

PUSPA NIYOGI

**Buddhist Scholars of Ancient Bengal**

Part One

Bengal produced in the past many renowned writers and scholars in the field of Buddhist religion, philosophy and literature 'who by their learning receive respect above gods and men serving under the Buddha and promoting His doctrine... Of such persons in every generation only one or two appear'<sup>1</sup>. Their alleged Bengali origin in some cases may be doubted but most of them are the worthy sons of the soil. Their greatness is reflected in their own contributions and characters. Not only the Indians but also foreign writers had the greatest respect for their sterling qualities of heart and mind. It is stated 'None of these great teachers was lacking in any of these kind of qualities (virtues)... secular or sacred. The men free from covetousness, and practising self-content, lived matchless lives. Men of such character have scarcely been found among the heretics or other people'<sup>2</sup>. These devoted scholars studied and worked in the Monastic universities of Bengal and Bihar. Our information about them being mostly derived from the accounts left by the Chinese Pilgrims, Cordier's Catalogue (*Bstan-hgyur*, I - LXX), the works of Tāranātha, the Pag Sam Jon Zang, and indigenous literary works.

Unfortunately for lack of necessary details, specially with regard to dates, it is impossible to present a systematic account of their lives, works, and personal history. Many of the texts attributed to them are still not available. Names of authors are often given in a confused manner; sometimes scholars bearing the same name but belonging to different periods are not clearly differentiated, so the question of authorship in a good number of cases remain controversial. Despite these handicaps, an attempt is being made to review broadly the career and achievements of the more prominent scholars and authors whose names are well known

---

<sup>1</sup> Takakusu, 181.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

in the Buddhist world. Their study is essential for a better understanding of the subject.

### CANDRAGOMIN

Candragomin, a scholar of great renown was a keen and critical student. He is the earliest known Buddhist writer on grammar, being the founder of the Candra School of Grammar<sup>3</sup>. He was born in Varendra in North Bengal in a Kṣatriya family<sup>4</sup>. Tāranātha records an interesting story about his birth and previous life. It is said that in his former life he was a *paṇḍita* living in Varendra and entered 'into a debate with a *tīrthika Lokāyata* teacher and defeated him'<sup>5</sup>. But the *tīrthika* denied it. This disheartened the *paṇḍita* and he embraced death. He was afterwards reborn as the son of Viśeṣaka, a scholar. For seven years after his birth he did not speak at the command of his mother. In the meantime the *tīrthika* rival composed a rather difficult book of verse, which was circulated amongst scholars. Viśeṣaka also got a copy of the same. But he could not understand its meaning. During his absence, his seven years old 'dumb' son, Candragomin, read the treatise which he fully understood and wrote verses criticising it. To his great surprise the father learnt about Candragomin's superiority of grasping the difficult verses at the age of seven only, so he organised a debate between Candragomin and the *tīrthika* in which the latter was defeated. Candragomin was well rewarded. He is supposed to have earned fame by having learnt the fundamentals of grammar, logic and other branches of knowledge by himself. He had the privilege of studying Buddhist texts such as the Abhidharmapiṭaka from his revered *guru* Sthiramati. He also received instructions from a Vidyādhārācārya named Aśoka; he attained *siddhi* in magic spells and had direct vision of Ārya Avalokiteśvara and Tārā<sup>6</sup>. Besides his immortal work on grammar he composed works on drama, religious-*kāvya*, treatises on medicine, fine arts, stotras on Tārā and Mañjuśrī, etc. In short, his learning was vast.

<sup>3</sup> Candra-vyākaraṇa-sūtra-nama by mahācārya Candragominapāda - Tg. mDo CXVI; HIL, 121-23; Tār., 203; Sumpā, xci, 82, 95, 139; Bu-ston, II, 13; JASB, NS, III, 221-22; IA, IX, 178; 'The teacher Candragomin was born in the east, in Bengal, whilst a youth, became greatly learned', Bu-ston, II, 132.

<sup>4</sup> Tār., 199 ff.; Cordier, Deuxième Partie, 302 - 'Inhabited Barendi in Eastern India'; Sumpā, xci, 95, 139 - 'Born in Varendra in Baṅgala'. Macdonell thinks that Kashmir was the native land of Candragomin but this may not be accepted may have been due to Kalhaṇa's misrepresentation. (IA, 1093, 376).

<sup>5</sup> Tār., 199 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Tār., 201.

Being a Buddhist he was a devotee of the Buddhist God Avalokiteśvara and Goddess Tārā. He was married to princess Tārā, daughter of a king of Varendra. He travelled widely in India. We are told that he lived at Candradvīpa for some time, where he established stone-images of Avalokiteśvara and Tārā; next he visited Ceylon and South India, where he wrote his famous grammar; lastly he came to Nālandā and met Candrakīrti.

### *Candra-vyākaraṇa*

Candragomin is the author of the famous treatise entitled Candra-vyākaraṇa. During his stay in South India he wrote his grammar. Tāranātha gives a story how the Candra-vyākaraṇa was completed. In the temple of *Brāhmaṇa* Vararuci, Candragomin saw Vararuci listening to grammar from the Nāga and also comments on Pāṇini's grammar. Thereafter he himself composed a commentary on the same grammar, which came to be called after his name as Candra-vyākaraṇa <sup>7</sup>.

The Candra-vyākaraṇa exercised a profound influence on the development of the later system of Sanskrit grammar. This grammar was extensively used in India and outside, and appreciated in Kashmir, Nepal, Tibet and Ceylon. It is not just a copy of Pāṇini but is original to a considerable extent, being a 'recast of and improvement upon the rules of Pāṇini' <sup>8</sup>. A special characteristic of Candra's grammar is that 'while it retains the most artificial terms of Pāṇini's grammar... it discards a large number of other terms, many of which have been adopted even by European grammarians ...' <sup>9</sup>. It may be noted that he omitted Pāṇinian rules about Vedic grammar. In fact, his object of writing a new grammar was to free it from the traditional Brahmanical elements <sup>10</sup>. In the matter of Dhātupāṭha he includes Vedic roots and follows Pāṇini in many respects but some novelty in the classification of verbs <sup>11</sup>. The Candra-vyākaraṇa consists of six chapters of four sections (*pādas*) each; the total number of Candra sūtras is about three thousand one hundred... It is interesting to note 'the matter of Pāṇini's first two chapters being scattered all through...' his great works <sup>12</sup>. The nature of Candragomin's grammar was meant 'as an improvement on that of Pāṇini, Kātyayana and Patañjali, mainly in the

<sup>7</sup> Tār., 202-208.

<sup>8</sup> HB, 299.

<sup>9</sup> IA, XV, 184.

<sup>10</sup> Belvalkar, 35.

<sup>11</sup> The Dhātupāṭha of Kātantra, is as Liebich shows, an adoption of the modified versions of the Candra-system which because of its close dependance on Pāṇini, ultimately loses its importance in the later history of Sanskrit Grammar - S. K. De, HB, 299-300.

<sup>12</sup> Belvalkar, 59-60.

way of greater brevity and precision... and the purpose of Candragomin was to 'rearrange the grammatical material with the object of bringing together all the rules that deal with the same phonetic or grammatical operations as well as the same part of speech...' <sup>13</sup>. The Candra-vyākaraṇa is supplemented by a Unāḍī list in three parts; a Dhāṭupāṭha in ten sections <sup>14</sup>, also Liṅgakarikās or Liṅgānerśāsana, Gaṇapāṭha, Upasarga-vṛitti and Varṇa-sūtras' <sup>15</sup>. Candragomin was not satisfied with his own famous work. Tāranātha records a story about Candragomin's reaction after seeing another grammar entitled Samantabhadra, attributed to Candrakīrti, which is lost <sup>16</sup>. It is said that while Candragomin was in Nālandā he came across an excellent grammar entitled Samantabhadra. As a fretful scholar he appreciated Samantabhadra so much that he thought that his own contribution on grammar was inferior to it and hence wanted to destroy it. He threw it into a well at Nālandā but soon he heard the goddess Tārā telling him, 'you worked this with the noble intention of causing welfare to the living beings. In the future it will be immensely useful for the intelligent living beings... so you take out your book from the well'. Candragomin obeyed the order. The well came to be called 'Candrakūpa' i.e. Candra's well. Thus the great work was saved <sup>17</sup>.

