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 suttavadinins 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 Sarvastivadinins and the Mahayanists to put forth their theories of Dharmakaya. The Sarvastivadinins 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 Nalapuja had conceived two kayas:

1) 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., collections 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 Niyanda-buddha or Dharmatma.
Nyaya-buddha (the Buddha produced by the Dharmas). The Sutra Lankara (I, Sutra, pp. 45, 188) used the term Sambhotakaya for Nyaya-buddha and Svabhavakaya for Dharmakaya. In the Abhisamayala Lankara Karika and in the recast version of the Pancaratnasati-Sahasravali Pratyaparamita, Sambhotakaya 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 Subhava or Svabhavika-kaya. The Vijnaptimatrataasidhidhi retains the conception of the Karika but adopts a new term, Svastambhoga kaya, to denote the Dharmakaya of the Karika and distinguishes the Sambhotakaya by calling it Parasambhoga kaya.

REALISTIC CONCEPTION OF BUDDHA IN THE NIKAYAS

In a land where the tendency to defy Saints is so strong, it goes to the credit of the early Hinayans 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:

"Bhagavad araham Sammavatuddhavuddavuttarasutta Vattacaranasampanno Sagato Lokavidu atatto Sammadatta Sarathi Sottho devamunassanam buddhussaddhagaya. So imam Lokam Sadiyakam Samarakam Sahabhakam Sasaannahu brahmanan pujam Sadavamsassassam Sayam asinham Sacchikaiva Pavedet. So dhamman daseti adhikyanam 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, mara, recless, brahmins and men, and having known them he makes his knowledge known to others. He preaches the dhamma (doctrines) 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 Lalavis, p. 3; sah p, pp. 44, 576) 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 Brahma-loka, (In the Mahayanic works also, as for instance in the Jata, it is stated that a Bodhisattva can become a Maha-brahman 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 Hinayans do not attribute any transcendent 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 Nikāya, 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 bhākṣaṇa who can be regarded as endowed with all the qualities in all their forms as possessed by Bud-

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 sublimaze 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 Yo Ananda moṣadhammo, cañciyo Ga desito Pannato Sova man' accayepa Satha. 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.15, Mil. P.99). The Dhamma and Vinaya clearly refer to the collection of doctrines and disciplinary rules delivered by Bud-

2) Bhagavate mhi putto orasa mukhato tasc dhammadāsadaṃ dhammanimmitto, dhammadāyado its. (Samyutta, 11, p.221; majjhima, 111, p.29) has the identical passage with the addition "no a misadasyado" after dhammadāyado. "For the interpretation of 'dhammadāyado' see majjhima, 1, pp. 12). Tam kissa hetu 2, Tathagatassa h'etam adhivacanam. "Dhammadayo tati dhammakatvato, (Majjhima, 11, p.84, Digha, 111, p.84, Majjhima, 111, pp.195, 224 has "Bhagavajanan jati passam pussati Gakkhattubito nana bhuto dhammakatvato")", iti pit. Just as a brahmana would say that he is born of Brahma, through his mouth Brahmāna putto orasa Muhato fato brahmo brahmanimmitto brahmano yado-so a Salya 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 brahma and a Sakya-puṣya-samana that Dharmakṣaya is equated with Brahmrāja.

3) Vakkali on his death-bed became very eager to see Buddha in person. So Bhagava came to him and said, 'Āḷam Vakkallikāṁ to Patikayena dittena. Yo kha vakkalādhammaṁ passatato mam passaṭi, Yo nam passaṭi so dhamma passaṭi.' 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 Mahasīya 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 puciya (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 -- Yopasīca amuppadaṁ passato so dharmam passati yo dhammaṁ passati so Patiṁ ca amuppadaṁ Passati). For other references see Pro. Valle poussic article 'Notes sur les corps du Bouddha' in Lermusson,1913. PP. 259-290 compare the remarks in the later Pāli works,-- sandhammaṁ sangaha (Jpt 1890), P61 Yone Passati saddhasanam so mam passaṭi Vakkali, Apassanana saddhasanam mam passe pīna passati,mūlinda, P71. Yodhammaṁ Passati so Bhagavanat passati, dhammo hi mahārasa bhagavata desitoiy. Ibid, P73: Dhammakayena pana kha vibhajara Sakka bhagava nissādetvam, dhanaṁohi mahārasa bhagavata desitoiy.

