The Doctrine of Kaya (Trikaya)

-Prof. P.G.Yogi

The first point of difference between the Hinayana and Mahayana schools was noticed by the Sadharma Pundarika, viz. that the Buddha makes a show of his existence in the three dhatus and leads us to an examination of the question of the kayas of Buddha as conceived by the Hinayanists and Mahayanists. Of the Hinayana schools, the sthaviravadins had very little to do with the Kaya conceptions, as Buddha to them was an actual man living in this world like any human being and subject to all the frailties of a mortal body. Metaphorically, they sometimes spoke of Buddha as identical with Dhamma without any metaphysical implication but these remarks gave opportunity to the Sarvastivadins and the Mahayanists to put forth their theories of Dharmakaya . The Sarvastivadins commenced by speculating on the kaya of Buddha, but it was the school of the Mahasanghikas that took up the question of the Kaya in right earnest and paved the way for the speculations of the Mahayanists. The early Mahayanists, whose doctrines are mostly to be found in the Astasahasrika Prajna Paramita, along with the school of Nagarjuna had conceived two kayas:

i) *Rupa-* (or Nirmana) Kaya, which included bodies, gross and subtle, meant for beings in general, and (ii) *Dharmakaya,* which was used in two senses, one being the body of Dharma, (i.e, collection of practices) which makes a being a Buddha and the other the metaphysical principal underlying the universe, the Reality (Tathata).

The Yogacara School distinguished the gross Rupakaya from the subtle Rupakaya, calling the former Rupa as Nirmanakaya and the latter as Sambhogakaya. The Lankavatara, representing the earliest stage of the Yogacara conception, called the Sambhogakaya as Nisyanda-buddha or Dharmatma

Nisyanda-buddha (the Buddha produced by the Dharmas). The Sutra Lankara (I, Sutra, pp. 45, 188) used the term Sambhogakaya for Nisyanda Buddha and Svabhavikakaya for Dharmakaya. In the Abhisamaya Lankara Karika and in the recast version of the Pancavimsati-Sahasrika Prajnaparamita, Sambhogakaya denotes the subtle body which the Buddhas had adopted for preaching their doctrines to Bodhisattvas and Dharmakaya denotes the body purified by the practice of the Bodhipaksika and other dharmas which constitute a Buddha. For the metaphysical Dharmakaya they use the term Svabhava or Svabhavika-kaya. The Vijnaptimatratasiddhi retains the conception of the Karika but adopts a new term, Svasambhoga Kaya, to denote the Dharmakaya of the Karika and distinguishes the Sambhogakaya by calling it Parasambhoga-kaya.

REALISTIC CONCEPTION OF BUDDHA IN THE NIKAYAS

In a land where the tendency to deify Saints is so strong, it goes to the credit of the early Hinayanists for being able to retain the human conception of Buddha even a century or two after his actual existence, when the scriptures may be regarded as having been put into a definite shape. They gave expression to their conception of Buddha in the following words:

"Bhagava araham Sammasambuddha Vittacaranasampanno Sugato Lokavidu anuttaro Purisadamma Sarathi Sattha devamanussanam buddhobhagava. So imam Lokam Sadivakam Samarakam Sabrahmakam Sassamana brahmanim pajam Sadevamanusassam Sayam abhinna Sacchikatva Pavedeti. So dhamam deseti adikalyanam etc". The Blessed one is an arhat , a fully awakened one, endowed with knowledge and good conduct, happy, a knower of the world, unsurpassed, a leader able to control men, a teacher of men and gods, the awakened, the blessed. He knows thoroughly the worlds of god, maras, recluses, brahmins and men, and having known them he makes his knowledge known to others. He preaches the dhamma (doctrine) which is excellent in the beginning , middle and end, (this passage occurs in many places of the Nikayas, see, eg. Digha, 1, pp. 87-88; et Lal vis, p. 3; sad p, pp. 144, 376) etc. A description like this does not suggest that Buddha was originally more than a man, a mortal. In the cosmology of the Buddhists, the gods of the various heavens, the highest of which is Brahmaloka, (In the Mahayanic works also, as for instance in the Dasa, it is stated that a Bodhisattva can become a Mahabrahman in the ninth bhumi if he so wishes) are only beings of Superior merit and power, but they are inferior, in the matter of spiritual attainments, to the saints or arhats. So in this description, the Hinayanists do not attribute any transcendental or theistic element to Buddha. All they say is that Sakyamuni, by pure and simple spiritual culture in this life and as a result of the accumulated merits of his previous lives, reached the highest stage of perfection

and attained not only knowledge and power superior to any man or god but also the highest knowledge and power attainable. In the Majjhima Nikya, Ananda explains why Buddha should be considered superior to the Arhats as well, although both arrive at the same goal. He says that there is not a single bhikkhu who can be regarded as endowed with all the qualities in all their forms as possessed by Buddha. Moreover, a Buddha is the originator of the marga, which is only followed by the Savakas (Majjhima, III, P.8.).

NIKAYA PASSAGES ADMITTING A NON-REALISTIC CONCEPTION

In the face of such description of Buddha, it would have been difficult for the later Hinayana schools to sublimate the human elements in him, had it not been for certain expression in some of the earlier works of the Pitaka, which lend themselves to other interpretations. Some of these expressions are:-

1) Yo Vo Ananda mayadhammo cavinayo Ca desito Pannatto Sovo mam' accayena Sattha. Buddha said to ananda just before his Parinirvana 'the dhamma and Vinaya that have been preached by me will be your teacher after my death, (Digha 11,P.154,Mil,P.99). The Dhamma and Vinaya clearly refer to the collection of doctrines and disciplinary rules delivered by Buddha. This is also evident from the conversation of Ananda with Gopaka Mogallana, where the former explains why the monks after Buddha's death should not feel without refuge (appatisarana). He says that they have now a refuge in Dhamma (dhammapatisaana) which he points out are the doctrines and disciplinary rules, (Majjhima, Gopaka-Moggalttana Sutta (No-108). In Saddhama Sanghaha (f PTS, 1890), ch.x,65: Buddha says "84,000 dhammakkhandhas have been preached by me in 45 years. I alone will pass away while there are 84,000 dhammakkandhas which like 84,000 Buddhas (Buddha_ Sadhisa will admonish you)".

2) Bhagavato' mhi putto orasa mukhato tato dhammato, dhammanimmito, dhammadayado its, (Samyutta, 11, p.221: majjhimo, 111, p.29 has the identical passage with the addition "no a-misadayado" after" dhammadayado. "For the interpretation of "dhammatayado" see majjhima, 1.pp. 12). Tam kissa hetu 2, Tathagatassa h'etam adhivacamam. "dhammakayoitipi Dhammabhuto, (Majjhima, 11, p.84, Digha, 111, p.84, Majjhima, 111, pp.195, 224 has "Bhagavajanam janati passam passati Cakkhubhuto nana bhuto dhammabhu to"), iti piti.

Just as a brahmana would say that he is born of Brahma, through his mouth-Brahmúno putto oraso Mukhato fato brahnajo brahmanimmito brahmana yado-so a Sakya puttiya samana may say that he is born of Bhagava, through his mouth, born of his doctrine made of his doctrine,

etc. Though in this passage Dhamma is equated with Brahma the context shows that there is no metaphysical sense in it; it is only to draw a parallel between a brahmana and a Sakyaputtya-samana that Dharmakaya is equated with Brahmakaya.