### Commentaries

According to Liebich Candragomin wrote a commentary on his own grammar. Dharmadāsa also wrote a commentary on the same grammar <sup>18</sup>. Besides, there were many other commentaries. There is no doubt that the grammar and the commentaries were very popular... 'a good many of them have been translated and freely circulated in Tibet at least since 1000 A.D... Some of these works have also gone to Ceylon along with other Buddhist texts...' <sup>19</sup>. The Candra-vyākaraṇa has made Candragomin famous but the system he introduced seems to have gone out of vogue. Explanations have been offered by some scholars regarding this. According to them the first cause is that the work is not original and secondly, being a Buddhist, it shared the fate of Buddhism' <sup>20</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> Belvalkar, 59-60.

<sup>14</sup> Both published by Liebich.

<sup>15</sup> Belvalkar, 59-60.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Bu-ston, II, 133; Tār., 206.

<sup>17</sup> Tār., 206; Sumpā, xci, 96.

<sup>18</sup> Ed., Liebich, Zur Einführung, part IV, of Liebeck - Analyses des Candra-vṛitti; Belvalkar, 61-62.

<sup>19</sup> Belvalkar, 61-62.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

### Other Works

Candragomin wrote a Buddhist drama called Lokānanda<sup>21</sup> relating the story of a certain Mañicūḍa who gave away his wife and children to a Brahmin in a spirit of generosity. The drama is based on a Jātaka story consisting of four acts and a prologue. His third composition is a religious *kāvya* entitled Śiṣya-lekha-dharma<sup>22</sup> in the form of a letter addressed to Prince Ratnakīrti, an ordained pupil of Candragomin. He later renounced ordination. The cause of this is given differently by Vairocana-mitra<sup>23</sup> and Prajñākaramati<sup>24</sup>. According to the former when Prince Ratnakīrti was about to ascend the throne Candragomin sent the letter to him. Secondly, it is held by Prajñākaramati, Ratnakīrti gave up ordination to marry a princess. When Candragomin heard about it, he wrote the letter. The text contains one hundred and fourteen verses in different metres. In this work Buddhist doctrines are given in refined *kāvya* style.

Candragomin's original contributions are confined to his work on sūtras<sup>25</sup>. These have been used by Kāśikā without acknowledgement. A work on logic entitled Nyāya-āloka-siddhi (a lamp of logical demonstration) was composed by one Candragomin. But this author was, according to some, different from our Candragomin. It was translated into Tibetan by *paṇḍit* Śrī-Sitāprabhu and the interpreter-monk Vairocana. The original in Sanskrit is lost<sup>26</sup>. Candragomin's writing also included Stotras on Tārā and Mañjuśrī<sup>27</sup> and some *sādhanas*. The Bstan-ḥgyur knows a Candragomin who wrote more than sixty books; these works are mostly Tantric treatises and Stotras on Tārā<sup>28</sup>.

### Candragomin and Tārā

Candragomin's favourite deities were Avalokiteśvara and Tārā. His devotion of Tārā became almost legendary. He is said to have married Tārā the daughter of a king of Varendra, whose identification is not known.

<sup>21</sup> We have got a Tibetan translation of this drama in Bstan-ḥgyur; Keith, Sanskrit Grammar, 168.

<sup>22</sup> Ed. I. P. Minayeff in Zapiski, IV, 29-52. A. Ivanowski: it is written to a prince named Ratnakīrti with an advice to abandon the world; Tg. mDo. xxxiii; cf. Tār., 209.

<sup>23</sup> Śiṣya-lekha-tippaṇa - Tibetan Tripiṭaka, Vol. 129, 227, last folio, line 4.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 78, first folio, line 4.

<sup>25</sup> Belvalkar, 59-60.

<sup>26</sup> JASB, NS, 1907, 245.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. S. C. Vidyabhusana, Introduction to Sarvajñamitra's Sragdharāstotra in Buddha-stotra-saṃgraha (Bibl. Ind., Cal. 1908, xx ff).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Tāranātha, 402.

As a dowry Candragomin received from the king a province as a gift<sup>29</sup>. He lived with her for sometime. Once, as the maid-servant was calling his wife 'Tārā' by name, it occurred to him that it was not proper that his wife and the tutelary deity (Tārā) should bear the same name. He asked (his wife) to forgive him, and made up his mind to leave his home. The king came to know about it, and ordered that in case he left his daughter he was to be thrown into the Ganges. Meanwhile the teacher addressed a prayer to Tārā, which gave him shelter in an island, as if by a miracle, in the middle of the Ganges... 'Up to this day' as the tradition says, the spot is known by the name where this happened 'the island of Candra' (i.e. Candradvīpa – Bakla in the Barisal district)<sup>30</sup>. It is interesting to note that the island Candradvīpa only contained villages but later it became a town. The villages were estimated to be seven hundred. Here Candragomin built some images of Avalokiteśvara and Tārā<sup>31</sup>. Another version of this story is that Candragomin after leaving his wife, Tārā, retired to a place on the other side of the Ganga, which came to be known as Candradvīpa after his name. Here he built temples of Tārā. A third story says that Candragomin having refused to marry the princess of Varendra named Tārā, its king became furious and kept him in prison on an island in Barisal. This island later came to be known by the name of Candradvīpa.<sup>32</sup> Before he joined Nālandā, Candragomin may have spent some years in Varendra. Legends may have been created to explain the origin of the geographical name 'Candradvīpa' a centre of worship of Tārā, associated with the name of its renowned devotee.

Tāranātha records another story about Candragomin's devotion to Tārā. Once an old woman went to Nālandā to Candrakīrti and begged money from him for the marriage of his daughter. Candrakīrti showed her the house of Candragomin. When he came to the house of Candragomin he had nothing except a 'set of robes' on him and a copy of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāparamitā. There was a picture of Tārā on the wall. Moved by her sight, Candragomin prayed to Tārā. It (the picture) became real Tārā, took off all the ornaments made of various jewels – inclusive of an invaluable gem – and gave all to the *ācārya*. Candragomin presented them to the old woman, consequently the image came to be known as Tārā without ornaments<sup>33</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> Tār., 201.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 201; cf. Bu-ston, II 132; Sumpā, xci. 95.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 202; Sumpā, xci, 95.

<sup>32</sup> SHAIB, 83, 89, 101; HIL, 334; Kaulajñāna-Nirṇaya, 1934, Introduction; cf. Sumpā, xci, 95.

<sup>33</sup> Tār., 208; cf. Roerich, Selected Works, 558.

Another story says how he was once saved from shipwreck while proceeding to Potala through prayers to Tārā. Śeṣa-nāga wanted to take revenge on Candragomin for his criticism, 'sent huge tidal waves in the sea and his ship was about to be wrecked. From inside the sea, came the voice: throw out Candragomin. Candragomin prayed to Tārā, the goddess with her attendants came flying on the back of a Garuḍa. The Nāgas fled in terror. The ship safely reached its destination<sup>34</sup>: It is said that Candragomin built hundred temples each for Tārā and Avalokiteśvara.