4) The passage in the Anguttara Nikāya, (Anguttara,11.P 38), where Buddha says that he is neither a got nor a gandhabba, nor a man has been taken by Prof. Masson-Oursel, (Prof. Masson-oursel in his article " Les trois corps du Buddha," J.A. 1933,PP. 581), as showing trace of the Mahasīya conception. It is not impossible to read some metaphysical ideas into the passage, through 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 Yakka 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, Yakka or mortal. Just as a lotus is born in water, grows 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 (abhīshāya) and lived unaffected by the same. Therefore, he asked the brahma 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 presumed that the Mahayana ideas are latent in the above mentioned expressions though not adequately expressed, the discussion in the Kathavatsalu has made it amply clear that the Vedavyasikas 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 term rupakaṇḍa and dharmakaṇḍa found their way into the later paśu works, (see, eg. sad san. (JPTS, 1890) 259). Sambuddhanam (sī Kāyarapakṣa Sīreddhassa, yo tehe desito dhamma dharmakāyoti vecati) in mahāyan or in the semi mahaṇa 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 Kāyas. Yoseso Bhagava asiti anuyayam janapatisamudita-dvattim samaha puresa lakkhana vicirya rupakṣya sabbakaśaparasuddha sīla lakkhaṇothādi gunaratana samuddhāya dharmakaṇḍya yasamhitā pannamahāta apparentikāyagama samma sambuddhaḥ. That Bhagavan, who is possessed of a beautiful rupakṣya, adorned with eighty minor signs and thirty-two major signs of a great man, and possessed of a dharmakaṇḍya purified in every way and glorified by sīla, samaddhi, (The five lśāndhas referred to here are sīla, sāmadhi, panna, vimutti and viśuddhannadassana, see mil, p.98) etc, who is full of splendour and virtue, is incomparable and fully awakened (vis.m, p.254, pataka, i, p. 94-Rupakṣyastre). Though Buddhaghosa's conception was realistic, he was not immune from the religious bias of attributing super human powers to Buddha. In the Itthasamane, (4th, p.16), he says that during the three months of his absence from the world while Buddha was engaged in preaching Adhīdhemma to his mother in the Tusita heaven, he created some Nimmita Buddhas as exact replicas of himself. These Nimmita Buddhas could not be distinguished from the real Buddha in voice, words and even the ray 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 Hinayanaists conceived Buddha's rupakaya as that of a human being, (see Prof. Valle Poussin's Buddhism, p. p. 252), and his dharmaikaya as the collection of his dharmas, i.e., 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 Pali texts 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 Chisen Akanuma (Eastern Buddhist, 11, p. 7) quotes some passages from the chinese Anuttara and Samyuta Agamas and shows that the dharmaikaya of Buddhis derived the collection of dharmas teaching. Our main source of information at present is the Abhidharmakosa, made accessible to us from Chavye by the monumental French translation of Professor le 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. At the present state of our knowledge indicates that the Dhyayadana and the Lalitstara, (Winteritz, Geschichte etc. 11, p. 194), originally belonged to this school, though they were recast by the Mahayanasists; we must examine with caution some of the statements found in them regarding the kaya conception.

Dhyayadana :- There are a few passages in the Dhyayadana throwing light on the rupakaya and dharmaikaya of the Buddha and bearing the identical sense of the Pali works. On one occasion Sromakoti karana said that through the grace of his teacher, he had seen the dharmaikaya 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. (DhyA, p. 19). Upajicpata once said to Mara that he had seen only dharmaikaya 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 isag Rodrany gave to Simbhasta it says, "na rajan Krapato loke dharmakayaena Sansspret" (I let not, o king, an irresistible person). Ibid, p 560. Krapa is defined thus:-

Yastu dharmaniragartham adharme nirotu arpala, sarajan krapa theyas tamasta maha parayahan, (attain, lit, touch) the dharmaikaya. The word 'dharmanair' may bear a metaphysical interpretation out the context does not
warrant it, (ibid p. 560). The remark made by Ašoka, after Upagupta had pointed out to him the stupas of Ananda, makes the sense of dharmakalya quite explicit. It runs thus - That body which you all call pure, excellent and made of dharma (dharmamāsa dvārām dharmaṁyā sah) was born (dharitam) by him called Visoka (Ananda) and therefore his stupa deserves great honour. The lamp of Dharma, the dissealer of the darkness of afflications that burnt still among men was due to the power of him, the son of Saguṇendra and therefore should be worshipped with special reverence (Divya, PP. 596-7.Cf. Priyukoti, Aśoka, P-408). In connection with the destruction of the law, Mahānāma exclaimed ceux qu'ont esquinté le corps dela loi (dharmakalya), Os Sont-ils allez). There are, however, Avadanās in the Divyavādana, which were not without some Mahāyānic 'int', for, we read in the Pudrāyana Vādana (Divya, xxxii, p.568), as we usually find in the Mahāyānic works, that rays of light issued forth from the Buddha's mouth when he smiled, iradinating, the beings of heaven and hell. It is noteworthy that the Athasakāle (Artha, p. 16), also speak of rāmaṇā (rays of light) of six colour issuing out of the Buddhas body. It seems that the Mahāyānic ideas were percolating gradually into the roody soil of the conservative Theravādins.