3) Vakkali on his death bed became very eager to see Buddha in person. So Bhagava came to him and said, 'Alam Vakkalikim to Putikayena ditthena. Yo kho vakkali dhammam passatiso mam passati, Yo mam passati so dhamma passati." Just after saying this Buddha referred to his dhamma of impermanence (anicca). There are in the Nikayas as many passages of this import which may be taken as precursors of the later Mahayanic conceptions and probably formed the basis of this speculation. But when read through the passage as they stand they do not appear to bear any metaphysical sense. In this passage Buddha refers to his body as putikaya (body of impure matter), and to lay stress on his doctrines he says that his dhamma should be looked upon with the same awe and reverence by his disciple as they regard his person,(Samyutta,111.p.120, Majjhima, 1 PP. 190,191 :- Yopaticca amuppadam passati so dhammam passati yo dhammam passati so Paticca sumuppadam Passati). For other references see Prof. Valle poussin article "Notes surless corpsdo Buddha" in Lemusion,1913,PP. 259-290 compare the remarks in the later pali works,- samdhamma sangaha (Jpts 1890), P.61. Yome Passati saddhamam so mam passati Vakkali, Apassamano saddhammam mam passe pina passati,milinda, P.71. Yodhammam Passati so Bhagavantam passati, dhammo hi maharaja bhagavata desitoti. Ibid, P,73: Dhammakayena pana kho maharaja Sakka bhagava nidadsetum, dhammohi maharaja bhagavata desitoti.

4) The passage in the anguttara Nikaya, (Anguttara,11.P. 38), where Buddha says that he is neither a god nor a gandhabba, nor a man has been taken by Prof. Masson-Oursel, (Prof. Masson- oursel in his article " Less trosis carps du Buddha," J.A. 1913,PP. 581), as showing trace of the Mahayanic Kaya conception. It is not impossible to read some metaphysical ideas into the passage , though probably the compiler of the sutras did not mean to convey them. Dona bramana noticing the sign of the wheel in the feet of Buddha, enquired him whether he was a deva, a gandhabba, a Yakkha or a mortal. The Buddha replied that he was none of these beings as he had got rid of the asavas (impurities) which continuing of would make one remain a deva, gandhabba, Yakkha or mortal. Just as a lotus is born in water, grow in it but remains above and is apart from it, so also Buddha was born in the world, grew up in it but overcome it (abhibhuyya) and lived unaffected by the same. Therefore, he asked the brahmana not to regard him as anything but Buddha.

There are other passages referring to the miraculous powers of Buddha viz, his ability to live a Kalpa or to assume different forms and perform such other miracles, but it should be noted that these powers were attributed not to Buddha alone but also to his disciple in general, who had been able to attain the higher stages of sanctification (See Kosa, ii, 10 also for references in the Nikayas).

KAYA CONCEPTION OF THERAVADINS REMAINED UNCHANGED

Even if it be assumed that the Mahayanic ideas are latent in the above mentioned expressions though not adequately expressed, the discussion in the Kathavatthu has made it amply clear that the Vetulyakas had referred to the passage cited above which says, "it is not right to say that the exalted Buddha lived in the world of mankind. The Theravadins did not agree with them. Buddhaghosa having pointed out how the passage should be interpreted to establish the historical existence of Buddha as against those who denied it and the manner in which references were made to the events of Buddha's life as depicted in the Nikayas had left no vestige of doubt about the opinion of theravadins regarding the kaya of Buddha, though the terms rupakaya and dharmakaya found their way into the later pali works, (see, eg. sad san. (JPTS, 1890) P.69:-
Sambuddhanam dve Kayarupakaya Siredharo, yo tehe desito dhammo dhammakayoti vuccati) in mahayana or in the semi mahayana works, they however did not bring with them any non realistic sense, Buddhaghosa, even as late as the fifth century A.D., refers thus to the Kayas:- Yopeso Bhagva asiti anuvyan janapatimandita-dvattim samaha puresa lakkhana vicitra rupakayo sabbakaraparasuddha silakkhandhadi gunaratanasamaddha dhammakayo yasamhatta punnamahatta appatipuggalo araham samma sambuddho.

That Bhagvan, who is possessed of a beautiful rupakaya, adorned with eighty minor signs and thirty-two major signs of a great man, and possessed of a dhammakaya purified in every way and glorified by sila, samadhi, (The five khandhas referred to here are sila samadhi, panna vimutti and vimuttinanadassana, see mil, p.98) etc, who is full of splendour and virtue, is incomparable and fully awakened (vis,m. p.234, jataka, i, p. 84:-Rupakayasire). Though Buddhaghosa's conception was realistic, he was not immune from the religious bias of attributing super human powers to Buddha. In the Atthasaline, (Attha, p.16), he says that during the three months of his absence from the world while Buddha was engaged in preaching Abhidhamma to his mother in the Tusita heaven, he created some Nimmita Buddha as exact replicas of himself. These Nimmita Buddhas could not be distinguished from the real Buddha in voice, words and even the rays of

light that issued forth from his body. The created Buddhas could be detected only by the gods of the higher classes and not by the ordinary gods or men of the world. In short, the early Hinayanists conceived Buddha's rupakaya as that of a human being, (see Prof. valle Poussin's Buddhisme. p.p. 232), and his dhammakaya as the collection of his dhammas, ie, doctrines and disciplinary rules collectively.

CONCEPTION OF THE SARVASTIVADINS

The other school such as the Sarvastivadins, who retained the realistic conception of Buddha, differed a little from the Theravadins. Unfortunately their original pitakasin sanskrit were lost beyond recovery and we have to depend for our information about them on the few fragmentary pieces of their literature discovered in central Asia, or on the Chinese translation of their Agamas, in which again very little spade-work has yet been done. Dr Chizen Akanuma (Eastern Buddhist, 11, p. 7) quotes some passages from the chinese Anguttara and Samyukta Agamas and shows that the dharmakaya of Budddha denoted the collection of dharmas teaching. Our main source of information at present is the Abhidharmakosa, made accessible to us from Chinese by the monumental French translation of Professor La Vallee Poussin. The Kosa, again, it should be noted, is the work of a system and the production of a time much later than that of the Agamas, to which it bears the same relation as the Visuddhimagga does to the Pali pitakas. As the present state of our knowledge indicates that the Divyavadana and the Lalitvistara, (Winternitz, Geschichte etc. 11, p. 194), originally belonged to this school, though they were recast by the Mahayanists, we must examine with caution some of the statements found in them regarding the Kaya conception.

Divyavadana :- There are a few passages in the Divyavadana throwing light on the rupakaya and dharmakaya of the Buddha and bearing the identical sense of the pali works. On one occasion Sronakotikarana said that through the grace of his teacher, he had seen the dharmakaya of the Buddha, but as he was anxious to see the rupakaya, he wanted to go to the place where the Buddha was living at the time, (Divya, p. 19). Upagupta once said to Mara that he had seen only dharmakaya and requested him to show him the rupakaya. Mara thereupon made an image (Vigraha) of the Buddha replete with all the major and minor signs of a great man, (Ibid, p.360). In the answer that king Rudrayana gave to Bimbisara it says, "na rajan Krpano Loke dharmakayena Samsprset" (Let not, o king, an irreligious person). Ibid, p.560. Krpana is defined thus:-

Yastu dharmaviragartham adharme niroto nrpala, sarajan krpano theyas tamasta mah parayanah, (attain(lit, touch) the dharmakaya). The word "dharmayana' may bear a metaphysical interpretation but the context does not

warrant it, (Ibid p. 560). The remark made by Asoka, after Upagupta had pointed out to him the stupa of Ananda, makes the sense of dharmakaya quite explicit. It runs thus :- That body which you all call pure, excellent and made of dharma (dharmatmano dharmamayo) was borne (dharitam) by him called Visoka (Ananda) and therefore his stupa deserves great honour. The lamp of Dharma, the dispeller of the darkness of afflictions that burnt still among men was due to the power of him, the son of Sugatendra and therefore should be worshipped with special reverence (Divya, PP. 396-7,Cf. Priyluski,-Asoka, P-408- In connection with the destruction of the law, Mahamaya exclaimed ceux quisortnesdu corps dela loi (dharmakaya), Ou Sont-ils alles). There are, however, Avadanas in the Divyavadana, which were not without some Mahayanic tint, for, we read in the Pudrayana Vadana,(Divya, xxxvii, p.568), as we usually find in the Mahayanic works, that rays of light issued forth from the Buddha's mouth when he smiled, irradiating, the beings of heaven and hell. It is noteworthy that the Atthasaline (Attha, p. 16), also speaks of rasmis (rays of light) of six colour issuing out of the Buddhas body. It seems that the Mahayanic ideas were percolating gradually into the rocky soil of the conservative Theravadins.