#### *Title 'Gomin'*

The word go-min affixed to his name and the homage paid by him to Sarvajña in his Maṅgala-sloke of the Vṛtti testifies to his attachment to Buddhism. Gomin means *upāsaka*<sup>35</sup>. According to Roerich, vows of Gomin mean 'abstaining from sexual life'<sup>36</sup>. S. K. Chatterjee equates the title 'gomin' with the modern Bengali surname 'gui'<sup>37</sup>. It is interesting to note that Candra-gomi is made equivalent to Candra Goswami<sup>38</sup>. It may be noted that 'Goswami' is one of the well known surnames of Bengal.

#### *Candragomin in South India*

Candragomin lived for sometime in South India and Ceylon. While staying at Ceylon (Sin-ga-la) he found that many people were suffering from leprosy. He saved them from the disease. He then built a temple of Ārya-simhadeva, preached the Mahāyāna doctrine and taught the people fine arts, medicine, etc. As the legend says, he built many centres of Mahāyāna with resources provided by the Yakṣa ruler of the island. His stay in the south is important because it was here that he produced his famous work on Candra-vyākaraṇa. It is mentioned in the Pag Sam Jon Zang that Candragomin visited Orissa. In the Dhana Śrīdvīpa he performed religious ceremonies in the great vihāra of Śrīdhānya Kaṭaka and established about one hundred chapels<sup>39</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> Tār., 208-209.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 202.

<sup>36</sup> BA, I, 297.

<sup>37</sup> HB, 298 n 5.

<sup>38</sup> Sumpā, xci, 95, 139.

<sup>39</sup> Tār., 209; cf. JASB, NS, III, 1907, 221-22.

*Candragomin and Nālandā*

Candragomin was intimately connected with the famous monastery of Nālandā and the great teacher Candrakīrti. He was a pupil of Sthiramati. It is said that the acquaintance of Candragomin with the Nālandā monastery initially was not very happy. When he first visited the monastery its priests failed to give him a hearty reception. This incurred Candrakīrti's displeasure; he wanted to teach the monks a lesson. Candrakīrti arranged a 'procession of priests' led by three chariots, with Candragomin in the first, an image of Mañjuśrī in the second, and himself in the third. The monks realised the impropriety of their conduct and hence offered all the honour and respect due to the great teacher and scholar. Candragomin is well remembered for his participation in the frequent discussions held at the great monastery at Nālandā. A different version of the same story is given by Tāranātha<sup>40</sup>. According to Tāranātha's story Candrakīrti knew Candragomin's name. Candrakīrti was preaching outside the boundary wall and Candragomin stood listening... on seeing him Candrakīrti had an occasion to be acquainted with him personally, and showed him great respect for his scholarship. Being a lay worshipper Candragomin complained that he could not have a direct access to Nālandā. He was advised by Candrakīrti to come along with the image of Mañjuśrī led in a procession which was fanned by Candrakīrti from the right and Candragomin from the left. The story says that Mañjuśrī's face was turned sideways as if he was talking to Candragomin. 'The people said, look! look! what the image is doing'<sup>41</sup>. This is the reason why Mañjuśrī is represented in the image with his neck turned towards the left. 'As the chariot failed to pull back, his chariot moved before that of Candrakīrti...' <sup>42</sup>. Thus according to this story, Candragomin was estimated higher than Candrakīrti. This was an insult for Candrakīrti, so he organised a debate between them which continued for seven years, when Candragomin was helped by Avalokiteśvara. Since then Candragomin stayed at Nālandā and preached his doctrine<sup>43</sup>.

Opinion differs on the question of his date. According to Minayeff<sup>44</sup> Candragomin lived as early as the beginning of the 5th century A.D.; N. Peri is inclined to place him in the second half of the 7th century A.D.<sup>45</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> Tār., 203 ff.

<sup>41</sup> Bu-ston, II, 133.

<sup>42</sup> Tār., 203 ff.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 203 ff.

<sup>44</sup> Liebech, Pāṇini, II.

<sup>45</sup> BEFEO, 1911, 388 n 2.



According to a Tibetan source he was a contemporary of Śīla mentioned as the son of Harṣavardhana. But we do not know whether Harṣavardhana had a son named Śīla<sup>46</sup>. Liebech is of the opinion that Candragomin flourished in the period between 465–544 A.D.<sup>47</sup>. This date is proposed on the basis of a supposed reference to a contemporary event cited in the *Sūtravṛtti*<sup>48</sup> which is taken to refer to the victory of the Guptas over the Hūṇas. Belvalkar<sup>49</sup> accepts in a general way the date put forward by Liebech and assigns him to c. 470 A.D. assuming that the victory over the Hūṇas mentioned in the text is to be credited to the Gupta king, Skandagupta. But the view that Jarta or Japta in the passage is a mistake for Gupta is disputed<sup>50</sup>. Some take Jarta as a Jat prince<sup>51</sup> or identify him with Yaśodharman who defeated the Hūṇas before 532 A. D.; S. Lévi, on the evidence of I-tsing, proposes to identify Candragomin with the great man named Candra, thus placing him sometime before I-tsing's visit to India i.e. 650 A. D.<sup>52</sup> Tāranātha suggests that Candrakīrti, Candragomin and *Ācārya* Dharmapāla were contemporaries<sup>53</sup>. Kielhorn shows that Jayāditya, the compiler of *Kāśikā-vṛtti* who died in c. 661 A.D. used the grammar of Candragomin, although he never mentioned it by name<sup>54</sup>. S. C. Vidya-bhusana suggests a still later date for him<sup>55</sup>. He may thus be placed any time between the 5th century and the 8th century A.D.

### Identification

There are some difficulties in regard to the identification of Candragomin in view of the fact that the same name may have been used by more than one scholar. Without entering into a minute discussion of the question of their identification, which cannot be solved definitely in the present context, it may be suggested that one Candragomin was the renowned Buddhist grammarian, was possibly a scholar who wrote several treatises

<sup>46</sup> Tār., Chapter XXIV.

<sup>47</sup> WZKM, XIII (1899), 308–15; Das Datum – Candragomin and Kalidāsa (Breslau); cf. Kṣīra-taraṅginī, 264 ff.

<sup>48</sup> The statement '*ajayad gupto*' (MS. jarto er japto) hūṇān – 1. 2. 81, p. 43.

<sup>49</sup> Belvalkar, Systems of Sanskrit Grammar, 58.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. HB, 97 n.

<sup>51</sup> Keith, History of Sanskrit Drama, 158.

<sup>52</sup> BEFEO, III, 1903, 38 ff.

<sup>53</sup> Tār., 209 ff; it may be noted that king Pañcasīmha was also their contemporary.

<sup>54</sup> IA, XV, 183 ff.

<sup>55</sup> HIL, 333 ff.

on various subjects. Besides, there was a philosopher Candragomin, author of the work Nyāya-siddhyā-loka and a Tantric author of the same name. I-tsing refers to a great man (*Mahāsattva*) and a scholar named Candra (or Candradāsa) who is compared to a Bodhisattva. He was alive when the pilgrim visited this country<sup>56</sup>. He composed songs on Viśvāntara (Sūdāna) which used to be recited to the accompaniment of dance. I-tsing mentions his lyrico-dramatic rendering of the Vessantara Jātaka. He says that 'The *Mahāsattva Candra (Kandra)*, a learned man of Eastern India', composed a lyric poem about the Prince Viśvāntara till then known as Sudāna, 'and people all sing and dance to it throughout the five countries of India'. This is undoubtedly an evidence of its great popularity in North India. The identification of Mahāsattva Candra or Candradāsa with the grammarian Candragomin has been refuted by Liebech<sup>57</sup>.