 Lalitavistara:- The Lalitavistara gives us a picture of the Buddha more super human than human and yet far from the Mahāyānic conception of the Samihogakāya and Dīrghamālakāya, though in the last two chapters it dwells on the doctrine of Tathāga. In the Lalitavistara Buddha is delfed but there are no trace of the Trikāya conceptions. It says in many places that Buddha appears in the world of men for Loka-vasādāna, (E. G mn. 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 awaiting emancipation there. The running account of the Buddha's life is interrupted at times probably they are afterthoughts of the compiler by dialogues between Buddhas and Ananda, in order to make the treatise appear Mahāyānic and not Hinayānic. At one place Buddha explained to Ananda that, unlike human beings he did not stay in the birth of mother's womb but in a jewel-casket (ratnavahsa), (Ila) Vis. pp. 88,165, 106. This formed one of the points of contention of the Mahāyānakītikas. See Maduca, early origos etc. in the Asia Major, Vol. 1, placed in the womb, which was as hard as adamant but soft to the touch like the down of a kecilindika bird, and that its 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, insolent, 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.8706. This goes against the Saivavāda and Theravāda conceptions). One can perceive through the poetical exaggeration of the Lalitavistara that it has in view the historical Buddha endowed with major and mino: sings of a human being who requires his-passives and his
resolution to become a Buddha and rescue beings from misery, and who needs a
stimulus to renounce the world in order to fulfill his resolution. (The descriptions
gave opportunity to the Mahayanaists to invent Upaya as a device, the duties
of Achyusana, Yacana etc.) In connection with the offer of houses which was
made by the gods to the Bodhisatva 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 houses by means of the Mahayana
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 men-
tioned, he is called the great tree (maha-druma) because he possesses a body of
Dharmakaya form (the knowledge of Dharmakaya) (Lal, vi, 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 Sarvastivadins, viewed Bud-
dha 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
sawanas, 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 Buddha, Dharma,
in fact, take refuge in the dharmas (qualities) which constitute a Buddha
(Buddhakaraka) i.e., the dharmas by the acquisition of which a person understands
all things. Those dharmas are karasana (knowledge of the destruction of misery).

Asutpadajata, kusa vi, 67, explain that Karasana with Asutpadajata, maker
of Bodhi. On account of difference among Saints in the acquisition of these jhanas,
bodhi is said to be three kinds: Srenika bodhi, Pratihaya Buddha bodhi and Amara
samyakam bodhi. By the above two jhanas one can completely abandon igno-
rance (Asesasiddhi Prana). By the first, one realises the truth that his task is
accomplished (i.e., the dharma has been realised by him); by the second, one
realises that his task is no more to be accomplished (i.e., the dharma has been
realised by him and he will not have to exert any more). The Sarvajnadrsti of the
Asmita is to see things as they really are and to know the true general character
(Sarvajnadrstia) of dharmas. (See kusa, vi, 50 ff. For a note on the Karajana,
see MISA. Early origin etc. in Asia mag, vol. II, Fane. 1.) Knowledge of the
further non-origin of misery, and Sarvajnadrstia (right view), of the Asmita
together with the dharmas attendant on the jhanas, viz. the five pure skandhas, are
found to be the dharmas constituting Dhammakaya. In another place, while show-
ing the sameness of the Dharma as all Buddhas, he explained the Dharma as
a series of pure dharmas, or rather a renewal of the psycho-physical organism
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of the substratum (anusravādharmatana, arṣaya-parāvṛtti). (Kosa, VII, 34, for the sense of Arṣaya see ibid., VIII, 34 in cf arṣaya parisiddhi in sutra, p. 186). The Dharmakaya then signifies a new purified personality or substratum (arṣaya), but it is pointed out that such a dharmakaya is possessed also by an arhat (Kosa, IV, 56). In the Śūtraśāstra, (Huber, Śūtraśāstra, pp. 217, 390 quoted in the Kosa vii, 32 p. 81), such a dharmakaya is attributed to the mother of Śākyamuni 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 (arṣaya) possessed by him. The Kosa, in fact, replaces the concrete conceptions of the Dharmakaya found in the Nikāya and the Veyyadana by an abstract one. In the last two works, the Dharmakaya signified only the doctrines, vi, the Bodhisattva dharmas or Antica, Dukkha and Anatta, together with the Vinaya rules contained in the Patimokkha, while to Vassañdhi it meant the qualities adhering to a Buddha as well as the purified personality (arṣaya).

Referring to the formula of the Saranas, Vassañdhi 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 sarvāra (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 the Buddha and not in the Buddha the person. In the same way Vassañdhi explains the two other Saranas, vi, Dharma and Sangha, the former being explained as Nirvana or the three Truths - Dukkha, Samudaya and Marga, or Sudda, Dukkha and Anākikha-anākikha and the latter as the qualities that a Sangha of evolks is expected to possess (compare the formula of Sarana in the Nikāya, e.g. Dīgha, 111, p. 227.

The Vīhāra 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 Tathāgata. Some say that as the body is born of parents, it is impure (sarvāra) and therefore should not be a place of refuge. The refuge should be the Anākika dharmas, which make a Buddha, i.e. the Dharmakaya. (Kosa, vi, p. 32, lhp. 76, viii, p. 54). Apparently the Vīhāra refers in the first case to the earlier Hinayana Schools and in the second to the Sarvastivādins and their followers.

