

THE REFUGE: INDIA, TIBET & MONGOLIA

—NIRMAL C. SINHA

I

I take refuge in the Buddha

I take refuge in the Dharma

I take refuge in the Sangha

The Triratna constitutes the Bauddha Dharma(1). One who takes refuge in the Three Jewels is a Bauddha: one who does not is not a Bauddha.

Authentic autographic evidence of Asoka being a Buddhist—in denominational sense—is borne by the single reference to the Three Jewels in Bairat Edict (Asiatic Society, Calcutta) and not from the multiple epigraphs recording Asoka's exhortation for observance of the Dharma. Asoka affirms thus to the Sangha "You know, Sirs, how deep is my veneration for and faith in the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha"(2).

All dates are in Christian era.

Diacritical marks are not used. Passages in Sanskrit and Tibetan appended in the Notes are in respective scripts. Between Prakrit/Pali and Sanskrit preference is made for Sanskrit for the simple reason that the Dharma reached the Trans-Himalayas in Sanskrit medium.

For Mongol data I have depended entirely on translation by competent scholars and have not therefore transcribed the Mongol passages.

This paper and the two succeeding ones may be described as Prolegomena to Lamaist Polity. These three papers enquire into the theory of political obligation and the title to reign in a Lamaist State. These papers are thus studies in history and politics and not in religion and philosophy.

I have consulted several Lamas and Theras for fuller understanding of the religion. These Lamas and Theras are however in no way responsible for my findings as a student of history. Lamas, Theras and other scholars consulted will be duly acknowledged in the completed work on Lamaist Polity. NCS

Before its final victory in Tibet towards the end of the 8th century Buddhism had several encounters with Bon. Firm evidence of Buddhism as state religion in Tibet can be traced from about 820 for the good reason that the Three Jewels were invoked as witnesses in the famous treaty (821/822) between Tibet and China(3). The Sanskrit-Tibetan lexicon *Mahavyutpatti*, a work of the 9th century, shows full familiarity with the concepts of Three Jewels and Refuge.

Centuries before the Yellow (Gelug) sect, the older Sects (Karma and Sakya) are known to have preached among the Mongols, Kalmuks and Buriats. That this early propagation was not superficial can be established from names and titles drawing upon Buddhist vocabulary; several names translated Three Jewels and Protection under Jewels(4). Contemporary epigraphic evidence speaks of the images of Three Jewels and invokes the blessings of Three Jewels (5). Sanskrit form Ratna itself became popular as Erdeni (Erteni)—‘r’ sound without a vowel prefix being impossible in Mongol speech.

II

The concept of refuge (Skt. Sarana)—Isvara/Purusha as refuge—was already in Indian thought before Gautama Buddha. The element of submission or surrender sublimated into faith (Skt. Sraddha) or devotion (Skt. Bhakti) found later its historic exposition in the *Bhagavadgita* (composed “not more than a few centuries before our era” acc. Edgerton; 5th century B.C. acc. Radhakrishnan). In chapter IX: verse 18 Krishna (God’s incarnation on earth) describes himself as the abode and the refuge. In the concluding chapter (XVIII, v.66) Krishna enjoins Arjuna thus “Fly to Me alone ! Make Me thy single refuge !” (Edwin Arnold’s tran. in verse). The origins of the Bhakti cult are traced back to centuries before the Buddha(6).

It will be wrong to say that the Buddhist concept of refuge was identical with the Brahmanical. The Brahmanical notion of Isvara/Purusha was rejected by Buddhism. The Buddhist doctrine of Karma did not admit the merits of Varna (caste) and the Buddhist formula of Pratityasamutpada (Interdependent Causation) was more omnipotent than Isvara/Purusha. There was thus no question of refuge in an abode of grace for a Buddhist.

An exposition of the philosophy of Buddhist refuge to be in any way satisfactory will need considerable space and cannot be conveniently accommodated in this paper(7). It is however necessary and relevant to emphasise here that without a feeling of submission or surrender one cannot seek refuge. A determined quest for refuge will no doubt demand a determined faith in the quest.

There is a controversy that the Buddha's own teachings being based on reason and being not focussed on any supernatural agency or divine instrument, the *Sraddha* (Pali. *Saddha*) of Buddhist vocabulary may not be called reverential faith and much less absolute faith. The context of Buddhist fundamentals will no doubt rule out faith divorced from reason and the Theravada profession, as Jayatilleke's brilliant arguments suggest, perhaps upholds this ideal(8). Yet it is a fair question that how many in the Sangha—besides a few scholarly monks and priests—can strive for salvation with reason as the only ritual. The arrogance of reason can kill the humility of the seeker but not kindle his spirit. In reality a seeker exercises his head to choose a way and once on the way he exercises his heart. As Nalinaksha Dutt said in 1930 "Be it Hinayana or Mahayana, *Sraddha* is at the basis of all practices"(9). The present writer would underline the word "practices" as practices more than theories provide data for his investigations.