Again, Kalhaṇa refers to one Candrācārya and his work on grammar. He places him under king Abhimanyu of Kashmir (3rd century A.D.)<sup>58</sup>. In his book he criticises the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. This is also recorded in the Pag Sam Jon Zang<sup>59</sup>. Bhartṛhari in his Vākyapadīya refers to one Candrācārya<sup>60</sup>. S. C. Vidyabhusana makes a distinction between Candragomin the senior, the author of Candravyākaraṇa and the junior Candragomin, whose preceptor was Ārya Aśoka (c. A.D. 950). Vidyabhusana holds that Candragomin the logician was different from both. There seems to be no doubt that there was one Candragomin who enjoyed a great reputation as a grammarian, philosopher and poet<sup>61</sup>, as already mentioned. Some scholars believe that though a reputed author of Candra-vyākaraṇa his grammatical system once so famous, lost its original popularity. But even as late as in the 10th century king Śricandra of the Candra dynasty of Bengal made a grant of ten *pāṭakas* of land to a teacher attached to a temple for the exposition of the Candra-vyākaraṇa<sup>62</sup>. In the Paschimbhag plate of Śricandra, year 5, the king created a *śāśana* called Candrapura. Some scholars read it as śricandrapura. It may be presumed that the *śāśana* was named after Candragomin who was very popular and famous in the territories ruled by the Candras.

<sup>56</sup> Takakusu, 163-64.

<sup>57</sup> Liebech, 9 ff.

<sup>58</sup> i. 176; IA, IV, 1875, 107-108; B. Liebech, Kṣira-taraṅgini, 27-072.

<sup>59</sup> Sumpā, Part, I, 95-6; HIL, 333 ff.

<sup>60</sup> ii, 489-490; the identification of the two is not accepted by many, Śāstri-Cat. VI, (Vyākaraṇa), Preface, i.

<sup>61</sup> HIL, 333 ff; Winternitz, II, 365.

<sup>62</sup> EI, XXXVII, No. 51, 289 ff.

## ŚĪLABHADRA

The earliest Mahāyāna scholar to achieve distinction in and outside Bengal is Prince Śīlabhadra, a scion of the Brahmanical royal family of Samataṭa, a pupil of Dharmapāla and a friend and teacher of Hiuen-tsang<sup>63</sup>. We are fortunate in getting an account of Śīlabhadra from Hiuen-tsang. When he arrived in Nālandā in 637 A.D. Śīlabhadra was the Head of that institution. The first meeting between the two was dramatic<sup>64</sup>. The object of Hiuen-tsang's visit to Nālandā was to study the principles of Yoga-śāstra under Śīlabhadra's guidance. He cast himself under his pupilage and Śīlabhadra welcomed and received him with great respect. The Chinese pilgrim attended a series of his lectures without missing even a single one<sup>65</sup>. Śīlabhadra was known to the members as *Ching-fa-tsang* (i.e. Treasurer of the Good Law). Hiuen-tsang pays a high tribute to his scholarship and states that 'he rose to be eminent for his profound comprehension of the principles of Subtleties of Buddhism and his fame extended to foreign countries'<sup>66</sup>. The meeting between these two renowned scholars is indeed an important event in Indian history. Without this meeting Śīlabhadra would have perhaps remained a less known figure in the Buddhist world, and Hiuen-tsang would have missed the precious guidance and association of the great teacher. In his estimate 'Śīlabhadra was one of the greatest monks who rendered a useful service to the cause of Buddhism through his lucid commentaries'.

Hiuen-tsang dedicated or presented his book entitled 'The Destruction of Hearsay' to Śīlabhadra. Their peace of mind was disturbed by the king of Kāmarūpa, who sent a letter to Śīlabhadra requesting him to send Hiuen-tsang to his kingdom. Political conditions were such that Śīlabhadra found it difficult not to comply with his request. In A.D. 643, under pressure of circumstances, Hiuen-tsang had to leave for Kāmarūpa<sup>67</sup>.

*Śīlabhadra and the Nālandā University*

In his early life Śīlabhadra travelled extensively in India for the purpose of studying Buddhist philosophy. He was a favourite pupil and successor of Dharmapāla who ordained him as a monk of the Nālandā monastery

---

<sup>63</sup> Watters, II, 109 ff.

<sup>64</sup> Life, 106-112.

<sup>65</sup> Watters, II, 109 ff.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

<sup>67</sup> Life, 169 ff.

of which he subsequently rose to be the Head. As a reputed teacher of that institution he attracted scholars from different parts of India and abroad, who came to Nālandā to listen to his lectures. It may be noted that when Śīlabhadra was the chief of the Nālandā University<sup>68</sup> 'the priests, belonging to the convent, or strangers (residing therein) always reached to the number of 10,000'. They all studied Mahāyāna, the doctrines belonging to the eighteen schools, the Vedas, the Hetu-vidyā, śabda-vidyā, chikitsā-vidyā, Atharvaveda and Saṅkhya. Śīlabhadra was known to be the only scholar who had acquired a mastery over the different collections of the Śāstras and the Sūtras. In this context it may be mentioned that his scholarship was once put to a test; Śīlabhadra, then only thirty years old, defeated his opponent, a very learned Brāhmaṇa from South India, in a serious discussion. This was regarded as a brilliant achievement, in appreciation of which a king offered him the gift of the city as a reward. In this city Śīlabhadra built a monastery and donated the gift villages for its maintenance<sup>69</sup>.

He was widely known in and outside India for his skill in Logic and extensive knowledge of the Sūtras specially as the author of the Ārya-Buddha-bhūmi-Vyākhyāṇa<sup>70</sup>. A complete list of his work is not available.

We learn from some Chinese and Japanese sources that Śīlabhadra made three divisions of Buddhism representing different standpoints from which it is to be studied, viz., those relating to (1) the doctrine of *Śūnyatā*, (2) the doctrine of existence (*Sarvāstiva-vada*), and (3) the doctrine of the *middle path*. Kimme shows how through this three-fold division, Śīlabhadra tried to establish the superiority of the Mahāyāna.

### ŚĀNTIDEVA

Śāntideva was a reputed teacher of Mahāyāna Buddhism and a poet. But there are some difficulties in singling him out from amongst others who bear the same name. The Bstan-ḥgyur<sup>71</sup> mentions a Tantric Śāntideva who is credited for having written three Vajrayāna texts viz., Śrī-guhyasamāja-mahāyoga-tantra-vali-vidhi, Sahaja-giti and Chittachaitanya-Śamanopaya. He is described as belonging to Zahor. Tāranātha refers to the Mahāyānist Śāntideva of the 7th century A.D.<sup>72</sup> who belonged to the

<sup>68</sup> Life, 112.

<sup>69</sup> Life, 161 ff.; Si-yu-ki, II, 110 ff.

<sup>70</sup> Cordier, III 365; it is translated into Tibetan.

<sup>71</sup> Cordier, Deuxième Partie, 140, 230, 241.

<sup>72</sup> Tār., 215; Winternitz, II, Part I, 365 ff.; Bu-ston, II, 161 ff.

royal family of Saurāṣṭra (in Gujarat). He is, however, silent regarding the name of his father. In the Sumpā, Śāntideva is called Śāntivarman. His father's name is given as Kalyāṇavarman<sup>73</sup>. In another work Śāntideva's father is called Mañjuvarman. We are informed by Tāranātha that this Śāntideva before his conversion to the order, was minister of king Pañcasīmha, king of Magadha<sup>74</sup>. Subsequently he became a pupil of Jinadeva (Jayadeva) who succeeded Dharmapāla at Nālandā. Śāntideva is credited with the authorship of three works viz., (1) Śikṣā-samuccaya, (2) Bodhicaryāvatāra and (3) Sūtra-samuccaya<sup>74a</sup>.