DHARMAKAYA CONCEPTION AMONG THE SATYASIDDHIS AND THE MAHYANISTS

The Satyasiddhi school takes almost the similar view of the Dharmakaya as the Sarvastivādins. According to it, the Dharmakaya is made of Sīla, samadhi,
Prajña, Vimala and Vimuktiñādarsana Buddhaghoṣa, 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 purification methods are obtained by Arhats also, Harivarman, the propounder of the Satyasiddha school distinguished the Dharmakaya of the Buddha by saying that his Dharmakaya consisted not only of the above five purificatory practices but also of ten powers (dana bala), four proficiencies (vīraśāraṇa), and the three recollections (smyṛvapātanaḥ), which the Arhats cannot obtain (Śoṇin, systems etc., pp.185,182).

The Abhisamayā Lātika Karika, (Karika,4n.VIII), and Pancavimsati Sahasrika-prajña-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., Bodhipakkhi, Aparanam, Vimsokus, Samapatis and so forth, constitute Sarvajñatva (omniscience) and sarvajñata is the Dharmakaya. It should be noted that the Karika and the Prajña-paramita use this expression in a sense different from that current in the Mahayana texts. They really mean the Svastabhogakaya of the later Vijnanavadin. The Prajña-paramitas also maintain the conception that the Dharmakaya is produced by dharmas, the highest of which is, according to them, the Prajña-paramita, i.e., the knowledge, which helps a person to realise the dharma-sunya. The Asastahasrīka 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 Prajña-paramita than the relics, (Asa, ch.4). It adds that all teachings of Buddha issued from the Prajnaparamita and the Dharmmahānakas should preserve and propagate them; so the Dharmmahānakas should also be respected. They are protected by the Dharmakaya developed from the Prajnaparamita. From Sarvajñata issues the body of Tathagata, the relics of whom are worshipped and hence prajnaparamita deserves greater honour (Bud, P 99). It is from this conception that the Prajña-paramita is addressed as the mother of Buddhas.

HINAYANIC SPECULATIONS

Whether Rupakaya is Vijpakaja?

The kṣa 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 Sañjñamuni. The Vuldinya and the Vibhasa explain that it happened to Sañjñamuni only, and not to the other Buddhhas, because in one of his former lives he sowed dissensions among the disciples of an ascetic, possessed of five Abhinna. (Kos'a, VII,34, p. 86, 84, IV, 102, p. 212 lh. 2). That the Buddhhas enjoy or suffer the effects of Karma is also maintained by the Divya Vadaana, (DIVVā p. 416), and the Majjhima Nikaya, (Majjhima, II p. 227). The Divya Vadaana refers to a saying of Sañjñamuni that even the jinas themselves are not free from their Karmas, while the Majjhima Nikaya says that aTagata 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 Kulpas 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 Opakammmika (accidental) cause and his illnesses to cause other than Karma (Mil.p. 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 Bodhisatta (in his last existence) a doubt expressed also in the Lalavistara, where a Ratnavaliya 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 (Upapati Vastiya), and that Sañjñamuni chose birth in a womb (jarayu) with two objectives: One was to benefit the Sañjña 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 deamon, 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 Mahasanghatan and their followers (e.g. the Vettiyaikās) insist that Sañjñamuni 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 Sakyaumuna made a show of his existence in the womb of Maya. They considered Buddha as Lokottara (transcendental), and Sakyaumuni as only a created body (Nirmanakaya). The transcendental Buddha has a Rupakaya, which is limitless, everlasting, and free from all Saṃsāra dharmas. He is always in Saṃadhī, (cf. Lanka, p.240 Sāda Samahīna Cattāgahā), 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 limitless powers and knowledge, who never desired to attain Nirvana, (see M anusda’s origin and Doctrines of Early Indian Buddhist schools, Asia Major, Vol.II Fasc. 1; Anesuki’s article in the ERE, US Doctetism Buddhist; suzuki’s Outlines of Mahayana and Buddhism, pp. 249-251. See also Rosa, III, 9, referring to Mūl, I pp.145,154).