Lalitavistara:- The lalitavistara gives us a picture of the Buddha more super human than human and yet far from the Mahayanic conceptions of the Sambhogakaya and Dharmakaya, though in the last two chapters it dwells on the doctrine of Tathata. In the Lalitavistara Buddha is defied but there are no trace of the Trikaya conception. It says in many places that Buddha appears in the world of men for Lokanuvartana, (E. G mtu..1.pp.168, 170), i.e to follow the ways of the world), which, if he so desired, he could avoid by remaining in one of the heavens and attaining emancipation there. The running account of the Buddha's life is interrupted at times-probably they are afterthoughts of the compiler-by dialogues between Buddha and Ananda, in order to make the treatise appear Mahayanic and not Hinayanic. At one place Buddha explained to Ananda that, unlike human beings he did not stay in the filth of mother's womb but in a jewel-casket (ratnavyuha), [Lal vis.pp. 88,105, 106. This formed one of the points of contention of the Mahasanghikas. See Masuda, early origin etc. in the Asia Major, Vol.. II],placed in the womb, which was as hard as adamant but soft to the touch like the down of a Kacilindika bird, and that his birth and other events connected with it were all superhuman. At the same time he prophesied that there will be, in the future, men defiled in act, thought and speech, ignorant, faithless, proud, believing without deliberation what is heard by them who will not believe in the super human nature of the Buddha's birth (Lal. vis.pp.8766. This goes against the Sarvastivada and Theravada conceptions). One can perceive through the poetical exaggeration of the Lalitavistara that it has in view the historical Buddha endowed with major and minor sings of a human being who requires his past lives and his

resolution to become a Buddha and rescue beings from misery, and who needs a stimulus to renounce the world in order to fulfil his resolution. (The descriptions gave opportunity to the Mahayanists to invent Upayakausalya paramita, the duties of Adhyesana, Yacana etc). In connection with the offer of houses which was made by the gods to the Bodhisattva when he was in the womb, it is said that in order to please all the gods who offered houses he caused the appearance of his pregnant mother Mayadevi in each of those house by means of the Mahavyaha Samadhi. This does not clearly reflect any idea of Nirmanakaya Samadhi. This does not clearly reflect any idea of Nirmanakaya- it appears more like some of the miracles mentioned in the Nikayas.

In the last chapter of the Lalitavistara where the Buddhas attributes are mentioned, he is called the great tree (mahadruma) because he possesses a body of Dharmakaya janana (the knowledge of Dharmakaya) (Lal, vis 7.428). As this chapter is very likely a Mahayana addition, we may reasonably say that the Lalitavistara, in its original form as a treatise of the Sarvastivadin's, viewed Buddha as a human being with superhuman attributes.

Abhidharmakosa :- We may now consider the writing of Vasubandhu, the great exponent of the Sarvastivada school. In his Abhidharmakosa he imported a new meaning into the words Dharmakaya and Rupakaya. In examining the three saranas, he tried to bring out the real sense of Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha in which a devotee takes refuge. He said that those who take refuge in Buddhasatto, in fact, take refuge in the dharmas (qualities) which constitute a Buddha (Buddhakarak) ie. the dharmas by the acquisition of which a person understands all things. These dharmas are Kayajana (knowledge of the destruction of misery). Anutpadajana, kosa vi, 67, explain that Kasyanana with Anutpadajhana, makes Bodhi. On account of difference among Saints in the acquisition of these Jnanas, bodhi is said to be three kinds:- Sravaka bodhi, Pratyika Buddha bodhi and Anuttara samyaksambodhi. By the above two jhanas one can completely abandon ignorance (Asesavidya Prahanat): by the first , one realise the truth that his task is accomplished (i.e. the dukha has been realised by him); by the second , one realises that his task is no more to be accomplished (i.e the dukha has been realised by him and he will not have to exert any more). The Samyagdrsti of the Asaikas is to see things as they really are and to know the true general character (Samanyalaksana) of dharmas. (See kosa, vi, 50 fn. For a note on the Ksayathana, see Masuda, Early origin etc, in Asia mator, vol. II, Fase. 1). knowledge of the further non-origination of misery, and Samyagdrsti (right view), of the Asaiksas together with the dharmas attendant on the jnana, viz. the five pure skandhas, are found to be the dharmas constituting Dharmakaya. In another place, while showing the sameness of the Dharmakayas of all Buddhas, he explained the Dharmakaya as a series of pure dharmas, or rather a renewal of the psycho-physical organism

of the substratum (anasravadharmatana, asrayaparavrtti), (Kosa, VII, 34, for the sense of Asraya see ibid, VIII, 34 in cf asraya parisuddhi in sutra, p. 186). The Dharmakaya then signifies a new purified personality or substratum (asraya), but it is pointed out that such a dharmakaya is possessed also by an arhat (Kosa, IV, 56). In the Sutralamkara, (Huber, Sutralamkara, pp. 217, 390 quoted in the Kosa vii, 32 p. 81), such a dharmakaya is attributed to the mother of Sakyamuni or to an advance Upasaka. Thus we see that the Kosa has two interpretations of the Dharmakaya, one being the qualities adhering to a Buddha and the other the purified personality (asraya) possessed by him. The Kosa, in fact, replaces the concrete conceptions of the Dharmakaya found in the Nikaya and the Divyavadana by an abstract one. In the last two works, the Dharmakaya signified only the doctrines, viz, the Bodhipakkiya dharmas or Anicca, Dukkha and Anatta, together with the Vinaya rules contained in the Patimokkha, while to Vasubandhu it meant the qualities adhering to a Buddha as well as the purified personality (asraya).

Referring to the formula of the Saranas, Vasubandhu says that the physical body (rupakaya)of the Buddha does not undergo any modification due to the acquisition of the quality of the Buddha, one should not therefore take refuge in the rupakaya of Buddha, which is, in fact, the rupakaya of the Bodhisattva and hence sasrava (impure). Just as a man would respect a monk for the qualities adhering to him and not for his person, so a devotee should take refuge in Buddhatva and not in Buddha the person. In the same way Vasubandhu explains the two other Saranas, Viz, Dharma and Sangha, the former being explained as Nirvana or the three Truths - Dukkha, Samudaya and Marga, or Sukha, Dukkha and Asukkha-adukkha-and the latter as the qualities that a Sangha of monks is expected to possess (compare the formula of Sarana in the Nikayas, e.g. Digha, 111, p. 227).

The Vidhasa informs us that there are some who believe that to take refuge in the Buddha is to take refuge in the body constituted by the head, the neck, belly, back, hands and feet of the Tathagata. Some say that as the body is born of parents, it is impure (Sasrava) and therefore should not be a place of refuge. The refuge should be the Asaiksa dharmas, which make a Buddha, i.e. the Dharmakaya, (Kosa, vi, p. 32, ivp. 76, viii, p. 34). Apparently the Vibhasa refers in the first case to the earlier Hinayana Schools and in the second to the Sarvastivadins and their followers.

DHARMAKAYA CONCEPTION AMONG THE SATYASIDDHIS AND THE MAHAYANISTS

The Satyasiddhi school takes almost the similar view of the Dharmakaya as the Sarvastivadins. According to it, the Dharmakaya is made of Sila, samadhi,

Prajna, Vimukti and Vimuktijnadarsana. Buddhaghosa, Nagarjuna and the author of the Milindapanha also refer to such a dharmakaya. It means that the body of the Buddha was purified by the practices of these five skandhas stated above, and hence it can be called Dharmakaya. But as these purifications are obtained by Arhats also, Harivarman, the propounder of the Satyasiddhi school distinguished the Dharmakaya of the Buddha by saying that his Dharmakaya consisted not only of the above five purifactory practices but also of ten powers (dasa bala), four proficiencies (vaisaradya) and the three recollections (smrtyupasthana), which the Arhats cannot obtain (Sogen, systems etc., pp-181,182).

