. Bloch, "Excavations at Rājgīr,"*ARASI, Eastern Circle* 1905-06; J. Marshal, "Rājagṛiha and its Remains," *ARASI* 1905-06; V.H. Jackson, "Notes on Old Rājagṛiha," *ARASI* 1913-14; D.N. Sen, "Sites in Rājgīr associated with Buddha and His Disciples," *Journal of the Bihar Research Society (Buddha Jayanti Special Issue)* 1956: 136-158; A. Ghosh, " Rājgīr 1950," *Ancient India, Bulletin of the ASI,*7, 1951: 66ff; *IAR* 1953-54: 9, 1954-55: 16ff, 1957-58: 11, 1958-59: 13, 1961-62: 6-8, 1962-63: 5f; A. Ghosh & M.H. Kuraishi, *Rājgīr*, fifth edition, New Delhi, 1958; S.M. Karimi, "Rājagṛha: The Magadhan Capital," *Journal of the Bihar Research Society,* LV, 1969: 69-89; G. Erdösy, "Early Historic Cities of Northern India," *South Asian Studies,* 3, 1987: 1-23.

[81]A. Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey Reports* I, 1871: 317ff, 330ff; J. Ph. Vogel, "Excavations at Saheth-Maheth,"*ARASI*: 1907-08: 81-131 and "The Site of Śrāvastī,"*JRAS*: 1908: 971ff; D.R. Sahni, "A Buddhist Image Inscription from Śrāvastī," *ARASI*: 1908-09: 133-38; J.H. Marshall, "Excavations at Saheth-Maheth," *ARASI*: 1910-11; IAR 1955-56: 71, 1958-59: 47-50; M. Venkataramayya, *Śrāvastī,* Delhi, 1956.

[82]K.K. Sinha, *Excavations at Śrāvastī: 1959*, 2,Varanasi: Monograph of the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, BHU, 1967.

[83]IAR 1957-58: 50, 1960-61: 37, 1961-62: 58, 1062-63: 41, 1963-64: 58-59, 1964-65: 44, 1965-66: 55; A.K. Narain & P. Aggarwal, *Excavations at Rajghat, 1957-58, 1960-65*, Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University, 1978; A.K. Narain & T.N. Roy *Excavations at Rajghat: 1957-58, 1960-65*, 4 vols., Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University, 1976-78.

The excavation records of Kosam (ancient Kosambī)[84] which put the fortification back to the second millennium BCE have been shown to be unfounded by a number of critics. But this cannot be denied that Kosambī was one of the earliest urban centres of historic India. Here a large number of levels down to the natural soil have been located, but it is not possible to point out a specially early Buddhist horizon. It needed the exposure of the structures of a big monastery of the Kuṣāṇa period to establish the first direct Buddhist connection with Kosambī. The Mathurā sculpture from the Ghositārāma of a *Cakkavatti* Buddha of the year 2 of Kaniṣka I, installed according to the inscription at the *caṅkama* of Gotama Buddha, is the oldest Buddhist relic from Kosam.[85] With the help of an inscribed stone slab the monastery was identified with the well known Ghositārāma.[86] The visible walls do not reach below Kuṣāṇa times, but the main *stūpa* of the monastery may rest on an earlier base. The excavator (G.R. Sharma) places the first phase of its construction in the century after the Buddha's death, though there is nothing to prove such a speculation. He exaggerated the dates so much that, to his dating of the stone-built palace in the sixth century BCE and its association with the Buddha's contemporary Udayana, another archaeologist felt that this palace is so recent that it "may really belong to a period roughly around the sixteenth century CE."[87] Another scholar has dated the rampart in the fifth century BCE.[88]

The excavation records of Campānagar (ancient Campā)[89] show that the rampart cannot be dated prior to the fifth century BCE and use of baked bricks in the rampart in the second century BCE. "Keeping in view the trend of development as a whole and also examining the internal evidence of the sites, one cannot but be left with the feeling that both the fortifications… (of Vesālī and Kosambī)… and therefore the origins of the cities, have been too highly dated."[90]

If we are to accept the existence of these six settlements as *mahānagaras,* then that can be visualized perhaps by the end of the fifth century BCE at the earliest.[91]

The Buddha shortly before his death visited Pāṭaligāma, when he saw two ministers of Ajātasattu, Sunīdha and Vassakāra, engaged in building fortifications to defend Pāṭaliputta against a possible attack by the Vajjians.[92] This is an indication of the fact that by the time the Buddha attained his *Mahāparinibbāna*, Pāṭaliputta still had not attained its glory that it attained as a capital. Incidently the wooden palisades, which were naturally used for defending the city, discovered at the ancient site of Pāṭaliputta belong in all probability to the time of Candagutta, and may well represent the conclusion of a more or less continuing period of extension beginning from the time of Ajātasattu. Could this be the case with the excavated pillared hall, which may possibly be the one constructed by Ghotamukha at the suggestion of Udena Thera?[93] The background to the construction of this hall appears quite reliable from the way it is mentioned in the *Majjhima Nikāya*. According to this account,

[84]IAR 1958-59: 68, 1961-62: 9, 1962-63: 6, 1963-64: 8, 1964-65: 7, 1968-69: 5-6; 1970-71: 7-8; 1971-72: 6-7; 1972-73: 8, 1980-81: 9,; G.R. Sharma, *The Excavations at Kausambi, 1957-59*, Alllahabad: University of Allahabad,1960: 27-41; *MASI* 1969: 36-39.

[85]K.G. Goswami, "Kosam Inscription of (the Reign of) Kanishka: the Year 2," *EI*, xxiv: 210ff; P. Chandra, *Stone Sculpture in the Allahabad Museum*, Bombay, 1970, no. 85, plate: xxxvii.

[86]A. Ghosh.*EI*.xxxiv.14ff.

[87]B.B. Lal, "Are the Defences of Kausambi Really as old as 1025 BC?," *Purātattva*, 11, 1979-80: 88-95; "The So-called Syenachiti at Kausambi: A Fallen Brick Mass," *Purātattva*, 15, 1986: 94ff; "When Did Udayana Rule?," *Purātattva*, 15, 1986: 80ff.

[88]G. Erdösy, "Early Historic Cities of Northern India," *South Asian Studies*, 3, 1987: 6.

[89]IAR 1968-69: 4, 1969-70: 2, 1970-71: 4-5, 1971-72: 5, 1972-73: 6-7, 1974-75: 8-9, 1975-76: 7, 1976-77: 11-12.

[90]A. Ghosh, *The City in Early Historic India*, Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study,1973: 11.

[91]Keeping in mind the ±100 years or so, for the probable C[14] dates.

[92]D.II.86ff.

[93]M.II.163.

after the death of the Buddha, brāhmaṇa Ghotamukha went to Udena and told him that he wanted to donate to the latter 500 *kahāpaṇas* daily which the former was getting from the king of Aṅga as a permanent offering of alms (*niccabhikkhā*). But as it was not "allowable for them *(Bhikkhus)*… to receive gold and silver", Ghotamukha offered to "have a dwelling-place (*vihāraṃ*) built for the good Udena." At this Udena said that if he wanted to build a dwelling place for him, he "should have an assembly hall (*upaṭṭhānasālaṃ*) built for the Order at Pāṭaliputta." We are further told in the text that then Ghotamukha "from his permanent … (and)… subsequent supplies of alms had an assembly hall built for the Order at Pāṭaliputta … (which was)… called *Ghotamukhi.*" Therefore, without attempting to associate the pillared hall at Kumrāhar with either of these accounts directly, we may venture to conjecture that the tradition of such halls (made of wood or possibly stone) may go back to the time of the Buddha himself, especially if the date of the Buddha is somewhat later. The archaeological data available from the Gaṅgā valley show that even by c.500 BCE, the new urban settlements were indeed not those cities which may be expected after reading the early Buddhist literature.[94]

Scholars disagree as to when coins came into existence in India. It has been proposed by some that the earliest coins in the Gaṅgā valley cannot be dated prior to the fourth century BCE,[95] whereas others say that it is not possible to date the earliest coins, yet "it may only be said that… coins… were current prior to the fifth century BCE."[96] Though no evidence of coinage can be found in later Vedic texts, measures of precious metals may have been used as payment. Discovery of 3000 cowrie shells from the NBPW levels at Masāoṅ-Dīh throws interesting light on the use of currency prior to the introduction of coins. Without entering into discussion on the numismatic evidence, we think it is reasonable to say that coins made their beginning in India during the fifth century BCE. Even the earliest portions of the Pāli Canon presuppose the existence of a developed currency[97] and such a currency involving large transactions of gold and silver coins must have taken time to develop.

Though the stratigraphical sequence of the cultures of the Gaṅgā valley is now well established, the absolute chronology still remains debatable. Uptil now quite a few radiocarbon dates from various sites are available.[98] Though normally they should suffice for establishing the chronology of various cultures, the erratic nature of many dates (even after calibration) has divided archeologists nearly as much as have the two traditions for the date of the Buddha. While dealing with C^{14} dates, we also have to bear in mind several problems connected with them, especially the fact that they are not precise statements of the age of samples but estimates of probability.[99] It is unlikely that we will get uniform dates for the beginning and end of a culture from all parts of its geographical area. The Buddhist Saṃgha was dependent on the existence of a strong economic base. The monks were supposed to spend the Rainy Retreat in fixed locations, and this would have been easiest near large urban settlements. The large cities were no longer mere administrative centres and sovereign residences. They had also become the nerve centres of economy and commerce. Uncertain and unsatisfactory as archaeological data still is in this context, it appears to lean towards supporting a later rather than earlier date for the *Mahāparinibbāna* of the Buddha. In other words, there is at least a good case that can be made for the age of the Buddha being about a century later than generally accepted.

As pointed out above, extensive use of bricks for construction works including fortifications, well developed sanitation, palatial buildings, fully developed state system and its paraphernalia,

---

[94]See for details, K.T.S. Sarao, *Op. Cit.*, 1989: 15-18.

[95]See J. Cribb, "Dating India's earliest Coins," *South Asian Archaeology*, 1983: 535-554.

[96]P.L. Gupta, *Coins*, New Delhi: National Book Trust, 1969: 10f.

[97]Coins are mentioned by name at several places. E.g. Kahāpaṇa (A.V.83-84). Kings gave loans of capital to traders (D.I.135). Instances of large transactions are spread throughout the Pāli Canon.

[98]See the dates collected in G.L. Possehl, *Radiocarbon Dates from South Asia*, data-list circulated by the author in September 1987.

[99]D.H. Thomas, "The Awful Truth about Statistics in Archaeology," *American Antiquity*, 43, 1978: 232.

extensive interregional commercial network with powerful and influential business magnates, well-developed currency and other financial institutions like usury, mortgage etc. are all well reflected throughout the Pāli *Tipiṭaka*. As many as 173 urban settlements are mentioned in the first two *piṭakas* alone.[100] The material milieu reflected in the early Buddhist literature is overwhelmingly urban. A collective analysis of the data available on the six *mahānagaras*, mentioned in the earliest portions of the Pāli literature, shows that urban centres of this magnitude could not have existed before the end of the fifth century BCE. As compared to the Later Vedic texts and their sociol-economic context, the early Buddhist texts depict a prosperous urban life, a flourishing interregional trade dominated by a new class of influential and powerful merchants, and the emergence of Magadha as the most powerful early state among a large number contesting *mahājanapadas* in the Gaṅgā valley. Urban development, characterized by town planning, fortifications, monumental buildings, the use of bricks etc. does not appear to be much older than the fourth century BCE. Prior to the fifth century BCE, the urban settlements in the Gaṅgā valley were indeed not those great cities which one would expect after studying urban life in early Buddhist texts. Fortifications around the various urban centres and their relationship with the Buddha's time, is yet another problem one finds difficult to resolve. When one looks at the archaeological evidence, none of the early Gaṅgā cities, with the possible exception of Kosambī, were fortified even in the fifth century BCE, whereas fortified towns are frequently mentioned in the early Buddhist texts. Political powers centred around the urban centres and riches were accumulated in these cities. Rich people came to be powerful and influential in cities where they enjoyed life of affluence. The emergence of these strong *mahājanapadas*, which is identifiable mainly in the early Buddhist literature, therefore would have to be dated in the fifth century BCE rather than in the sixth century BCE as we have been used to do till now. Furthermore, such an interpretation would leave the needed time for a gradual evolution of the urban settlements and their surrounding kingdoms. The same would be true with regard to the development of interregional trade and the rise of an urban merchant class. Particularly the latter may have needed much more time than we have been used to concede to them in view of the early date of the Buddha and of the early Buddhist literature which depicts an already flourishing merchant culture. Such a late date of the rise of urban centres, a merchant class and its flourishing interregional trade may help to explain the lateness of the punch-marked coins. Some scholars are also of the considered view that if one were to consider the probable distance between the Buddha and Asoka in terms of doctrinal development of Buddhism, then a study of that kind "would seem to render a somewhat later date more probable."[101] A study of Buddhist poetry also tends to shows that the corrected long chronology "definitely seems to lie too far back in time."[102] "It would seem to be easily compatible with the assumption that Buddhism had not yet produced distinctive monuments and institutions, and that, instead, it was still rather young and not yet fully visible when Megasthenes visited Pāṭaliputra around 300 B.C."[103] Eggermont too feels that "Buddhism was still young at Aśoka's time."[104]

In the chronological system on which the *Dīpavaṃsa* and the *Mahāvamsa* are based, the succession of the great teachers from Upāli down to Mahinda played an important part. This *ācariyaparamparā* is of interest because in it there is a continuous synchronological connection between the histories of Sri Lanka and India. Here the system appears to have been carried out in detail and completed. As is clear in the accounts of the *Dīpavaṃsa* and the *Mahāvaṃsa,* there was a teacher/

---

[100]See K.T.S. Sarao, *Op. Cit.,* 1989: Appendix-II.

[101]Lambert Schmithausen, "An Attempt to Estimate the Distance in Time between Aśoka and the Buddha in Terms of Doctrinal History," Heinz Bechert (ed), *Op. Cit.*, 1992: 143.

[102]S. Lienhard, "A Brief Note on the Date of the Historical Buddha and Classical Poetry," Heinz Bechert (ed), *Op. Cit.*, 1991: 196.

[103]W. Halbfass "Early Indian References to the Greeks and the First Encounters between Buddhism and the West," H. Bechert (ed), *Op. Cit.*, 1995: 205.

[104]P.H.L. Eggermont, "New Notes on Aśoka and His Successors II,"*Persica 4*, 1969: 97.

pupil relationship between them and this continuity is of vital importance. The lists of *ācariyas* which occur in the *Vinaya*, Sri Lankan chronicles and elsewhere as *Vinayadharas*, are more reliable and useful than any other form of information to determine the date of the Buddha. As most of the research was conducted in the light of number 218, it was given out that the number of Elders[105] as the *Vinayapāmokkhas* for the period between the Buddha and Asoka caused a problem. There were not enough number of Elders. Thus, it was pointed out that to bridge the gap of 218 years each of the elders had to be assigned such a lengthy period of time as guardian of the *Vinaya* that it seemed highly unlikely. The statement that the eight Elders who considered the Ten Extravagances (*dasavatthūni*) in the Second Council had all seen the Buddha,[106] was also seen as creating difficulties. These so-called *contradictions,* however, were regarded as faulty records on the part of the Theravādins. More weight was given to the chronology of the kings, even though this too posed difficulties. All these problems had come up because the number 218 was thought to be supreme.

In our calculation of the date of the Buddha based upon the lists of patriarchs, we have used the beginning of the reign of Candagutta as the base year as against the year of Asoka's coronation. This shortens the gap between the date of the Buddha and the base year, thus reducing the margin of error. The calculation of the date of the coronation of Asoka has been found to be more problematic than the date of Candagutta.[107] Besides the fact that some scholars do not consider Moggaliputta as an historical personality,[108] his name may not necessarily be taken seriously for many reasons. There are many inaccuracies in the account relating to him and it seems Moggaliputta's name was either invented to give more credence to the name of Asoka, Mahinda and the spread of Buddhism into Sri Lanka or facts regarding him have been simply exaggerated for one reason or another. For instance, at one place we are told that he died in his 80ᵗʰ year,[109] at another at 80[110] and yet at another place his age at death is given as 86.[111] It has been shown that Moggaliputta Tissa who is said to have received the *Vinaya* from Siggava, had been an advisory monk to Asoka and had converted Mahinda, has actually been inserted through a fabricated legend and in reality he may have lived in Western India in the third-second centuries BCE.[112]

The Northern sources[113] point out three generations of patriarchs i.e. Mahākassapa/ Ānanda→ Sāṇavāsa→ Upagupta, dating from the Buddha's death to the time of Asoka (excluding Madhyāntika,

---

[105]Vin.V.2; Dīp.IV.27-46; Mhv.V.95, 153.

[106]Dīp.IV.54-56; Mhv.IV.59.

[107]See, for instance, Richard Gombrich, "Dating the Buddha: A Red Herring Revealed," Heinz Bechert (ed), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha/ Die Datierung des historischen Buddha (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, IV, II),* Gottingen: 1991: 238-259. Apart from the fact that Gombrich takes unbridled liberties with the patriarchal data at his disposal, the biggest flaw of his hypothesis is created by the use of the year of coronation of Asoka as the base year. By doing this, not only does he push back his own calculation of the date of the Buddha's death from 404 BCE to 422 BCE, but also the use of information on Moggaliputta widens his margin of error. See his fn. 26.

[108]J. Przyluski, *Le Légende de l'Empereur Aśoka (Aśoka-Avadāna) dans les textes indiens et chinois, Paris,* 1923: 62-66; G. Yamazaki, "The lists of Patriarchs in the Northern and Southern Legends," Heinz Bechert (ed), *Op. Cit. 1),* Gottingen: 1991: 317-318.

[109]Dīp.V.107.

[110]Dīp.V.95.

[111]Dīp.V.94.

[112]G. Yamazaki, "The Spread of Buddhism in the Mauryan Age, With Special Reference to the Milinda Legend," *Acta Asiatica*, 4, 1982 : 1-16; "The List of the Patriarchs in the Northern and Southern Legends," Heinz Bechert (ed), *Op. Cit*., 1991: 313-325.

[113]The *Aśokavadāna* (T 2042, ch. 2-3: 111b 28-121b 1; T2043, ch. 6-9: 149b 162c 10), the *Divyāvadāna* (348, 1.27-364, 1.10), the *Mūlasaravāstivādin Vinaya*, the *Bhaisjyavastu* (*Gilgit Manuscripts* III, part I: xvii, 3-7; T 1448, ch. 9: 41c 18-42b 26), the *Kṣudrakavastu* (T 1451, ch. 40: 408c-411b 18), the *Saṃyuktāgama* (T 99, ch. 25: 177b 12-19) and the *Fên pieh kung tê lun* (T 1507, ch. 2: 37b 16-27). I owe these references to Ē. Lamotte, *Op. Cit*.: 226. A French translation of most of these sources is available at J. Przyluski, "Le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde," *JA,* 1914: 493-568.

whose name appears to have been inserted by the legend-teller monks).[114] Sāṇavāsa was a merchant of Magadha at the Buddha's time, who after the Buddha's death became a monk under Ānanda's guidance, moved to Madhurā (Mathurā) later on and introduced Upagupta into monkhood. Sāṇavāsa must be Sambhūta-Sāṇavāsī of Madhurā/ Ahogaṅga who took part in the Second Council. As many different sects agree, it appears Sāṇavāsa's participation in the Second Council is quite probable. Upagupta is said to have been temporary advisory-monk of Asoka, but some scholars like Przyluski have faulted in considering the whole relationship as cooked up by the monks of Madhurā for the purposes of extolling their city, sect and one of their most famous predecessors i.e. Upagupta.[115] But if the Short Chronology is followed, Upagupta could have been after all a contemporary of Asoka.

The *Southern Sources* relate that five patriarchs transmitted the Vinaya from the time of the Buddha's death till the days of Asoka.[116] These five Elders were Upāli→ Dāsaka→ Soṇaka→ Siggava→ Moggaliputta Tissa.[117]

> *Catusattati Upāli ca, catusaṭṭhi ca Dāsaka,*
> *chasaṭṭhi Soṇako thero, Siggavo tu chasattati,*
> *asīti Moggaliputto sabbesaṃ upasampadā|*[118]

Seventy-four (years) of Upāli, sixty-four of Dāsaka,
sixty-six of Thera Soṇaka, seventy-six of Siggava,
eighty of Moggaliputta: this is the *Upasampadā* of them all.

Though this verse mentions the years of *Upasampadā*, but in reality they are the years at which these Elders died. This fact is borne by the verses preceding as well as following this verse. E.g. Dīp.V.103 mentions that Upāli attained nibbāna at the age of 74.

> *Sabbakālamhi pāmokkho vinaye Upālipaṇḍito,*
> *paññāsaṃ Dāsako thero, catucattārīsañ ca Soṇako,*
> *pañcapaññāsavassaṃ Siggavassa, aṭṭhasaṭṭhi Moggaliputtesavhayo|*[119]

Learned Upāli was all the years chief of the Vinaya,
Thera Dāsaka (became chief in the year) fifty, Sonaka forty-four,
Siggava fifty-fifth year, the (Thera) called Moggaliputta sixty-eight.

It may be interesting to note that Dīp.V.96 has been taken to imply the number of years for which the five Elders were the custodians of the *Vinaya*. This is difficult to accept not only because it would have been impossible for any Elder to keep the *Vinaya* for such a long time,[120] but also because the verse itself does not mean as much as it has been taken to. Rationally speaking, the numbers mentioned in this verse appear to be the ages of the Elders at which they became the custodians of the *Vinaya*. The expression *sabbakālaṃhi* (i.e., *all the years*) in the case of Upāli means that he was the custodian of the *Vinaya* all the years from the death of the Buddha till his own death. Furthermore, in the case of Dāsaka, Soṇaka, Siggava and Moggaliputta, it is not the total number of years that is given, but the

---

[114]E. Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, Roma:Is. M.E.O., Serie Orientale Roma, 8, 1956: 34.

[115]J. Przyluski, *Op. Cit.,* 1923: 62-66. See also, G. Yamazaki, *Op. Cit.*1991: 314-316.

[116]Dīp.V.55-107; Mhv.V.95-153.

[117] Dīp.V.95-96.

[118]Dīp.V.95.

[119]Dīp.V.96.

[120] As he would have become the custodian at a fairly senior age.

respective ages at which each of them became the custodian of the *Vinaya*. That means they became custodians respectively in the 50th, 44th, 55th and 68th years of their ages. In other words, they became custodians respectively when they were 49, 43, 54 and 67 years old. Following this argument, the total length of custodianship for each of the first four Elders may be computed as follows:

Pāmokkha	Age at Death	Age at becoming Vinaya Pāmokkha	Custodianship
Upāli	74	44	30 years
Dāsaka	64	49	15 years
Soṇaka	66	43	23 years
Siggava	76	54	22 years
Total			90 years

As the custodianship of these four *Vinaya pāmokkhas* is mentioned only in years and no months and days are mentioned, one year per *pāmokkha* may be added to make-up for the margin of error. This would put the total period of guardianship of these four *pāmokkhas* i.e. the time span between the death of the Buddha and the death of Siggava at approximately 90+4= 94 years. As we shall see in the following pages, Siggava died in the year c.303 BCE. This would mean that the Buddha's death may approximately be placed in the year 303+94= c.397 BCE.

It appears that Upāli joined the Saṃgha at quite a mature age. He was born in the family of a barber, later took up service with the Sākyan princes and joined the Saṃgha along with them.[121] Even during the life time of the Buddha, monks considered it a great privilege to learn the *Vinaya* under him.[122] He specialized in the study of the *Vinaya*, and won the foremost place among the *Vinayadharas*. He is known as having reached the pinnacle of the *Vinaya* (*Vinaye agganikkhitto*)[123] and it was in this capacity that Kassapa entrusted him with compiling the *Vinaya Piṭaka* at the Council of Rājagaha. We are told that when 16 years had elapsed after the death of the Buddha, at that time Upāli was 60 years old.[124] This means he was 44 (60-16) years old when the Buddha died i.e. when he became the *Vinayapāmokkha*. But as mentioned above, he actually lived to be 74. Thus, Upāli was the custodian of the *Vinaya* for 30 (74-44) years. This is also supported by a direct statement in the *Dīpavaṃsa* that Upāli guarded the *Vinaya* for 30 years.[125]

Dāsaka, who died at the age of 64, was a learned brāhmaṇa from Vesālī and appears to have been fairly matured in years at the time of joining the Saṃgha to study the Dhamma.[126] When Upāli died, Udaya had completed 6 years of his 16-year reign.[127] This means during the last 10 (16-6) years of Udaya's reign, Dāsaka was the custodian of the *Vinaya*. But Dāsaka died when 8 years of the 10-year reign of Susunāga had elapsed.[128] As Anuruddhaka/ Muṇḍa ruled for 8 years between Udaya and

[121]Vin.II.182; DhA.I.116f; BuA.44 etc.

[122]Vin.IV.142; VA.IV.876.

[123]Dīp.IV.3,5.

[124]Dīp.IV.33, V.76.

[125]Dīp.IV.34, V.89.

[126]Dīp.V.95; Vin.V.2; VA.I.32, 62, 235, VII.1304; Dvy.3ff etc.

[127]Dīp.V.97.

[128] Dīp.V.97.

Susunāga,[129] Dāsaka appears to have been the custodian for a total of $10+8+8=26$ years.

Soṇaka, the son of a caravan leader from Kāsī, joined the Saṃgha at the age of 15 at Rājagaha.[130] We know that Susunāga ruled for 10 years and Dāsaka died 8 years after the end of Susunāga's reign.[131] After the death of Susunāga, the Ten Brothers reigned for 22 years and Soṇaka died when 6 years of their reign were over.[132] This means Soṇaka kept the *Vinaya* during the last two years of the reign of Susunāga and first 6 years of the reign of the Ten Brothers, making it 8 $(2+6)$ years.

Siggava, the son of a minister from Pāṭaliputta, joined the Saṃgha at the age of 18. His friend Caṇḍavajjī too entered at the same time.[133] Siggava was the custodian during the remaining 16 (22-6) years of the reign of the Ten Brothers. Siggava died when 14 years of the reign of Candagutta had elapsed.[134] In other words, Siggava was the custodian for a total period of 30 $(16+14)$ years. But as we shall see in the following paragraphs, Candagutta did not succeed the Ten Brothers who began their reign not at Pāṭaliputta but elsewhere because we are told that Susunāga had a son called Kālāsoka who held power at Pāṭaliputta[135] for a period of 28 years.[136] It appears after his governorship for ten years during Susunāga's reign, Kālāsoka reigned for 28-10=18 years as a king at Pāṭaliputta and the Ten Brothers continued to rule from the same place as Susunāga after the possible split of the kingdom. In other words, it appears that Candagutta succeeded Kālāsoka at Pāṭaliputta and the Ten Brothers (possibly the Nandas) at Rājagaha. We are also told that Siggava was 64 years old when Candagutta had completed 2 years of his reign.[137] Candagutta's reign began in the year c.317 BCE. This means that in the year c.315 (317-2) BCE Siggava was 64 years old. But as Siggava died at the age of 76, that means, he lived for another 12 (76-64) years after 315 BCE. This would put the death of Siggava in the year c.303 (315-12) BCE. This statement is also supported by another reference where we are told that Siggava died 14 years after the beginning of the reign of Candagutta[138] i.e., c.303 (317-14) **BCE.**

The upshot of the calculation made above is as follows:

The death of Siggava took place in the year c.303 BCE. Soṇaka died 30 years before Siggava. Dāsaka died 8 years before Soṇaka. Upāli died 26 years before Dāsaka. The Buddha died 30 years before Upāli. In other words, between c.303 BCE and the death of the Buddha 94 $(30+8+26+30)$ years had elapsed. This would mean that the Buddha died in the year c.397 $(303+94)$ BCE.

When the Second Council took place, Kālāsoka, son of Susunāga,[139] was ruling at Pāṭaliputta.[140] In this

---

[129] See the following pages.

[130]Vin.V.2; VA.I.32, 62, 235, VII.1304etc.

[131]Dīp.V.98.

[132]Dīp.V.99.

[133]VA.I.32, 62, 235, VII.1304 etc.

[134]Dīp.V.73, 100.

[135]Dīp.V.25.

[136]Mhv.IV.7.

[137]Dīp.V.81.

[138]Dīp.V.73, 100.

[139]VA.I.33.

[140]Dīp.V.25.

Council, eight distinguished monks viz., Sabbakāmī,[141] Sāḷha, Revata, Khujjasobhita, Vāsabhagāmi, Sumana, Sambhūta-Sāṇavāsi and Yasa Kākaṇḍakaputta participated.[142] They are all said to have seen the Buddha.[143] Soreyya-Revata, who was a pupil of Ānanda and participated in the Second Council, had also seen the Buddha.[144] We are told in the Sri Lankan chronicles that the Second Council took place in the 11th year of Kāḷāsoka.[145] This means that the Second Council took place 62 years after the death of the Buddha i.e. in c.335 BCE.[146] The oldest source on the Third Council is Dīp.I.25, followed by Dīp.VII.34-59. The later reference appears to have been expanded by the editor/ editors from the *aṭṭhakatthā* with a view to justify the number 218. It must be noticed that different kinds of detail have been introduced which correspond to the opinions and circumstances of later times and thus, should be looked upon with scepticism. The date for the Third Council appears hard to fix, though it took place when Asoka was ruling at Pāṭaliputta.

Here some explaining may be done regarding the kings who are supposed to have ruled between the death of the Buddha and the Moriyas. Before the Moriyas, the kings who are said to have ruled at Pāṭaliputta were Udaibhadda/ Udāyī,[147] Muṇḍa[148] and Kāḷāsoka.[149] It seems that between the death of Ajātasattu and accession of Candagutta Moriya, Rājagaha and Pāṭaliputta simultaneously played the roles of capital cities.

Bimbisāra was 5 years younger to the Buddha and ruled for a total of 52 years. He became a king at the age of 15, spent the last 32 years of his life as a follower of the Buddha and died at the age of 67. Ajātasattu ruled for 32 years. He died 24 years after the *Mahāparinibbāna* and began his reign 8 years before the Buddha's death.[150] This means Bimbisāra ruled from $8+52=60$ BB $(397+60=c.457BCE)$ to 8 BB $(397+8=c.405$ BCE). Ajātasattu ruled from 8 BB (405 BCE) to 24 AB $(397-24=c.373$ BCE). Both of them are known to have ruled from Rājagaha.

Udaya/ Udāyi/ Udayabhadda of the Pāli sources is the same as the Udāyin of the *Purāṇas*. The Pāli sources clearly point out that Udayabhadda was Ajātasattu's son[151] and succeeded him.[152] But the *Purāṇas* place Darśaka/ Vaṃsaka/ Darbhaka between the two.[153] Either the *Purāṇas* have recorded him incorrectly or he ruled from a place other than Rājagaha and Pāṭaliputta. Udaya/ Udāyi/ Udayabhadda had been ruling for 6 years at the time of the death of Upāli.[154] Upāli kept the *Vinaya* for 30 years[155] and thus, died at the age of 74 (30+44).[156] This means that Udaya/ Udayabhadda succeeded Ajātasattu,

---

[141]Sabbakāmī/ Sabbakāma was born before the Buddha's death (DPPN.II.1033).

[142]Dīp.V.21-23.

[143]Dīp.V.24; Mhv.IV.57f. As all of them had seen the Buddha, it is highly unlikely that they lived another 100 years to be able to participate in the Second Council. However, this could be probable if the council had taken place (as suggested by us) about 62 years or so after the death of the Buddha.

[144]Mhv.IV.57, 60.

[145]Dīp.IV.44, 47; Mhv.IV.8. The later sources (the *Mahābodhivaṃsa* and the *Sāsanavaṃsa*) put it in his 10th year (See W. Geiger, *Op. Cit*, 1912: lv).

[146]See Appendix-I.

[147]Vin. Texts.II.102 fn 1.

[148] A.III.57.

[149] S. Beal, *Si-yu-ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World*, vol. 2, London: Trübner & Co.1906: 85; Dīp.V.25.

[150] Dīp.III.60.

[151] D.I.50.

[152] Dīp.V.97.

[153] See P.H.L. Eggermont , *The Chronology of the Reign of Asoka Moriya*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1956: 145.

[154] Dīp.IV.43; V.97.

[155] Dīp.IV.39; V.89.

[156] This is also mentioned at Dīp.V.95.

as his reign began 24 (30-6) years after the *Mahāparinibbāna*. He ruled for a total of 16 years.[157] Thus, he ruled from 24 AB (397-24=c.373 BCE) to 24+16=40 AB (397-40=c.357 BCE).

The *Mahāvaṃsa* list appears suspicious as Udayabhadda, Anuruddhaka, Muṇḍa and Nāgadāsaka- all in one row are shown as parricides. Anuruddhaka and Muṇḍa are allotted a reign of 8 years,[158] but they do not even exist in the lists provided by the *Purāṇas* and the *Dīpavaṃsa*. It may also be interesting to note that Muṇḍa/ Mahāmuṇḍa was the same as Anuruddha/ Anuruddhaka.[159] Muṇḍa, who is also absent in the Jaina sources, is however, mentioned in the *Mahāvaṃsa* and the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*.[160] He appears to have been a historical king. In the lists provided by the *Purāṇas*, there are some obvious errors. Whereas the *Vāyu Purāṇa* provides a list of ten kings, the *Matsya Purāṇa* inserts two more kings in it.[161] It seems that though "the *Vāyu Purāṇa* refers to the Gupta and other dynasties, still the material of the *Vāyu* is much older than the *Matsya Purāṇa*."[162] The 8-year reign of Anuruddhaka/ Muṇḍa may be placed between 40 AB (c.357 BCE) and 48 AB (c.349 BCE).

It seems Susunāga, who is put after Nāgadāsaka, actually appears to have started ruling at the same time as Nāgadāsaka. Nāgadāsa possibly did not belong to this line of kings and his reign is included in the list, in an effort to show 100 years as having elapsed between the *Mahāparinibbāna* and the Second Council.[163] Eggermont also felt that "Nāgadāsa is a figure, who arrived in the list of kings afterwards."[164] He perhaps ruled uneventfully for four years at Pāṭaliputta from 48 AB (c.349 BCE) to 52 AB (c.345 BCE), if at all he is to be accepted as an historical king.

After Nāgadāsaka's death (in case we accept him as a historical king), it appears Susunāga appointed his son Kāḷāsoka, the governor at Pāṭaliputta and himself continued ruling from Rājagaha. Susunāga's reign ended two years after the death of Dāsaka.[165] As his reign lasted 10 years[166] he appears to have ruled from 48 AB (c.349 BCE) to 58 AB (c.339 BCE). It appears that after the death of Susunāga, the Ten Brothers (possibly the same as the Nandas) succeeded him while his son Kāḷāsoka[167] continued ruling at Pāṭaliputta (now possibly assuming full control in the absence of his father).[168] The Ten Brothers ruled for 22 years.[169] Susunāga's reign of 10 years[170] is inflated to 18 years in the *Mahāvaṃsa*.[171] Furthermore, Nine Nandas are added,[172] almost certainly duplicating the Ten Brothers. The Jaina list is quite defective and may not be discussed here. Clarifying some other contradictions, Geiger had pointed out that when the dynasty before Candagutta had once received the name Śaiśunāga, then in order to exalt its greatness and antiquity, the eponymous and his immediate

---

[157] Dīp.IV.43; V.97.

[158] Mhv.IV.2-3.

[159] Dvy.369 says that Muṇḍa was Udāyī's son, whereas according to Mhv.IV.1ff Anuruddhaka was Udāyī's son. DA.I.153, however, says that Anuruddha was Mahāmuṇḍa's son. In any case as their reign is given as total of 8 years, counting them either as one or two kings does not affect our chronological calculation.

[160] Mhv.IV.2-3; A.III.57.

[161] See P.H.L. Eggermont,*Op. Cit*: 145.

[162] V.R.R. Dikshitar, *The Matsya Purāṇa: a Study*. Madras: University of Madras, 1925: 74.

[163] Mhv.IV.8.

[164] P.H.L. Eggermont, *Op. Cit*,: 162.

[165] Dīp.V.95.

[166] Dīp.V.98.

[167] Dīp.V.25.

[168] Dīp.V.25.

[169] Dīp.V.98.

[170] Dīp.V.98.

[171] Mhv.IV.6.

[172] Mhv.V.15.

successors, including Bimbisāra and his successors, were placed at the head of the whole series of kings. This would end in a reversal in the order of the first and second half.[173] Śreṇika and Kūṇika of the Jaina sources correspond to Bimbisāra and Ajātasattu of the Pāli sources as pointed out by Jacobi.[174] Kāḷāsoka and Kākavarṇa were one and the same person,[175] though strangely the *Purāṇas* place Sisunāga and Kākavarṇa before Ajātasattu.[176] As they succeeded Susunāga, their reign lasted from 339 BCE to 317 BCE and Kāḷāsoka , it seems, after the death of his father Susunāga, assumed full kingship at Pāṭaliputta and ruled till he was overthrown by Candagutta in c.317 BCE. This would make Kāḷāsoka's total reign as $10+18 = 28$ years i.e. he was the governor at Pāṭaliputta from 52 AB (c.345 BCE) to 62 AB (c.335 BCE) and king from 62 AB (c.335 BCE) to 80 AB (c.317 BCE).

The *Purāṇas* assign 100 years to the reign of the Nandas, the predecessors of the Moriyas. Within these 100 years, Mahāpadma alone is assigned 88 years[177] and his 8 sons accounting for 12 years.[178] Interestingly, the Nandas are not mentioned at all in the *Dīpavaṃsa*. The reason for this may haven been that they did not play any role in the two councils or any other Buddhist activity and may actually have been unconcerned about Buddhism. It is impossible to believe that Mahāpadma ruled for as long as 88 years. This certainly is an inflated number. It is very much possible that the total period of the reign of the Nandas was much shorter. The *Mahāvaṃsa* assigns the Nandas only 22 years.[179] The list of kings provided by the *Mahāvaṃsa* has to be taken cautiously because not only that its editor/editors appear to have consulted the *Dīpavaṃsa* but some names appear to have been fabricated in an attempt to rationalize the number 218, a number which had already appeared somewhat unconvincingly in the *Dīpavaṃsa*.[180]

It must finally be emphasized that our sources are not always exact in their calculation of time supposing we do not accept a deviation by one year. The number of years for which a particular king reigned or an Elder kept the *Vinaya* are given as rounded off numbers in our records. Months and days are not mentioned. A deviation of a couple of years one way or another cannot be denied in a calculation involving about 100 years or so. Thus, the 397 BCE may only be taken as a rough approximation to the year in which the Buddha expired.

---

[173] W. Geiger, *Op. Cit*, 1908: xlii.

[174] See W. Geiger, *Op. Cit.*, 1908: xliii.

[175] Quoted at W. Geiger 1908: xlii.

[176] See the table at W. Geiger 1908: xli.

[177] F.E.Pargiter, *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, facsimile of first edition, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies, 1913: 69.

[178] *Ibid.*

[179] Mhv.V.15.

[180] A careful study of Dīp.I.24-26 shows that they can be interpreted to mean a gap of 118 years between the *Mahāparinibbāna* and the Third Council (See K.T.S. Sarao, *Urban Centres and Urbanization as Reflected in the Pāli Vinaya and Sutta Piṭakas*, Ph.D. thesis submitted to the University of Cambridge, 1989: 18) as against the less convincing argument of W. Geiger (1908) that as some lines in the text have *dropped out* regarding the Second Council whereby 118 years should be taken as the time gap between the Second and the Third Council. The number 218, which is the corner stone of the Long Chronology, appears to have taken strong roots at a later date.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE PĀLI *VINAYA* AND *SUTTA PIṬAKA*

Of the literary sources for a systematic exposition of geography of the Gaṅgā Urbanization, the Pāli *Vinaya* and *Sutta Piṭaka* are undoubtedly the most important source of information. But they consist of a mass of material which is overwhelmingly religious in nature and highly problematic in chronology. One has to first eliminate from the tradition all the miraculous stories and then examine the residue critically to extract authentic history. The historical material which can be extracted from this mass is mainly in the form of similes, stories, direct verbal statements and objective observation. Perhaps only a fraction is in the form of direct historical description and even that, in fact, is highly formalized. It is also very repetitive and full of contradictions. But the very incidental nature of this material increases its value as a source of history. In the *Piṭakas* most of the sayings and speeches are not only passed as the *Buddhavacanaṃ*, but are even related exactly circumstantially to where and on what occasion Gotama delivered them. However, it is really very difficult to find out as to how much of this should be attributed to the Buddha himself. Some of the sayings, speeches and poems contained in our texts might have been composed by some of his chief disciples. But as our concern here is with the chronological placings of the Pāli *Vinaya* and *Sutta Piṭaka*, who wrote what is not really an issue as far as we are concerned.

The formation of the Pāli Canon is traditionally associated with the first two councils, first at Rājagaha (immediately after the *Mahāparinibbāna*) and the second at Vesālī. The Canon was committed to writing in the first century BCE during the reign of king Vaṭṭagāmaṇī Abhaya (29-17 BCE) in Sri Lanka.[181] Though once the texts were written down, the chances of interpolation must have diminished, nevertheless there was room for a certain amount of minor emendation to take place in the course of the centuries old scribal tradition.[182] A huge collection like our Canon naturally must have been preceded by considerable literary activity and its component parts must belong to different parts of this activity, as is shown by changes of technique within the Canon. But similarities between the Pāli Canon and those of other early schools indicate a common origin of literature at a reasonably early date and before the religion became divided into various sectarian divisions.

Some scholars have doubted the historicity of the First Council because, firstly, the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* gives the motive but not a word about the session of the Council[183] and secondly, *Cullavagga*-XI & XII constituted the only independent source of tradition and were based on the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* in bringing in a description of the Council. It is manifestly impossible that the huge mass of the *Vinaya* and the *Sutta Piṭaka* in any case could have been *recited* in its entirety in the First Council,[184] though may be a sort of beginning in the direction of composing the Canon may have been made. Hence the First Council does not appear to have been of great importance even if it took place in some form. The historicity of the Second Council is more reliable. It seems to have taken place not only to do away with the Ten Extravagances (*Cullavagga*-XII) but also to revise the doctrine during a session of eight months.[185] By looking at the description given in *Cullavagga*-XII one feels quite convinced that even if the first century after the Buddha may not have witnessed the formation of a Canon, at least a fundamental stock of texts for such a Canon must have been formed.[186]

---

[181]DPPN.II.818.

[182]K.R. Norman, *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol VII, Fasc 2, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983: 6.

[183]H. Oldenberg, *Op. Cit*, 1979: xxxi; 1898: 613-32.

[184]H. Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, Strassburg: Grundriß der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, III, Band 8 Heft:1896: 103; G.C. Pande, *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*, Allahabad: University of Allahabad: 1957: 10.

[185]Dīp.V; Mhv.IV.

[186]M. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, tr. S. Ketkar & H. Kuhn, vol.2, Calcutta: University of Calcutta:1933 (reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass: 1990): 5.

We are told in the *Dīpavaṃsa* that a *real* Cannon of sacred books was compiled on the occasion of the Third Council at the time of king Asoka.[187] By this time Buddhism had come to acquire many sects because Asoka himself in one of his edicts warns that heretical monks and nuns shall be excommunicated.[188] Consequently, it would have been only natural for him to take an active interest in establishing what tenets constituted the true religion of the Buddha. But we do not find any mention of the Third Council in Asoka's edicts, though there is really no strong reason why he should have done so. The Bhābru-Bairāṭ Edict (also called the Calcutta-Bairāṭ Rock Inscription) recommends the study of seven texts by monks and nuns and these texts have been identified (though not with full conviction). The evidence drawn from the inscriptions may be put aside on the ground that they do not explicitly state that the *Suttantas* and the *Nikāyas* which they refer and the passages they mention, are the same as those we have now. Following this sort of logic, some scholars even now maintain that the *Piṭakas* are not Indian books at all and are Sri Lankan forgeries. Such doubts were answered by Rhys Davids[189] that though a healthy and reasonable scepticism is a valuable aid to historical criticism, but it cannot be said of a scepticism that involves belief in things far more incredible than those it rejects. In one breath we are we reminded of the scholastic dullness, the sectarian narrowness, the literary incapacity, even the senile imbecility of the Sri Lankan Buddhists; and in the next we are asked to accept proposition implying that they were capable of forging extensive documents so well, with such historical accuracy, with so delicate a discrimination between ideas current among themselves and ancient views, that they deceived their contemporaries and opponents. It is not unreasonable to hesitate in adopting a scepticism which involves belief in so unique, and therefore so incredible a performance. It may be said that the Asokan age was conversant with certain portions of the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, the *Dīgha Nikāya*, the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, the *Sutta Nipāta* and the *Majjhima Nikāya*.[190] However this may be, the terms used by Asoka in the Bairāṭ-Bhābru Inscription are conclusive proof of the existence of Buddhist literature called either a *Piṭaka* or *Piṭakas*.[191] The duties of a pious householder stressed by Asoka through his edicts all fall within the scheme of the *Nikāyas*. The occurrence of the word *peṭakin* (knower of *Piṭaka/ Piṭakas*) in the Bharhut inscription indicates that the word *Piṭaka* became popular enough to be part of popular usage.[192] Hence, it appears that before the end of the Moriyan period there was something in the nature of a Canon in existence, which was regarded as having been uttered by the Buddha, and which if not entirely identical, resembled the Pāli Canon very closely.[193]

We may now move on to consider the individual texts:

THE *VINAYA PIṬAKA*

In the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, the chapters dealing with the convening of the two Buddhist councils[194] are generally considered late additions to the earlier texts. As we said earlier, the report of the First Council in *Cullavagga*.XI expects us to believe too much, and this fact speaks against its trustworthiness in its oldest form as it has come down to us in the *Tipiṭaka* itself, for it is absolutely impossible that the *Vinaya* and the *Sutta Piṭaka* should soon after Gotama Buddha's death have been essentially such as we find in our Canon. It may, indeed, be possible that the elders of the Buddhists must have assembled immediately after the Mahāparinibbāna in order to agree upon the principal points

---

[187]Dīp.VII.39f, 57ff.

[188]E. Hultzsch, *Inscriptions of Aśoka*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925: xliii fn.

[189]DB.I.xvii-xviii.

[190]M. Winternitz, *Op. Cit*, 1933: 606-609; Oldenberg & Rhys Davids 1881: xxvif.

[191]T.W. Rhys Davids.DB.I.xiii.

[192]See K.R. Norman, *Op. Cit*, 1983: 16f.

[193]M. Winternitz, *Op. Cit*, 1933: 18, 608.

[194]CV.xi-xii.

of the doctrine and the discipline of the Order; and hence though we may not be justified in assuming the tradition to be completely unfounded, it was far too short a time for the compilation of a Canon of the sort under consideration. Moreover, *Cullavagga*.XI begins abruptly unlike any other chapter of the *Cullavagga*. It commences in the same way as the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* and is closely allied to it in contents. It is not impossible that originally *Cullavagga*.XI formed a part of the *Dīgha Nikāya*[195] or maybe *Cullavagga*.XI-XII and the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* existed separately as an independent text. In the *Khandhakas* the arrangement by subject matter, so that the stories had to be inserted into the appropriate *Khandhakas*, has led to their being separated and so the author of the *Khandhaka* work had available to him an old account of the way in which the Buddha gave fundamental instruction to his first followers.[196] But the date of the compilation of the 20 *Khandhakas* (leaving the above two) is pre-Moriyan and the other two were composed not much later than the Second Council, because had the compilation of the *Khandhakas* remained open after that, it would have included an account of the later councils, particularly of the one held during the reign of Asoka.[197]

The *Parivāra*, the *Vinaya* treatise, was composed in Sri Lanka because there are references within it that it was written after *Milindapañha* and is later in time than other sections of the *Vinaya*. G.P. Malalasekera feels that some of the chapters of the *Parivārapāṭha* are older than the *Vinaya*.[198] But it seems rather the other way round as stated in the *Dīpavaṃsa* that the *Mahāsaṅghikas* did not accept it as one of their texts and this casts doubt on its earlier historicity. Hence for all historical purposes the *Parivārapāṭha* belongs to the first century BCE, when it must have been Canonised at Vaṭṭagāmaṇī's time.

The *Suttavibhaṅga* comprising the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* and the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* must have been composed in pre-Moriyan days because the historical references in it, all belong to a period not far removed from the *Mahāparinibbāna*.

In the opinion of C.A.F. Rhys Davids, *Pātimokkha* is of more recent origin and she assumes that at the time when the main body of the *Tipiṭaka* was collected, it either did not exist or was of too recent a date to be admitted into the holy writings.[199] But according to Oldenberg, the *Pātimokkha* is the earliest literary record of the Buddhist *Vinaya* because in his opinion the whole *Vibhaṅga* is nothing but an extended reading of the *Pātimokkha*.[200] Though it seems quite unlikely that the complete set of rules was formulated at once and some of these rules were undoubtedly proclaimed as the need arose,[201] yet we can say with certainty that the earlier *Pātimokkha* Code (i.e. 152 rules) is older than the *Suttavibhaṅga* because the *Suttavibhaṅga* scheme makes room for the 75 *Sekhiya* rules, thereby recognizing the *Pātimokkha* to be total 227 rules which was possible only in the second or final stage of codification of the *Pātimokkha* rules.

THE *SUTTA PIṬAKA*

When the Buddha died, the sayings were collected together by his disciples into the first four *Nikāyas*. They could not have reached their final form till about fifty years afterwards. Other sayings and verses, most of them not ascribed to the Buddha himself, but to his disciples, were put into a supplementary *Nikāya*. We know of slight additions made to this *Nikāya* as late as the time of Asoka. And the developed doctrine found in certain smaller books-- especially the *Buddhavaṃsa*, the *Cariyāpiṭaka*, the

---

[195]G.C. Pande, *Op. Cit*, 1957: 10.

[196]E. Frauwallner, *Op. Cit*, 1956: 135; K.R. Norman, *Op. Cit*, 1983: 23.

[197]B.C. Law, *A History of Pāli Literature*, 2 vols, London: Kegan Paul Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd, 1933: 15.

[198]DPPN.II.162.

[199]C.A.F. Rhys Davids, *Outlines of Buddhism: A Historical Sketch*, first Indian print, Delhi, 1978: 6.

[200]H. Oldenberg, *Op. Cit*, 1879: xvi-xx.

[201]K.R. Norman, *Op. Cit*, 1983: 20.

Petavatthu and the *Vimānavatthu*-- show that they are younger than the first four *Nikāyas*. The first four *Nikāyas* belong to the earlier part of the Canon and in language and style too, there is no essential difference amongst themselves, though the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* may be later than the others, but not much later.[202] The fact that the four *Nikāyas* do not take much notice of the issues contested by the earlier sects, certainly suggests that they practically reached completion by the Second Council. In the opinion of Rhys Davids the *Nikāyas* were known at a very early date in northern India[203] and were put together out of older material at a time between the death of the Buddha and the accession of Asoka.[204] Oldenberg also dates the main substance of *Suttanta* literature prior to the Vesāli Council.[205] Hence there is general agreement that the *Nikāyas* appear to reflect perhaps the earliest period of the history of Buddhism, possibly the only exception appears to be concluding part of the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* relating to the redistribution of the bodily remains of the Buddha. This portion belongs to Moriyan days, as pointed out by Law on the basis of Buddhaghosa's reference to that effect.[206]

In the *Khuddhaka Nikāya*, such texts as the *Khuddhakapāṭha*, the *Dhammapada*, the *Itivuttaka*, the *Vimānavatthu*, the *Petavatthu*, the *Niddesa* and the *Paṭisambiddāmagga* are excluded from the discussion on chronology because they do not give much information on our present subject.

Several *suttas* of the *Udāna* can be traced in the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, and though it may be difficult to say as to who borrowed from whom, it seems probable that both the texts borrowed the *suttas* directly from the great body of oral material which must have existed in the early days of Buddhism.[207] Most of the short and beautiful utterances certainly are very old and many of them are possibly the actual words of the Buddha himself or of his most prominent disciples.[208] But there can be no doubt that verse and prose form two separate and distinguishable strata within the *Udāna*, in which the former are quite early.[209] In fact, the narratives appear to be the handiwork of the compiler.[210] Thus, the verses of the *Udāna* are pre-Moriyan whereas the prose may not be older than the third century BCE.

The *Theragāthā* and the *Therīgāthā* seem to have been composed at a comparatively late date. Though certain songs and verses in these texts can be traced in the four *Nikāyas*, but still there are a considerable number of poems which must be of later origin,[211] that is, the Buddha-cult and the various types of miracles developed in these texts could not have developed prior to the later Mahāyāna texts.[212] Further Dhammapāla, the commentator, tells us that some of the verses of the *Theragāthā* were composed by an Elder who lived at Bindusāra's time and they were added to the collection at the Third Council.[213] Hence, it seems that these two books may be used as sources for the Moriyan period as far as their historical utility is concerned.

The *Jātakas*, which are full of historical data have created such problems regarding their dating that a large number of scholars have avoided using them as a source of history altogether. Two recent

---

[202]M. Winternitz, *Op. Cit*, 1933: 69.

[203]DB.I.x.

[204]T.W. Rhys Davids, *Op. Cit*, 1922: 195.

[205]H. Oldenberg, *Op. Cit*, 1889: xxxvii-xxxviii.

[206]B.C. Law, *Op. Cit*, 1933: 3, 30f.

[207]K.R. Norman, *Op. Cit*, 1983: 61.

[208]M. Winternitz, *Op. Cit*, 1933: 85.

[209]G.C. Pande, *Op. Cit*, 1957: 71.

[210]M. Winternitz, *Op. Cit*, 1933: 85.

[211]M. Winternitz, *Op. Cit*, 1933: 110; K.R. Norman, *Op. Cit*, 1983: 77.

[212]M. Winternitz, *Op. Cit*, 1933: 110.

[213]Quoted at Oldenberg and Pischel, *Op. Cit.*,1883: 46.

examples are Pande[214] and Wagle.[215] Rhys Davids finds them totally heterogenous[216] and so does Winternitz who feels that they cover a wide span of time and are perhaps as late as sixth century CE and for him to decide the dates of the Jātakas "not only every large section and every single narrative, but every single *gāthā* will have to be tested independently as regards its date."[217] But Winternitz seems to have reached some sort of conclusion when he says that the *gāthās* have been generally accepted as constituting the oldest stratum as compared to the later prose portions which show marked signs of editing perhaps at the hands of Buddhist monks.[218] In the opinion of Kosambi "Sātavāhana period and territory would suit best" for the *Jātakas*.[219] But Sharma criticizes this view saying that regulations regarding trade in the *Arthaśāstra* presuppose an extensive economy and "the stories of the past" in which scenes lie in central or western India are pre-Asokan, whereas "the stories of the present" which occur in the cities of eastern India like Rājagaha and Sāvatthi are late in chronology.[220] Mehta finds some of the poems and prose narratives to be pre-Buddhist and he, in fact, uses the *Jātakas* quite liberally for discussing pre-Buddhist India.[221]

We must remember that the *Jātaka* text edited by Fausböll is not the original, but it is actually an *aṭṭhakathā* on the *Jātaka*. The *Jātakas* originally consisted only of *gāthās*, because their language is more archaic and they were less prone to change as compared to the prose and hence they have a stronger claim to be regarded as canonical than the prose portions.[222] Moreover, there is no chronological significance in the distinction between "the stories of the past" and "the stories of the present" because both are the work of one and the same commentator and for the great mass of the verses no greater antiquity than the third century BCE can be conscientiously urged, certainly not proved, and much of the prose certainly belongs to the Christian era.[223]

Some of the *Jātakas* in one shape or another appear in other canonical texts. The *Cariyāpiṭaka* consists of 35 *Jātakas* though not all are found in Faubsöll's edition. Some *Jātakas* can be traced in the *Vinaya Piṭaka* as well as the *Nikāyas*. Kern and Barua have shown that Bharhut and Sāñcī sculptures prove that at the time of their construction (i.e. between c.100 and 0 BCE) the *Jātakas* were known as an integral part of the Buddhist lore.[224] It appears that the *gāthās* are pre-Asokan if not pre-Moriyan, but the prose passages are quite late. Though some of the passages undeniably have earlier elements mixed in them, as they exist at present, they do not appear to be of any value other than for the Kuṣāṇa and the Sātavāhana periods.

The *Apadāna* though less useful, is like the *Jātakas*. Since it connects together the past and present lives of the *theras* and the *therīs*, it appears to be an appendix to the *Jātakas*. It is certainly one of the very latest books of the *Khuddhaka Nikāya*, if not of the Pāli Canon itself, because at all events judged by its general character, it is much more closely allied to the Sanskrit *Avadānas* than to the remaining works of the Pāli Canon,[225] though E. Muller and S. Levi found some portions even later

---

[214]G.C. Pande, *Op. Cit*, 1957: 1-76.

[215]N. Wagle, *Society at the Time of the Buddha*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1966: 13.

[216]T.W. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1903: 208.

[217]M. Winternitz, *Op. Cit*: 1933: 122, 156.

[218]*Ibid*.119-125.

[219]D.D. Kosambi, *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1956: 259.

[220]R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit.*, 1958: 85.

[221]R.L. Mehta, *Pre-Buddhist India*, Bombay: Indian Historical Research Institute, 1939: xxi ff.

[222]M. Winternitz 1933: 119; E. Cowell, *Op. Cit.*,1895: xiii.

[223]M. Winternitz 1933: 119-122.

[224]H. Kern, *Op. Cit.*, 1896: 2; B.M. Barua, "Identification of Four *Jātakas* at Bharhut," *JASB*, New Series, 1923: 349-356.