The practice of seeking refuge, for example, has been inspired for 2500 years more by reverential faith than by cold reason. Tagore had pointed out at the beginning of this century—Buddhism has a hard core of metaphysics in it but its universality was due to its humanism: *Karuna*, *Maitri* and *Hridayaprasara* and not because of the excellence of its metaphysics(10). Refuge is sought in promising quarters. The Three Jewels hold the promise of Love and Friendliness and naturally evoke in the seeker Reverence and Faith. No *cultus intellectualis* was involved when in the historic past nearly half of Asia went for refuge (Skt. *Saranagamana*/Tib. *Skyabs-hgro*). Hundreds in the West today seek this refuge with *Sraddha* because of their emotional response to the promise of Love and Friendliness; most of these Westerners have yet to read the *Abhidharma*.

III

The sequence of the Three Jewels follows the chronological sequence of the emergence of the Three. While Enlightenment (Skt. *Bodhi*/Tib. *Byang-chub*) witnessed an almost simultaneous origination of the Buddha and the Dharma, the Sangha was certainly a later phenomenon in terms of history. Many believers would however consider that the Three Jewels were from the first inseparable. As Christmas Humphreys puts it "the organization of the Sangha in the Buddha's lifetime was not the mere child of necessity. The *Triratna* was clearly conceived as a unit, for the Buddha said in terms that after his passing the Dharma was to be the disciples' Teacher, and the Sangha was founded as a missionary enterprise within a few weeks of the Enlightenment"(11).

While history does not subscribe to the doctrine of an interdependent simultaneous origination of the Three, history records that the

Sangha was as powerful as the Dharma at the time of Nirvana. "It is chiefly to this institution (i.e. Sangha) that the permanence of his (i.e. Buddha's) religion is due" (12). "The continuity of the monastic organisation has been the only constant factor in Buddhist history" (13).

The *Dhammapada*, a faithful embodiment of the Buddha's teaching and perhaps containing many of the Buddha's own words, has these five verses on refuge (14)—

"Men driven by fear go to many a refuge, to mountains, and to forests, to sacred trees, and shrines.

"That, verily, is not a safe refuge, that is not the best refuge. After having got to that refuge a man is not delivered from all pains.

"But he who takes refuge in the Buddha, the Law, and the Order, he perceives, in his clear wisdom, the four noble truths.

"Suffering, the origin of suffering, the cessation of suffering, and the noble eightfold path which leads to the cessation of suffering.

"That, verily, is a safe refuge, that is the best refuge; after having got to that refuge a man is delivered from all pains. (tr. Radhakrishnan)

The objective is freedom from all fears and all pains: the cessation of all suffering in the present and in the future. The prescribed refuge became a categorical imperative for deliverance from all evils. Like the belief in Karma or the acceptance of the Pratityasamutpada, the refuge in the Triratna was a matter of faith. In congregational worship a spirit of conformity is generated. This spirit endows the categorical imperative with faith for one and all: faith of the individual is but a reflex of the faith of the community and vice versa. While the Buddha (after Nirvana) and the Dharma were transcendental and intangible objects, the Sangha was immanent and tangible and the refuge in the Sangha evoked faith par excellence. The Sangha under favourable circumstances could be the "single refuge" in matters spiritual as well as temporal. The Sangha had a mission "for the profit of the many, for the bliss of the many, out of compassion for the world, for the welfare, the profit, the bliss of *devas* and mankind".

IV

The designation SANGHA was truly prophetic. It recalled a past and promised a future. Panini (c.600 B.C., that is, sometime before the Buddha) considered Sangha as synonymous with Gana (an old Vedic term meaning a group, a company or a corporate body with a

definite object). By the Buddha's time Sangha was an omnibus word which could mean a craft-guild, a body of (tribal) mercenaries, a group of mendicants or recluses, or even a tribal state (oligarchic/republican).

The Buddha framed for his Sangha elaborate organizational rules which made it a historic force in India and Asia. These rules (Vinaya: Prati-moksha) avoided the orthodox heritage (Varnasrama) and drew upon the practices of the Sakyas, Vajjis and the Mallas (15). Suffering humanity released from the disabilities and discriminations based on birth could have no better refuge than the Sangha which battled against JATI-VARNA and JARA-MARANA.