The Abhisamaya Lankara Karika, (Karika,ch,VIII), and Pancavimsati Sahasrika-prajna-paramita, (panca,ASBS, leaf 224a), and important text-books of the Yogacara school, define the Dharmakaya in a similar sense. They stated that the various dharmas, viz, Bodhipaksika, Apramanas, Vimoksas, Samapattis and so forth, constitute Sarvajnata (omniscience) and sarvajnata is the Dharmakaya. It should be noted that the Karika and the Prajna-paramita use this expression in a sense different from that current in the Mahayana texts. They really mean the Svasambhogakaya of the later Vijnanavadins. The Prajna-paramitas also maintain the conception that the Dharmakaya is produced by dharmas, the highest of which is, according to them, the Prajna-paramita, i.e., the knowledge, which helps a person to realise the dharma-sunyata. The Astasahasrika takes up the question, whether the honour shown to the relics of the Tathagatakaya is more meritorious than the honour shown to the Prajnaparamita, e.g., by making a copy of it. The answer given is that the relics depend on the body purified by the Prajnaparamita, and therefore it is the source of Buddha. The source deserves more honour than the remnants of the fruit (i.e., relics of Buddha) produced therefrom, and therefore it is more meritorious to honour the Prajna-paramita than the relics, (Asta, ch.IV). It adds that all teachings of Buddha issue from the Prajnaparamita and the Dharmabhanakas should preserve and propagate them; so the Dharmabhanakas should also be respected. They are protected by the Dharmakaya developed from the Prajnaparamita. From Sarvajnata issues the body of Tathagata, the relics of whom are worshipped and hence prajnaparamita deserves greater honour (Ibid, P 99). It is from this conception that the Prajna-paramita is addressed as the mother of Buddhas.

HINAYANIC SPECULATIONS

Whether Rupakaya is Vipakaja?

The kosa maintains that the Rupakaya of the Buddha endowed with the major and minor signs is the results of the excellent karmas of his previous lives. According to it, even the Buddhas cannot escape the effects of their karma. The

schism created by Devadatta in the sangha is attributed to a deed in one of the previous lives of Sakyamuni. The Vyakhya and the Vibhasa explain that it happened to Sakyamuni only, and not to the other Buddhas, because in one of his former lives he sowed dissensions among the disciples of an ascetic, possessed of five Abijnas, (Kos'a, VII,34, p. 8th, 84, IV, 102, p. 212 th. 2). That the Buddhas enjoy or suffer the effects of Karma is also maintained by the Divya Vadana, (DIVYA p. 416), and the Majjhima Nikaya, (Majjhima, III.p. 227). The Divya-Vadana refers to a saying of Sakyamuni that even the Jinas themselves are not free from their Karmas, while the Majjhima Nikaya says that a Tathagata performs good deeds in his previous lives, and as a result of these, he enjoys in the present, pure and pleasant sensations (Vedana) only. Tradition says that when Buddha was hurt by the splinter of stone thrown by Devadatta, he said that ninety-one Kalpas ago he had hurt a person by a spear, and as the result of which evil deed, he now received a wound. The Milindapanha, however, takes a different view of this matter. Admitting that Devadatta created a schism in the Sangha, it says that the schism was not created by any act of the Buddha's own, and as it was caused by an external influence, it should not be said that Buddha as the result his Karma had a divided assembly (Bhejjapariso). In a similar way, it explains away the wound or the illnesses, from which Buddha suffered. First it asserts that Buddha attained omniscient after uprooting all roots of evil (Akusalamulas) so that he could not have any more sufferings through Karma. It then says that apart from Karma, there are other cause like the three humours, seasons etc., which produce Vedana (feelings). According to it, the wound that Buddha received was due to Opakammika (accidental) cause and his illnesses to cause other than Karma (Mil,pp. 134 F).

WAS THE BUDDHA A JARAYUJA OR UPAPADUKA ?

In order to remove doubt from the mind of the people as to the nature of the birth of so great and meritorious a being as the Bodhisattva in his last existence-a doubt expressed also in the Lalitavistara, where a Ratnavyuha has been devised for the Bodhisattva's abode in his mother's womb- the Kosa, (Kosa, III. 9), proceeds to show that the Bodhisattvas possess the power of choosing the manner of their birth (Upapatti Vasitva), and that Sakyamuni chose birth in a womb (Jarayu) with two objectives:- One was to benefit the Sakya clan and at the same time not to give an opportunity to the people to consider him as a magician or a god or a demon, and the other was to leave some relics of his body, by worshipping which men and other beings would go to heaven by thousands, or attain deliverance. The Mahasanghikas and their followers (eg. the Vetulyakas) assert that Sakyamuni was an Upapaduka (self-born), and that even his son Rahula was also an Upapaduka for Bodhisattvas are possessed of 'Adhisthaniki rddhi' (i.e., the miraculous power

of appearing anywhere and in any form), and by that power Sakyamuni made a show of his existence in the womb of Maya. They considered Buddha as Lokottara (transcendental), and Sakyamuni as only a created body (Nirmanakaya). The transcendental Buddha has a Rupakaya, which is limitless, everlasting, and free from all Sasrava dharmas. He is always in Samadhi, (cf. Lanka, p.240 Sada Samahitas Catathagatah), never sleeps or dreams, and can know everything in an instant of thought. He knows neither fatigue nor rest, and is ever busy in enlightening sentient beings. His power and his life are limitless. For the benefit of sentient beings, he appears at will in any one of the six Gatis. Whatever he utters relates to the truth, though people may understand him differently. In short, the Mahasanghikas conceived Buddha as a totally supramundane being with illimitable powers and knowledge, who never desired to attain Nirvana, (see Mansuda's origin and Doctrines of Early Indian Buddhist schools, Asia Major, Vol.II.Fasc, 1; Anesaki's article in the ERE, SV Docetism Buddhist; suzuki's Outlines of Mahayana and Buddhism, pp. 249-251. See also Kosa, III, 9, referring to Mtu, 1.pp.145,154).

KAYA CONCEPTION AT THE BEGINNING OF MAHAYANA

The Mahayanists incorporated the Nirmanakaya conception of the Mahasanghikas into their Trikaya Theory, adding the two others, Sambhogakaya and Dharmakaya, the former approaching the Mahasanghika conception of the transcendental Buddha, and the latter being a new metaphysical conception of the Mahayanists. These new Kaya conception, it seems, did not make much of an appeal at the beginning of Mahayana. The Saddharma Pundarika and the Suvarnaprabhasa tried to erase from the minds of the people the lingering impression about the historical existence of Sakyamuni. In the Pundarika (Sad. p.pp. 311ff), we find Maitreya assuming the role of a sceptic and enquiring how Buddha could, within short space of forty years after the attainment of Bodhi at Gaya, perform the innumerable duties of a Tathagata and lead incalculable bodhisattvas to Buddhahood. It appears like the paradox of a man of twenty five years claiming centenarians as his sons and the latter calling him their father. Similarly Buddha's pointing to the Bodhisattvas, who had been performing the various duties conducive to Buddhahood for many millions of years, as his disciples, appears paradoxical. Maitreya says further that in the minds of those Bodhisattvas, who recently became Mahayanists (Navayanasamprasthitah), there may be doubts of this nature, so the Tathagata should explain the paradox for the welfare of the religion. The Buddha then asks his audience thrice to believe his words (Avakalpayadhvam Abhisraddaddham) and says " it is not to be considered (Naiva Drastavyam), that Bhagavan Sakyamuni having renounced his family life had attained Bodhi at Gaya". He again said "I attained Sambodhi in calculable ages ago, and since then I have

been preaching the dharma. All that I have said about the previous Tathagatas, Dipankara etc, and their Parinirvana were all my own creations. These were only my expedients for imparting the dharma (Upayakausalya-dharma-disanabhinirhanirmitane). All that I have said to the effect that I was young, recently born, left home, and attained Bodhi, was to appeal to a class of people, who otherwise would not have been convinced of the excellence of the religion and derived benefits therefrom. But all that I said was not untrue, as the Tathagatas know that what the three dhatus really are; they know that the dhatus are neither born nor non-existing; neither they are the same nor different, and they are neither true or false". All that the Tathagatas say is true, but people devoid of right knowledge construe different meaning out of it. "Though I have not attained Parinirvana, I say that I have attained it. In order to rouse curiosity in the minds of the people and in order to inculcate a desire to see Buddha, I say that the appearance of the Buddha is an exceedingly rare event. I made a show of Nirvana, but did not enter into it, but people with distorted views could not see my real self, and engaged themselves with the worship of my relics. But this also produced a good effect, for they thereby became righteous and gave up their passions. From among them I formed my Sravakasangha, and showed myself at Gradhrakuta, and explained to them how to attain the agrabodhi".