[225]M. Winternitz 1933: 159-169.

than the Sanskrit *Avadānas*.[226]

The *Buddhavaṃsa* talks about 24 Buddhas whereas the earlier texts know only of 6 of them. Hence, it may be classed amongst the latest productions of the canonical literature.[227] Moreover, this text is full of that Buddha-worship and Buddha-deification, which is again unknown to the other texts of the Pāli Canon and forms more affinity with the Mahāyāna Sanskrit literature.

The *Cariyāpiṭaka* is a collection of 35 *Jātakas* in verse. But compared with the *Jātaka* verses, those in the *Cariyāpiṭaka* are mediocre and introduce sentimental and supernatural elements lacking in the *Jātakas*. In fact, the *Cariyāpiṭaka* serves as a supplement to the *Buddhavaṃsa*.[228] The doctrine of the *Pāramitās* which belongs to later phase of the cult of the Buddha as well as the form of presentation show that the *Cariyāpiṭaka* is a very late text.[229]

On the basis of the foregoing discussion, the texts may be divided into three broad chronological categories. But it must once again needs to be clarified that hardly any Pāli text is a unitary production and almost all the texts are made up of materials of different dates. The following categorization, hence, is neither water-tight nor final. The only thing that we can say with certainty is that these texts cover a chronological span from the days of the Buddha till the Sātavāhana period and that this corresponds with the flourishing of the early periods of the Gaṅgā Urbanization. Still certain verses or prose pieces may fall out of our division as given below and we shall date such portions separately, whenever such a prose or verse portion is used.

Substantially Pre-Moriyan Texts	Substantially Moriyan Texts	Substantially Post-Moriyan Texts
The *Vinaya Piṭaka* (except CV-xi, xii, *Sekhya Rules* and the *Parivārapāṭha*)	CV-xi, xii, *Sekhya Rules*	The *Parivārapāṭha*
The *Dīgha Nikāya*		
The *Majjhima Nikāya*		
The *Aṅguttara Nikāya*		
The *Udāna* (verse only)		
	The *Udāna* (prose only)	
	The *Theragāthā*	
	The *Therīgāthā*	
	The *Jātaka* (verse with few exceptions)	
		The *Jātaka* (prose only)
		The *Apadāna*
		The *Buddhavaṃsa*
		The *Cariyāpiṭaka*

---

[226]*Ibid*. fn 2.

[227]M. Winternitz 1933: 162; K.R. Norman, *Op. Cit.*, 1983: 93f.

[228]K.R. Norman, *Op. Cit.*,1983: 95.

[229]M. Winternitz 1933: 164; K.R. Norman, *Op. Cit.*,1983: 95.

3

IRON, URBANIZATION AND BUDDHISM

Like the date of the Buddha, the issue of the background to the origin of Buddhism has generated a lot of controversy. The period in which the Buddha was born had already witnessed the origin and development of an urban culture. The effect of such a culture was at once both agonizing and emancipating. The old socio-religious order with its ideological foundations in the Brāhmaṇical ritualism had not been able to establish itself in a commanding position on the eastern flanks of the Vedic culture. However, the new social setup of urbanization further exacerbated this ideological vacuum. The consequence was the rise of a whole new range of religio-philosophical speculation. The exigencies of an exceptional situation such as this, demanded not just new answers, but new ethos as well. This saw the mushrooming of a unique class of professional seekers who sought to formulate the fabric of that new ethos by cogitating over a fresh set of questions and their possible answers.

Initially, some scholars proposed that Buddhism was just a protest movement against the different developments (such as destruction of life through the cult of sacrifices, appearance of superstition and intellectual bedlam, inequalities of gender and caste etc.) that had taken place in the pre-Buddhist period. It was suggested by scholars like S. Radhakrishnan[1] and D.R. Bhandarkar[2] that Buddhism was an ethical system that was endeavouring to cleanse the Vedic religion of its aberrations. The weakness of the views of Radhakrishnan and Bhandarkar lay in the fact that they viewed Buddhism purely as an ideological protest movement without any economic or social ramifications. G.C. Pande[3] and G.S.P. Mishra[4] saw the emergence of Buddhism in the resurrection of the non-and-pre-Āryan ascetic (*samaṇic*) tradition, which unlike Brāhmaṇism, was based on detachment. In their opinion, this tradition, which laid stress on world negation and world renunciation, was overpowered by the activistic culture during the Ṛg Vedic period. However, the ascetic tradition reasserted itself and was accepted by the suffering humanity when, according to Pande, the Vedic equation of work and worship, wealth and welfare, man and nature was rudely broken.[5] Buddhism became the most successful because it was the most systematic and articulate expression of the pre-Vedic and non-Āryan ascetic culture. The flaw in this hypothesis is that though it cannot be denied that Buddhism borrowed and improved upon certain concepts of the pre-Buddhist period, the originality and wholeness of Buddhism is undeniable. Sociologists like G.S. Ghurye[6] and N. Dutt[7] suggested that Buddhism and its contemporary faiths resulted from the struggle for social hegemony waged by the khattiyas against the brāhmaṇas. According to them, the khattiyas began asserting their importance in a situation where the brāhmaṇas held a monopoly in performing rituals and thus, held supremacy over other sections of the society including the khattiyas. In order to attack the pretensions of the brāhmaṇas, the khattiyas sought help from the masses, especially from the emerging prosperous sections of the society like business magnates. Though it cannot be denied that the khattiyas resented the brāhmaṇical pretensions,

[1]S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, vol.1, London: Library of Philosophy, 1923: 352.

[2]Reference from G.B. Upreti, *The Early Buddhist World Outlook in Historical Perspective*, Delhi: Manohar, 1997: 25.

[3]G.C. Pande, *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*, Allahabad: University of Allahabad, 1957: 251-332; "On the Question of the Social Origins of Buddhism," Mahesh Tiwary (ed), *Bodhi-Raśmi*, New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984: 5-8; □*ramaṇa Tradition: Its History and Contribution to Indian Culture*, Allahabad, 1978.

[4]G.S.P. Mishra, *The Age of Vinaya*, New Delhi, 1972; *Development of Buddhist Ethics*, New Delhi, 1984.

[5]G.C. Pande, *Op. Cit.* (1984): 62.

[6]G.S. Ghurye, *Caste and Race in India*, London, 1932: 67.

[7]N.Dutt, *Origin and Growth of Caste in India* vol. 1, Calcutta, 1968.

but such a resentment is not a sufficient explanation for the rise of movements like Buddhism. It is true that not only that the Buddha was born in a khattiya family and that the kings of the time provided support to Buddhism, but also Buddhism places the khattiyas before the brāhmaṇas in the class hierarchy. Some friction, as was obviously to be expected, may have existed between these two non-producing classes, but too much stress cannot be laid upon it. However, T.W. Rhys Davids[8] felt that animism of the Ṛg Vedic period, which developed into the cult of *ātman* or individuality, attacked everything that was socially healthy; and Buddhism, in turn, attacked this process in order to reverse it. A.N. Bose[9] proposed that Buddhism like Protestantism was the byproduct of the rising fortunes of the merchants and the monarchs. Similarly, Richard Fick felt that the drunkenness, cruelty, corruptibility, untruthfulness, unrighteousness of many kings and the readiness of many *purohitas* often helping kings to carry out their desires may have created difficult times for common folks.[10] Rahul Sankrityayana[11] suggested that the Buddha, being influenced by the contemporary social trends, rewarded the merchants, monarchs and usurers by laying down rules which favoured their class interest. D.D. Kosambi pointed out that various types of social, economic and political changes had dislocated the society at different levels and there coexisted distinct sets of social groups in various stages of development.[12] In his opinion, though iron came into use during the post-Vedic period, yet the economic resources were over-strained as a result of the sacrificial cult which, in turn, promoted the interests of the two upper classes at the cost of the producing class. The producing class, in turn, was looking for a new social philosophy that would ensure the smooth growth of culture. Due to the advent of brāhmaṇical ideas and institutions in the middle Gaṅgā region, the producing class could buy the very bonafides of the brāhmaṇical ideology.[13] Modifying Kosambi's view, D.P. Chattopadhyaya[14] advanced the thesis that as the religious movements in the post-Vedic period had a far wider view than the ritualistic nature of brāhmaṇism, they were not contented with it. In his opinion, the tribals organization had already begun to disintegrate from within.[15] In their frantic drive for conquest and expansion, the early monarchies were systematically annihilating the surviving free tribes. And within the orbits of their direct domination, new phenomena- "base greed, brutal sensuality, sordid avarice, selfish plunder of common possessions"- phenomena that were unknown to tribals recently left behind, were emerging.[16] In other words, the emergence of private property, subversion of tribal solidarity, rise of autocratic monarchies and the growth of anti-social tendencies such as himsā, greed etc. and the institutions of mortgage, tax, usury- traumatized the populace. In a traumatizing situation such as this, the Buddha offered an ideology which could provide psychological comfort to the populace. The Buddha, instead of going into the causes of such developments, provided them with a perfect solution by replacing the material suffering by universal suffering. Those who elected to be ascetics were sheltered in the Buddhist Saṃgha modeled on tribal mode of life, i.e., based on liberty, equality and fraternity. According to Trevor Ling,[17] the development of agriculture in this region witnessed a high density of population and urbanization. And urbanization, in turn, led to individualism at the social level and autocratic monarchism at the political level. Growth of individualism and monarchy led to

[8]T.W. Rhys Davids, *The History and Literature of Buddhism*, Varanasi, reprint, 1975: 26.

[9]A.N. Bose, *The Social and Rural Economy of North-East India*, vol. 2, Calcutta, 1945: 266-67.

[10]R. Fick, *Social Organization in North-East India in Buddha's Time*, tr. S.K. Mitra, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1920: 101-02.

[11]R. Sankrityayana *et al*, *Buddhism: The Marxist Approach*, N. Delhi: PPH, 1978.

[12]D.D. Kosambi, *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1956: 40.

[13]*Ibid*.167ff.

[14]D.P. Chattopadhyaya, *Lokāyata*, New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1978: 459ff.

[15]*Ibid*. 468.

[16]*Ibid*.

[17]Trevor O. Ling, *The Buddha: Buddhist Civilization in India and Ceylon*, London: Temple Smith, 1976: 104-117.

the unsettling of the individual morally and spiritually. This dilemma created dissatisfaction in the human condition and for the Buddha this point of individual suffering became the starting point of his analysis of the human condition.

Some scholars believe that the increased use of iron technology resulted in qualitative changes in the society towards the end of the Vedic period and gave birth to the Gaṅgā Urbanization. The birth of Buddhism is further linked with the rise of the Gaṅgā Urbanization. In other words, the birth of Buddhism is seen as resulting from the increased use of iron tools in the Gaṅgā plains. They point out that iron technology played an important role in the field of agriculture leading to production of surplus and thus, creating urban centres based on the economy of crafts and trade. This urbanization engendered many problems which had to be addressed at the ideological level so that the agricultural base could grow further and the prevailing social structure could become more consolidated. It was because of this, these scholars believe, that the Buddha condemned the killing of cattle and provided legitimacy to trade, commerce, usury etc. He socially accepted the alienated women and public eating houses. Buddhist monks were advised to lead a simple and pure life in order to draw the masses towards Buddhism by presenting a contrasting picture to the ostentatious, greedy and extravagant Brāhmaṇical priests. In this way, the increased use of iron technology is seen as responsible for the birth and success of Buddhism. It may be worthwhile here to examine this hypothesis in detail.

The issue of the role of iron in the context of ancient India was taken up in the early 1950s, when D.D. Kosambi laid stress on the use of iron in the age of the Buddha.[18] After him this issue was further taken up and supported by a number of scholars who assigned a significant role to iron technology.[19] The proponents of this hypothesis point out that from the sixth century BCE onwards, iron implements played a significant role in the clearing of thick vegetation in the middle Gaṅgā basin for the purposes of cultivation as well as settlement. Though they accept that fire too may have been helpful, but are not prepared to concede the vanguard role of clearing the jungles to anything but iron tools. As per this hypothesis, it would not have been possible to remove the burnt stumps, even if fire was used.[20] Further, in the middle-Gaṅgā basin, we are told, trees strike horizontal roots and cultivation becomes difficult unless the roots are cleared with iron axe and hoe. The Northern Black Polished Ware (NBPW)[21] settlements in this region did not have enough population and stone tools were insufficient to accomplish this job. Moreover, it is claimed that without the use of iron-axes and spades, the roots and stumps of the trees of tropical forest were not possible to clear and crops like sugar cane, mustard, paddy-seedlings need very deep ploughing, which would have been impossible without an iron ploughshare particularly in the hard and clayey soil of Bihar and eastern Uttar Pradesh. In other words, the clearing of roots could not be done without the help of iron technology.[22] It is also

---

[18]D.D. Kosambi, "Ancient Kosala and Magadha," *JBBRAS*, XXVIII, 1952: 108-123; "The Beginning of the Iron Age in India," *JESHO*, VI, Pt. III, 1963: 309-318.

[19]For instance, N.R. Banerjee, *The Iron Age of India*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass: 1965; D.P. Agrawal, "Steps Towards Urban Revolution in the Doab: Archaeological and Ecological Data," cyclostyled paper, 1971; K. Deva, "Observations on Chakrabarti's Paper," *Purātattva*, 6, 1972-73: 33-34; M.C. Joshi, "Observations on Chakrabarti's Paper," *Purātattva*, 6, 1972-73: 35; and "Early Historical Urban Growth in India: Some Observations," *Purātattva*, 7, 1974: 90-91; R.S. Sharma; "Material Background of the Origin of Buddhism," M. Sen & M.B. Rao (eds), *Das Capital Centenary Volume: A Symposium*, Delhi: People's Publishing House: 1968: 58-66; "Material Milieu of the Birth of Buddhism," a paper read at the *29th Conference of the Orientalists*, Paris, 1974; "Iron and Urbanization in the Gaṅgā Plain," *IHR*, I, 1974: 98-103; *Perspectives in Social and Economic History of Early India*, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal: 1983: 105-127; *Material Culture and Social Formation in Ancient India*, first edition, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal:1983, paperback reprint, Madras: Macmillan: 1992: 89-134; R. Thapar, *Ancient Indian Social History: Some Interpretations*, New Delhi: Sangam Publishers: 1978: 236-37; S.P. Gupta, "Two Urbanizations in India: A Study of Their Social Structure," *Purātattva*, 1974: 53-60.

[20]R.S. Sharma, *Perspectives in Social…: 120.*

[21]Though the date of the NBPW is still not settled, c.500-200 BCE may be taken as reasonably representative of the Gaṅgā valley.

[22]R.S. Sharma, *Perspectives in Social…: 92.*

pointed out that the soil in most of the middle-Gaṅgā basin is hard and it could not have been possible to cultivate it with a wooden plough.[23] Sharma, however, pointed out that literary evidence particularly the early Pāli literature and the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇinī refer to iron tools like ploughshares, axes, hoes, sickles, hammers etc. According to him, these literary sources are also corroborated to a large extent by the findings of iron ploughshares at Kosāmbi and Vesāli, the socketed iron-axes at Kosāmbi, Vesāli and Bārāṇasī; and sickles, hoes etc. in places like Vesāli, Prahlādpur etc.[24] However, the absence of iron tools meant for agriculture during this period is explained away through ecological effect. Sharma proposed that the acidic, highly humid, warm-alluvial soil of western Uttar Pradesh and Bihar being highly corrosive, proved to be bad for the preservation of iron artifacts and through oxidation reduced them to brown-reddish dust.[25] In the later period, when steel came into use as against wrought iron, the tools proved more lasting and serviceable and thus, one can find them in the excavations. Moreover, it is pointed out, the sites that have been dug so far are administrative, commercial, craft or religious centres such as Campā, Rājagaha, Bārāṇasī etc. and are not the right places for agricultural tools. Apart from this, defectiveness of the methods employed in the excavations of the various settlements is also blamed for the absence of these tools.[26] Some indirect evidence is also seen for the use of iron technology in the cutting of punch-marked coins, as early as 500 BCE. The appearance of large scale wooden structures which were seen by Megasthenes is also visualized only through the use of iron technology. Thus, it is argued that *unprecedented growth* of the crafts, industries and some occupations was initiated by iron technology.[27] In a nutshell, use of iron on this scale is seen as resulting in a revolution in agriculture, which in turn produced surplus and this surplus led to the origin of trade, commerce and urbanization; and ultimately to the birth of Buddhism.[28]

This theory of the revolutionary role of iron has not found acceptance with many scholars. Niharranjan Ray initially raised objections on the ground that the introduction of iron technology and iron implements in the Gaṅgā-Yamunā valley before the beginning of the Moriyan rule was of such a scale as to induce social changes which are held to have been triggered off by the technological changes associated with the use of iron.[29] He further wrote that the archaeological evidence did not indicate any large scale clearance of the forests through the use of iron technology. Furthermore, iron technology was neither qualitatively nor quantitatively diversified enough to bring about significant social change.[30] His objections appeared valid on the ground that at the Painted Grey Ware (PGW) sites,[31] the iron implements that were discovered included slags and shapeless bits, arrowheads, spearheads, knife-heads, daggers, spades, adzes, hoes etc. and noticeably the list did not include any iron axe (socketed or unsocketed), iron ploughshare or any other iron implement that could possibly be useful for large scale forest clearance and land reclamation leading to extensive agricultural operations which could possibly yield a surplus for rearing up towns and cities.[32] Wooden ploughshares may have been used in cultivation, though hoe-cultivation could have been more universal. The use of words like *hoe* (*kuddāla*)[33] in early Buddhist literature is also an indication of this. Some hoes have

---

[23]R.S. Sharma, *Material Culture*…: 120.

[24]R.S. Sharma, *Perspectives in Social*…: 93.

[25]R.S. Sharma, *Perspectives in Social*…: 93-94. Sharma has taken this cue from H.C. Bharadwaj, "Aspects of Early Technology in India," D.P. Agrawal & A. Ghosh (eds), *Radiocarbon and Indian Archaeology*, Bombay, 1973: 393-397.

[26]R.S. Sharma, *Perspectives in Social*…: 93-94.

[27]*Ibid*: 95.

[28]*Ibid*: 96.

[29]N.R. Ray, "Technology and Social Change," *Purātattva*, No. 8, 1978: 133.

[30]*Ibid*: 133.

[31]PGW may be dated between c.1000-500 BCE, though these dates are not universally accepted.

[32]N.R. Ray, *Op. Cit*.: 133.

[33]Vin.III.144; A.I.204, II.199; D.I.101; S.II.88, V.53; J.V.45.

been found in the excavations and iron technology could not have come into full play before the Moriyas.[34] It may also be interesting to note that the beam of a ploughshare (*naṅgala-īsā*)[35] could have been made of anything ranging from wood to even the tusk of an elephant.[36] Though iron became the basic technological element from the NBPW level, an extensive use of iron artifacts is not testified by the early NBPW levels of any site. In a slow-moving society the effect of iron is likely to have been slow[37] and "did not produce any *spurt* in the material prosperity of the society."[38] Thus, the role of iron cannot be seen as more than a stabilizer as against an initiator.[39]

It may be pointed out here that iron was known in the Gaṅgā valley as a whole by about c.1000 BCE or thereabouts and iron technology got widely disseminated in the valley in the first half of the first millennium BCE.[40] The hypothesis about the absence of agricultural tools because of unrewarding soil does not appear tenable. The so-called acidic and humid soil could not have discriminated against agricultural tools as against pins, nails etc. which are available in the excavations during the period under consideration. Hence, the idea of a sudden and revolutionary role of iron technology in the age of the Buddha does not appear to be convincing. Interestingly, the iron deposits of Bihar were not in use till the end of the Mughal Empire.[41] Iron must have been imported from elsewhere, possibly from one of the iron-mines at Malpur (Rājasthān), Narwar (Rājasthān), Kaliñjar (about 70 miles south-west of Allāhābād), Maṇḍī (Himāchal Pradesh), Rāmgarh (Kumāoṅ Hills), Burhānpur (Central India), Gañjam (Orissā) and Gwālior region.[42]

As far as the question of clearance of forests is concerned, there could have been an ample number of possibilities. The role of fire cannot be undervalued, especially when we know that even with modern equipment it is very difficult to tackle wild fires. Even if some stumps could not be destroyed by fire, there may not have been an immediate need for removing each and every stump, especially when enough land was available. Moreover, all the land surely could not have been covered by forests. Considering the population of those days, large portion of which depended upon hunting and various types of wild growth, it is a moot point whether there was any serious need for claiming forest land on a large scale for the purposes of cultivation. Early Buddhist literature is full of stories and references to jungles and it will be unwise to believe that most jungles were cleared before the Moriyan period. It may also be interesting to note that the forest clearing tool kit was already present in the PGW period. Thus, jungles could have been cleared equally effectively with copper-bronze tools if need be. Though the number of tools in the NBPW period increases twofold, the area for this ware is also almost double and the numerical increase is basically made by smaller objects like nails etc. We do not find any appreciable change either in the technology or the extensiveness of the use of tools from the PGW to the NBPW period.[43] Surveys conducted in some areas in the Gaṅgā valley show that

---

[34]N.R. Ray, *Op. Cit*: 130-138.

[35]S.I.104.

[36]See e.g. PED. *s.v. nangala-īsā*.

[37]A. Ghosh, "Observations on Chakrabarti's Paper," *Purātattva*, 6, 1972-73: 35.

[38]A. Ghosh, *The City in Early Historic India*, Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1973: 10.

[39]D.K. Chakrabarti, "The Study of Iron Age in India," *Purātattva*, Nos. 13-14, 1984: 85.

[40]*Ibid*. For details and discussion on the beginning of iron in India, see D.H. Gordon 1950: 58-78; N.R. Banerjee, *The Iron Age of India*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass: 1965: 4-5, 224-225; D.K. Chakrabarti, Op. Cit.: 1973: 336-338; "The Beginning of Iron in India," *Antiquity*, 50 (198), 1976: 114-124; "Distribution of Iron Ores and Archaeological Evidence of Early Iron in India," *JESHO*, XX, Part II, 1977: 166-185; "Iron in Early Indian Literature," *JRAS*, 1979: 22-30; "The Study of Iron Age in India," *Purātattva*, Nos. 13-14, 1984: 81-85; F.R. Allchin & B. Allchin, *The Rise of Civilization in India and Pakistan,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1982: 345.

[41]See e.g. the details in I. Habib 1982: 41 and map 10B.

[42]I. Habib, *An Atlas of the Mughal Empire*, 1982: 38 and maps nos. 4B, 6B, 8B, 9B.

[43]M. Lal, "Iron Tools, Forest Clearance and Urbanization in the Gangetic Plains," *Man and Environment*, X, 1986: 85.

possibly there was not much need for any forest clearance at all. For instance, in Kanpur district, which quite well represents the Gaṅgā plains, a survey has shown that during this period not more than 3% of the total land was actually needed for cultivation and most of it was available on the soft alluvial soils along the rivers and lakes and other open areas in the forests.[44] Early Buddhist literature is at least silent about the jungle clearing activity and it seems that a laconic cue from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa has been taken rather too far. It may further be pointed out that soil is ploughed only when it has a sufficient quantity of humidity in it, because without humidity seeds simply would not germinate. It would be difficult to hear of a peasant who would try to plough his land for rice cultivation (staple food of the Gaṅgā basin) unless not only a sufficient supply of water is available for a longer period of time but also the soil is quite wet and soft at the time of the ploughing. Therefore, a wooden plough may prove equally useful though not as lasting. Moreover, before rice saplings are planted, the land is thoroughly kneaded with a heavy wooden-plank and this process is the most important part of wet-rice cultivation.

Despite the fact that iron had been in use in the Gaṅgā valley from about c.1000 BCE, one cannot see real changes in size categories and the general settlement pattern till during the NBPW period, a time by which urbanism had become an established fact. If iron were the main causative factor in the early historic urban growth in the Gaṅgā valley, this departure in size categories and settlement patterns would have taken place in the PGW period itself.[45] Thus, it may be reasonable to assume that before iron technology became fully established in the Gaṅgā basin, its development was spread over a long span of time, at least between c.700 BCE and the Moriyas. This new technological element may have indeed strengthened the economic base which was primarily laid down by the neolithic-chalcolithic settlers, but it may not be taken for granted that the advent of iron was the basic causative factor of urbanization in the Gaṅgā valley.

Urbanization did not develop suddenly in the Gaṅgā valley. Its development was an integral part of the overall development of the society in the Gaṅgā valley. Various institutions which played their role in the origin and development of urbanization in the Gaṅgā valley had a long history of their development. Almost all the important cities in the age of the Buddha were capitals of various important kingdoms and hence centres of political power. They were extensions of rural settlements where, with the passage of time, the ruling classes organized and established themselves with all their pomp and glory. Moreover, in the fifth century BCE, the number and size of those settlements which could be called urban, were hardly of a magnitude that would call for a major and sudden shift in the mode of production.

THE QUESTION OF SURPLUS

The concept of surplus sometimes appears as the causal factor, but more often it is regarded as a necessary, if not sufficient cause of development. Its application to evolutionary change may be divided into two main parts.[46] Firstly, surplus is taken to represent that quantity of material resources which exist over and above the substance requirements of a society in question. Herskovits defined it as "an excess of goods over the minimum demands of necessity"[47] and to Childe, *social surplus* was the "food above domestic requirements."[48] It is pointed out that such surpluses which appeared with advancing technology and productivity, distinguished one level of social and economic organization from another.

---

[44]Ibid.

[45]D.K. Chakrabarti, *Op. Cit.* (1984).

[46]The issue of surplus has been discussed in the light of the observations of H.W. Pearson ("The Economy has no Surplus: A Critique of the Theory of Surplus," K. Polanyi *et al* (eds), *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957: 320-341).

[47]M.J. Herskovits, *Economic Anthropology*, New York, 1952: 395.

[48]V. Gordon Childe, "The Birth of Civilization," *Past and Present*, II, Nov. 1952: 3.

Secondly, surplus is seen as the root cause of typical social and economic developments of prime importance. Trade and markets, money, cities, differentiation into social classes, indeed civilization itself, are thus, seen as consequences of the emergence of surplus.[49]

These two points clearly imply that there is a level of subsistence which once reached provides a measure over which the surplus comes into existence. This surplus which is beyond needs, howsoever these happen to be defined, is then in some sense available: it may be traded abroad, or used to support the existence of craftsmen, a leisure class, or other non-productive members of the society. In other words, it becomes the key variable in the emergence of more complex social and economic institutions. But, as the term *surplus* is applied to that which is over and above subsistence needs, subsistence needs need to be defined. These needs may be determined either biologically or socially. As it is difficult to determine the subsistence minimum for an individual, it is impossible to determine the minimum biological needs of the whole society. It is well known that large or small sections of the populations of almost every society live at a level of subsistence which is considered scientifically inadequate. Even if, let us say for the sake of argument, subsistence needs can be determined biologically, then the surplus which is said to arise after these needs are met, would be an absolute surplus, i.e., it would be a quantity appearing with no socially defined purpose over and above that which is biologically necessary. If it is held that subsistence needs are not biologically but socially defined, there is no room for the concept of absolute surplus, for then the distribution of economic resources between subsistence and other requirements is determined only within the total context of needs thus defined. Bare subsistence needs cannot be separated from the total functional demands which the society makes on the economy. If the concept of surplus is to be applied here at all, it must be in a relative or constructive sense, i.e., a given quantity of goods or services would be surplus only if the society in some manner set these quantities aside and declared them to be available for a specific purpose. Into this category might then fall such things as food for ceremonial feasts and sacrifices as was done in the Vedic period onwards in anticipation of a future dearth. It is true that such surpluses may be made to appear along with a windfall increase of material means or a more permanent rise in production capacity; but they may also be created by reallocating goods or services from one use to another making no difference whatsoever in the quantity of subsistence. More important than the natural conditions associated with the creation of relative surpluses is, thus, an attitude toward resources, and the institutional means of counting out, setting aside, and making available. Actually the idea of a subsistence level can only be used in an altruistic sense.

Economy at all levels of material existence is a social process of interaction between man and his environment in the course of which goods and services change form, are moved about and change hands. The shape of this process is determined not by any single factor but is the sum total of several interdependent levels of human existence, ecological, technological, social and cultural. "Man, living in society, does not produce a surplus unless he names it as such, and then its effect is given by the manner in which it is institutionalized."[50] Of course, it cannot be denied that changing technology and productivity play their role in the course of institutional development. The argument here is simply that they do not create generally available surpluses, for this implies a separation of technological development from the institutional complex of which it is but a part. There "are definite institutional requirements for the creation of relative surpluses... the operational facilities, as well as the motivation for separating out, counting up, storing, mobilizing material means and human services must be provided by the institutional framework of the economy, if surpluses are to be made available for

---

[49]V. Gordon Childe, *What Happened in History?*, Harmondsworth: Pelican Books: 1942; "The Birth of Civilization," *Past and Present*, II, Nov. 1952; M.J. Herskovits, *Op. Cit.*; R.H. Hilton, "The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism," *Science and Society*, XVII, 4, Fall 1953.

[50]H.W. Pearson, "The Economy has no Surplus: A Critique of the Theory of Surplus," K. Polanyi *et al* (eds), *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957: 326.

specific purposes."[51] It also must be taken into consideration that study of primitive man has shown that he did not live by a day-to-day satisfaction of his needs but showed foresight and engaged in forms of abstinence.[52] Nor can be ignored the importance of the *prestige factor*. Certain animals, though they can form an important part of food material, are not eaten because they represent certain prestige values of a society.

Finally, it may be said that there are perennially omnipresent potential surpluses available. What counts is the institutional means for bringing them into existence. And as far as the Indian situation was concerned, political centralization of power was impossible to avoid if surplus had to be made available. In the ancient Malthusian world, scarcity often struck and the people at the end of the queue died as a result. The ones who must die were demarcated in advance. Thus, agricultural revolution or no agricultural revolution, the first cities of the Gaṅgā valley, always managed to squeeze out a surplus as long as they were centres of strong political powers. After a certain stage, the development that took place in agriculture was to a great extent dictated by the demands of the urban centres and not the other way round.

In primitive and egalitarian societies *covert* surplus exists but it is used to support the weak and in providing a hedge against environmental uncertainties. But in redistributive societies, it is forced apart as surplus products. In other words, some sort of surplus exists in all social groups. It is only the *cornering* of this surplus by one element and its subsequent use to exploit other elements that triggers off the urbanization sequence. We must also remember that despite scarcity and inadequacy, even the poorest sing, dance and fight wars, thus using their resources in non-utilitarian ways.

In India till recent times it was not possible to produce or foresee a long-term and dependable surplus. The periodical droughts and floods caused scarcity which not only ate away the surplus but caused famine-conditions, making the accumulation of surplus impossible. The producer in the field, therefore, suffered more (and still does) than the privileged consumer in the city, who would have the authority to squeeze out whatever is left with the producer and has the wherewithal to obtain food-stuffs from distant lands where conditions have not been adverse. We do not come across any impressive godowns or grain storehouses in the excavations or in the literature. It seems the urban centres depended upon the seasonal supply of grains and in cases of scarcity, villages and the common masses had to bear the brunt. More than surplus or even the capacity to produce surplus, what was therefore, was a socio-political institution to force or induce the farmer to shed a portion of whatever he had. The same institution was needed to divert the surplus to where it was required, and to procure food (again by coercion or for consideration) from distant hinterlands should the crop in the near hinterland fail. For procurement by coercion, which would include taxes and tributes, an administrative authority is required and by commercial means a mercantile system is called for. The prerequisite, therefore, is not a hypothetical surplus, but an administrative and mercantile organization- the ruler and the merchant, both of the city and each the ally of the other in history. Surplus was, thus, not a technical but a social product; "the institution created the surplus, which is not *there* the moment it is technically possible but only after it has been institutionalized through taxes, trade and other means."[53] The non-agricultural aspect is dominant in the procurement, and therefore in the production of surplus.[54] Moreover, certain built-in incentives to population growth also cannot be ignored. Children can be employed earlier in the productive process than among hunter-gatherers. Instead of passively exploiting the existing land, it can be extended by bringing more area under cultivation resulting in an increase in the number and size of agricultural communities. Slaves (*dāsas*) and forced labour (*viṣṭi*), thus, could have been another way of making surplus available. As far as the technological inventions are concerned, most of the pre-industrial inventions and discoveries took place

[51]*Ibid*: 335.

[52]R. Firth, *Op. Cit*.: 9.

[53]P.M. Hauser & L. Schnore, Hauser, *The Study of Urbanization*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965: 270.

[54]A. Ghosh, *Op. Cit*, (1973): 21.

during the 1000 years or so immediately preceding 3000 BCE. Thus, the great change between urban and a pre-urban stage came in realms of life other than core technology. "The later technological superiority… may have had little to do with the processes which brought the city into being."[55] It may also be pointed out that, strictly speaking, regular armies, which perhaps must have made storage of foodstuffs a necessity, did not come into existence at least till the beginning of the expansionist policy of the Magadhan king Ajātasattu.

URBANIZATION AND BUDDHISM

Weber perhaps was the first scholar to put forward the idea that Buddhism was the creation of a city culture. According to him, "Buddhism presents itself as a product of the time of urban development, of urban kingship and the city nobles."[56] He further emphasized the point that "as a whole early Buddhism was the product not of the underprivileged but of very positively privileged strata."[57] Buddhism of early days depended very heavily on the donations and munificence of the rich and the influential and there is no doubt that Buddhism reflects its dependence on cities and their rich inhabitants in more than one way.[58] Urbanization created Buddhism and more than that was certainly vital for its early popularity and material support. A decay of that urbanism in later days was an important point in the decline of Buddhism, as it sapped some of the socially vital foundations of the Buddhist movement.[59] "The urban palace with its elephant-riding kings was characteristic of Buddha's time. Moreover, the dialect form reflects the advent of city culture."[60]

With the rise of urbanism, different kinds of new social, economic, religious and political forces came into existence. Emergence of urban centres, well-defined trade-routes, coinage and trade and commerce in the days of the Buddha, helped create a new and powerful class of merchant-bankers, like Anāthapiṇḍika of Sāvatthī, one of Buddhism's greatest patrons. Along with this new merchant class, a new kind of state was emerging about the time when the Buddha was completing his long ministry of 45 years.[61] The most prominent representatives of this political transformation were the kings Bimbisāra of Magadha and Pasenadi of Kosala, both of whom were claimed by the Buddha as his personal friends and patrons. New kinds of armies and instruments of war as well as the expressed needs of the new mercantile class formed the basis of the power of these monarchies.[62] Prostitutes from different urban centres like Sāvatthī (Ambapāli), Hatthinīpura (Serinī), were regarded in high esteem by the new social order and Buddhism avoids censuring them. In fact, it may be important to notice that whereas young people, debtors, soldiers, diseased people and married women had various kinds of restrictions imposed upon them by Buddhism in connection with their entry into the Saṃgha, prostitutes were free to join the faith of the Buddha.

The following two tables strongly attest to the urban character of ancient Indian Buddhism.

Place of Birth	Frequency	Percentage

---

[55]R. McC Adams, "The Origins of Cities," *Scientific American*, 203 (3), 1966: 153-172.

[56]M. Weber, *The Religion of India*, nd: 204. (The text seems to have been written in the 1920s or so).

[57]*Ibid*: 227.

[58]K.T.S. Sarao, *Op. Cit*: (1985).

[59]B.G. Gokhale, "Early Buddhism and the Urban Revolution," *JIABS*, Vol. 5(2), 1982: 19.

[60]M. Weber, *Op. Cit*: 205.

[61]B.G. Gokhale, *Op. Cit*. (1982): 7.

[62]See for details D.D. Kosambi, "Ancient Kosala and Magadha," *JBBRAS*, XXVIII, 1952: 103; J. Rai, *The Rural-Urban Economy and Social Changes in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1974: 165ff.

Urban	223	84.47
Rural	041	15.53
Total	267	100.00

Table 1: Birthplaces of the Bodhisattvas of the *Jātakas*.

Place of Birth	Frequency	Percentage
Urban	1289	93.74
Rural	0086	06.26
Total	1375	100.00

Table 2: Native places of persons mentioned in the Pāli *Vinaya* and *Sutta Piṭaka*.

The Bodhisattva was born 315 times as a human being in the *Jātakas* and in 51 of these cases it is not possible to know the place of birth of the Bodhisatta. Of the remaining 264 births, he is born 223 times (84.47%) at an urban place and only 41 times (15.53%) at a rural place. The urban character of early Buddhism is further proved by Table 2. Of all the persons mentioned in the Pāli *Vinaya* and *Sutta Piṭaka*, the native background of 1375 persons can be found out. Of these, 1289 persons, i.e., 93.74% of the total came from urban places as compared to only 86 persons, i.e., 6.26 who came from rural places. Table 3 also further confirms this argument. Of the total 229 births as Bodhisatta where the professional background of the Bodhisatta is available, only 32 times, i.e., less than 14% of the times he is either born in or adopts a low profession. More than 86% of the times he is either a king/ prince, a rich businessman or a high state-official. Preference shown for high professions, urbane background and elitism for its characters is quite apparent in the *Jātakas* as well as other texts of the Pāli *Vinaya* and *Sutta Piṭaka*.[63]

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
King/ Prince	86	37.55
Merchant/Rich man	57	24.89
High Official	54	23.58
Low Professions	32	13.98
Total	229	100.00

Table 3: Occupational background of the Bodhisattvas

The Pāli Tipiṭaka abounds in examples where city-richness, pomp and show are praised, and especially those who had access to them are unequivocally praised for their huge donations to the order. In theory Buddhism professed to give up worldly pleasures, but in practice the life style of Buddhist monks gave birth to jealousy in the hearts of the common masses. The issue is clinched by the story of a young

---

[63]See Appendices III & IV.

man who became a monk thinking "day and night I am toiling away with my hands at all sorts of tasks, yet never do I taste food so sweet. I must become a monk myself."[64]

The social heroes of early Buddhism are the great merchant-bankers and the new kings, perhaps in that order of importance. Anāthapiṇḍika, who was one of the richest urbanites of his days is regarded by the Buddha as a saviour of the faith. His house "was to the saṃgha like a pool dug where few roads meet."[65] We are told in the *Jātakas* that Anāthapiṇḍika alone lavished 54 crores on the monastery of the Buddha.[66] After the Bodhisatta and Ānanda, Anāthapiṇḍika is the most popular figure in the *Jātakas*. [67] The Jetavana, where the Buddha spent most of his Rainy Retreats, was a very expensive place indeed. Most of the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* was recited in this garden only. References to this garden, with the Buddha staying in it, make quite an interesting reading as shown in table 4.

Text	Frequency of the Jetavana
The Vinaya Piṭaka	196
The Dīgha Nikāya	005
The Majjhima Nikāya	078
The Saṃyutta Nikāya	075
The Aṅguttara Nikāya	050
The Jātakas	574

Table 4: Frequency of Jetavana in various Pāli texts

It may be interesting to note that whereas pre-Buddhist literature has almost exclusively for its background a rural milieu, the literature of early Buddhism breathes a new urban spirit. Curiously enough, the practice of *vassāvāsa* (rainy retreat) which created the institution of the monastery (*āvāsa*) led to the *socialization* of what had begun primarily as an asocial movement.[68] Moreover, the early Buddhist elite had clearly shown a weakness for wealth, pomp and show. Majority of them including the Buddha himself lived around the various urban centres most of the time. In two separate statistical studies[69] it was found that in frequency of reference, urban centres far outnumbered rural settlements.[70] Of the 1009 place names, collected from the *Vinaya* and *Sutta Piṭaka* where a *sutta* or rule was delivered, the break up was found as follows:[71]

---

[64]J.I.311.

[65]J.I.227.

[66]J.I.226.

[67]He appears 66 times in the Jātakas alone.

[68]B.G. Gokhale, *Op. Cit*.(1982): 8.

[69]One which was prepared specially for this chapter and is based on appendices III and IV. Appendix III is based on the *Jātakas* and Appendix IV has used all the names of men and women mentioned in the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, *Dīgha Nikāya*, *Majjhima Nikāya* and the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* and their caste, urban/ rural background, name of the place they belonged to etc have been collected. The other study was conducted by B.G. Gokhale, *Op. Cit*.(1982).

[70]B.G. Gokhale, *Op. Cit*.(1982): 11.

[71]After B.G. Gokhale, *Op. Cit*.(1982): 10.

Settlement	Frequency	Percentage
Sāvatthī	593	58.77
Rājagaha	140	13.87
Kapilavatthu	056	05.55
Vesālī	038	03.76
Kosambī	015	01.46
Other cities & villages	167	16.57

Table 5: Frequency of *Suttas*/ Rules delivered at various places.

As can be seen from Table 5, five cities alone accounted for 83.43%, while the rest 16.57% covered 76 separate places which apart from rural settlements, did include many urban centres. The following table prepared on the basis of Appendix II also proves this point. The references to urban settlements are overwhelming as compared to the rural settlements:

Settlement Type	Frequency	Percentage
Urban	4257	95.37
Rural	0208	04.67
Total	4465	100.00

Table 6: Textual references to urban and rural settlements.

Of the 2426 men and women[72] mentioned in the *Vinaya* and *Sutta Piṭaka* the rural/ urban background of 1379 could be determined. Of these, as many as 1291, i.e., 93.62% came from urban background and only 88, i.e., 6.38% could be said to have come from rural centres. Equally important was the fact as reflected in the following table:

Settlement	Total number of Persons	Percentage

---

[72]See appendix IV.

Bārāṇasī	273	22.92
Sāvatthī	165	13.85
Rājagaha	109	09.15
Kapilavatthu	055	04.70
Vesālī	042	03.53
Mithilā	038	03.19
Añjana	018	01.51
Haṃsavatī	017	01.43
Kosambī	015	01.26
Ujjenī	014	01.18
Kampila	014	01.18
Campā	013	01.09
Kusinārā	011	00.92
Sāketa	010	00.84
Indapatta	010	00.84
Sāgala	009	00.76
Anomā	009	00.76
Dantapura	008	00.67
Bhaddiya	007	00.59
Bharukaccha	007	00.59
Takkasilā	006	00.50
Ariṭṭhapura	006	00.50
Aruṇavatī	006	00.50
Pāvā	005	00.42
Madhurā	005	00.42
Pāṭaliputta	005	00.42
Devadaha	005	00.42
Sumaṅgala	005	00.42
Other cities & villages	303	25.44
Total	1379	100.00

Table 7: Persons from different settlements.

As can be seen, the top five cities alone made up for more than 54% of all the men and women who are referred to in the *Vinaya* and *Sutta Piṭaka*. The six mahānagaras mentioned in the Buddhist texts,[73] i.e., Bārāṇasī, Rājagaha, Vesālī, Campā, Kosambī and Sāketa alone accounted for more than 40% of them, whereas the top ten urban settlements contributed 62.72% of the men and women who were connected with Buddhism one way or the other.

Text	Urban	%age	Rural	%age

---

[73]D.II.146.

The Vinaya Piṭaka	098	87.50	14	12.50
The Aṅguttara Nikāya	132	88.00	18	12.00
The Dīgha Nikāya	065	73.88	19	22.62
The Majjhima Nikāya	090	84.11	17	15.89
The Saṃyutta Nikāya	111	79.86	28	20.14
The Sutta-Nipāta	130	85.72	05	14.28
The Jātakas	561	95.89	24	04.11
The Thera- & the Therīgāthā	242	89.63	27	10.37
The Caripyapiṭaka	019	90.48	02	09.52
The Apdāna	326	94.77	18	05.23
The Buddhavaṃsa	125	100.00	00	00.00
The Udāna	020	80.00	05	20.00
The Petavatthu	019	90.48	02	09.52
The Vimānavatthu	017	94.44	01	05.54

Table 8: Text-wise urban vs. rural background of various persons

The Buddha is said to have spent at least 25 rainy-retreats in Sāvatthī alone, out of which 19 were spent at the famous Jetavana and the other 6 at the Pubbārāma.[74] One obvious reason for the return of the Buddha to Sāvatthī again and again may have been the presence of powerful patrons such as Anāthapiṇḍika and king Pasenadi as well as the high degree of mercantilism and urbanism presented by the city.[75] New powerful classes of merchant-bankers and kings together lent their distinguishing character to the movement. Early Indian Buddhism drew its major social support from these classes, and in turn, reflected their social and spiritual concerns. These classes needed a new spiritual-social orientation and value-system which Buddhism provided with its opposition to Vedic theology, the dominance of the priest and by supporting indirectly money-lending, prostitution etc. In their value system, the individual (and his family) rather than the *vaṇṇa-jāti* was the centerpiece, and the Buddha articulated such values. Portraying the Buddha as the first great reformer in Indian social history is a gross oversimplification. The Buddha did ignore caste distinctions in the matter of admission into and treatment of individuals within the Saṃgha, but outside it, his attitude was pragmatic, if not ambivalent.[76] When the Buddhists maintained that a person's *jāti* had no bearing on his chances of salvation, they did not attack the operation of the caste system in daily life, as generally believed. Even through his choice of greetings, the Buddha recognized differences in social standing. We are told that the Buddhas are born only in khattiya or brāhmaṇa families and not in any other caste.[77] The Buddha used the *vaṇṇa-jāti* terminology of his times in his reference to existing society and only tended to rank the khattiyas higher than the brāhmaṇas. He ridiculed brāhmaṇical pretensions to ritual purity and social eminence and insisted that a person be judged by his individual virtue rather than his familial, class or social origins, which was precisely the demand of the new urban social classes who felt closer to Buddhism than the traditional brāhmaṇical sacrifice-dominated Vedic cults.[78] These classes were not much interested in speculative metaphysics, for their emphasis was on practical and everyday concerns of making good in this world and assuring one's welfare in the next. This, in part, may explain the relatively a-metaphysical predilection of the early Buddhist movement.[79] Urban centres like Sāvatthī and Rājagaha with supporters like Bimbisāra, Jīvaka and Ajātasattu reflected the importance of royal and bureaucratic support for the success of early Buddhism. Viable environment for Buddhism was

[74]See DPPN.II.1126-27.

[75]B.G. Gokhale, *Op. Cit*.(1982): 12f.

[76]*Ibid*: 19.

[77]See DPPN.II.324.

[78]B.G. Gokhale, *Op. Cit*.(1982): 19.

[79]*Ibid*: 13.

created by extensive trade, accumulation of mercantile capital and the emergence of a powerful class of merchants and bankers- a class which was in search of new ethical values and a religious philosophy of a significantly different character than the one contained in the old Vedic religion.[80]

The Buddhism maintained an extensive and continuous contact with lay devotees during the Buddha's lifetime and for some time after his demise. But by the end of the Moriyan empire, Buddhism appears to have become localized in fixed and well-endowed monasteries, first drawing lay mercantile support, but later, increasingly dependent upon royal endowments. These monasteries came to bear feudal characteristics in their own style. Apart from the textual evidence, epigraphical sources also carry this impression home and the names of donors to Buddhist establishments prove the solid support of guild leaders. The feudal style of the monasteries received a further boost from the perpetuation of the feudalization of Indian economy and society. Some renowned monasteries are known to have issued their own seals and coins.[81] With the passage of time such monasteries came to have their own property in various forms and were able not only to attain self-sufficiency but were also in a position to extend their power and influence in their respective localities through the ownership of land, villages, pasturage and cattle etc.[82] Thus, it may not be far from truth to say that Buddhism provided the ideological superstructure of the growing urbanization[83] and depended increasingly upon it for its own growth.

---

[80]*Ibid*: 17.

[81]P. Niyogi, "Organisation of Buddhist Monasteries in ancient Bengal and Bihar," *Journal of Indian History*, LI (3), 1973: 539.

[82]*Ibid*: 535.

[83]D.D. Kosambi, *Op. Cit*. (1973): 100-104.

4

ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHISM AND AHIṂSĀ

In historic India, the concept of ahiṃsā was used for the first time by the authors of the *Upaniṣads* in connection with the cruelty of Vedic *yajñas*.[1] It is from this that the concept of vegetarianism developed. In the fifth century BCE it was strongly advocated by the Buddha, who included it amongst his main teachings, provided it a theoretical basis and regarded it as of incomparable merit. It may be pointed out that one of the fundamental contributions of Buddhism in the sphere of ahiṃsā was that the image of the wheel (*cakra*) as a symbol of sacred warfare (most famously the chariot wheel) was changed into a symbol of sacred peacemaking (the "dhamma wheel" or *dharmacakra*).[2] Buddhist insights regarding ahiṃsā turn out to be applicable to areas as diverse as environmental ethics, daily living, relations with and ethical considerations regarding other animals, and surely our need to understand the plight of marginalized humans.

Violent actions in the context of early Indian Buddhism may broadly be put in the following four categories:

1. Hiṃsā that took place through organized fighting such as wars, battles etc. and in an unorganized fighting such as murders, suicides, abortions, and euthanasia etc.
2. Hiṃsā that took place in the form of sacrifices in which animal life and sometimes human life was destroyed.
3. Hiṃsā that took place at the hands of hunters, trappers, butchers, fishermen etc. for human food and other needs, especially for medicinal purposes. Thus, human consumption of meat and fish entailed an important form of violence.
4. Hiṃsā that took place through farming and other related activities like digging, irrigating, ploughing, reaping, trampling on grasses and crops, cutting of trees and destruction of *ekindrīya jīva* (one-facultied life) which inhabits plants, trees, soil etc.

We live in a world of mutual injury where life can only be sustained by marginalizing others. In a situation such as this, violence in one form or the other is unavoidable. In order to live, one must eat, and for that most amongst us acquire our food through the capture of various kinds of animal and aquatic life. Some take to vegetarianism to escape such a killing. However, some believe that plants also possess life, and from their point of view even this cannot be called a correct way of life. Moreover, when one is attacked by others, there arises the question of indulging in violence in self-defence. Then, there is the question of various kinds of insects like flies and mosquitoes being regularly eliminated in large numbers in order to minimize the risk of the harmful germs carried by them. Various kinds of drugs also kill germs in the body so that humans can recover from different ailments. As a matter of fact, germ theory which forms the very basis of modern medicine involves elimination of life in different forms. Scientists conduct experiments on animals in order to find cures for diseases that afflict humans. Therefore, if the principle of ahiṃsā is upheld literally, it would be difficult, to say the least, to obtain suitable food to maintain one's own life and probably one shall have

---

[1] *Atha yat tapo dānam ārjavam ahiṃsā satya-vacanam iti, tā asya dakṣiṇāḥ* (*Chāndogya Up*.III.17.4).

[2] Christopher S. Queen, "The Peace Wheel: Nonviolent Activism in the Buddhist Tradition," D.L. Smith-Christopher (ed) *Subverting Hatred: The Challenge of Nonviolence in Religious Traditions*, Boston: Boston Research Center for the 21st Century, 1998:25-28.

to starve oneself to death, i.e., commit suicide. Strictly speaking, suicide is also inconsistent with the principle of ahiṃsā. In other words, the practice of perfect and absolute ahiṃsā in this particular sense is impossible.

However, Buddhism saw the inner feeling of the spirit of ahiṃsā and its outer manifestation in the form of non-violent action, as two different things. Thus, the Buddha based his philosophy of ahiṃsā on this simple fact that even though the action of ahiṃsā maybe difficult to perfect, yet the perfection of the spirit of ahiṃsā is not impossible to cultivate in the heart. In other words, the actual practice of ahiṃsā can only be undertaken on the basis of a true cognition of life, the contradictions of which are difficult to resolve. Recognizing this fact, the Buddha did not set up unduly strict rules for ahiṃsā as action. This form of moderate and rational doctrine of ahiṃsā is perhaps the most important contribution of Buddhism to human civilization. In the Pāli texts, this principle is stated mainly in three terms, viz., *pāṇātipātā veramaṇī*, *pāṇātipātā paṭivirati* and *ahiṃsā*. Of these three terms, *ahiṃsā* or *avihiṃsā,* meaning 'non-violence,' is the most widely used in the Buddhist texts. The other two expressions indicate the same meaning of 'abstaining or restraining oneself from *causing injury to living beings*' (*pāṇātipāta/ pāṇavadha/ pāṇaghāta*)[3] and are used mainly in relation to *Vinaya* rules regarding *sīla* that forbid the killing of living creatures as against destroying life (*pāṇaṅ atimāpeti*).[4] Here, a special meaning in the form of precautionary endeavour and the application of will is contained in the words *veramaṇī* (abstaining) and *paṭivirati* (restraining). The endeavour of will is imperative for abstaining from evil proclivities such as destruction of life in any form. When the vow is made, 'I will observe the principle not to kill living beings,' *sīla* is the self-actualizing attitude that emerges when one undertakes to carry on this endeavour. A child does not commit hiṃsā, and yet there is no *sīla*. The reason for this is that the child is not conscious of the fact that it is not doing evil. In the same manner, it cannot be said that one abides by *sīla* just because one does not kill living creatures. Ahiṃsā, thus, implies *deliberate* avoidance of injury to living beings. In other words, a Buddhist is expected not only to shun killing but also avoid inciting others to kill.

Ahiṃsā to living beings, which is the first precept in Buddhism,[5] is based upon the principle of mutual attraction and rightness common to all nature. To willfully take life means to disrupt and destroy the inherent wholeness and to blunt feelings of reverence and compassion that form the basis of humaneness. This precept is really a call to life and creation even as it is a condemnation of death and destruction. Deliberately to shoot, knife, strangle, drown, crush, poison, burn, or otherwise inflict pain on a human being or animal- these are not the only ways to defile this precept. To cause another to kill, torture, or harm any living being likewise offends against the first precept. Though violence (*hiṃsā*) can take place in words, thoughts and deeds, ancient Indian Buddhism was mainly concerned with violence in deeds. Sacrifices in various forms, especially the ones in which animals were deprived of life, were seen by the Buddha as not only a ridiculous absurdity, but also as an unpardonable cruelty. He did not recognize the efficacy of sacrifices on the one hand, and highly regarded the life of living beings, on the other. According to him, "all living beings are not to be harmed."[6] "At the sort of sacrifice… (where)… creatures are put an end to… is neither of great fruitfulness nor of great profit; nor of great renown; nor of widespread effect. It is just as if a farmer were to enter a wood taking with him plough and seed, and were there, in an untilled tract, in unfavourable soil, among uprooted stumps, to plant seeds that were broken, rotten, spoilt by wind and heat, out of season, not in good condition, and the god were not to give good rain in due season."[7] We are told in the

---

[3]Vin.I.83, 85, 193; D.I.4, III.68, 70, 149, 182, 235; M.I.361, III.23; Sn.242; KhA.26; It.63; J.III.181; Pug.39, DhA.II.19, III.355; DA.I.69; PvA.27f, 33.

[4]D.I.52.

[5]The other four precepts being: 2. not to take what is not given; 3. not to engage in improper sexuality; 4. not to lie; 5. not to cause others to use liquors or drugs that confuse or weaken the mind nor to do so oneself.

[6]GS.II.183.

[7]DB.II.307f.

Sāmaññaphala Sutta that "the bhikkhu, putting away the killing of living beings holds aloof from the destruction of life. The cudgel and the sword he has laid aside, and ashamed of roughness, and full of mercy, he dwells compassionate and kind to all creatures that have life."[8]

The basis of the practice of ahiṃsā is compassion (*dayā*), mercy (*hitānukampā*) and a feeling of shame (*lajjā*) of the cruelty of killing and injuring life. In this way, ahiṃsā has been amalgamated by Buddhism with compassion and a consciousness of shame. Where there is compassion in the heart, it is expressed in an outward act as ahiṃsā. Ahiṃsā is considered a noble act because it is not only the object of the act, but it also results in happiness to the one who practices it. On the other hand, those who harbour hatred, not only injure others but also bring unhappiness to themselves.[9] The killing of living beings is a shameful act and is wrong because it opposes the spirit of compassion. Moreover, when ahiṃsā is practiced one comes to know the true feeling of love and attains happiness. The attainment of this kind of happiness is said to be spiritually of a highly exalted state.[10] In this way, taking delight in ahiṃsā, and cultivating a mind of compassion (*mettā-citta-bhāvanā*), are one and the same. Thus, to develop a compassionate heart is to desire happiness and well-being of all living beings. In Buddhism, ahiṃsā is taught from the standpoint that all people love their own lives and do not wish to be hurt or killed by others. This feeling of self-preservation and self-love is transferred in thought to other people and in this way the love for and protection of life come to be promoted. For instance, the *Dhammapada* echoes this very thought by pointing out that as all fear death, comparing others with oneself one should neither kill nor cause to kill.[11]

The application of ahiṃsā makes one aware of the true feeling of love and leads to the attainment of happiness, and, further this happiness is also said to be spiritually a highly exalted state. To develop a compassionate heart is to desire that all living beings shall reach a state of happiness, tranquillity and well-being, and then to awaken in oneself the feeling of compassion towards innumerable and infinite kinds of life, and thus, encompassing all life by the thought of compassion. This is called the mind of boundless compassion (*mettā-appamaññā*). Again, the fact that ahiṃsā has as its basis the compassionate mind it also merges with the principle of the emancipation of mind by the power of compassion (*mettā-cetovimutti*). This principle means that the mind achieves serenity by developing a compassionate heart and thus attains emancipation. In Buddhism, ahiṃsā is not just confined to the ethical rule that one should love all living beings. It goes far beyond that and recognizes in a religious sense that by practising it the lofty heights of Buddhahood can be realized. Therefore, in Buddhism the practice of ahiṃsā is taught in many ways. For example, right action (*sammākammanta*) in the *Noble Eightfold Path* can be explained and interpreted as ahiṃsā.[12] Again, in the highly regarded *dasakusalakammapatha* (Path of Ten Kinds of Good Actions), the first step is that of not killing living beings.[13] Similarly, when the Buddha taught the correct daily conduct of a lay follower to Siṅgālika, the first principle expounded was that of non-killing of beings.[14]

---

[8] DB.I.79.Similarly, in one of the verses of the *Dhammapada*,(v275) it has been pointed out that one does not become noble through the killing of living beings, but through *ahiṃsā* towards all of them ("*Na tena ariyo hoti, yena pāṇāni hiṃsati,/Ahiṃsā sabbapāṇānaṃ, ariyo'ti pavuccati.*")

[9] "Hatred never ceases by hatred in this world. Through loving kindness it comes to an end. This is an ancient law." (Dh.v5). "Who kills not, nor aught causes to be killed,/Who robs not, not makes others rob, for all/ Within his heart hath share, he hateth none."(GS.IV.104.)