Centuries later, Asanga expounded that the Sangha being the highest of all Ganas was the appropriate refuge. The Sangha was no longer a category needing Panini's aphorism; unless repugnant to the context the term Sangha would mean the Gana founded by the Buddha. A millennium stood between Panini and Asanga. The millennium witnessed the rise and fall of dynasties and empires, foreign invasions and advent of new races, rebellions against old sacrifices and old gods, and rise of new schools of metaphysics and epistemology; in the second half of this millennium the Dharma moved in two separate Vehicles but the Sangha in either Vehicle accommodated members of the other and professed the same Vinaya (16). The monastic organization, to quote Conze again, has been the only constant factor in Buddhist history (17).

Asoka was fully seized of the role of the Sangha and therefore strove much to prevent split or schism. The schism eventually occurred. But the Sangha was a most active force for another thousand years, and out of its native land made history from the sunny islands in the Indian Ocean to the freezing steppes in Siberia. While Asoka's name was almost forgotten in his own country, the chronicles of Ceylon and Burma or of Tibet and Mongolia ranked Asoka higher than their national heroes. Much is said about Asoka having contributed to the spread of the Dharma. It is however not clear whether Asoka could have succeeded without an instrument as the Third Jewel.

Asoka himself had no doubt that the Sangha was greater than Devanampriya Priyadarsiraja Asoka. The epithet "Beloved of the Gods" is thought by many as an approximation to Divine Right, a concept not yet grown in Indic polity. Asoka's description of his subjects "All men are my children" (Kalinga Rock Edict) is interpreted as a mark of paternal despotism. In the famous Bairat Edict, meant for the Sangha, Asoka describes himself simply as Raja Priyadarsi of Magadha, salutes the Sangha and addresses the members of the Sangha with the honorific Bhanta/Bhadanta (18). The Bairat Edict was not a proclamation to the Church from its Imperial Protector: it was an advice from one who had taken refuge in the Church.

Asoka fixed the precedence and protocol. Even today in any orthodox Buddhist community from the sunny south to the freezing north the highest laity takes precedence after the junior most monks. Refuge in the Sangha requires submission without reservation.

V

The concept of refuge was deeper and wider in Mahayana than in the other school. The lesson of Prajnaparamita was that even if the Nirvana was unreal in the sense that it was incomprehensible, endeavour for liberation from suffering was compulsive or inevitable; aware of the unreality of all phenomena a believer was to strive for the enlightenment of all beings. Liberation must be universal or total. Even if a tiny brute was left unredeemed the Nirvana of the rest would be spoiled with the suffering of that tiny one. One who realized this truth and worked for all was the Bodhisattva (19). The promise of universal salvation evoked a deeper response in Mahayana.

Śraddha in Mahayana was not unlike that in the contemporary Brahmanical movement called Bhagavata or Bhakti. Even the term Bhakti as understood in Brahmanism would be appropriate to describe devotionism in Mahayana. It is not within the scope of the present enquiry to notice which religion or which school originated Bhakti (20). It is however material to note that the Buddha cult, that is, the doctrine of past, present and future Buddhas and the cult of faith in saviours were the dominant and interlinked features of Indian milieu during the Kushana times, the times which witnessed the spread of Buddhism all over Central Asia. The refuge in Triratna did no longer proceed out of intellectual comprehension (Pali. Panna/Skt. Prajna). The refuge trod the path of love and devotion to the Buddha who had discarded his material riches to save the suffering lives and to those who renounced their rights to Nirvana to lead the rest to the same goal. Radhakrishnan considers the Anusmriti (constant remembrance or awareness) of Mahayana to be the same as the Bhakti of Bhagavata or the Isvarapranidhana of Yogasutra (21)

Santideva, the scholar-saint of 8th century, expressed the depths and forms of the devotional Buddhism. His two works *Sikshasamuchchaya* and *Bodhicharyavatara* are fortunately available in both original (Sanskrit) and translation (Tibetan). A chapter in *Sikshasamuchchaya* is devoted to Remembrance of Three Jewels. Here the author discusses individually the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha as objects of remembrance but concludes, with more than half the space of the whole chapter, with the virtues of the Bodhisattvas (22). In *Bodhicharyavatara* the devotee bows not only to the Buddha (past-present-future), the Dharma and the Ganottama (the best of Ganas i.e. Sangha) but also

to the Bodhisattva-resorts and Chaityas and the Upadhyayas (preceptors) and Yatis (ascetics). Then the devotee takes refuge in the Buddha, the Dharma and the Bodhisattvagana (the Gana of the Bodhisattvas i.e. Sangha) (23). The accent on Bodhisattvas is obvious and significant. The best of Ganas is the Gana of Bodhisattvas. The Bodhisattvagana was the dearest Jewel; nearer and more tangible than the other two; dearer than the other two because it was the assembly of saviours.