In the Suvarna Prabhasa (Suvarnaprabhasa, B.T.s.ed.pp.4-8), Ruciraketu and Kaundinya the brahmana play the role of sceptics. The former enquires why Sakyamuni, who performed so many meritorious deeds, should have a short span of life as eighty years. The latter sought a mustard-like relic of the Buddha's body to worship and thus went to heaven. Ruciraketu is told by the Buddhas of all lokadhatus that they did not know any man or god who could calculate the length of Sakyamuni's life. They said that it might be possible to count the drops of water in a sea but it would be impossible to ascertain the length of his life. Kaundinya brahmana, who only feigned ignorance, was told by Litsavikumara that, just as it is absurd to expect coconuts from a rose-apple tree, so it is absurd to expect a relic from the Buddha Kaya. The Tathagatas have no origin and they are ever existing and inconceivable. It is only the Nirminakaya that is shown by them. How can a baby, in which there is no bone or blood, leave a dhatu (relic)? The Buddhas have only Dharmakaya and there is only the Dharmadhatu.

Nirmanakya:- The Mahayanic texts tried to show, on the one hand, that the Hinayanists were wrong in their belief that Sakyamuni was really a man of flesh and blood and that relics of his body existed, while on the other hand, they introduced the two conceptions of Nirmanakaya and Buddhakaya. Whatever is said to have been done by Sakyamuni is accounted for by those texts as the apparent doing of a created body of the Buddhakaya, a shadowy image created to follow the ways of the world (Lokanu Vartana, of mtu, 1.pp. 168, 170) in order to bring

conviction in the hearts of the people that the attainment of Buddhahood was not an impossibility.

As the Buddhas possess the knowledge of all that is to be done (Krtyanusthana Jhana, one of the four jhanas peculiar to Buddha, see Mvyut. p.2), they can take any form they desire for the enlightenment of the various classes of beings. The Mahayanic conception of Nirmanakaya is essentially the same as that of the Mahasanghikas. The Prajna-Paramitas in their quaint way refer to the Nirmanakaya or Rupakaya. The Pancavimsati, says that a bodhisattva, after acquiring all the necessary dharmas and practising prajnaparamita, becomes a Sambuddha. He then renders service to beings of all Lokadhatus (worlds) of the ten corner at all times by Nirmanamegha (Nirmana clouds, panca, camber, MS.leaf 34 c). This is called the Nirmanika-kaya.

From the Chinese sources we are informed that Nagarjuna, in his commentary on the Prajna Paramita, names it as Maha Prajnaparamita sastra and speaks of two kayas, Rupakaya and Dharmakaya. The former is the body born of parents, possessing the qualities of sentient beings, and is subject to human frailties. It was born in Kosala while his dharmakaya was born at Rajagriha. The material body was necessary for "earthly truth". It was for the deliverance of beings that Buddha assumed different kayas, different names, birthplaces and ways of emancipation. This interpretation of Rupa and Dharma-Kayas is also followed in the Chinese Parinirvana sutra and Sandhinirmocanasutra, (E.B. 11.pp. 21 F), EB. 11. pp. 17 ff).

The Sutralankara (p. 45), explains the Nirmanakaya to be those forms , which are assumed by the Buddhas to render service to beings of the various worlds. It generally refers to the human form that Buddha takes in order to make a show of his acquiring the ordinary arts and crafts required by an average man, living a family life and than retiring from it, and ultimately attaining Nirvana by recourse to the ascetic practices.

The Vijnaptimatrata siddhi:- tells us that the Nirmanakaya is meant for Sravaskas, Pratyeka Buddhas, Prthagjanas (common men) and Bodhisattva, who are not yet in one of the ten bhumis. It may appear in all lands whether pure or impure. The Chinese commentaries on the Siddhi mention the various ways, in which Buddha can transform his body or another's body or voice, and his or other's mind, to suit his purpose.

Not only could he transform himself into Sakyamuni, or Sariputra into a young girl, but also could create an altogether new apparitional body, not, of course, a living thinking being. Often he assumed the voice of Brahma or expressed himself through the mouth of Sariputra or Subhuti, and it was for this reason that we find Sariputra or Subhuti explaining some of the abstruse Mahayana teachings which they themselves were not expected to understand, (Asta, pp. 14, 33, 414). The

third way in which he could transform his voice was to produce sounds from the sky. His thoughts were supramundane (Lokottra) and pure (Anasrava). He could produce in mind any thought he liked, in fact, he appeared in his Nirmitakaya as Sakyamuni with a mind (citta) suited to the way of the world. He could also impose his thought on the mind of others.

The Abhisamaya Lankarakarika states that there are four kayas, of which the Svabhavika-kaya is real, and the three others, viz, Dharmakaya(svasambhogakaya), sambhogakakaya (parasambhoga kaya) and Nirmanakaya are samvrta (i.e. unreal) and these are meant for Bodhisattvas and Sravaskas respectively. According to it, the Nirmanakaya was intended for Sravakas and Bodhisattvas who are not yet in one of the ten bhumis. It describes the Nirmanakaya as a body unsevered from the real kaya and as the action performed by it are similarly unsevered from the kaya, they should be regarded as asamsara (transcendental, i.e. not worldly). Then it proceeds to show that the thirty-seven kinds of purificatory actions performed by the Nirmanakaya are really the actions of the Dharma-kaya. The thirty-seven actions, explained by it, are the thirty seven steps, through which a Nirmanakaya passes after its inception. These are as follows :- A Nirmanakaya (i) is unmindful of good or bad forms of existence; in other words, takes birth as an animal, human being or god as require is called Gatiprasama; (ii) practises the four Samgrahavastus (elements of popularity); (iii) enlightens himself about matter opposite and similar, good and evil, by the Srutamayi and such other means of knowledge, and than applies himself to the service of others, keeping himself unconcerned (i.e. having no Anunaya, like a magician for the things made by him magically); (iv) Practises the six paramitas purified in three ways of Trimanda Lavisuddha); (v) performs, and persuades other's to perform the ten kusala Karmapathas (moral duties) and thus establish all in the path leading to Buddhahood; (vi) exerts for realising the non-existence in reality of all things; (vii) comprehends the non-duality of thing and the all-pervasiveness of the Dharmadhatu, and so on, until he reaches the Tathagatabhumi after realising the absence of difference between things constituted and unconstituted (Karika, ch. viii, J.A. 1913. pp. 599, 600). In short, the Karika wants to say that the whole course of life of a Bodhisattva, extending through incalculable births is nothing but the Nirmanakaya, a thing not separate from the Dharmakaya, as in fact, according to the Mahayana philosophy, all creations are neither the same as, nor different from the Dharmadhatu.

The Lankavatara explains the relation of Nirmanakaya to Dharmakaya in the same way as the Karika. It states that Nirmitabuddhas are not produced by actions; the Tathagata is neither in them nor outside them (sarve hinirmita buddha na karmaprabhava na tesu tathagato na canyatratebhyatathagata) (Lanka. P.242, Ibid, P.73, Ibid,P.2no. Ibid,P.242, Ibid,P.57). It is only when the sons of the Jina

realise the visible world to have no existence apart from the citta that they obtain, the Nirmanakaya is free from Kriya and Samskara, and endowed with Bala, Abhijna and Vasita. Like the Siddhi, it says that the Tathagatas, by creating Nirmanakaya, perform the various duties of a Tathagata (Tathagata Krtya). It also gives an interesting information that Vajrapani had serves as an attendant on the Nirmitanirmana Buddhas, and not on the real Buddha. And that the function of such a Buddha is to preach and explain the characteristics of Dana, Sila,Dhyana, Samadhi, Citta, Prajna, Jnana, Skandha, Dhatu, Ayatana, Vimoksa, and Vijnana.