[10] "The sage who injures none/ who aye controls himself,/ Goes to the everlasting state/ where those who go don''t grieve." (Dh.v225.); "Gotama's disciples are always well awake;/ Both day and night their minds in harmlessness delight." (Dh.v300); "With all am I a friend, comrade to all,/ And to all creatures kind and merciful;/ A heart of amity I cultivate,/And ever in good-will is my delight." (Thā.v648).

[11] Dh.v129.

[12] M.III.251.

[13] D.III.269.

[14] D.III.181.

The lay follower (*upāsaka*, *upāsikā*) is exhorted to follow the *pañcasīla* (Five Precepts) of which the first one is that of non-injury to living beings (*pāṇātipātā veramaṇī sikkhāpadaṃ*). As a result, the lay follower undertakes to abstain from injury to living beings not only as a matter of intent but also by actualizing it in action. Even despite having the intent, when one cannot practice it in real life on certain occasions, the precept is broken. This sort of breach of the precept means that while the *intent* of ahiṃsā is there, the selfish desires opposed to this intent are very strong. In such circumstances, there is inevitably a regret for the breach of the precept and thus, confession (*paṭidesanā*) is made. However, this confession must come from the heart. The importance of the doctrine of *ahiṃsā* in Buddhism can be measured from the fact that the precept of *ahiṃsā* is included in the *Aṭṭhaṅgika-uposatha* (Eight Precepts) which are practised by the Buddhists on the four days of *uposatha* (fast) of the month. It is also included as the first of the ten precepts for the *sāmaṇera* and *sāmaṇerī*. The non-killing of life is given in great detail in the *Pātimokkha*, in the *Vinaya* of the bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs. As per the third precept of the *Pārājikā* in the *Pātimokka* a monk or a nun is expelled from the Saṃgha for committing a murder, which is the severest punishment for the members of the Saṃgha. Buddhism condemns strongly the one "who should deliberately and purposely (*iticittamano cittasaṃkappo*) in various ways praise the beauty of death or should incite (anyone) to death."[15] The *methods* of causing death mentioned in the *Vinaya* are many and varied, including the use of weapons, devices ranging from pits and traps to more subtle psychological strategies like frightening someone to death by dressing up as a ghost, and, of course, death resulting from unsuccessful medical treatments. In terms of *intention*, the examples show that guilt is firmly tied to state of mind (*mens rea*) of the accused at the time the offence was committed. Guilt or innocence depends upon the outcome tallying with the intention with which one undertook the project in question. The concept of *agency* is important where other parties are involved as intermediaries, as when one monk instructs another to carry out a lethal plan. Generally speaking in the *Vinaya*, an action which requires intention for it to be an offence is no offence at all if there *is* no bad intention. Moreover, as Andrew Huxley has shown, the *Kurudhamma Jātaka*[16] emphasizes the idea that, at least in a lay context, unintended harm to others should not be counted against one, and it is not wise to agonize over such matters.[17] Buddhism places abortion on the same level as killing a human being. Suicide is also forbidden in Buddhism.[18]

There is a ban on injuring plant life[19] and, thus, according to the Buddha, the perfect person abstains from injury both to seed life and plant life" (*bījagāma bhūtagāma*).[20] He called upon all "for having compassion on creatures."[21] The Buddha felt that the humane sentiment of mankind is not to be limited merely to themselves but to be extended to all sentient beings, who should share as much kindness as mankind itself does. The Buddha taught "never to destroy the life of any living creature, however tiny it might be."[22] It is even forbidden to throw the remains of food on green grass or into water because the creatures living in both water and grass can be harmed.[23] According to him "making onslaught on creatures, being cruel, bloody-handed, intent on injury and killing, and without mercy

---

[15]Vin.III.73.

[16]J.III.366-381.

[17]A. Huxley, "The Kurudhamma: From Ethics to Statecraft." *Journal of Buddhist Ethics, Vol. 2,1995: 191-203.*

[18]Vin.III.73, 82.

[19]*Pācittiya* nos. 10 & 11.

[20]GS.II.222.

[21]S.V.241.

[22]SBE.XVII.30; XX.128.

[23]SBE.XVII.22.

on living creatures… is conducive to shortness of life span"[24] and saw it as repulsive (*āmagandha*).[25] Not even "for the sake of sustaining life would we intentionally deprive any being of life,"[26] said the Buddha. Monk are forbidden from digging soil.[27] Water must be strained before drinking because it contains living things[28] and only that fruit should be eaten which "has not yet any seed in it… (or)… has no more seed in it."[29]

All those following bloody and cruel occupations (*kurūrakammantā*) such as a butcher, fowler, hunter, fisherman, bandit, executioner, and jailer are seen by Buddhism with a distinct disfavour.[30] Similarly, professions involving cutting, flogging, binding, highway-robbery, and plundering are considered as violent and heinous.[31] A cattle-butcher suffers for "many hundred thousands of years in purgatory."[32] "One neither sees or hears of a butcher slaughtering and selling cattle-- rams, pigs… or beasts of the forest and living in the abundance of great wealth." [33] Some of the *kammic* results, which a man brings upon himself by committing injury to a life are "suffering in an unpleasant state for a long period, and rebirth in some lower form of being. If born again as man, he may be infirm, ugly, unpopular, cowardly, divested of compassion, subject to disease, dejected and mournful, separated from the company of loved ones, and unable to attain to ripe age."[34] In Buddhism, the circumstances under which a being is killed as well as the physical and mental development of the being decide the gravity of the moral guilt involved in killing. The *kammic* "result of killing a man and killing a child vary in proportion to the physical and mental development of the two."[35]

However, in unavoidable circumstance "indirect killing" was allowed in early Buddhism. For instance, early Buddhism allowed "the use of skins, such as sheep-skins, goat-skins and deer-skins as coverlets in all the border countries."[36] It was also permitted that raw flesh and blood may be used in case of non-human disease.[37] In one of the *Jātakas*, it has been pointed out that "in certain cases a Bodhisatta may destroy life."[38] At one place the Boddhisatta indulged in "killing deer and pig, and eating the flesh broiled,"[39] then with others chased a thief and "kicked and cuffed him."[40] We also come across the Bodhisatta selling meat for a coin.[41] Moreover, contradictions arise when the Bodhisatta is born as a carnivorous animal and has to kill not only for himself, but also for his herd and in fact, in such cases the Bodhisatta specializes in killing and hunting techniques.[42] However, here

---

[24]MLS.III.250.

[25]SBE.X(2).39.

[26]GS.IV.129.

[27]Vin.IV.33.

[28]BD.III.3; J.I.83.

[29]SBE.XX.75.

[30]KS.II.171, A.III.383; Pug.56; PugA.233; PvA.

[31]GS.II.223.

[32]KS.II.170.

[33]GS.III.273.

[34]H. Saddhatissa: *Buddhist Ethics: Essence of Buddhism*, New York: G. Braziller, 1970: 89.

[35]*Ibid*:1970: 88.

[36]SBE.XVII.39.

[37]SBE.XVII.49.

[38]J..II, 265; III.296.

[39]J.IV.272.

[40]J.I.219.

[41]J.I.295.

[42]The *Jātakas* are full of such incidents. The Bodhisatta is born 8 times as a lion and thrice as a vulture.

it may be important to remember that most of such contradictions appear in the *Jātaka* commentary which is a composition of a very late stage. Moreover, regarding unavoidable violence committed by animals for the purposes of food, it seems as if Pāli Buddhism in general leaves the animals alone to fulfill the dhamma of their own existence.

It has been generally pointed out that the attitude of ancient Indian Buddhism towards "warfare, agriculture and meat-eating was more mixed than was its attitude to blood sacrifices. It made no whole-hearted condemnation of these three practices although they all entail the taking of life."[43] Though soldiers were not admitted into monkhood,[44] and monks were told to stay away from watching wars or walking the armies,[45] and yet the Buddhist attitude appears somewhat contradictory. There are some similes and examples given in the *Vinaya* and *Sutta Piṭaka* in which fighting men and martial qualities are emulated. For instances, monks are often told to be steadfast as in battle and to wage spiritual *battles* like the armed ones.[46] There are certain *Jātaka* stories in which the Bodhisatta participates in a battle "to win renown... raising his battle cry as he dashed into the fight."[47] Despite the drum of non-killing being sounded through a town,[48] its having been heard by the kings of yore[49] and landlords laying interdiction upon the slaughter of animals,[50] killing of animals continued on a large scale at least till the days of Asoka.[51] Except perhaps bringing about a decrease in the popularity of great sacrifices, in the other fields of violence, Buddhism appears to have met with very little success due to the following two reasons:[52]

1.   Masses as well as the rulers did not want to give up these ways of ministering to their ambitions, pleasure or livelihood.
2.   The Buddha was not a temporal ruler, hence, he had no actual power to impose a body of restrictive regulations and penalties on the laity as he had on his monastic followers.

In *Matakabhatta Jātaka*, the Bodhisatta thinking about killers, expresses a desire: "If only these beings (*sattā*) perceived the outcome of sinning, maybe they would stay away from killing."[53] He also uttered the following stanza on this occasion:

"If people were only aware that penalty would be birth unto sorrow, living beings would stop taking life. Sorrow is indeed killer's lot.[54]

The Buddhist concept of ahiṃsā has two facets: 1. negative which covers injury inspired by compassion, self-restrain, and the desire to alleviate pain; and 2. positive which covers non-injury inspired by the same motive and desire and intention. In other words, positive objective considerations

---

[43]I.B. Horner: "Early Buddhism and Taking of Life," D.R. Bhandarkar, K.A. Nilakanta Sastri *et al* (eds), *B.C. Law Volume*, I, Calcutta, 1945: 443.

[44]SBE.XIII.196, 230.

[45]Vin.IV.104-108.

[46]See, for example, A.II.116; III.89, 100, 161; J.II.276.

[47]J.I.205-206.

[48]J.III.428, 434.

[49]J.III.428.

[50]J.IV.115.

[51]I.B. Horner, *Op. Cit*: 348.

[52]I.B. Horner, *Op. Cit*: 439.

[53]J.I.168.

[54]J.I.168.

justify injury as an expression of nonviolence. Thus dual concept on nonviolence is realistic. The negative aspect is based on the recognition of the fact that the universe as such is suffused with death and destruction. No one can survive and live in the world without committing one or the other kind of violence. The positive aspect of nonviolence partakes of the nature of a moral ideal without which no social, human, or cosmic order can survive. Violence cannot be eschewed completely and is inescapable in certain critical situations. In other words, in certain situations application of negative aspect of nonviolence is unavoidable. One can see certain examples of the application of the negative concept of nonviolence, namely injury with a view to alleviate pain, or violent defence of the honour of women. Buddhism also makes a distinction between man and animals plus plants, seeds etc. Though destruction of or injury to both involves sin, there is a difference of degree. The sin accrued by killing a man is more than the cutting of a plant. Further, sin accrued as a result of killing a person with a developed mind is more than in the case of a man whose mind is less developed.

The Buddhist concept of ahiṃsā has been directly associated with the so-called agricultural revolution.[55] This agricultural revolution is only an illusion. The idea of economic utility of animals being partly responsible for the unpopularity of sacrifices, was propounded by Horner way back in the 1940s. She had proposed that "the growing realization that large scale sacrifice was both spiritually and economically unsound will have played a decisive part in stamping it out."[56] Though there may have been some truth in Horner's argument, but this relationship between economic utility and sacrificial futility should not be stretched too far. It seems that the basic and logical cause behind the propagation of ahiṃsā by the Buddha was compassion, sympathy, equanimity, forbearance and goodwill, which are generally admired and taken as of great fruit and profit by ancient Indian Buddhism.[57] The Buddha asked every one to "cultivate a boundless (friendly) mind towards all beings,"[58] and not only the agricultural ones. Had the Buddha been really concerned about the sudden need of agricultural animals, he certainly would have included the names of these animals in the list of those whose meat had been declared avoidable by the Buddha. We must bear in mind that none of these animals had any fruitful bearing on agriculture and the loss of their lives would have made no difference whatsoever to agriculture. Strictly speaking, the Buddha considered agricultural activities as entailing violence because they led to destruction of life.[59] The reason as to why the Buddha criticized animal sacrifices, was that they were cruel, illogical and futile. Moreover, cow (especially a milch-cow) which most importantly contributed towards agriculture, had been protected much earlier. In the *Sutta-Nipāta*, "brāhmaṇas of yore" are told as having regarded cows as their parents, brothers and kin, as their best friends and as the source of all healthful things, and hence in gratitude they never killed cows.[60] Also the evidence provided by early Indian Buddhist literature for the suppression of great animal sacrifices suggests that outside the brāhmaṇical circles, this practice was not particularly cherished by the ordinary people.[61] Moreover, finding an association between two existing realities, may itself be full of dangers. For example, if we go by the logic that "society today needs a lowering of the birth rate, celibacy would contribute to the lowering of the birth rate (therefore) the practice of celibacy in the monastic orders of the country reflects the economic needs of the time."[62] But we know this is not so.

---

[55]See, for example, amongst others R.S. Sharma: *Material Culture and Social Formation in Ancient India*, first edition, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1983, paperback reprint, Madras: Macmillan, 1992: 96.

[56]I.B. Horner, *Op. Cit*: 440.

[57]KS.V.149.

[58]SBE.X(2).25.

[59]Vin.IV.33.

[60]Sn.52.

[61]I.B. Horner, *Op. Cit.*: 442.

[62]G.C. Pande: "On the Question of the Social Origins of Buddhism," Mahesh Tiwary (ed), *Bodhi-Raśmi*, New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984: 6.

If the statements of the Pāli texts, which presume to be a record of the *Buddhavacana*, are accepted at face value, it can be argued that the Buddha allowed the eating of animal flesh. But are these portions a later interpolation in the Pāli literature? The view of flesh eating is sharply criticized and contradicted by the *Mahāyāna Sūtras*, also purporting to be the spoken words of the Buddha, which categorically assert that flesh eating is contrary to the spirit and intent of the first precept since it makes one an accessory to the slaying of animals and therefore contravenes the compassionate concern for all life that lies at the core of Buddhism. Is there reliable evidence that the Buddha sanctioned flesh eating? Unfortunately no serious attempt has been made by scholars to resolve the glaring discrepancy between the contentions of the two branches of Buddhism on meat eating. Along with this also arises the question as to whether the Buddha died of eating a piece of pork, as claimed by some scholars, or from a poisonous mushroom, as asserted by others. If we go by the Pāli Tipiṭaka as it is, the Buddha did not put a ban on the eating of flesh. A monk is allowed to accept "what has been put in his alms bowl."[63] Then, there is the case of Devadatta, the Buddha's cousin and brother-in-law, who may possibly have been inspired by the total prohibition observed by some *samaṇas* and brāhmaṇas.[64] He challenged the Buddha and asked him for a total ban on meat-eating. The Buddha is said to have refused to do so even at the cost of losing some of his followers.[65] Many other references prove, though almost incidentally, that the eating of meat was thought of as customary, and monks are recorded to have eaten flesh and fish frequently enough to give it the appearance of its having been a fairly important part of their diet. Meat, fish, fruit, dairy products and cereals especially rice, constituted the staple food of the population, and the Buddha was strongly convinced that purity did not depend upon food,[66] but on restraint over such bodily, mental and moral conduct as could defile a man.[67]

Pāli based Buddhism allowed monks to eat meat with the following exceptions:

1. In three cases meat may not be eaten by a monk if he has (a) seen, (b) heard or (c) suspected that the meat has been especially acquired for him by killing an animal. In other words, at the time of accepting cooked-meat if a monk has no reason to think that the animal whose flesh he is accepting was not killed on purpose for him, then the monk can accept it.[68] This rule is called the *Rule of Tikoṭiparisuddha (Pure in Three Ways)*. Pāli Buddhism did not see any sin being committed by meat-eating monks as long as they followed the *Rule of Tikoṭiparisuddha*, even if the meat that they happened to eat had been acquired by somebody by deliberately killing an animal to feed them.[69]

2. Use of raw meat was not allowed,[70] except in case of sickness when "raw flesh and blood could be used."[71] The cooking and eating of the remains of the kills of lions, tigers, hyenas, and wolves are allowed by the Buddha to be eaten by the monks.[72] The Buddha also allowed "the use of the fat of bears, fish, alligators, swine, asses, if

---

[63]SBE.III.155.

[64]C.S. Singh, "Meat-Eating and the Rule of *Tikoṭiparisuddha*," A.K. Narain (ed), *Studies in Pāli and Buddhism*, Delhi, 1979: 289-295.

[65]SBE.XI.196ff; BD.I.297ff.

[66]M.I.80.

[67]A.I.221.

[68]MLS.II.33; BD.I.298.

[69]"The wicked may for gift slay wife or son,/ yet, if the holy eat, no sin is done." (J.II.182).

[70]D.II.5.

[71]SBE.XVII.49.

[72]BD.I.98.

received at the right time to be partaken of with oil."[73] Indeed, fish and meat are mentioned among the delicate foods (*pāṇitabhojanīya*) which a monk who is ill is allowed to eat.[74]

3.   The meat of the following ten beings i.e., man, elephant, horse, dog, snake, lion, tiger, leopard, bear, and hyena is forbidden to be eaten by the monks due to a variety of reasons involved in their eating.[75]

The *Rule of Tikoṭiparisuddha*, though restrained the monks from being directly instrumental in killing animals for meat and to a small extent the "rules prohibiting the eating of meat of socially disapproved beings made up for the limitations,"[76] yet the Pāli Indian Buddhist attitude towards meat-eating and ahiṃsā appears to be somewhat contradictory. The *Mahāyāna Sūtras* deeply deplore any kind of allowance made for the eating of meat. Paradoxically, the *Rule of Tikoṭiparisuddha* absolved the monks of any sin, but the slaughterer was very severely criticized. Thus, these days one often comes across a large number of Theravādīn monks savouring meat. They justify eating meat on the grounds that not only that there are references in the Pāli literature to the Buddha allowing the eating of meat, but they invariably point out that the Buddha, in fact, had died as a result of eating pork (which was putrid, and thus, poisoned the Buddha) at the home of one of his followers called Cunda. They further point out that they gratefully accept whatever is put before them, without preference or aversion. Various statements and actions of the Buddha are used to justify the eating of meat, implying that if the Buddha himself ate flesh food when it was offered to him, surely they have permission to do likewise. The relevant portion of the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* regarding the Buddha's last meal reads as follows:

> "Then Cunda addressed the Lord and Said, "May the Lord, together with the bhikkhus, do me the honour of taking his meal, at my house tomorrow?" And the Lord gave his consent by his silence... Now at the end of the night, Cunda, the smith, prepared at his house sweet rice and cakes, and *sūkara-maddava*."[77]

Sūkara-maddava has been variously translated by scholars. Franke has translated it as "soft (tender) boar's flesh."[78] Arthur Waley gives four interpretations of *sūkara-maddava*: a pig's soft food (food eaten by a pig), pig's delight (a favourite food of a pig), the soft parts of a pig, or pig-pounded (food trampled by pigs).[79] There are many compound words in Pāli of which *sūkara* (pig) forms a part, e.g., the compound word *sūkara-sāli* is used in Pāli literature for a kind of wild rice.[80] K.E. Neumann as quoted by Waley "has shown that in Narahari's *Rajanighantu*, among the names of medical plants, there occurs a whole series of compound words having 'pig' as their first element; thus *sūkara-kanda*, 'pig-bulb,' *sūkara-padika*, 'pig's foot,' *sūkareṣṭa*, 'sought-out by pigs.' On the analogy of the last, Neumann takes *sūkara-maddava* to mean 'pig's delight,' and assumes that it is the name of some kind of truffles... Plant names tend to be local and dialectical. It is quite likely that if such an expression as *sūkara-maddava* meant "truffles" in Magadha, it might, in more western and southern centres where

---

[73]SBE.VII.43.

[74]Pātimokkha, Pacittiya Dhamma No.33.

[75]SBE.XVII.85.

[76]C.S. Prasad, *Op. Cit*: 104-05.

[77]D.II.126-27.

[78]*PED*: s.v. *Sūkara*. Oldenberg (*Ibid)* and Fleet (JRAS: 1906: 656, 881) agree with him.

[79]Ivan Morris, *Madly Singing in the Mountains: An Appreciation and Anthology of Arthur Waley*: 342.

[80]J.VI.531.

Pāli Buddhism came into existence, have been entirely unknown and consequently misunderstood."[81] T.W. Rhys Davids, in fact, translated it as "quantity of truffles."[82] The word in Pāli used for pork is *sūkaramaṃsa*.[83] Edward Thomas correctly points out that "The word... is not the obvious *sūkaramaṃsa*, 'pig flesh,' which we would expect if this were meant."[84] C.A.F. Rhys Davids points out that, "A food-compound of pig-flesh (*sūkaramaṃsa*) does occur once in the scriptures,[85] in a *sutta* of a curiously unworthy kind, where a householder, in inviting Gotama to dine, goes through quite a menu in a restrained detail! *Maddava* is nowhere else associated with meat, and [T.W.] Rhys Davids' opinion appears to be logical that we have here a dish... of a root, such as truffles, much sought by swine, and which may have been called 'pig's joy.' Such a root we actually have-- this the critics did not know-- in our "pignut,"... the little nut-shaped bulbous roots of which, called also 'earthnuts,' are liked by both pigs and children."[86] There is another reason as to why *sūkara-maddava* cannot mean "pork." Cunda had invited the Buddha to his house. He could not have offered pork to the Buddha as it would have meant violation of the *Tikoṭiparisuddha*.[87] Regarding the meal requirements of the Buddha, the would-be-donors of meals to the Buddha often consulted Ānanda. For example, this is amply clarified by a conversation between Ānanda and a Brāhmaṇa in the *Vinaya Piṭaka*:

> "If I were to prepare, my dear Ānanda, rice-milk and honey-lumps (for the monks), would the reverend Gotama accept it from me?"
> "Well, my good Brāhmaṇa, I will ask the Blessed One." And the venerable Ānanda told this thing to the Blessed One.
> "Well, Ānanda, let him prepare (those dishes)."
> "Well, my good Brāhmaṇa, you may prepare (those dishes)."[88]

To say that the Buddha sanctioned meat-eating after having taken care of certain conditions is quite difficult to accept. He who condemned animal sacrifices in the strongest possible language and also the bloody trades of slaughtering, hunting, and trapping, is difficult to imagine to have savoured the flesh of the same animals. Each human being who eats flesh, whether an animal is killed expressly for him or not, is supporting the trade of slaughtering and contributing to the violent deaths of harmless animals. Anyone familiar with the numerous accounts of the Buddha's extraordinary compassion and reverence for living beings, for instance, his insistence that his monks carry filters to strain the water they drink lest they inadvertently cause the death of any micro-organisms in the water, could not have imagined that the Buddha allowed their flesh to be eaten. Monks by virtue of their training, their strength of character, and their life purpose are different and stronger than the laity and better able to resist the pleasures of the senses to which ordinary people succumb. It appears that later scribes interpolated the portions relating to meat-eating into the Pāli Tipiṭaka. For over 300 years the scriptures were transmitted orally and as of now they do contain early and later portions.

---

[81]Quoted at R.P. Kapleau, *Op. Cit.*, 24.

[82]DB.II.137.

[83]*sampanna-kolaṅ sūkaramaṃsa* (pork with jujube) at A.III.49.

[84]Edward Thomas, *The Life of the Buddha*, London: Routledge, 1949: 149.

[85]A.III.49.

[86]C.A.F. Rhys Davids, *A Manual of Buddhism*, London: Sheldon, 1932: 260.

[87]Considering that the Buddha had actually made this rule.

[88]SBE.XVII.88.

In *the Puttamaṃsa Sutta*[89] the Buddha taught his disciples that material food (*kabalaṅkāra āhāra*) should be taken not for pleasures (*davāya*), not for indulgence (*madāya*), not for personal charm (*maṇḍanāya*), not for comeliness (*vibhūsnāya*), but for the sheer necessity of living. While it is admitted that food is the main prerequisite for existence, it is also acknowledged as a principal source of temptation, as an object through which the sense of taste develops into craving. Hence, on numerous occasions temperance with regard to food is advocated, although never to the extent of self-mortification (*attakilamatha*). The ideal monk is described as controlled in deed and word, restrained in food for the stomach (*kāyagutto, vacīgutto, āhāre dare yato*);[90] with light stomach, moderate in food, easily satisfied, and undisturbed (*ūnūdaro, mitāhāro, appicch'assa alolupo*).[91] On the other hand, a person who is immoderate as to food is described as one who thoughtlessly and unwisely takes food for the sake of amusement, pride, decoration, ornamentation, insatiability, immoderation and thoughtlessness as to food.[92]

A religion that bases it philosophy on *mettā*, *karuṇā*, *upekhā*, and *muditā* directed towards the welfare of all creatures (*sabbapāṇa-bhūta-hitānukampin*)[93] whose founder rising daily surveyed the world to look for beings to be worthy of his mercy and help,[94] could not have sanctioned meat-eating. A good Buddhist who is expected to be *intent upon compassion (karuṇādhimutta)*[95] cannot be expected to live by eating meat acquired in whatever manner. Thus, to put the flesh of an animal into one's belly makes one an accessory to the act of its slaughter, simply because if cows, sheep, fowl, and fish, to mention the most common, were not eaten they would not be killed. With the exception of butchers, hunters and fishermen, who kill the food they eat, the majority of flesh eaters are only indirectly responsible for the violence to and destruction of animals. This, however, does not make them less answerable to the first precept. Thus, all those portions of the Pāli *Tipiṭaka* which condone meat-eating directly as well as indirectly (including the Rule of *Tikoṭiparisuddha*) must be seen as interpolations made by meat-eating bhikkhus after the death of the Buddha.

---

[89]S.II.98-100.

[90]S.I.172; Sn.78.

[91]*Ibid.* 707.

[92]*Puggalapaññatti, PTS*.21; *tr.31.*

[93]S.IV.314; A.II.210, III.92, IV.249; Pug.57, 68.

[94]D.II.237; Ps.I.126f; DhA.I.26, 367; PvA.61, 195.

[95]D.II.241f.

5

ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHIST ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN

Before we analyze ancient Indian Buddhist attitude toward women, it is important to keep in mind that the history of the world has been men's history as it was written without much reference to women. The role of women in society has been severely restricted, stereotyped and minimized. Language, culture and habitual thought patterns of _mankind_ are the creations of males.[1] Thus, men have looked at women as bizarre and often troubling objects rather than as co-partners in the creation and progress of this world. They were given very little to choose from as only meaner things were placed within their reach. The course of their lives, from birth to death, was set by fathers, brothers and above all, husbands- the male citizens who formed governments and raised armies. In a male dominated world such as this, not much, which speaks favourably of women, could be expected because men found it hard to accept that women, like them, could also be capable of passion and pain, growth and decay. Interestingly, in most religious traditions, those who kept the records chose to record men's experiences and mental images much more frequently than women's. Thus, it is not surprising that the texts of different religions have focussed on male characters, male themes and male fantasies. Even when information about women was recorded, later commentators often neglected to keep those records alive in communal consciousness and memory. Sadly, the current academic scholarship also usually focusses on what the religious tradition itself has emphasized, i.e., the records of its male heroes. The habit of thinking and doing research in the generic masculine (which simply does not cover the feminine) is so ingrained in modern scholarship that many scholars are genuinely unaware of it.

In spite of formal equality and access to education, women are still accorded a subordinate position in our society. They are exclusively expected to bear children. The result is the well-known bourgeois ideal of the _protected housewife and mother-_ an ideal which is directly transferred to women in ancient contexts. The presence of a few and isolated _women worthies_ here and there did not have any perceivable influence on the overall position of women or the attitude of men toward them. Thus, for the proper understanding of humanity, there is the need of a model which would strictly avoid placing one gender in the centre and the other on the fringes. Such a model would acknowledge that humans come in two sexes and that both are equally human. It would also recognize the fact that gender roles and stereotypes in every society have shown men and women as more distinct and divergent from each other than is biologically dictated. However, neither human creativity nor its experience are gender neutral and the concepts of gender and sexuality are crucial variables in the understanding of the world in which humans live and interact. Thus, such a model would also acknowledge that expression of human creativity, whether it is artistic, social or intellectual, is both _created_ and _experienced_ by gendered sexual beings.

In the light of the above stated, we have expanded and elaborated on the following conclusions:

1.   By the time of the birth of Gotama, the Buddha, androcentrism and patriarchy had become the main stay of Indian society in which it was considered imperative to protect and control women by a social structure like the family. Birth of a female child was seen not only as undesirable but also as unfortunate. Social institutions like polygamy, harems and prostitution which degrade women had become an integral part

---

[1]The archetypal expression of this vision can be observed in the writings of feminist intellectuals such as Simone de Beauvoir, (_Second Sex_, New York: Knopf, 1953) and Dorothy Sayer (_Are Women Human?,_ Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971).

of the Indian social and economic fabric. Wife-beating had become fairly common and a woman who completely surrendered herself to a husband, worshipped him (*patidevatā*)[2] and found solace at his feet (*pādaparicārikā*)[3] was perceived as the ideal wife. Dowry (*itthidhana*)[4] was a reality then, as it is now, and women were occasionally put up as goods for sale.[5] In the *Vinaya* there are several examples of brāhmaṇas who spoke of *bhikkhunīs* as *harlots*. These stories provide a glimpse of bhikkhunīs in the midst of the Brāhmaṇical social milieu during the time of Gotama, the Buddha. For example:

> Now at that time several nuns, going to Sāvatthī through the Kosalan districts, having arrived at a certain village in the evening, having approached a certain brāhmaṇa family, asked for accommodation. Then that brāhmaṇa woman spoke thus to these nuns:
> "Wait, ladies, until the brāhmaṇa comes."
> Then that brāhmaṇa having come during the night, spoke thus to that brāhmaṇa women: "Who are these?"
> "They are nuns, master."
> Saying: "Throw out these shaven-headed strumpets," he threw them out from the house.[6]

2.   The Buddha and some of his like-minded colleagues like Ānanda had a very positive and revolutionary attitude toward women. The Buddha opened the doors of his dhamma for the equal benefit of both men and women- a position that was exceptional for the time and was perceived as radical and dangerous by his critics. Adoption of such a position reflects an attempt on the part of the Buddha and Ānanda to locate virtue and spiritual potential beyond conventional gender distortions. A large number of women took advantage of such an opportunity. The Buddha regarded the feminine as wise, maternal, creative, gentle, and compassionate. There were many women among the Buddha's followers who could and did become arahants, fully liberated from the psycho-physiological suffering that actualizes human existence. Some of the bhikkhunīs had their own following, and were capable not only of introducing the dhamma, but also of bringing new aspirants to full liberation without the mediation of the Buddha or some other senior bhikkhu. There is enough evidence to suggest that women not only were conspicuously present in the earliest community, but also seem to have held prominent and honoured places both as practioners and teachers. It cannot be denied that the Buddha unfolded new horizons for women by laying the foundations of the bhikkhunī-saṃgha. This social and spiritual advancement for women was ahead of the times and, therefore, must have drawn many objections from men, including bhikkhus. But the powerful and magnificent personality of the Buddha was able to keep such objections at an arm's length. Various restrictions and disadvantages, including the eight rules associated with Gotamī Mahāpajāpatī, referred to in early Buddhist literature, were imposed after the death of the Buddha and thus, were interpolations of post-Mahāparinibbāna period. Despite various forms of disadvantages and harassments, the combination of education in monasteries, free time, and a sense

---

[2]J.II.406, VvA.128.

[3]S.I.125; J.II.95, VI.268; DhA.II.194.

[4]Vin.II.116.

[5]*itthiyo vikkiṇiya bhaṇḍaṅ,* (DhA.I.390), *bhaṇḍānaṅ uttamaṅ* (S.I.43).

[6]SBB.XII.275.

of personal moral superiority must have led many women into an organized life of unknown possibilities. Here, women were able to indulge in activities outside the home, including proselyting, development of organizational skills, and above all, an atmosphere where they could experience a sense of accomplishment. Unfortunately, the bhikkhunī-saṃgha did not survive for long.

3.   The death of the Buddha created a void at least as far as women were concerned. In the absence of a towering personality like the Buddha, the few remaining supporters of women like Ānanda were simply overwhelmed by those elements within the saṃgha, who considered their entry as an affront. This became quite apparent in the First Buddhist Council at Rājagaha where Ānanda was vilified for being instrumental in the entry of women into the saṃgha. In the post-Mahāparinibbāna period, the Buddhist saṃgha became an institution dominated by an overwhelmingly androcentric-patriarchal power structure. The canon was edited and revised to go with this kind of mentality. With the passage of time, ascetical misogyny of brāhmaṇism was adopted by the Buddhist saṃgha which associated women almost invariably with adjectives like imperfect, wicked, base, deceitful, destructive, treacherous, ungrateful, untrustworthy, vile, degraded, lustful, envious, greedy, unbridled, foolish and profligate.[7] Such an attitude asserted that women must be suppressed, controlled and conquered by men. This type of logic obviously rooted out the existence of the bhikkhunī-saṃgha and reduced women in general to a state of marginal existence.

While evaluating ancient Indian Buddhist attitude toward women, it needs to be kept in mind that most of our understanding is based on the functioning of the saṃgha and its members. The Buddha or for that matter the saṃgha had very little or no control over the functioning of the society at large. But on the other hand, the society could influence the decisions of the Buddhist saṃgha in many ways as the latter had to depend upon it for various kinds of support. In the absence of a towering personality such as the Buddha himself, the influence of the aggressively male-dominated ancient Indian Brāhmaṇical society may have been inescapable. Androcentric-patriarchy, as it functioned in Brāhmaṇical ancient India, regarded men as normal and women as an exception to the normal. Such a system considered men as legitimate masters and holders of all positions that society valued, whereas women were expected to acquiesce and assist men in maintaining their status. In other words, men had power over women and monopolized all the roles and pursuits that society most valued and rewarded, such as religious leadership and economic power.[8] Therefore, inequality was the fundamental basis of androcentric-patriarchy in ancient India under which men literally ruled over women, prescribing the rules and parameters by and within which women were reckoned to conduct themselves. Women who did not conform, and many who did, had to bear another form of male dominance- physical violence. Male power over females formed the very basis of all forms of social hierarchy and oppression.[9] But one of the most abusive aspects of androcentrism and patriarchy in ancient India was men's automatic, rather than earned or deserved, power over women. Ascetical misogyny of Brāhmaṇism was even more negative and aggressively hostile in its expression toward women and the feminine. It voiced its own distinctive set of concerns and perceived women as agents of destruction, distraction, and ruin.

---

[7]GS.I.93; KS.I.146; J.I.111, 285; II.474, 478, 527; IV.124-25.

[8]It must be remembered that patriarchy is not an inevitable necessity of human biology but was the cultural creation of a certain epoch in human history. (See, Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

[9]The abuse of power is a major human problem, and androcentrism and patriarchy are rife with abuse of power. In fact, in modern times androcentrism and patriarchy may directly be linked to the rise of militarism, violence against animals and the ecologically dangerous use of the environment. Such a conclusion is based on the fact that all such policies share an attitude of glorifying and approving the power of one group over another as inevitable and appropriate.

Asceticization and Brāhmaṇization of Buddhism was not only a black chapter in the history of Indian women as the bhikkhunī-saṃgha got snuffed out of existence as a result thereof but also a tragedy for Buddhism itself as it lost its identity.

As a result of the repeated editing of the canon one can find in it a multiplicity of opinions expressed regarding women. These opinions range from the unusually positive to downright condemnation and insult. In order to understand this kind of multiplicity of opinions, it is imperative to recognize the specific institutional or intellectual context out of which each of such opinions arose.[10] In the opinion of Kate Blackstone Buddhist misogynistic attitude grew out of the fact that women's ordination was perceived as a serious and inescapable threat to the *dhamma* and *vinaya*.[11] The Pāli *Vinaya* contains a meticulous transference of the authority of the Buddha onto the saṃgha as a corporate body, and if that authority is displayed as inherently masculine, then following that logic, women cannot be considered full members of the saṃgha.[12] Women's presence in the saṃgha is depicted as a grave tragedy[13] and Blackstone perceives an important clue in it as to why women's ordination was seen as posing such a threat and how institutional subordination was used in the hope of averting it.[14] However, scholars who have tried to explain this can be divided into two diametrically opposite groups. One group explains this through an egalitarian attitude later modified by misogynistic editors,[15] and the other sees a bit-by-bit betterment from an inherently sexist, even misogynist attitude in Theravāda to the growth of sexual egalitarianism in Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna.[16]

---

[10]One can often see such a diverse and sometimes even contradictory attitude within a single text. A quintessential example of such a paradox is the incident of the founding of the bhikkhunī-saṃgha, a story in which we find Gotama, the Buddha, recognizing that women indeed are quite capable of attaining the highest goal of nibbāna, but adding at the same time that the formation of the bhikkhunī-saṃgha will tragically reduce the Dhamma's life by half: "If women had not been allowed to go forth from the home to the homeless life, then long would have lasted the godly life; for a thousand years… But now… since women have gone forth… not for long will the godly life last… just for 500 years." (A.IV.278).

[11]Kate Blackstone, "Damming the Dhamma: Problems with Bhikkhunīs in the Pāli Vinaya," a paper presented at the *Twelfth Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Lausanne, Switzerland, August 1999.

[12]*Ibid*.

[13]It is compared to a house falling prey to robbers, a rice field stricken by disease, and sugar-cane attacked by red rust.

[14]Kate Blackstone, *Op. Cit*.

[15]I. B. Horner (*Women Under Primitive Buddhism: Laywomen and Almswomen,* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975: 193) was the first one to come up with this idea. Now a large number of scholars hold such a view, especially, Nancy S. Barnes ("Buddhism," A. Sharma (ed.), *Women in Religion*, Albany: State University of New York, 1987: 105-133); Cornelia D. Church ("Temptress, Housewife, Nun: Women's Role in Early Buddhism," *Anima*, 1,1975: 54); Rita Gross (*Buddhism After Patriarchy: A Feminine History, Analysis, and Reconstruction of Buddhism,* Albany: State University of New York, 1992: 34-38); Kajiyama Yuichi ("Women in Buddhism," *Eastern Buddhist,* NS, XV No. 2 Autumn 1982: 53-70); and Tessa Bartholomeusz (*Women Under the Bo Tree*, a PhD Dissertation submitted to the University of Virginia, 1991: 55-61).

[16]For instance, Diana Paul (*Women in Buddhism: Images of the Feminine in the Mahāyāna Tradition*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979: 245-302) ascribes the misogyny of early Buddhist texts to the Indian context in which they evolved.Karen Lang ("Lord Death's Snare: Gender-related Imagery in the Theragāthā and the Therīgāthā," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion,* 2, 1986: 78) and Janice Willis ("Nuns and Benefactresses: The Role of Women in the Development of Buddhism," Y. Haddad & E. Findly (eds), *Women, Religion, and Social Change*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985: 59-85) perceive a positive progression in the portrayal of women as we move from Pāli to Mahāyāna texts. Though Rita Gross (*Buddhism After Patriarchy: A Feminine History, Analysis, and Reconstruction of Buddhism,* Albany: State University of New York, 1992: 57, 114) acknowledges positive portrayals of women in early Pāli texts such as the *Therīgāthā*, she argues that the full flowering of an incipient egalitarianism takes place only with the growth of Vajrayāna. A few studies on the implication of the entry of women into the *saṃgha* have also tried to explain it from either the sociological point of view (E.g., C. Kabilsingh, *A Comparative Study of Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha*, Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia, 1984; Mohan Wijayaratna, *Les Moniales Bouddhistes: Naissance et Developpement du Monachisme Feminin*, Paris: Ed. du Cerf, 1991: 29-30 and *Buddhist Monastic Life: According to the Texts of the Theravāda Tradition*, tr. C. Grangier & S Collins, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990: 158-163), or they have located its language within the context of the *Vinaya*'s legalistic discourse (E.g., Ute Hhsken, "Die Legende von der Einrichtung des buddhistischen Nonnenordens im Vinaya-Piṭaka der Theravādin," R. Grhnendahl et al (eds), *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde*, Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1993: 151-170).

Personally the Buddha treated women at par with men within the saṃgha. It appears that the anti-women statements that one finds in the ancient Indian Buddhist literature are an interpolation into the original word of the Buddha (*Buddhavacana*) by the monastic élite whose attitude toward women was shaped, at least partly, by the various historical developments.[17] It may be pointed out that major portion of the Pāli *Tipiṭaka* appears to have been compiled at the Third Buddhist Council.[18] In this and the earlier two councils, called to decide the *Buddhavacana*, the dominant androcentric-patriarchal monks were able to carry through their own points of view. The age of the Buddha was a witness to the origin and development of the Gaṅgā Urbanization as well as the emergence of an individualism and its effects upon those who socially and spiritually lived on the margins of the prevailing Brāhmaṇical culture. The new emerging social order had very little interest in defending the prevailing social values, and in such a climate both women and people of lower social strata in general were freer to explore and profess religious pursuits of their choice. Just as the goal set by the Buddha was not limited to those born in any particular social denomination, so it was not limited to those born as males. Both of these positions reflect an attempt to locate virtue and spiritual potential beyond conventional social and gender distortions. Both can be seen as evidence of a newly emerging sense of the individuality that began to take precedence over narrower biological and social compulsions in the post-Vedic period. Many women were quick to take advantage of the opportunity provided by the Buddha. Some of the Buddha's most acclaimed benefactresses were women, indicating not only that there were a large number of women of independent means during this period but also that their support was instrumental in nursing the nascent saṃgha. Among the female followers of the Buddha, some remained lay-followers and others gave up worldly pursuits to become nuns. In the role of nun or virgin, sexuality could be transcended as unimportant in the accomplishment of human potential. In the role of mother, sexuality is usually viewed as in a controlled state, a state of equilibrium. The Buddha viewed the masculine and the feminine as complementary aspects of a unified spirit, in the manner of compassion and wisdom. Undoubtedly there were many women among Gotama's followers who were recognized as fully and equally enlightened and the earliest strata of the Indian Buddhist literature agrees that women could and did become arahants, fully liberated individuals living free from the psycho-physiological suffering that actualizes human existence. Sources within the *Tipiṭaka* offer many examples of arahants among the women who had renounced worldly life and even a few cases of women like Khemā, who, as chief consort to the king of Magadha, became fully enlightened even before giving up householder's life. Many amongst these well-known women followers like Pāṭācārā and Soṇā, were known for their ability to teach the dhamma; others like Khemā were particularly held in high esteem by the Buddha himself for the depth of their knowledge. Some of the bhikkhunīs had their own following, and were capable not just of introducing the dhamma, but of bringing new aspirants to full liberation without the mediation of the Buddha or some other senior bhikkhu. In the *Tipiṭaka*, women most often are presented as teachers to other women, yet even the conservative editors of these texts preserved a few stories of women like Dhammadinnā, who, after becoming a bhikkhunī, had the opportunity to instruct her former husband, Visākha. In the *Cūḷavedallasutta*,[19] Dhammadinnā answers a long series of questions regarding aspects of the doctrine and practice put to her by Visākha, a prominent merchant and lay Buddhist teacher, who the commentaries say, had a substantial following of his own. Visākha later reports Dhammadinnā's answers to the Buddha, who is greatly pleased, proclaiming that he would have answered in precisely the same way. There is enough evidence to suggest that women not only were conspicuously present in the earliest community, but also seem to have held prominent and honoured places both as practioners and teachers. But as we move to the post-Gotama period, though whereas women patrons and donors remain quite visible, the

---

[17]See, Alan Sponberg, "Attitudes toward Women and the Feminine in Early Buddhism" Jose Cabezon (ed), *Buddhism, Sexuality, and Gender*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992: 3-36.

[18]Chandradhar Sharma, *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983: 70.

[19]M.I.298-305.

bhikkhunī-saṃgha does not appear to have enjoyed the prestige or creativity one might have expected of the successors of Khemā, Dhammadinnā, and the early arahant nuns.[20] In Buddhism, not only is the path open to women, but it also is indeed the same path for both women and men. It is not that sex and gender differences do not exist, but they are rather "soteriologically insignificant"[21] that they amount at most to a diversion from the true goal of liberation. When 500 of king Udena's wives including Sāmāvatī perished in a fire, remarking on the tragic incidence, the Buddha said: "Monks, among these, some women disciples are stream-winners, some once-returners, some non-returners."[22] This clearly implies that women were considered quite capable of accomplishing the standard stages of the path of liberation by which one becomes an arahant.

> "And be it a woman, or be it man for whom
> Such chariot doth wait, by that same car
> Into nibbāna's presence shall they come."[23]

Passages such as this suggest that whatever limitations women might conventionally be held to have had, they were not to be kept out of any form of Buddhist practice nor from the ultimate goal, i.e., nibbāna. Radical as this position was socially, it was quite consistent with the basic philosophical principles of the Buddha's teaching. It was a revolutionary breakthrough in the sense that women were explicitly included in the Buddhist quest for liberation. In other words, the Buddha and some of his associates like Ānanda clearly held the view that one's sex, like one's caste, presented no barrier to attaining the Buddhist goal of liberation from suffering. However, there may have been one negative side effect of the founding of the bhikkhunī-saṃgha. According to Altekar, the institution of nunnery in Jainism and Buddhism and the instances of several grown up maidens taking holy orders against their parents' wish and some of them later falling from high spiritual ideal must also have strengthened the view of those who favoured marriage at an early age especially before puberty. We may, therefore, conclude that after the establishment of the bhikkhunī-saṃgha, the marriageable age of girls was being constantly lowered.[24] Almost nonexistence of the bhikkhunī-saṃgha in the modern Theravādī countries also reflects this inherent bias of the South Asian society against women. However, as pointed out by Horner, it goes without saying that the Buddha "saw the potentially good, the potentially spiritual in them as he saw it in men."[25]

Buddhism offered better opportunities to women than did the surrounding brāhmaṇism.[26] Through the bhikkhunī-saṃgha, women did have an alternative to their family roles. In one form or another, this faith contained teachings about sexual equality and the ultimate irrelevance of gender. However, his colleagues in the saṃgha especially after his death relied on popular, often non-Buddhist beliefs lifted from the surrounding woman-hating Brāhmaṇical culture which believed that a woman should always be under the protective control of a male relative, whether father, husband, or son. Traditional Buddhist thought may have admitted that women were disadvantaged in Indian androcentric-patriarchy, but their difficulties are seen as a result of their kamma, accrued in past lives.

---

[20]A. Sponberg, *Op. Cit*: 7.

[21]*Ibid*: 9.

[22]Ud.VI.X.

[23]S.I.5-6.

[24]A.S. Altekar, *The Position of Women in Hindu Civilization*, 3rd Edition, Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass, 1974: 54-55

[25]I.B. Horner: *Op. Cit*: XXIV.

[26]In an interesting study, Katherine K. Young organized the major religions of the world along a continuum on a scale moving from the greatest formal or proclaimed male dominance to the greatest acceptance or inclusion of genuine female power. She suggested this order: Judaism, Hinduism, Confucianism, Islam, Christianity, and Buddhism (See, Katherine K. Young, "Introduction," Arvind Sharma (ed), *Women in World Religions*, Albany: State University of New York, 1987:16.)

Women can, however, overcome their suffering in the future by being reborn as men. Dissatisfying as this solution is to someone with feminist values, it does at least admit that male dominance is unpleasant and difficult for women and tries to offer hope in the long run.[27] A feminist would, of course, suggest that what needs to be eliminated is not female rebirth in the future, but the *present* conditions that make life difficult or intolerable for women. Thus it has been pointed out with some justification that though early Indian Buddhism had a strong ethical tradition, its tradition of social activism and criticism was not as strong. Buddhism has rather been censured for regarding the society at large as mulish and balky and thus, for its lack of "the willingness and the courage to name oppression as *oppression*."[28]

If domesticity had been oppressive (as, in fact, it was and still is) then monasticism has usually been liberating for women as far as Buddhism is concerned. Women's monasticism was most often women's closest approximation to the self-determination and prestige normally accorded to men. However, this was not without its problems though as women's order has fared far less well than men's monasticism. Women as nuns received less economic support and prestige and less access to ritual and study that was enjoyed by men. In Buddhism like many other religious traditions, men's celibacy and chastity were protected by isolating or restricting women to a delimited sphere. These institutions also have the power of limiting women's access to the highest quality teaching and practising environment. Women who could be sited as role models, were not very many as compared to their male counterparts. They are largely exceptions to the norm for their gender. They could be called tokens. More importantly, they were largely unsupported by the institutional fabric of their society and their religion.

Some quarters have criticized the Buddha for having abandoned his wife and child. But this kind of criticism is misplaced. Regarding Siddhattha abandoning his wife and child, it must be remembered that their abandonment by him took place before and not after his enhancement to the status of a great person. The circumstances and mind-set under which he abandoned them were dictated by the prevailing circumstances under which those who wanted to seek spiritual insight were expected to "kick away gold, women and fame, the three universal fetters of man."[29] Siddhattha did this while following the traditions of Brāhmaṇism in renouncing the world to seek knowledge and his actions at this stage cannot be extrapolated to force a meaning upon his views and actions after Enlightenment. The prosecution of Ānanda during the First Buddhist Council also proves the hardening of attitudes among the followers of the Buddha after he was no longer there to guide or control them. Yet the subordination of women in the Buddhist community might not have been universal. While women were, indeed, reduced to lowliness by both precept and practice, history also offers examples to the contrary. Bartholomeusz has shown how the case of Saṃghamittā proves this point of view. She was the daughter of the powerful Indian king Asoka, who had sent her to establish bhikkhunī-saṃgha in Sri Lanka. This is an indication of the high position that a woman might attain in the Buddhist hierarchy and suggests that, at least in Asoka's time, nothing in Buddhist doctrine prevented women from being considered equal to men.[30] There are some references in the Pāli *Tipiṭaka* that accept and even appreciate the presence of women. For instance, Khemā was instructed by the Buddha in person. According to the legend, when he had finished, she attained arahantship together with a thorough grasp of the dhamma and its meaning. Thereafter, she became known for her great insight and was ranked high by the Buddha himself.[31] Similarly, Sujātā, while returning from a festival, listened to the Buddha's discourse and she attained arahantship, together with complete grasp of the dhamma in form

---

[27]Rita M. Gross, *Feminism & Religion: An Introduction*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1996: 139.

[28]Diana Y. Paul, *Op. Cit*: 145.

[29]*Ibid*:6.

[30]Tessa Bartholomuesz, "The Female Mendicant in Buddhist Sri Lanka," Jose Ignacio Cabezon (ed), *Buddhism, Sexuality and Gender*, New York: State University of New York Press, 1992: 38-51.

[31]Thī.61.

and meaning.[32] Kisā-Gotamī attained arahantship after understanding the dhamma preached by the Buddha.[33] Bhikkhunī Samā is said to have listened to the preachings of Ānanda and thereby attained arahantship.[34] Cittā was ordained by Mahāpajāpati Gotamī and later won arahantship.[35] Similarly, bhikkhunī Muttā claimed freedom not only from three crooked things, i.e. quern, mortar, and husband but also from rebirth and death.[36] All the above stated examples show that the Buddha respected women as equals and personally bestowed his teachings on many of them.

The bhikkhunī-saṃgha was founded five years later than the bhikkhu-saṃgha.[37] In the early stages of the bhikkhunī-saṃgha, bhikkhunīs may have learnt not only various forms of disciplinary acts but also different aspects of knowledge from bhikkhus. Here, it must be remembered that the social and spiritual opportunities offered by the Buddha to women being quite radical, must have drawn many objections from men, including bhikkhus. As a result, he must have been well aware of the fact that his female disciples would be constantly harassed and humiliated. Moreover, apprehensions that bhikkhunīs would be susceptible to male violence were realistic and are proved by the various incidents of male violence against bhikkhunīs, as do regulations designed to prevent such a violence. Thus, as pointed out by Rita Gross these regulations usually restrict women from lonesome travel and practices, just as today we often counter male violence against women by advising them not to be at unsafe places at unusual hours.[38] As a result of the establishment of the monasteries on the outskirts of human settlements, bhikkhunīs were exposed to the strong possibilities of lay-people finding faults with them, taking advantage of them or even sexually harassing them as single women. For instance, once several bhikkhunīs were going along a highroad to Sāvatthī through the country of Kosala. A certain bhikkhunī there, wanting to relieve herself, having stayed behind alone, went on afterwards. People, having seen that bhikkhunī, seduced her.[39] According to the Vinaya, lay people and non-Buddhists were always free to criticize bad conduct of bhikkhunīs and bhikkhus. Incriminations and scandalmongering of people toward bhikkhunīs and bhikkhus abound in the Vinaya. It is worthy of notice that harsher opprobrium was directed toward bhikkhunīs than toward bhikkhus. When a bhikkhunī did something wrong, people frequently reproved bhikkhunīs as "shaven-headed whores." In contrast, when a bhikkhu did something wrong, people never spoke in derogatory terms of him to the extent they did in the case of bhikkhunīs. Comparison of the criticisms of bhikkhunīs and bhikkhus suggests that people in ancient Indian society were more wrathful toward the wrongdoings of bhikkhunīs than those of bhikkhus. It also indicates that this provided a reason for the formulation of more rules for bhikkhunīs than bhikkhus in this category. People in the society were unwilling to permit women to fracture out from the household life.For women to regulate and protect themselves, even if consistent with the notion of parity, was nonetheless socially unthinkable. In the opinion of I.B. Horner, it is quite likely that they were in general considered as of poorer calibre than the monks, and that, therefore, there had to be a severer testing in order to weed out those who had entered the saṃgha without having a real purpose.[40]

The Buddha treated women as individuals in their own right. Doctrinally also he considered them at par with men, though such a position appears limited to women's ability to attain nibbāna.

---

[32]Thī.69.

[33]Thī.89.

[34]Thī.25.

[35]Thī.36.

[36]Thī.11.

[37]Kajiyama Yuichi, *Op. Cit*: 159-60.

[38]Rita Gross, *Buddhism After Patriarchy: A Feminine History, Analysis, and Reconstruction of Buddhism,* Albany: State University of New York, 1992: 36.

[39]SBB.XII.189.

[40]SBB.XX.xiv.

Social rights of women within the society at large may not have drawn the attention of the Buddha as much as it deserved. Yet, it is important to remember that whenever opportunities came up, the Buddha did speak his mind. This is proved by his remark to Pasenadi, who became unhappy on hearing the news that his queen had given birth to a daughter rather than a son. The Buddha told him that a daughter may actually prove to be an even better offspring than a son as she may grow up to be wise and virtuous. Having once noted that women were quite capable of pursuing the religious life, the early Buddhist saṃgha had to decide as to what was to be done with regard to the interest that was generated by a view such as this. In the beginning, this does not appear to have posed any problem as the towering personality and charisma of the Buddha was enough to offset any worries regarding authority on the inside and acceptability at large on the outside. However, as the saṃgha developed during the post-Mahāparinibbāna period, it began to calibrate its character in relation to the society on the outside. With shift such as this, one can find increasing evidence of an attitude that meant that women indeed may pursue a full-time religious career, but only within a carefully regulated institutional structure that preserved and reinforced the conventionally accepted social standards of male dominance and female subordination.

It cannot be denied that with the founding of the bhikkhunī-saṃgha, the Buddha granted a religious role to women that for a long time to come remained virtually without parallel in the history of the world. However, after his death, some practical considerations appear to have formed the basis of an excuse to speculate about the limitations of the female nature. This kind of mentality became increasingly characteristic of Buddhism as the saṃgha became more institutionalized and male dominated in the first several centuries following the Buddha's death. The saṃgha, after the death of the Buddha, reconciled the religious direction he had provided it with the social contingencies within which the Buddhist community grew thereafter. Lay mentality unmistakably impresses itself on the workings of the Saṃgha especially because at least the majority within the Saṃgha believed that isolation from society was no object of monastic life.[41] This type of monk-and-layman intercourse on a regular basis must have left indelible impact of lay mentality on monk-mind. Such a contradiction made its appearance in Buddhism not out of the identification of realities of gender differences, but rather out of the additional supposition that this distinction consigned women to a lower capability for following the spiritual path. Though one can get occasional glimpses into the lives of women through the autobiographical literature, but on the whole, one can examine only what Buddhist men had said about women historically, not what Buddhist women had claimed or felt. In contrast to an attitude of parity, which focussed on the capability of women to pursue the path, the focus, after the death of the Buddha, shifted from the women themselves, to a rather perceived danger to the integrity of the saṃgha, as it existed, within the broader social harmony. It was felt that women must be protected by some androcentric-patriarchal social structure like the family and the bhikkhu-saṃgha was ill-suited to that task for the simple reason that monks, by definition, had simply given up such social responsibilities.

Various contradictions that appeared in the post-Mahāparinibbāna saṃgha were sought to be reconciled through the invention of the story of Gotamī Mahāpajāpatī as the first bhikkhunī and her acceptance of the eight restrictive rules. Interestingly, Mahāpajāpatī became bhikkhunī after her husband's death by which time the Buddha had converted many women. Due to her prestige, her name appears to have been included in the mythologized version. I.B. Horner feels that the whole prophecy of the decline of the dhamma after 500 years may have been an addition by monks.[42] It is also worthy of notice that these contradictions were resolved only over a period of time and the version in the *Cullavagga*[43] is probably a still later attempt to rationalize and legitimize *post facto* what had already

---

[41]*vihāre vijjamāne sulabhadassanaṃ dassanakāmānaṃ anikete duddassanaṃ bhavissati* (V. Trenckner (ed), *Milindapañha*, London: Williams and Norgate: 1880: 212).