The refuge was now not a purely doctrinal matter. The imagery of the believers demanded and created iconic forms for the Three Jewels. Three points, three prongs or a triangle (Skt. Trikona/Tib. Zur-gsum) could not satisfy the aesthetic yearnings of the believers (24) and finally a set of three anthropomorphic forms emerged. The Buddha was depicted as Sakyamuni in earth-touching posture, the Dharma as goddess Prajnaparamita with four hands and the Sangha as Avalokitesvara with four hands (25). As Prajnaparamita expressed the quintessence of the Dharma, Avalokitesvara expressed the compassion of the Sangha (26). Elaborate rituals for the adoration of the Three Jewels were as ancient as the Mahayana. *Bodhisattvabhumi* of Asanga has a chapter on Puja-seva-apramana of which the first and foremost section is Ratnapuja (27). Ratnapuja and/or Saranagamana in one form or other continued and found conspicuous expression in Vajrayana. The Sadhanas of medieval Tantra abound with references to the Triple Refuge (28). Vajratarasadhana of Ratnakarasanti (Atisa's teacher) has the refuge formula (29) in which the Buddha is described as the Highest of Men (following Asanga's diction), the Dharma as Mahayana (stating the dominance of Mahayana visavis Hinayana in India) and the Sangha as Avaivartikabodhisattvagana (claiming the Sangha as an organization of infallible altruists). The words within brackets are our comments; as 'infallible' represents the spirit of the word 'avaivartika' it is not necessary to probe into the etymology or history of this word here (30).

By the thirteenth century Buddhism came to an end in the plains of India. The founder, Gautama Buddha, was absorbed into Brahmanical pantheon. The doctrine, Dharma, was remembered as a futile rebellion though considerable parts of its philosophy were conveniently added to the corpus of Brahmanical learning and its adoration (Dharmapuja) was combined with a pre-Vedic ritual. The Sangha, the true arm of the Dharma and the real enemy of traditionalism, died for ever in the plains of India (31).

The Triratna migrated to the Trans-Himalayas and found refuge upto the Siberian steppes. The Sangha played the leading role in this migration.

The Saranagamana (Tib. Skyabs-hgro) as recorded in Nikaya, Avadana, Vinaya and Mahayana Sutras or as expounded by Asanga and Atisa was duly translated for incorporation into Tibetan canon; these need no citation here. In Tibetan understanding, however, the Sangha appeared as the leading Jewel. This was natural as the Sangha was the instrument of propagation of the Dharma as of confrontation with the indigeneous religion. Till the arrival of Santarakshita (popular as Khempo Bodhisattva in Tibet) and Padmasambhava (popular as Guru Rimpoche in Tibet) the Sangha was composed of Indian monks and priests; as history bears out they were men of character, learning and determination and individually made deep impression thus contributing to the stock of the Sangha. The Bodhisattva doctrine of collectivist striving for salvation struck a responsive chord in Tibetan mind (32) and the Sangha as Bodhisattva Gana stimulated loyalty even when it was a body of foreigners only. Besides the medium of preceptor being indispensable in the esoteric Vajra cult, the Sangha developed as the dominant Jewel. This fact finds reflection in Tibetan expositions on refuge.

For representative Tibetan expositions one, whether a student of religion or a student of history, has to look into compositions made between c. 1050 and 1150. This period began with the emergence of Buddhism as the national religion and witnessed the rise of several monasteries whose corridors became corridors of power (33).

Atisa came to Tibet in 1042 and preached for twelve years till his death. His disciples Hbromston and others recorded his sermons as the Word of the Spiritual Father (Bkah-gdams-pha-chhos) and supplemented with their own comments entitled the Word of the Spiritual Son (Bkah-gdams-bu-chhos). The Word of the Father has many passages extolling the imperative need of refuge in the Three Jewels. The conspicuity of the Lama (Guru) in these passages holds the attention of a student of history. "The Guru is the Buddha, the Guru is the Dharma and the Guru is the Sangha". Therefore, "I take refuge in the Guru: I take refuge in the Buddha: I take refuge in the Dharma: I take refuge in the Sangha" (34). The Word of the Son continues this, describes the Guru as the excellent refuge and hails the Sangha as the leader (hdrenpa/Skt. nayaka) (35).