Some scholars say that Bhusuku was another name of Śāntideva<sup>75</sup>. But it is not definitely known which Śāntideva is meant in this connection. It may be mentioned that eight Dohās are assigned to one Bhusuka in the Charyācarya-viniścaya<sup>76</sup> and also a Vajrayāna work called Chaturābhanaṇa<sup>77</sup>. Grünwedel refers to a Śāntideva who also bore the name of Bhusuku. He was a *Kṣatriya* by caste and lived in Nālandā during the reign of Devapāla. Tāranātha refers to one Bhusuku as a contemporary of Dipamkara<sup>78</sup>. Here he is not identified with Śāntideva.

<sup>73</sup> Sumpā, xcix, 101-103.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., cxix, 66, 102. As a minister of king Pañcasīmha he always carried a wooden sword with him and helped the king in his work of administration according to the Doctrine. This roused the jealousy of the other ministers who went and complained to the king about Śāntideva and his wooden sword. The king wanted to see the swords of all his ministers including Śāntideva. When he heard about it he told the king that it may do him harm. But the king did not listen to Śāntideva and insisted him to show the sword. As soon as he took out the sword its lustre destroyed the left eye of the king. Śāntideva then became a *siddha*. After this Śāntideva expressed his intention to leave the kingdom. The king tried to keep him but was unsuccessful. Before taking leave from the king he advised him to 'look after the kingdom according to the Doctrine and establish twenty centres for the insiders'. Then he went to Mandhyādeśa and lived among the *paṇḍits* and used to eat 'five *mahādroṇas* of rice at each meal' and always meditating and listing to the Doctrine from Mañjuśrī.

<sup>74a</sup> The Sūtrasamuccaya is attributed to Nāgārjuna by some scholars - and not to Śāntideva - cf. A. Pezzali, Śāntideva - mystique bouddhiste des VII<sup>e</sup> et VIII<sup>e</sup> siècles (Firenze: Vallecchi Editore, 1968), p. 80 ff.; D. Seyfort Rugg, The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1981), pp. 29, 84, 113, 114, 124; J. W. de Jong, Buddhist Studies (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1979), pp. 119-140; P. L. Vaidya, edition of the Śikṣasamuccaya of Śāntideva (Darbhanga: Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 11-Mithila Institute, 1966), vii; A. C. Banerjee, The Sūtrasamuccaya in the IHQ, XVII, No. 1 (March 1941), pp. 121-126; The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, V, no. 2, 1982, 101-109.

<sup>75</sup> Sastri-Cat. I, 52, No. 9990/52 -ASB; cf. IA, 1913, 49-52.

<sup>76</sup> BGD, Nos. 6, 12, 23, 27, 30, 41, 43, 49.

<sup>77</sup> Sastri-Cat. I, 82; cf. IA, XLIII, 51.

<sup>78</sup> Tār., chapter 35.

### Early Life

Some details about the early life of Śāntideva are available. He was born in a royal family<sup>79</sup>. At the time of his investiture as *Yuvarāja*, his mother discouraged him to become a king and told him to go 'where Buddha and Bodhisattvas are to be found... you will prosper spiritually'<sup>80</sup>. This inspired Śāntideva to leave his father's kingdom. He lived with his *guru* for twelve years<sup>81</sup>. After completing his education, his *guru* advised him to go to Madhyadeśa. Here he took up the work of a military officer and adopted a new name Achalasena. Shortly after this Achalasena went to Nālandā and 'renounced the world'. This work also refers to his three monumental works, and his two names, Śāntideva and Bhusuku<sup>82</sup>. H. P. Sastri believes that Śāntideva was a Bengalee and a native of Bengal<sup>83</sup>, a view which is not shared by some scholars. Śāntideva's favourite deity was Mañjuśrī. Śāntideva travelled widely in India, converted many to Buddhism and spent a few years in Śrīparvata in South India<sup>84</sup>. Śāntideva was a Mahāyānist of the Madhyamika School. He was also influenced by Tantric Buddhism. Most scholars agree that the Mahāyānist Śāntideva is the author of the three works, already referred to<sup>85</sup>.

<sup>79</sup> Cf., Tār., 15; Bendell, Intro., 3.

<sup>80</sup> IA, XLII, 50; Tār, 215 – According to Tāranātha there are some legends about Śāntideva's abandonment of his father's throne. It is said that Śāntideva occasionally had vision of Mañjuśrī from childhood. When he was grown up and was about to ascend the throne he saw to his great surprise that it was already occupied by Mañjuśrī and heard him say: 'Oh son! 'This seat is mine... It will be highly improper for you to sit on the same throne with me'. There is another legend which states, 'In the dream he (also) saw Ārya Tārā, in the guise of his own mother, pouring hot water on his head. When he asked the cause of this, she said 'kingdom is nothing but the unbearable boiling water of hell. I am consecrating you with this...' (Tār., 215).

<sup>81</sup> The name of his *guru* is not known. Tāranātha gives a different version of this story. According to him, after leaving his father's kingdom Śāntideva walked for twenty-one days; being very thirsty he went to drink water from a spring in the forest. But he was stopped by a woman who offered her sweeter water instead. Then she led him to a yogi. From him Śāntideva received *samyak-upadeśa* and attained *samadhi*. Then he lived in the kingdom of Pañcasīnha as a minister.

<sup>82</sup> Cf., IA, XLII, 49–52.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 51; JBORS, 1928, 335.

<sup>84</sup> Bu-ston, II, 163.

<sup>85</sup> Winternitz on the other hand contends that 'the statement about the three works is merely based upon an erroneous interpretation of the verse in the Bodhicaryāvatāra, where Śāntideva recommends the study of his Śikṣa-samuccay or the Sūtra-samuccay of Nāgārjuna' – Winternitz, II, Part, I, 366; cf. WZKM, 1912, XXVI, 46 ff.; Keith, HSL, 72 ff.; 336.

### Śāntideva's Works

The Śikṣa-samuccaya<sup>86</sup> is one of the works attributed to Śāntideva which deals with the ethics of Mahāyāna Buddhism. But it is noteworthy that the text 'nowhere gives the name of the author', although the Tibetan translation gives Śāntideva the credit of writing the book. It was written as early as the 7th century A.D. The Śikṣa-samuccaya can be divided into several distinct parts:

Part I consists of 27 *kārikas* (memorial verses);

Part II gives the commentary written by Śāntideva himself, which is full of quotations. Śāntideva was acquainted with many old texts which are cited in this work, as Winternitz holds<sup>87</sup>, while the Śikṣa-samuccaya does not show much originality on the part of its author although it is undoubtedly a scholarship based on extensive reading. Śāntideva's object in writing the work and the obvious limitations of its treatment are expressed in his own words in characteristically exact and unpretentious style; 'I have nothing new to say here, neither have I any skill in the writing of literary works. Therefore my efforts are not for the benefit of others, but my only desire is to perfect my own mind'<sup>88</sup>.

The second great work is known as Bodhicaryāvatāra<sup>89</sup>. This work begins with an adoration of *Bodhicittam* and the subsequent chapters deal with the duties of Bodhisattva. The two works are based on 'the same doctrinal standpoint'. 'In both, the ethical ideal is the Bodhisattva...'<sup>90</sup>. The Śikṣa-samuccaya is almost flooded with quotations testifying to the scholarship and learning of its author; while the Bodhicaryāvatāra reaches a high level enriched by a flow of spontaneity and elevated tone<sup>91</sup>. Many commentaries were written on the Bodhicaryāvatāra, Bu-ston puts the number at one hundred or more<sup>92</sup>. Winternitz refers to

<sup>86</sup> Ed. C. Bendell, *Bibl. Buddhica*, St. Peterburg, 1902.

<sup>87</sup> HSL, II, 371.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 367.