[42]I.B. Horner: *Op. Cit*: 105.

[43]Chapter.X.

become the status quo. Beyond simple rationalization, one may also see a recurrent theme that attempts to reconcile the various contradictions. Mahāpajāpatī appears to have been chosen because she commanded great respect as a woman to whom the Buddha owed the greatest debt. To make the story look credible, the editors initially show Mahāpajāpatī as having accepted all eight of the restrictive rules readily, but later, approaching Ānanda to go back to the Buddha to see if he would relent on the first rule regarding seniority.[44] Such a concession would have allowed bhikkhunīs far greater status and prerogatives within the monastic community and one that would, thus, no doubt have significantly altered the subsequent history of the bhikkhunī-saṃgha. The reply, obviously, is shown as negative and justified on the ground that such a sexual parity was totally unprecedented. But by the time this dilemma became a social issue the bhikkhunī-saṃgha had certainly existed for quite some time. The bhikkhunīs, no doubt, had regulated themselves quite successfully and probably continued to do so after the resolution, albeit now officially under the control (and protection) of the monks. It was an uneasy compromise, most likely, but one that got the monks off the hook while also legitimizing as much as possible the existence of the anomalous group of quasi-autonomous women. However, in this story, the *Vinaya* redactors had to resolve many more issues. In the story, Mahāpajāpatī functions as a leader of women who parallels the Buddha's leadership of bhikkhus.[45] Despite the Buddha's initial rejection of her request, Mahāpajāpatī and her followers are also shown as having shaved, donned the yellow robes and following the Buddha and his saṃgha.[46] Such a position would mean not only a direct challenge to the authority of the Buddha but also an overturning of the hierarchical scheme to be maintained throughout the *Vinaya*. The *Vinaya* redactors resolved this contradiction by reestablishing the (*proper*) hierarchy of bhikkhus over bhikkhunīs, thus, separating the bhikkhu-saṃgha from the flood of contamination and allowing it to (re-)gain its purity. By accepting the authority of the monks, at least nominally, the bhikkhunīs may have gained a more acceptable place in the eyes of the broader society. But long term consequences of such an arrangement turned out to be disastrous for the bhikkhunī-saṃgha as it was subsequently relegated to a position of second-class status, a constraint that was certain to be reflected in the diminished prestige, educational opportunities, and financial support. Historically speaking, the bhikkhunī-saṃgha went into a steady decline in spite of having secured some degree of acceptability. Given the earlier precedent of accomplished women practitioners among the Buddhists, one might reasonably expect the bhikkhunīs to have maintained a creative religious life in

---

[44]*Cv*.X.257.

[45]Jonathan Walters is of the opinion that Gotamī Mahāpajāpatī is the female counterpart to Gotama, the Buddha. Their clan-names reflect this, as does their treatment in the *Gotamī-Apadāna*. Both appear surrounded by their disciples (female and male, respectively); both save a group of 500 (nuns and monks, respectively) through their mercy; both are worshipped by deities (gods and goddesses, respectively), each pays mutual homage to the other, and there is a conscious parallelism in the descriptions of their respective deaths in the *Gotamī-Apadāna* and the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*. On the basis of these parallels, Walters argues that historically two separate paths for women and men existed in early Buddhism. According to him, Mahāpajāpatī's presentation in the *Apadāna* exemplifies the subordination required of all women in ancient India. (Jonathan Walters, "A Voice from the Silence: the Buddha's Mother's Story,"*History of Religions* 33/4, 1994: 358-379). However, Liz Wilson disagrees and points out that, if gender connotations in the text can be laid aside, the parallels would be equal. (*Women in the Footsteps of the Buddha: Struggle for Liberation in the Therīgāthā*, Curzon, 1998: 44-51).

[46]In the Mahāsaṃghika-Lokottaravādin account of the story, her leadership and her subversiveness are emphasized. After the Buddha has rejected her initial request, she returns to her friends and proposes that they shave, don the yellow robes, and follow the Buddha. She then says "if the Buddha allows it, we will enter the religious path. If not, we will do it anyway."(See Edith Nolot (tr), *Regles de Discipline des Nonnes Bouddhistes: Le Bhikṣuṇīvinaya de L'Ecole Mahāsaṃghika-Lokottaravādin* (Paris: Collège de France, 1991). Now an increasing number of scholars finds it difficult to believe that the Buddha whose teachings were based on universality and gender equality would have created rules such as these. These rules and the legends connected with them are later interpolations.

the monasteries despite the increasing androcentric and patriarchal restrictions. Although that may have been the case at least for some centuries after the death of the Buddha, but in direct proportion to the increasing Brāhmaṇization and asceticization of Buddhism, life in the bhikkhunī-saṃgha appears to have become more and more marginalized and, finally, ceased to play any role in the official accounts of the tradition. By the third century AD, the bhikkhunī-saṃgha in India appears to have virtually disappeared from the official records. We know, from the report of the Chinese pilgrims in India, for example, that female monasteries continued to exist well into the 7th century AD and beyond, yet there is no record of what these women achieved in their practice or what they contributed to the larger Buddhist community. All this would not have been possible without the overt support of the bhikkhu-saṃgha, which had much to lose and little to gain for asserting a place of parity for the bhikkhunīs. For all its adherence to gender parity at the doctrinal level, institutional Buddhism was not able to (or saw no reason to) challenge prevailing attitudes about gender roles in the society. Thus, the initial success of the bhikkhunī-saṃgha in ancient India was followed by decline because people supported bhikkhus more readily than they supported bhikkhunīs.[47] There are unmistakable traces of the trends and the elements of lay mentality impressed in Saṃgha. The Saṃgha never aimed at completely isolating itself from the people as it was expected to work for the *bahujana hitāya*. In the *Milindapañha*,[48] for instance, it has been pointed out that monks must make themselves accessible to lay people and so live in monasteries. This monk-and-layman intercourse brought monkhood into such relationship with the life of the laity that it made inevitable the reaction of lay mentality on monk-mind. Thus, it is actually quite surprising that the bhikkhunī-saṃgha managed to survive for as long as it did, however, marginally.

Ascetical misogyny was the most hostile and negative tenor toward the feminine that one finds in the latest strata of Pāli *Tipiṭaka*.[49] Such an attitude suggested that a woman could neither attain to the highest religious ideals such as nibbāna, arahanthood, Bodhisattahood or Buddhahood nor could she become a Sakka, Māra or Brahmā.[50] She was directly held responsible for the fall of human race and death of the spiritual being.[51] Now the feminine came to be perceived as base, closer to nature, conjurer, crackpot, crooked, deceitful, degraded, destructive, elusive, envious, fatuous, feeble-minded, foolish, greedy, imperfect, lustful, mundane, mysterious, prestidigitator, profligate, profane, ravaging, sensual, sinful, timid, treacherous, unbridled, ungrateful, untrustworthy, vile, vulnerable, weak in wisdom and wicked.[52] She came to be equated with a snake in five aspects i.e. "angry, ill-

---

[47]Rita M. Gross, *Feminism & Religion: An Introduction*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1996: 83.

[48]*vihāre vijjamāne sulabhadassanaṃ dassanakāmānaṃ anikete duddassanaṃ bhavissati* (V. Trenckner (ed), *Milindapañha*, London: Williams and Norgate: 1880: 212).

[49]It was in this kind of background that the whole issue of women's ordination comes in for severest criticism and condemnation. Their ordination began to be seen as possibly the biggest tragedy in Buddhism and among other things is compared to mildew (*setaṭṭhika*) attacking a whole field of rice (BD.V.356).

[50]Bu.I.59; SnA.I.48f.; A.I.28; M.II.65-66. A Bodhisatta is expected to abandon his female partner (J.VI.552). It is interesting to notice that none of the bodhisattas mentioned in the 547 *Jātakas* is a female.

[51]In fact, this is the theme of the *Agañña Suttanta*.

[52]GS.I.93; IV.150; KS.I.146; A.II.61; J.I.111, 134, 285, 289; II.474, 478, 527; IV.124-25; V.36, 435; VI.17, 339.It may be interesting to note some of the post-Mahāparinibbāna Buddhist statements made against women: 1."given an opportunity, all women will go wrong" (J.V.435); 2."Like river, road, or drinking shed, assembly hall or inn/ So free to all are womenfolk, no limits check their sin."(J.V.446); 3."the attribute of women folk is scolding." (GS.IV.150); 4. They are "the peril of sea-monsters" (*susukābhyaṃ*). (A.I.126); 5."The ways of womenfolk are secret, not open," (A.I.282); 6.Women are seen bent upon losing their honour and respect even when they were kept "in mid-ocean in a palace by the

tempered, deadly poisonous, forked-tongued and betrayer of friends."[53] The *Jātakas* present themselves as the ultimate example of this kind of virulent attitude.[54] Now it was felt that association with woman was polluting and deadly because she was capable of causing defilement and impurity even in those sanctified souls "whose sins have been stayed by the power of ecstacy."[55] Over and over again it is pointed out that women are biologically determined to be sexually uncontrollable.[56] As a consequence of this kind of mind-set, it was given out that the female must be suppressed, controlled, and conquered by the male. Female sexuality began to be seen as a threat to culture, society and religion which in turn was used as a rationale for relegating women to a marginal existence.[57]

Such aggressive misogynist sentiments arose in response to a specific set of issues. The cosmogonic myths of the old Indian culture, focussed on the fact that this world has evolved from a pure realm of formless, asexual beings. Embodiment and sexual differentiation were seen as the manifestation of a lower state of existence, one bound by attachment to the earth and brought on by eating and sexual activity. These scriptures imply that, since sexuality was involved in the fall, abstention from sexual pleasures will weaken the ties that bind humanity to the lower material world and thus enable seekers after Enlightenment to ascend to the luminous state of perfection forfeited by their ancestors. Given this world-view, it is not surprising that impurity came to be associated with

---

Simbal lake."(J.II.90) 7. "Verily, woman is wicked and ungrateful. Of old, Asura-demons swallowed women, though they guarded them in their belly, they could not keep them faithful to one man." (J.II.527). 8. It is very hard to know the nature of women (J.V.446) as they are "vile wretches" and "no limit bounds their shame."(J.V.448). In the *Culla-Paduma Jātaka* (J.I.115-121.) the Bodhisatta relates how he offered his thirsty wife blood from his knee to drink and she in turn tried to kill him and started living with a man with criminal background. At another place, the Bodhisatta says: "Surely Brethren, even when I was in an animal form, I knew well the ingratitude, the wiles, the wickedness, and immorality of womenfolk, and at that time so far from being in their power I kept them under my control." (J.V.419). Still, in another *Jātaka* story, the Bodhisatta tells his father "if women come into this house, they will bring no peace of mind for me and for you." (J.IV.43).

[53]A.II.260-61. The same *sutta* mentions the following five disadvantageous similarities between a snake and a woman: unclean, evil-smelling, timid, fearful and betrayer of friends.

[54]Such an attitude is reflected through the innumerous episodes of the Bodhisatta taking pride in being called a woman-hater (*anitthigaṅdha*) (J.IV.48), seducing the bride of a king to prove a point (J.VI.235-236), a *generous* king giving away his wife to a man to enjoy for seven days (J.II.337) or a king telling a woman, with whom he has casual sex, to bring the child to him only if she gives birth to a male child (J.I.28), so on and so forth. The following statements from the *Jātakas* about women speak for themselves: 1. "They are like unto robbers with braided locks, like a poisoned drink, like merchants that sing their own praises, crooked like a deer's horn, evil-tongued like snakes, like a pit that is covered over, insatiate as hell, as hard to satisfy as she-ogre, like the all-rapacious Yama, all-devouring like a flame, sweeping all before it as a river, like the wind going where it lists, undiscriminating like Mount Neru, fruiting perennially like a poison tree." (J.V.425).

> 2. "A wife may youthful be and good and fair,
> Own troops of friends, and children's love may share,
> Not e'en to her entrust thy hidden thought,
> Or of her treachery thou must beware." (J.V.80).

> 3.. "Go parley with a man with sword in hand;
> Use question with a goblin, sit ye close
> Beside th'envenomed snake, whose bite is death;
> But never alone with a lone female talk." (A.II.260).

[55]The *Jātakas* are replete with examples of women leading ascetics astray from their avowed goal. See, for instance, J.I.27; IV.468; V.157

[56]The recurrent theme of post-Mahāparinibbāna Buddhism is that they are of easy virtue who end their lives unsatiated and unreplete with "intercourse, adornment, and child-bearing."(GS.I.77; J.II.342).

[57]Simultaneously, the mystery of the female body and its powers came to be associated with disruptive cosmological powers. Exceptions to this view, however, may be found with regard to female sex-workers such as Ambapāli. A sex-worker's sexuality, although feared, was also desired. She was powerful because she was not subjugated by any single male authority figure. She was appreciated because she gave of herself indiscriminately.

the natural realm and female fecundity, while transcendent purity began to be expressed in masculine celibacy. In the Buddhist literature such sentiments most often are expressed in discussions of male religious practice, and especially in texts that present the spiritual ideal primarily in terms of ascetic purity. This suggests that the psychological demands of ascetic celibacy are more central to understanding this attitude than the legacy of cosmogonic assumptions. In this we find a fear of the feminine, and a fear specifically of its power to undermine male celibacy.

Rejection of household life by a religion with ascetic ideals basically meant rejection of woman and ancient Indian Buddhism of post-Mahāparinibbāna period came to perceive rejection of woman as an act of religious merit. The stories, images, and ideals frequently became vehicles of misogynist views.[58] Like non-renunciants, transgressors, and novices, bhikkhunīs did not have the right to protest statements uttered during official proceedings or comment upon the behaviour of the bhikkhus and, in fact, were completely subordinated to them.[59] Women began to be ridiculed and condemned for their *typical womanish* characteristics (*itthinimitta*) and attitude (*itthikutta*).[60] It is not surprising that post-Mahāparinibbāna Buddhist ethos does not consider women as worthy of sitting in a court of justice, capable of embarking on business, good enough to reach the essence of things, mature enough to be good managers of households or competent and desirable to be heads of social and political institutions.[61] This type of vehement, doctrinaire, terrifying logic painfully degraded women and obviously reduced them to a state of marginal existence.

Thus, in the post-Mahāparinibbāna Buddhism only those women appear to have been accepted into the saṃgha who were either over and above the morality of the society like Emperor Asoka's daughter Saṃghamittā or those who were rootless and free and had already fractured out of the moral moorings of the society. But nevertheless, it offered a chance to some women in whatever condition or circumstance. In an androcentric-patriarchal society, it must have been indeed a tricky situation whereby on the one hand, the bhikkhus and the bhikkhunīs had to maintain sufficient distance from each other to avoid the question of impropriety, and on the other the saṃgha had to deal with the social unacceptability (indeed unimaginability) of an autonomous group of women not under the direct regulation and control of some male authority. By being formally associated with the monks, the bhikkhunīs were able to enjoy the benefits of leaving the household life without incurring immediate

---

[58]Womanhood is invariably seen as "a snare of Māra" (A.III.68).

[59]It was prescribed in no uncertain terms that "one should not carry out greetings, rise up for salutation and proper duties toward women."(BD.V.227, 358). On seeing a bhikkhu, a bhikkhunī was told to get off the way when still at a distance, and make room for him, greet him respectfully, rise from her seat, salute him with folded hands and pay proper respects even if she was senior to him. (Vin.V.52; SBE.XX.345). The admonition of monks by bhikkhunīs was strictly forbidden, but was allowed the other way around. (A.IV.277-78).

[60]A.IV.57; Dhs.633, 713, 836; J.I.296, 433, II.127, 329, IV.219, 472; DhA.IV.197.Now any attempt by a woman to deviate from the standards laid down for her began to be portrayed as an "unwomanlike behaviour" (*anitthi*) (J.I.126).During the post-Mahāparinibbāna period women were primarily expected to train themselves in a way that "To whatever husband … parents… (gave them)… for him (they would) rise up early, be the last to retire, be willing workers, order all things sweetly and be gentle voiced." (A.II.37; IV.265).

[61]1. They are "unworthy of sitting in a court of justice, embark on business or reach the essence of things," because they are "uncontrolled (*kodha*)… envious (*issukī*)… greedy (*maccharī*)… and)… weak in wisdom (*duppañño*)." (A.I.82-83).
2. It was prescribed that bhikkhunīs must remain away from the *pavāraṇā* ceremony (*Mv* IV 2-14.) and also outside the boundaries during bhikkhus' recitation of *Pātimokkha* (even though it includes the rules for bhikkhunīs).(*Mv*.I.36.1-2.).
3. It was held that "an official act… which requires the presence of four persons, if performed by a congregation in which a bhikkhunī is the fourth, is no real act, and ought not to be performed."(SBE.XVII.269). Thus, they were no more to be counted to make up the quorum required of any of the formal acts of the saṃgha from ordination of bhikkhus and other major ritual events to disciplinary proceedings, and they could not split a saṃgha even if they sided with the schismatic.(Mv.VI.5.1). Warning signals begun to be sounded that a land becomes "infamous… which owns a woman's sway and rule, and infamous are the men who yield themselves to women's dominion." (J.I.43).
4. The *Jātakas* prophesied that bad days will come when "men will leave everything at the disposal of their wives," (J.I.342) as they are "like cats, deceiving and cajoling to bring to ruin one who has come into their power."(J.V.152.).

harm. Whilst it is understandable to abhor the attitude and behaviour of the society toward women which necessitated such a protection, but it is misplaced to criticize the saṃgha for adopting this particular policy.[62] Now women could improve their lot by taking their future into their own hands. It must be remembered that the worst enemies of a woman were and still are the family, marriage and maternity- where she is exploited by man as a child-bearing and child-rearing machine. The fact that Buddhism provided her with the opportunity of not only breaking free of such institutions but also of getting unionized- it is no mere achievement. It was only under such an environment that a unique text such as the *Therīgāthā*, was produced, which should be mentioned whenever the issue of Buddhism and women is considered. This would balance the record.[63]

---

[62]Ian Astley, (A book review of) Rita M. Gross, *Buddhism After Patriarchy: A Feminist History, Analysis, and Reconstruction of Buddhism Buddhism,* Albany: State University of New York, 1992, in *Studies in Central & East Asian Religions* Vol. 5/6, Copenhagen: Journal of the Seminar for Buddhist Studies, 1992-3: 208.

[63]However, Rita M. Gross warns that though the stories of women related in the *Therīgāthā* are highly useful, their utility is also limited. These women are heroines, but they are also tokens in an androcentric and patriarchal past. We need to know about and celebrate our heroines and role models, but on the other hand it is important not to overcompensate by making more of them than is justified (*Buddhism After Patriarchy: A Feminine History, Analysis, and Reconstruction of Buddhism,* Albany: State University of New York, 1992: 118).

6
Devadatta

Devadatta and Bhaddakaccānā/Bhaddakaccā were respectively the son[1] and daughter of Sākyan Suppabuddha and Amitā.[2] Amitā was the sister of prince Siddhattha's father, Suddhodana.[3] Prince Siddhattha's mother Māyā/Mahāmāyā and step-mother Pajāpatī Gotamī were Suppabuddha's sisters.[4] According to Pāli texts, Bhaddakaccānā was married to prince Siddhattha.[5] On the occasion of the Buddha's first visit to Kapilavatthu after Enlightenment, when the Buddha went to have a meal at the palace on invitation of Suddhodana, all the ladies of the court came to pay their respect to the Buddha. The only exception was the Buddha's wife. It is said that she refused to go, saying that if she had any virtue in her the Buddha would come to her.[6] The Buddha, of course, fulfilled her wish, but it is quite strange that she has hardly been mentioned by name in the Pāli *Tipiṭaka*. Perhaps the single time when she is mentioned by name is was this very occasion when she asked Rāhula to go to the Buddha saying, "That is your father, go and ask him for your inheritance."[7] There is so much ambiguity in Pāli texts that one is not even sure of her real name. The attitude of her brother Devadatta and father Suppabuddha toward the Buddha forms the basis of one of the most acrimonious relationships in the history of ancient India. Interestingly, while Devadatta is mentioned by the Pāli texts as wanting to kill his sister's husband, Suppabuddha is shown as making a public display of his opposition to his son-in-law to the extent that he perishes into hell as a result. It is hard to come across another example in the history of India where the duo of son and father hold the son-in-law of the family in such an utter contempt and where the two are depicted as jumping at every possible opportunity to harm him. Suppabuddha's brother Daṇḍapāṇi too is known to have joined the duo and openly made attempts to poke fun at the Buddha. Why did the male in-laws of the Buddha *en bloc* oppose him so much?

In order to evaluate the plausible reasons behind the strong contempt in which Devadatta and his family held the Buddha, we shall make an attempt to evaluate the following issues:

1. When did the relationship between Devadatta and the Buddha become acrimonious? Did it start in their childhood or did it start after Devadatta joined the Saṃgha?
2. Did Suppabuddha and Daṇḍapāṇi dislike the Buddha for the same reasons as Devadatta?
3. To what extent was the relationship soured by the fact that prince Siddhattha had abandoned his wife and infant son?
4. How does one explain the fact that as time goes by the criticism of Devadatta's character becomes more and more virulent in the Pāli texts?
5. Is it plausible to believe that someone whom the Buddha himself as certified as the one who had 'put away evil' could turn into an incorrigible villain?

---

[1] However, some texts like the *Mahāvaṃsa* and the *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā* show Devadatta as the son of Suppabuddha's brother Amitodana and thus, the brother of Ānanda. See, the *Mahāvaṃsa* (henceforth Mhv) (London: PTS, 1908).II.22; the *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā* (henceforth DhA), (London: PTS, 1906-15).III.44.

[2] At one place in the *Vinaya Piṭaka* she is called Godhī. See, the *Vinaya Piṭakaṃ* (henceforth Vin.) (London: PTS, 1879-1883).II.189.

[3] The *Paramatthadīpanī* (henceforth ThaA) (London: PTS, 1891-1977).I.105; the *Papañcasūdanī* (henceforth MA) (London : PTS, 1922-38).I.289.

[4] See, G.P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, Reprint, vol. 2, New Delhi: Oriental Reprint, 1983, *s.v.* Māyā.

[5] The *Buddhavaṃsa* (henceforth Bu) (London: PTS, 1974).XXVI.15; the *Manorathapūraṇī* (henceforth AA) (London: PTS, 1956-1973).I.204; Mhv.II.24. Though her name is generally given as Rāhulamātā, in some later Pāli texts she is also called Yasodharā, see for instance, the *Madhuratthavilāsinī* (henceforth BuA) (London: PTS, 1946).245.

[6] The *Jātakas* (henceforth J) (London: Trubner & Co, 1877-1897).I.58ff.

[7] Vin.I.82. See, G.P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, Reprint, vol. 2, New Delhi: Oriental Reprint, 1983, *s.v.* Rāhulamātā.

Devadatta, who is said to have had the strength of five elephants,[8] made his entry into the Saṃgha when the Buddha visited Kapilavatthu after Enlightenment. According to the account given in the *Cullavagga* of the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, the Buddha preached to the Sākyans and converted many of them including Devadatta.[9] We are told that Devadatta began his career quite impressively as a monk. During the *Vassāvāsa* that followed his entry into the Saṃgha, Devadatta acquired the power of *iddhi,* possible to those who are still of the world (*puthujjanika-iddhi*).[10] According to the account, as a result of this achievement, the prestige of Devadatta grew tremendously and he came to acquire great respect within the Saṃgha. In fact, elsewhere in the Pāli *Nikāyas*, Devadatta is praised as a quintessential example of an ideal monk, who had rights view, preach the correct dhamma,[11] and on whom Sāriputta lavished praises saying: "Godhīputta is of great psychic power, Godhīputta is of great splendour."[12] The Buddha also praised Devadatta and included him amongst those eleven Elders[13] who were particularly praiseworthy. In fact, the Buddha goes so far as to call Devadatta and the others as the ones who have "put away evil, who have destroyed the fetters, the wise ones."[14]

But after this, we are told, begins the story of acrimony and bad-blood. Devadatta is suspected of evil designs.[15] He is shown in the Pāli texts as a person who became not only jealous of the Buddha's fame but also became eager for gain and fame. Thus, it is pointed out, Devadatta begun to entertain ambitions to win lay converts and satisfy his desire for honour and material gain. To attain this objective, Devadatta decided to enlist the support of crown prince Ajātasattu. Devadatta manifested himself to him as a young boy clad in a girdle of snakes. Ajātasattu was tremendously impressed with Devadatta's display of his supernatural power and became his loyal patron showering all kinds of favours on him.[16] After this, we are told, Devadatta began to smell real power and conceived the idea of becoming the leader of the Saṃgha in the Buddha's place. But at this point his psychic powers diminished.

According to the *Cullavagga* account, almost immediately afer Devadatta joined the Saṃgha, the Buddha was warned by the *devaputta* Kakudha about Devadatta's desire to deprive him of the leadership of the Saṃgha.[17] But the Buddha is not troubled by such reports as he felt that such actions of Devadatta would only be counterproductive.[18] For the fulfilment of his desire to take up the leadership of the Saṃgha, the story goes, Devadatta approached the Buddha and pointed out to him that as the latter was getting old, he should let former assume leadership of the Saṃgha. The Buddha outrightly rejected his request and snubbed him for entertaining such thoughts.[19] Devadatta left dejected and threatened revenge. The Buddha, thereafter, told the monks to carry out the following formal act of information against Devadatta in Rājagaha:

> "whereas Devadatta's nature was formerly of one kind, now it is of another
> kind; and that whatever Devadatta should do by gesture and by voice, in that
> neither the Awakened One nor Dhamma nor the Order should be seen, but

---

[8]The *Sāratthappakāsinī* (henceforth SA) (London: PTS, 1977).I.62.

[9]Vin.II.182-202; III.172-175.

[10]Vin.II.183.

[11]The *Aṅguttara Nikāya* (henceforth A) (London: PTS, 1885-1900).IV.402.

[12]*mahiddhiko godhiputto, mahānubhāvo godhiputto* (Vin.II.189).

[13]Sāriputta, Mahāmogallāna, Mahākassapa, Mahākaccāyana, Mahākoṭṭhita, Mahākappina, Mahācunda, Anuruddha, Revata, Devadatta, and Ānanda. See, The *Udānaṃ* (henceforth Ud) (London: PTS, 1885).I.5.

[14]Ud.I.5.

[15]The *Saṃyutta Nikāya* (henceforth S) (London: PTS, 1884-1898).II.156.

[16]Vin.II.184.

[17]Vin.II.184.

[18]Vin.II.187-188.

[19]Vin.II.188; The *Majjhima Nikāya* (henceforth M) (London: PTS, 1888-1896).I.393.

in that only Devadatta should be seen."[20]

The act being carried out, the Buddha asked Sāriputta to inform against Devadatta in Rājagaha. When Sāriputta expressed hesitation because he had formerly spoken in praise of him, the Buddha allowed that just as Sāriputta's former praise had been true, now his condemnation will be equally true.[21] When Sāriputta proclaimed the act of information in Rājagaha against Devadatta, it leads to protest by at least some of the lay devotees of Devadatta who accused the followers of the Buddha of being jealous of Devadatta's gains and honours.[22]

After the above stated incident, according to Pāli literature, Devadatta turns into a complete anti-social and a criminal. He makes up his mind to murder the Buddha. For this purpose, he approaches Ajātasattu so that he can assassinate the Buddha and usurp the leadership of the Saṃgha. But the assassins sent by him are dissuaded from their intended act by the charisma, insight, and kindness of the Buddha.[23] Thereafter, Devadatta tries to kill the Buddha by rolling down a boulder on to him from a hilltop. Though the boulder is miraculously destroyed, splinters from the boulder draw blood from the Buddha's foot. At this the Buddha remarks:

> "You have produced great demerit, foolish man, in that you, with your mind,
> malignant, your mind on murder, drew the Tathāgata's blood."[24]

After this incident the monks become very worried about the Buddha's safety, but the latter tells them not to worry as a Buddha cannot be killed before his time by a person such as Devadatta.[25] Now, Devadatta sets a mad killer elephant on the Buddha, but the Buddha tames the elephant through his loving-kindness.[26] Attempts to kill the Buddha led to an outrage and public unpopularity of Devadatta. Ajātasattu was compelled by the force of public opinion to withdraw his patronage from Devadatta, whose gain and honour, any way, had decreased.[27] However, according to Pāli Buddhism, these plans of Devadatta to harm the Buddha were the result of the Buddha's evil deeds in previous births.[28] In any case, despite the hatred shown by Devadatta towards him, the Buddha on his part did not harbour any ill-will towards him.[29]

After having failed to kill the Buddha, Devadatta along with four other companion monks (Kokālika, Koṭamorakatissa, Khaṇḍadeviyāputta and Samuddadatta), goes to the Buddha and requests him that the following five austere (dhuta) practices be imposed on the Saṃgha and that their violation be treated as sinful:

1.   Monks should dwell all their lives in the forest (āraññaka); whoever should carry himself to the neighbourhood of a settlement, sin (vajja) would sully him.
2.   Monks should all their lives obtain alms by begging (piṇḍapātika); whoever should accept invitations for meals, sin would sully him.
3.   Monks should all their lives wear robes made of discarded clothes (paṃsukūlika); whoever should accept a robe given by the laity, sin would

---

[20]The *Book of the Discipline*, (henceforth BD) (London: PTS, 1938-1966).V.264-65.

[21]Vin.II.189.

[22]Vin.II.190.

[23]Vin.II.190-193.

[24]Vin.II.193.

[25]Vin.II.194.

[26]Vin.II.194-94.

[27]The *Samantapāsādikā* (henceforth VA) (London: PTS, 1947-1975).IV.811.

[28]The *Apadāna* (henceforth Ap) (London: PTS, 1925-27).II.300-01.

[29]The *Milindapañha* (henceforth Mil) (London: Williams and Norgate: 1880).410.

sully him.

4. Monks should all their lives dwell at the foot of a tree (*rukkhamūlika*); whoever dwell under a roof, sin would sully him.

5. Monks should all their lives abstain completely from fish and flesh (*macchamaṃsaṃ na khādeyyuṃ*), whoever should eat fish and flesh, sin would sully him.[30]

As pointed out by Mukherjee,[31] it is quite strange indeed to note that even after the various attempts made by Devadatta on the life of the Buddha (including injuring him), he was not expelled from the Saṃgha. So much so, he even went over to the Buddha as a monk and demanded the imposition of these five austere practices.[32] As a justification for demanding the imposition of these practices, the story goes, Devadatta appeals to the Buddha in the following words:

> Lord, the lord in many ways speaks in praise of desiring little, of being contented, of expunging (evil), of being punctilious, of what is gracious, of decrease (of the obstructions), of putting forth energy. Lord, these five items are conducive in many ways to desiring little, to contentment.[33]

The Buddha leaves the option to the monks and enjoins Devadatta not to bring out a schism in the Saṃgha:

> "Whoever wishes, let him be a forest-dweller; whoever wishes, let him dwell in the neighbourhood of a village; whoever wishes, let him be a beggar for alms; whoever wishes, let him accept an invitation; whoever wishes, let him wear rags taken from the dust-heap; whoever wishes, let him accept a householder's robes. For eight months, Devadatta, lodging at the foot of a tree is permitted by me [i.e., except during the rains]. Fish and flesh are pure in respect of three points: if they are not seen, heard or suspected (to have been killed for him)."[34]

However, Devadatta in turn, according to the account, accuses the Buddha of being prone to luxury and abundance especially because "people esteem austerity."[35] Davadatta then goes ahead (in the *Uposatha* ceremony) through the formalities of creating the first schism in the Saṃgha and leaves for Gayāsīsa along with 500 supporting monks.[36]

According to the commentary of the *Dhammapada*, then onwards Devadatta tries to imitate the Buddha by keeping two chief disciples by his side.[37] Among his followers, Devadatta also has some

---

[30]Vin.III.171.

[31]B. Mukherjee, *Die Uberlieferung von Devadatta, dem Widersacher des Buddha, in den kanonischen Schriften*, Munich, 1966: 120.

[32]But some non-Theravādin texts reverse these incidents and put them in different chronological order thus making them look more logical.

[33]BD.I.296.

[34]BD.I.298.

[35]Vin.III.171-172.

[36]Vesālī was the scene of the Second Buddhist Council in which the issue of the Ten Extravagances (*dasavatthūnī*) was raised and a large number of monks belonging to the Vajjian clan (known as Vajjiputtakā/ Vajjiputtiyā) who were practising these 'extravagances' were expelled from the Saṃgha. As a consequence the Vajjiputtakas formed a separate sect, the Mahāsaṃghikas. It is interesting to note that the same Vajjiputtakas seceded from the Saṃgha under the leadership of Devadatta (Vin.II.199f). Buddhaghosa as a matter of fact actually identifies the heretics as belonging to the same party (VA.I.228). It is also important to remember here that initially the Vajjiputtakas were supported even by Kāḷāsoka, the king. See, for instance, Mhv.IV.7ff; the *Chronicle of the Island of Ceylon or the Dīpavaṃsa* (henceforth Dīp), the Ceylon Historical Journal, 7, 1958: 1-266).IV.44.

[37]DhA.I.122.

prominent personalities like nun Thullanandā who upheld Devadatta as a stalwart in the *sāsana*.[38] The Buddha sends Sāriputta and Moggallāna to Devadatta's camp. After arriving, though these two seem to have approved of Devadatta's dhamma but when Devadatta goes to sleep, they convince the 500 'wayward' monks to return to the Buddha. Kokālika then wakes up Devadatta and reveals the bad news to him. Devadatta is so shocked by the events that hot blood gushes out of his mouth and he falls fatally ill. The Buddha subsequently remarks that Devadatta would fall into Niraya Hell. However, when Devadatta breaths his last nine months later, he makes a dying statement that he has no refuge other than the Buddha:

> In him, who of the best is far the best.
> The god of gods, the guide of gods and men,
> Who see'th all, and bears the hundred marks
> Of goodness,- 'tis in him I refuge take
> Through all the lives that I may have to live.[39]

Though Devadatta falls into Niraya Hell, yet he is assured that after a hundred thousand aeons he would be born as a *paccekabuddha* by the name of Aṭṭhissara.[40]

It is quite curious to see that as one moves away from the Buddha chronologically, the criticism of Devadatta becomes more and more scathing. Thus, in the different commentaries of the *Nikāyas* and later texts such as the *Jātakas*, Devadatta is depicted as the quintessential example of a wicked person. The *Dhammapada* commentary gives graphic details of the tortures inflicted on Devadatta in Avīcī.[41] The same text also mentions that when people heard of the death of Devadatta, they were so happy that they held a great festival.[42] As many as 88 *Jātakas* (i.e., 16% of the total) centre around the condemnation of Devadatta. In all the references, he is shown as the Buddha's arch rival who constantly competed with him and tried to usurp the leadership of the Saṃgha from him. The different stories portray him as performing a variety of pernicious deeds and as an inveterate evildoer who was driven by ambitious and hateful intentions. The *Jātakas* clearly portray him as the object of hatred of Buddhists. The following table prepared on the basis of information available in the *Jātakas* is self-explanatory.

Nature of the character of Devadatta	*Jātaka* **no.**
A fake ascetic.	11, 277, 492
A person of bad principles, bad leader, and a bad companion	12, 26, 397
A pretender, an ungrateful person, a plotter, a traitor, a drunkard, and a murder.	21, 57, 58, 72, 110, 111, 112, 131, 142, 143, 160, 168, 174, 204, 206, 208, 210, 220, 221, 241, 308, 329, 335, 342, 350, 358, 364, 389, 404, 407, 416, 445, 448, 452, 457, 471, 472, 473, 482, 500, 505, 508, 516, 517, 530, 533, 546

---

[38] Vin.II.66, 335.

[39] DhA.I.147; Mil.111. Translation from the *Questions of King Milinda*, (henceforth Milinda) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1890, Sacred Books of East).XXXV 167.

[40] Mil.111; DhA.I.125. However, according to the *Saddharmapuṇḍrīka*, Devadatta would be born as a Buddha by the name of Devarāja (Chapter.XI, stanza 46).

[41] DhA.I.147.

[42] DhA.I.126-27.

A liar, low, mean, unwise, double-faced, inefficient, dishonest, shameless, self-destructive, criminal-minded, disobedient, unjust, harsh, and cruel person.	1, 3, 10, 113, 139, 141, 150, 184, 193, 194, 209, 224, 231, 240, 294, 295, 313, 353, 357, 367, 422, 438, 466, 503, 506, 514, 518, 543, 547
Heretical, deserter, schism-creator, jealous & anti-Buddha.	122, 222, 243 , 326, 474, 544
A wicked man who attempted human sacrifice.	542

Some of the close relatives of the Buddha from his wife's side also appear in bad light. Sākyan Daṇḍapāṇi is said to have preferred Devadatta to the Buddha.[43] He was brother of Suppabuddha and thus, brother of Buddha's mother and paternal uncle to both Devadatta and Bhaddhakaccāna.[44] It has been pointed out in the *Madhupiṇḍika Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya* that once Daṇḍapāṇi met the Buddha and questioned him on his teachings. But being unsatisfied by the Buddha's explanation, he left in contempt and "shook his head, pulled out his tongue, made three wrinkles on his forehead."[45] The *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā* points out that Sākyan Suppabuddha was angry with the Buddha because he had not only deserted his daughter in renouncing the household life but had also turned hostile to his son Devadatta after ordaining him as a disciple in the Saṃgha.[46] In the fifteenth year of his ministry the Buddha revisited Kapilavastu, and there his father-in-law, Suppabuddha, in a drunken fit, refused to let the Buddha pass through the streets. Seven days later he was swallowed up by the earth at the foot of his palace.[47]

Different personalities associated with Devadatta also face the brunt of criticism and this criticism becomes sharper as time goes by. Kokālika draws maximum flak amongst all of Devadatta's associates. The early Pāli texts do not say much by way of criticism of Kokālika and simply point out that whenever anyone criticized Devadatta, Kokālika was always ready to defend him.[48] However, the incident of Devadatta being kicked by Kokālika[49] is added in the later portions of Pāli literature. The criticism against him becomes quite virulent in the *Jātakas* where he is not only portrayed as an accomplish of Devadatta but is also held to ridicule. We are told that when Devadatta's gains diminished, Kokālika went about praising him, his birth, accomplishments and holiness, and many believed him.[50] His character is compared to a jackal who tried to imitate lions,[51] an ass in the lion's skin,[52] the talkative tortoise who lost his life because he could not keep his mouth shut,[53] the crow who

---

[43]MA.I.298.

[44]Northern Buddhist sources mention Daṇḍpāṇi as Prince Siddhattha's father-in-law (W.W. Rockhill, *Life of the Buddha and the Early History of His Order: Derived from Tibetan Works,* reprint, London: Kegan Paul International, 2003: 20).

[45]M.I.103.

[46]DhA.III.44. Devadatta's enmity towards the Buddha is also shown as being based on the same reasons as that of Suppabuddha.

[47]DhA.III.44.

[48]Vin.III.174.

[49]DhA.I.143; J.I.491.

[50]J.II.438f.

[51]J.II.65ff; II.108.

[52]J.II.110.

[53]J.II.175.

praised the jackal (Devadatta),[54] the young cuckoo who lost his life because he would not keep quite,[55] and the talkative tawny-brown brāhmaṇa.[56] In another *Jātaka* story,[57] we are told that once he expressed unhappiness because he had never been asked to recite the *suttas*; so once the monks decided to fulfil his wish. He took his favourite soup, and at sundown, wearing a blue lower robe and an outer robe of white[58] and carrying a beautifully carved fan, he appeared in the assembly. But when he tried to recite he began to sweat and lost his nerve. Thereafter, we are told, the monks became aware of the fact that his claim to learning was but a pretence. This story obviously contradicts his portrayal in the *Vinaya* as a furious defender of Devadatta. But Thullanandā held him, Devadatta, Khaṇḍadeviyāputta, Samuddadatta, and Kaṭamorakatissa as eminent disciples (*mahānāgā*) and rated them above Sāriputta, Moggallāna, and Mahā Kaccāna.[59] Thullanandā, who was known for her knowledge of the Dhamma, was a clever preacher. However, Thullanandā too faces criticism for taking sides with Devadatta. She appears to have had charge of a large number of nuns, all of whom are shown as following her in various mal-practices.[60] She is also accused of once using a false pretense to keep away monks from good food so that these friends of hers and their colleagues could have it.[61] We are told that she was greedy for possessions and often misappropriated gifts intended for other nuns.[62] She is also shown as being fond of the company of men, and frequenting streets and cross-roads unattended so that she might not be hindered in her intrigues with them.[63] She is also accused of having regarded with sympathy such women who succumbed to temptation and having tried to shield them from discovery.[64] We are told that she bribed dancers and singers to sing her praises. She could brook no rival and especially hated Bhaddā Kapilānī Therī.[65] She was fractious.[66] It has further been pointed out that she was an ardent admirer of Ānanda[67] and once when Mahā Kassapa called him a 'boy', she is said to have become very upset and soon after that left the Saṃgha.[68] She is also criticized for befriending Ariṭṭha when he was cast out of the Saṃgha.[69] In the *Suvaṇṇahaṃsa Jātaka* she is portrayed as a greedy woman.[70] The *Khuddakapāṭha Aṭṭhakathā* mentions Khaṇḍadeviyāputta, another associate of Devadatta, in a list of wicked persons.[71] In a late portion of the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, Kaṭamorakatissa is mentioned as one of the monks about whom dissatisfaction was expressed to the Buddha and by two Pacceka-brahmā, Subrahmā and Suddhāvāsa.[72]

Interestingly, three *suttas* are named after Devadatta in the Pāli *Tipiṭaka*. Once mention is also

---

[54] J.II.438.

[55] J.III.102.

[56] J.IV.242.

[57] J.II.65f.

[58] See the violation regarding meal-timing and dress.

[59] Vin.IV.66.

[60] Vin.IV.211, 239-40, 280.

[61] Vin.IV.335.

[62] Vin.IV.245,-46, 258.

[63] Vin.IV.270, 273.

[64] Vin.IV.216, 225, 230-31.

[65] Vin.IV.283, 285, 287, 290, 292.

[66] Vin.IV.248, 250.

[67] Her criticism may partly be explained by the fact that Ānanda too was criticised by a section of the Saṃgha on the eve of the First Council.

[68] S.II.219ff.

[69] Vin.IV.218.

[70] J.I.474ff.

[71] The *Paramatthajotikā* I (henceforth KhpA) (London: PTS, 1915).126.

[72] S.I.148.

made of the text of a sermon delivered by Devadatta. Candikāputta reports this to Sāriputta, who makes it an occasion for a talk to the monks.[73] As a matter of fact, Devadatta does not stand totally condemned in the Pāli literature. In some of the references he is mentioned an impeccable saint whose achievements were not only acknowledged by other saints like Sāriputta but also by the Buddha himself. For instance, the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* mentions him as the one who had the right view and could preach the correct dhamma.[74] Sāriputta and Ānanda are known to have acknowledged his great psychic power and majesty, which the Buddha also affirmed.[75] As pointed out above, the Buddha once not only praised Devadatta but also called him along with ten other Elders as the one who had "put away evil… (and)… destroyed the fetters."[76] In one reference in the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, in which he is condemned, he is also mentioned as the one who meditates in solitude.[77] In the same text he is mentioned as an eloquent teacher, who "gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted the monks far into the night with talk on *dhamma*."[78] Some found in him a ready friend who was at their service both in prosperity and adversity.[79] How does one reconcile with such a contradictory description? In one of the dilemmas, discussed in the *Milindapañha*, Devadatta is depicted as a mixture of good and evil.[80] Here, king Milinda asks Nāgasena

> "But, venerable, Nāgasena, your people say that Devadatta was altogether wicked, full of wicked dispositions, and that the Bodhisatta was altogether pure, full of pure dispositions. And yet Devadatta, through successive existences, was not only quite equal to the Bodhisatta, but even sometimes superior to him, both in reputation and in the number of his adherents."[81]

Nāgasena replies:

> "Devadatta … was a protection to the poor, put up bridges and courts of justice and rest-houses for the people, and gave gifts according to his bent to the Samaṇas and Brāhmaṇas, to the poor and needy and the wayfarers, it was by the result of that conduct that, from existence to existence, he came into the enjoyment of so much prosperity. For of whom, O king, can it be said that without generosity and self-restraint, without self-control and the observance of the Uposatha, he can reach prosperity?"[82]

A critical review of all the references appears to indicate that stories regarding Devadatta being an opponent of the Buddha since childhood are only later additions. There does not appear to be any historical truth in them. The differences between the Buddha and Devadatta appear to have arisen out of some serious issues which may have been personal and/or related to the functioning of the Saṃgha. It certainly cannot be denied that after the death of the Buddha and with the passage of time, the positive side of the character of Devadatta is overshadowed by the vitriolic condemnation as most of

---

[73]A.IV.402f.

[74]A.IV.402.

[75]Vin.II.189. See, R.A. Ray, *Buddhist Saints in India: A Study in Buddhist Values & Orientations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994: 162.

[76]Ud.I.5. Strangely the name of Devadatta is missing from the same list in the *Majjhima Nikāya* (III.78-89).

[77]Vin.2.184.

[78]BD.V.280.

[79]*Devadatto amhākaṃ maṅgalāmaṅgalesu sahāyo udakamaṇiko viya niccappatiṭṭhito* (DhA.I.65).

[80]Mil.200-205.

[81]Mil.200. Translation from Milinda.284.

[82]Mil.204. Translation from Milinda.291.

this condemnation appears in later Buddhist literature.[83] The statements of some of the contemporaries of the Buddha also seem to point to the fact that criticism of Devadatta was not justified. For instance, Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta is quoted by Pāli texts as saying that by maligning Devadatta as incorrigible (*atekiccho*), the Buddha was being unfair to him.[84] So much so that once even Ānanda who was a constant companion of the Buddha is said to have been unsure about the criticism of Devadatta.[85]

The episodes relating to Devadatta have been analysed systematically by Mukherjee[86] and Bareau.[87] Both of them have pointed out quite convincingly that most of the episodes maligning Devadatta are a fabrication of later times. Devadatta's positive character becomes darker and darker as time goes by and one can discern an attempt to white wash the positive side of his character as more and more blame is heaped on him. He is, thus, accused of being filled with greed, pride, and ambition and of attempting various crimes, to set himself in the Buddha's stead, to induce Ajātasattu to kill his father, to himself murder the Buddha, and so on- all in spite of his (in some accounts) previously saintly character. All this appears to be nothing but a misrepresentation intended to tarnish his character.[88] Therefore, argues Ray, Devadatta was not an evil doer but a realized master and that the most important reason for the vilification was his strict identification with forest Buddhism as it did not go well with settled monasticism. "It is not just that he practices forest Buddhism, is a forest saint, and advocates forest renunciation. Even more, and worse from the viewpoint of his detractors, he completely repudiates the settled monastic form, saying in effect that he does not judge it to be authentic at all."[89] He considered this "as a form of laxity, a danger for the future of the community and of Buddhism altogether."[90] His unwavering advocacy of the five austere practices may also be seen in the issue of leadership whereby Devadatta may have shown interest in taking up leadership after the Buddha's death considering that he believed and wanted to keep Buddhism austere against settled monasticism. As pointed out by Bareau the only issue that could be accepted historically true is that Devadatta proposed to the Buddha that the five austere practices be made obligatory, which the Buddha rejected; and thereafter Devadatta affected schism in the Saṃgha by leaving along with 500 bhikkhus; and later these bhikkhu were won back by Sāriputta and Moggallāna.[91]

That Devadatta was not so bad, after all, has also been pointed out in some of the texts of other Buddhist traditions. In the Sarvāstivāda-Vinaya, we are told that for twelve years after his admission into the Order, Devadatta conducted himself with faultless deeds and thoughts. He read and recited the *sūtras*, lived according to proper discipline, and strove in his practice of Dharma.[92] In the *Saddharmapuṇḍrīka Sūtra* Devadatta is depicted in a former life as a forest renunciant who assisted Buddha Sākyamuni to Buddhahood,[93] and the Buddha calls him his 'spiritual-friend' (*kalyāṇamitra*)[94] in effect his teacher. It was through training under Devadatta as his teacher, the Buddha tells us, that

---

[83]See, R.A. Ray, *Op. Cit*.176 fn 32.

[84]M.I.392-93.

[85]For instance, when once monks asked Ānanda whether the Buddha's predictions regarding the results of Devadatta's crimes were based on actual knowledge, he furnished them with no answer at all until he had consulted the Buddha (A.III.402).

[86]B. Mukherjee, *Die Uberlieferung von Devadatta, dem Widersacher des Buddha, in den kanonischen Schriften*, Munich, 1966.

[87]A. Bareau, "Ètude du bouddhisme," *Annuaire du Collège de France*, 1988-89: 533-47.

[88]A. Bareau, *Op. Cit*. 542.

[89]R.A. Ray, *Op. Cit*.171.

[90]A. Bareau, Op. Cit: 542.

[91]*Ibid*.540ff.

[92]B. Mukherjee, *Op. Cit*: 120.

[93]H. Kern (tr), *Saddharma-Puṇḍrīka or the Lotus of the True Law*, Sacred Books of the East, no. 32, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884: Chapter.XI, stanza 46.

[94]*Ibid*.

he was able to perfect the qualities by which he eventually became a Buddha.[95]In future times, the Buddha continues, Devadatta will be greatly revered and honored and shall become no less than the greatly revered *Tathāgata* Devarāja, who shall lead innumerable beings to Enlightenment. His relics will be not be divided and shall be kept in a single gigantic *stūpa* worshipped by gods and humans. So holy will this *stūpa* be that those who circumambulate it may hope for realization as an arhant, a pratyekabuddha, or a Buddha. Finally, in the future, a great blessing shall come to those who hear bout Devadatta: for those hearing this chapter of the *Saddharmapuṇḍrīka Sūtra* and gaining from it shall be liberated from rebirth in the three lower realms.

It appears the schism created by Devadatta was successful and Sāriputta and Moggallāna were either unsuccessful in winning back all those dissident monks who had left with Devadatta for Gayāsīsa or Devadatta succeeded later in recruiting some of his own. This fact is proved by a story related in one of the *Jātakas*.[96] According to this story, Ajātasattu built a monastery for Devadatta where the food served was so luxurious that even some of the followers of the Buddha would steal themselves to taste it. Thus, it seems that not only that Devadatta continued to have his own followers, but he even continued to have the support of Ajātasattu. Over seven centuries later, Faxian saw near Sāvathī a community of disciples following Devadatta who rendered homage to the three previous Buddhas but not to the Sākyamuni Buddha.[97] Similarly, Xuanzang saw three monasteries in Bengal where the followers of Devadatta were in residence.[98] Xuanzang also saw a cave known as the Devadatta *samādhi* that was located near Rājagaha.[99] It is suggested that the reason for Devadatta's schism was indeed his adherence to certain austerities, which the mainstream community from which he and his group seceded were not willing to follow. These references also reveal the great success of Devadatta and his tradition which was in existence at least up to a thousand years after its separation from mainstream Buddhism.[100] However, Ray believes that Devadatta's schism actually took place after the death of the Buddha.[101] This appears a little far-fetched. Not only that Devadatta pre-deceased the Buddha, but the tradition of Devadatta's differences with the Buddha is also well-grounded in all the traditions. Thus, it is hard to believe that Devadatta's parting of ways with the Saṃgha took place after the Mahāparinibbāna. The argument in the *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā* that Devadatta's resentment against the Buddha was for reasons similar to Suppabuddha's who did not forgive the Buddha for abandoning his daughter,[102] may have some truth in it. Though it cannot be denied that the real reasons for the parting of ways between the Buddha and Devadatta were the five austere practices and the issue of leadership, yet this aspect may have worked as a last straw in the differences that existed between the two.

After the death of the Buddha, many members of the Saṃgha seem to have become busy settling old scores against each other. The organizers of the First Council appear to have spent fair amount of time and energy in humiliating persons such as Ānanda and Channa who were intimately associated with the Buddha. In this kind of witch hunting, many associates of Devadatta including Kokālika and Thullanandā seem to have become innocent victims of slander just because they threw their loyalty behind Devadatta. Similarly, Ajātasattu who had built a monastery for Devadatta, appears to have fallen out of favour with the saṃgha because he supported Devadatta-style of monkhood. Thus,

[95]*Ibid.*

[96]J.I.186, 508.

[97]S. Beal, *The Travels of Fah-hian and Sung yun,* London, 1869: 82.

[98]Thomas Watters (tr), *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, vol. 2, London, 1904-05, 2nd Indian edition, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1973: 191.

[99]*Ibid*.155.

[100]A. Bareau, *Op. Cit*.,1988-89: 544; R.A. Ray, *Op. Cit*:172; È. Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien: Des origenes à l'ère Śaka,* Louvain: Bibliothêque du Muséon, vol. 43, Louvain, 1958: 374. Also see, È. Lamotte, "Le Buddha insulta-t-il Devadatta?," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 33, 1970: 107-15.

[101]R.A. Ray, *Op. Cit*: 172.

[102]DhA.iii.44f.

the stories relating to his support to Devadatta for eliminating the Buddha, seem to have been inventions of the fertile minds of anti-Devadatta monks. The hostility and anger of Suppabuddha and his brother Daṇḍapāṇi appears to have arisen out of the fact that Bhaddakaccāna had been abandoned by the Buddha at a young age of 29.[103] Regarding Siddhattha abandoning his wife and child, it must be remembered that their abandonment by him took place before and not after his enhancement to the status of a great person. The circumstances and mind-set under which he abandoned them were dictated by the prevailing circumstances under which those who wanted to seek spiritual insight were expected to "kick away gold, women and fame, the three universal fetters of man."[104] Siddhattha did this while following the traditions of Brāhmaṇism in renouncing the world to seek knowledge and his actions at this stage cannot be extrapolated to force a meaning upon his views and actions after Enlightenment. However, considering that Suppabuddha was Bhaddhakaccānā's father, his anguish as well as that of his brother are understandable. The near absence of Bhaddhakaccānā's name in the early Buddhist literature also seems to indicate that she may not have found enough favour with the Buddhist Saṃgha. Her personage appears to be quite mysterious, to say the least. Her behaviour at the time of the Buddha's visit to his father's palace throws a clear hint of anger and hostility. By sending little Rāhula to the Buddha to ask for inheritance, she seems to be making an effort to bring home the point that after the departure of Prince Siddhatha, she had become a nobody in her own husband's house.

---

[103]It seems quite curious that she and the prince Siddhatha (both being of the same age) got married at such a late age! Some Non-Pāli traditions may be correct in pointing out that they got married at the age of 19 and that the Buddha spent 16 years (not 6) in wilderness before he attained Enlightenment at Bodhagayā.

[104]D. Paul (*Women in Buddhism: Images of the Feminine in the Mahāyāna Tradition*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979: 6.

7

SOCIAL THOUGHT OF ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHISM

Human experience has shown that a totally egalitarian society in which no one has more influence, prestige, or wealth than others is quite impossible. Hierarchy is inevitable. This means that the main issue before humankind has been the establishment of *proper hierarchy*. Liberty and equality, which are an essential part of human civilization, may be divided into two categories: *formal* and *effective*. In the Western democracies, formal liberty and equality are more or less available to all citizens. However, their laws work in the interest of the rich only and effectively speaking, many poor people suffer from various disabilities. Thus, effective liberty and equality are available only to the propertied people.[1] It is for this reason that even today Marxism appeals to millions of exploited human beings due to its emphasis on the removal of privileges and discrimination. A positive step in the direction of establishment of effective liberty and equality can only be taken through the abolition of class-system. As Buddhism did not believe in caste-based privileges, some scholars have compared it with Marxism.

While analyzing any social issue, it needs to be kept in mind that the history of ancient India is the history of upper caste men. Almost none of our sources represent the view point of the various submerged sections of the society. By the beginning of the age of the Buddha, caste system with its gross inequalities had been well-established in the Indian society. It had become both functional and hereditary. The word *vaṇṇa,* which may be translated as *social grade*, *rank* or *caste* is liberally used in the Pāli literature not only as a distinguishing mark of race or species, but also as constituting a mark of class (caste) distinction. Similarly, lineage (*gotta*) was considered of important social significance at the time of the Buddha and references to statements like "*of what lineage*?", or "*belonging to such and such an ancestry*" do find their mention in the Pāli literature.[2] Likewise, a feeling of family/ clan (*kula*) is quite strongly reflected in the Pāli literature[3] and one comes across references to people who were well-bred, endowed with distinguished/ good/ pure/ high birth, *race*, beauty and nobility.[4] The term *ariya* is used

---

[1]It may be interesting to look at the case of United States of America which claims to be the vanguard of liberty and equality. Various well-documented studies on the United States of America have shown that life-expectancy and condition of health are directly related to the living conditions of the working class and the material conditions of capitalism. (See, e.g., Vincente Navarro, "Social Class, Political Power and the State and Their Implications for Medicine," *Social Science and Medicine*, 10, 1976: 437-57). As pointed out by C.W. Mills, "It is very difficult to climb to the top… it is much easier and much safer to be born there." (*The Power Elite*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1956: 39). Westergaard and others have also shown that although there has been some mobility among the different social groups or strata within each social class, there has been practically no mobility among social classes (J.H. Westergaard, "Sociology: The Myth of Classlessness" in R. Blackburn (ed), *Ideology in Social Science*, New York: Fontana, 1972: 119-163). See, also, Linda McQuaig, *The Wealthy Banker's Wife*, Penguin Books, 1993.