Another exposition of the Triple Refuge is in Sgampopa (1079-1153)'s Jewel Ornament of Liberation. Rooted deeply in Indian

tradition and drawing profusely on Indian sources, this treatise is an exposition—for laity as well as clergy—of the real meaning, that is, the spiritual meaning of refuge. Yet words and comments about the ordinary mind's reaction are significant. "Ordinary persons frightened by the misery of Samsara hold the Three Jewels to be gods." "Ordinary mind takes refuge because it cannot bear its individual misery". Though "the Buddha is the ultimate refuge the ordinary mind takes refuge in Bodhisattvas (Sangha) as the most excellent refuge" (36).

It is thus not surprising that in the next century the presiding abbot of a powerful monastery would be addressed as Skyabs-mgon (Lord of Refuge). Tradition in Sakya as well as Kargyu (Karma) Sects traces such usage back to the thirteenth century. Later the Gelugpa found this a convenient usage and sanctified it officially (37).

VII

The Gelugpa propagation in Mongolia (1500-1700) not only disseminated the merits of refuge in the Triratna but also the indispensability of the Lama. Following passages from *Erdeni-yin-Tobci*, composed in 1662, echo the response of the Mongol nobility (38).

As for these three sublime and rare jewels,
Combined thus into one (in the person of) one's benevolent
Lama (chaplain),

Although one seek a refuge other than that one,
On account of its being very difficult to find, (it is apparent that)

This refuge, one's benevolent Lama's
Clearly-perceiving thought (is) the many Buddhas;
The commandments to be voiced exclusively (are) Sublime Doctrines;
Obviously, the material body (is) the Holy Clergy.

Until one find true *bodhi*-sanctity by this,
One should rely completely on this meritorious teacher.

(tran. Krueger)

This veneration for the Lama as also for the Holy Clergy was not an altogether Gelugpa achievement and perhaps went back to the thirteenth century when the Sakya Lamas were chaplains of the Imperial Mongol (Yuan) Dynasty. The Mongol chronicles of the seventeenth century played down the Sakya and Karma propagation of the earlier times. Even then evidence is forthcoming. A period which produced the Mongol

versions of *Pancharaksha*, *Suvarnaprabhasa* or *Lalitavistara* (39) could not be ignorant of the merits of Triratna. Unimpeachable epigraphic data not only speak of the veneration for the Three Jewels but also of the use of their images (40). Among the popular names of pre-Gelugpa times were: Protected by the Buddha, Slave of the Three Jewels and Slave of the Sangha (41).

VIII

The refuge formula universally accepted, from the Himalayas to the Altais and from the Kokonor to the Baikal, was

- I take refuge in the Lama (Guru)
- I take refuge in the Sangye (Buddha)
- I take refuge in the Chhos (Dharma)
- I take refuge in the Gedun (Sangha)



NOTES

1. Hermann Oldenberg's celebrated work *Buddha* (Berlin 1881/1922) had the subtitle 'His Life, His Doctrine and His Community'. Bhikshu Sangharakshita's just published 'introduction to Buddhism' has the title *The Three Jewels* (London 1967). All later developments of Buddhism stuck to the concept of Triratna. The Tantra was based on Ratna; vide Lama Anagarika Govinda: *Foundations of Tibetan Mysticism* (London 1959), Part Two entitled Mani. Even the Zen (variously described as scientific Buddhism, free Buddhism etc.) affirms refuge in the Three Jewels; vide Philip Kapleau: *The Three Pillars of Zen* (Tokyo 1965), pp. 198, 347-8.

2. For the original text see Note 18 infra.

3. དཀོན་མཆོག་གསུམ་དང་། འཕགས་པའི་རྣམས་དང་གཉི་ལྔ་དང་གཟེ་སྐར་
ལ་ཡང་དབང་དུ་གསོལ་དེ། །

The document as read by Hugh Richardson is reproduced in *Ancient Historical Edicts at Lhasa* (Royal Asiatic Society London 1952), pp. 66-69.

The Samye pillar-inscription, which Giuseppe Tucci accepts as that of Khri-srong-lde-btsan himself, speaks of དཀོན་མཆོག་གསུམ་གྱི་

རྗེ་བཙུགས་པ་དང་། སངས་རྒྱལ་གྱི་ཚོས།

The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings (Rome 1950), p.94. The Karchung inscription, attributed to Khri-lde-srong-btsan, describing the triumph of Buddhism over Bon abounds with དཀོན་མཆོག་གསུམ།

ibid, pp 104-8. Whatever may be the exact dates of these two epigraphs, the evidence of state (or public) adoration of the Three Jewels in the first quarter of the ninth century is writ large here.