<sup>89</sup> Ed. by I. P. Minayeff in *Zapiski*, IV, 1889; trans. by Poussin and Barnett, L. D. – *Wisdom of the East*. Tāranātha gives a story of how the Bodhicaryāvatāra was composed. It is said that the *paṇḍits* being jealous of Śāntideva organised a function for the recitation of the sūtra. Śāntideva at first did not agree to take part in the function but he was compelled to do so. Śāntideva asked the *paṇḍits* to prepare a seat for him and began to recite the Bodhicaryāvatāra; while reciting he rose up in the sky, he became invisible but his voice could still be heard. Some of the *paṇḍits* retained this in their memory – *Tār.*, 218.

<sup>90</sup> HSL, II, 370.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. G.K. Narriman, *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*.

<sup>92</sup> Bu-ston, II, 166.

eleven commentaries only, all of which were translated into Tibetan<sup>93</sup>. Commentaries on this are also said to have been written by Dīpaṅkara and Vibhūticandra. According to Tāranātha, Śāntideva was the author of another work entitled *Sūtrasamuccaya*<sup>94</sup> but this is not accepted by many scholars.

#### *Date*

Tāranātha represents Śāntideva as a contemporary of Śīla, son of Harṣavardhana of Kanauj. B. Bhattacharyya holds that Śāntideva flourished 'in a period between the departure of I-tsing from India in 695 A.D. and Śāntarakṣita's first visit to Tibet in 743 A.D.'<sup>95</sup>. In this connection it should be noted that a verse from the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* composed by Śāntideva is found quoted in the *Tattvasiddhi* of Śāntarakṣita<sup>96</sup>. Winternitz placed Śāntideva in the 7th century A.D.<sup>97</sup>. It would not be far from truth if it is concluded that the date of Śāntideva possibly lay between the 2nd half of the 7th century A.D. and the beginning of the 8th century A.D.

Reference to one Śāntideva is to be noticed in the Gunaighar grant of the reign of Vainyagupta<sup>98</sup> which records grants of land in favour of the Buddhist *saṅgha* at the beginning of the 6th century A. D. This *saṅgha* was founded by one Śāntideva who himself had his residence in the Āśrama-vihāra. The date of the record must discourage any attempt to identify him with the scholar Śāntideva.

### ŚĀNTARAKṢITA

Śāntarakṣita was another front-rank Buddhist scholar, an author of repute and a distinguished teacher. He was widely known as a 'philosopher and dialectician'.

#### *Birth and Homeland*

Śāntarakṣita belonged to the 'royal' family of Zaḥor in East Bengal<sup>99</sup>, which also produced the celebrated scholar Dīpaṅkara. The Brom-ston-pa

<sup>93</sup> HSL, 374; for the titles of the commentaries see P. L. Vaidya, *Études sur Āryadeva*, 56 ff.

<sup>94</sup> Tār., 17; cf. 197; cf. op. cit. fn. 74a.

<sup>95</sup> *Sādhnamālā*, II.

<sup>96</sup> TS, Foreward, xxiii.

<sup>97</sup> HSL, II, 365.

<sup>98</sup> IHQ, VI, 53 ff.

<sup>99</sup> *Sumpā*, ci, 112; xcix, 49, 112; HIL, 328.



states: 'I offer prayer to the feet of Dipaṅkara-śrī, who was born in the noble Jēva family of the kings of Zahor of the trisampanne Bengal in the same line to which Śāntijīva (Śāntarakṣita) belonged' <sup>100</sup>. According to some, he was a native of Gauḍa in North Bengal <sup>101</sup>. Opinion differs as to the location of Zahor mentioned above. Waddell places it in Lahore <sup>102</sup>. A. K. Franke identifies it with Mondī in North-Western India <sup>103</sup>. S. C. Das locates it in Jessore in South Bengal <sup>104</sup>. Some are inclined to place it in Rāḍha <sup>105</sup>. B. Bhattacharyya regards Zahor to be a regular phonetic equivalent to Sabhor, the name of a well-known village in the Dacca district in East Bengal <sup>106</sup>. It appears that Śāntarakṣita was intimately connected with Bengal although it is difficult to locate his birth-place definitely.

### *Śāntarakṣita and Tibet*

The earlier religion of Tibet was known as Ban-po which was finally replaced by Buddhism. The nature of the Buddhist religion which came to prevail in Tibet and its system of monasticism were largely determined by a number of famous Buddhist teachers who went there from Bengal. Srong-tsan founded a powerful kingdom in Tibet by the end of the 6th century A.D. (581-600 A.D.). He was succeeded by his son, Srong-tsan Gampo <sup>107</sup>. He was a man of great personality and married the princesses of Nepal <sup>108</sup> and China <sup>109</sup>. Through the influences of his queens he embraced Buddhism. He refashioned Tibetan alphabets on the model of the Indian scripts and invited Indian scholars to his kingdom who engaged themselves in the work of translating Buddhist scriptures into Tibetan. His contemporary was Harṣavardhana. It is claimed by Tibetan tradition that Srong-tsan Gampo conquered Assam and Nepal and half of Jambu-

<sup>100</sup> Śloka 1, section 1.

<sup>101</sup> JBTS, I, i.

<sup>102</sup> Waddell, *Lamaism*, 379 ff; P. C. Bagchi does not agree with him, cf. *IHQ*, 1930, 581-88; *Sumpā*, ci, 112.

<sup>103</sup> *Antiquities of Tibet*, II, 65, 89-90.

<sup>104</sup> D-Ted, 1089; cf. *Sumpā*, ci, 112.

<sup>105</sup> *IHQ*, 1935, 143-44.

<sup>106</sup> *HB*, 672 n. 1; *BA*, I, 39.

<sup>107</sup> Franke, *Antiquities of Tibet*, II, 82-84 (*Chronicles of Ladakh*); L. Petech, *A Study on the Chronicles of Ladakh*, chapter V; *IHQ*, XV; *Levi-Nepal*, II, 148-52; *JASB*, L, 1881, Part I, 218-24; L. A. Waddell, *The Buddhism of Tibet*, chapter III.

<sup>108</sup> *Bu-ston*, II, 184; The Nepalese princess was the daughter of king Aṅsuvarman.

<sup>109</sup> *HB*, 91 ff

dvīpa. Nepal remained a vassal state of Tibet for more than two hundred years <sup>110</sup>.

A late successor of Srong-tsan Gampo was Khri-srong-Ida-btsan (755-797 A.D.). He was one of the greatest ruler of Tibet and also a patron of Buddhism. He was regarded as an incarnation of Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī. During his reign there was a clash between the Buddhists and the adherents of the Ban-po religion. The king succeeded with great difficulty in suppressing the Ban-po religion and spreading Buddhism. At this time Śāntarakṣita's fame spread to Tibet. The king invited him to visit Tibet in order to strengthen the cause of Buddhism in his territory. Śāntarakṣita heartily accepted the invitation and went to Tibet from Nepal and began to preach the Buddhist doctrine in that country. At this the 'demigods' of Tibet became furious. Śāntarakṣita was sent back to Nepal. Sometime afterwards he was requested by the Tibetan king to revisit Tibet. He went to Tibet again. He introduced the ten virtues and Dharma <sup>111</sup>. But he found himself unequal to his task as a Buddhist missionary. He advised the king to invite his pupil Padmasambhava who was armed with the knowledge of mystic charms for fighting against the 'evil spirits'. Padmasambhava came to Tibet and succeeded within a short period in bringing the tormenting genii under his control <sup>112</sup>. From the account furnished by S. C. Das it appears that Śāntarakṣita visited Tibet in 749 A. D. and died in 762 A.D. <sup>113</sup>. He and Padmasambhava together assisted the Tibetan king in building the first Buddhist monastery of Bsam-ya on the model of the Odantapurī vihāra in India <sup>114</sup>. Bsam-ya became 'the centre of the apostolic activity of the Indian missionaries supported by the court' <sup>115</sup>. The *agrahāra* system was introduced; a part of the land was assigned to the monks. Thus the monastery got a property of its own, free from taxation, its tenants became subjects of the gods presiding over the monastic establishment. In this way a position of primacy was secured by the Buddhist community of Tibet <sup>116</sup>. These Indian teachers established in Tibet the order of 'Buddha's religion' and trained some of the Tibetans to become monks. They preached the main points of the doctrine of Buddhism, the *daśa-kuśalas* and the *devādaśa-nidāna* i.e. the ten fundamental principles

<sup>110</sup> HB, 91 ff.