[2]*gottavāda* (D.I.99); *kathaṅgotta*? (D.I.92); *evaṅ-gotta* (M.I.420, II.20, 33).

[3]Thus, we have a king's clan (*rājakula* J.I.290; III.277; VI.368*)*, a khattiya clan (*khattiyakula* Vin.II.161), a brāhmaṇic clan (*brāhmaṇakula* A.V.249; J.IV.411), a trader's clan (*vāṇijakula* J.III.82), a farmer's clan (*kassakakula* J.II.109), a banker's clan (*purāṇaseṭṭhikula* J.VI.364) and an esteemed clan (*aggakulika* Pv.III.5.5); a daughter of good family (*kuladhītā* Vin.II.10); *sadisakula* (PvA.82); lineage/ progeny (*kulavaṃsa* M.II.181; A.III.43; IV.61; DA.I.256) so on so forth.

[4]*jāti sampanna (*A.III.152); *ājāniya* (J.I.181); *jātimant* (Sn.420); *sujātimant* (J.VI.356); *kula-rūpa-sampanna* (PvA.3, 280); *ariyāya jātiyā jāto* (become of the Ariyan lineage- M.II.103); *uccakulīnatā* (A.III.48); *uccākulīnatā* (M.III.37; VvA.32; Pv.III.1.16); *kolīniyā/ koleyyaka* (J.II.348).

quite liberally in accordance with the customs and ideals of the Ariyan clans[5] and it is not surprising to come across people who were conceited or proud of birth.[6] Then there were those of the so-called *inferior* race and not of good blood/ birth.[7] They were perceived as morally ignoble, low, undistinguished, mean, uncultured, common, not Aryan and of shameless behaviour.[8] Many amongst such unfortunate human beings had been placed outside the pale of caste system and were thus, known as outcasts or having no caste at all.[9] Whereas Pāli literature registers an unmistakable disdain for ruralism and things rural,[10] the word *nagarika* insinuates *urbane and polite*.[11] Other than the gradations at the social level, one also comes across references to divisions at the economic level. Thus, we have references to destitutes[12] as well as wealthy and influential people.[13] Human beings were bought and sold as slaves[14] and there are references to the existence of unpaid labourers and serfs.[15] In other words, at the time of the Buddha, Indian society suffered from both social and economic disparities.

The brāhmaṇas who viewed themselves as the highest caste claimed every social privilege and ascendancy as an inalienable birthright. In the period, immediately prior to the time of the Buddha, with the development of the sacrificial cult, the position of the brāhmaṇas had become considerably powerful and their social prestige soared far above the rest of the populace. They came to be viewed as gods in human form and even kings were obligated to place themselves at their services. They were reckoned with so much fear and idolization that they were not considered accountable for any kind of punishment even if they happened to commit the gravest of crimes.[16] Though they derived their power from the efficacy of the sacrifice, in the time of the Buddha all brāhmaṇas were not necessarily sacrificial priests, for they seem to have followed all sorts of occupations. But, the basic qualification to be a brāhmaṇa appears to have been his birth. The *Soṇadaṇḍa Sutta*[17] gives a list of the essential characteristics of a brāhmaṇa as it was accepted at that time. Thus, "a brāhmaṇa is well born on both sides, on the mother's side and on the father's side,

---

[5]For instance, *ayyaputta i.e.,* son of an Ariyan or an aristocratic young man (J.I.62, III.167, VI.146.) and *ariyapuggala* i.e., aristocratic person (Vin.V.117; Ps.I.167; ThA.206.). The term *ariya* has been used in terms like *ariyadhamma* (S.IV.250); *ariyasaṃgha* (PvA.1); *ariyamaggo* (S.V.421); *ariyasaccāni* (Vin.I.10; Sn.229, 267; Dh.190; D.I.189; II.90; III.277; M.I.62; III.248; S.V.435 etc.) more or less in the same sense.

[6]*jātithaddha* (Sn.104).

[7]*anājāniya* (M.I.367); *ajātimanta* (J.VI.356), *ajacca* (J.III.17, VI.100); *ittarajacca* (M.II.47); *hīnajacca* (J.I.342); *nihīnajacca* (J.V.257); *jātinihīna* (PvA.198); *nihīna-jātika* (PvA.175).

[8]*anariya* (Vin.I.10; D.II.87; III.232; Sn.664, 782; A.I.8); *anāriya* (Sn.815); *anariyadhamma* (Pug.13); *anariya-rūpa* (J.V.48, 87; DhA.IV.3); *nīcakula* (Sn.411, 462; J.I.106). The term *dāsīputta* (son of a slave) is often used as an expression of contempt *(Gharadāsiyā va putto* D.I.93; DA.I.257).Also see, *PED* s.v. *dāsīputta*.

[9]*vevaṇṇiya* (A.V.87); *vaivarṇika* (Divy.424).

[10]*gāmakūṭa* (sycophant- S.II.258); *gāmadhamma* (vile conduct- D.I.4); *gāma-vāsīnaṅ dhamma* (vile conduct- DA.I.72); *gāmadārakā* (street urchins- J.II.78, 176, III.275).

[11]DA.I.282.Most of the sermons recorded in the *Nikāyas* were delivered in large cities like Sāvatthī, Rājagaha and Kosambī. In the *Jātakas*, of the 315 bodhisattas who were born as human beings, 223 (84.47%) were born in urban centres and most of them belonged to the families of kings, their minister or rich magnates. (See, K.T.S. Sarao, *Origin and Nature of Ancient Indian Buddhism*, Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers: 1989: Appendix:4).

[12]*dalidda/ daḷida* (Vin.II.159; S.I.96; V.100, 384, 404; M.II.73; A.II.57, 203; III.351; IV.219; V.43; DA.I.298).

[13]*aḍḍhaka* (J.IV.495; Pv.8.2); *mahāvibhava* (PvA.107).

[14]D.I.5; DA.I.78; J.I.200, 223, III.343, 347; Pug.56; PvA.112.

[15]*dāsakammakāra* (Vin.I.240; A.I.240; D.III.189; DhA.IV.1).

[16]J.H. Hutton, *Caste in India: Its Nature, Function and Origins*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1946: 81.

[17]D.I.111ff.

of pure descent back through seven generations, with no slur put upon him, and no reproach, in respect of birth; he is a preacher of the sacred words, knowing the mystic verses by heart… he is handsome, pleasant to look upon, inspiring trust, gifted with great beauty of complexion, fair in colour, fine in presence and stately to behold; he is virtuous, increased in virtue, gifted with virtue." The first of the five characteristics constituting a *well-bred* brāhmaṇa is to be of unblemished parentage back to the seventh generation.[18] Most of these are obviously only ideal qualities whereas the purity of birth, which is given pride of place in the lists, was the most essential quality. Because of their supposed high birth, and the virtuous, systematic and well-disciplined life they were expected to lead, brāhmaṇas claimed special prerogatives not only in religious affairs but also in day to day affairs of life.

The claim to superiority by the brāhmaṇas against the rest of the society was challenged by the khattiyas, who took lead in the struggle against this kind of brāhmaṇic attitude, when their power as the rulers of the society increased. A section of the brāhmaṇas themselves also opposed such pretensions of the brāhmaṇas. This vein of criticism is seen in the story of Asita Devala detailed in the *Assalāyana Sutta*[19]. Asita Devala, himself a well-known brāhmaṇa priest, but scorned because of his dark complexion by the other priests, examines, and cross-questions them about their pretensions regarding their lineage, thus, forcing them to give up their claims to superiority. By such criticisms, the brāhmaṇas' claim to superiority was gradually weakened. This process was expedited by the rational arguments put forward by the Buddha.[20] At the outset, the Buddha attempted to refute the brāhmaṇas' claim to divine origin. The brāhmaṇa Assalāyana approaches the Buddha and says, "… only brāhmaṇas are sons of Brahmā, born of his mouth, born of Brahmā, formed by Brahmā, heirs to Brahmā. What does the good Gotama say about this?" To this the Buddha replies, "But, Assalāyana, brāhmaṇa wives of brāhmaṇas are known to have their seasons and to conceive and to give birth and to give suck. Yet those brāhmaṇas, born of women like everyone else, speak thus: '… only brāhmaṇa form the best caste… heirs to Brahmā.'"[21] The supremacy of the brāhmaṇas was also combined with the dogma of the efficacy of sacrifice. So the Buddha also directed his attack on the brāhmaṇical sacrificial cult and gave the Buddhist view of what a right sacrifice should be. Similarly, austere ascetic practices carried out by the brāhmaṇas, too, were completely ridiculed and denounced.[22]

The Buddha's main argument against this was that no man could be superior or inferior in society

---

[18]*yāva sattmā pitāmahāyugā akkhitto anupakkuṭṭho jātivādena* (D.I.120; DA.I.281; A.I.166, III.152, 233; Sn.315, 596).

[19]M.II.156ff.

[20]In the Buddhist terminology, other than as a caste name, the word *brāhmaṇa* is also used for a man leading a pure, virtuous life and often even synonymous with arahant. Numerous brāhmaṇas of varied social standing are referred to in the Buddhist texts where they are held in high esteem. The Buddha's selection of the term *brāhmaṇa* as a title of honour for the best men is also proof of the fact that the term conveyed to the mind of the Buddhist as an exalted meaning, a connotation of real veneration and respect. Thus, *brāhmaṇahood* (*brāhmaññaṃ*) is seen as one of the highest virtues of a Buddhist monk.(*Vin.*III.72).

[21]M.II.148f.

[22]M.I.387ff; D.III.6f, 44f; S.IV.338.Brāhmaṇas believed that their sins could be washed away by bathing themselves with water. The sarcastic remark by Puṇṇā *therī*, shows the Buddhist attitude towards such futile purificatory rites:
Nay now, who ignorant to the ignorant,
Hath told thee this: that water-baptism
From evil kamma can avail to free?
Why then the fishes and the tortoises
The frogs, the water snakes, the crocodiles
And all that haunts the water straight to heaven
Will go… (Thī.vv.240-241).

merely by reason of his birth. He clearly pointed out that the position of man depended on his conduct. This meant that it was a person's attitude and behaviour (*kamma*) which made a man superior or inferior. The Buddha did not find it easy to put across this simple teaching of social philosophy to the overbearing brāhmaṇas of his day. Despite the immense popularity which his teaching enjoyed in Indian society, the Buddha seems to have met very strong opposition from the brāhmaṇas in propagating his teaching. The Buddhist *suttas* record some interesting discussions which the Buddha had with some of the well-known brāhmaṇas of his day. The *Ambaṭṭha Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* is one of the more important discourses in this respect.[23] It mainly deals with the sociological aspect of the caste problem. Ambaṭṭha was a learned brāhmaṇa who, on the advice of his teacher, went to meet the Buddha in order to find out whether the Buddha deserved all the respect and reputation that was accorded to him. Ambaṭṭha was so proud of his brāhmaṇic birth that he disparaged the Sākyans to the very face of the Buddha, who in order to humble his pride, explained to him that Ambaṭṭha's lineage was traceable to the son of a slave girl of the Sākyans. In the course of the argument that followed, the Buddha concluded by pointing out that if lineage is taken into consideration then the khattiyas are the best,[24] but the outward behaviour of a person who is morally superior, is a result of his inward knowledge and it is that kind of person that the Buddha described as being endowed with true knowledge and conduct (*vijjācaraṇa)* and it is he who is the best both among men and gods,[25] thereby implying that the righteous life leading to Nibbāna is independent of caste distinctions. The Buddha's approach, thus, was based upon ethics. The *Madhura Sutta* attributed to *thera* Mahākaccāna, shows how economic superiority can defeat caste superiority by birth.[26] This *sutta* points out that the ability to command the services of another did not depend upon one's caste but on one's wealth. If one has wealth, whether he be a sudda, he can obtain the services even of a brāhmaṇa. The king of Madhurā, to whom the discourse was addressed, is made to admit that in this respect there is no difference among the four castes as claimed by the brāhmaṇas. And, in fact, the profession of brāhmaṇas was not only that of priest; there were those who earned their livelihood even as butchers and carriers of corpses which were normally confined to suddas in the laws, drawn up by the brāhmaṇas themselves.[27] This shows that the brāhmaṇas could not maintain their so-called superiority by birth in society, although they preached it in theory. Under such circumstances, it is natural that the claim of the brāhmaṇas that they are the highest caste is referred to by the Buddhists as a propagandist cry.[28] It is only moral superiority that can stand against secular temptation. The next point raised by Kaccāna is an ethical one, in that he makes the king admit that in the retribution of kamma, both in reward and in punishment, there is no caste difference. Moral and spiritual development is not a special privilege by virtue of birth, but is open to all. The Buddha taught that all men, irrespective of caste, are equal before moral law. The *Assalāyana Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*[29] is another discourse that contains some arguments against the social attitude of the brāhmaṇas. Here the brāhmaṇas seem to have been offended by the Buddha's statement that all the four castes had the ability to practice virtue and achieve purity (*catuvaṇṇiṃ suddhiṃ*). Here, the Buddha pointed out that fire kindled with a piece

---

[23]D.I.87ff.

[24]The statement attributed to the Buddha that khattiyas are the best caste if lineage is to be taken into consideration, is not without its sociological and historical significance, for it seems that during the days of the Buddha khattiyas had overcome brāhmaṇic superiority in society. The fight against brāhmaṇic snobbery came mainly from the khattiyas, who also produced the originators of the two non-brāhmaṇic religions of the then Indian society, Buddhism and Jainism.

[25]D.I.99.

[26]M.II.83-90.

[27]SBE.XXV.150-168.

[28]*ghoso yeva eso lokasmin.*

[29]M.II.147ff.

of sandal wood by a man of so-called high birth serves the purpose of fire just as it would serve if kindled with the branch of the caster oil shrub by a man belonging to a low caste. Irrespective of the source, the fire is the same, and in the same way whatever be the caste of a man by birth, he can have the ability for self-development to the highest degree. Any division whether it be social, economic, intellectual or racial, is an obstacle for the realization of the spiritual unity of mankind. Well-known brāhmaṇas are very often mentioned as pure by birth back to seven generations on both their father's and mother's side.[30] This question is taken up towards the end of the *Assalāyana Sutta* where the seer Asita Devala questions seven brāhmaṇas, who made that claim, whether they can be sure of the fact their mothers and grandmothers, back through seven generations, never committed adultery. The same question is put with regard to their forefathers and to both questions the brāhmaṇas have to reply that they cannot be sure on this point. These questions are followed by a more interesting question, where the brāhmaṇas are asked whether they know the caste of the *gandhabba*, the spirit that takes conception in the womb of the mother. Ultimately, the irony that is found in the *Ambaṭṭha Sutta* recurs here when these caste conscious brāhmaṇas are made to admit that they do not know who they are.[31]

The Buddha's opposition to the attempt of the brāhmaṇas to divide society into watertight compartments on the basis of caste by birth is clearly seen in his discourses.His interview with the brāhmaṇa Esukārī is especially interesting.[32] Esukārī asked the Buddha about castes and their distinctions from the point of view of their functions. The Buddha points out that the divisions imposed on society by the brāhmaṇa are quite arbitrary and are not conducive to the good of the individual or of society. Giving his own alternative, the Buddha says that all the four castes alike, can practise the pure life which is the true service (personal as well as public) and follow the Dhamma, which is the true wealth (spiritual as well as material). Here the Buddha never forgets the practical side of social life as he points out that whatever be the work one does, it should be done skilfully. Otherwise, he cannot do justice to his work. Even if caste be regarded on the basis of occupation, only a clever person can do his work well. And when he does his job well, he will grow in the five forms of noble (*ariya*) growth, viz., faith, morality, learning, renunciation and wisdom. From the Buddhist point of view there is no reason whatsoever for one class of people to be hereditary rulers and masters over another class regarded as slaves and inferiors by birth. From the Buddhist point of view, the work one does has no genetical significance and everyone has the ability to rise to the highest position in society if one has the will and the ability to do so. It is in accordance with this doctrine that the Buddha threw open the doors of his Saṃgha to everyone alike, irrespective of caste by birth. He pointed out that just as the great rivers like the Gaṅgā, Yamunā, Aciravatī, Sarabhū and Māhī lose their separate identities once they join the ocean, even so do the four castes lose their former names and origins once they become members of the Saṃgha.[33] The truth of his theory was amply proved when even the most base-born were able to become eminent members of his Saṃgha. He fearlessly proclaimed that merit acquired by virtue, knowledge and practice, and not by birth, was the sole criterion of worth. Whatever the birth be, a person who lives according to this theory would be the true social worker, useful to himself and to others.The Buddha was opposed to the fatalistic view that the situation into which one is born is unalterable. What the Buddha taught was that one's kamma alone is important, not the circumstances of his birth. Another important point that needs clarification is whether a person cannot be born into a conventionally despised caste because of his previous bad kamma. This possibility is clearly admitted in Buddhism, as understood in the doctrine of kamma. Gradations in human society based on

---

[30]A.I.162; D.I.113, 121, 123.

[31]*evaṃ sane bho na mayaṃ jānāma keci mayaṃ homā'ti*.

[32]M.II.177ff.

[33]Vin.II.239.

caste, race, religion etc are a universal phenomenon and cannot be eliminated completely. They have to be admitted as a part of social life. The Buddha's advice is to work against that kind of divisive phenomenon in society by changing one's kamma for the better. If one is base-born due to one's bad kamma, let one change that kamma and be "nobly born" in this life itself. Truly diligent men should be able to achieve this metamorphosis and that is what is expected of those who call themselves Buddhists. The moral worth of a person should receive social recognition, regardless of the caste to which he belongs and everyone should have the opportunity for moral and spiritual development which the individual concerned could achieve according to the potentiality for such development (*upanissaya*) he has.

The Buddha stressed the fact that biologically man is of one species and thus any distinction based on birth goes against the biological unity of mankind. On this ground, too, he rejected the brāhmaṇa claim to superiority and special privileges. Men differ not by birth but by kamma and belong to one species genetically. This fact can be easily observed if we look at the distinctions between the vegetable and animal kingdoms on the one hand and human beings on the other. This scientific truth has been very well expressed in the *Vāseṭṭha Sutta* of the *Sutta-Nipāta*.[34] The *sutta* opens with a discussion between two brāhmaṇas as to whether one becomes a brāhmaṇa by birth (*jāti*) or by conduct (kamma).Unable to decide the matter for themselves, they visited the Buddha and asked him for a solution. The Buddha pointed out that among grass, trees, worms, moths, fishes, beasts, birds, etc. there are various types, whereas in the case of men they constitute only one.[35] Then the Buddha cites examples of how men are designated by different names according to their occupations. The Buddha pointed out that, whereas in the case of the plants and animal kingdoms there were many species and marks by which they could be distinguished, in the case of man there were no such species and no such marks.[36]As R. Chalmers says, "Gotama was in accord with the conclusion of the modern biologists, that the *anthropidae* are represented by the single genus and species, Man."[37] According to the Buddha, the apparent divisions among men are not due to basic biological factors but are only conventional (*sāmañña*). The Buddha provides an evolutionary account of society and shows that the four-fold order arose from the division of functions in society.[38] With a deep tinge of irony, the Buddha pointed out the fallacy of the brāhmaṇas' view that members of the fourfold order are obliged to perform specific tasks assigned to them.[39] The brāhmaṇas even regarded salvation as their prerogative, but the Buddha pointed out the error of this claim and stated that all alike had the capacity to attain salvation, and that there was no difference in regard to the quality of salvation attained.[40] Such arguments against the brāhmaṇas' claim to superiority were, however, not meant to place the khattiyas above brāhmaṇas, but to establish the fact that all men are on an equal footing (*samasama*) with regard to their capabilities. The Buddha equally denounced the khattiya and vessa claims for superiority. He emphatically pointed out the fact that it is not one's birth, but one's conduct (kamma) that make one a brāhmaṇa or a low caste person.[41]As compared to the old brāhmaṇic concept of what constitutes a brāhmaṇa, the Buddha laid down the two qualities of virtue (*sīla*) and wisdom (*paññā*), as understood by

---

[34]Sn.115ff.

[35]The biological unity of mankind as against genetical caste distinctions is further shown by the Buddha in the *Assalāyana Sutta* (M.II.154) where he argues that if by the union of a brāhmaṇa and a khattiya, a child were born, his offspring would remain a human being whereas if a he-ass and a mare were to mate the offspring would still be called a mule.

[36]M.II.196f; Sn.vv.600ff.

[37]R. Chalmers, *JRAS*, 1994: 396.

[38]D.III.80ff.

[39]M.II.151f.

[40]M.II.129, 130, 147.

[41]Sn.vv.116-142; J.IV.301ff.

the Buddhists, to be the most important characteristics of a true brāhmaṇa.[42] The equality of mankind is also stressed by later Buddhist thinkers, e.g., Asvaghosa in his *Vajrasūci* says, "the doctrine of the fourfold order is altogether false. All men are of one grade."[43]

In sharp contrast to the brāhmaṇas who considered themselves as an *ukkaṭṭhakulīna* (superior caste),[44] caṇḍāla, nesāda, veṇa, rathakāra and pukkusa are mentioned in the Pāli literature as five categories of people who were viewed as *nīcakulas* (base-born).[45] Birth in any of these five *nīcakulas* was considered as most unfortunate as only sinful people were said to be born into these *nīcakulas*. A man born into any of these castes was not only hard-pressed for basic necessities but also handicapped by physical disabilities.[46]

As the nesādas/nisādas were a hunting tribe,[47] it is not difficult to explain the inclusion of nesādas in the list of castes regarded with extreme dislike and hostility. As per the information available in the brāhmaṇical texts, they were a pre-Āryan people, who are portrayed as short-limbed, of the complexion of scorched wood, with blood-red eyes, high cheekbones, snub-noses, and copper-coloured hair.[48] The legend of their quirky origin from the body of Veṇa,[49] the king who proved tyrannous to the priestly class, may point to the resistance they offered to the process of brāhmaṇization. According to Baudhāyana, nisāda was the son of a brāhmaṇa father and a sudda mother.[50] Even after they were accepted into the brāhmaṇical society, the nesādas continued primarily as hunters and lived in their own villages.[51] There are quite a few references to the black colour of the nisādas in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*.[52] The rathakāras and the nisādas appear to have enjoyed the privilege of sacrifice till the end of the Vedic period after which they were degraded.[53]

Veṇas were another aboriginal tribe, who lived by hunting and working in bamboos.[54] A *Jātaka* alludes to a veṇukāra/ veḷukāra who goes into the forest with his knife to collect a bundle of bamboos for his trade.[55] According to brāhmaṇical texts, a veṇa is the descendant of a vaidehaka father (born of a vessa father and a khattiya mother) and an ambaṭṭha mother (born of a brāhmaṇa father and a vessa mother).[56] Thus, unlike the caṇḍālas and the pukkusas, the veṇa was not presumed to have sudda blood. Although in a *Jātaka*, the term *veṇī* is bracketted with the caṇḍāla as a term of chastisement,[57] there is nothing to show

[42]*The Soṇadaṇḍa Sutta* (D.I.124f).

[43]See, H.H. Wilson, *Indian Caste,* London, 1877: 202ff.

[44]Vin.IV.6.

[45]Vin.IV.6, 9; M.II.152, 183f; S.I.93; A.I.107, II.85, III.385; Pug.51. In some texts, *chapaka* is also mentioned as the name of a low-caste tribe (Vin.IV.203).

[46]M.III.169; S.I.93f.

[47]Vin.IV.7; J.IV.364.

[48]R.S. Sharma, *Śūdras in Ancient India*, 3rd revised edition, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas:1990:143 fn 1 & 2.

[49]See, R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit.*1990:142 fn 3.

[50]Quoted at R.S. Sharma, *Op.Cit.* 1990.:113 fn 7; 132 fn 6.

[51]J.II.200; VI.71f, 170.

[52]Quoted in R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit.*1990: 78 from Shafer, *Ethnography of Ancient India*, 10.

[53]R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit.*1990: 78-79.

[54]Vin.IV.6; S.I.93; A.II.85, III.385; Pug.51; PvA.175.

[55]J.IV.251.

[56]See, R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit.*1990:142 fn 1.

[57]J.V.306.

that the veṇas were reckoned as untouchables like the caṇḍālas. The commentary on the *Vinaya Piṭaka* perspicuously avers that birth as a veṇa implies birth as a carpenter (*tacchaka*).[58]

Rathakāras, born of vessa father and sudda mother,[59] were chariot-makers/ carriage-builders.[60] Rhys Davids suggests that they were an aboriginal tribe.[61] Though the rathakāras continued to be hired by kings to make the wheels of their chariots,[62] on the basis of a passage in one of the *Jātakas* it has been suggested that they fell in status because of their having taken to leather work.[63] Perhaps one of the reasons as to why the rathakāras are treated as a despised caste in the Buddhist texts is the Buddhist revulsion to war, for which they built chariots.[64] In any case, it is clear that they were not downgraded to the same level as the caṇḍālas.

Pukkusas, who were scavengers or refuse-removers,[65] are said to have been the offsprings of nisādas by sudda women.[66] Thus, they appear to have been a mixed tribe. They lived by hunting,[67] but were piecemeal assimilated into the brāhmaṇical society for different tasks such as removing flowers from the temples and the palaces.[68] The fact that they could approach the temple premises to remove flowers indicates that they were not reckoned as being quite as degraded as the caṇḍālas.

The caṇḍālas were the most unfortunate people who were often vituperated as vile (*duṭṭhacaṇḍālā*)[69] and odious-outcasts (*mahācaṇḍāla*).[70] Originally, the caṇḍālas seem to have been an aboriginal tribe. This is clear from the use of their own argot.[71] But later they appear to have become a mixed tribe as some of them do not appear to be physiognomically different and could hide their identity.[72] Later Vedic literature and the laws of Manu, also regarded the caṇḍālas as a very low caste of mixed origin, who were the descendants of a sudda father and a brāhmaṇa mother.[73] According to this theory, the lower the caste of the father and higher the caste of the mother, the lower would be the caste of the offspring. Hence the caṇḍālas came to be regarded as the meanest and the most loathed of all the mixed castes. According to the Buddhist texts, the caṇḍālas and the pukkusas were not included in the sudda caste.[74] T.W. Rhys Davids is of the view that they were originally an abominable group of aborigines, who were dealt with as such by the

---

[58]*veṇajāti ti tacchakajāti* (SBB.IX.173. Also see, J.V.306).

[59]See, R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit*.1990: 132 fn 9.

[60]S.I.93; Vin.IV.9; M.II.152, 183f. At PvA.175 this caste is explained as *cammakārin* (a tanner, a leather-worker).

[61]DB.I.100.

[62]A.I.111-113.

[63]A.N. Bose, *the Social and Rural Economy of North-East India*, vol. 2, Calcutta: 1942-45, II.456.

[64]R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit*.1990:142.

[65]A.I.107, II.85; Pug.51; Vin.IV.6. Also see, R. Fick, *Social Organization in North-East India in Buddha's Time*, tr. S.K. Mitra, Calcutta: University of Calcutta: 1920: 206f.

[66]See, R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit*.1990: 132 fn 7.

[67]Though Pāli texts do not indicate this, but various brāhmaṇical texts prescribe hunting as their occupation (See, R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit*.1990: 141 fn 5).

[68]J.III.195.

[69]J.IV.392, 397; A.I.107, 162, II.85; Vin.IV.6; M.II.152; S.V.168; Pug.51.

[70]J.IV.200.

[71]J.IV.391f.

[72]J.IV.390-401.

[73]R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit*.1990: 71.

[74]S.I.102, 106.

Āryans.[75] Since the conquering Āryans regarded all aborigines as much below themselves on grounds of colour and other criteria, the caṇḍālas, too, could have been one such group who were more despised than the others due to some reason or the other.[76] In the *Mahāvastu,* caṇḍālas are listed among the enemies of birds.[77] In one of the *Jātakas*, a caṇḍāla is mentioned as a mongoose-trainer (*koṇḍa-damaka*)[78] and in another *Jātaka*, caṇḍālas are mentioned as learning *caṇḍālavaṃsadhopana*.[79] Gradually, they came to be looked upon as untouchables. In a *Jātaka* tale when a caṇḍāla enters a town, people pound him with blows and render him unconscious.[80] The extent to which the caṇḍālas were abhorred could be conceived from various occurrences mentioned in some of the *Jātakas*. Contact with the air that touched a caṇḍāla's body was regarded as contamination. In one of the Jātakas,[81] a brāhmaṇa youth who was very conceited about his caste, was going out from the city with his companions when he saw a caṇḍāla. Fearing that the wind which contacted the caṇḍāla might touch his own body and contaminate him, he swore at him for being there and commanded the wretched man to move to leeward and he himself ran in the opposite direction. But the caṇḍāla youth refused to do his bidding and stood to the windward of him. This incensed the brāhmaṇa so much that he started abusing caṇḍāla prodigally. Then the caṇḍāla threw a challenge to the other to answer a question on condition that the failure to do so would result in the caṇḍāla putting the brāhmaṇa between his feet. As he failed to answer the question, the caṇḍāla forcibly put him between his feet. This is evidently expressive of the Buddhist attitude towards the whole question of caste, for it rebuffs the brāhmaṇas, indicating the superiority of knowledge over caste. But the incident also divulges the spite in which the brāhmaṇas held the caṇḍālas.

The very sight of a caṇḍāla foreboded evil.[82] Even the sight of the caṇḍālas from a distance was enough for high caste people, especially women, to wash their eyes with scented water (*gandhodaka*) to remove the contamination. As told in the *Citta-Sambhūta Jātaka*,[83] two women, a daughter of a wealthy merchant and a royal councillor, who had gone to the city gate to play, on seeing two caṇḍāla brothers, washed their eyes with scented water and turned back. The poor caṇḍālas received a sound beating from the people who lost a very good chance of feasting on the occasion. Same sort of incident is related in the *Mātaṅga Jātaka*[84] when the daughter of a seṭṭhi of Bārāṇasī, seeing a caṇḍāla, washed her eyes with perfumed water, that had been contaminated by a mere glance at that despised person.

Food and drink, if seen by a caṇḍāla, were not to be taken and ingesting of his food, even unknowingly, led to social ostracism.[85] The *Satadhamma Jātaka*[86] exemplifies the harshness of these caste rules. According to the story told in this *Jātaka*, two youths, a brāhmaṇa and a caṇḍāla travel together on a long journey. Incidentally, it may be observed here that it was very unusual that a brāhmaṇa travelled together with a caṇḍāla. Only the caṇḍāla youth, who is the bodhisatta, takes provisions for the journey.

[75]T.W. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons: 1903: 40.

[76]G.S. Ghurye, *Castes and race in India*, London: 1932: 47-48.

[77]Mv.II.251.5.

[78]J.IV.389.

[79]J.IV.390 (Translated variously as "art of sweeping in the caṇḍāla breed," "feat of acrobats by caṇḍālas").

[80]J.IV.376, 391.

[81]J.III.232-237.

[82]J.IV.376, 391.

[83]J.IV.390-401.

[84]J.IV.375-390.

[85]J.IV.390.

[86]J.II.82ff.

On the way, before taking his meals, the caṇḍāla invited the other to join him, which was naturally turned down. After having travelled the whole day, the bodhisatta had his second meal in the evening. The brāhmaṇa, who had been very tired by this time, was feeling very hungry. His hunger made him forget all about his caste and this time he asked for a portion of the meal from the caṇḍāla and ate it. No sooner had he finished eating, than he was overcome by grief and remorse, that he being a brāhmaṇa, had eaten food left over by a caṇḍāla, and he immediately vomitted out with blood what he had eaten. He was feeling so guilty that he became sick of life for having committed such a serious crime that he decided to starve himself to death and entered a forest to do so. Here, too, it is a case of Buddhist authors scoffing at the rule of the brāhmaṇas that no brāhmaṇa should eat the food left over by a caṇḍāla. This is also pointed out in another *Jātaka*,[87] results in the brāhmaṇa losing his caste altogether. According to this *Jātaka*, 16,000 brāhmaṇas are said to have lost their caste just because the water which had been mixed with rice left over by a caṇḍāla fell into their mouths. The disdain for such a food was so great that the Buddha in his introduction to the *Satadhamma Jātaka*,[88] says that for the followers of his doctrine the eating of food obtained illegitimately is like eating the table-leavings of a caṇḍāla.

There is another story in a *Jātaka*[89] where a brāhmaṇa ascetic was humbled by a caṇḍāla. Although the aim of the story is to deride the brāhmaṇic attitude towards caste system, the low position of the caṇḍālas in the society at that time is divulged by this story too. Here the ascetic had his hermitage on the bank of a river and a caṇḍāla, too, lived in the neighbourhood. One day when the ascetic was taking bath in the river, a toothpick (*dantakaṭṭhaṃ*) thrown by the caṇḍāla upstream into the river got stuck into the ascetic's hair. At this the ascetic became offended through and through, vituperated him and commanded the caṇḍāla to go somewhere else.

By and large, the *Jātaka* references indicate that although the caṇḍālas were loathed as untouchables by the members of the higher castes, they were especially hated by the brāhmaṇas. When the caṇḍālas were absorbed into the brāhmaṇical society, this assimilation did not mark a complete break with their former style of life. The caṇḍālas led a life of misery and squalor. A simile from a Pāli text informs us that a caṇḍāla boy or girl, clad in rags, with begging tray (*kalopihattha*) in hand, on entering a settlement assumes a humble mien and then goes on.[90] In popular parlance the term *caṇḍāla* signifies a person who was without any virtues, a person without faith and morals.[91] Fick rightly says that in their portrayal of the caṇḍāla the *Jātakas* show that the reality was not far different from the priestly theory.[92]

Brāhmaṇic attitude towards the caṇḍālas was so negative that even when a brāhmaṇa took a caṇḍāla woman as his wife he was accused of having transgressed a major covenant and is referred to as a *brāhmaṇa-caṇḍāla*.[93] There are references to a caṇḍāla's begging tray, which consisted of a small vessel fixed to the end of a stick so that there is no contact between the giver and the recipient.[94] Just as the origins of the caṇḍālas cannot be clearly explained, even their professional work defies clear explanation. Probably on account of their being hunters and fowlers, they appear to be associated with the removal and disposal

---

[87] J.IV.388.

[88] J.II.82.

[89] J.IV.388.

[90] *kalopihattho nantikavāsī gāmaṃ vā nigamaṃ vā pavisanto nīcacittaṃ yava utaṭṭhapetvā pavisati* (A.IV.376).

[91] A.III.206.

[92] R. Fick, *Op. Cit*: 318.

[93] A.III.228-228.

[94] A.IV.376.

of corpses,[95] execution,[96] whipping and cutting off the limbs of the criminals,[97] coffin-making and grave-digging.[98] The caṇḍālas were also sometimes engaged for street sweeping.[99]

Due to the contempt with which they were regarded, the caṇḍālas were kept out of the society at large. As a result, they were made to live in settlements (*caṇḍālagāma*) which were earmarked for the purposes and located outside towns (*bahinagare*).[100] It appears to have been mandated by the brāhmaṇical society that whenever they entered a village or a town, either for begging or to do their professional work, they had to be distinguished from the others in terms of their appearance. We learn from a *Jātaka* that the caṇḍāla possessed a pair of coloured garments in order to distinguish him from the rest of the population, a girdle, a ragged robe and an earthen bowl.[101] In the *Cittasambhūta Jātaka,*[102] we are told how two caṇḍāla brothers dressed as brāhmaṇas go to Takkasilā to study under a teacher. Later, one of them burns his mouth with hot-rice, forgets himself, cries in his own caṇḍāla-language (*caṇḍālabhāsāya*) upon which their disguise is detected. According to the story, they were driven out immediately and then they entered a forest to become ascetics. It may be remarked here that this distinction in their speech was probably not in their language as a whole, but in certain words and expressions, for, being excluded from the rest of the population, they must have preserved some traits of their original language. Sometimes the term *caṇḍāla* is used in the Pāli literature as a term of contempt. Thus, when a jackal makes a proposal of marriage to a young lioness, the latter says that the jackal is regarded as the lowest and the most wretched among the four-footed animals and is similar to a caṇḍāla.[103] The lioness felt so insulted at the jackal's proposal that she decided to kill herself. However, there is an instance in which a departure from the normal is mentioned. In the *Chavaka Jātaka,*[104] a king, on being pleased with the behaviour of a caṇḍāla, appoints him as the lord protector of the city.

The origin of untouchability has sometimes been explained variously through the intermixture of castes,[105] as a result of the total isolation and loss of tradition of Buddhist communities,[106] beef-eaters being condemned as untouchables,[107] the psyche of revulsion leading to untouchability being borrowed from the

---

[95]*chavachaḍḍaka-caṇḍālā* (J.III.195).

[96]*coraghātaka* (Execution of a thief). See, A.N. Bose, *Op. Cit*: 438.

[97]J.III.41, 179.

[98]J.H. Hutton, *Caste in India: Its Nature, Function and Origins*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1946: 145.

[99]J.IV.390.

[100]J.IV.376, 390 etc.

[101]J.IV.379.

[102]J.IV.390-401.

[103]*caṇḍāla-sadiso* (J.II.6).

[104]J.III. 27-30. See also, Vin.IV.203.

[105]The Dharmasūtras ascribe the origin of untouchability to the intermixture of castes (R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit*.1990: 144).

[106]*Modern Review*, Calcutta, December 1923: 712-13. But this appears to have been a post-Moriyan phenomenon.

[107]B.R. Ambedkar, *The Untouchable* (*Who are They? And Why They became Untouchables?*), New Delhi: 1948: Ch. X. This may have swelled the ranks of the untouchables in later times, but cannot be taken as an explanation of their origin as there is nothing which may imply that beef-eating was prohibited in the brāhmaṇical society during this period (R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit* 1990: 144).

Dravidians,[108] or the theoretical impurity of certain occupations.[109] Most of the mixed castes were nothing more than backward tribes, who were annexed to the four original and recognized vaṇṇas by giving them a wholly arbitrary genesis.[110] It seems that the inhabitants of tribal settlements en masse were condemned to the position of untouchables by the brāhmaṇas. The ranks of such people later appear to have been swelled by those who were kicked out of the caste system due to serious violations of caste laws laid down by the brāhmaṇas. Thus, perhaps the most important reason for the origin of untouchability was the cultural lag of the aboriginal tribes, who were mainly hunters and fowlers, in contrast to the members of the brāhmaṇical society, who possessed the knowledge of metals and agriculture,[111] and were developing urban life. The low material culture and the resultant woeful situation of these tribes is recounted in the Pāli texts as "a life of vagrancy, want and penury, scarcely getting food and drink for the stomachs or clothes to their backs."[112] This would suggest that these despised castes had a very precarious living, and were in far worse condition than the suddas some of whom as *dāsas* and *kammakāras* enjoyed at least some security of livelihood. As pointed out by R.S. Sharma, during the post-Vedic period, the upper vaṇṇas, who tended to be hereditary in their positions and functions, gradually withdrew from the work of primary production and developed a contempt not only for manual work but also extended it to those who practised it.[113] Against the background of a very low material culture of the aborigines, the increasing contempt for manual work, combined with primitive ideas of taboo and impurity associated with certain materials, produced the unique social phenomenon of untouchability. This was particularly true of the work of the caṇḍālas who dealt with corpses, with which were linked primitive ideas of impurity and horror. Consequently, it was felt necessary to avoid contact with such persons. In later times, the idea of untouchability was extended not only to the nisādas and pukkusas but also to the leather workers and weavers.[114]

Though some members of the third caste i.e. vessas had become financially quite well-off, but in the brāhmaṇical order they were just above the suddas and hence a low caste. Interestingly, the feminine of vessa is vesī, vesiyā or vessī which may be translated as "a woman of low caste, a harlot or a prostitute."[115]

Though the Buddha is never known to have taught the excellence of caste system, yet his theory of kamma is seen as the most effective rationalisation of caste system. Buddhist tradition conceived cycles of birth and rebirth in individual terms and once the cycle was so conceived, one's present position in a low caste was justified by virtue of the deeds in a previous existence and a higher one was promised if one performed the set obligations properly. Further more, nowhere do we come across a statement which is against the division of society into castes. As pointed out by Romila Thapar the Buddha made a distinction between the caste as the frame of the socioeconomic structure, which he accepted, and the notion of the relative purity inherent in the upper castes, which he rejected.[116] Untruth entails rebirth in the lowest of

[108]R.C.. Dutt, *A History of Civilization in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1891: 106f. But there is no evidence that untouchability existed amongst the Dravidians before their brāhmaṇization (See R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit*.1990: 145).

[109]G.S. Ghurye, *Castes and Class in India*, Bombay, 1950: 159. But this does not appear to be correct as the question as to why certain occupations came to be regarded as impure remains unanswered.

[110]R. Fick, Op. Cit.: 9.

[111]*Ibid*.: 324.

[112]*na lābhī annassa vatthassa yānassa* (M.III.169-70; A.II.85).

[113]R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit*.1990:145-46.

[114]*Ibid*.146f.

[115]Vin.III.138, IV.278; D.I.193; A.III.226, 229; Sn.108; J.V.425; Thī.73; Vbh.247.

[116]R. Thapar, *Ancient Indian Social History: Some Interpretations*, New Delhi: Sangam Publishers, 1978: 51-52.

castes.[117] In the Saṃgha the adoption of a new name by the *bhikkhu* was symbolic not merely of a new birth in the Saṃgha but also of a removal from his caste and status. But unfortunately, the value attached to upper caste birth and the privileges that went with upper caste birth does not appear to have been completely extinguished from the minds of the members of the Saṃgha. The fact that upper castes may have swamped the Saṃgha completely is hinted at by an incident related in the *Tittira Jātaka*.[118] Once when the Buddha put a question to the *bhikkhus* as to "who deserves to have the best quarters, the best water, the best food?" He received a reply from some: "He who was a khattiya before he became initiated,"[119] and from others: "He who was a brāhmaṇa or a gahapati."[120] Thus, in the consciousness of the great majority of the *bhikkhus*, the caste distinction had value.[121] The Buddha also appears to have been extremely careful not to antagonise the established order and its guardians. For example, he disallowed the entry into his *Saṃgha* of all those who were in the royal service,[122] debtors,[123] slaves[124] and sons without the permission of their parents.[125] These were some of the questions which a person seeking ordination into the Buddhist *Saṃgha* was asked:[126]

> "Are you a freeman?"
> "Have you no debts? "
> "Are you not in the royal service?"
> "Have your parents given their permission?"

If the answer to any of these questions was in the negative, then that person was denied entry into Buddhist community.

The ambiguous use of the word *'brāhmaṇa'* also appears to have led to some negative implications. There is no doubt that the Buddha was critical of the brāhmaṇas as far as their pretentiousness as a caste was concerned. However, Pāli literature holds the word *'brāhmaṇa'* in high esteem implying a person of high moral character and insight. The very choice of this word as a title of honour, must have actually afforded a fresh strength to the veneration which the word inspired. Rhys Davids, in fact, goes on to say that "the very means they (Buddhists) adopted to lend weight to their doctrine of emancipation became a weapon to be used against them."[127] It is perhaps because of such ambiguities that some scholars have gone to the extent of saying that "[t]here was in fact nothing substantial in the Buddhist clerical order which could ruin the entire caste system"[128] and that the Buddha was not a champion of the cause of lower classes,

---

[117]*Nīcakulesu nibbattidāyikā* (J.I.106).

[118]J.I.217.

[119]*khattiya kulā pabbajito*.

[120]*brāmaṇakulā gahapatikulā pabbajito*.

[121]R. Fick, *Social Organization in North-East India in Buddha's Time*, tr. S.K. Mitra, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1920: 33.

[122]Vin.I.72-74.

[123]Vin.I.75-76.

[124]Vin.I.76.

[125]Vin.I.84; III.12ff.

[126]SBE.XIII.230.

[127]DB.I.139-141.

[128]Ē. Senart, *Caste in India*, London: 1950: 305.

despite the fact that the Buddhist theory acknowledged the equal right of all males to be received in the *Saṃgha*.[129] In other words, it has been alleged that a marked leaning to aristocracy (of all the three varieties, birth, brain and bullion) lingered in ancient Buddhism as an inheritance from the past.[130] M. Weber, too agreed with such a view and pointed out that as the members of the Saṃgha were predominantly recruited from the great noble families, the rich 'burghers', and the brāhmaṇas who were distinguished representatives of a 'cultured laity', Buddhism had no tie with any social movement and as a whole was the product not of the underprivileged but of a very clearly privileged strata.[131] In a similar vein, R. Fick stated that the development of caste was in no way broken or even retarded by Buddhism because its doctrine did not aim at a transformation of social conditions and it was taken for granted that they were unchangeable.[132] C. Eliot too did not see the Buddha as a social reformer and pointed out that although the Buddha denied the superiority of the brāhmaṇas, he did not preach against caste, partly because it existed only in rudimentary form at that time.[133] C. Bouglé also argued that though it cannot be denied that "the Buddhist community worked to undermine the brāhmaṇa's clientele and the conflict of interests in undeniable,"[134] the Buddhists were far from "reconstructing the edifice of Hindu society according to new plans; if they worked at replacing the roof, they never gave a thought to changing the foundations."[135] R.S. Sharma too echoes similar views and agrees that only occasionally the Buddhist texts show some lurking sympathy for the lower orders[136] and that early Buddhism could not have crusaded against the upper castes, as they constituted the interest of its patrons.[137]

Undeniably lower castes, especially the suddas had a very low *representation* in the Saṃgha. An analysis of the background of various *tharas* and *therīs* mentioned in the *Theragāthā* and *Therīgāthā* showed that about 91% of them were *dvijās* (twice born, i.e., the upper three castes) and only 9% came from the sudda background.[138] One has only to go through the Pāli canonical literature to see how strong in numbers were the brāhmaṇa followers of the Buddha who had rejected the claim of their brāhmaṇahood by birth in theory, but followed mostly in practice. It has been shown that well over 40% of the leading *bhikkhus* and *bhikkhuṇīs* taken together belonged to the brāhmaṇa caste.[139] It has been pointed out that the Buddha used the *vaṇṇa-jāti* terminology of his times in his reference to existing society and only tended to rank the khattiyas higher than the brāhmaṇas. He ridiculed Brahmaṇical pretensions to ritual purity and social eminence and insisted that a person be judged by his individual virtue rather than his familial, class or social origins, which was precisely the demand of the new urban social classes who felt closer to

[129]*Ibid*.153f.

[130]H. Oldenberg, *The Buddha- His Life, His Doctrines, His Order*, reprint, Delhi, 1971: 155-59 (originally published 1927).

[131]M. Weber, *The Religion of India*, ed and tr H.H. Garth & D. Martindale, Glencoe & Illinois: The Free Press: 1958: 225-27.

[132]R. Fick, *The Social Organization of North-East India in Buddha's Time,* Calcutta: 1920: 335.

[133]C. Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, vol. I, London: 1954: xxii.

[134]C. Bouglé, *Essays on the Caste System*, Cambridge: 1977: 73.

[135]*Ibid*.

[136]R.S. Sharma, "Material Background of the Origin of Buddhism," M. Sen & M.B. Rao (eds), *Das Capital Centenary Volume: A Symposium*, Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1968: 94.

[137]R.S. Sharma, *Op. Cit.*, 1968: 58-66.

[138]B.G. Gokhale, "The Early Buddhist Ēlite," *JIH*, XLIII, Pt. II, 1965: 395.

[139]*Ibid*. 395.

Buddhism than the traditional Brahmaṇical sacrifice-dominated Vedic cults.[140]

Of the 2426 men and women mentioned in the Pāli *Vinaya and Sutta Piṭakas,* the castes of 1371 persons could be determined and the following table speaks for itself. [141]

Caste	Frequency	%
Khattiya	706	51.50
Brāhmaṇa	400	29.18
Vessa	155	08.02
Sudda & Untouchable	110	11.30

Table 1: Caste background of various persons

These trends are not particular to any one text. They appear to be true of all the texts used here. The following table shows the text-wise break-up and point towards the high-caste affiliation of Buddhism.[142]

Text	Khattiya	%	Brāh-maṇa	%	Vessa	%	Low Caste	%
Vin.	38	38.24	43	42.16	11	10.78	09	08.82
A	42	30.88	63	46.32	24	17.65	07	05.15
D	33	38.82	40	47.05	03	10.59	09	10.59
M	33	27.05	63	51.64	06	4.92	14	11.48
S	37	31.09	61	51.26	09	9.56	12	10.08

Table 2: Text-wise Caste Background of Various Persons

The appeal of the Buddha's doctrine primarily to men and women of urban background is unmistakable. Most of the sermons recorded in the *Nikāyas* were delivered in large cities like Sāvatthī, Rājagaha and Kosambī. Of the 547 bodhisattas, 315 were born as human beings, out of which 223 (84.47%) were born in urban centres in the families of kings, their ministers or business magnates. The Buddha is said to have spent most of his Rainy Retreats at the Jetavana, whose price, we are told, was equal to gold coins spread over its entire surface. It is revealing that as many as 71% of the *bhikkhus* and *bhikkhuṇīs* listed in the *Theragāthā* and the *Therīgāthā* came from urban areas and nearly 86% came from big cities like Sāvatthī, Rājagaha, Kapilvatthu and Vesālī. Of the other cities, 6 belonged to Sāketa, 5 each to Kosambī, Bārāṇasī, and Ujjenī, 4 to Campā, 3 to Pāṭaliputta, 2 to Bharukaccha and one to Suppāraka.[143]

---

[140]*Ibid.*

[141]See, Appendices 5a and 5b.

[142]As appendices 5a and 5b mention all the persons (including the adversaries of the Buddha), the same sort of orientation of all the heterodox sects is apparent.

[143]B.G. Gokhale, *Op. Cit.*461.

Buddhism clearly prescribes that the Buddhas can only be born in khattiya or brāhmaṇa families and not in any other caste.[144] And the one born of the womb of a slave, can never be a Bodhisatta.[145]

D.P. Chattopadhyaya, taking a balanced view, argued that while it is true that Buddhism was supported by monarchs, merchants and contemporary aristocrats, it would be superficial to see only this aspect of Buddhism. In his opinion, Buddhism was destined to become for various reasons the "biggest socio-religious movement in Indian history." He believed that the Buddha's attitude to injustice of the caste system and his attacks upon brāhmaṇic rituals were significant reasons for its appeal to the people. However, Chattopadhyaya also argues that the Buddha created an illusion of liberty, equality, and fraternity by modelling his Saṃgha on the tribal values, whereas in reality these values were being trampled upon in the world outside the Saṃgha.[146]

Though the all-pervading influence of caste system had in fact affected Buddhist way of thinking, yet it cannot be denied that the Buddha threw the doors of his Saṃgha open to the lowliest of the low who could achieve the bliss of the nibbāna.[147] Buddhism made no distinction in the imparting of knowledge.[148] As pointed out by Rhys Davids, the advantages or disadvantages arising from birth, occupation, and social status were completely irrelevant when it came to recruitment into the Saṃgha, the only organ of the society over which the Buddha had complete control.[149] He supports his argument by citing examples of *Vinayācariya* Upāli (barber), Sunita *(pukkusa)*, Sāti (fisherman), Subhā (daughter of a smith), and Puṇṇā and Puṇṇikā (slave girls).[150] However, outside the Saṃgha, argues Rhys Davids, the Buddha tried to influence public opinion by a "constant inculcation of reasonable views." He cites the example of the *Āmagandha Sutta* of the *Sutta-Nipāta*, where the Buddha points out that defilement does not come from eating this or that, prepared and given by this or that person, but from evil action, speech and thought.[151] Actually, Rhys Davids was of the opinion that had the views of the Buddha won the day, the evolution of social gradation and distinctions would have developed differently and the caste system would never have been built up.[152]

The Buddha argued that just as the king or the owner of the royal domain should not appropriate all revenues to himself, so also a brāhmaṇa or a samaṇa should not monopolize all knowledge to himself.[153] In the Buddhist view anybody could be a teacher irrespective of his caste and it is said that a

---

[144]See, DPPN.II.324.

[145]See, DPPN.II.323; SnA.I.550f.

[146]D.P. Chattopadhyaya, *Lokāyata: A Study in Ancient Indian Materialism*, N. Delhi: People's Publishing House: 1978: 466-67.

[147]*Khattiyā brāhmaṇa vessā suddā caṇḍālapukkusā
Sabbe va soratā dantā sabbe va parinibbutā* (J.IV.303).

[148]That the members of the lower orders actually got into the Saṃgha is indicated by quite a few instances. Mātaṅga, the son of a caṇḍāla, is said to have attained infinite bliss, which many khattiyas and brāhmaṇas could not attain (Sn.vv. 137 and 138). A monk is described as a former hawk-trainer (DPPN.I.174.) and two caṇḍālas as adopting the homeless state (J.IV.390-401). Nearly a dozen suddas and caṇḍālas are mentioned in the Pāli *Tipiṭaka* who reached positions of seniority within the Saṃgha (K.T.S. Sarao, *Op Cit.*: Appendix.4).

[149]DB.I.102.

[150]DB.I.102.

[151]DB.I.104.

[152]DB.I.107.

[153]D.I.226-230.

teacher is always to be respected, be he a sudda, a caṇḍāla or a pukkusa.[154] In fact, when the Sākyan youths and their employee and barber Upāli approached the Buddha together for ordination, the Buddha is said to have ordained Upāli before the Sākyan youths, so that their pride of birth and caste may be humbled.[155] It is typical of the Buddhist attitude that in a *Jātaka* story a brāhmaṇa loses the charm learnt from a caṇḍāla because of denying his teacher out of shame.[156] A Buddhist monk or a nun never made any distinction between people while begging for food and could approach any householder for a meal, or could eat at his house when invited by him.[157] Thus, it cannot be denied that Buddhism left lasting impact on the social organization in India.

---

[154]*Khattiya brāhmaṇa vessā suddā caṇḍāla pukkusā*
   yasmā dhammaṃ vijāneyya so hi tassa naruttamo.(J.IV.205).

[155]Vin.II.182; Bu.I.61.

[156]J.IV.200ff.

[157]Vin.III.184-85; IV.80, 177.