Sambhogakaya:- We have seen that the Rupakaya or Nirmanakaya was meant for the Sravakas, Pratyeka Buddhas, Prthagjanas and Bodhisattvas, who were not in one of ten Bhumis. So another kaya had to be devised which should be very suitable kaya for the benefit of all Bodhisattvas. This is called Parasambhogakaya, as distinguished from Svasmbhogakaya,a similar subtle body perceived by the Buddhas alone. It is this Parasambhogakaya, which plays the role of a preacher of the various Mahayana sutras being delivered either at Grdhrakuta, the only place in the three dhatus considered pure and suitable for the appearance of a Sambhogakaya, or at the Sukhavativyuha, or at one of the heavens. It will be observed from the description of the appearance of the Buddha and his manner of preaching the sutras that the Mahayanist were not yet able to forget or rise above the human conception of the Buddha of the Hinayanists.

They still gave Sakayamuni the role of the presiding Buddha of the universe, to whom flocked reverently with flower, incense, etc, all the Bodhisattvas, Sravakas and Grhapatis of the various lokadhatus of the ten directions, to hear from him the Prajna Paramita, the Saddharma Pundarika, or the Gandhavyuha.

These Bodhisattvas again had their own tutelary Buddhas, who according to the Mahayana metaphysics, possessed the same Dharmakaya as that of Sakyamuni. They also came or were sometimes sent by their Buddhas, with message of greetings and flowers as tokens of their regard to Sakyamuni Buddha, whose Buddhaksetra was then the Sahalokadhatu. Sometimes the descriptions go so far as to say that the Buddhas themselves came to hear discourse from Sakyamuni Buddha and the concourse of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas became so great that the Saha Lokadhatu had to be cleared of all oceans, mountains, seas, rivers, and cities as well as of gods, men and other beings. As we read in the Hinayana texts that monks used to come to meet Buddha, bringing with them one or two Samaneras, so also we read in the Saddharma Pundarika that on account of insufficiency of space the countless Buddhas could not have with them more than one or two Bodhisattvas as attendants (Upasthapakas, sad.p.pp.244-245).

Now let us see what was their conception of the Kaya of this Buddha. According to the Satasahasrika and the Pancavimsatisahasrika, (Sata pp.8-29, Panca, pp.6ff, Samadi rajasutra B.t.S.ed,p.. 10), it is an exceedingly refulgent body, from

every pore of which streamed forth countless brilliant rays of light, illuminating the Lokhadatus as innumerable rays of light issued forth from it, and on each ray of light was found a lotus of thousand petals on which was seated a Tathagata Vigraha (an image of the Tathagata, a sort of Nirmanakaya), preaching to Bodhisattvas, Grhasthas (householders), Pravarajitas (recluses) and other the dharma consisting of the six Paramitas.

After a Simhavikridita Samadhi his body illuminated the Trisahasra Mahasahasra Lokadhatu just as the bright clear sun or the full moon illuminates the World. The Buddha then showed his prakrtyatmabhava (real form) to all the Worlds. The several classes of gods as well as the men of the four continents, Jambudvipa, Aparagodana, etc. saw this Prakrtyatmabhava and thought that the Tathagata was sitting before them and preaching the doctrine. From this body again issue forth some rays of light, by which all beings of all Lokadhatus saw Sakyamuni Buddha Preaching the Prajnaparamita to his Sangha of monks and congregation of Bodhisattvas. Though this conception of the refulgent body of that Buddha had found currency in the prajnaparamitas, the expression Sambhogakaya was still unknown to them.

It was usually called by them as Prakrtyamabhava (natural body) or Asecanakaatmabhava (all-diffusing body). As a matter of fact, the Astasasrika is not even aware of the Prakrtyatmabhava or Ascanakaatmabhava, showing clearly its priority to the other Prajnaparamitas. It speaks only of Rupakaya and Dharmakaya, (Asta, pp.338, 497,513), and the long glorious description of Buddhakaya, which appears in the Sata and Pancavimsati-Sahasrika as Nidana, is totally absent from it. It is only in the recast version of the Pancavimsati that the expression Sambhogikakaya was introduced by way of giving a gist of the topic, (Panca, A.S.B Ms, Leaf, 359a; Iti Sambhogika-Kaya). In it the Sambhogakaya is described thus:- "Bodhisattvas, after attaining bodhi by means of the Prajnaparamita, take a body endowed with thirty-two major and eighty minor signs with a view to preach the doctrines of Mahayana to the Bodhisattvas and at the same time to arouse in their minds joy, delight and love for the excellent dharma ". The original Prajnaparamita regarded this refulgent Kaya as Nirmita (created) and as such it included in it Rupakaya and did not feel the necessity of introducing the conception of a third kaya, the Sambhogika. Acharya Nagarjuna was interested in giving an exposition of the real Kaya (i.e. Dharmakaya or Svabhavakaya only). To him the distinction of Sambhogakaya and Rupakaya was unimportant, as both of them were unreal (Eastern Buddhist, 11pp. 17ff,). The rupa of both the Sambbhogakaya is exceedingly subtle and expansive without limit, yet it is Sapratigha (possessed of the quality of obstruction). Nevertheless, the subtle bodies of countless Buddhas are interpretable . The recast version of the Pancavimsatti, (Panca ASB MS, Leaf 359 a, cf Siksa. p. 159, Bodhic pp. 1.4,

Mtu, iii pp, 344, 452), refers to the Sambhogakaya , and does not, like the karika, distinguish between Dharmakaya (Svasambhoga) and Parasambhogakaya, the reason being that in the original version of the Pancavimsatti, there must have been, as in the other Prajnaparamitas, the conceptions of only two kayas, and not of three or four . The Karika in fact, supports the Siddhi in regard to the conception of kaya by using only somewhat different names. The conception of the Svasambhogakaya shows a tendency of the Yogacara school to posit something like the Isvara of the Upanishads behind the Phenomenal universe. The Dharmakaya corresponds to the impersonal absolute of the Vedanta of the Brahman, and the Sambhogakaya to the Isvara when Brahman assumes name and form. Every Buddha, it should however, be noted has his own Sambhogakaya but all Buddhas have one Dharmakaya. The Lankavatara also gives hints to this effect. It says that Abhara (absence of anything) is not Tathagata and again, as Tathagata is described as "Anutpada-anirodha", it has some meaning. It then describes the Manomaya-dharmakaya (For the definition of Manomaya Kaya and its three subdivisions see Lanka, p. 81, Suzuki, E.B. iv. pp 284-5).

It cannot be seen by the non-Buddhists, Sravakas, Pratyeka-Buddhas and even Bodhisattvas in one of the first seven bhumis. Just as different names of one things or one person like Hasta, Kara, Pani or Indra, Sakra, Purandara indicate different aspects of the same thing, so also the different name of Sakyamuni Buddha in the Sahalokadhatu, eg. Svayambhu, Nayaka, Trsabha, Visnu, Isvara, Pradhana, Kapila, Soma, Bhaskara, Rama, Vyasa or Sunyata, Tathata, Bhutakoti, Nirvana, Sarvajna, etc., indicate the different aspects of Sakyamuni Buddha (Lanka, pp. 192-3, ef Dasa p. 55). People being subjected to the conceptions of two extremes "is" or "is not" (Dvayantapatitaya) do not know that Buddha is like a reflection of the moon on water which neither appears nor disappears. In this passage there is a clear hint that this Manomaya Dharmakaya, existing in the Saha Lokadhatu, is the same as the Svasambhogakaya or the Siddhi and the Asecanka-atmabhava or Prakrtyatmabhava of the Prajnaparamitas and it corresponds to the Upanisadic conception of Isvara.