KAYA CONCEPTION AT THE BEGINNING OF MAHYAYANA

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 Savanaprabhāsa tried to erase from the minds of the people the lingering impression about the historical existence of Sakyaumuni. In the Pundarika (Sad. p pp. 51ff), we find Maitreyya assuming the role of a septic and enquiring how Buddhas could, within short space of forty years after the attainment of Bodhi at Gaya, perform the innumerable duties of a Tathāgata 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. Maitreyya says further that in the minds of those Bodhisattvas, who recently became Mahayanists (Navayanasaṃprasthitāh), there may be doubts of this nature, so the Tathāgata should explain the paradox for the welfare of the religion. The Buddha then asks his audience thrice to believe his words (Avakalpyadhamm Abhiruddadhādam) and says “it is not to be considered (Nava Drastavyam); that Bhagavan Sakyaumuni 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 Parinirvānas were all my own creations. These were only my expediencies for imparting the dharma (Upaya-kausalya-dharma-disanabhinnanirmitane). All this I have said to the effect that I was young, recently born, left home, and attained Bodhi, was to appear 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. To the Tathagatas know that what the three dhatus really are; they know that the dhatus are neither born nor non-existing; they are the same nor different, and they are neither true nor 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 Parinirvāna, I say that I have attained it. In order to arouse curiosity in the minds of the people and in order to incite 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. By this also produced a good effect, for they thereby became righteous and gave up their passions. From among them I formed my Sriyakusumita, and showed myself at Grahakuta, and explained to them how to attain the apratihata.

In the Svarman Prabhava (Suvamaprabhava, R.T.s.ed.pp.4-8), Nanciraketa and Kaundinya the brahma play the role of sceptics. The former enquires why Sakayamuni, 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. Nanciraketa is told by the Buddhas of all lokadhatus that they did not know any mun or god who could calculate the length of Sakayamuni’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 brahma, who only fogged ignorance, was told by Laksatvikmara that, just as it is absurd to expect corns from a rose-apple tree, so it is absurd to expect a relic from the Buddha’s body. The Tathagatas have no origin and they are ever existing and inconceivable. It is only the Nirmukata that is shown by them. How can a baby, in which there is no bone or blood, leave a dhātu (relic)? The Buddhas have only Dhamnakaya and there is only the Dhammadhatu.

Nirmukata:- The Mahayanists tried to show, on the one hand, that the Hinayans were wrong in their belief that Sakayamuni 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 Nirmukata and Buddha-kaya. Whoever is said to have been done by Sakayamuni is accounted for by those texts as the apparent thing of a created body of the Buddha-kaya, a shadowy image created to follow the ways of the world (Lokan Vartana, of mutu, I pp. 168, 170 in order to bringg
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 (Sekharamanahana Jhata, one of the four jhanas peculiar to Buddha, see Nyanat. p.2), they can take any form they desire for the enlightenment of the various classes of beings. The Mahayana conception of Nirmanakaya is essentially the same as that of the Mahasanghikas. The Prajna-Paramita in their quaint way refer to the Nirmanakaya or Rupakaya. The Pancevimsi, 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 corners at all times by Nirmanarupaka (Nirmana clouds, pacca, cumber, MS.leaf 34 c). This is called the Nirmanakaya-laya.

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 Dharmanakaya. 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 delivery 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 Parinirvāna sutra and Sandhinirmocanasutra, (E.B. II. pp. 21 f), EB. II. 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 thus retiring from it, and ultimately attaining Nirvana by recourse to the ascetic practices.

The Vijñaptimatrata saddhi tells us that the Nirmanakaya is meant for the Buddha, Pratyo-Buddhas, Pratihagjanas (common men) and Bodhisattvas, who are not yet in one of the ten bhutas. 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, as 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 Brahman 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. (Asts. 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 (lokuttara) and pure (anasa). He could produce in mind any thought he liked, in fact, he appeared in his Nirmukta as Sakyaamuni with a mind (citta) suited to the way of the world. He could also impose his thought on the mind of others.

The Abhidhamma Lankavatara states that there are four keys, of which the Sthaviravasya-kaya is real, and the three others, viz., Dharmakaya (svasambhogakaya), sambhogakakay (parasambhogakaya) and Nirmanakaya are samvrita (i.e. unreal) and these are meant for Bodhisattvas and Sraavakas respectively. According to it, the Nirmanakaya was intended for Sraavaka and Bodhisattvas who are not yet in one of the ten bhumi. 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 Gati-prasama; (ii) practises the four Samagrahasvastus (elements of popularity); (iii) enlightens himself about matter opposite and similar, good and evil, by the Srutamay and such other means of knowledge, and than applies himself to the service of others, keeping himself unencumbered (i.e. having no Avasaya, like a magician for the things made by him magically); (iv) performs the six paramitas purified in three ways of Trimunda Lavisuddha; (v) performs, and persuades other's to perform the ten kusala Karma-patiths (moral duties) and thus establish all in the path leading to Buddhism; (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 Tathagata-bhumini 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 Bodhisatta extending through incalculable births is nothing but the Nirmanakaya, a thing not separate from the Dharma-kaya, 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 Nirmukta-Buddhas are not produced by actions; the Tathagata is neither in them nor outside them (saran hindrota buddha na karmaprabhava na tesu tathagata na caryate bhuta tathagata) (Lank. P.242, Ibd, P.242, Ibd, P.242, Ibd, P.242, Ibd, P.242). It is only when the sons of the Jina
realise the visible world to have no existence apart from the citrula that they obtain, the Nirmanakaya is free from Kriya and Samskara and endowed with Bala, Abhijna and Vaya. Like the Siddhi, it says that the Tathagata, by creating Nirmanakaya, perform the various duties of a Tathagata (Tathagata Kaya). It also gives an interesting information that Vajrapani had served as an attendant on the Nirmanakaya Buddha, and not on the real Buddha. And that the function of such a Buddha is to preach and explain the characteristics of Dana, Siha, Dhyana, Samadhi, Citta, Praja, Jnana, Skandha, Dhatu, Japana, Vayu, and Vijnana.

