The Doctrine of Kaya (Trikaya)

-Prof. R.G. Vagi

The first point of difference between the Hinayana and Mahayana schools was noticed by the Sadharm Purusarika, viz. 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 Hinayanaists and Mahayanaists. 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 Mahayanaists 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 Mahayanaists. The early Mahayanaists, whose doctrines are mostly to be found in the Astasahasrikā Prajñā Paramitā, along with the school of Naṭṭūṇa had conceived two kayas:

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

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 Sambhoga-kaya for Nyaya-buddha and Svabhavakakaya for Dharmakaya. In the Abhisamaya Lankara Karika and in the recast version of the Pancaravimuni-Sahostottra-Prajnaparamita, Sambhoga-kakaya denotes the subtle body which the Buddhadas 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 Svabhavakaya-ka. The Vijnaptimatratusiddhi retains the conception of the Karika but adopts a new term, Svamsabhoga kaya, to denote the Dharmakaya of the Karika and distinguishes the Sambhoga-kakaya by calling it Parasambho-ga 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 Hinayanaists for being able to retain the human conception of Buddha even a century or two after his actual existence, when the scriptures may be regarded as having been put into a definite shape. They gave expression to their conception of Buddha in the following words:

'Bhagava araham Sammata-sambuddha Vittacarinasaampanno Sagato Lokavidu anuttaro Purisadamma Sarathi Sthita devamavitussanam buddhabhaga. So imam Lokam Sadiyakam Samarakam Sabrahmakam Sassyamanci Brahmanim pajam Saduvamauussanam Sayam aishhina Sacchhitkata Pave. So dharam deseti aitikyanam etc'. The Blessed one is an arhat, a fully awakened one, endowed with knowledge and good conduct, happy, a knower of the world, unsurpassed, a leader able to control men, a teacher of men and gods, the awakened, the blessed. He knows thoroughly the worlds of god, maras, recluses, brahmans and men, and knowing 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, Dhaga, 1, pp. 87-88; et Lalvis, p. 3; sad p, pp. 444, 376) etc. A description like this does not suggest that Buddha was originally more than a man, a mortal. In the cosmology of the Buddhists, the gods of the various heavens, the highest of which is Brahmaloka, (In the Mahayana works also, as for instance in the Dasa, it is stated that a Bodhisattva can become a Mahabrahman in the ninth bhumi if he so wishes) are only beings of Superior merit and power, but they are inferior, in the matter of spiritual attainments, to the saints or arhats. So in this description, the Hinayanaists do not attribute any transcendental or theistic element to Buddha. All they say is that Sakyamuni, by pure and simple spiritual culture in this life and as a result of the accumulated merits of his previous lives reached the highest stage of perfection
and attained not only knowledge and power superior to any man or god but also the highest knowledge and power attainable. In the Majjhima 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 Buddhas. Moreover, a Buddha is the originator of the marga, which is only followed by the Savakuśas (Majjhima, III, p.8).

NIKAYA PASSAGES ADMITTING A NON-REALISTIC CONCEPTION

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

1) Yo Yo Ananda maṇḍapī amañña cāyamano Ga desito Paññato Sova man' accayena Sathā. 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, P154, Mil.P.99). The Dhamma and Vinaya clearly refer to the collection of doctrines and disciplinary rules delivered by Buddha. This is also evident from the conversation of Ananda with Gopako Moggallana, where the former explains why the monks after Buddha's death should not feel without refuge (appatiṣārasa). He says that they have now a refuge in Dhamma (dhammanatāsaana) which he points out are the doctrines and disciplinary rules, (Majjhima, Gopako-Moggallana Sutta (No. 108). In Saddhāma Sanghāha (I PTS, 1890), ch.65, Buddha says "84,000 dhammakārhādhas have been preached by me in 45 years. I alone will pass away while there are 84,000 dhammakārkandhas which like 84,000 Buddhas (Buddha, Saddhāma will admonish you)".