4. Henry Serruys: Early Lamaism in Mongolia in *Oriens Extremus*, October 1963.

5. Nicholas Poppe: *The Mongolian Monuments in hPhagspa Script* (Wiesbaden 1957); vide the two metal plates illustrated, transcribed and translated on pp. 60-66.

6. Bhagavadgita, ch IX, v.18
 गतिर्भर्ता प्रभुः साक्षी निवासः शरणं सुहृत् ।
 प्रभवः प्रलयः स्थानं निधानं बीजमव्ययम् ॥

and ch XVIII, v.66

सर्वधर्मान् परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं व्रज ।
 अहं त्वा सर्वपापेभ्यो मोक्षयिष्यामि मा शुचः ॥

Origins and history of the Bhakti cult have several theories and controversies. Vide R.G. Bhandarkar: *Vaishnavism Saivism and Other Minor Religious Systems* (Strassburg 1913; later reprints Poona etc.); H.C. Raychaudhuri: *Materials for the Study of the Early History of the Vaishnava Sect* (Calcutta 1936); S.N. Das Gupta: *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol II (Cambridge 1932/1952); and Bhagavat Sastri: *The Bhakti Cult in Ancient India* (Calcutta 1924/Varanasi 1965). Har Dayal's theory, in *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature* (London 1932), that Bhakti first originated in Buddhism and that Bhakti was an integral part of Buddhist ideal from the earliest times (p.32) does not convince historians and offend the Theravada scholars.

7. No attempt is made in this paper to present the doctrinal meaning since the theme of this paper is quite mundane, namely, how the popular mind reacted to the doctrine and its impact in Samsara (mundane milieu). A short but authentic Mahayana exposition in English (six super octavo pages) is that of Marco Pallis: *Peaks and Lamas* (London 1939/1946), ch XVII; a mystic and a scholar Marco Pallis presents the cream from Gampopa and Tsongkhapa. Gampopa's treatise is now available in English translation with ample notes in Herbert Guenther: *The Jewel Ornament of Liberation* (London 1959).

8. K. N. Jayatilleke : *Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge* (London 1963), pp.383-400. From a purely textual point of view Jayatilleke is perfect. But perfection detached from reality has no bearing on present enquiry. It is not denied that "there has existed throughout Buddhist history a tension between the Bhaktic and the Gnostic approach to religion". Edward Conze: *Buddhism Its Essence and Development* (Oxford 1951/1953 etc), p.40. As Conze says "There are a few modern writers who make Buddhism quite rational by eliminating all metaphysics, reincarnation, all the gods and spirits, all miracles and supernatural powers. Theirs is not the Buddhism of the Buddhists". *Buddhist Thought in the India* (London 1962), p.29, f.n.

9. Nalinaksha Dutt: *Aspects of Mahayana and its Relation to Hinayana* (London 1930), p.303; further developed in *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta), Vols 16 & 21. Dutt has perhaps overdone the word Sraddha in conjunction with Prasada; but his theory has support in Asoka's use of the term Prasada for faith (Bairat Edict). See Note 18 infra.

10. Vide the present writer's article "Rabindranath Tagore on Buddhism" contributed to the Tagore Centenary Number of *The Mahadodhi* (Calcutta) or *France-Asia/Asia* (Tokyo). It is needless to labour the point that Brahmanism, Confucianism or Zoroastrianism failed in Inner Asia not because of lack of metaphysical content.

11. Christmas Humphreys: *Buddhism* (Penguin 1962), p.132

12. Charles Eliot: *Hinduisim and Buddhism* (London 1921/1954), Vol I, p.237.

13. Conze: *Buddhism*, p.54

14. *Dhammapada*: Buddhavagga 10-14

बहुं वे सरणं यन्ति, पब्बतानि वनानि च ।
आरामरुक्खचेत्यानि, मनुस्सा भयतज्जिता ॥
नेतं खो सरणं खेमं, नेतं सरणमुत्तमं ।
नेतं सरणमागम्म, सब्बदुक्खा पमुच्चति ॥
यो च बुद्धं च धम्मं च, सङ्घं च सरणं गतो ।
चत्तारि अरियसञ्चानि, सम्मपञ्जाय पस्सति ॥
दुक्खं दुक्खसमुप्पादं, दुक्खस्स च अतिक्रमं ।
अरियं चट्ठङ्गिकं मग्गं, दुक्खूपसमगामिनं ॥
एतं खो सरणं खेमं, एतं सरणमुत्तमं ।
एतं सरणमागम्म, सब्बदुक्खा पमुच्चति ॥