Dharmakaya: The three Kayas of which we have so far spoken, belong strictly to the realm of Samvrti, worldly and transcendental and as such they were treated as Rupa or Nirmanakaya by the early Mahayanists including Nagarjuna. The only real Kaya of Buddha is the reality as conceived by the Mahayanists, and is not different from the things or beings of Universe (In a Buddhist inscription of Battambang, a stanza in salutation of Buddha brings out this idea, see le Museon, vol. vii). Though an attempt to define it by the current words and expressions is bound to be not only incorrect but misleading, the Mahayanic texts however tried to give an idea of it as far as the language permitted. The Karika and the Siddhi call it Svabhavika or Svabhavakaya. It is according to them, immeasurable and illimit-

able. It fills all space. It is the basis of the Sambhoga and Nirmanakaya. It is devoid of all marks (i.e. Mahapurusalaksanas) and is inexpressible (Nisprapanca). It is possessed of eternal, real and unlimited Gunas. It has neither Citta nor Rupa and again Dharmakaya Buddhas may have their individual Sambhogakayas but they have all one Dharmakaya, (c.f. vis. M.P. 508:Nirvana is one for all Buddhas). It can only be realised within one's own self (Pratyamavedya) and cannot be described, for that would be like the attempt of a blind man to describe the sun, which he has never seen (Masuda, op. cit. p. 59,- Suzuki, Awakening of Faith, p. 62). It is often questioned whether the conception of Dharmakaya can be traced in the Prajnaparamitas, and in the works of Nagarjuna, and whether the Prajnaparamitas and the works of Nagarjuna admit of such a reality or rather preach only pure and simple negativism. To put it in another way, was it the object of the Prajnaparamitas and Nagarjunas works to point out only the incongruities of the world and worldly knowledge and avoid making any statement about the reality or the truth.

The Astasahasrika and other Prajnaparamitas though unrelenting in their negation of every possible statement about the reality, never assert that Tathata or Sunyata or Dharmakaya in its real sense is also non-existing. The statements like "Tathatavikara nirvikaravikalpa nirvikalpa", (Suchness is immutable, inchangeable, beyond concept and distinctions) show rather a positive conception of the Reality than a purely negative one(Asta, p. 307, cf, the passage :-Ya ca tathata ekaivaisa tathata dvaya, dvidhikara dvyata thata na Kavacit tathata Yatah sa na Kasyacita tathata tatah sa tathata dvaya'dvaidhi Karavayata thata. That which is Tasthagata- tatha ta and that which is all things Tathata are non-dual, one and the same. Tathata is neither anywhere nor arises from anywhere, nor belongs to anything , hence as Tathata does not belong to anybody, it is non-dual and one. For other passage of similar import, see M.Vr.Ch xxii). In regard to the Dharmakaya also the Astasahasrika makes similar statements. It says that he who knows that the dharmas, existing in the world or preached by the Tathagata, have no more existence than things seen in a dream and does not enquire when the Tathagata comes and where he goes or realises the tathagata through dharma, (ASTA. p. 514 the dharmatcaya tathagatam prajnati, cf. m. Vr. p. 448 dharmato buddha drastavyah). The Buddhakaya, that people speak of, arises through cause and condition like the sound of flute; it involves really no appearance or disappearance,. Those, who run after the form and voice of the Tathagata and conceive of his appearance and disappearance are far from the Truth (Asta. p. 513). No further statements than this can be made about the reality, for that would be again Prapanca. When the Astasahasrika asserts that the Tathagata does not exist, it refers to that Tathagata as conceived by one on reading the Mahayana texts. Even the Bodhisattvas, unless and until they reach the tenth bhumi, cannot extricate themselves from a concep-

tion of the Tathagatakaya, however, subtle it may be(eg. the Svasambhogakaya). They are still under a delusion and it is this delusion that the Prajnaparamitas endeavour to remove by asserting that there is no Tathagata.

Nagarjuna by denying the existence of a so-called Tathagata does nothing more than what the Prajnaparamitas endeavour to establish. His point is that, if Bhvasantati (series of existence) be admitted then the existence of a tathagata should also be admitted for the Tathagata represents the ultimate state of this Bhavasantati. There is also no Tathagata of a being who is supposed to have become a Tathagata after practising Mahakaruna and other virtues of attaining omniscience. If the Tathagata had really existed, he would either be the same as five Skandhas or different from them, or the Skandhas would be in him or he in the Skandhas, but as he is none of these nor anyone of these is he, he cannot have any real existence.

By these and other similar arguments Nagarjuna asserts that there is no Tathagata. By such denial he only establishes that the Tathagata as the ultimate state of Bhavasantati does not exist, (Tathagato nihsvabhaavastat svabhavam idam jagat, Tathagato nihsvahavam-nihsvabhavam idam jagat).

Candrakirti, in support of Nagarjuna's arguments, quotes a passage from the Astasahasrika (p.472) in which Buddha and his dharma are compared to Maya or Svapna, but at the same time he says that they do not assert the nonexistence (Nastitva) of the Tathagata in every way, for then they would be guilty of Apavada (denial) and yet being desirous of describing the Tathagata by means of Vyavaharasatya (conventionally) and by taking recourse to super-impositions (Samaropa) they say that he is Sunya or Asunya, Sunyasunya or Naiva Sunya Nasunya. But he who endeavours to realise the true Tathagata by having recourse to statements and denial will never know him. Candrakirti, in support of the above, quotes the verses from the Vajrachedika, to which the Astasahasrika as well as the Bodhicaryava-tara (p. 42) refers to viz "he who endeavoured to see me through my form and voice could not see me because : dharmato buddha drastavya dharmakaya he nayakah, dharmata capy avijneyana sa sakya vijanitum. A Buddha is to be seen in the sense of dharmato (nature of dharmas), for the leaders (of men) have only Dharmakaya. That dharmata is unknownable so also is the Tathagata, (Vr. p. 448, cf. Asta, pp. 513-514, vajra, p. p.43). Nagarjuna concludes his examination of the Tathagata kaya by identifying Tathagata with the world (Jagat), (Tathagato yatsvabhavstat svabhavamidamjagat), or nature itself and asserting that the Tathagata, whom people or even Bodhisattvas have in view, is only a Bimba (image) of Kusala dharmas and is not the real Tathata or Tathagata, (m,Vr, pp. 448-9). A dialectician like Nagarjuna cannot go further than this to establish the reality, it is by denial of the existence of unreal things, including the so called Tathagata, that he points towards the reality-the real Tathagata kaya, the Dharmakaya

(Prapancayantiye buddham prapancatitamavyayam, Te prapancahatah sarvenepasyante-Tathagatam. M. Vr, p. 534).

The conception of Dharmakaya was of special interest to the Yogacarins. The Lankavatara, pp. 57, 60, in describing it, says that (Dharmata) Buddha is without any substratum (Niralamba) and lies beyond the range of functioning of the organs of sense, proofs or signs and hence beyond the vision of Sravakas, Pratyeka Buddhas or the non-Mahayanists. It is to be realised only within one's own self. The Sutralankara sutra, p. 45, calls it Svabhavika dharmayakaya. It is one and the same kaya in all Buddhas, very subtle, unknownable and eternal.