APPENDIX: 1

BUDDHIST CHRONOLOGY

BB/AB	BC	ELDERS	PĀṬALIPUTTA KINGS	RĀJAGAHA KINGS	COUNCILS
80	477	The Buddha is born			
75	472		Bimbisāra is born		
60	457		Bimbisāra's accession		
45	442		Bimbisāra's conversion		
44	441	Upāli is born			
02	399	Soṇaka is born			
08	405	Dāsaka is born		Ajātasattu's accession	
--	397	The Buddha dies & Upāli becomes Vinaya Pāmokkha			First
13	384	Soṇaka joins the Saṃgha			
18	379	Siggava is born			
24	373	Siggava joins the Saṃgha	Udaya/ Udāyi's accession		
30	367	Upāli dies & Dāsaka becomes Vinaya Pāmokkha			
40	357		Anuruddha/Muṇḍa's accession		
48	349		Nāgadāsaka's accession	Susunāga's accession	
52	345		Kāḷāsoka as governor		
56	341	Dāsaka dies & Soṇaka becomes Vinaya Pāmokkha			
58	339			Ten Brothers' accession	
62	335		Kāḷāsoka takes over as king		Second
64	333	Soṇaka dies & Siggava becomes Vinaya Pāmokkha			
80	317		Candagutta's accession	End of Ten Brothers' rule	
94	303	Siggava dies			
104	293		Bindusāra's accession		
120	268		Asoka's accession		
132	265		Asoka's coronation		

FREQUENCY OF URBAN SETTLEMENTS IN
THE PĀLI VINAYA AND SUTTA PIṬAKA

S. #	Urban Centre	Type	Vin	D	M	S	A	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
1	Aggaḷapura	N P	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	Āḷakamandā/Āḷka	N R	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Āḷavī	N	38	-	5	4	2	7	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Allakappa	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
5	Amaravatī/Amara	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
6	Ambaravatī/Ambara-Ambaravatiya	N	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	Andhapura	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	Anupama/Anopama/Anoma	N R	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	6	-	1	3	-	-	-
9	Anupiya/Anūpiya/Anopiya/Anupiyā	Ni N	3	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
10	Āpaṇa/Āpana	Ni	3	-	7	1	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	Ariṭṭha/Ariṭṭhapura	N P	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
12	Aruṇapura/Aruṇavatī	N R	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-
13	Asitaṇjana	N R	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	Assapura	Ni	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	Aṭānāṭā	N	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	Aṭṭhaka/Aṭṭhakanagara	N	-	-	3	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	Ātumā	Ni	6	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	Ayojjhā	N R	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	Bandhumatī	N R	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
20	Bārāṇasī	P N R	35	3	14	20	5	-	712	1	1	2	2	-	2	4
21	Bhaddhavātika/Bhaddavatī	Ni	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	Bhaddiya	N	22	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	Bhīmaratha/Bhīmaraṭṭha	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
24	Bharukaccha/Bharunagara	Pt N	2	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

S. #	Urban Centre	Type	Vin	D	M	S	A	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
25	Bhoganagara/Bhogagāmanagara	G Gn N	-	3	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	Brahmavaḍḍhana	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
27	Cālikā	N	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	Campā/Campāmālinī/Campānagara	N R	12	17	1	1	6	-	4	-	1	-	2	-	-	-
29	Candavatī/Candavārī	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
30	Cātumā	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	Daddara/Daddarapura	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	Daṇḍaka	N	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	Daṇḍakappa	Ni	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	Dantapura	N R	-	1	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	Desaka	Ni	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36	Devadaha	Ni	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	Dhaññavatī	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
38	Dvāravatī/Dwārka	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	1	1	-	5	-
39	Erakaccha	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
40	Gambhīra	Pt	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	Gayā	Ni	3	-	4	2	1	1	-	4	-	-	-	1	-	1
42	Gonaddha	N	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
43	Haliddavasana	Ni	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
44	Haṃsavatī	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-
45	Hatthipura/Hatthigāma/Hastinīpura	G N P	-	1	-	1	5	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
46	Indapatta/Indapattha/Indapattana	N P R	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	-	2	-	1	-	-	-
47	Janogha	N	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
48	Jetuttara/Jetuttarapura	N P R	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
49	Kajaṅgalā/Kajaṅgala	N	1	-	1	-	12	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50	Kakkarapatta	Ni	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51	Kāḷacampā	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

FREQUENCY OF URBAN SETTLEMENTS

S. #	Urban Centre / Type Vv	Vin	D	M	S	A	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv
52	Kāmaṇḍā	N	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
53	Kammāsadamma/Kammāssadhamma	Ni	-	2	3	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
54	Kampilla/Kampilla/Kampilliya	N P R	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	-	1	-	-	-
55	Kaṇṇakujja	N	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
56	Kapilavatthu/Kapilanagara	N R	15	7	23	15	13	2	30	-	-	-	10	1	-	1
57	Kapivanta/Kasivanta	N	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
58	Kārambiya	Pt	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
59	Kāsī/Kāsikā	Ni N P R	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
60	Kāvīra	Pt	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
61	Keka	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
62	Kekaka/Kekaya	N R	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
63	Kesaputta	Ni	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
64	Ketumati	R	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
65	Khema/Khemavatī/Khemapura	N P R	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
66	Khomadussa	Ni	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
67	Kimbilā/Kimilā	N	-	2	-	2	4	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	1
68	Kīṭāgiri/Kiṭāgiri	Ni	25	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
69	Kokāli	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
70	Koliyanagara	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
71	Kosala	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
72	Kosambī	N R	50	2	9	14	8	1	21	-	-	-	2	-	-
73	Kukkuṭa	N R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
74	Kumbhavatī	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
75	Kuṇḍiya/Kuṇḍi	N	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
76	Kuraghara/Kusaghara/Kulaghara	Ni	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-
77	Kusāvatī	N R	-	16	-	2	-	-	13	-	1	-	-	-

S. #	Urban Centre	Type	Vin	D	M	S	A	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
78	Kusinārā/Kusināra	N R	9	28	1	1	2	1	3	-	-	-	1	2	-	-
79	Kusināṭā	N	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
80	Lambacūḷaka	Ni	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
81	Macchikāsaṇḍa	Ni	3	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
82	Madhurā/Uttara Madhurā	N R	-	-	5	-	4	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
83	Māhissatī	N R	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
84	Makkarakaṭa	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
85	Mantāvatī	N R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
86	Mekhala	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
87	Mithilā	N P R	-	1	12	-	-	-	91	3	1	-	1	-	-	-
88	Molinī	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
89	Nagara	N P R	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
90	Nāgapura	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
91	Naḷakapāna	Ni	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
92	Nālandā	N	1	9	5	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
93	Naṅgaraka/Nagaraka	Ni	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
94	Nāṭapuriyā/Nāṭapariyā	N	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
95	Navanvatiya	N	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
96	Paṇkaḍhā	Ni	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
97	Paṇṇakata	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4
98	Parakusināṭā	N	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
99	Parakusitanāṭā	N	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100	Pārileyya/Pārileyyaka	N	6	-	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
101	Pāṭaliputta/Pāṭaligāma	G N Pb R	22	9	4	4	3	-	-	3	-	-	13	6	1	1
102	Patiṭṭhāna	N R	-	-	-	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
103	Potali/Pota/Potaka/Potana	N R	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
104	Pāvā	N R	17	16	4	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-

FREQUENCY OF URBAN SETTLEMENTS

S. #	Urban Centre	Type	Vin	D	M	S	A	Sn	Vv	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv
105	Payāgatittha/Payāgapatiṭṭhāna		-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
106	Pipphalivana		-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
107	Pupphavatī		N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
108	Rājagaha/Giribbaja		N R	264	31	40	99	26	4	85	2	-	9	2	4	-
109	Rāmagāma		G R	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
110	Ramma/Rammavatī		N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
111	Reṇuvatī		N R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
112	Roruva/Ruruka/Rorukā		N R	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
113	Sādhuka		Ni	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
114	Sāgala/Sākala		N R	2	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	2	-	-	-	-
115	Sahajāti/Sahajāta		Ni	5	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
116	Sajjanela		Ni	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
117	Sāketa		N R P	19	2	6	9	1	3	12	2	-	-	-	-	-
118	Sakkhara/Sakkara		Ni	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
119	Sakula		N R	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
120	Saṃkassa		N	6	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-
121	Sāpūga/Sāpāgiyā		Ni	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
122	Saraṇa		N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
123	Sāvatthī		N R	364	9	141	569	67	10	199	1	-	15	1	1	-
124	Senānigama/Senānīnigama		Ni	1	-	1	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
125	Setakaṇṇika		Ni	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
126	Setavya/Setavyā/Setabbya		Ni	-	10	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
127	Sīhapura		N	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
128	Silavatī		N	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
129	Sirīsavatthu		N	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
130	Sobhana/Sobhita		N	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-

S. #	Urban Centre	Type	Vin	D	M	S	A	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
131	Sobha	N	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
132	Sobhavatī	N R	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
133	Soreyya	N	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
134	Sotthivatī	N R	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
135	Suddassana	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
136	Sudhamma	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
137	Sudhañña/Sudhaññavatī	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
138	Sumaṅgala	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
139	Suṃsumāragiri/Suṃsumāragira	N P	4	-	3	2	4	-	2	1	-	1	-	1	-	-
140	Suppāra/Suppāraka	Pt N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
141	Surundhana/Surundha	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
142	Takkarā	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
143	Takkasilā	N R	8	-	-	-	-	-	139	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
144	Tāvatiṃsa	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
145	Thullakoṭṭhita	Ni R	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
146	Thūṇa/Thūna	G N	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
147	Tidasa	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
148	Udumbara	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
149	Uggapura	Ni P	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
150	Ujjenī	N R	2	-	7	-	-	1	7	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
151	Ujuññā/Ujjuññā	Ni	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
152	Ukkaṭṭhā	N	-	3	4	1	2	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
153	Ukkācelā/Ukkaveḷā	Ni	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
154	Uḷumpa/Meduḷumpa	Ni	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
155	Upakārī	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
156	Uruvelā	G N	6	2	2	8	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	1	-
157	Uruvelakappa	Ni	-	-	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

FREQUENCY OF URBAN SETTLEMENTS

S. #	Urban Centre Vv	Type	Vin	D	M	S	A	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv
158	Uttara		Ni N	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	
159	Uttarakuru		P	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
160	Uttarapañcāla		N	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	
161	Vajirā		N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	
162	Vanasa/Vamsa		N	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	
163	Varaṇā		N	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
164	Vebhaḷiṅga/Vehaliṅga/Vekaliṅga		Gni	-	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
165	Vedisā		N	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	
166	Veḷukaṇḍa/Veḷukaṇṭakī		N	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
167	Venāgapura/Venāhapura		G N P	-	-	5	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
168	Verañjā/Verañja/Verañji		Ni	22	-	1	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	
169	Vesālī		N Pt P R	108	36	18	30	30	1	16	-	1	2	1	-
170	Veṭhadīpa		G R	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	
171	Vettavatī		N	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
172	Visāṇā		R	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	
173	Yavamajjhaka		Ni	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	

Abbreviations used in the appendix

G	Gāma	Gn	Gāmanagara
Gni	Gāmanigama	N	Nagara
Ni	Nigama	Pb	Puṭabhedanaṃ
Pt	Pattanagāma	R	Rājadhānī
Th	Theragāthā & Therīgāthā		

APPENDIX: 3

DEVADATTA IN THE JĀTAKAS

S.#	Jātaka #	Remarks on Devadatta
1	1	A foolish merchant.
2	3	A foolish hawker.
3	10	Obtained the power of self-destruction.
4	11	A fake ascetic.
5	12	A bad leader.
6	21	A plotter.
7	26	Ill-mannered and bad-principled.
8	57	A plotter.
9	58	A plotter.
10	72	An ungrateful person.
11	110	A pretender.
12	111	A pretender
13	112	A pretender
14	113	A big liar.
15	122	Utterly jealous of the Buddha and plotted against him.
16	131	An ungrateful person.
17	139	Full of failures and shortcomings.
18	141	A low and mean creature.

S.#	Jātaka #	Remarks on Devadatta
19.	142	A plotter.
20.	143	A pretender.
21.	150	A base and wicked person.
22.	160	A pretender.
23.	168	A plotter.
24.	174	Treacherous and ungrateful.
25.	184	A bad character.
26.	193	A criminal.
27.	194	A wicked and criminal person.
28.	204	A pretender.
29.	206	A plotter.
30.	208	A plotter and disloyal friend.
31.	209	A fowler.
32.	210	A pretender.
33.	220	A plotter and a killer.
34.	221	A pretender and a killer.
35.	222	Cruel, tyrannical, harsh, baneful and anti-Buddha.
36.	224	Lacking in truth, wisdom, self-control and piety.
37.	231	Disobedient pupil.
38.	240	Unjust and cruel.
39.	241	Mischievous and plotter.

S.#	Jātaka #	Remarks on Devadatta
40.	243	Heretical and bad in profession.
41.	277	A false ascetic.
42.	294	Employs wrong means of livelihood.
43.	295	Employs wrong means of employment.
44.	308	Ungrateful.
45.	313	Wicked and cruel.
46.	326	A liar, schism-creator and a wicked person.
47.	329	A plotter.
48.	335	A pretender.
49.	342	A plotter.
50.	350	A pretender.
51.	353	A harsh and cruel man.
52.	357	Harsh, cruel, violent and roguish.
53.	358	A plotter and a killer.
54.	364	A pretender.
55.	367	An evil-minded person.
56.	389	A plotter.
57.	397	A bad companion.
58.	404	A mischievous person.
59.	407	A plotter.
60.	416	A plotter.

S.#	Jātaka #	Remarks on Devadatta
61.	422	A liar.
62.	438	Shameless, base and wicked.
63.	445	Ungrateful and treacherous.
64.	448	A plotter.
65.	452	A pretender.
66.	457	A plotter.
67.	466	Foolish and ruthless.
68.	471	A pretender.
69.	472	A plotter.
70.	474	A deserter and schism-creator.
71.	482	Ungrateful.
72.	492	A sham ascetic.
73.	500	A pretender.
74.	503	Cruel and nasty.
75.	505	A plotter.
76.	506	A cruel man.
77.	508	A pretender.
78.	514	A wicked man.
79.	516	Ungrateful, treacherous and a plotter.
80.	517	A pretender.
81.	518	A liar.

S.#	Jātaka #	Remarks on Devadatta
82.	530	A plotter and a murderer.
83.	533	A plotter.
84.	542	A wicked man attempting human sacrifice.
85.	543	Dishonest and sinful.
86.	544	Heretical.
87.	546	A pretender.
88.	547	A wicked person.

APPENDIX: 4

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of Birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
1	Man	City	Merchant	Vessa
2.	Man	City	Merchant	Vessa
3.	Man	NK	Merchant	Vessa
4.	Man	City	Treasurer	Vessa
5.	Man	City	King's valuer	Vessa
6.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
7.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
8.	Man	City	King's adviser and Courtier	Brāhmaṇa
9.	1.Man	City	King	Khattiya
	2.Man	City	Ming	Khattiya
10.	Man	NK	Rich brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
11.	Stag	NA	NA	NA
12.	Deer	NA	NA	NA
13.	Fairy	NA	NA	NA
14.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
15.	Deer	NA	NA	NA
16.	Stag	NA	NA	NA
17.	Man	NK	Hermit	NK
18.	Tree-fairy	NA	NA	NA

1

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
19.	Tree-fairy	NA	NA	NA
20.	Monkey	NA	NA	NA
21.	Antelope	NA	NA	NA
22.	Dog	NA	NA	NA
23.	Sindh Horse	NA	NA	NA
24.	Horse	NA	NA	NA
25.	Man	City	King's minister	Brāhmaṇa
26.	Man	City	King's minister	Brāhmaṇa
27.	Man	City	King's minister	Brāhmaṇa
28.	Bull	NA	NA	NA
29.	Bull	NA	NA	NA
30.	Ox	NA	NA	NA
31.	1.Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
	2.Sakka	NA	NA	NA
32.	Mallard	NA	NA	NA
33.	Quail	NA	NA	NA
34.	Man	City	King's priest	Brāhmaṇa
35.	Quail	NA	NA	NA
36.	Bird	NA	NA	NA
37.	Partridge	NA	NA	NA
38.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
39.	Man	NK	Squire	Brāhmaṇa
40.	Man	City	Lord High Treasure	Vessa
41.	Man	City	Famous teacher	Brāhmaṇa
42.	Pigeon	NA	NA	NA
43.	Man	NK	Of a rich family	NK
44.	Man	NK	Trader	Vessa
45.	Man	City	Lord high treasure	Vessa
46.	Man	NK	NK	NK
47.	Man	City	Treasurer of Bārāṇasī	Vessa
48.	Man	Village	NK	NK
49.	Man	City	NK	NK
50.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
51.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
52.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
53.	Man	City	Treasurer of Bārāṇasī	Vessa
54.	Man	City	Rich merchant	Vessa
55.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
56.	Man	Village	Farmer	Vessa
57.	Monkey	NA	NA	NA
58.	Monkey	NA	NA	NA
59.	Man	Village	Drummer	Low

3

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
60.	Man	Village	A conch blower	Low
61.	Man	City	Famed teacher	Brāhmaṇa
62.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
63.	Man	NK	Anchorite	NK
64.	Man	NK	Famous teacher	Brāhmaṇa
65.	Man	NK	Famous teacher	Brāhmaṇa
66.	Man	NK	Rich family	Brāhmaṇa
67.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
68.	Man (3000 births)	NK	Recluse	NK
69.	Man	NK	Doctor's son	NK
70.	Man	City	Gardner	Low
71.	Man	NK	Famed teacher	Brāhmaṇa
72.	Elephant	NA	NA	NA
73.	Man	NK	Hermit	Brāhmaṇa
74.	Fairy	NA	NA	NA
75.	Fish	NA	NA	NA
76.	Man	NK	Householder turned recluse	Brāhmaṇa
77.	Man	NK	Householder turned recluse	Brāhmaṇa
78.	Man	City	Barber	Low
79.	Man	NK	Trader	Vessa
80.	Man	City	Bowman	Brāhmaṇa

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
81.	Man	NK	Householder turned recluse	Brāhmaṇa
82.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
83.	Man	City	Treasure of Bārāṇasī	Vessa
84.	Man	City	Lord Treasurer	Vessa
85.	Man	City	Caravan leader	Vessa
86.	Man	City	King's chaplain	Brāhmaṇa
87.	Man	NK	Householder turned recluse	Brāhmaṇa
88.	Ox	NA	NA	NA
89.	Man	City	Trader	Vessa
90.	Man	City	Rich merchant	Vessa
91.	Man	NK	Rich family	NK
92.	Man	City	King's minister	NK
93.	Man	City	Rich merchant	Vessa
94.	Man	NK	Recluse	NK
95.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
96.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
97.	Man	City	World famous teacher	Brāhmaṇa
98.	Man	City	Merchant's son	Vessa
99.	(a). Man	NK	Householder turned recluse	Brāhmaṇa
	(b).Mahā-Brahmā	NA	NA	NA
100.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
101.	1.Man	NK	Householder turned recluse	Brāhmaṇa
	(b).Mahā-Brahmā	NA	NA	NA
102.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
103.	Man	City	Rich merchant	Vessa
104.	Divinity	NA	NA	NA
105.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
106.	Man	NK	Rich man turned ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
107.	Man	City	King's courtier	Brāhmaṇa
108.	Man	City	King's courtier	Brāhmaṇa
109.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
110.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Vessa
111.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Vessa
112.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Vessa
113.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
114.	Fish	NA	NA	NA
115.	Bird	NA	NA	NA
116.	Man	NK	Acrobat's son	Low
117.	Man	NK	Householder turned recluse	Brāhmaṇa
118.	Quail	NA	NA	NA
119.	Man	NK	Teacher	Brāhmaṇa
120.	Man	City	Chaplain's son	Brāhmaṇa

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
121.	Sprite	NA	NA	NA
122.	Elephant	NA	NA	NA
123.	Man	NK	Rich brāhmaṇa's son	Brāhmaṇa
124.	Man	NK	Householder turned recluse	Brāhmaṇa
125.	Man	City	Rich treasurer	Vessa
126.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
127.	Man	City	Treasurer of Bārāṇasī	Vessa
128.	Rat	NA	NA	NA
129.	Rat	NA	NA	NA
130.	Man	NK	Distinguished family	Brāhmaṇa
131.	Man	City	King's treasurer	Vessa
132.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
133.	Bird	NA	NA	NA
134.	(a). Man	NK	Householder turned recluse	Brāhmaṇa
	(b).Mahā-Brahmā	NA	NA	NA
135.	(a). Man	NK	Householder turned recluse	Brāhmaṇa
	(b).Mahā-Brahmā	NA	NA	NA
136.	(a). Man	NK	Householder	Brāhmaṇa
	(b).Golden Mallard	NA	NA	NA
137.	Man	Village	Stone-cutter	Low
138.	Lizard	NA	NA	NA

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
139.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
140.	Crow	NA	NA	NA
141.	Iguana	NA	NA	NA
142.	Jackal	NA	NA	NA
143.	Lion	NA	NA	NA
144.	Man	NK	Recluse	Brāhmaṇa
145.	Parrot	NA	NA	NA
146.	Sea-sprite	NA	NA	NA
147.	Air-sprite	NA	NA	NA
148.	Jackal	NA	NA	NA
149.	Man	NK	Householder turned recluse	Brāhmaṇa
150.	Man	NK	Rich family	Brāhmaṇa
151.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
152.	Lion	NA	NA	NA
153.	Lion	NA	NA	NA
154.	Man	NK	Recluse	NK
155.	Man	City	Lawyer's son	Brāhmaṇa
156.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
157.	Lion	NA	NA	NA
158.	Man	City	King's adviser	Brāhmaṇa
159.	Peacock	NA	NA	NA

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
160.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
161.	Man	NK	Leader of anchorites	Brāhmaṇa
162.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
163.	Man	City	Son of king's chaplain	Brāhmaṇa
164.	Vulture	NA	NA	NA
165.	Man	Village	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
166.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
167.	Man	Village	Hermit	Brāhmaṇa
168.	Quail	NA	NA	NA
169.	Man	NK	Teacher	Brāhmaṇa
170.	Man	City	Prince turned ascetic	Khattiya
171.	Man	City	Rich family	Vessa
172.	Lion	NA	NA	NA
173.	Man	Village	Hermit	Brāhmaṇa
174.	Man	Village	Householder	Brāhmaṇa
175.	Man	NK	Sages' leader	Brāhmaṇa
176.	Man	City	King's adviser	Brāhmaṇa
177.	Monkey	NA	NA	NA
178.	Man	Village	Potter's son	Low
179.	Man	NK	Poor	Low
180.	Man	NK	Ascetics' Leader	Brāhmaṇa

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
181.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
182.	Man	City	Son of an elephant trainer	Low
183.	Man	City	King's adviser	Brāhmaṇa
184.	Man	City	King's adviser	Brāhmaṇa
185.	Man	NK	Son of a brāhmaṇa magnifico	Brāhmaṇa
186.	Man	City	King's adviser	Brāhmaṇa
187.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
188.	Lion	NA	NA	NA
189.	Man	Village	Farmer	Vessa
190.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
191.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
192.	Man	City	Prince turned ascetic	Khattiya
193.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
194.	Man	Village	Householder's son	NK
195.	Man	City	Courtier's son	NK
196.	Horse	NA	NA	NA
197.	Man	NK	Hermits' chief	Brāhmaṇa
198.	Parrot	NA	NA	NA
199.	Man	Village	Householder	NK
200.	Man	NK	Famed teacher	Brāhmaṇa
201.	Man	NK	Wage earner's son	NK

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
202.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
203.	Man	City	Sages' teacher	Brāhmaṇa
204.	Marsh crow	NA	NA	NA
205.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
206.	Antelope	NA	NA	NA
207.	Man	NK	Ascetic	NK
208.	Monkey	NA	NA	NA
209.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
210.	Wood-pecker	NA	NA	NA
211.	Man	Village	Farmer's son	Brāhmaṇa
212.	Man	NK	A beggar	Low
213.	Man	NK	Monks' teacher	Brāhmaṇa
214.	Man	City	Chaplain's son	Brāhmaṇa
215.	Man	City	King's adviser	Brāhmaṇa
216.	Man	City	King's chaplain	Brāhmaṇa
217.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
218.	Man	City	King's lord justice	Brāhmaṇa
219.	Monkey	NA	NA	NA
220.	Man	City	King's chaplain	Brāhmaṇa
221.	Elephant	NA	NA	NA
222.	Monkey	NA	NA	NA

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
223.	Man	City	Son of king's courtier	NK
224.	Jātaka not enough for data.			
225.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
226.	Man	City	King's courtier	NK
227.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
228.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
229.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
230.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
231.	Man	NK	Elephant trainer's son	Low
232.	Man	City	Rich family	Vessa
233.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
234.	Man	NK	Ascetic	NK
235.	Man	City	Mendicant	Brāhmaṇa
236.	Fish	NA	NA	NA
237.	Man (3000 births)	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
238.	Man	City	Rich merchant's son	Vessa
239.	Frog	NA	NA	NA
240.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
241.	Man	City	King's chaplain	Brāhmaṇa
242.	Man	NK	Rich man's son	NK
243.	Man	City	Musician's son	NK

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
244.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
245.	Man	NK	Ascetic leader	Brāhmaṇa
246.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
247.	Man	City	King's adviser	Brāhmaṇa
248.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
249.	Man	Village	Landowner's son	Vessa
250.	Man	NK	Hermit	Brāhmaṇa
251.	Man	City	A very rich brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
252.	Man	City	Teacher	Brāhmaṇa
253.	Man	NK	A very rich brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
254.	Man	City	Trader's son	Vessa
255.	Parrot	NA	NA	NA
256.	Man	City	Big merchant's son	Vessa
257.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
258.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
259.	Man	City	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
260.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
261.	Man	City	Rich merchant's son	Vessa
262.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
263.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
264.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA

13

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
265.	Man	Village	Forester's son	Low
266.	Singh Horse	NA	NA	NA
267.	Elephant	NA	NA	NA
268.	Man	City	Wiseman	Brāhmaṇa
269.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
270.	Goose	NA	NA	NA
271.	Man	NK	Of a good family	NK
272.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
273.	Man	NK	Hermit	NK
274.	Pigeon	NA	NA	NA
275.	Pigeon	NA	NA	NA
276.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
277.	Pigeon	NA	NA	NA
278.	Buffalo	NA	NA	NA
279.	Man	Village	Robber	NK
280.	Man	City	Householder	NK
281.	Man	City	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
282.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
283.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
284.	Man	NK	Recluse	Brāhmaṇa
285.	Man	NK	Hermit	Brāhmaṇa

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
286.	Ox	NA	NA	NA
287.	Man	NK	Teacher	Brāhmaṇa
288.	Man	Village	Landed proprietor's son	Vessa
289.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
290.	Man	City	Chaplain	Brāhmaṇa
291.	(a). Man	City	Rich merchant's son	Vessa
	(b).Sakka	NA	NA	NA
292.	Crow	NA	NA	NA
293.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
294.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
295.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
296.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
297.	Sprite	NA	NA	NA
298.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
299.	Man	Village	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
300.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
301.	Man	NK	Hermit	NK
302.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
303.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
304.	Snake	NA	NA	NA
305.	Man	NK	Householder	Brāhmaṇa

15

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
306.	Man	City	King's minister	Brāhmaṇa
307.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
308.	Woodpecker	NA	NA	NA
309.	Man	NK	Outcast	Caṇḍāla
310.	Man	City	Priest	Brāhmaṇa
311.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
312.	Man	City	Hermit	Brāhmaṇa
313.	Man	City	Preacher	Brāhmaṇa
314.	Man	Village	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
315.	Man	City	Rich merchant's son	Vessa
316.	Hare	NA	NA	NA
317.	Man	City	Rich merchant's son	Vessa
318.	Man	Village	A robber	NK
319.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
320.	Man	City	Minister & Councillor	Brāhmaṇa
321.	Siṅgila bird	NA	NA	NA
322.	Lion	NA	NA	NA
323.	Man	City	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
324.	Man	City	Wise merchant	Vessa
325.	Lizard	NA	NA	NA
326.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
327.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
328.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
329.	Parrot	NA	NA	NA
330.	Man	City	King's family priest	Brāhmaṇa
331.	Man	City	King's wise minister	Brāhmaṇa
332.	Man	City	King's lord justice	Brāhmaṇa
333.	Man	City	King's minister	Brāhmaṇa
334.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
335.	Lion	NA	NA	NA
336.	Man	City	King's minister	NK
337.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
338.	Man	City	Famous teacher	Brāhmaṇa
339.	Peacock	NA	NA	NA
340.	Man	City	Great merchant	Vessa
341.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
342.	Monkey	NA	NA	NA
343.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
344.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
345.	Man	City	Wise councillor	NK
346.	Man	NK	Teacher	Brāhmaṇa
347.	Man	City	King	Khattiya

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
348.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
349.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
350.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Vessa
351.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
352.	Man	Village	Landowner	Vessa
353.	Man	City	Famous teacher	Brāhmaṇa
354.	Man	Village	Householder	Brāhmaṇa
355.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
356.	Man	NK	Chief disciple	Brāhmaṇa
357.	Elephant	NA	NA	NA
358.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
359.	Stag	NA	NA	NA
360.	Garuda NA	NA		NA
361.	Tree-god	NA	NA	NA
362.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
363.	Man	City	Merchant	Vessa
364.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Vessa
365.	Man	City	Corn merchant	Vessa
366.	Man	City	Merchant	Vessa
367.	Man	Village	Householder's son	NK
368.	Man	Village	Proprietor's son	Vessa

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
369.	Divinity	NA	NA	NA
370.	Golden Goose	NA	NA	NA
371.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
372.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
373.	Man	City	Famous teacher	Brāhmaṇa
374.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
375.	Pigeon	NA	NA	NA
376.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
377.	Man	City	King's priest	Brāhmaṇa
378.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
379.	Golden Goose	NA	NA	NA
380.	Man	Village	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
381.	Vulture	NA	NA	NA
382.	Man	City	Merchant	Vessa
383.	Cock	NA	NA	NA
384.	Bird	NA	NA	NA
385.	Deer	NA	NA	NA
386.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
387.	Man	Village	Smith	Low
388.	Wild sow	NA	NA	NA
389.	Man	Village	Farmer	Brāhmaṇa

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
390.	Man	City	Merchant	Vessa
391.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
392.	Man	Village	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
393.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
394.	Quail	NA	NA	NA
395.	Pigeon	NA	NA	NA
396.	Man	City	Wise minister & councillor	Brāhmaṇa
397.	Lion	NA	NA	NA
398.	Man	NK	Labourer	NK
399.	Vulture	NA	NA	NA
400.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
401.	Man	City	King's councillor	Brāhmaṇa
402.	Man	City	Minister	Brāhmaṇa
403.	Man	Village	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
404.	Monkey	NA	NA	NA
405.	Man	NK	Disciple	NK
406.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
407.	Monkey	NA	NA	NA
408.	Man	City	Potter's son	Low
409.	Man	City	King's minister	NK
410.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
411.	Man	City	King	Brāhmaṇa
412.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
413.	Man	City	King's priest	Brāhmaṇa
414.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
415.	(a). Man	NK	Labourer	Low
	(b). Man	City	King	Khattiya
416.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
417.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
418.	Man	City	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
419.	Deity	NA	NA	NA
420.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
421.	(a). Man	City	Labourer	Low
	(b). Man	City	King	Khattiya
422.	Man	City	Priest	Brāhmaṇa
423.	Man	City	King's priest's son	Brāhmaṇa
424.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
425.	Man	City	Vessa	Khattiya
426.	Man	Village	Wealthy family	NK
427.	Vulture	NA	NA	NA
428.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
429.	Parrot	NA	NA	NA

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
430.	Parrot	NA	NA	NA
431.	Man	Village	Rich Brāhmaṇa's son	Brāhmaṇa
432.	Man	City	King	Brāhmaṇa
433.	Man	City	King's son's priest	Brāhmaṇa
434.	Goose	NA	NA	NA
435.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
436.	Man	NK	Ascetic	NK
437.	Divinity	NA	NA	NA
438.	Partridge	NA	NA	NA
439.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
440.	Man	City	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
441.	Details not available.			
442.	Man	City	Householder	Brāhmaṇa
443.	Man	City	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
444.	Man	NK	Ascetic	NK
445.	Man	Village	Poor woman's son	NK
446.	Man	Village	Of a poor family	NK
447.	Man	Village	Householder	Brāhmaṇa
448.	Fowl	NA	NA	NA
449.	(a). Man	NK	Wealthy Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
	(b). Divinity	NA	NA	NA

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
450.	(a). Man	City	Rich merchant's son	Vessa
	(b). Sakka	NA	NA	NA
451.	Goose	NA	NA	NA
452.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Vessa
453.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Brāhmaṇa
454.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
455.	Elephant	NA	NA	NA
456.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
457.	Divinity	NA	NA	NA
458.	(a). Man	City	King	Khattiya
	(b). Sakka	NA	NA	NA
459.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
460.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
461.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
462.	Man	City	Adviser to king	Brāhmaṇa
463.	Man	City	Master mariner's son	NK
464.	(a). Bird	NA	NA	NA
	(b). Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
	(c). Man	City	Goldsmith	Low
	(d). Man	City	Householder	Brāhmaṇa
	(e). Man	City	Householder	Brāhmaṇa

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
	(f). Man	City	King	Khattiya
465.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
466.	Man	City	Wise carpenter	Low
467.	Man	City	Wise youth	NK
468.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
469.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
470.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
471.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Vessa
472.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
473.	Man	City	Wise courtier	Brāhmaṇa
474.	Man	Village	Sage	Caṇḍāla
475.	Deity	NA	NA	NA
476.	Goose	NA	NA	NA
477.	Man	NK	Rich man turned ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
478.	Man	Village	Householder	Brāhmaṇa
479.	Man	City	Courtier	NK
480.	Man	City	Brāhmaṇa magnate	Brāhmaṇa
481.	Man	NK	Pupil	Brāhmaṇa
482.	Deer	NA	NA	NA
483.	Stag	NA	NA	NA
484.	Parrot	NA	NA	NA

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
485.	Fairy	NA	NA	NA
486.	Lion	NA	NA	NA
487.	Man	City	Chaplain	Brāhmaṇa
488.	Man	City	Rich man turned ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
489.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
490.	Man	NK	Of great brāhmaṇa family	Brāhmaṇa
491.	Peacock	NA	NA	NA
492.	Tree-sprite	NA	NA	NA
493.	Man	City	Caravan leader	Vessa
494.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
495.	Man	City	King's adviser	Brāhmaṇa
496.	Man	NK	Ascetic	NK
497.	Man	City	Wise man	Caṇḍāla
498.	Man	Village	Wise man	Caṇḍāla
499.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
500.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Vessa
501.	Stag	NA	NA	NA
502.	Wild goose	NA	NA	NA
503.	Parrot	NA	NA	NA
504.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
505.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
506.	Serpent	NA	NA	NA
507.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
508.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Vessa
509.	(a). Divinity	NA	NA	NA
	(b). Man	City	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
510.	Man	City	Prince turned ascetic	Khattiya
511.	Man	City	King turned ascetic	Khattiya
512.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
513.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
514.	Elephant	NA	NA	NA
515.	Man	NK	Wise householder	Brāhmaṇa
516.	Monkey	NA	NA	NA
517.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Vessa
518.	Garuda	NA	NA	NA
519.	Man	City	King turned recluse	Khattiya
520.	Divinity	NA	NA	NA
521.	Parrot	NA	NA	NA
522.	Man	City	King's priest's son	Brāhmaṇa
523.	Man	NK	Ascetic	Brāhmaṇa
524.	(a). Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
	(b). Nāga	NA	NA	NA

JĀTAKA DATA ON THE BODHISATTAS

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
525.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
526.	Man	NK	Wealthy family	Brāhmaṇa
527.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
528.	Man	City	Son of a brāhmaṇa magnate	Brāhmaṇa
529.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
530.	Man	City	King's priest's son	Brāhmaṇa
531.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
532.	Man	City	Son of a brāhmaṇa magnate	Brāhmaṇa
533.	Goose	NA	NA	NA
534.	Goose	NA	NA	NA
535.	Sakka	NA	NA	NA
536.	(a). Bird	NA	NA	NA
	(b). Man	City	Prince	Khattiya
	(c). Man	City	Goldsmith	Low
	(d). Man	City	Householder	Brāhmaṇa
	(e). Man	City	Householder	Brāhmaṇa
	(f). Man	City	King	Khattiya
537.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
538.	Man	City	Prince turned ascetic	Khattiya
539.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
540.	Man	Village	Hunter chief's grandson	Low

J. #	Form	Place of birth	Profession/ Family Background	Caste
541.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
542.	Man	City	King	Khattiya
543.	Nāga	NA	NA	NA
544.	Brahmā	NA	NA	NA
545.	Man	City	King's minister	Brāhmaṇa
546.	Man	City	Rich man's son	Vessa
547.	Man	City	Prince	Khattiya

Key: NA= Not Applicable;   NK= Not Known.

APPENDIX : 5a

MALE PERSONALITIES MENTIONED IN
THE PĀLI *VINAYA* AND *SUTTA PIṬAKA*

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Abbhañjanadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Abhaya (a)	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Abhaya (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Abhaya/Vaṭaṃsakiya Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Abhayarājakumāra	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Abhaya	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Abhibhū	Br	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-
Abhibhūta/Citakanibbāpaka Thera	Kh	Urban	Veṭhadipa	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Accuta (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Accuta (b)	-	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Accuta (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Accutagāmabyāmaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Acela-Kassapa	Br	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aciravata	Br	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ādāsamukha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aḍḍhacandiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aḍḍhamāsaka	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Addhuvasīla	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ādhāradāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Adhicchattiya Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Adhimutta	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Adhopupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
ādiccabandhu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
āgantuka	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aggapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aggidatta	Br	Urban	Khemavatī	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Aggideva	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aggika-Bhāradvāja	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aggika-Bhāradvāja	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

2

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Aggisama	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aggisikha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aggivessa	Br	Urban	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ahiṃssaka Bhāradvāja	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ahipāraka	-	Urban	Ariṭṭhapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ajacca	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ajapāla	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ajātasattu	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Ajelaphaladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ajinadāyaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ajina Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ajita (a)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ajita (b)	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ajita (c)	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ajita (d)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Ajita (e)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Ajita-Kesakambalin	-	-	-	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Ajita-Mānava	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ajjuka	-	Urban	Vesālī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ajjuna (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ajjuna (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ajjuna (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Ajjuna (d)	Kh	Urban	Kekaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ajjuna (e)	Kh	Urban	Hatthipura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ajjuna (e)	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ajjuna Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
ākāsagotta	-	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ākāsukkhipiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Akitti/Akatti	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Akkantasaññaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Akkosaka-Bhāradvāja	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alambāyana	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
āalamabanadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aḷāra/āḷāra	Vessa	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

4

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
āḷāra Kālāma	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alāta/Alātaka	-	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
āḷavaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
āḷavi-Gotama Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alinacitta	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alinasattu	Kh	Urban	Kampilla	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
āḷuvadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
āmagandha	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
āmaṇḍaphaladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ambapiṇḍiya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ambapiṇḍiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ambasakkhara	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Ambāṭakiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ambatillhaka	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ambaṭṭha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ambaṭṭha-Mānava	Low	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ambayāgadāyaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Ambayāgadāyaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Amita	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Amittabhā	Kh	Urban	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Amoraphaliya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
ānanda (a)	Kh	Urban	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
ānanda (b)	Kh	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
ānanda (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
ānanda (d)	Kh	Urban	Uttara	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ānanda (e)	Kh	Urban	Anoma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
ānanda (f)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
ānandakumāra	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anantajālī	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Anāsava	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Anāthapiṇḍika	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Andhakaveṇhu	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṅga (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Aṅga (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Aṅga (c)	Kh	Urban	Campā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṅgaka	Br	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṅgaṇika-Bhāradvāja	Br	Urban	Ukkaṭṭhā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṅgati	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṅgirasa (a)	-	-	-	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṅgirasa (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṅgirasa (Asayha)	Vessa	Urban	Bheruva	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Aṅgirasa-Gotama	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṅgulimāla	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-
Anīgha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anikaratta/Anikadatta	Kh	Urban	Vāraṇavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aṇi-Maṇḍavya	Br	Urban	Ksoambī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anitthigandhakumāra (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anitthigandhakumāra (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anitthigandhakumāra (c)	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anitthigandhakumāra (d)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anivatta-Brahmadatta	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Añjana	Kh	Urban	Devadaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Añjana-vaniya Thera	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Añjasa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aṅkolaka-pupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aṅkolaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aṅkura	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Annabhāra (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Annabhāra (b)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Annasaṃsāvaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aññātta-Koṇḍañña Thera	Br	Rural	Doṇavatthu	*	*	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anoma	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Anoma/Asoka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Anoma/Anuma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Anomadassī Buddha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Antalikkhacara	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Anugāra	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anukevaṭṭa	Low	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

8

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Anulepadāyaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Anulomadāyaka Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Anupama (a)	Kh	Urban	Mekhala	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Anupama (b)	Kh	Urban	Vebhāra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Anurādha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aunurdha Thera (a)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	-
Anurudha Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Anurudha Thera (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Anurudha Thera (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Anusaṃsāvaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Anusissa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Apacara/Upacara	Kh	Urban	Sotthivatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Apadāniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aparājita (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aparājita (b)	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Apassena	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Apilāpiya	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Aputtaka/āgantaka	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Araka	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ārakkhadāyaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
ārakkhadāyaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
ārāmadaṇḍa	Br	Urban	Varaṇā	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Araṇadīpiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Araṇemi	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arindama (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Arindama (b)	Kh	Urban	Uttara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Arindama (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Arindama (d)	Kh	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ariṭṭha (a)	Low	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ariṭṭha (b)	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ariṭṭha (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ariṭṭhajanaka	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ariya	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ārohanta	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Aruṇa	Kh	Urban	Aruṇvatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Aruṇapāla	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aruṇavā	Kh	Urban	Aruṇavatī	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Asadisa	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asama	Kh	Urban	Campā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Asanabodhiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
āsanatthavika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
āsanupaṭṭhāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Asibandhakaputta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asita (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asita (b)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asita/Kaṇhasiri	Br	Urban	Ujjenī	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asita Devala	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asoka (a)	-	Rural	Ñatikā	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asoka (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Asokapūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Assaji (a)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

11

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Assaji (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assaji Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assaka/Aruṇa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assaka	Kh	Urban	Potali	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assalāyana	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Assapāla	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assāroha	-	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asubhakammika Tissa Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Atideva	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Atimuttaka/Adhimuttaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Atipaṇḍita	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Atthadassī Buddha	Kh	Urban	Sobhana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Aṭṭhaka (a)	Br	-	-	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṭṭhaka (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṭṭhaka (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṭṭhaka (d)	Kh	Urban	Kumbhavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aṭṭhaka (e)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

12

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Aṭṭhaka (e)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Atthasandassaka thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aṭṭhisena	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Atula (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Atula (b)	Kh	Urban	Aruṇavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Atuliya	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
ātuma Thera	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Avaṇṭaphaladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Avanti	Kh	Urban	Ujjenī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Avantiputta	Kh	Urban	Madhurā	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Avāriyāpitā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Avaṭaphaliya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Avaṭaphaliya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
āveyya	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
āvopupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
āyāgadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ayoghara	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
āyūra	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Avyādhika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bāhiya	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bāhiya-Dārucīriya	Br	Urban	Bhārukaccha	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-
Bahudhīti	Br	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bāhuna	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bahuputta/Bahuputtaka	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baka	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bakkula	Br	Urban	Kosambī	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Baladeva	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bālaka	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Balarāma	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bandhujīvaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bandhula	Kh	Urban	Kusinārā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bandhumā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bandhumā Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bandhura Thera	Vessa	Rural	Silāvatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Bāvarī	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belaṭṭha-Kaccāna	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belaṭṭhānika/Belaṭṭhakāni Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belaṭṭhasīsa Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhadda (a)	-	Rural	ṇatikā	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhadda (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Bhaddaji Thera	Vessa	Urban	Bhaddiya	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhaddasena	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhaddāli Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhadda Thera (a)	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhadda Thera (b)	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhaddiya (a)	Kh	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhaddiya (b)	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhaddiya Thera (a)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhaddiya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhadragaka	-	Urban	Uruvelakappa	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhadrakāra	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

15

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Bhadrāvuddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhagīrasa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhaggava	Low	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhaggavagotta	Low	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhaggavī	Low	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhagu	Kh	-	-	*	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhagu Thera	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhājanadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhallātakadāyaka Thera	-	-	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhallāṭiya	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhallika/Bhalliya/Bhalluka	Vessa	Rural	Pokkharavatī	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhallika/Bhalluka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Bhaṇḍa/Bhaṇḍu Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhaṇḍukaṇṇa	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhāradvāja (a)	Br	-	-	-	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhāradvāja (b)	Br	Urban	Kammāssadhamma	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhāradvāja (c)	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

16

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Bhāradvāja (d)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Bhāradvāja Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhāradvāja Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bharaṇḍukālāma	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bharata (a)	Kh	Urban	Roruva	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bharata (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bharata (c)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bharatakumāra	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bharu	Kh	URban	Bharukaccha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhavanimmita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhāvaseṭṭhī	Vessa	Urban	Sāketa	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhāvitatta	Br	Urban	Sumana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Bhāvitatta Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhayasīva Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhikkhadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhikkhādāyaka Thera	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Bhīma	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

17

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Bhīmasena (a)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhīmasena (b)	Kh	Urban	Indapatta	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhīmaratha (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhīmaratha (b)	Kh	Urban	Bhīmaratha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Bhīmaratha (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhisa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhisadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhisāluvadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhisamuḷāladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhīya/Bhiyyasa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Bhiyya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Bhoja (a)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhoja (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhojanadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhojanasuddhika	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhojaputta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhūmija Thera	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

18

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Bhummajaka	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhūmiya	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhūridatta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Bhūripañña	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhūta Thera	Br	Urban	Sāketa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bījaka (a)	-	Rural	Kalandakagāma	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bījaka (b)	Low	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biḷālidāyaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Biḷālikāyaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bilaṅgika-Bhārdvāja	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biḷārikosiya	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Billaphaliya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bimbijāliya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bimbisāra	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bodhi	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bodhighariya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bodhikumāra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Bodhirājakumāra	Kh	Urban	Kosambī	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bodhisiñcaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bodhiupaṭṭhāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bodhivandaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Brahmadatta (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brahmadatta (b)	Kh	Urban	Potana	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brahmadatta (c)	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brahmadatta (d)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brahmadatta (d)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Brahmadatta-Kumāra	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brahmadatta Thera	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brahmadeva (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Brahmadeva (b)	Kh	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Brahmadeva Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brahmāli Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brahmāyu	Br	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Buddha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Buddhadeva	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Buddhamitta Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Buddharakkhita Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Buddhasaññaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Buddhasaññaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Buddhasaññaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Buddhija/Buddhiya	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Buddhupaṭṭhāka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Buddhupaṭṭhāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Cakkhulola-Brahmadatta	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Cakkhupāla Thera	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cāla Thera	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Campaka	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Campakapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Caṇḍa (a)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caṇḍa (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Caṇḍa (c)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Candābha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Candadeva	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Candakumāra/Candiya/Candaka	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Candakumāra	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Candanamāliya Thera	Br	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Candanamitta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Candanapūjaka Thera	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Candatittha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Candupama/Candasama	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Candanaṅgalika	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Candapaduma	Br	Urban	Ujjenī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Caṇḍappajjota	Kh	urban	Ujjenī	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Candikāputta	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caṅkamadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Cānura	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caṅgoṭakiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Caṅkolapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Cātumāsika-Brahmadatta (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Cetaka	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cetta (a)	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cetta (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chaḷaṅga	Br	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Chaḷaṅga-kumāra	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chambhī	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Channa (a)	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Channa (b)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Channa (c)	-	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Chattadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Chattapāṇī (a)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chattapāṇī (b)	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ciṇṇamāla	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Cirappa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ciravāsī	-	Urban	Uruvelakappa	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Citakapūjaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

23

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Citakapūjaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Citakapūjaka Thera (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Citakapūjaka Thera (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Citta (a)	Low	Urban	Ujjenī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Citta (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Citta (c)	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Citta-gahapati	-	Urban	Macchikāsaṇḍa	*	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Citta Hatthirohaputta	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cittaka Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Cūlābhaya	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cūlacunda	Br	Rural	Nāḷaka	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cūladeva	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cūla-Gavaccha Thera	Br	Urban	Kosambī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Cūla-Jālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cūlaka Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cūlanāga	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cūḷapanthaka	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Cūlaṇī-Brahmadatta	Kh	Urban	Kampilla	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Cūlasubhaddā	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Culla-Anāthapiṇḍika	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Culla-Dhanuggaha	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Culla-Dhanuggaha/Culla-Dhanupaṭṭāka	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Culla-Kāḷinga	Kh	Urban	Dentapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cullakaseṭṭhi	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cullapiṇḍapātika-Tissa	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cunda (a)	Low	URban	Pāvā	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
Cunda (b)	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dabba-Mallaputta	Kh	Urban	Kusinārā	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-
Dabbasena	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Dabbila Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Daāhadhamma	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Daḷhanemi	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Daḷhika	-	Urban	Sāgala	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Damatha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

25

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Daṇḍadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Daṇḍakī	Kh	Urban	Kumbhavatī	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Daṇḍapāṇī	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Daṇḍasena	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Darīmukkha Buddha	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dārupattaka	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dāsaka Thera (a)	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dāsaka Thera (b)	Br	Urban	Vesālī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dasakittiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dasama	-	Urban	Aṭṭhakanagara	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dasaratha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Desapūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Deva/Sudeva	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Devabhūti	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Devadatta Godhiputta	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-
Devagajjita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Devaganadha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Devahita	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Devala (a)	Kh	URban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-
Devala (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Devapa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Devasabha Thera (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Devasabha Thera (b)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Devinda	-	URban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Devuttara	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dhaja	Br	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhajadāyaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dhajadāyaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dhamma (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Dhamma (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dhammacakkika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhammadassī Buddha	Kh	Urban	Saraṇa	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Dhammadinna	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhammagutta Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Dhammantarī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhammapāla	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhammapāla-kumāra (a)	Br	Urban	Indapatta	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhammapāla-kumāra (b)	Br	Rural	Dhammapāla	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhammapāla Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dhammapālita Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhammarūci Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dhammasavaṇiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dhammasava-pitā	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhammasava Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhammasena (a)	Br	Urban	Kaṇṇakujja	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Dhammasena (b)	-	Urban	Mekhala	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Dhammika	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhammika Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhānañjani	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanañjaya (a)	Kh	Urban	Indapatta	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanañjaya (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Dhanañjaya (c)	Vessa	Urban	Bhaddiya	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanañjaya (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-
Dhanantevāsī	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanapāla	Vessa	Urban	Erakacha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Dhaniṭṭha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dhaniya/Dhanika	Vessa	Rural	Dhammakaṇḍa	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhaniya/Naḷamāliya Thera	Low	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-
Dhanuggaha-Tissa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanusekha/Dhanusekhavā	Low	Urban	Kampilla	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dharaṇīruha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dhataraṭṭha (a)	Kh	Urban	Campā	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhataraṭṭha (b)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhataraṭṭha (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhātupūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dhotaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhūmakāri	Br	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhūmaketu	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

29

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Dhūpadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dibbacacakkhu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīgha	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīghajānu	Kh	Urban	Kakkarapatta	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīgha-Kārāyaṇa	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīghanakha	Br	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Dīghapiṭṭhi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīghasumana	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīghatapassin	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīghāvu (a)	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīghāvu (b)	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīghāvu (c)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīghāvu-kumāra	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīghīti	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīpa	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dipadādhipati	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dipankara Buddha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Dīpayana	Br	Urban	Kosambī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Disampati	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Doṇa	Br	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dudipa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dujipa/Dudīpa	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dukkhamūla Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dukūla/Dukūlaka	-	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dumasāra	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dummukha (a)	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dummukha (b)	Kh	Urban	Kampilla	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dussadāyaka Thera	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dussalakkhaṇa	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Duṭṭha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Duṭṭha-kumāra (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Duṭṭha-kumāra (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Duyyodhana	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dvebhāra/Vebhāra	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Dverataniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekacampakapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekacāriya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekachattiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekacintita Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekacintita Thera (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekadaṃsaniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekadhammasavaṇiya Thera (a)	Vessa	Urban	Setavyā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekadhammasavaṇiya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekadīpiya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekadīpiya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekadussadāyaka Thera	Low	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekajjha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekañjalika Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekañjalika Thera (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekañjalika Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekañjalika Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Ekapadumiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekapuṇḍrīka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekapattadāyaka Thera	Low	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekaphusita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekamanadāriya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekāpassita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekaputtika-Brahmadatta	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ekarāja	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekāsanadāyaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekāsanadāyaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekasaṅkhiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekasaññaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekāsaññaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekassara Thera	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ekavajjaka-Brahmadatta	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ekavandiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Ekavihāriya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ekuddāna/Ekuddāniya Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eḷakamāra	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eḷeyya	Kh	Urban	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eraka Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Esukārī (a)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Esukārī (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gagga (a)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gagga (b)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gagga (c)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gahavaratīriya/Gavaharatīriya Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gāmaṇī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gāmaṇi-Caṇḍa	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gaṇaka-Moggailāna	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gaṇḍa	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gandhabba	Low	Urban	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gandhapūjaka Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Gandhāra	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gandhathūpiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gandhodakadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gandhodakiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gaṅgamāla	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gaṅgātīriya Thera	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gaṇṭhipupphiya Thera	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gatasaññaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gatasaññaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gatipacchedana	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gavampati	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gavesī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gayā-kassapa	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ghatakumāra	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ghatemaṇḍadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ghatapaṇḍita	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ghaṭāya	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

35

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Ghaṭīkāra	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ghosasaññaka Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ghosita/Ghosaka	Vessa	Urban	Kosambī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ghoṭamukha	Br	Urban	Pāṭaliputta	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Giridanta	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Giridāsa	Vessa	Urban	Ujjenī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Girimānanda Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Girinelapūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Godatta Thera	Vessa	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Godha Thera	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Godhika Thera	Kh	Urban	Pāvā	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Goḷakāḷa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gopaka	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gopaka Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gopaka Moggallāna	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gorimanda	-	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gosāla Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-

36

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Gosīsanikkhapa Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gotama	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gotama Thera (a)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gotama Thera (b)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gotama Thera (c)	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Govinda	Br	Urban	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gulissāni	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guṇa	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gutijjita	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guttila	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hāliddakāni/Hālidikāni	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hārika	Low	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hārita Thera (a)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hārita Thera (b)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harittaca-kumāra	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hāsajanaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Hatthaka	Kh	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Hatthaka Āḷavaka	Kh	Urban	āḷavī	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Hatthāroha	-	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hatthārohaputa Thera	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hatthidāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Hatthipāla (a)	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hatthipāla (b)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hemaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Heraññakāni Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hiṅga Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hiṅgū Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Huhuṅka	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Icchānaṅgalaka	-	Rural	Icchānaṅgala	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
Indasamānagotta	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Illisa	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Isibhatta Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Isidāsa Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Isidinna Thera	Vessa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Isimuggadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Isisiṅga	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Isidatta	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Isidatta Thera	-	Rural	Vaḍḍhagāma	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jagatidāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jagatikāraka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jāli (a)	Kh	Urban	Jetuttara	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Jāli (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jālina	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jāliya	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jambugamika Thera	-	Urban	Campā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jambuka Thera	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jambukhādaka	Br	Rural	Nālaka	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jambuphaliya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Janaka (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Janaka (b)	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Janasandha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Janasandha/Dasaratha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Janasandha/Saccasandha	Kh	Urban	Anoma	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Jāṇussoṇī	Br	Rural	Icchānaṅgala	-	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Januttama	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jarā	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jaṭā-Bhāradvāja	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jaṭila/Jaṭika	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jātimanta	Br	Urban	Vettavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jātipūjaka Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jātipupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jatukaṇṇī/Jatukaṇṇika	Kh	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Javahaṃsaka Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jayadissa	Kh	Urban	Kampilla	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jayampati	Kh	Urban	Kusinārā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jayasena (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Jayasena (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Jayasena (c)	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Jetakumāra	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jenta Thera	-	Rural	Jenta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jeta	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jinadatta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jita	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jitamitta/Vijjitamitta	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jīvaka-Komārabhacca	Low	Urban	Rājagaha	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jotidāsa Thera	Br	Rural	Pādiyattha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jotika	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jotipāla (a)	Br	Urban	Vehaliṅga	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-
Jotipāla (b)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jotipāla (c)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jotirasa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jotiya	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jūjaka	Br	Rural	Dunniviṭṭha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Juṇha (a)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Juṇha (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

41

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Jutindhara (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Jitindhara (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kaccānagotta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaccāyana Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kedalīphaladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kadamapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kāka	Low	Urban	Ujjenī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kakkaṭa	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kakkārupūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kakkārupupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kakudha/Kakkaṭa	-	Rural	Nādikā	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kakudha (a)	Kh	Urban	Koḷiyanagara	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kakudha (b)	-	Urban	Koḷiyanagara	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kakudha (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kakusandha Buddha	Br	Urban	Khemavatī	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷa (a)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷa (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

42

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Kalābu	Kh	Urban	Barāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷadevala	-	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷahatthi	-	Urban	Barāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kālaka	Vessa	Urban	Sāketa	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷaka	-	Urban	Barāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷakhemaka/Khemaka	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kalaṇḍuka	Low	Urban	Barāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalambadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kālārajanaka	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalārakkhattiya	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaḷāramatthuka	-	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷasena	Kh	Urban	Sāketa	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷasumana	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalimbha/Kalimma	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāliṅga	Kh	Urban	Dantapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāliṅga-Bhāradvāja	Br	Urban	Dantapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷudāyī/Udāyī	-	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Kalyāṇaka	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāmabhū	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāmanīta	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṃsa/Mahākaṃsa	Kh	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṃsa Bārāṇasiggaha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṃsassa	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṇaverapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kañcanaveḷa	Kh	Urban	Sudhaññavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Kandalīpupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kaṇḍarāyana	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṇḍari	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṇha (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṇha (b)	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṇha (c)	Low	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṇhadinna Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-
Kaṇhadīpāyana	Br	Urban	Kosambī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṇha Vāsudeva	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

44

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Kaṅkhā-Revata Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-
Kaṇṭaka/Kaṇḍaka	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāpaṭhika/Kāpaṭika	Br	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kapila (a)	Br	Urban	Sotthivatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kapila (b)	Br	Urban	Sāgala	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kapila (c)	-	Rural	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kapiṭṭhaphaladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kappa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kappakumāra	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kappa/Kapparukkhiya Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kappaṭakura Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kappa Thera	-	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kappitaka Thera	-	Rural	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Kāraṇapālī	Br	Urban	Vesālī	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Karaṇḍu/Karaṇḍaka	Kh	Urban	Dantapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāraṇḍiya	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Karaṇīyavimāna	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Kasī-Bhāradvāja	Br	Rural	Ekanāḷā	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
kassapa (a)	Br	-	-	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kassapa (b)	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kassapa (c)	-	Urban	Uruvelā	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kassapa (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kassapa (e)	Br	-	-	*	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kassapa (f)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kassapa (g)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kassapa (h)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kassapa Buddha	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Kassapa Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kassapagotta (a)	Br	Rural	Vāsabhagāma	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kassapagotta (b)	Br	Urban	Paṅkadhā	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kassapagotta (c)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kasumāriphaliya Thera	Br	Rural	Pādiyattha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kaṭāhaka	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṭamorakatissaka	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Kaṭissabha	-	Rural	Nādikā	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Katissaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Kaṭissaha Thera	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāṭiyāna Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṭṭhvāhana	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāvinda	-	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kekarājā	Kh	Urban	Ketaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Keniya/Keṇiya	Br	Urban	Āpaṇa	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kesarapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kesava/Kesi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kesi	Low	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ketumā	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ketumbarāga	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
kevaddha/Kevaṭṭa	Vessa	Urban	Nālandā	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kevaṭṭa	Br	Urban	Kampilla	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Khajjakadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Khaṇḍa	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-

47

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Khaṇḍadeva	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Khaṇḍahāla	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Khaṇḍaphulliya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Khaṇḍasumana	Kh	Urban	Pāvā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Khaṇḍadevīputta	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Khema (a)	Kh	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Khema (b)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Khema/Khemaka (a)	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Khema/Khemaka (b)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Khemaṅkara	Kh	Urban	Khemavatī	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Khemaṅkara Thera	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Khitaka Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-
Khomadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Khuddaka-Tissa Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Khujjasobhita Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kikī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kikī-Brahmadatta	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-