15. For Sangha and Gana vide K.P. Jayaswal: *Hindu Polity* (Calcutta 1924-Bangalore 1943); D.R. Bhandarkar: *Carmichael Lectures* (Calcutta 1918-19) and *Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity* (Benares 1925/1963); R.C. Majumdar: *Corporate Life in Ancient India* (Calcutta 1922); and Gokuldas De: *Democracy in Early Buddhist Sangha* (Calcutta 1965). On the question whether the Buddha derived the name as well as the organization from the political Sangha, see a balanced and erudite review in U.N. Ghoshal: *Studies in Indian History and Culture* (Calcutta 1965), pp.260-65. Marco Pallis, who finds it difficult to translate Sangha into any European idiom, has this comment: "The Indian word originally

used, *Sangha*, means "assembly" which is also the primitive meaning of the Greek *ekklesia*." *Peaks and Lamas*, p.285 fn.

16. Nalinaksha Dutt: *Aspects of Mahayana* etc, p.vi (La Vallee Poussin) and chapter 5.

The present writer attended the Sixth World Fellowship of Buddhist Conference (Phnom Penh, November 1961) and must quote in this context what Prince Norodom Sihanouk (Head of the State of Kamboja) said in inaugurating this session: "Whether Buddhists of the Southern School or Buddhists of the Northern School, we all live in accordance with the same doctrine; the unity of thought and the search for truth by different but not divergent paths gives us a moral strength of which the world has few examples to offer".

It is relevant to quote the words with which the Crown Prince of Sikkim (now the Chogyal) reciprocated:

"The writings of Nagarjuna, Vasubandhu and other masters of Mahayana philosophy abound with references to this basic unity of the two Vehicles. The Tibetan canon bears evidence of the essential unity of the different Buddhist schools and sects.

"The anxiety for reconciliation between the schools is as ancient as the schism. The Saddharama Pundarika is an instance of this spirit.

"The Chinese pilgrims visiting India long ago noticed that the members of the two Vehicles resided together in a number of establishments. The monks of the two Vehicles lived in harmony, performing in unison ecclesiastical acts and complying with the same rules of discipline. Some European critics and their Asian disciples, oblivious of the great tradition of Tolerance and Love in the Sangha, attributed the findings of these pilgrims to confusion. There was no confusion certainly in the minds of the master scholars and sages reported by the pilgrims. Such tolerance or coexistence was reported also among Central Asian Buddhists. In the highest step towards Bodhi and Nirvana there could be no conflict."

Vide *France-Asie/Asia* (Tokyo), No.171 (Jan-Feb. 1962) for these two speeches.

17. Vide Note 13 supra.

18. The relevant words are: प्रियदसि लाजा मागधे संघं अभिवादेतूनं
आहा । अपाबाघतं च फासु-विहालतं चा । विदिते वे भंते आवतके हमा बुधसि धंमसि
संघसि ति गालवे च प्रसादे च ।

Sanskrit rendering by Amulya Sen: प्रियदर्शी राजा मागधः संघम् अभिवाद्य
आह । अन्पाबाघतां च स्पर्श (=सुख) — विहारतां च । विदितं वः भदन्ताः
यावत्कं मम बुद्धे धर्मो संघे इति गौरवं च प्रसादः च ।
Asoka's Edicts (Calcutta 1956), p.135.

The word Bhanta (Bhadanta) is generally rendered as Sir ; D.R. Bhandarkar
(*Asoka*, Calcutta 1955, p.335) renders as Reverend Sir ; Reverend One
will also be good.

The word Pasada (Prasada) here certainly means faith. B.M. Barua
points out बुधसि धमसि संघसि गालावे चं पसादे च recalls बुद्धे धम्मो
संघे अवेच्चप्पसादो of Angut. Nikaya. *Asoka and his Inscriptions*
(Calcutta 1955), Pt II, p.64. Prasada in Sanskrit can also mean faith.
Vide Edgerton: *BHS Dictionary*.

19. *Rgyan-Drug Mchog-Gnyis* (Gangtok 1962) gives a brief account
(in English) of Prajnaparamita and connected issues.
For Bodhisattva-vada, the kingpin of the Mahayana, Har Dayal's book
(cited above under Note 6) remains the standard authority.