<sup>111</sup> JASB, 1882, 72 ff.

<sup>112</sup> Das, S. C. - JBTS, I, 12-13.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Bhattacharya, B. - An Introduction to Tattva-saṅgraha, xiv ff.

<sup>114</sup> S. C. Das thinks (JASB, 1882, 92n) that the Bsam-ya monastery was not exactly like Odantapurī. 'The top of the monastic temple was constructed in Chinese style, the middle part in Indian style and the lowest part in Tibetan style'.

<sup>115</sup> Tucci, MBT, II, 55.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Tucci, MBT, II, 59.

of morality. These Tibetans carried on the missionary activities and also translated many Buddhist texts into Tibetan. Padmasambhava did not stay in Tibet for a long time. He left Tibet in order to preach Buddhism in other lands. Śāntarakṣita was not only the first Indian to visit Tibet but was also the first abbot of the monastery of Bsam-ya. He held this post for thirteen years. Shortly before his death a Chinese missionary named Hva Sam or Hoshang of the Dhyāna school visited Tibet. He began to lecture on Buddhism which was quite different from that preached by Śāntarakṣita. As Śāntarakṣita could not persuade himself to accept the views of Hva Sam he requested the king to invite his pupil Kamalaśīla to Tibet as he thought that he might be of greater use in opposing the teaching of Hva Sam; the Tibetan king acted according to his advice<sup>117</sup>. The invitation was sent to Kamalaśīla in Magadha. But unfortunately before he reached Tibet Śāntarakṣita had died in an accident. Kamalaśīla defeated the Chinese missionary in a debate<sup>118</sup> and thereby established the authenticity of the doctrine advocated by his teacher Śāntarakṣita.

#### *Śāntarakṣita and the Nālandā University: the Tattvasaṅgraha*

Śāntarakṣita was intimately connected with the Nālandā University<sup>119</sup>. For some time he was the High Priest of this monastery. He was proud

<sup>117</sup> 'Not only did the royal temple of Bsam-yas see its regular cults greatly impaired, but the followers of the two parties, the Indian and the Chinese, lost control of their nerves... the quarrel turned into tragedy. Some of the members of the two opposite parties had recourse to violence...' – Tucci, MBT, II, 9.

<sup>118</sup> As soon as Kamalaśīla arrived 'the meeting took place between the great religious teachers...' The Hva Sam spoke first, then Kamalaśīla replied... In the end the Hva Sam was unable to give a reply and therefore he offered the garland to Kamalaśīla. Then the king decided that the views of the Hva Sam should not be followed and gave a summary of the doctrine as established by Kamalaśīla, viz. that prajña and upāya are both to be realised.

'Thus he severely ordered and the (order) was written in three accurate letters (containing) the edict, and they were placed in a letter box, a lock was applied to its opening and it was placed in the royal archives... in this way... Śāntarakṣita established the foundation for the authors of the introduction of Buddhism in Tibet...' (MBT, II, 38-40).

'It has been pointed out that there is 'no complete agreement between the Chinese records and the Tibetan traditions. According to the Chinese documents translated by Demiéville the Tibetan king decided in favour of the Hva Sam' (Ibid., 44). But in due time there was a strong revival of Indian Buddhism, caused not only by the direct instigation of the court, anxious to prevent any further Chinese influence, but also by the growing prestige of the Indians and the coming of the Indian *Ācāryas* in greater numbers than before... during this period 'the real consolidation of Indian Buddhism took place'. (Ibid., 50).

<sup>119</sup> HIL, 323; S.C. Das, Indian Paṇḍits in the Land of Snow, 51.

of his pupils at Nālandā, specially Padmasambhava and Kamalaśīla. It was during his stay at Nālandā that he produced the encyclopaedical work entitled 'Tattva-saṅgraha'. Its commentary was written by Kamalaśīla. Both the books in their original Sanskrit and Tibetan translation are preserved<sup>120</sup>. In his monumental work he critically reviews the earlier philosophical systems, Buddhist and non-Buddhist. He quotes from and acknowledges the works of about sixty previous authors. By refuting the views of earlier writers systematically he strengthened the foundation of Vijñānavāda of Asaṅga. As B. Bhattacharyya states: 'It is probable that the Tattva-saṅgraha-kārikā was written mainly to refute the arguments and theories of Kamalaśīla and ... others'<sup>121</sup>.

### Other Works

Śāntarakṣita was the reputed author of some more books. They are the following:

1. Vāda nyāya-vṛtti-vipañcītārtha<sup>122</sup>.
2. Madhyamaka-alaṅkāra-kārikā<sup>123</sup>.
3. Vajradhara-saṅgīta-bhagavat-stotra-ṭikā.
4. Aṣṭa-tathāgata-stotra.
5. Hevajra-udbhava-kurukullā-pañca-mahā-upadeśa.
6. Tattvasiddhi-nama-prakaraṇa.
7. Satyadvaya-vibhaṅga-pañjika.
8. Madhyamaka-alaṅkāra-vṛtti.
9. Samvara-viṃśaka-vṛtti.
10. Vādanyāya-vṛtti-vipañcītārtha.
11. Daṇḍa-hasta-lekha<sup>124</sup>.

He examined twenty-seven different systems or schools of thought. His style of writing was both simple and learned. It shows a 'wonderful mastery over the syllogistic reasoning'. He had his own characteristic way of arguing. He carefully studied the points and then criticised them. He only points out their mistakes and inconsistencies in an impartial and unaffected manner. Śāntarakṣita was known in Tibet as *Ācārya* Bodhisattva and his Tibetan name was Zi-ba-htsha. Needless to say that he was greatly loved and revered by the Tibetans. There is some confusion about the

<sup>120</sup> GOS, XXX-XXXI, Baroda, 1926.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., XXX, lxxxii-iii.

<sup>122</sup> An elaborate commentary on the Vaḍa-nyāya of Dharmakīrti. The Sanskrit original of this work appears to be lost, but there is a Tibetan translation of it. The translation was made by Kumāra-Śrī-bhadra. - cf. HIL, 32 ff.

<sup>123</sup> Tibetan translation of this work exists; cf., Tār., 204-205, 213; Winternitz, II, 375.

<sup>124</sup> From nos. 3-11 see Tār., 415 ff.

identity of the author mentioned under the name Śāntarakṣita. Probably there were two scholars of this name. One of them was a Mahāyānist logician, a High Priest and a teacher of Nālandā. He was the author of *Tattva-saṃgraha*. The second Śāntarakṣita was a Tantric author. It is not known whether the two Śāntarakṣitas were identical. The Tibetan historians, however, believe that there was only one Śāntarakṣita. There is also difference of opinion about his date. The *Sumpā* asserts that Śāntarakṣita must have lived from the time of king Gopāla to that of king Dharmapāla.<sup>125</sup> Accepting this, Śāntarakṣita must have lived in the second half of the 8th century A.D. It agrees with the Tibetan chronology according to which khri-sron-īde-btsan, a contemporary of Śāntarakṣita, ruled during the same period. He died in 864 A. D. in an accident.