Sasambhogakaya: We have seen that the Rupakaya or Nirmanakaya was meant for the Savakas, Pratyeka Buddhas, Prakhandas and Bodhisattvas, who were not in one of the Bhumas. 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 Sasambhogakaya, 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 Grdhakuta, the only place in the three dhatus considered pure, and suitable for the appearance of a Sasambhogakaya, or at the Sakudandhavaha, 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 Mahayastins were not yet able to forget or rise above the human conception of the Buddha of the Hinayastins.

They all gave Sakyanimti the role of the presiding Buddha of the universe to whom Boddhisattva, Vajrapani, and other Bodhisattvas, Savakas and Pratyekas, of the various lokas, sent their greetings and flowers at the karya of regard to Sakyanimti Buddha, whose Buddhakaya was then the Chakradhara. Sometimes the descriptions go so far as to say that the Buddhas themselves came to hear discourse from Sakyanimti Buddha and the concourse of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas became so great that the seven lokas were cleared of all oceans, mountains, seas, rivers, and cities as well as of gods, men, and other beings. As we read in the Lankayana texts that monks used to come to meet Buddha, bringing with them one or two Samaneras, so also we read in the Suddhadvirdanapitaka that on account of insufficiency of space the countless Buddhas could not have been with them more than one or two Bodhisattvas as attendants (Upasannakayas, sat Pp. 2/3-245).

Now let us see what was their conception of the karya of this Buddha. According to the Sasanabhahakika and the Pasupatalaahitakika, (Sat Pp. 8-29, Patco, pp. 6/7, Samita rajavatra B.T.S ed., p. 10), it is an exceedingly refinable body, from
every pore of which streamed forth countless brilliant rays of light, illuminating the Lokadadattas 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 Vajraha (an image of the Tathagata, a sort of Nirmanakaya), preaching to Bodhisattvas, Grusthitas (householders), Prajvaajitas (recluses) and other the dharma consisting of the six Paramitas.

Afer a Simhavikriditta Samadhi his body illuminated the Trisahasta Mahasakagara Lokadhatu just as the bright clear sun or the full moon illuminates the World. The Buddha then showed his prakrijayamahabhava—real form—to all the Worlds. The several classes of gods as well as the men of the four continents, Jambudwipa, Aparagodana, etc. saw this Prakrijayamahabhava and though 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 Lokadhatu saw Sakyaamauni Buddha Preaching the Prajnaparamita to his Sangha of monks and congregation of Bodhisattvas. Though this conception of the refractile body of the Buddha had found currency in the Prajnaparamitas, the expression Sambhogakaya was still unknown to them.

It was usually called by them as Prajnyamahabhava (natural body) or Asecanakaatmahabhava (all-diffusing body). As a matter of fact, the Atasasrilekha is not even aware of the Prajnyamahabhava or Asecanakaatmahabhava, showing clearly its priority to the other Prajnaparamitas. It speaks only of Rapakaya and Dharmakaya. (Ast, pp.338, 497,513, and the long glorious description of Bodhisattva, which appears in the Sata and Pancavinsati-Sahasrika as Nalana, is totally absent from it. It is only to the recast version of the Pancavinsati that the expression Sambhogakaya was introduced by way of giving a gist of the topic. (Panc, A.S.B Ms, Leaf, 339a, B1 Sambhogika-Kaya). Is 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 refractile Kaya as Netvoja (crested) and as such it included in Rapakaya 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 Sambhogakaya only). To him the distinction of Sambhogakaya and Rapakaya was unimportant, as both of them were unreal (Eastern Buddhist, 11pp. 17ff.). The rupa of both the Sambhogakaya is exceedingly subtle and expansive without limit, yet it is Saratigtha (possessed of the quality of obstruction). Nevertheless, the subtle bodies of countless Buddhas are interpretable. The recast version of the Pancavinsatti, (Panc, A.S.B Ms, Leaf 359 a, cf. Skt. p. 159, Bodiv pp. 1-4,
Mū., iii pp. 344, 452), refers to the Sambhogakāya, and does not, like the karika, distinguish between Dharmakāya (Svasambhoga) and Parasambhogakāya, the reason being that in the original version of the Pancavimsati, there must have been, as in the other Prajñaparamitas, 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 kāya by using only somewhat different names. The conception of the Svasambhogakāya shows a tendency of the Yogacara school to posit something like the Isvara of the Upanishads behind the Phenomenal universe. The Dharmakāya corresponds to the impersonal absolute of the Vedanta of the Brahman, and the Sambhogakāya to the Isvara when Brahman assumes name and form. Every Buddha, it should however, be noted has his own Sambhogakāya but all Buddhas have one Dharmakāya. The Lanka-vatara also gives hints to this effect. It says that Abhara (absence of anything) is not Tathāgata and again, as Tathāgata is described as "Anutpada-amṛtrodha", it has some meaning. It then describes the Manomaya-dharmakāya (for the definition of Manomaya Kāya 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 bhūmis. Just as different names of one things or one person like Hasta, Kuru, Puni or Indra, Suka, Purandara indicate different aspects of the same thing, so also the different name of Saśāmuni Buddha in the Sahalokadhātu, eg. Svayamabhū, Nāyaka, Trisāhā, Vīsnu, Isvara, Pradhanā, Kapila, Soma, Bhaskara, Rama, Vyasa or Surya, Tāhata, Bhūtakūti, Nirvāna, Sarvajña, etc., indicate the different aspects of Saśāmuni Buddha (Lanka, pp. 192-3, cf Dasa p. 55). People being subjected to the conceptions of two extremes "is" or "is not" (Dvanyantapatiṣya) 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 Dharmakāya, existing in the Saha Lokadhātu, is the same as the Svasambhogakāya or the Siddhi and the Aseanaka-atmahāva or Prakṛtyātmabha of the Prajñaparamitas and it corresponds to the Upanisadic conception of Isvara.