20. Vide Note 6 supra.

21. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan: *The Bhagavadgita* (London 1949),
p.60, f.n.5

22. Pp.316-47 in Bendall's edition (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, Petro-
grad/Hague).

23. Chapter II in Vidhusekhara Bhattacharya's edition (*Bibliotheca*
Indica, Calcutta). Verses 24-26.

सर्वक्षेलाणुसंख्यंश्च प्रणामैः प्रणमाम्यहं ।
सर्वलाध्वगतान् बुद्धान् सहधर्मगणोत्तमान् ॥
सर्वचैत्यानि वन्देऽहं बोधिसत्त्वाश्रयांस्तथा ।
नमः करोम्युपाध्यायानभिवन्द्यान् यतींस्तथा ॥
बुद्धं गच्छामि शरणं यावदाबोधिमण्डतः ।
धर्मं गच्छामि शरणं बोधिसत्त्वगणं तथा ॥

24. Early ornamental motifs of Triratna are seen in Sanchi, Barhut
and Amaravati. Standard works like Coomaraswamy: *History of Indian*
and Indonesian Art (London 1927/New York 1965) or Zimmer: *Art*
of Indian Asia (New York 1955) depict some of these.

25. Benoytosh Bhattacharyya: *Indian Buddhist Iconography* (Calcutta
1958), p.40 illustrates a set from Nepal. For somewhat different forms

see Alice Getty: *The Gods of Northern Buddhism* (Oxford 1928/Tokyo 1962), p.21.

26. Edward Conze: *The Prajnaparamita Literature* (The Hague 1960), p.30

27. Pp.159-170 in Nalinaksha Dutt's edition (Jayaswal Research Institute Series).

28. *Sadhanamala* ed. Bhattacharyya (Gaekwad Oriental Series), Vol I, pp.72, 100, 106, 173, 201-2, 225, 272, 273 & 297.

29. एषोऽहमाबोधेर्बुद्धं शरणं गच्छामि द्विपवानामग्रचम्, धम्मं शरणं गच्छामि समग्रं महायानम्, सङ्घं शरणं गच्छामि अवैवर्तिकबोधिसत्त्वगणम्
Sadhanamala, Vol I, p.225.

30. Vide *Mahavyutpatti* and Edgerton: *BHS Dictionary*.

31. An account of the lasting contributions of the Sangha will be found in S. Dutt: *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries in India* (London 1962).

32. The facts of Tibetan ecology, that is, the socio-economic factors which favoured a collectivist striviing will be presented by this writer elsewhere.

33. To be discussed in the succeeding papers in this journal.

34. *Bkah-gdams pha-chhos* (xylograph in Namgyal Institute of Tibetology) ལྷ་མ་སངས་རྒྱལ། ལྷ་མ་སངས་རྒྱལ། ལྷ་མ་སངས་རྒྱལ། (vol. ཁ)
སྐུབས་ཀྱི་དམ་པ་ལྷ་མ་རིན་པོ་ཆེ་ལ་སྐུབས་སུ་མཚོའོ། །སྐུབས་ཀྱི་དམ་པ་སངས་
རྒྱལ་རིན་པོ་ཆེ་ལ་སྐུབས་སུ་མཚོའོ། །སྐུབས་ཀྱི་དམ་པ་དམ་ཚོས་རིན་པོ་ཆེ་ལ་སྐུབས་
སུ་མཚོའོ། །སྐུབས་ཀྱི་དམ་པ་དགའ་འདུན་རིན་པོ་ཆེ་ལ་སྐུབས་སུ་མཚོའོ། །(vol. ང)

35. *Bkah-gdams bu-chhos* (xylograph in NIT) ང་ལ་རྩོན་པ་རྩོགས་པའི་
སངས་རྒྱལ་ཡོད། སྐྱོབ་པ་དམ་ཚོས་ཡོད། འདུན་པ་འཕགས་པའི་དགའ་འདུན།
(vol. ཀ) བདག་ཅག་བླ་མ་རྗེའི་ཚོགས་རབ་ཀྱི། །སྐུབས་ཀྱི་དམ་པ་ལྷ་མ་མཚོག་
།བདག་ཅག་སྐུལ་བ་ལྷན་པ་ཡི། །སྐྱིང་གི་པདྨ་འི་རྗེ་འབྲུལ། །ལྷ་མ་ཁྱོད་བཞུགས་
ཚོས་པར་མཚོད། །(vol. ཀ)

36. Vide Ch.8 in Guenther's English translation (cited under Note 7 supra).
 37. To be discussed in the succeeding papers in this journal.
 38. John Krueger: The Epilogue and Gnostic Colophon of the Erdeni-yin Tobci in *Central Asiatic Journal* (Wiesbaden), Vol.VIII, No.2.
 39. Nicholas Poppe: *The Twelve Deeds of Buddha* (Wiesbaden 1967), p.13.
 40. Nicholas Poppe: *The Mongolian Monuments* etc (cited under Note 5 supra), pp.60-66.
 41. Henry Serruys (cited under Note 4 supra), pp.198-9.
-