#### JITĀRI

Jitāri is known to us mainly from Tibetan sources. He was a Brāhmaṇa by birth but embraced Buddhism. His father Garbhapāda was a Brahmin. He was born in Varendra in North Bengal when his father lived at the court of king Sanātāna, who was a vassal of king Mahipāla I of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal and Bihar<sup>126</sup>. It is believed that he was born of a *yoginī* whom king Sanātāna kept for Tantric practices<sup>127</sup>. He was banished by his Brahmin kinsmen and soon after he embraced Buddhism and became a worshipper of Mañjuśrī and a disciple of *dPal sde* (Śrīsenā)<sup>128</sup>. Jitāri lived alone in a jungle<sup>129</sup> and devoted his life to the study of Buddhist doctrines. Prior to this he had his early education from his father and many other teachers. Besides, he had the special privilege of listening to all the doctrines from Mañjuḡhoṣa himself<sup>130</sup>.

<sup>125</sup> *Sumpā*, 112.

<sup>126</sup> *Tār.*, 230-33; Tāranātha gives an interesting story about Garbhapada and his wife. It is said that the Pāla king had a beautiful wife as his chief queen. The king received the *abhiṣeka* of Guhyasamāja from the Brāhmaṇa Ācārya Garbhapada and 'offered him as fee this queen, horses, gold, elephants, etc.' - *Tār.*, 200.

<sup>127</sup> *Sumpā*, xcvi, 116.

<sup>128</sup> Tucci, *MBT*, I, 250; *Tār.*, 291. 'At the age of seven he was sent to an elementary school of the Brāhmaṇas'. The other Brāhmaṇa boys teased him and talked ill about his parents. He told his father about all that had happened. After this his father 'conferred the *abhiṣeka* of Mañjuḡhoṣa on him and led him to meditation with proper instructions'. - *Tār.*, 291.

<sup>129</sup> Rāhula *Sankṛityāyana* 227-228; Tāranātha gives a different version of the story, 291-92.

<sup>130</sup> *Tār.*, 290 ff.

*Jitāri as a Scholar and Author*

Jitāri was a great Buddhist scholar, whose contributions are many sided. 'He commented upon Tantras, wrote *Sādhanas* and treaties on logic', etc.<sup>131</sup> He was a distinguished teacher and on the whole possessed a glorious career in association with some of our Buddhist universities.

Jitāri is the reputed author of many books, the chief among them are the following:

1. *Hetu-tattva-upadeśa* <sup>132</sup>.
2. *Dharma-dharmi-viniścaya* <sup>133</sup>.
3. *Bālāvātara-tarka* <sup>134</sup>.

In addition to the above the Tanjur furnishes a list of books attributed to Jitāri <sup>135</sup>. He also composed short commentaries on the *Śikṣa-samuccaya*, *Caryāvātara*, etc. In addition to these he wrote about one hundred *Śāstras* <sup>136</sup>. We do not know whether all these books were written by Jitāri himself or by other authors bearing the same name. However, some scholars are inclined to attribute some of these works to another author. The Tibetan tradition 'Appears to distinguish a senior and junior sage of that name' <sup>137</sup>. The senior or *Mahājitāri* belonged to Varendra and may be identified with our author. The younger Jitāri was a Buddhist Tantric saint of Bengal 'who initiated Bodhibhagya and gave him the name *Lāvaṇyavajra*' <sup>138</sup>. S. K. De is of the opinion that 'the three learned works on Buddhist logic, ... belonged to the Senior *Jetāri*, while the junior *Jetāri* was responsible for eleven Vajrayanist *Sādhanas* also preserved in Tibet' <sup>139</sup>. As the two Jitāris, referred above, do not belong to the same period but there is a wide interval 'it is therefore possible to admit that one and the same person was the pupil of *Lilavajra* and the master of *Atiśa*; this incongruity led the Tibetan authors to distinguish between an elder and a younger *Jetāri*... this is not impossible, but it is also prob-

<sup>131</sup> MBT, I (Vol. IX), 249.

<sup>132</sup> The Sanskrit original of this appears to be lost, but a Tibetan translation is available. The subject matter is based on the instruction on the real nature of the middle term in a syllogism. - HIL, 337.

<sup>133</sup> HIL, 337.

<sup>134</sup> It is a work on 'Children's Introduction to Logic' - HIL, 337.

<sup>135</sup> Tār., 426 ff.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid., 229.

<sup>137</sup> *Sumpā*, xcvi-xcviii, 112, 116.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid., xcvi, 112.

<sup>139</sup> HB, 334 ff.

able that either Jetāri's being the pupil of Lilavajra or his being a master of Atīśa is a blunder of the source upon which later tradition was founded... ' 140.

#### *Association with Vikramaśīla*

Jitāri was associated with the Vikramaśīla vihāra on being awarded the diploma of 'Paṇḍita' by king Mahīpāla I of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal<sup>141</sup>. He served there as a Professor for a long time. He was succeeded by Naropāda. It is said that he was the 'custodian of the Northern door of Nālandā and the master of Atīśa when the latter was still a boy'<sup>142</sup>. He had the proud privilege of being the teacher of many eminent scholars. Besides Dīpaṅkara, Naropā and Ratnākara-Śānti were also his pupils<sup>143</sup>. Another pupil was Buddhaśrījñāna<sup>144</sup>. There are some differences of opinion among scholars regarding the actual relation between Jitāri and Dīpaṅkara. S. C. Das believes that Dīpaṅkara's parents sent him at a very young age to the sage Jitāri for his education<sup>145</sup>. Jitāri taught him the five kinds of minor sciences, and thereby paved his way for the study of philosophy and religion. Altogether a different account is furnished by Rāhula Sāṅkṛityāyana<sup>146</sup>. He holds that Dīpaṅkara at the age of eleven accidentally met Jitāri in a cottage, who advised him to go to Nālandā. How far this account is correct is not known. If this version of the story is to be accepted then there is no reason to hold the view that Jitāri was a teacher of Dīpaṅkara. But it cannot be denied that both of them lived at the same time and Dīpaṅkara was indebted to him, if not as his direct pupil, at least for his valued guidance and advice which prompted him to go to Nālandā.

#### *Name*

There are at least two forms of his name Viz., Jetāri and Jitāri. The first is based upon the Tibetan texts which contain some information about Jetāri. This form is accepted by most scholars<sup>147</sup>. The name Jitāri is found in two extant Sanskrit originals of his work<sup>148</sup>. This form is also

<sup>140</sup> MBT, Part I, 251.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid., Tār., 292.

<sup>142</sup> S. C. Das, Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow, 50; cf. MBT, I, 251.

<sup>143</sup> HB, 420, 682.

<sup>144</sup> MBT, I, 252. He was also a pupil of Haribhadra. Tucci points out 'wide interval occurs between Buddhaśrījñāna and Atīśa'.

<sup>145</sup> BA, I, 243.

<sup>146</sup> Rāhula, in 2500, 227-228.

<sup>147</sup> HIL, 337; HB, 334 ff.; JBORS, XXI, 1935, 41; XXXIII, Part I, 55, 56.

<sup>148</sup> MBT, Part, I, 250.

used by Vidyākara<sup>149</sup>. According to Tucci this is the more appropriate form of his name. 'In fact Jitāri (cf., Jitamitra epithet of Viṣṇu) is a title of the Buddha himself<sup>150</sup> and therefore a name quite appropriate for a Buddhist,<sup>151</sup>

Jitāri was a contemporary of Dīpaṅkara and Mahīpāla I and must have lived in the 10th century A. D.<sup>152</sup>.

*(to be continued)*

---

<sup>149</sup> HOS, Vol. 42, xxxv; Jitāripada, 1xxviii.

<sup>150</sup> Trikāṇḍaśeṣa, I, 8.

<sup>151</sup> MBT, Part I, 250. Durgacharan Chattopadhyā also prefers this form on the basis of the colophon of Jātinirākṛti.

<sup>152</sup> HOS, Vol. 42, 1xxviii -- (940-980 A. D.).