**Dharmakāya:** 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 Nirmanakāya by the early Mahāyānists including Nagarjuna. The only real Kāya of Buddha is the reality as conceived by the Mahāyānists, and is not different from the things or beings of Universe (In a Buddhist inscription of Butsumbang, a stanza in salutation of Buddha brings out this idea, see le Muscoun, vol. vii). Though an attempt to define it by the current words and expressions is bound to be not only incorrect but misleading, the Mahāyānic texts however tried to give an idea of it as far as the language permitted. The Karika and the Siddhi call it Svabhavikā or Svabhavakāya. It is according to them, immeasurable and illimit-
able. It fills all space. It is the basis of the Sambhogha and Nirmanakaya. It is devoid of all marks (i.e. Mahapurusalaakasana) and is inconceivable (Nisparpanca).

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. vs. M.P. 508:Nirvana is one for all Buddhas).

It can only be realised within one's own self (Pratyamvedya) 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 of 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 nirvikarikapala nirvikuppa", (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 ekavaha tathata duyasa, dividikaara duyasa thata na kavachic tathata Vayu sa na Kanyacita tathata tattha sa tathata duyasa dividhik Karayavata thata. That which is Tathagata-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.Yr. 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 dharmatraya tathagatam prajnati. cf. M. Yr. p. 448 dharmato bodhii darsatyah).

The Buddha-kaya, 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. 515). 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 Bodhisatvas, unless and until they reach the tenth bhumi, cannot extricate themselves from a concep-
tion of the Tathagatakaya, however, sūtra it may be (e.g. the Svamabhokakya). They are still under a delusion and it is this delusion that the Prajnaparamitas endeavor 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 endeavor to establish. His point is that, if Bhavasatat (series of existence) be admitted then the existence of a tathagata should also be admitted for the Tathagata represents the ultimate state of this Bhavasatati. 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 Bhavasatati does not exist, (Tathagato nisvabhava-nisvabhava idam jagat, Tathagato nisvabhava-nisvabhava 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 Stupa, but at the same time he says that they do not assert the nonexistence (Nastvita) of the Tathagata in every way, for then they would be guilty of Apyavada (denial) and yet being desirous of describing the Tathagata by means of Vayu- vahatra-satya (conventionally) and by taking recourse to super-impositions (Samarupa) 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 Vajracchedika, to which the Astasahasrika as well as the Bodhicaryavatara (p. 42) refers to viz. he who endeavoured to see me through my form and voice could not see me because: dharmato buddha drustvanyah dhammakaya he nayakah, dharmatma capy avijnaten us sadya vijacitum. 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 unknowable 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 yasvathavastat svabhavamidjamagat), or nature itself and asserting that the Tathagata, whom people or even Bodhisattvas have in view, is only a Bubha (imagine) of Kosala dharmas and is not the real Tathata or Tathagata, (im, 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
(Prapancaśāntive buddham prapancaśānti tattvaś ca, Te prapancaśāntai sarveṇaṃ viśvaṃ, Tathāgatām. 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 (Niralambha) 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-Mahayanaists. It is to be realised only within one's own self. The Sutravatara Sūtra, p. 43, calls it Svabhūvaka dharmakāya. It is one and the same kaya in all Buddhas, very subtle, unknowable and eternal.