2) Bhagavata mhi putto orasa mukhato tarī dhammato, dhammanimmito, dhammadāsado. (Samyutta, 11, p.221, majjhima, 111, p.29 has the identical passage with the addition "no a misadāsado" after dhammadāsado. "For the interpretation of 'dhammadāsado' see majjhima, 1, pp.12). Tam kissa hetu 2, Tathagatassa h'etam adhiyacanam. "dhammakāryotip Dhammaṁbhūto, (Majjhima, 11, p.84, Digha, 111, p.84, Majjhima, 111, pp.195, 224 has "Bhagavāvanānaṃ janati passam punsatī Gakkikabhūto na bhuto dhammanimito no"), tī piti.

Just as a brahmāna would say that he is born of Brahma, through his mouth Brahmāna putto orasa Mukhato fato brahajjo brahmānimmito brahmāna yado-so a Sāvyā puttiya samaya may say that he is born of Bhagava, through his mouth, born of his doctrine made of his doctrine,
etc. Though this passage Dhamma is equated with Brahms the context shows that there is no metaphysical sense in it; it is only to draw a parallel between a brahma and a Sakayupathy-samana that Dhammakaya is equated with Brahmskaya.

3) Vakkali on his death bed became very eager to see Buddha in person. So Bhagava came to him and said, 'Alam Vakkali kum to Patikayena dithema. Yo kho vakkali dhammam passati mam passati, Yo nam passati so dhamma passati.' Just after saying this Buddha referred to his dhamma of impermanence (anicca). There are the Nikayas as many passages of this import which may be taken as precursors of the later Mahayanic conceptions and probably formed the basis of this speculation. But when read through the passage as they stand they do not appear to bear any metaphysical sense. In this passage Buddha refers to his body as puthkaya (body of pure matter), and to lay stress on his doctrices 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 - Yopasica amuppadam passat so dhammam passat yo dhammam passati so Pati-ca samuppadam Passati). For other references see Pro. Valle poussic article 'Notes sur les corps du Buddha' in Lemusin,1913,PP. 259-290 compare the remarks in the later pali works, samatthamit sangaha (Jpto 1890), P61 Yone Passati saddhanam so mam passati Vakkali, Apassamana saddhanam mam pase pina passati,milinda, P71. Yodhammam Passati so Bhagavantam passati, dhammo bi maharaja bhagavata desitoi. Ibid, P73: Dhammakayena pana kho xaraha Sakka bhagava nidussetv, dhammohi maharaja bhagavata desitoi.

4) The passage in the anugutta Nigaya, (Anguttara,11 P. 38), where Buddha says that he is neither a goa nor a gandhabba, nor a man has been taken by Prof. Masson-Oursel, (Prof. Masson-oursel in his article "Les trets troits carps du Buddha," J.A. 1913,PP. 581), as showing trace of the Mahayanic kaya conception. It is not impossible to read some metaphysical ideas into the passage, though probably the compiler of the sutras did not mean to convey them. Dona bramana noticing the sign of the wheel in the feet of Buddha, enquired him whether he was a deva, a gandhabba, a Yakkha or a mortal. The Buddha replied that he was none of these beings as he had got rid of the asavas (impurities) which continuing of would make one remain a deva, gandhabba, Yakkha or mortal. Just as a lotus is born in water, 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 (abhiphappiya) and lived unaffected by the same. Therefore, he asked the brahma not to regard him as anything but Buddha.
KAYA CONCEPTION OF THERAVADINS REMAINED UNCHANGED

Even if it be assumed that the Mahaparinic ideas are latent in the above mentioned expressions though not adequately expressed, the discussion in the Kathavatthu has made it amply clear that the Vettiyakas 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 terrors pukakaya and dhammakaya found their way into the later pali works, (see, eg. sad san. (IPTS, 1890) p69-
Sambuddhanam dew Kayarapakaya Siredhaza, yo tehe desito dhammo dharmakayo vecati) in mahayana or in the semi mahayana works, they however did not bring with them any non realistic sense, Buddhaghosa, even as late as the fifth century A.D., refers thus to the Kayas: Yopeso Bhaggra asiti anuyyan janapatomandita-dvattim xama na purea lakkhana vicitra pukakayo sabbakara parusuddhi sila lakka hotthi gunaratanasamaddhi dhammakayo yasamhato pennamahatta appatipaggala graham samma sambuddhe.