48

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Kilañjadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kimbila/Kimila	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kiṃsukapūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kiṃsukapupphiya Thera	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-
Kirapatika	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kisalayapūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kisasaṅkicca	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kisa-Vaccha/Vaccha-Kisa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kitava	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Kitavāsa	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kokālika/Kokāliya (a)	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kokālika/Kokāliya (b)	Vessa	Rural	Kokāli	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Komāyaputta	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Koṇāgamana Buddha	Br	Urban	Sobhavatī	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Koñca	Kh	Urban	Mantavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Koṇḍañña Buddha	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Korakalamba/Korakalambaka	Br	Urban	Sotthivatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Korakkhattiya/korakhatta	Kh	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Koraṇḍapupphiya Thera (a)	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Koraṇḍapupphiya Thera (b)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kosambika/Kosambaka	Kh	Urban	Kosambī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kosika	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kosiya Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kosiyāyana	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kosumbaphaliya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Koṭumbaariya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kuddātaka Paṇḍita	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kulavaddhana	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kulla Thera	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kumāra-Kassapa	-	Urban	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kummāsadāyaka Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kumudadāyaka Thera	Br	Urban	Bharukaccha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kumudamāliya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kumudamāliya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Kuṇḍadhāna	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kuṇḍaka-kumāra Khantivādī	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kuṇḍala/Kuḷakuṇḍala Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kuṇḍaliya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kuṇḍinagarīya Thera	Low	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Kuñjara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Kureñjiyaphaladāyaka Thera	Vessa	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kusa	Kh	Urban	Kusinārā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kusaṭṭakadāyaka Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kūṭadanta	Br	Rural	Khānumata	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kuṭajapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kuṭidāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kuṭidhūpaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kuṭivihārī Thera (a)	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kuṭivihārī Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kuṭumbiyaputta-Tissa Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lakkhaṇa (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Lakkhaṇa (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lakkhaṇa Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lakuṇṭaka-Bhaddiya Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-
Lāḷudāyī Thera	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lasuṇadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Lohicca (a)	Br	Urban	Makkarakaṭa	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lohicca (b)	Br	Rural	Sālāvatikā	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lohitaka	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lomahaṃsa Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lomasakaṅgiya Thera	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Lomasakassapa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Losaka-Tissa Thera	Low	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maccharikosiya	Vessa	Urban	Sakkhara	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maddava	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Madhudāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Madhumaṃsadāyaka Thera	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Madhupiṇḍika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Māgandiya	Br	Urban	Kammāsadamma	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maggadattika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Maggadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Maggasaññaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Māgha (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Māgha (b)	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maghavapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahācūlanī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahādeva Thera	-	-	Bhaggari	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahādhana (a)	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Mahādhana (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahādhanaka	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahādhana-Kumāra	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahādundubhi	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahāgavaccha Thera	Br	Rural	Nāḷaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahājāli Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahājanaka (a)	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

53

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Mahājanaka (b)	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahaka	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahākāḷa Thera	Vessa	Urban	Setavyā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahākāliṅga	Kh	Urban	Dantapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahā-Kaccāna	Br	Urban	Ujjenī	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahā-Kañcana	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahā-Kappina Thera	Kh	Urban	Kukkuṭavatī	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahā-Kassapa Thera	Br	Rural	Mahātittha	-	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahā-Koṭṭhita Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahāli/Oṭṭhaddha	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahā-Moggallāna Thera	Br	Rural	Kolitagāma	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Mahānāga Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahānāga Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahānāma (a)	Kh	Urban	Kapilabatthu	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahānāma (b)	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahānāma Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Mahānela	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahānidāna	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahānigghosa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahāpaduma	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāpanāda	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāpanthaka Thera	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāpiṅgala	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāpuḷina	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahāpatāpe/Mahāpatāpana	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāpatāpa (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahāpatāpa (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahārakkhita Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahārāma	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahāratha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahārohita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahāruci	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahāsāgara	Kh	Urban	Madhurā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Mahāsammata	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāsaṅgharakkhita	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāsīlava	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāsīva Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāsīva Thera (b)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāsudassana	Kh	Urban	Kusinārā	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Mahātissa	-	-	Bhaggari	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāvajjita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahāvaṃsaka-Tissa Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahiṃsāsa	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahisamanta	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mahosaddha	Vessa	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Majjhantaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Makkhali-Gosāla	Low	Rural	Saravana	*	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malaya-Mahādeva Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malitavambha Thera	Br	Urban	Bharukaccha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-
Mallika	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Mālunkyāputta Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Māluta	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mānacchidda Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mānadiṇṇa	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mānatthaddha/Janta Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mānatthaddha Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Māṇava Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-
Mañcadāyaka Thera (a)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mañcadāyaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mandāravapūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Maṇḍavya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maṇḍissa	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maṅgala (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maṅgala (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
Maṅgala (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Maṅgala (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maṅgala Buddha (a)	Kh	Urban	Uttara	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

57

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Maṅgala Buddha (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maṇicūḷaka	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maṇipūjaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Maṇipūjaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mañjarīpūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Manoja	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manomaya Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mantī	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mantidatta/Datta Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mātaṅga (a)	Low	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mātaṅga (b)	-	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-
Mātaṅga Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mātaṅgaputta Thera	-	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Maṭṭakuṇḍali/Maṭṭhakuṇḍali	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Mṭuluṇgaphaladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Medakathalikā	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Medhaṅkara Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Megha (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Megha (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Meghabba/Meghava	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Meghiya/Buddhasaññaka Thera	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-
Meḷajina Thera	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Meṇḍaka	-	Urban	Bhaddiya	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Meṇḍasira/Meṇḍasīsa Thera	Low	Urban	Sāketa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Meṇḍissara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Methula	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mettagū Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mettaji Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Metteya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mettiya Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Miga	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Migajāla Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Migājina	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Migaketu	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Migalaṇḍika	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Migāra	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Migāra Rohaṇeyya	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Migasira Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Miṇjavaṭaṃsakiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mittagandhaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mittavindaka	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moggalla	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mogharāja Thera	Br	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Moliya-Phagguna Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moliyasīvaka	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Morahatthiya/Senaka Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Mucalinda/Mujalinda	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mudita Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mudusitala	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mūgapakkha	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mujalinda	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Munāli	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Muṇḍa	Kh	Urban	Pāṭaliputta	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Muraja	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Mūsila	-	Urban	Ujjenī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mūsila Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Muṭṭhika	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Muṭṭhipūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Muṭṭhipupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nadī-Kassapa	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nāga (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nāga (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Nāgadatta Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nāgapupphiya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nāgapupphiya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nāgasamāla Thera (a)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-
Nāgasamāla Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nāga Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

61

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Naggaji	Kh	Urban	Takkasilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Najjūpama Thera	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Nagakesarīya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Nāgita Thera (a)	Br	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nāgita Thera (b)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nakulapitā	-	Urban	Suṃsumāragiri	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nālaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Naḷakuṭidāyaka Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Nāḷijaṅgha	Br	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nālikeradāyaka Thera	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Naḷinakesariya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Nāḷikīra/Nāḷikera	Kh	Urban	Dantapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ñāṇasaññaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Ñāṇathavika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Nanda (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Nanda (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-
Nanda (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Nanda (d)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nanda (e)	Br	Urban	Takkasilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nanda-Gopālaka	Low	Urban	Kosambī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandaka (a)	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandaka (b)	-	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Nandaka Thera (a)	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nandaka Thera (b)	-	Urban	Campā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nanda-Māṇava (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nanda-Māṇava (b)	Br	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nandasena	-	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Nanda Thera (a)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-
Nanda Thera (b)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nanda-Kumāputta Thera	-	Urban	Veḷukaṇḍa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Nanda-Kumāra	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nanda-Vaccha	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandisena	-	Urban	Potali	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandivaḍḍha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

63

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Nandivisāla	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandiya (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandiya (b)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandiya (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nandiya Thera	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nanduttara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Nārada (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Nārada (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Nārada (c)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nārada (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nārada (e)	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nārada (f)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nārada (g)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nārada Buddha	Kh	Urban	Dhaññavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Nārada Thera	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Naruttama	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nāsamāla Thera	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Naṭakuvera	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Navakammika-Bhāradvāja	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nāvindakī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nehātakamuni Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nesāda	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nigaṇṭha-Nāthaputta	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nigguṇḍipupphiya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nigguṇḍipupphiya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nigrodha (a)	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nigrodha (b)	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nigrodha (c)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nigrodha-Kappa Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nigrodha Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nikaṭa	-	Rural	ṇatikā	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nikaṭa Thera	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nilavāsī Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nilīya	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Nimi/Nemi	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Nimi Buddha	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nimitta	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nimittasaññaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nimittavyākaraṇīya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nirabbuda	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nisabha (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-
Nisabha (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Nisabha Thera	Kh	Urban	Koḷiyanagara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nisseṇidāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nīta Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nītha Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Okkāka (a)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Okkāka (b)	Kh	Urban	Kusinārā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Opavuhya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pabbata	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Paccāgamanīya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Paccaṇīkasāta	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paccaya Thera	Kh	Urban	Rohiṇī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pacetana	Kh	Urban	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pādalola-Brahmadatta	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pādañjali	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pādapāvara	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pādapīṭiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pādapūjaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pādapūjaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Padasaññaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Padavikkamana Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Paduma (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Paduma (b)	Kh	Urban	Saraṇa	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Paduma (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Paduma (d)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paduma (e)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paduma Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

67

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Padumacchadaniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Padumadhāriya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Padumakesariya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Padumakūṭāgāriya Thera	Low	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Padumapūjaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Padumapūjaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Padumapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Padumissara	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Padumuttara Buddha (a)	Kh	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Padumuttara Buddha (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pahārāda	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pahasambahula	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pajāka	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pajjuna	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Pakkha Thera	Kh	Urban	Devadaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pakudha-Kaccāyana	Br	-	-	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Palaṅkadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

68

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Pālita (a)	Kh	Urban	Sumaṅgala	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Pālita (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Pamatta	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pamokkharaṇa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Paṃsukūlasaññika Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Panasaphaladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pañcadīpika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pañcahatthiya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pañcahatthiya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pañcakaṅga	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pañcālacaṇḍa (a)	-	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pañcālacaṇḍa (b)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pañcālacaṇḍa (c)	Kh	Urban	Kampilla	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pañcaṅguliya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pañcavuddha-kumāra	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṇḍaka	-	Rural	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṇḍita	Vessa	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Paṇḍitakumāraka	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṇḍuka	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṇḍukaṇṇa	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṇḍuputta	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṅga Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṇṇadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pāpaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pāpanivāniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Parantapa	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pārāpariya Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parappasādaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pārāsariya (a)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pārāsariya (b)	Br	Urban	Takkasilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pārāsariya (c)	Br	Urban	Takkasilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pārāsariya Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paripuṇṇaka Thera	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pasenadi	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Passī Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Passika Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Paṭala	Low	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṭhavidundubhi	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pāṭihīrasaññaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pāṭika (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pāṭika (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pāṭikaputta	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṭikolamba	Low	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṭisaṅkhāra	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Paṭṭadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Patthodanadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pattipupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pāvārika/Pāvāriya	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pavattā Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paviṭṭha Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pāyāsadāyaka Thera	-	Urban	Setavyā-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Pāyāsi	Kh	Urban	Campā	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pessa	Low	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phagguna	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phaladāyaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Phaladāyaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Phaladāyaka Thera (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Phaladāyaka Thera (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Phaladāyaka Thera (e)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Phalagaṇḍa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phalikasandāna	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phārusaphaladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Phulla	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Phussa Buddha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-
Phussadeva	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Phussadeva Thera (a)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phussadeva Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pilinda-vaccha	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Piliya	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Piliyakkha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pilotika	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Piṇḍapātika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Piṇḍola	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Piṇḍola-Bhāradvāja	Br	Urban	Kosambī	*	*	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Piṅgala (a)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Piṅgala (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Piṅgalakoccha	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Piṅgiya	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Piṅgiya-māṇava	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Piṅgiyānin	Br	Urban	Vesālī	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Piṅguttara	-	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Piyadassī Buddha (a)	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Piyadassī Buddha (b)	-	Urban	Sudhaññavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Piyaka	Vessa	Urban	Pāṭaliputta	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Piyālaphaladāyaka Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Piyālapupphiya Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Piyañjaha Thera	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pokkharasādi	Br	Urban	Ukkaṭṭhā	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Polajanaka	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Posāla	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Potaliputta	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Potaliya	-	Urban	āpaṇa	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poṭṭhadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Poṭṭhapāda	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poṭṭhapāda Thera	Low	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Poṭṭhila/Poṭhila Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poṭṭhika/Poṭṭiya	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pubbaṅgamaniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pukussa (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pukussa (b)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pukussa (c)	-	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pukkusāti	Kh	Urban	Takkasilā	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Pulinacaṅkamiya Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pulinapūjaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pulinapūjaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pulinathūpiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pulinuppādaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Punabbusaka	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Punabbasumitta	Vessa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Puṇṇa	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puṇṇa/Puṇṇaka Thera	-	Urban	Suppāraka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Punnāgapupphiya Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Puṇṇaka	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puṇṇaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puṇṇa-Koliyaputta	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puññavaddhava	Kh	Urban	Saraṇa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Puṇṇa-Mantāniputta	Br	Rural	Donavatthu	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Puṇṇaji	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puṇṇiya	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Puppha Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pupphacaṅgotiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pupphachadaniya Thera	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pupphachattiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pupphadhāraka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pupphāsaniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pupphathūpiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pupphita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Purāṇa (a)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Purāṇa (b)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pūraṇa-Kassapa	Br	-	-	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puthujjana	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rādha Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Rāhula Thera	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	*	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Rājadatta Thera	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Rakkhita Thera (a)	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rakkhita Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Rāma (a)	Br	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rāma (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rāma (c)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rāma (d)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ramaṇīyakuṭika Thera	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ramaṇīyavihārī Thera	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rāmaputta	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ramma (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Ramma (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Ramma (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Rammaka	Br	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Raṃsisaññaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Raṃsisaññaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ratanapajjala/Ratanapattaka	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Rattapāṇi	Low	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Raṭṭhapāla	-	Urban	Thullakoṭṭhita	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rattipupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

77

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Reṇu (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reṇu (b)	Kh	Urban	Kampilla	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reṇupūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Revata	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Revata Buddha	Kh	Urban	Sudhaññavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Revata Khadiravaniya Thera	Br	Rural	Upatissa	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Rohaṇa	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rohiṇeyya	-	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rohita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Roja (a)	Kh	Urban	Kusinārā	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Roja (b)	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Romasa Buddha (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Romasa Buddha (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ruci	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Rucigatta	Br	Urban	Sobhavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ruhaka	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sabbābhibhū Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sabbadassī	Br	Urban	Sumaṅgala	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sabbadatta	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sabbadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sabbagahana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sabbagandhiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sabbaka/Sappaka	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sabbakāma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sabbakāmin	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sabbakittika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sabbamitta	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sabbaphaladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sabhāsammata	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sabbattha-abhivassī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sabbosadha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sabhiya	Br	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sabhiya Thera	Low	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sacakkhu	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sacca	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saccaka	Br	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saccasaññaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sādhina	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāgara (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sāgara (b)	Kh	Urban	Sobhana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sāgara (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāgara (d)	Kh	Urban	Madhurā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāgata	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-
Sachadeva	Kh	Urban	Indapatta	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sahassāra	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sahassaratha (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sahassaratha (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sajjha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sajjhadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sakacittaniya Thera	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sākha	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

80

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sakiṃsammajjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sakula	Kh	Urban	Sāketa	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sakuladāyin	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāla	Kh	Urban	Campā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sālakusumiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sālamāliya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sālamaṇḍiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sālaḷapupphadāyaka Thera	Vessa	Urban	Aruṇavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sālapupphadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sālapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sāḷha (a)	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāḷha (b)	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāḷha (c)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāḷha Migāranattā	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāgata Thera	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sālissara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāma	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-

81

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Samādapaka Thera	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samalaṅkata	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samaṇa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Samaṇaguttaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Samaṅaga	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sāmaññkāni Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāmaṇḍakāni	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Samantabhadda	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samantacakkhu (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samantacakkhu (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samantacchadana	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samantadharaṇa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samantagandha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samantanemi	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samantapāsādika (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samantapāsādika (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samantavaruṇa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Samavattakkhandha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sambala (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sambala (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sambhava (a)	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sambhava (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sambhava (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sambhava (d)	Kh	Urban	Indapatta	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sambhūta	Low	Urban	Ujjenī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sambhūta Thera (a)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sambhūta Thera (b)	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sambula-Kaccāna Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāmidatta	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Samidhi Thera	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Samitigutta Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Samudda (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Samudda (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Samogadha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Samotthata	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sampasādaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samphusita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samuddadatta	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Samuddakappa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samuddhara	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Saṃvara (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṃvara (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṃvasita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Saṃyama	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sandaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sandha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sandhāna	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sandhita Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sandho-Kaccāyano	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṅgamaji Thera	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Saṅgārava (a)	Br	Rural	Caṇḍalakappa	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Saṅgārava (b)	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṅgharakkhita	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṅgharakkhita Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṅghupaṭṭāka Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sañjaya (a)	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sañjaya (b)	Kh	Urban	Taggara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-
Sañjaya (c)	Kh	Urban	Jetuttara	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sañjaya (d)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sañjaya-Belaṭṭhiputta	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sañjikāputta	Br	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sañjaya-ākāsagotta	Br	-	-	-	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sañjaya Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sañjīva (a)	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sañjīva (b)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sannaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Saññaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Saññasāmika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

85

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sannibbāpaka	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sannidhāpaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Santa	Kh	Urban	Sucandaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Saṅkha (a)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṅkha (b)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṅkha (c)	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṅkha (d)	Br	Urban	Takkasilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṅkha (e)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Saṅkha (f)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Saṅkicca Thera (a)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṅkicca Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santacitta Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santati	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saṇṭhita Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Santuṭṭha	-	Rural	Ñātikā	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sānu Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saparivāra	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

86

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Saparivāracchattadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Saparivārasana Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sapoarivāriya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sappadāsa Thera	Br	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sappidāyaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sappidāyaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sarabha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sarabhaṅga	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sarabhaṅga Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sarakāṇī/Saraṇāni	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saraṇa (a)	Kh	Urban	Mekhala	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Saraṇa (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Saraṇa (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Saraṇa (a)	Kh	Urbanl	Saraṇa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Saraṇāgamaniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Saraṇaṅkara Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sāriputta Thera	Br	Rural	Nālaka	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-

87

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Saritacchadana	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Satacakkhu	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Satadhamma/Santadhamma	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Satapatta	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sataraṃsi Buddha (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sataraṃsi Buddha (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sataraṃsika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sāti Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sattabhū	Kh	Urban	Dantapura	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sattāhapabbajita Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sattakadamabapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sattapaduminiya Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sattapaṇṇiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sattapāṭliya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Satthā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sattipaṇṇiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sattuka (a)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sattuka (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sattuttama	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sāvatthīvihārī Thera	-	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Saviṭṭha Thera	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sayampabha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sayampaṭibhāniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sayanadāyaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sayanadāyaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sayha (a)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sayha (b)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sayha Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seggu	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sela	Br	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sena (a)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sena (b)	Kh	Urban	Sobhana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Senaka (a)	Br	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Senaka (b)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Senaka (c)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Senaka (d)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Senaka Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Senānī	Vessa	Urban	Senānīnigama	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Senāsandāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Seniya	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sereyyaka Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Setaketu	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Setuccha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seyyasaka	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sīdārī Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siddhattha Buddha	Kh	Urban	Vebhaāra	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sigāla	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sigālapitā Thera	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sīha (a)	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sīha (b)	Br	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sīha (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

90

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sīhāsandāyaka Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sīhāsandāyaka Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sihāsanavījaniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sikhā-Moggallāna	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sikhī Buddha	Kh	Urban	Aruṇavatī	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sīlava	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sīlavā Thera	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sīluccaya	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sindhavasandana	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Siṅgāla	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siri	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
Siridhara	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sirimaṇḍa Thera	Br	Urban	Suṃsumāragiri	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sirimā Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sirimitta Thera	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sirivaḍḍha (a)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sirivaḍḍha (b)	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sirivaḍḍha (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sirivaḍḍha (d)	Vessa	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sirivaḍḍha Thera	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sītāluka-Brahmadatta	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sīvaka	-	Urban	Ariṭṭhapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Sīva Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sīvalī Thera	Kh	Urban	Sajjanela	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sivi (a)	Kh	Urban	Ariṭṭhapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sivi (b)	Kh	Urban	Jetuttara	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Sivi (c)	Low	Urban	Dvāravatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sivi (d)	Kh	Urban	Ariṭṭhapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sobha	Kh	Urban	Sobhavatī	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sobhita (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sobhita (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sobhita Buddha (a)	Kh	Urban	Sudhamma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sobhita Buddha (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sobhita Thera (a)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-

92

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sobhita Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Somadatta (a)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somadatta (b)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somadatta (c)	Br	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somadeva (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Somadeva (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Somamitta Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somanassa (a)	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somanassa (b)	Kh	Urban	Kampilla	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Sona	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Soṇa	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soṇadaṇḍa	Br	Urban	Campā	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonaka	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soṇakāyana	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soṇaka Thera	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soṇa-Kuṭikaṇṇa/Kuraraghariya-Soṇa	-	Urban	Kuraraghara	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-
Soṇa-Koḷivisa Thera	Vessa	Urban	Campā	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

93

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Soṇa-Poṭiriyaputta Thera	Vessa	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soṇa Thera (a)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soṇa Thera (b)	Kh	Urban	Anoma	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Soṇṇābha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sonuttara	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sopāka Thera (a)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Sopāka Thera (b)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Sorata Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sorreya-Revata	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sotthika/Soṭṭhiya	Vessa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sotthisena	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sotthiya (a)	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sotthiya (b)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sovaṇṇakattarika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sovaṇṇakiṅkhaniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Subāhu Buddha	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subāhu Thera (a)	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Subāhu Thera (b)	Kh	Urban	Pāvā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subbata	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Subha Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subhadda (a)	Low	Rural	Ātumā	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subhadda (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Subhadda (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Subhadda (d)	-	Rural	Ñātikā	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subhadda Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Subha Todeyyaputta	Br	Rural	Tudigāma	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subhūta Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subhūti/Cūlasugandha Thera	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-
Succhavi	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sūcidāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sucintita Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sucintita Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sucintita Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sucintita Thera (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

95

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sucintita Thera (d)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Suciparivāra (a)	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suciparivāra (b)	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sucīrata	Br	Urban	Indapatta	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudassana (a)	Kh	Urban	Sarabhavatī	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudassana (b)	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudassana (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sudassana (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sudassana (e)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sudassana (f)	Low	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sudassana Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sudatta (a)	-	Rural	Ñādikā	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudatta (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudatta (c)	Kh	Urban	Mekhala	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudatta (d)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudatta (e)	-	Urban	Sudhaññavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudatta (f)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sudātha Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudatta Thera	-	Urban	Velukaṇṭaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudāyaka	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sudhamma	Kh	Urban	Sudhamma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudhamma Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudeva (a)	Kh	Urban	Sudhaññavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudeva (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudeva (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudhāpiṇḍiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Suddhika-Bhāradvāja	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suddhodana	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudinna	-	Urban	Sudhaññavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudinna Kalandakaputta	-	Rural	Kalandakagāma	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sugandha Thera (a)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sugandha Thera (b)	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sugandha Thera (c)	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sujāta (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sujāta (b)	Kh	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-
Sujāta (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sujāta (d)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sujāta (e)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sujāta (f)	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sujāta (g)	Kh	Urban	Polanagara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Sujāta Buddha	Kh	Urban	Sumaṅgala	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sujāta Thera	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sujhemanta Thera	Br	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sukaṭaveliya Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sumana (a)	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sumana (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sumanā Buddha	Kh	Urban	Mekhala	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sumanadāmadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sumantālavaṇṭiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sumana Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sumana Thera (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sumanavijaniya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sumaṅgala (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sumaṅgala (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sumaṅgala (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sumaṅgala (d)	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sumaṅgala Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sumaṅgala Thera (a)	-	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sumaṅgala Thera (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sumbha Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sumedha (a)	Br	Urban	Amarāvatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sumedha (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sumedha (c)	Kh	Urban	Dhaññavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sumedha (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sumedha (e)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sumedha (f)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sumedha Buddha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sumeghaghara	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sumitta (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sumitta (b)	Kh	Urban	Amara	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sumitta (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sumitta (d)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sunāga	Br	Rural	Nāḷakagāma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunakkhatta	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunāma	-	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunanda (a)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sunanda (b)	Kh	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunanda (c)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunanda (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sunanda (e)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sunanda (f)	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunanda (g)	Low	Urban	Ariṭṭhapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunanda (h)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sundara	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sundarasamudda Thera	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-

100

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sundarika-Bhāradvāja	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunela	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sunetta (a)	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunetta (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sunetta (c)	Kh	Urban	Sudhamma	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sunetta Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Sunīdha/Sunidha	-	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
Sunikkhama	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sunisāvimānavatthu	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Sunīta Thera	Low	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supajjalita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Supāricariya Thera	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Supatiṭṭhita Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suppabuddha (a)	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suppabuddha (b)	Low	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
Suppabuddha (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Suppāraka	-	Urban	Bharukaccha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Suppasanna	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Suppatīta	Kh	Urban	Anoma	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Suppatiṭṭhita	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Suppiya (a)	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suppiya (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Suppiya Thera	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Supuṭakapūjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sura	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sūra-Ambaṭṭha	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surabhi Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Surādha Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Surakkhita	Kh	Urban	Kaṇṇakujja	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surārāgotta	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suriyadeva	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suriyakumāra (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suriyakumāra (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suruci (a)	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Suruci (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Surucikumāra	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Susārada Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Susīma (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Susīma (b)	Br	Urban	Campā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Susīma (c)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Susīma (d)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Susuddha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sutana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sutasoma (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sutasoma (b)	Kh	Urban	Indapatta	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sutavā (a)	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sutavā (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sutavā Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suvaccha	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Suvaṇṇabimbohaniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Suvaṇṇasāma	Low	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Suyāma	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suyāma Thera	Br	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suyāna	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tadadhimutta Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Taggarasikhī Buddha	-	Rural	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
Takkāriya	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tālaphaliya Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tālapuṭa	Low	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tālavaṇṭadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Tamālapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Tamba	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tambapupphiya Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-
Tamonuda	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Taṇhaṅkara Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Tārukha	Br	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tapassu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Tapassu/Tapussa	Vessa	Urban	Ukkala	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Taraṇiya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Taraṇiya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Taraṇiya Thera (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Taraṇiya Thera (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tatha Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tavaṇṇika/Tavakaṇṇika	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tekicchakārī Thera	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tekuḷa	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Telakāni Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Telamakkhiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Thambāropaka Thera	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ṭhitañjaliya Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Thūpasikha/Thūpasikhāra	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tikaṇṇa	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tilamuṭṭhidāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Timberuka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Timirapupphiya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Timirapupphiya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tiṇamuṭṭhidāyaka Thera	Low	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tiraṃsiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tirīṭavaccha (a)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tirīṭavaccha (b)	Vessa	Urban	Ariṭṭhapura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tirīṭavaccha (c)	Br	Urban	Ujjenī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tissa (a)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Tissa (b)	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tissa (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tissa (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-
Tissa (e)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tissa (f)	Kh	Urban	Roruva	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tissa (g)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Tissa (h)	-	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tissa Buddha	Kh	Urban	Anoma	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Tissadatta	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

106

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Tissa-Kumāra	Low	Urban	Pāṭaliputta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tissa-Metteyya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tissa-Metteyya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tissa Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ti-Campakapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tikaṇḍipupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ti-Kaṇikārapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tikaṇṇipupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tikhiṇamantī	Low	Urban	Kampilla	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tikicchaka/Tekicchakāni Thera	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tikiṅkinipupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tiṇakuṭidāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tiṇasanthāradāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tiṇasanthāraka Thera	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tiṇasūlaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tiṇasūlakachādaniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Tindukadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

107

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Tindukaphaladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ti-padumiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ti-pupphiya Thera	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ti-saraṇāgāmaniya Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ti-ukkādhāriya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ti-ukkādhāriya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ti-ukkādhāriya Thera (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Todeyya (a)	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Todeyya (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tudu	Vessa	Rural	Kokāli	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tuṇḍila	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tuṭṭha	-	Rural	Ñātika	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tuvāradāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ubbhida/Ubbiddha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ucchaṅgamāya	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ucchaṅgapupphiya Thera	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ucchukhaṇḍika Thera	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Udakadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Udakāsanadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Udapānadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Udaya	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Udaya/Udayana	Kh	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Udāyibhadda/Udayabhadda	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Udayabhadda	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Udāyin Thera (a)	Br	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	*	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Udāyin Thera (b)	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Udāyin	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uddaka-Rāmaputta	Br	-	-	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uddāladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uddālaka	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uddālapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Udena (a	Kh	Urban	Kosambī	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Udena (b)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Udena (c)	Kh	Urban	Vehaāra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Udena Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Udena Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Udumbaraphaladāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ugga (a)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ugga (b)	-	Urban	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ugga (c)	-	Urban	Vesālī	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ugga (d)	Vessa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Ugga (e)	-	Urban	Hatthigāma	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uggāhamāna Meṇḍikāputta	Low	Rural	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uggasena	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uggata (a)	Kh	Urban	Sumaṅgala	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uggata (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uggata (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Uggatasarīra	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ugga Thera	Vessa	Urban	Ugga	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ujjaya (a)	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ujjaya (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

110

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Ujjaya (c)	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ukkāsatika Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ukkhepakaṭavaccha Thera	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Ukkhittapadumiya Thera	Low	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uḷāra-vimāna	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Uḷuṅkasaddaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ummāpupphiya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ummāpupphiya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uṇṇābha	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upacāla	Br	Rural	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Upaḍḍhadussadāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Upāgatabhāsaniya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Upajjhāya	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upajotiya	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upaka/Kāla	-	Rural	Nāla	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upaka Maṇḍikāputta	Low	Rural	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upakaṃsa	Kh	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

111

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Upakañcana	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upāli	-	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upāli Gahapati	-	Urban	Nālandā	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upāli Thera (a)	Low	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	*	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Upāli Thera (b)	Low	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Upananda (a)	Kh	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upananda (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Upananda (c)	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upananda (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upananda Thera	-	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upanemi	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upanīta	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uparittha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uparuci	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Upasābha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upasāgara	Low	Urban	Madhurā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upasāla	Kh	Urban	Campā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

112

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Upasāḷha	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upasanta (a)	-	Urban	Nārivāhana	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Upasanta (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Upasanta (c)	Br	Urban	Sucandaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Upasena	Kh	Urban	Sumaṅgala	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Upasena Vaṅgantaputta	Br	Rural	Nāḷaka	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-
Upasīdarī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upasīva	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Upatissa (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Upatissa (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Upaṭṭhāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Upavāṇa	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Upavāṇa Thera	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uposatha	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uposatha-Kumāra	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uppala	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uruveḷa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Uruvela-kassapa	Br	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-
Usabha (a)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Usabha (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Usabha (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Usabhakkhandha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Usānara/Usinnara	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Utta Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uttara (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uttara (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uttara (c)	Kh	Urban	Anoma	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uttara (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uttara (e)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uttara (f)	Kh	Urban	Uttara	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uttara (g)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uttara (h)	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uttara-Māṇava	Br	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uttarapāla	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-

114

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Uttara Thera (a)	Br	Urban	Sāketa	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Uttara Thera (b)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uttara Thera (c)	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Uttareyyadāyaka Thera	Br	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Uttika/Uttiya Paribbājaka	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Uttiya Thera (a)	Kh	Urban	Pāvā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uttiya Thera (b)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Utuḷhipupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Uvāḷa/Upavāla Thera	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vaccha	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacchagotta	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacchanakha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacchapāla Thera	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vaḍḍha	Kh	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vaḍḍhamāna Thera	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vaḍḍha Thera	-	Urban	Bharukaccha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vajirasama	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Vajjiputta Thera (a)	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vajjiputta Thera (b)	-	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vajjita Thera	Low	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vajjiyamāhita	-	Urban	Campā	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vakkali Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vakkali Thera (b)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Valliya Thera (a)	Kh	Urban	Pāvā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Valliya Thera (b)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Valliya Thera (c)	Br	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vāmadeva	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vāmaka	-	-	-	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vaṅganta	Br	Rural	Nālaka	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vaṅka	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vanakoraṇḍiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vanavaccho Thera	Br	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vaṅgīsa Thera	Br	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vaṇṇakāraka Thera	Low	Urban	Aruṇavati	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Vappa	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vappa Thera	Br	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Varadhara	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Varakalyāṇa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Varamandhātā	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Varaṇa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vāraṇa	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vararoja	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Varuṇa (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Varuṇa (b)	Kh	Urban	Sudhaññavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Varuṇa (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Varuṇa (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Varuṇa (e)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Varuṇa (f)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Varuṇa (g)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Varuṇa (h)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Varuṇa (i)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Varuṇa (j)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Varuṇa (k)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Varuṇadeva	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vasabha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vāsabhagāmika	-	Rural	Vāsabhagāma	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vasabha Thera	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vasavattī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vāseṭṭha (a)	-	-	-	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vāseṭṭha (b)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vāsaṭṭha (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vāseṭṭha (d)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vāseṭṭha (e)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vāseṭṭha (f)	Br	Urban	Aṅguttarāpa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vasidāyaka Thera	Low	Rural	Tivarā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vassakāra	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
Vāsula	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vedeha (a)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

118

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Vedeha (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vedeha (c)	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vediyadāsaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vejayanta	Low	Urban	Kusinārā	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vekhanassa	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Velāma	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Veḷukaṇṭakiya	-	Urban	Veḷukaṇḍa	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vessabhū Buddha	Kh	Urban	Anoma	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vessāmitta (a)	-	-	-	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vessāmitta (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vessantara	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vibhūsaka-Brahmadatta	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Victoli/Vicikoli	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Videha (a)	Vessa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Videha (b)	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Videha (c)	Kh	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhura (a)	Br	Urban	Indapatta	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Vidhura (b)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vidhura (c)	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Viḍūḍabha	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vigatānanda	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vihatābhā	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vijamāna	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vijaya (a)	-	Urban	Mithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vijaya (b)	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vijaya Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vijita Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vijitamitta	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vijitasena (a)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vijitasena (b)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vijitasena Thera	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vijitāvī (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vijitāvī (b)	Kh	Urban	Arimanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vilokana	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

120

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Vimala (a)	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vimala (b)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vimala (c)	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vimala Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vimala-Koṇḍañña Thera	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vinelapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vipassī Buddha	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	*	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vipula	Kh	Urban	Sudhaññavatīī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vipulābhāsa	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Viraja Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virapupphiya Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vīra Thera	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virocamānā Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vīsākha (a)	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vīsākha (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vīsākha (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Visākha Pañcāliputta	Kh	Urban	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-

121

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Visayha	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vissasena	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vītamāla	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vītarāga Buddha	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vīthisammajjaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Viṭiṇṇa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Yadatthīya	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Yagudāyaka Thera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Yāmahanu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yamaka (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yamaka (b)	-	Urban	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yamataggi/Yamatāggi	-	-	-	*	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yameḷu	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yaññadatta (a)	Br	Urban	Sobhavatī	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-
Yaññadatta (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yasadatta Thera	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Yasa Kākaṇḍakaputta	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

MALE PERSONALITIES

Name	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Yasapāṇi	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yasa Thera	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Yasava	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Yasodhara	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Yasoja Thera	Low	Rural	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-
Yava	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yavakalāpiya Thera	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yodhājiva	-	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yudhañjaya	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yudhiṭṭhila (a)	Kh	Urban	Hatthipura	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yudhiṭṭila (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yūthikarapupphiya Thera (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Yūthikarapupphiya Thera (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Yuvañjaya	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

123

Name	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settlement	Vin	A	D	M	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv

KEY: "Br" and "Kh" stand for "Brāhmaṇa" and "Khattiya" respectively. The sign of an asterisk (*) means "the name of the person is mentioned in that text" and the sign of a hyphen (-) means "the name of the person in not mentioned in that text." As is clear from the title of this appendix, only those names have been used which appear in the texts as mentioned against them, though from time to time help of other texts and commentaries has been taken to establish the caste and Rural/Urban background of the individuals.

FEMALE PERSONALITIES MENTIONED IN
THE PĀLI *VINAYA* AND *SUTTA PIṬAKA*

Nae	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Abhayā/Sattuppalaālikā Therī	-	Urban	Ujjenī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Abhayaātā/Paduavatī	-	Urban	Ujjenī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Abhibhū	Br	-	-	-	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-
Abhirūpā-Nandā Therī	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aḍḍhakāsī Therī	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Akhilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Aloā	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Aarā	Vessa	Urban	ithilā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aarādevī	Vessa	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Abapālī	Br	Urban	Vesālī	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Aitā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Aittatāpanā	Br	Rural	Dunniviṭṭha	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Añjanā/Añjanadevī	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

1

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHIS

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D		S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Anoā	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Anopaā	-	Urban	Sāketa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anujjā/Anojā	Br	Urban	Indapatta	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anulā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Anulā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Aruṇavā	Kh	Urban	Aruṇavatī	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Asaā (a)	Kh	Urban	Saraṇa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Asaā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Āsañkā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asokā (a)	-	Rural	Ñatikā	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asokā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-
Avāriyā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Avāriyāpitā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Avavādakā	-	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bahudhīti	Br	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bandhuā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bandhuatī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D		S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Bāvarī	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhaddā Kapilānī Therī	Br	Urban	Sāgala	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhaddā-Kuṇḍalakesā	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Bhadrā Therī	Kh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhaggavī	Low	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bherī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhesikā	Low	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bhikkhādāyikā (a)	-	Urban	adhurā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Bhikkhādāyikā (b)	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Bhikkhudāsikā/Bhikkhadāyikā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bhikkhuṇī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Bibā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bibī	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bojjhā	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cālā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Cālā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Cālā Therī	Br	Rural	Nālaka	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-

3

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHIS

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Capā/Capakā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Candā/Sucandā	-	Urban	Sudhaññavatī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Candā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	-
Candā (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Candā (c)	Kh	Urban	Sāgala	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Candā (d)	Kh	Urban	Kaiplla	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Candādevī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Candā Therī	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Candavatī (a)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Candavatī (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caṇḍakālī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caṇḍī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Cāpā/Chāva Therī	Low	Rural	Vañkahāra	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cañkī	Br	Rural	Opsāda	-	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cetā	Br	Urban	Indapatta	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chattapāṇī (a)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chattapāṇī (b)	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Ciñcaāṇavikā	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Cittā (a)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cittā (b)	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cittā (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Cittā (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Cūlasubhaddā	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cullanandikā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cundī	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dāā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Dantikā Therī	Br	URban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Devagabbhā	Kh	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhaadinnā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Dhaadinnā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Dhaadinnā (c)	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Dhaā Therī	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhānañjānī	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhanapālī	Low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

5

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHIS

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Dhanavatī	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-
Dhīrā Therī (a)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhīrā Therī (b)	Kh	Urban	Kapillavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dhūkāri	Br	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dīghatālā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Disā	Low	Urban	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diṭṭhaañgalikā (a)	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diṭṭhaañgalikā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Duṭṭha-kuārī	Vessa	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ekapiṇḍadāyikā Therī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ekuposathikā Therī	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Gāyikā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Godhī	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gopālā	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gopī/Gopīkā	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gotaā/Gotaī (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gotaā/Gotaī (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

6

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Guttā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guttā Therī	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hatthā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Indavarī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Isidāsī Therī	Vessa	Urban	Ujjenī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jaṭilagāhī	-	Urban	Jaṭilagaha	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jentā/Jentī	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jīvā	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaccānī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kajaṅgalā	-	Urban	Kajaṅgala	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kākātī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷakaṇṇī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷī (a)	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷī (b)	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷī (c)	-	Urban	Barāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷigodhā	Kh	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāḷī Kuraragharikā	-	Urban	Kuraraghara	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

7

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHIS

Nae	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Kāṇā	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kāṇaātā	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kañcanadevī	Br	Urban	Barāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṇhājinā	Kh	Urban	Ariṭṭhpura	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kaṇṭakā/Kaṇḍakā	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kātiyānī/Kaccānī	-	Urban	Kuraraghara	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kesakārī	Br	Urban	Āpaṇa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Kesinī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kheā (a)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kheā (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kheā (c)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kheā Therī (a)	Kh	Urban	Sāgala	-	*	-	*	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-
Kheā Therī (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Khujjuttarā	Low	Urban	Kosabī	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kiṇṇarā/Kinnarā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kisāgotaī (a)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kisāgotaī (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D		S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Kisāgotaī (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Kisāgotaī Therī	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Kokilā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kosiyāyānī	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kuraṅgavī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lakhuā	-	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Lakkhī/Siri	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Latā	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Lolā	Br	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
addarūpī	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
addī	Kh	Urban	Sāgala	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
adhurapācikā	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ahāāyā/āyā	Kh	Urban	Devadaha	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-
ahāpajāpatī Gotaī	Kh	Urban	Devadaha	*	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
ahāsubhaddā (a)	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ahāsubhaddā (b)	Kh	Urban	Kusinārā	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
akhilā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHIS

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D		S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
akhilā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
allikā	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
aṇḍapadāyikā Therī	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
andhātā	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-		-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
antānī (a)	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-		*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
antānī (b)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ekhaladāyikā Therī	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
ettā Therī	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-		-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
ettikā Therī	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-		-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
ettiyā	-	-	-	*	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
igasālā	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ittā/etta Therī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
uditā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
udulakkhaṇā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
udusitā	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
ūsikā	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
uttā	-	-	-	-	*	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D		S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
uttā Therī (a)	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
uttā Therī (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nāgauṇḍā	Low	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nāgasaālā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-
Nakulā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nakulā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nakulaātā	-	Urban	Suṃsuāragiri	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Naḷinikā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandā (a)	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandā (c)	-	Rural	acalagāa	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandā (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Nandā (e)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Nandā (f)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandā (g)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandādevī	Kh	Urban	Kapilla	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nandagopā	Low	Urban	Asitañjana	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

11

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Nandarāā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Nandā/Rūpanandā Therī	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Nandavatī	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nanduttarā Therī	Br	Urban	Kaāssadaa	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Niddā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Oparakkhī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pabhāvatī	Kh	Urban	Sāgala	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paduā (a)	Vessa	Urban	Bhaddiya	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paduā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Paduā (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Paduā (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Paduā (e)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Paduā (f)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Paduā (g)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Pañcadīpadāyikā Therī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pañcālacaṇḍī	Kh	Urban	Kapilla	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pañcālī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Pañcapāpā	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pārikā/Pārī	Low	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṭācānā	Kh	Urban	Dantapura	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paṭācānā Therī	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Pāyāsi	Kh	Urban	Capā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Phusatī	Kh	Urban	Sāgala	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Piñgiyānī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pokkharakkhī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puṇṇā (a)	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puṇṇā (b)	Low	Urban	Ukkaṭṭhjā	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puṇṇā Therī	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Puṇṇā/Puṇṇikā Therī	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Puññalakkhaṇā	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rādhā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Rāhulaātā	Kh	Urban	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Rajjuālā	Low	Urban	Gayā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Rāmā a)	Br	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

13

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHIS

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D		S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Rāmā b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rāmā a)	Br	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Rohiṇī	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rohiṇī Therī	Br	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-		-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-
Rucī (a)	-	-	-	-	*	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rucī (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Rucidevī	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Rujā	Kh	Urban	ithilā	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sabbakāā	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Saccā	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saddhā	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sakulā	-	-	-	-	-	-		*	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-
Sakulā Therī	Br	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sālaḷapupphikā Therī	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sālavatī	-	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāliyā	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sāmā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D		S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sāmā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sāmā (c)	-	Urban	-	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Samaṇā/Saaṇī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samaṇaguttā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Samañagī	Kh	Urban	Sudhaññavatī	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sāmā Therī (a)	-	Urban	Kosabī	-	-	-		-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāmā Therī (b)	-	Urban	Kosabī	-	-	-		-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sāmāvatī	Vessa	Urban	Bhaddavatī	-	*	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sabulā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sauddā	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sauddajā	Low	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sauddavijayā	Kh	Urban	Roruva	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sañgadāsī/Sañgadāyikā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sañgā Therī	-	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-		-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sañkaanattā Therī	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sattuppalaālikā Therī	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sāvatthi	-	-	-	-	-	-		*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

15

Nae	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sāvatthīdevī	Kh	Ur	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Selā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Selā Therī (a)	Kh	Urban	āḷavī	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Selā Therī (b)	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Serinī	-	Urban	Hatthinipura	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Sigālamātā Therī	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sīhā Therī	Kh	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Silavatī	Kh	Urban	Kusinārā	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siriā (a)	Low	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siriā (b)	Kh	Urban	akhala	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Siriā (c)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Siriā (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Siriā (e)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Siriā (f)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Siriā (g)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Siriā (h)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Siriā (i)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

16

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D		S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sirinandā	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sīsupacālā Therī	Br	Rural	Nālaka	-	-	-		*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sītā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soā	-	-	-	-	*	-		*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soā Therī	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	-		*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Soṇā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Soṇā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Soṇadinnā	-	Urban	Nālandā	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Soṇakāyaātā	-	-	-	-	*	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soṇā Therī	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-		-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subhaddā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Subhaddā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Subhaddā (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Subhaddā (d)	Kh	Urban	Sāgala	-	-	-		-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subha Jīvakabavanikā	Br	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-		-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sūbhā Kaāradhītā	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-		-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sucandā	-	Urban	Sudhaññavatī	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHIS

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Suciukhī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sucittā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudassanā (a)	-	Urban	Sobhana	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudassanā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudattā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudhaā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sudhaā (b)	Kh	Urban	Kapilla	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudhaā (c)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sudhaā (d)	Kh	Urban	Sudhaa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Suddhanā	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suguttā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sujā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sujātā (a)	-	Urban	Senānigaa	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sujātā (b)	-	Rural	Ñātikā	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sujātā (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sujātā (d)	Vessa	Urban	Bhaddiya	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sujātā (e)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

18

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sujātā (f)	Kh	Urban	Haṃsavatī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sujātā (g)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sujātā (h)	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sujātā Therī	Vessa	Urban	Sāketa	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sukkā Therī	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sulakkhaṇā	Kh	Urban	Devadaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sulasā	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Suanā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Suanā (b)	-	Urban	ithilā	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suanā (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Suanā (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Suanā (e)	-	Urban	Paṇṇakata	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Suanadevī	Br	Rural	ahātittha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Suanārājakuārī	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suanā Therī	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suañgalaātā Therī	Low	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suedhā Therī	Kh	Urban	antāvatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Suittā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sundarī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Sundarī/Sundarikā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-
Sundarīnandā	Br	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sundarīnandā Therī	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sundarī Therī	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supabbā	-	Urban	Rājagaha	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suphassā	Kh	Urban	Vebhāra	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suppavāsā Koliyadhītā	Kh	Urban	Koḷiyanagara	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Suppiyā	-	Urban	Bārāṇasī	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surādhā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Surāā (a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Surāā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Surāā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Sussondī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sutanā (a)	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sutanā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

20

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Sutanā/Sutanū	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Talatādevī	Kh	Urban	Kapilla	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Therikā	-	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Thullanandā	Br	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thullatissā	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tissā (a)	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tissā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Tissā (c)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Tissā (d)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Tissā (e)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Tissāyaātā	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tikhiṇaantī	Low	Urban	Kapilla	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ubbarī (a)	Kh	Urban	Potali	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ubbarī (b)	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ubbirī Therī	Kh	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Ucchudāyikā-Viāna	-	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Udakadāyikā Therī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHIS

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Udayabhaddā/Udayā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Udubarikā	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uggaha eṇḍkanattā	Vessa	Urban	Bhaddiya	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upacālā (a)	Br	Rural	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upacālā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upacālā (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uparāā/Surādhā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Upasaā Therī	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upaseṇā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Upaseṇī	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uposathā	-	Urban	Sāketa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Uppalā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uppaladāyaka Therī	Kh	Urban	Aruṇavatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Uppalavaṇṇā Therī	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	*	*	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-
Urucchadā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uruveḷā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uttaā Therī (a)	Vessa	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-

22

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Uttaā Therī (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uttarā (a)	Kh	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uttarā (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uttarā (c)	-	Urban	Sāvatthī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uttarā (d)	-	Urban	Uttara	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uttarā (e)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uttarā (f)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uttarā (g)	Kh	Urban	Capā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Uttaraātā	-	Urban	Kosabī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Uttarā Nandaātā	Vessa	Urban	Rājagaha	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Vaḍḍhaātā Therī	-	Urban	Bharukaccha	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vajirā Therī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vajirī/Vajirā/Vajirakuārī	Kh	Urban	Rājagaha	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Valiyā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vāsabhā/Vāsabhakkhattiyā	Low	Urban	Kapilavatthu	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vāseṭṭhī	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vāseṭṭhī Therī	-	Urban	Vesālī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF ANCIENT INDIAN BUDDHIS

Nae	Caste	Rural/Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D	S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Vedehikā	Kh	Urban	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Velaikā/Khattiyānī	Kh	Urban	Kusinārā	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vicittā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vijayā Therī	-	Urban	Rajagaha	-	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-
Vijitasenā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vialā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vipulā	Kh	Urban	Sudhaññavatīvatī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vīrā Therī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vīsākhā (a)	Vessa	Urban	Bhaddiya	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Vīsākhā (b)	Br	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Vīsākhā (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Visākhā Therī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yasavā	Kh	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Yasavatī (a)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yasavatī (b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Yasavatī (c)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Yasavatī (d)	Kh	Urban	Anoa	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-

24

FEALE PERSONALITIES

Nae	Caste	Rural/ Urban	Settleent	Vin	A	D		S	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
Yasavatī (e)	Br	Urban	Bārāṇasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yasavatī (f)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
Yasodharā	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Yassasī	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

KEY: "Br" and "Kh" stand for "Brāhaṇa" and "Khattiya" respectively. The sign of an asterisk (*) eans "the nae of the person is entioned in that text" and the sign of a hyphen (-) eans "the nae of the person in not entioned in that text." As is clear fro the title of this appendix, only those naes have been used which appear in the texts as entioned against the, though fro tie to tie help of other texts and coentaries has been taken to establish the caste and Rural/Urban background of the individuals.

Appendix: 6

FREQUENCY OF RURAL SETTLEMENTS IN THE PĀLI *VINAYA* AND *SUTTA PIṬAKA*

S. #.	Rural Settlements	Vin	D	M	S	A	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
1	Ambagāma	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	Ambasaṇḍā	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Ambatittha	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Andhakavinda	5	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	Ārāmikagāma/ Pilindagāma	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	Beluva/Veḷva	-	4	3	4	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	Bhaṇḍagāma	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	Bhogagāma	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	Caṇḍalakappa	-	-	2	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Codanāvatthu	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	Cundaṭṭhila/ Cundavīla	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
12	Dunniviṭṭha	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	Ekanālā	-	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	Ekasālā	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	Govaḍḍhamāna	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	Hatthigāma	-	1	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	Icchānaṅgala/ Icchānaṅkala	-	1	3	2	8	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
18	Iṭṭhkāvatī	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
19	Jambugāma	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	Janagāma/ Jantugāma	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-

S. #.	Rural Settlements	Vin	D	M	S	A	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
21	Kalandaka	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	Kallavāla/	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Kailavālamutta														
23	Kalyāṇī	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	Khānumata	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	Koṭigāma	3	2	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	Macala	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	Mahāsāla/	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mahāsālā														
28	Manasakaṭa	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	Mātulā	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	Migapathaka	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	Nagaravinda	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	Naḷakāragāma	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	Nālā/Nā$la/	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Nālakagāma														
34	Ñādikā/Nādikā	6	4	1	9	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	Opsāda	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36	Pańcasālā	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	Parileyya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
38	Pāṭaligāma	6	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-
39	Pubbajira/	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Pubbavicira														
40	Rāmagāma	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
41	Sālā/Sāla	-	-	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
42	Sālavatī/	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Sālavatikā														
43	Sālindiya	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
44	Sāmagāma	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	Thūṇa	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
46	Uruvelā	6	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

2

RURAL SETTLEMENTS

S. #.	Rural Settlements	Vin	D	M	S	A	Sn	J	Tg	Cp	Ap	Bu	Ud	Pv	Vv
47	Uttarakā	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
48	Vasabha	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
49	Veṭhadipa	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DICTIONARIES, ENCYCLOPAEDIAS ETC.

Sanskrit-English Dictionary
> Ed. M. Monier-Williams, Oxford, 1951.

Pāli-English Dictionary
> Eds. T.W. Rhys Davids & W. Stede, London: Pāli Text Society, 1921-25. (First Indian reprint, New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1975).

Pāli-Hindi Kośa
> Ed Bhadanta Ananda Kausalyayana, Nagpur: Sugat Prakashan Co, 1974.

Encyclopaedia of Buddhism
> First 5½ Vols, Colombo: Government of Ceylon, 1961-1996.

An Encyclopaedia of Indian Archaeology
> 2 vols, ed A. Ghosh, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1989.

Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names
> 2 Vols, ed. D.P. Malalasekera, Reprint, New Delhi: Oriental Reprint, 1983.

Vedic Index of Names and Subjects
> 2 vols, eds., A. Macdonnell & A.B. Keith, London: Murray, 1912, reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1995.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOURCES

Ayodhyā
> IAR: 1955-56: 71; 1969-70: 40-41; 1976-77: 52-53, 1979-80: 76-77.

Rājgīr
> A. Cunnigham, *Archaeological Survey Reports*, 1871, 1873 & 1878; T. Bloch, "Excavations at Rājgīr,"*ARASI, Eastern Circle* 1905-06; J. Marshal, "Rājagṛiha and its Remains," *ARASI* 1905-06; V.H. Jackson, "Notes on Old Rājagṛiha," *ARASI* 1913-14; *IAR* 1953-54: 9, 1954-55: 16ff, 1957-58: 11, 1958-59: 13, 1961-62: 6-8, 1962-63: 5f.

Campānagar
> IAR 1968-69: 4, 1969-70: 2, 1970-71: 4-5, 1971-72: 5, 1972-73: 6-7, 1974-75: 8-9, 1975-76: 7, 1976-77: 11-12.

Kosam
> IAR 1958-59: 68, 1961-62: 9, 1962-63: 6, 1963-64: 8, 1964-65: 7, 1968-69: 5-6; 1970-71: 7-8; 1971-72: 6-7; 1972-73: 8, 1980-81: 9; *MASI* 1969: 36-39.

Rājghāṭ
>IAR 1957-58: 50, 1960-61: 37, 1961-62: 58, 1062-63: 41, 1963-64: 58-59, 1964-65: 44, 1965-66: 55.

Saheṭh-Maheṭh
>A. Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey Reports* I, 1871: 317ff, 330ff; J. Ph. Vogel, "Excavations at Saheth-Maheth,"*ARASI*: 1907-08: 81-131. D.R. Sahni, "A Buddhist Image Inscription from Śrāvastī," *ARASI*: 1908-09: 133-38; J.H. Marshall, "Excavations at Saheth-Maheth," *ARASI*: 1910-11; IAR 1955-56: 71, 1958-59: 47-50; K.K. Sinha, *Excavations at Śrāvastī: 1959*, 2,Varanasi: Monograph of the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, BHU: 1967.

TEXTS

The *Vinaya Piṭakaṃ*
>Ed. H. Olderberg, 5 vols. London: PTS, 1879-1883. Translated references are from tr. I.B. Horner; *The Book of the Discipline*, 6 vols. London: PTS, 1938-1966; tr. T.W. Rhys Davids & H. Oldenberg, *Vinaya Texts*, Vol 13, 17, 20, SBE, reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass: 1982-85; राहुल सांकृत्यायन (अनुवादक), विनय पिटक, reprinted and donated by the Corporate Body of the Buddha Education Foundation: Taipei: Taiwan: nd.

The *Dīgha Nikāya*
>Ed. T.W.Rhys Davids & J.E. Carpenter, 3 Vols. London: PTS, 1890-1911. Tr. T.W. & C.A.F. Rhys Davids; *The Dialogues of the Buddha*; 3 vols. 1899, 1910 & 1957 respectively (reprints), London: PTS. Also translated by M. Walshe, *Thus Have I Heard: The Long Discourses of the Buddha*, London: Wisdom Publications, 1987.

The *Majjhima Nikāya*
>Ed. V. Trenckner & R. Chalmers, 3 vols. London: PTS, 1888-1896. Tr. I.B.Horner; *The Collection of Middle Length Sayings*, 3 vols. London: PTS, 1954-1959 (Reprints). Also tr. R. Chalmers, *Further Dialogues of the Buddha*, 2 vols, London: Sacred Books of the Buddhists Series, 1926-27; Also tr. Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*, Boston, Mass: Wisdom Publications, 1995.

The *Aṅguttara Nikāya*
>Ed. R. Morris & E. Hardy, 5 vols. London: PTS, 1885-1900. The translated references are from *The Book of the Gradual Sayings*, tr. F.L. Woodward: vols. I, II & V; E.M. Hare: vols. III & IV, London: PTS, 1955-1970 (Reprints).

The *Saṃyutta Nikāya*
>Ed. M.L. Feer, 5 vols. London: PTS, 1884-1898. Tr. C.A.F. Rhys Davids and S.S. Thera, vol. I; C.A.F. Rhys Davids & F.L. Woodward vol. II; F.L. Woodward vols. III, IV, V. *The Book of the Kindred Sayings*; London: PTS, 1950-1956 (Reprints).

The *Khuddakapāṭha*
>Ed. H. Smith, London: PTS, 1915. Tr. with its commentary, Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli, *Minor Readings*

and Illustrator, London: PTS, 1960.

The *Sutta-Nipāta*
Eds. D. Andersen & H. Smith, reprint, London: PTS, 1984. Tr. K.R. Norman; *The Group of Discourses*, with alternative tr. by I.B. Horner & W Rahula, London: PTS, 1984.

The *Jātakas*
Ed. V. Fausböll , 7 vols. (7 vol. index by D. Anderson), London: Trubner & Co, 1877-1897. Tr. by various hands, 6 vols. *The Jātaka or the Stories of the Buddha's Former Births*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895-1907.

The *Dhammapada*
Ed & tr. Nārada Thera, Kuala Lumpur: Buddhist Missionary Society, 1978.

The *Udānaṃ*
Ed. P. Steinthal, London: PTS, 1885. Tr. F.L. Woodward; *Verses of Uplift*, London: Oxford University Press, 1948. Tr. John D. Ireland, *The Udāna: Inspired Utterances of the Buddha*, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1990.

The *Theragāthā*
Ed. K.R.Norman & L. Alsdorf; London: PTS, 1966. Tr. with an intro. & notes K.R.Norman; *Elders' Verses II*, London: PTS, 1969.