The Trimśika, p. 44, explains the Dharmakaya as the transformed Āśraya (substratum) - the alaya-vijnana - the transformation being effected by knowledge (Jñāna) and the suppression of the two evils (Duṣṭa-hyuṣya), viz., Klesavatara and Jhreyavatara. The Alokā on the Athbhavapalankara Kārika also explains the Dharmakāya in the similar way. According to it, there are two kinds of Dharmakaya, one being the Bodhipakṣa and the other dharmas, which are themselves pure and productive of clear knowledge (nirprapanchapramanana) and other the transformed Āśraya of the same, which is then called Svabhavakāya. Professor Schierbatsky, con. of N.P. 185 n, supplies us with nearly the same information that we find in the Alokā of some sources which he does not mention. He says that "according to the early Yogacaras, the Dharmakaya is divided into Svabhavakāya and Jhānakāya of which the first is the motionless (Nīpita) substance of the universe and the second is Ātmya i.e., changing, living." Evidently, when the Professor means by Jhānakāya is the Dharmakāya, consisting of the Bodhipakṣa and other dharmas of the Alokā. Then the Svabhavakāya is the Nīpata, as pointed out by him, is also supported by the Svaraṇābhāsana and other texts, (Svārāṇābhāsana B.T. S.P. 8, laukā, p. 78, Sutra, p. 46). The Chinese commentators on the Siddhi state that Dharmakaya is the metaphysical principle of real Gita and Rupa of the Tathāgata. It is the real nature of things, and can be equated with Tathata. Dharmadhatu or Tathāgatagarbha, (Laukā, pp. 77, 78). The goal of Bodhisattvas is to realise the Dharmakaya. Every being hit the Dharmakaya, or the Dharmakaya comprises all beings of the World, but as they are blinded by śaya, they do not realise this fact. What the Bodhisattva aims at is the removal of this śaya and the realisation of the fact that he is the same as the Dharmakaya. The Alokā on the Kārika enumerates the steps through which Bodhisattva passes and points out that the last step of a Bodhisattva is to realise the Dharmakaya (Dharmakāyaśānti-bhūmībhodhena bhavati), after which it becomes easy for him to assume any one of the four kayas. In the Lankavatara we notice that Mahāmati is anxious to know how are Bodhisattvas, after completing the ten bhumis, can attain the Tathāgatakāya or Dharmakaya and go to any one of the buddha-keoters or heavens. The Lankavatara also describes in rosy colours the prospect of attain-
ing the Madhavamanghe 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 Bodhisattvas by realising within himself the Dharmakaya Nairatmya and confronts the Dharmakaya (Lanka, pp. 51, 70). The Trimsika says that just as Vimalakirti is the goal of the Arhats, so Dharmakaya is the goal of the Bodhidatas. It shows that as the arhats by getting rid of Klesavaranas obtain a purified kaya, so also a Buddha by getting rid of both Klesavaranas and Jeyavarana obtains the Dharmakaya (Trimsika, p. 49). The world of experience is phenomenal. It may be compared to a magical illusion or dream. In the Asatasahsrita-Prajnaparamita (R. Mitra’s ed. p. 39) the following passage appears:

Ayuṣman Subhirītīn tān devaputraṇa etāt avacat mayapamas te Sattva. Svapnopamases te Sattrāḥ iti he mayacat Satācas ca advaṣa avideviñāka. Evam Sakrdagamim pi arhattam pi Samyak-dhīnaṃ pi mayapama Svapnopamah. Ayuṣman 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 Gāstana Buddha are illusion or dream. The absolute, i.e. the Dhammakaya of Buddha, is indescribable. It is the only reality that Buddha realised at Bodhigaya. 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 unattractive and unmeasurable, 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 Upāsiṇids. This is identical with the Dhammakaya 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 aspect with the world.

The leaders of men possess true body or nature, which is unknowable. It cannot be known except within one's own self (Pratyatma-vedya). In the Astasahsri-Prajnaparamita (R. Mitra’s ed. p. 94) appears the following passage:

Mudhali imam bhiksavah satkāraya kaṃ ca manyadhyam. Dharma-kaṣa Parinirvattato mām bhiksavo drales yanti; O mones, you should not think that this individual body is my body. O monk, 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 Dharma. 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 up to one thousand or still more. On waking up, he would however, no longer see even one Tathagata or two or three or up to thousand or still more. These Tathagata do not come from anywhere nor go to anywhere. They are eternal and ever existing. (As. 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 fulfills the needs of others by manifesting itself to them, does not do so through the cognitive norm, the Dharma Kaya, but through the two operational ones, the Sambhogakaya and Nirmanakaya. In this respect the philosophical conviction of all Mahayanaists, that the realization of the cognitive norm through intelligent appreciative of discrimination which intensively 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 attest to an inner course that corresponds to the ultimate cognitive norm by conceiving the nature of all that is beyond the judgments 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 own 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 is performed, and because of these actions they remain 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 fulfillment 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 awareness of motive which is the crucible of cogitable 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 appurtenance being, while its subjective pole (iv) is the cognition of its nothingness. The last step (v) is the unity of appurtenance existence and nothingness. It is a means to realize Buddhahood which is the most sublime idea man can have of man. “With Metta”.