That Bhaggra, who is possessed of a beautiful pukakaya, adorned with eighty minor signs and thirty-two major signs of a great man, and possessed of a dhamnakaya purified in every way and glorified by sila, samadhi. (The five Jhanhas referred to here are sīla samadhi, parma viśūthi and vimutinana dassana, see mil, p.98) etc, who is full of splendour and virtue, is incomparable and fully awakened (vis.m. p.234, jataka, i, p. 94-95pukakayaste). Though Buddhaghosa's conception was realistic, he was not immune from the religious bias of attributing superhuman powers to Buddha. In the Athisaline, (4tha, p.16), he says that during the three months of his absence from the world while Buddha was engaged in preaching Athisalama to his mother in the Tusita heaven, he created some Nimmita Buddha as exact replicas of himself. These Nimmita Budhas could not be distinguished from the real Buddha in voice, words and even the rays of
light that issued forth from his body. The created Buddhas could be detected only by the gods of the higher classes and not by the ordinary gods or men of the world. In short, the early Hinayanaists conceived Buddha's rupakaya as that of a human being, (see Profs. Valéry Poussin's Buddhism, p. p. 252), and his dhammakaya 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 pitakas in Sanskrit were lost beyond recovery and we have to depend for our information upon them 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. Chien Akanuma (Eastern Buddhist, 11, p. 7) quotes some passages from the Chinese Anguttara and Samyutta Agamas and shows that the dhammakaya of Buddha derived the collection of dharmas teaching. Our main source of information at present is the Abhidhammaka, made accessible to us from Pali by the monumental French translation of Professor A. Valéry Poussin. The Kosa, again, 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 Lalitavistara, (Winternitz, 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 dhammakaya of the Buddha and bearing the identical sense of the Pali works. On one occasion Sramokottikanassa said that through the grace of his teacher, he had seen the dhammakaya 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. (Dhyya, p. 19). Upagupta once said to Mara that he had seen only dhammakaya 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. 560). In the answer that Isag Rodramana gave to Simhsara it says, “na rajan Kapano loke dhammakaayena Simhspreet” (Let not, o king, an impious person). Ibid, p 560. Kapano is defined thus:

Yastu dhammavirgarathm adhanre nirotu arpala, sarajman kapano theyam tamasta mah parayanan, (attain, attain, touch) the dhammakaya. The word ‘dhammacaya’ may bear a metaphysical interpretation out the context does not
warrant it. (Ibid p. 560). The remarks made by Asoka, after Upagupta had pointed out to him the stupa of Ananda, makes the sense of dharmakaya quite explicit. It runs thus - That body which you all call pura, excellent and made of dharm (dharmatma= dharmamaya) was borne (dharmam) by him called Visoka (Ananda) and therefore his stupa deserves great honour. The lamp of Dharm, the dispeller of the darkness of afflictions that burn still among men was due to the power of him, the son of Sagarttara and therefore should be worshipped with special reverence (Divya, pp. 596-7). Cf. Priyulski, Asoka, P-408. In connection with the destruction of the law, Mahyzaya exclaimed cettv quisortaeedu corps dela loi (dharmakaya), Ou Sont-ils alles. There are, however, Avadanas in the Divyavadara, which were not without some Mahayanistic in, for, we read in the Pudrayana Vadana (Divya, xxxii, p. 568), as we usually find in the Mahayanic works, that rays of light issued forth from the Buddha's mouth when he smiled, iradating, the beings of heaven and hell. It is noteworthy that the Athasakade (Arth, p. 16), also speaks of raysa (rays of light) of six colour issuing out of the Buddha's body. It seems that the Mahayana ideas were percolating gradually into the rudy soil of the conservative Theravadin.