The Trimsika, p. 44, explains the Dharmakaya as the transformed Asraya (substratum)-the alayavijnana-the transformation being effected by knowledge (Jnana) and the suppression of the two evils (Dausthulyas), viz, Klesavarana and Jheyavarana. The Aloka on the Abhisamayalankara Karika also explains the Dharmakaya in the similar way. According to it, there are two kinds of Dharmakaya, one being the Bodhipaksika and the other dharmas, which are themselves pure and productive of clear knowledge (nisprapancajnanatmana) and other the transformed Asraya of the same, which is then called Svabhavakaya. Professor Stcherbatsky, con of N.P. 185 n, supplies us with nearly the same information that we find in the Aloka of some sources which he does not mention. He says that "according to the early Yogacaras, the Dharmakaya is divided into Svabhavakaya and Jhanakaya of which the first is the motionless (Nitya) substance of the universe and the second is Anitya i.e., changing , living." Evidently, what the Professor means by Jhanakaya is the Dharmakaya, consisting of the Bodhipaksika and other dharmas of the Aloka. That the Svabhavakaya is the Nityakaya, as pointed out by him, is also supported by the Suvarnaprabhasa and other texts, (Suvarnaprabhasa B.T. S.P. 8, lanka, p. 78, Sutra, p. 46). The Chinese commentators on the Siddha state that Dharmakaya is the mataphysical principle of real Citta and Rupa of the Tathagata. It is the real nature of things, and can be equated with Tathata. Dharmadhatu or Tathagatagarbha, (Lanka, pp. 77,78). The goal of Bodhisattvas is to realise the Dharmakaya. Every being has the Dharmakaya, or the Dharmakaya comprises all beings of the World, but as they are blinded by Avidya, they do not realise this fact. What the Bodhisattva aims at is the removal of this Avidya and the realisation of the fact that he is the same as the Dharmakaya. The Aloka on the Karika enumerates the steps through which Bodhisattva passes and points out that the last step of a Bodhisattva is to realise the Dharmakaya (Dharmakayabhisambodhena bhavi syati), after which it becomes easy for him to assume any one of the four kayas. In the Lankavatara we notice that Mahamati is anxious to know how are Bodhisattvas, after completing the ten bhumis, can attain the Tathagatakaya or Dharmakaya and go to any one of the Buddhaksetras or heavens. The Lankavatara also describes in rosy colours the prospect of attain-

ing the Mahadharmamegha of the ninth bhumi, who is adorned with many jewels, and sits on a lotus in a jewelled palace surrounded by Bodhisattvas of his status. He comprehends there the illusory nature of all things. He is anointed (Abhiseka) by Vajrapani and a son of Buddha. He then goes beyond the bhumi of Buddhasutas by realising within himself the Dharma Nairatmaya and confronts the Dharmakaya (Lanka, pp. 51, 70). The Trimsika says that just as Vimuktikaya is the goal of the Arhats, so Dharmaklya is the goal of the Bodhidattvas. It shows that as the Arhats by getting rid of Klesavarana obtain a purified kaya, so also a Buddha by getting rid of both Klesavarana and Jheyavarana obtains the Dharmakaya (Trimsika, p. 44). The world of experience is phenomenal. It may be compared to a magical illusion or dream. In the Astasahasrika Prajnaparamita (R. Mitra's edition p. 39) the following passage appears:-

Ayusman Subhutih tan devaputran etad avocat. mayapamas te Sattvah. Svapnopamas te Sattvah Iti he mayaca Sattcas ca advaya advidhikara. Evam Sakrdagamim pi arhattam pi Samyaksambuddham pi mayopama Svapnopamah. Ayusman Subhuti said to the Devaputras that all worldly beings are illusion or dream. Illusion and worldly beings are one and the same. It should be noted that not only worldly beings but also saints like the Once-returners (Sakrdagami) and the perfect Arhat and even the worldly figure of Gautama Buddha are illusion or dream. The absolute, i.e. the Dharmakaya of Buddha, is indescribable. It is the only reality that Buddha realised at Bodhgaya. All things of the world has three aspects: viz, (i) quintessence, (ii) attributes and (iii) activity. Take for instance, an earthen jar. It is subject to origination and disintegration, while the earth is indestructible, i.e. unconditioned. Another simile may be useful. Take for instance, an ocean and the waves of the ocean. The latter may be high or low, according to the force of wind of ignorance but the water of the ocean, neither increases nor decreases. It is unfathomable and immeasurable , i.e. unconditioned . The whole Universe has two aspects, i.e. changed and unchanged. The latter is known as the Bhuta-tathata, the absolute. It persists through all space and time as the basis of all, and as the universal and eternal substratum. It corresponds to the conception of Brahman of the Upanisads. This is identical with the Dharmakaya of Buddha. Dharma is the supreme principle of life. Adi-Buddha happens to be the first conception of the personification of Dharma. It is a metaphysical conception. It is not in active touch with the world.

The leaders of men possess true body or nature, which is unknownable. It cannot be known except within one's own self (Pratyatmavedya). In the Astasahasrika-Prajnaparamita (R. mitra's ed. p. 94) appears the following passage:- Makhalu imam bhiksavah satkayam kayam manyadhvam. Dharmakaya Parinispattito mam bhiksavo draks yanti : O monks, you should not think that this individual body is my body. O monks, you should see me from the accomplish-

ment of the Dharma body.

The Tathagatas cannot be seen in his form (rupa) i.e., material body. The Dharma bodies are the Tathagatas. There is no coming or going of Dharmata. Similarly, there is no coming or going of the Tathagatas. A sleeping man might see in his dream one Tathagata or two or three or upto one thousand or still more. On waking up, he would however, no longer see even one Tathagata or two or three or upto thousand or still more. These Tthagata do not come from anywhere nor go to anywhere. They are eternal and ever existing, (Ast. prajnapa p, 513). Buddha appears in this world with high intelligence and unlimited amity (maitri) and compassion (karuna) to rescue beings from their lives of misery on account of birth and death. In the saddharma-pundarika, (ch.III) appears an episode as to the ways and means (Upaya-kausalya-paramita) adopted by the Buddha. In fact, all the four Yanas were of one nature and the Buddha could not have told a lie by taking recourse to the expedients (Upaya-kausalya) of teaching his dharma in different ways, viz., Sravakayana, Pratyeka buddhayana and Bodhisattvayana.

Buddhahood, which fulfils the needs of others by manifesting itself to them, does not do so through the congnitive norm, the Dharma Kaya, but through the two operational ones, the Sambhogakaya and Nirmanakaya. In this respect the philosophical conviction of all Mahayanists, that the realization of the cognitive norm through intelligent appreciative of discrimination which intuitively apprehends the profound nature (nothingness) of all, i.e., the realization of the two operational norms, comes through unbounded activity and that insight and action must forever work together because they are unable to effect anything if they are divorced from each other. Intelligence which apprehends the profound nature of all that is, is the same in Mantrayana as it is in the two lower courses (Hinayana and Paramitayana), because without understanding existentiality it is impossible to cross the ocean of Samsara by exhausting our emotional reactions. Therefore, the special and prominent feature of the Mahayana path is the instrumentality of the two operational norms which manifest themselves to the prepared and serve as a protective guidance to sentient beings as long as Samsara lasts. Although, the followers of the Paramitayana attend to an inner course that corresponds to the ultimate cognitive norm by conceiving the nature of all that is beyond the judgements of reason and not existing in truth, they however have no such course of Mantrayana which is abound in operational modes. Therefore, because there is a great difference in the main feature of the path, the realization of operational norms for the sake of others is therefore divided into two courses. While the division into Hinayana and Mahayana is due to the means employed and not because of a difference in nature of intelligence through which nothingness is apprehended, the division of the Mahayana into Paramitayana and Mantrayana also is not due to a difference in the discriminative acumen which understands the

profound nature of all that is, but because of the techniques employed. The differentiating quality is the realization of operational norms and the transfigurational techniques which effects the realization of these norms is superior to all other techniques used in the other courses. From this it follows that the combination of Paramitayana and Mantrayana is more effective than any course pursued alone, although each course has its goal achievement . It has been said that one is liberated from Samsara when one knows properly both the Mantrayana and Paramitayana methods.Common to both is the idea that, failing to understand the nature of mind as not existing as a self, and by believing it to be a self, all other emotional upsets are generated, and through them, in turn, Karmic action are performed, and because of these actions they roams about in Samsara. The contemplation of nothingness in the first stage is a most important factor. Once the developing stage has become a stable experience and the necessary preliminary experience is present, the fulfilment stage can be entered upon. This passes through five steps, each of which is a purely psychological process even if it is described in terms of physical locations. After detachment from the preoccupation with the body has been established the first step (i) is one of an awareness of motive which is the cradle of cognizable mind. From this awareness develops an experience (ii) which is likened to an emptying of the mind and which is in itself not determined at all. It is not just nothing, but an intensive mode of existing and acting, which underlies all actual cognition. When it achieves determination, its objective pole (iii) is of the nature of an apparitional being, while its subjective pole (iv) is the cognition of its nothingness. The last step (v) is the unity of apparitional existence and nothingness. It is a means to realize Buddhahood which is the most sublime idea man can have of man.

"With Metta".