The *Therīgāthā*
Ed. K.R. Norman & L. Alsdorf; London: PTS, 1966. Tr. with an intro. & notes K.R. Norman; *Elders' Verses II*, London: PTS, 1971; tr. C.A.F. Rhys Davids & K.R. Norman, *Poems of Early Buddhist Nuns*, London: PTS, 1989.

The *Apadāna*
Ed. M.E. Lilley; 2 vols, London: PTS, 1925-27.

The *Itivuttaka*
Ed. E. Windish; London: PTS, 1889. tr. F.L. Woodward; *Itivuttaka: As It Was Said*, London: Oxford University Press, 1948. Also tr. John D. Ireland, *Itivuttaka: The Buddha's Sayings*, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1991.

The *Petavatthu & the Vimānavatthu*
Ed. N.A. Jayawickrama; London: PTS, 1977. Tr. H.S. Gehman; *Petavatthu: Stories of the Departed, The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon*, Part IV, London: PTS, 1974. Tr. I.B. Horner (assisted by N.A. Jayawickrama); *Vimānavatthu: Stories of the Mansions, The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon*, Part IV, London: PTS, SBB, XXI, 1974.

The *Mahā-Niddesa*
Eds. L. de le Vallêe Poussin & E.J. Thomas; London : PTS, 2 vols, 1916-17. Combined reprint London: PTS, 1978.

The *Culla-Niddesa*

Ed. W. Stede; 3 vols, London: PTS, 1918.

The *Paṭisambhidāmagga*
Ed. A.C.Taylor; London: PTS, 2 vols, 1905, 1907. Tr.Bhikkhu Ñaṇamoli (with an inttro. by A.K. Warder); *The Path of Discrimination*, London: PTS, 1982.

The *Cariyāpiṭaka & the Buddhavaṃsa*
Ed. N.A.Jayawickrama, London: PTS, 1974. Tr. I.B. Horner; *The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon*, Part III, London: PTS, 1975. References are from R. Morris' edition, London: PTS, 1882.

The *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*
Ed. London: PTS, 1885; Ed. P.V. Bapat and R.D. Vadekar, Poona: The Bhandarkar Research Institute, 1940. Tr. C.A.F. Rhys Davids, *A Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics, being a Translation of Dhamma-saṅgaṇi* (*Compendium of State or Phenomena*), London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1900.

The *Vibhaṅga*
Ed. C.A.F. Rhys Davids, London: PTS, 1904. Tr. U. Thittila, *The Book of Analysis*, London: PTS, 1969.

The *Kathāvatthu*
Ed. A.C. Taylor, 2 vols, London: PTS, 1894-95. Tr. Shwe Zan Aung and C.A.F. Rhys Davids, *Points of Controversy or Subjects of Discourse, being a Translation of the Kathāvatthu from the Abhidhammapiṭaka*, London: PTS, 1915.

The *Puggalapaññatti*
Ed. London: PTS, 1883; Tr. B.C. Law, *Designation of Human Types* (*Puggalapaññatti*), London: PTS, 1924.

The *Dhātukathā*
Ed. U. Nārada, *Discourse on Elements (Dhātukathā)*, London: Luzac & Co, 1962; Tr. U. Nārada and Thein Nyun, *Discourse on Elements (Dhātukathā): The Third Book of the Abhidhammapiṭaka*, London: PTS, 1962.

The *Paṭṭhāna*
Tr. U. Nārada, *Mūla Paṭṭāna Sayadaw*, London: Luzac & Co, 1969.

The *Visuddhimagga*
Ed. H.C. Warren and rev. D. Kosambi, *The Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosācāriya*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 41, 1951.Tr. Pe Maung Tin, *The Path of Purity, being a Translation of Buddhaghosa's Visuddhimagga*, 3 vols, London, 1922-31. Tr. Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli, *The Path of Purification (Visuddhimagga), Colombo, 1956.*

The *Vinaya Piṭaka Aṭṭhakathā*
Ed. J. Takakusu & M. Nagai, *the Samantapāsādikā*, Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Vinaya Piṭaka,*, 8 vols (including index by H.Kopp), London: PTS, 1947-1975.

The *Dīgha Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā*

> Eds. T.W. Rhys Davids, J.E. Carpentier & W. Stede, *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Dīgha Nikāya*, 3 vols, London: PTS, 1886-1932.

The *Aṅguttara Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā*

> Eds. H. Walleser & H. Kopp, *the Manorathapūraṇī,* Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, 5 vols, London: PTS, 1956-1973.

The *Saṃyutta Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā*

> Ed. F.L. Woodward, *the Sāratthappakāsinī*, Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, 3 vols, London: PTS, 1977.

The *Majjhima Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā*

> Eds. J.H. Woods, D. Kosambi & I.B. Horner, *the Papañcasūdanī*, Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Majjhima Nikāya*, 5 vols, London : PTS, 1922-38.

The *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā*

> Ed. H. Smith, H.C. Norman, L.S. Tailang, *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā*, 4 vols, London: PTS, 1906-15; Tr. E.W. Burlingame, *Buddhist Legends*, 3 vols, Harvard Oriental Series, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1921, repr. London: PTS, 1979.

The *Buddhavaṃsa Aṭṭhakathā*

> Ed I.B. Horner, *the Madhuratthavilāsinī,* Buddhadatta Thera's commentary on the *Buddhavaṃsa*, London: PTS, 1946; tr I.B. Horner, *the Clarifier of Sweet Meaning (Madhuratthavilāsinī),* trnaslation of the Pāli Commentaries No. 1, , London: PTS, SBB, XXXIII, 1978.

The *Udāna*, the *Theragāthā*, the *Therīgāthā*, the *Cariyāpiṭaka,* the *Itivuttaka*, the *Vimānavatthu*, and the *Petavatthu Aṭṭhakathā*

> Eds. F.L. Woodward, E. Hardy, E. Muller, D.L. Barua *et al*, *Paramatthadīpanī,* Dhammapālācariya's commentary on *the Udāna*, *the Theragāthā*, *the Therīgāthā*, the *Cariyāpiṭaka, the Itivuttaka*, *the Vimānavatthu*, and *the Petavatthu*, London: PTS, 1891-1977; Tr. W. Pruitt, *The Commentary on the Verses of the Therīs*, Oxford: PTS, 1998; P. Masefield, *The Udāna Commentary*, vol.1, Oxford: PTS, 1994.

The *Khuddaka-Pāṭha Aṭṭhakathā*

> Ed. H. Smith, the *Paramatthajotikā I* , London: PTS, 1915. Tr. with its commentary, Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli, *Minor Readings and Illustrator*, London: PTS, 1960.

The *Sutta-Nipāta Aṭṭkathā*

> Ed. H. Smith, *the Paramatthajotikā II*, the *Sutta-Nipāta* commentary, London: PTS, 1916-18.

The *Dhammasaṅgaṇi Aṭṭhakathā*

> Eds. P.V. Bapat and R.D. Vadekar, *the Aṭṭhasālinī*, Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi,* Poona: The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1942.Tr. Pe Maung Tin and rev. and ed. C.A.F. Rhys Davids, *The Expositor (Aṭṭhasālinī)*, *Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dhammasaṅgaṇī:* London: PTS, 1920-21.

The Kathāvatthu Aṭṭhakathā
> Ed. J. Minayeff, *Kathāvatthuppakarṇa Aṭṭhakathā*, JPTS, 1889: 1-222. Tr. B.C. Law, *The Debates Controversy*, London: PTS, 1940.

The Puggalapaññatti Aṭṭhakathā
> Ed. G. Landsberg and C.A.F. Rhys Davids, London: JPTS, 1913-14: 170-254.

The Mahāniddesa Aṭṭhakathā
> Ed. A.P. Buddhadatta, *Saddhamapajjotikā-Mahā-niddesa Aṭṭhakathā*, 3 vols, London: PTS: 1931-41.

The Cullaniddesa Aṭṭhakathā
> Ed. Bruggamuwe Sri Revata, *Saddhamapajjotikā-Culla-niddesa Aṭṭhakathā* Colombo: Simon ewavitarane Bequest, XIV, 1923.

The Paṭisambhidāmagga Aṭṭhakathā
> Ed. C.V. Joshi, *Saddhammap-Pakāsini*, 3 vols, London: PTS, 1933-47.

The Apadāna Aṭṭhakathā
> Ed. C.E. Godakumbura, *Visuddhajanavilāsini*, London: PTS, 1954.

The Vibhaṅga Aṭṭhakathā
> Ed. A.P. Buddhadatta, the *Sammohavinodanī*, London: PTS, 1923.

The Milindapañha
> Ed. Swami Dwārikādāsaśāstrī, *Milindapañhapāli*, (Devanagari), Varanasi: Bauddhabharati, 1979. References are from ed. V. Trenckner*, Milindapañha*, London: Williams and Norgate: 1880. Tr T.W. Rhys Davids, *The Questions of King Milinda*, SBE, Vols. 35 & 36, reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982 (first published by Oxford University Press, 1890).

The Dīpavaṃsa
> Ed. & tr. with intro. B.C.Law; *The Chronicle of the Island of Ceylon or the Dīpavaṃsa*, Colombo: The Ceylon Historical Journal, 7, 1958, 1-266; Ed & tr., H. Oldenberg, *The Dīpavaṃsa: An Ancient Buddhist Historical Record*, London, 1979, reprint, New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 1992.

The Mahāvaṃsa
> Ed. W. Geiger; *The Mahāvaṃsa*, London: PTS, 1908 & 1912. Tr. W. Geiger & M.H. Bode; *The Mahāvaṃsa or the Great Chronicle of Ceylon*, London: PTS, 1912.

The Cūlavaṃsa
> Tr. W. Geiger, *The Cūlavaṃsa: Being the More Recent Part of the Mahāvaṃsa*, 2 vols.,London, 1930; tr. (German to English) C. Mabel Rickmers, Reprint, New Delhi: Asian Educational Service, 1992.

Si-Yu-Ki
> Tr. Thomas Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, London, 1904-05, 2nd Indian edition,

Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1973. Tr. Samuel Beal, *Si-Yu-Ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World*, 2 vols, London, 1884, Indian reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981.

220

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adikaram, E.W.   *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, 1953.

Agrawal, D.P.   *Radiocarbon Dates from India*, Bombay: Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, 1963.

Agrawal, D.P.   "Steps Towards Urban Revolution in the Doab: Archaeological and Ecological Data," cyclostyled paper, 1971.

Agrawal, D.P.   *The Archaeology of India*, New Delhi, 1984.

Agrawal, V.S.   *India, as Known to Pāṇinī,* Lucknow: *University* of Lucknow, 1953.

Agrawal, V.S.   पाणिनी कालीन भारत, बनारस: v.s.2012.

Aguilar, H.   *The Sacrifice in the Ṛgveda*, Delhi, 1976.

Aiyer, V.G.   "The Date of Buddha," *Indian Antiquary*, 37, 1908: 341-350.

Akira, H.   *A History of Indian Buddhism: A History of Indian Buddhism from "Sākyamuni to Early Mahāyāna*. Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press, 1990.

Allan, J.   *A Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India*, London, 1967.

Allchin, B. & F.R.   *The Birth of Indian Civilization*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968.

Allchin, B. & F.R.   *The Rise of Civilization in India and Pakistan,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Allchin, F.R. & V. Mishra   *Report on the Kumrahar Excavations, 1951-55*, Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1959.

Alsdorf, Ludwig   *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung in Indien*, Wiesbaden: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenchaften und der Literature in Mainz, 1962.

Altekar, A.S.   *The Position of Women in Hindu Civilization*, 3rd Edition, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1974.

Ambedkar, B.R.   B.R. Ambedkar, *The Untouchable* (*Who Are They? And Why They Became Untouchables?*), New Delhi, 1948.

Aronson, H.B.   *Love and Sympathy in Theravāda Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980.

Astley, Ian	(A book review of) *Buddhism after Patriarchy: A Feminist History, Analysis, and Reconstruction of Buddhism,* in *Studies in Central & East Asian Religions* Vol. 5/6 (Copenhagen: Journal of the Seminar for Buddhist Studies, 1992-3: 208.
Banerjee, N.R.	"Excavations at Ujjain," E. Waldachmidt (ed), *Indologen Tagung Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck Ruprecht, 1959-60: 74-86.
Banerjee, N.R.	*The Iron Age of India*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass*, 1965*.
Bapat, P.V.	"The Literary Strata in the Literary Material of the *Dīgha Nikāya*," *Annals of the Bhandarkar Research Institute*, VIII, Pt. I, Poona, 1926, 1-16.
Bapat, P.V. (ed),	*2500 Years of Buddhism*, New Delhi: Publication Division, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, Government of India, 1956.
Bareau, André	"La date du nirvāṇa," *Journal Asiatique*, 241, 1953: 27-62.
Bareau, André	*Recherches sur la Biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtrapiṭaka et les Vinayapiṭaka Anciens*, 2 vols, Paris: Ecole Francaise d'Extreme-Orient, 1963 &1970.
Bareau, André	"The Problem Posed by the Date of the Buddha's Parinirvāṇa," Heinz Bechert (ed), *When Did the Buddha Live?*, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1995: 211-219.
Barlingay, S.S.	"Buddhism and Change," *ABORI*, Jubilee Volume: 459-467.
Barnes, Nancy S.	"Buddhism," A. Sharma (ed), *Women in Religion*, Albany: State University of New York, 1987, 105-133.
Barnett, L.	*Antiquities of India: An Account of the History and Culture of Ancient Hindustan*, London: Philip Lee Warner, 1913.
Bartholomeus, Tessa	*Women Under the Bo Tree*, a Ph.D. Dissertation submitted to the University of Virginia, 1991: 55-61.
Bartholomuesz,Tessa	"The Female Mendicant in Buddhist Sri Lanka," Jose Ignacio Cabezon (ed), *Buddhism, Sexuality and Gender*, New York: State University of New York Press, 1992: 38-51.
Barua, B.M.	"Identification of Four Jātakas at Bharhur," *JASB*, New Series, 1923: 349-356.
Barua, B.M.	*Aśoka and His Inscriptions*, Part II, 3rd edition, Calcutta: New Age Publishers, 1965.

Barua, D.K.   "Buddhism and Lay Worshipers," *Mahābodhi*, LXXIV, Nos. 3-4: 39-44.

Basham, A.L.   *The Wonder that was India*, London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1954.

Basham, A.L.   *History and Doctrine of the Ājivīkas*, London: Luzac & Co. Ltd., 1951.

Basham, A.L.   "The Background to the Rise of Buddhism," A.K. Narain (ed), *Studies in History of Buddhism*, Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation, 1980.

Beal, S.   *Si-Yu-Ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World*, 2 vols., London: Trübner & Co, 1906.

Bechert, H.   "The Date of the Buddha Reconsidered," *Indologica Taurinensia*, 10, 1982: 29-36.

Bechert, H.   "A Remark on the Problem of the Date of Mahāvīra," *Indologica Taurinensia*, 11, 1983: 287-290.

Bechert, H. & R. Gombrich (eds)   *The World of Buddhism*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1984.

Bechert, H. (ed),   *The Dating of the Historical Buddha/ Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*, 2 vols, 3 Folge, nos. 189, 194, Göttingen: Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 1991, 1992.

Bechert, H. (ed)   *When Did the Buddha Live?*, Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series No. 165, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1995.

Bhandarkar, D.R.   *Lectures on the Ancient History of India*, Carmichael Lecture Series 1918, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1919.

Bhandarkar, D.R.   *Aśoka*, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1925.

Bharadwaj, H.C.   "Aspects of Early Technology in India," D.P. Agrawal & A. Ghosh (eds), *Radiocarbon and Indian Archaeology*, Bombay, 1973: 393-397.

Bhattacharya, N.N.   *Buddhism in the History of Indian Ideas*, Delhi, 1993.

Bhattasali, N.   "Mauryan Chronology and Connected Problems," *JRAS*, Part II, 1932: 273-288.

Blackstone, Kate, R.   *Women in the Footsteps of the Buddha: Struggle for Liberation in the Therīgāthā*, London: Curzon Press, 1998.

Blackstone, Kate, R.   "Damming the Dhamma: Problems with Bhikkhunīs in the Pāli Vinaya," a paper presented at the *Twelfth Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Lausanne, Switzerland, August 1999.

Bloch, T.	"The Piprahwā Inscription," *JRAS*, 1899: 425ff.
Bloch, T.	"Excavations at Rājgīr,"*ARASI, Eastern Circle* 1905-06.
Bloch, T.	"Notes on Buddha-Gayā,"*ARASI,*1908-09, 139-158.
Bongard-Levin, G.M.	*Mauryan India*, New Delhi, 1985 (Translated from Russian).
Bose, A.N.	*The Social and Rural Economy of North-East India*, 2 vols, Calcutta, 1942-45.
Bouglé, C.	*Essays on the Caste System*, Cambridge, 1977.
Bühler, G.	"Three New Edicts of Aśoka," *Indian Antiquary*, 6, 1877, 149-160.
Bühler, G.	"Three New Edicts of Aśoka, Second Notice," *Indian Antiquary*, 7, 1878, 141-160.
Bühler, G.	"Aśoka's Sahasram, Rupnath and Bairat Edicts," *Indian Antiquary*, 12, 1893: 299-306.
Cabezon, J. (ed)	*Buddhism, Sexuality and Gender,* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
Carmody, D.L.	*Women and World Religions*, 2nd edition, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1989.
Chakrabarti, D.K.	"The Beginning of Iron in India," *Antiquity*, 50 (198), 1976, 114-124.
Chakrabarti, D.K.	"Distribution of Iron Ores and Archaeological Evidence of Early Iron in India," *JESHO*, XX, Part II, 1977, 166-185.
Chakrabarti, D.K.	"Iron in Early Indian Literature," *JRAS*, 1979: 22-30.
Chakrabarti, D.K.	"The Study of Iron Age in India," *Purātattva*, Nos. 13-14, 1984: 81-85.
Chakrabarti, D.K.	*The Archaeology of Ancient Indian Cities*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995.
Chakraborti, H.	*Trade and Commerce in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1966.
Chakravarti, U.	*The Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism*, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1987.
Chandra, P.	*Stone Sculpture in the Allahabad Museum*, Bombay, 1970.

Chapple, C.K.   *Nonviolence to Animals, Earth, and Self in Asian Traditions*, First Indian Edition, New Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1995. Originally published by New York: State University of New York Press, 1993.

Chattopadhyaya, D.P.   *Lokāyata*, New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1978.

Chattopadhyaya, D.P.   *Indian Atheism*, Second Print, New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1983.

Chattopadhyaya, D.P.   *Religion and Society*, Bangalore, 1987.

Childe, V.G.   *What Happened in History?*, Harmondsworth: Pelican Books, 1942.

Childe, V.G.   "The Birth of Civilization," *Past and Present*, II, Nov. 1952, 1-10.

Church, Cornelia D.   "Temptress, Housewife, Nun: Women's Role in Early Buddhism," *Anima*, 1, 1975: 52-58.

Collins, S.   *Selfless Persons: Imagery and Thought in Theravāda Buddhism*, Cambridge, 1982.

Conze, E.   *Buddhism: Its Essence and Development*, New York: Philosophical Library, 1951.

Conze, E.   *A Short History of Buddhism*, Oxford, 1960: 86.

Cribb, J.   "Dating India's earliest Coins," *South Asian Archaeology*, 1983: 535-554.

Cunningham, A.   *Archaeological Survey Reports*, 1871, 1873 & 1878.

de Beauvoir, Simone   *Second Sex*, New York: Knopf, 1953.

De, Gokuldas.   *Democracy in Early Buddhist Saṅgha*. Calcutta: Calcutta University, 1995.

della Casa, Carlo   "Ahiṃsā: Significato e Ambito Originari della Non Violenza," *Indologica Taurinensia*, Vol. III, No. 4, 1975-76: 187-196.

Deva, K & V. Mishra   *Vaiśālī Excavations, 1961*, Vaishali: Vaishali Sangh, 1961.

Deva, K.   "Observations on Chakrabarti's Paper," *Purātattva*, 6, 1972-73: 34.

Dewaraja, L.S.   *The Position of Women in Buddhism*, Wheel Pamphlet # 280, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1981.

Dhammananda, K.   *Status of Women in Buddhism*, Kuala Lumpur: BMS Publication, 1980.

Dikshit, K.N. — "Buddhist Relics from Sopara Re-Examined," *Journal of the Gujarat Research Society*, 1 (4), 1939, 1-5.

Dikshitar, V.R.R. — *The Matsya Purāṇa: A Study*. Madras: University of Madras, 1925.

Dumont, Louis — *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications*, tr. Mark Sainsbury, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Dutt, N. — *Early Monastic Buddhism*, Calcutta, 1941.

Dutt, N. — *Origin and Growth of Caste in India* vol. 1, Calcutta, 1968.

Dutt, N. — *Buddhist Sects in India*, 2nd edition, Delhi, 1978.

Dutt, R.C. — *A History of Civilization in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1891.

Dutt, S. — *Early Buddhist Monachism*, London: Luzac and Co. Ltd, 1957.

Dutt, S. — *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India: Their History and Their Contribution to Indian Culture*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1962, reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988.

Eggermont, P.H.L. — *The Chronology of the Reign of Asoka Moriya*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1956.

Eggermont, P.H.L. — "New Notes on Aśoka and His Successors II,"*Persica 4*, 1969: 77-120.

Eggermont, P.H.L. — "New Notes on Aśoka and His Successors III,"*Persica 5*, 1970-71: 69-80.

Eggermont, P.H.L. — "New Notes on Aśoka and His Successors IV,"*Persica 8*, 1979: 55-93.

Eggermont, P.H.L. — "The Year of Buddha's Mahāparinirvāṇa," Heinz Bechert (ed), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha/ Die Datierung des historischen Buddha (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, IV, 1),* Gottingen, 1991: 237-251.

Eisler, Riane — *The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future*, San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987.

Eliot, C. — *Hinduism and Buddhism*, II, London, 1954: 6.

Embree, A.T. (ed) — *Sources of Indian Tradition: From the Beginning to 1800*, 2nd revised edition, New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1992.

Engels, F. — *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1940.

Erdösy, G.   "Early Historic Cities of Northern India," *South Asian Studies,* 3, 1987, 1-23.

Erdösy, G.   *Urbanization in Early Historic India*, Oxford: B.A.R. International Series 430, 1988.

Erdösy, G.   "The Archaeology of Early Buddhism," N. K. Wagle & F. Watanabe (eds), *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of Professor A.K. Warder*, Toronto, 1993: 40-56.

Fairservis Jr., W.A.   *The Roots of Ancient India*, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1971.

Falk, Nancy A.   "An Image of Woman in Old Buddhist Literature: The Daughters of Mara,"Judith Plaskow & John A. Romero (eds), *Women and Religion*, Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1974.

Falk, Nancy A.   "The Case of the Vanishing Nuns: The Fruits of Ambivalence in Ancient Indian Buddhism," (ed), *Unspoken Words: Women and Religious Lives*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1989.

Fick, R.   *Social Organization in North-East India in Buddha's Time*, tr. S.K. Mitra, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1920.

Findly, E. Banks   "Ānanda's Hindrance: Faith (*saddhā*) in Early Buddhism," *Journal of Indian Philosophy,* 20, 1992: 253-273.

Findly, E. Banks   "Women and the *Arahant* Issue in Early Pāli Literature," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion,* 15/1, Spring 1999: 57-76.

Fleet, J.F.   "The Tradition about the Corporal Relics of the Buddha," *JRAS*, 1906: 655-671, 881-913, 1907: 341-363.

Fleet, J.F.   "The Day on Which Buddha Died," *JRAS*, 1909, 1-34, 426-428.

Fleet, J.F.   "The Date of the Death of Buddha," *JRAS*, 1912: 239-241.

Frauwallner, E.   *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, Roma:Is. M.E.O., Serie Orientale Roma, 8, 1956.

Freedman, M.   "Ānanda in the Theravāda," *Journal of Indian Philosophy,* 20,1992: 442-485.

Geiger, W.   *The Dīpavaṃsa and the Mahāvaṃsa and Their Historical Development in Ceylon*, tr. E.M. Coomaraswamy, Colombo, 1908. (Originally published in German in 1905).

Geiger, W.   "Introduction" to *The Mahāvaṃsa or the Great Chronicle of Ceylon*, London: PTS, 1912.

Ghosh, A.   "Rājgriha," *Ancient India, Bulletin of the ASI,*7, 1951: 66-78.

Ghosh, A. & M.H. Kuraishi,   *Rājgīr*, 5th edition, New Delhi, 1958.

Ghosh, A.   "Observations on Chakrabarti's Paper," *Purātattva*, 6, 1972-73: 35.

Ghosh, A.   *The City in Early Historic India*, Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study*, 1973.*

Ghurye, G.S.   *Caste and Race in India*, London, 1932.

Gokhale, B.G.   "The Early Buddhist Ēlite," *JIH*, XLIII, Pt. II, 1965: 391-402.

Gokhale, B.G.   "Early Buddhism and the Urban Revolution," *JIABS*, Vol. 5(2), 1982: 7-22.

Gokhale, B.G.   *New Light on Early Buddhism*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1994.

Gombrich, Richard F.   *Theravāda Buddhism: A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo*, London & New York: Routledge, 1988.

Gombrich, Richard   "Dating the Buddha: A Red Herring Revealed," Heinz Bechert (ed), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha/ Die Datierung des historischen Buddha (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, IV, II),* Gottingen, 1991: 238-259.

Gomez, L.O.   "Nonviolence and the Self in Early Buddhism," *Kraft*, 1992: 31-48.

Gordon, D.H.   "The Early Use of Metals in India and Pakistan," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 80, 1950: 58-78.

Goswami K.G.   "Kosam Inscription of (the Reign of) Kanishka: the Year 2," *EI*, xxiv: 210ff.

Gross, Rita M.   "Buddhism and Feminism: Toward Their Mutual Transformation," *The Eastern Buddhist,* New Series, Tokyo: Komiyama Printing Co., Vol. XIX, Nos. 1-2, 1986: 46-62..

Gross, Rita M.   *Buddhism after Patriarchy: A Feminine History, Analysis, and Reconstruction of Buddhism*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.

Gross, Rita M.   *Feminism & Religion: An Introduction*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.

Gross, Rita M.   "Some Buddhist Perspectives on the Goddess," Karen King (ed), *Women and Goddess Traditions*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.

Gunawardana, R.A.L.H.   "The Analysis of Pre-Colonial Social Formations in Asia in the Writings

of Karl Marx," *IHR*, II (2), 1976: 365ff.

Gupta, P.L.   *Coins*, New Delhi: National Book Trust, 1969.

Gupta, S.P.   "Two Urbanizations in India: A Study of Their Social Structure," *Purātattva*, 1974: 53-60.

Hauser, PM & L.Schnore (ed)   *The Study of Urbanization*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Halbfass, W.   "Early Indian References to the Greeks and the First Encounters between Buddhism and the West," H. Bechert (ed), *When Did the Buddha Live?*, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1995, 195-209.

Hercus, L.A. et al (eds.)   *Indological and Buddhist Studies*, Canberra: ANU, 1982.

Hersokovits, M.J.   *Economic Anthropology*, New York, 1952.

Hhsken, Ute   "Die Legende von der Einrichtung des buddhistischen Nonnenordens im Vinaya-Pitaka der Theravādin," R. Grhnendahl et al (eds), *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde*, Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1993, 151-170.

Hilton, R.H.   "The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism," *Science and Society*, XVII, 4, Fall 1953: 340-348.

Hoey, W.   "On the Identification of Kusinara, Vaishali and Other Places Mentioned by the Chinese Pilgrims," *JASB*, LXI, Pt. I, 1900: 74-92.

Holt, J.C.   *Discipline: The Canonical Buddhism of the Vinayapiṭaka*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981.

Horner, I.B.   "Early Buddhism and Taking of Life," D.R. Bhandarkar, K.A. Nilakanta Sastri *et al* (eds), *B.C. Law Volume*, I, Calcutta, 1945.

Horner, I.B.   *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass, 1975.(originally published London, 1930).

Horner, I.B.   *Women in Early Buddhist Literature*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1982.

Hutton, J.H.   *Caste in India: Its Nature, Function and Origins*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1946.

Hultzsch, E.   "Contributions to Singhalese Chronology," *JRAS*,1913: 517-531.

Hultzsch, E.   *Inscriptions of Aśoka*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

Huxley, A.   "The Kurudhamma: From Ethics to Statecraft," *Journal of Buddhist Ethics, Vol. 2,1995, 191-203.*

Indraji, B.L.   "Antiquarian Remains at Sopārā and Padaṇa," *JBBRAS*, XV, 1881-82: 292-315.

Jackson, V.H.   "Notes on Old Rājagṛiha," *ARASI* 1913-14.

Jacobi, H.(ed)   "Introduction" to *Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu*, Leipzig, 1879, 1-16.

Jacobi, H.(tr)   *The Jaina Sūtras*, SBE, vols. XXII & XLV, Oxford, 1884-85.

Jacobi, H. (ed)   *Sthavirāvalī-Carita or Pariśiṣṭaparvan, Being an Appendix of the Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita by Hemacandra*, Bibliotheca Indica, 96, Calcutta, 1883-1891; 2ⁿᵈ edition, Calcutta, 1932.

Jaini, Padmanabh S.   "Indian Perspectives on the Spirituality of Animals," David J. Kalupahana & W.G. Weeraratne (eds), *Buddhist Philosophy and Culture: Essays in Honour of N.A. Jayawickrema*, Colombo: N.A. Jayawickrema Felicitation Volume Committee, 1987: 169-178.

Jatava, D.R.   "Is Buddhism Pessimistic?," U. Thakur (ed), *Proceedings: The Fifth International Buddhist Conference*, vol. 5, Bodh Gaya, 1979, 131-133.

Jayatilleke, K.N.   *Ethics in Buddhist Perspective*, Wheel Pub. No. 175/176, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1972.

Jayawickrama, N.A.(ed)   *The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna,* London: Luzac and Co. Ltd, 1962.

Jones, K.   *The Social Face of Buddhism*, London: Wisdom Publications, 1989.

Jong, J.W. de,   "The Background of Early Buddhism," *Buddhist Studies*, Berkeley, 1979: 29-42.

Jong, J.W. de,   "The Beginnings of Buddhism," *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, 26, No. 2, Autumn 1993, 11-30.

Joshi, L.M.   *Studies in the Buddhist Culture of India*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass: 1967.

Joshi, M.C.   "Observations on Chakrabarti's Paper," *Purātattva*, 6, 1972-73: 35.

Joshi, M.C.   "Early Historical Urban Growth in India: Some Observations," *Purātattva*, 7, 1974: 90-91.

Kabilsingh, C.   *A Comparative Study of Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha*, Varanasi: Chaukhambha

Orientalia, 1984.

Kapleau, R.Philip	*To Cherish All Life: A Buddhist View of Animal Slaughter and Meat Eating*, The Buddha Educational Foundation, 1981.
Kapleau, R. Philip	"Animals and Buddhism," *Zen Bow Newsletter: A Publication of the Zen Center*, Vol. V, No. 2, spring 1983: 1-9.
Karaimi, S.M.	"Rājagṛha: The Magadhan Capital," *Journal of the Bihar Research Society,* LV, 1969: 69-89.
Keown, D.	*The Nature of Buddhist Ethics*, London: Macmillan, 1992.
Keown, D.	*Buddhism and Bioethics*, London: St Martin's Press, 1995.
Kern, H.	*Manual of Indian Buddhism*, Strssburg: Grundriß der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, III, Band 8 Heft, 1896.
Kosambi, D.D.	*The Culture and Civilization of Ancient India*: Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1950.
Kosambi, D.D.	"Ancient Kosala and Magadha," *JBBRAS*, XXVIII, 1952, 108-123.
Kosambi, D.D.	*An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1956.
Kosambi, D.D.	"The Beginning of the Iron Age in India," *JESHO*, VI, Pt. III, 1963: 309-318.
Krishan, Y.	"Buddhism and the Caste System," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 9 (1), 1986: 71-83.
Kuraishi, M.H.	*Rājgīr*, rev. A. Ghosh, New Delhi: ASI, 1958.
Lal, B.B.	"Are the Defences of Kausambi Really as old as 1025 BC?," *Purātattva*, 11, 1979-80: 88-95.
Lal, B.B.	"The So-called Syenachiti at Kausambi: A Fallen Brick Mass," *Purātattva*, 15, 1986: 94ff.
Lal, B.B.	"When Did Udayana Rule?," *Purātattva*, 15, 1986: 80ff.
Lal, M.	*Settlement History and the Rise of Civilization in the Ganga-Yamuna Doab from 1500 BC to 300 AD*, Delhi: B.R. Publishers, 1984.
Lal, M.	"Iron Tools, Forest Clearance and Urbanization in the Gangetic Plains," *Man and Environment*, X, 1986: 85ff.

Lamotte, Ė.   *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śaka Era*, tr.Sara Webb-Boin, Louvain-la-Neuve: Insitut Orientaliste, 1988; originally published as *Histoire du bouddhisme indien: Des origenes à l'ère Śaka,* Louvain: Bibliothêque du Muséon, vol. 43, Louvain, 1958.

Lang, Karen   "Lord Death's Snare: Gender-related Imagery in the Theragāthā and the Therīgāthā," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion,* 2, 1986: 63-79.

Law, B.C.   *A History of Pāli Literature*, 2 vols, London: Kegan Paul Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd, 1933, reprint, Delhi: Indological Book House, 1983.

Law, B.C.   *Rājagṛiha in Ancient Literature*, *MASI*, No. 58, 1938.

Law, B.C.   *India as Described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism*, Delhi, 1950.

Law, B.C.   *Indological Studies*, Part I, Calcutta: The Indian Research Institute, 1950.

Law, B.C.   *Buddhistic Studies*, reprint, Delhi: Indological Book House, 1983.

Law, B.C.   *Historical Geography of Ancient India*, Paris: Société Asiatique de Paris, 1954.

Law, B.C.   *Women in Buddhist Literature*, reprint, Varanasi & Delhi, 1981.

Lerner, Gerda   *The Creation of Patriarchy*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Lienhard, S.   "A Brief Note on the Date of the Historical Buddha and Classical Poetry," Heinz Bechert (ed), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha/ Die Datierung des historischen Buddha (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, IV, 1),* Gottingen, 1991, 194-196.

Ling, T.O.   *The Buddha: Buddhist Civilization in India and Ceylon*, London: Temple Smith, 1976.

Lorna, Devaraja.   "The Position of Women in Buddhism," *Sākyadhītā: International Association of Buddhist Women*. Vol. 4, No. 1. Summer 1993. Honolulu: Sakyadhita, 1993.

Macdonnell, A.& AB Keith   *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, 2 vols., London: Murray, 1912.

Mahapatra, C.   *The Real Birthplace of Buddha*, Cuttack: Grantha Mandir, 1977.

Majumdar, R.C.   "Identification of Some Old Sites in Rājagṛiha," *JBBRAS*, XV (2), 1947: 65-80.

Macdonnell, A.& AB Keith   *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, 2 vols., London: Murray, 1912.

Malalasekera, G.P.   *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, 2 vols., London: PTS, 1937-3.

Marasinghe, M.M.J.   *Gods in Early Buddhism*, Colombo, 1974.

Marshall, J.H.   "Rājagṛiha and its Remains," *ARASI* 1905-06: 86-106.

Marshall, J.H.   "Excavations at Sravasti," *ARASI*, 1910-11, 1-24.

McC Adams, R.   "The Origins of Cities," *Scientific American*, 203 (3), 1966, 153-172.

McDermott, James P.   "Animals and Humans in Early Buddhism," *Indo-Iranian Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 2, 1989: 269ff.

McQuaig, *Linda*   *The Wealthy Banker's Wife*, Penguin Books, 1993.

Meena, Talim,   *Woman in Early Buddhist Literature*, Bombay: University of Bombay, 1972.

Mehta, R.L.   *Pre-Buddhist India*, Bombay: Indian Historical Research Institute, 1939.

Meillassoux, C.   "Historical Modalities of the Exploitation and Over-Exploitation of Labour," *Critique of Anthropology*, 1979, 4, Nos. 13 & 14: 7-17.

Mendis, G.C.   "The Chronology of the Early Pāli Chronicle of Ceylon," *University of Ceylon Review*, 5, No.1, 1947: 39-54.

Mills, C.W.   *The Power Elite*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Mishra, D.   *Excavations at Tilaurakot and Explorations in Nepalese Terai*, Kathmandu: Department of Archaeology, 1972.

Mishra, G.S.P.   *The Age of Vinaya*, New Delhi, 1972.

Mishra, G.S.P.   *Development of Buddhist Ethics*, New Delhi, 1984.

Mitra, D.   *Buddhist Monuments*, Calcutta: Sahitya Samsad, 1971.

Morgan, K.W.   *The Path of the Buddha*, New York, 1956.

Morris, Ivan   *Madly Singing in the Mountains: An Appreciation and Anthology of Arthur Waley*, New York: 1998.

Mukherjee, B.N.   *The Genesis of Buddhism: Its Social Content*, vol. 1, Calcutta, 1976.

Mukherjee, P.C.   *Antiquities of Kapilavastu*, No. XXVI, Pt. I, Calcutta, 1901, reprint, Delhi, 1969.

Mukherjee, P.C. & VA Smith   *A Report on a Tour of Exploration of Kapilavastu, Terai of Nepal, during February and March of 1899*, reprint, Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1969.

Müller, F. Max,   "The True Date of Buddha's Death," *The Academy*, 1 March 1884, No. 617, 152-153.

Murcott, Susan   *The First Buddhist Women: Translations and Commentary on the Therīgāthā,"* Berkeley: Parallax Press, 1991.

Nakamura, H.   "Ethical Values of Buddhism in Light of World Civilization," *Berkeley Bussei*, 1958, 15-20.

Nakamura, H.   *Indian Buddhism: A Survey With Bibliographical Notes*, Tokyo, 1980; reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarasidas, 1989.

Narasu, P.L.   *The Essence of Buddhism*, Delhi, 1976.

Narain, A.K. & T.N. Roy   *Excavations at Rajghat, 1957-58, 1960-65*, 4 vols., Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University, 1976-78.

Narain, A.K. & P. Agrawal   *Excavations at Rajghat, 1957-58, 1960-65*, Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University, 1978.

Narain, A.K. (Ed),   *Studies in History of Buddhism*, Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation, 1980.

Nash, M.(ed),   *Anthropological Studies in Theravada Buddhism*, New Haven, 1966.

Nattier, Jan   *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*, Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991.

Navarro, Vincente   "Social Class, Political Power and the State and Their Implications for Medicine," *Social Science and Medicine*, 10, 1976: 437-57.

Niyogi, P.   "Organisation of Buddhist Monasteries in ancient Bengal and Bihar," *Journal of Indian History*, LI (3), 1973: 531-557.

Nolot Edith (tr.)   *Regles de Discipline des Nonnes Bouddhistes: Le Bhikṣuṇīvinaya de L'Ecole Mahāsaṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, Paris: College de France, 1991.

Norman, K.R.   *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol VII, Fasc 2, Wiedbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.

Oldenberg, H.   "Die Datierung der neuen angeblichen Asoka-Inschriften," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlaändischen Gesellschaft*, 35, 1881: 472-476.

Oldenberg, H.   *The Buddha: His Life, His Doctrines, His Order*, reprint, Delhi, 1971 (originally published 1927).

Pachow, W.   "A Study of the Dotted Record," *JAOS*, vol. 83 (3), 1965: 344-45.

Pande, G.C.   *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*, Allahabad: University of Allahabad, 1957.

Pande, G.C.   बौद्ध धर्म के विकास का इतिहास, लखनऊ, हिन्दी समिति, 1963.

Pande, G.C.   *Śramana Tradition: Its History and Contribution to Indian Culture*, Allahabad, 1978.

Pande, G.C.   "On the Question of the Social Origins of Buddhism," Mahesh Tiwary (ed), *Bodhi-Raśmi*, New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.

Paranavitana, S.   "New Light on the Buddhist Era in Ceylon and Early Sinhalese Chronology," *University of Ceylon Review*, 18,1960, 129-155.

Pardue, P.A.   *Buddhism: A Historical Introduction to Buddhist Values and the Social and Political Forms They have Assumed in Asia*, New York: Macmillan, 1971.

Pargiter, F.E.   *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age with Introduction and Notes*, Oxford, 1913, facsimile of first edition, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies, 1962.

Pargiter, F.E.   "A Copper-Plate Discovered at Kasi, and Buddha's Death Place," *JRAS*, 1913, 151-153.

Pargiter, F.E.   *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, London, 1922; rep. Delhi, 1962.

Paul, Diana Y.   *Women in Buddhism: Images of the Feminine in the Mahāyāna Tradition*, Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1979.

Pearson, H.W.   "The Economy has no Surplus: A Critique of the Theory of Surplus," K. Polanyi *et al* (eds), *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957: 320-341.

Perera, L.P.N.   "Faculties of Sex and Related Phenomena in Buddhist Sexual Theory," David Kalupahana and W. G. Weeratne (eds), *Buddhist Philosophy and Culture: Essays in Honour of N. A. Jayawickrama*, Sri Lanka: N. A. Jayawickrema Felicitation Volume Committee, 1987, 179-188.

Pillai, L.D.S.   "The True and Exact Day of Buddha's Death," *Indian Antiquary*, vol. 43, 1914, 197-204.

Pischel, R.   "The Aśokan Inscriptions," *The Academy*, XII, 11 August 1977, 145.

Przyluski, J.   *Le Légende de l'Empereur Aśoka (Aśoka-Avadāna) dans les textes indiens et chinois Aśoka, Paris*, 1923.

Possehl, G.L.   *Indian Archaeology: A Review Guide to Excavated Sites, 1953-82*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1985.

Possehl, G.L.   *Radiocarbon Dates from South Asia*, data-list circulated by the author in September 1987.

Prasad, C.S.   "Logic Behind Allowing Meat-Eating and Prohibiting it in Buddhism," *Transactions of the International of Orientalists*, Japan, XVI, 1971, 104f.

Preston, J.   *Sacred Centres: Development of a Classificatory Scheme*, Bhuvaneshwar: India Book Centre, 1987.

Przyluski, J.   *La légende de l'empereur Açoka*, Paris, 1923.

Przyluski, J.   *Le Concile de Rājagṛiha*, Paris: Buddhica le sér.2, 1926.

Queen, Christopher S.   "The Peace Wheel: Nonviolent Activism in the Buddhist Tradition," D.L. Smith-Christopher (ed) *Subverting Hatred: The Challenge of Nonviolence in Religious Traditions*, Boston: Boston Research Center for the 21st Century, 1998, 15-36.

Radhakrishnan, S.   *Indian Philosophy*, vol.1, London: Library of Philosophy, 1923.

Rai, J.   *The Rural-Urban Economy and Social Changes in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1974.

Rao, M.R.   "Burmese Records Corroborate the Puranic Date of Buddha's Death," D.R. Bhandarkar *et al* (eds), *B.C. Law Volume*, Part 1, Calcutta: Indian Research Institute, 1945: 392-399.

Rapson, E.J.   *Cambridge History of India*, vol. 1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.

Ray, N.R.   "Technology and Social Change," *Purātattva*, No. 8, 1978, 130-138.

Raychaudhuri, H.C.   *Political History of Ancient India*, 6th revised and enlarged edition, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1953.

Rhys Davids, C.A.F.   *Outlines of Buddhism: A Historical Sketch*, London: Methuen, 1934, 1st Indian print, Delhi, 1978.

Rhys Davids, T.W.   "The New Aśoka Inscriptions," *The Academy*, XII, 14 July 1877: 37.

Rhys Davids, T.W.   *Buddhist India*, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1903.

Rhys Davids, T.W.   "The Early History of the Buddhists," E.J. Rapson (ed), *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. 1, Cambridge, 1922, 171-197.

Rhys Davids, T.W.   *The History and Literature of Buddhism*, Varanasi, reprint,1975.

Rijal, B.K.   "Excavation, Exploration and Other Archaeological Activities in Tilaurakot," *Ancient Nepal*, 1977, 11-31.

Rijal, B.K.   *Archaeological Remains of Kapilavastu, Lumbini and Devadaha*, Kathmandu: Educational Enterprises (pvt) Ltd, 1979.

Robinson, R.H.   *The Buddhist Religion: A Historical Introduction*, 2nd edition, California, 1976.

Rossitor, C.   *Marxism: The View From America*, New York, 1966.

Roy, B.P.   *The Later Vedic Economy*, Patna, 1984.

Roy, Kumkum   *The Emergence of Monarchy in Northern India, Eighth to Fourth Century BC*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Roy, T.N.   *The Gaṅgā Civilization*, New Delhi: Ramananda Vidya Bhawan, 1983.

Ruegg, D.Seyford   "Ahiṃsā and Vegetarianism in the History of Buddhism," Samaratna *et al* (eds), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*, London: Gordon Fraser, 1980.

Saddhatissa, H.   *Buddhist Ethics: Essence of Buddhism*, New York: G. Braziller, 1970.

Sahni, D.R.   "A Buddhist Image Inscription from Śrāvastī," *ARASI*, 1908-09, 133-138.

Sanghadevi, Dharmacharini   "The History of the Ordination of Women in Buddhism: Including an Overview of the Contemporary Situation," *Dakini*. Issue 7, Summer 1991. Glasgow, Scotland: Ink Print and Design, 1991.

Sangharakshita, B.   *A Survey of Buddhism*, Sixth totally revised edition, London: Tharpa Publications, 1987.

Sankrityayan, R. *et al* (eds) *Buddhism: The Marxist Approach*, Reprint, New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1978.

Sarao, K.T.S.   "Liberty and Equality in Buddhism and Marxism," a paper presented at the *National Conference on Marxism and Buddhism*, Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, Varanasi, 14-17 Feb. 1985.

Sarao, K.T.S.	"Meat-Eating and Non-Violence in Early Indian Buddhism," a paper presented at the *7th Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Bologna, Italy, 8-10 August, 1985.
Sarao, K.T.S.	"Early Buddhist Attitude Towards Women," a paper presented at the *32nd International Conference of Asian & North African Studies*, Hamburg (Germany), 31 August - 6 September, 1986 and later published in the *Aligarh Journal of Oriental Studies*, Vol.III, Autumn 1986, 101-110.
Sarao, K.T.S.	*Urban Centres and Urbanization as Reflected in the Pāli Vinaya and Sutta Piṭakas*, Delhi: Vidyanidhi, 1990.
Sarao, K.T.S.	"Urban Centres Reflected in Early Buddhist Literature," a paper presented at the *8th Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Berkeley, USA, 8 August-11 August 1987.
Sarao, K.T.S.	"Who and What Originated Earliest Buddhism?," a paper presented at the *7th World Sanskrit Conference*, Leiden, Holland, 23 August- 29 August 1987 and later published as "Background to the Origin of Earliest Buddhism," *Indologica Taurinensia*, 15-16, 1989-90: 305-318.
Sarao, K.T.S.	"Iron, Urbanization and Buddhism," *Archív Orientální*, No. 2, Volume 58, 1990: 102-124.
Sarao, K.T.S.	"Did the Buddha Really Belong to the Sixth-Fifth Century BC?," H.S. Prasad (ed.), *Philosophy, Grammar, and Indology: Essays in Honour of Professor Gustav Roth*, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1992: 303-317.
Sastri, N.K. (ed),	*Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*; Delhi, 1967.
Sayer, Dorothy	*Are Women Human?,* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
Schmidt, Hanns-Peter	"The Origin of Ahiṃsā," *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*, Paris: Publication de l'Insitut de Civilisation Indienne, 1968: 626ff.
Schmithausen, L.	*Buddhism and Nature*, Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1991.
Schmithausen, L.	"An Attempt to Estimate the Distance in Time between Aśoka and the Buddha in Terms of Doctrinal History," Heinz Bechert (ed), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha/ Die Datierung des historischen Buddha (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, IV, 2),* Gottingen, 1992, 110-147.
Sen, D.N.	"Sites in Rājgīr associated with Buddha and His Disciples," *Journal of the Bihar Research Society (Buddha Jayanti Special Issue)* 1956, 136-158.

Senart, Ē.   *Caste in India*, London, 1950.

Sharma, Arvind (ed)   *Women in World Religions*, Albany: State University of New York, 1987.

Sharma, C.   *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

Sharma, G.R.   *The Excavations at Kausambi, 1957-59*, Alllahabad: University of Allahabad, 1960.

Sharma, G.R.   *History to Prehistory: Archaeology of the Gaṅgā Valley and the Vindhyas*, Allahabad: University of Allahabad, 1980.

Sharma, J.P.   *Republics in Ancient India*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968.

Sharma, R.S.   *Śūdras in Ancient India*, 3rd revised edition, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1990.(Originally published in 1958).

Sharma, R.S.   "Material Background of the Origin of Buddhism," M. Sen & M.B. Rao (eds), *Das Capital Centenary Volume: A Symposium*, Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1968: 58-66.

Sharma, R.S.   "Material Milieu of the Birth of Buddhism," a paper read at the *29th Conference of the Orientalists*, Paris, 1974.

Sharma, R.S.   "Iron and Urbanization in the Gaṅgā Plain," *IHR*, I, 1974: 98-103.

Sharma, R.S.   *Perspectives in Social and Economic History of Early India*, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1983.

Sharma, R.S.   *Material Culture and Social Formation in Ancient India*, first edition, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1983, paperback reprint, Madras: Macmillan, 1992.

Sharma, Y.D.   "Remains of Early Historical Cities," *Archaeological Remains, Monuments and Museums*, Part I, New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 1964: 43-84.

Singh, C.S.   "Meat-Eating and the Rule of *Tikoṭiparisuddha*," A.K. Narain (ed), *Studies in Pāli and Buddhism*, Delhi, 1979: 289-295.

Sinha, B.P. & S.R. Roy   *Vaishali Excavation, 1958-62*, Patna: The Directorate of Archaeology and Museums, Bihar, 1969.

Sinha, B.P.   "The Excavations at Champa," B.P. Sinha (ed), *The Archaeology and Art of India*, Delhi: Sundeep Prakashan, 1979: 87-106.

Sinha, K.K.   *Excavations at Śrāvastī, 1959*, 2,Varanasi: Monograph of the Department

of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, BHU, 1967.

Sircar, D.C. (ed)   *Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization*, I, 1st edition, 1942, 2nd edition, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1985.

Sirkar, D.C.   *Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1960.

Smith, Brian K.   "Eaters, Food, and Social Hierarchy in Ancient India: A Dietary Guide to a Revolution of Values," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 1990, Vol. LVIII, No. 2: 177-205.

Smith, R.M.   *Date and Dynasties in Earliest India*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1973.

Smith, V.A.   "The Birthplace of Gautama Buddha," *JRAS*, 1897: 615-621.

Smith, V.A.   "The Remains Near Kasia in the Gorakhpur District," *JRAS*, 1897: 919-921.

Smith, V.A.   "The Piprahwā Stūpa: Note," *JRAS*, 1898: 579-588, 868-870.

Smith, V.A.   *Aśoka: The Buddhist Emperor of India*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.

Smith, V.A.   "Kusinārā or Kuśinagara and Other Buddhist Places," *JRAS*, 1902, 139-63, 430-431

Smith, V.A.   "Vaiśālī," *JRAS*, 1902: 267-288.

Smith, V.A.   *Early History of India*, 4th edition revised by S.M. Edwards, Oxford: Clarendon Press: nd.

Smith-Christopher, D.L.(ed) *Subverting Hatred: The Challenge of Nonviolence in Religious Traditions*, Boston: Boston Research Center for the 21st Century, 1998.

Spiro, M.E.   *Buddhism and Society*, New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Sponberg, A.   "Attitudes toward Women and the Feminine in Early Buddhism," J. Cabezon (ed), *Buddhism, Sexuality, and Gender*, Albany: State University of New York, 1992: 3-36.

Spooner, D.B.   "Exploration and Research," *ARASI*, 1922-23: 87-91.

Srivastava, K.M.   *Discovery of Kapilavastu,* New Delhi: Books & Books, 1986.

Srivastava, K.M.   *Buddhist Relics from Kapilavastu*, Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1986.

Stein, O.   "The Coronation of Candragupta Maurya," *Archiv Orientalni*, 1, 1929:

354-371.

Strong, John S.   *The Legend and Cult of Upagupta*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Tachibana, S.   *The Ethics of Buddhism*, New York, 1975.

Tähtinen, Unto   *Ahiṃsā: Nonviolence in Indian Tradition*, London: Ryder and Company: 1976.

Takakusu, J.   "Pāli Elements in Chinese Buddhism: A Translation of Buddhaghosa's *Samantapāsādikā*, a Commentary on the *Vinaya,* Found in the Chinese *Tripiṭaka*," *JRAS* 1896: 415-439.

Thapar, R.   *Aśoka and the Decline of the Mauryas*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Thapar, R.   "The Purāṇic Lineage and Archaeological Data," *Purātattva*, 8, 1978: 86-98.

Thapar, R.   *Ancient Indian Social History: Some Interpretations*, New Delhi: Sangam Publishers, 1978.

Thapar, R.   *From Lineage to State*, Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Thapar, R. (ed)   *Recent Perspectives of Early Indian History*, revised 2nd edition, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1998. (Originally published 1995).

Thomas, D.H.   "The Awful Truth about Statistics in Archaeology," *American Antiquity*, 43, 1978: 231-244.

Thomas, E.J.   *Life of the Buddha as Legend and History*, London, 1927, 1949.

Thomas, E.J.   "Theravādin and Sarvāstivādin dates of the Nirvāṇa," D.R. Bhandarkar *et al* (ed), *B.C. Law Volume,* vol. 2, Poona, 1946, 18-22.

Thomas, E.J.   "Buddha's Last Meal," *Indian Culture*, Calcutta, XV, 1948, 1-3.

Tiwary, M.   "Socio-economic ideas reflected in early Buddhist Scriptures," paper presented at the *First International Conference on Buddhism and National Cultures*, New Delhi, 10-15 October, 1984.

Upreti, G.B.   *The Early Buddhist World Outlook in Historical Perspective*, New Delhi: Manohar, 1997.

Venkataramayya, M.   *Śrāvastī,* Delhi, 1956.

Varma, V.P.   *Early Buddhism and its Origins*, Delhi, 1973.

Vogel, J. Ph.   "Excavations at Saheth-Maheth,"*ARASI*, 1907-08: 81-131.

Vogel, J. Ph.   "The Site of Śrāvastī,"*JRAS*, 1908: 971ff.

Wagle, N.   *Society at the Time of the Buddha*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1966.

Waley, A.   "Did the Buddha die of Eating Pork?" *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, Bruxelles, I, 1932: 343-354.

Walli, Koshelya   *The Conception of Ahiṃsā in Indian Thought According to Sanskrit Sources*, Varanasi: Bharata Manisha, 1974.

Walters, Jonathan   "A Voice from the Silence: the Buddha's Mother's Story," *History of Religions* 33/4, 1994: 358-379.

Warder, A.K.   "On the Relationship between Buddhism and other Contemporary Systems," *BSOAS*, xviii, 1956.

Warder, A.K.   *Indian Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.

Warder, A.K.   *An Introduction to Indian Historiography*, Bombay, 1972.

Westergaard, J.H.   "Sociology: The Myth of Classlessness" in R. Blackburn (ed), *Ideology in Social Science*, New York: Fontana, 1972: 119-163.

Wheeler, Kate   "Bowing Not Scraping," Helen Tworkov (ed), *Tricycle*, New Jersey: Mark Printing Corp., 1993.

Wickremasinghe, D.M.Z.   "Kiribat-Vehera Pillar Inscription," *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, I, 1904-12, 153-161.

Wijayaratna, M.   *Les Moniales Bouddhistes: Naissance et Developpement du Monachisme Feminin,* Paris: Ed. du Cerf, 1991.

Wijayaratna, M.   *Buddhist Monastic Life: According to the Texts of the Theravāda Tradition*, tr. C. Grangier & S Collins, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Weber, M.   *The Religion of India*, ed & tr H.H. Garth & D. Martindale, Glencoe & Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

Wheeler, Kate   "Bowing Not Scraping," Helen Tworkov (ed), *Tricycle*, New Jersey: Mark Printing Corp.: 1993.

Willis, Janice D.   "Nuns and Benefactresses: The Role of Women in the Development of Buddhism," Y. Haddad & E. Findly (eds), *Women, Religion, and Social Change*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985: 59-85.

Wilson, Liz   *Women in the Footsteps of the Buddha: Struggle for Liberation in the Therīgāthā*, Curzon, 1998.

Wilson, H.H.   *Indian Caste,* London, Luzac & Co, 1877.

Winternitz, M.   *A History of Indian Literature*, tr. S. Ketkar & H. Kuhn, 2 vols, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1933; reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1990.

Yamazali, G.   "The Spread of Buddhism in the Mauryan Age, With Special Reference to the Milinda Legend," *Acta Asiatica*, 4, 1982 , 1-16.

Yamazaki, G.   "The List of the Patriarchs in the Northern and Southern Legends," Heinz Bechert (ed), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha/ Die Datierung des historischen Buddha (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, IV, 1),* Gottingen, 1991: 313-325.

Young, Katherine K.   "Introduction," Arvind Sharma (ed), *Women in World Religions*, 1987:16ff.

Yuichi,Kaiyama   "Women in Buddhism," *Eastern Buddhist,* NS, 15, 1982: 53-70.

Zimmermann, Francis   *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meats: An Ecological Theme in Hindu Medicine*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Zoysa, G.H. de,   *Original Buddhism*, Anuradhapura, 1989.

Zwilling, Leonard   "Homosexuality as Seen in Indian Buddhist Texts," Jose Cabezon (ed), *Buddhism, Sexuality and Gender,* New York: State University of New Press, 1992: 203-214.