Lalitavistara:- The Lalitavistara gives us a picture of the Buddha more super human than human and yet far from the Mahayana conception of the Samabhogakaya and Dharmakaya, though in the last two chapters it dwells on the doctrine of Tathata. In the Lalitavistara Buddha is defied but there are no trace of the Trikaya conception. It says in many places that Buddha appears in the world of mea for Lokavnanta, (E. G. mm. I pp. 168, 178), i.e. to follow the ways of the world, which, if he to 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 Buddha and Ananda, in order to make the narrative appear Mahayana and not Hinayana. At one place Buddha explained to Ananda that, unlike human beings he did not stay in the fifth of mother's womb but in a jewel-casket (rattanyula), [U] vis.pp. 88,165, 106. This formed one of the points of contention of the Mahasanghikas. See Maeda, early origio etc. in the Asia Major. Vol. I, placed in the womb, which was as hard as adamant but soft to the vouch like the down of a Kacalindika bird, and that its birth and other events connected with it were all supernaturn. At the same time he prophesied that there will be, in the future, men defiled in act, thought and speech, ignorant, insatiable, 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. 87-86. This goes against the Sarvastivada and Theravada conceptions). One can perceive through the poetical exaggeration of the Lalitavistara that it has in view the historical Buddha endowed with major and minos sings of a human being who requires his passions 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-Jaana paramita, the art of Achyana, Vacana etc.) In connection with the offer of houses which was made by the gods to the Bodhisattva when he was in the womb, it is said that in order to please all the gods who offered houses he caused the appearance of his pregnant mother Mayadevi in each of those 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 mentioned, he is called the great tree (mahabodhi) because he possesses a body of Dharmakaya Joana (the knowledge of Dharmakaya) (LaI, vis. 7.428). As this chapter is very likely a Mahayana addition, we may reasonably say that the Lalitavistara, in its original form as a treatise of the Sarvastivadin's, viewed Bodha as a human being with superhuman attributes.

Abhidharmakosha: We may now consider the writing of Vasubandhu, the great exponent of the Sarvastivada school. In his Abhidharmakosha he imports a new meaning into the words Dharmakaya and Rupakaya. In examining the three savanas, 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 Buddhahood, 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 Kaya (knowledge of the destruction of misery). Annapada, kosa, vi, 67, explain that Kaya with Annapada, maker Bodhi. On occasion of difference among Saints in the acquisition of these jhanas, bodhi is said to be three kinds: Swaha bodhi, Pratistha Buddha bodhi and Ananta, samyakamahabodhi. By the above two jhanas one can completely abandon ignorance (Asesavida Pratapa): 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 Samyagdrsti of the Asaikas is to see things as they really are and to know the true original character (Samyagdakasa) of dharmas. (See kosa, vi, 50 fn. For a note on the Kayavaha, see Macion, Early origin etc., in Asia major, vol. II, Fane. 1.) Knowledge of the above non-originating, and Sannyagdrsti (right view), of the Asaikas together with the dharmas attendant on the jhana, viz., the five pure skandas, are found to be the dharmas constituting Dharmakaya. In another place, while showing the sameness of the Dharmakayas of all Buddhas, he explained the Dharmakaya as a series of pure dharmas, or rather a renewal of the psycho-physical organism.
of the substratum (anuśravādhamatana, asrayaparamāvatī). (Kosa, VII, 34, for the sense of Āśraya see ibid, VIII, 34 in cf āśraya paripāddhi in sutra, p. 186). The Dharmakaya then signifies a new purified personality or substratum (āśraya), but it is pointed out that such a dharmakaya is possessed also by an arhat (Kosa, IV, 56). In the Suśralakāra, (Huber, Suśralakāra, pp. 217, 390 quoted in the Kosa vii, 32 p. 81), such a dharmakaya is attributed to the mother of Sākyamuni 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 (āśraya) possessed by him. The Kosa, in fact, replaces the concrete conceptions of the Dharmakaya found in the Nikaya and the Vayavadana by an abstract one. In the last two works, the Dharmakaya signified only the doctrines, viz., the Bodhisattva dharmas or Āntica, Dukkha and Anatta, together with the Vinaya rules contained in the Patimokkhā, while to Vasubandhu it means the qualities adhering to a Buddha as well as the purified personality (āśraya).

Referring to the formula of the Saranas, Vasubandhu says that the physical body (rupakaya) of the Buddha does not undergo any modification due to the acquisition of the quality of the Buddha, one should not therefore take refuge in the rupakaya of Buddha, which is, in fact, the rupakaya of the Bodhisattva and hence sāravā (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 Buddha the person. In the same way Vasubandhu explains the two other Saranas, viz., Dharma and Sangha, the former being explained as Nirvana or the three Truths - Dukkha, Samudaya and Marga, or Suddha, Dukkha and Anikkha-waikkha-and the latter as the qualities that a Sangha of monks is expected to possess (compare the formula of Sarana in the Nikayas, e.g. Diśha, 111, p. 227).

The Viśhūsa 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 (sārava) and therefore should not be a place of refuge. The refuge should be the Anuśrava dharma, which make a Buddha, i.e. the Dharmakaya, (Kosa, vi, p. 32, lpp. 76, viii, p. 54). Apparently the Viśhūsa refers in the first case to the earlier Hinayana Schools and in the second to the Sarvastivadins and their followers.

DHARMKAYA CONCEPTION AMONG THE SATYASIDDHIS AND THE MAHAYANISTS

The Satyasiddhi school takes almost the similar view of the Dharmakaya as the Sarvastivadins. According to it, the Dharmakaya is made of Sīla, samadhi,
Prajñā, Vimukti and Vimuktiśādarsana Buddhaṅgārāja, Nāgārjuna and the author of the Milindapantha also refer to such dharmakāyas. 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 Dharmakāya. But as these purifications are obtained by Arhats also, Bhūrirman, the propounder of the Satyāsiddhi school distinguished the Dharmakāyas of the Buddha 4 saying that his Dharmakāya consisted not only of the above five post facto practices but also of ten powers (dana bala), four proficiencies (vaiśāradhyā), and the three recollections (svayapāsana), which the Arhats cannot obtain (Śūra, systems etc., pp.187,182).

The Abhisamaya Laktara Karika, (Karika, cn. VIII), and Pancavimsati Sahasrika-prajñā-paramita, (pans. ABS, leaf 224a), and important text-books of the Yogacara school, define the Dhammakāya in a similar sense. They stated that the various dharmas, ‘ūś, Bodhipākṣa, Aparama, Vimokṣa, Samapatis and so forth, constitute Sarvajñata (omniscience) and Sarvajñata is the Dharmakāya.

It should be noted that the Karika and the Prajñā-paramita use this expression in a sense different from that current in the Mahāyāna texts. They really mean the Svastabhimahākāya of the later Viśnuavadins. The Prajñā-paramitas also maintain the conception that the Dharmakāya is produced by dharmas, the highest of which is, according to them, the Prajñā-paramita, i.e., the knowledge, which helps a person to realise the dharma-sunya. The Astasahasrika takes up the question, whether the honour shown to the relics of the Taithāgata-kāya is more meritorious than the honour shown to the Prajñāparamita, e.g., by making a copy of it. The answer given is that the relics depend on the body purified by the Prajñāparamita, 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 Prajñā-paramita than the relics, (Astā, ch.4). It adds that all teachings of Buddha issue from the Prajñāparamita and the Bhārmahānākas should preserve and propagate them; so the Bhārmahānākas should also be respected. They are protected by the Dharmakāya developed from the Prajñāparamita. From Sarvajñata issues the body of Taithāgata, the relics of whom are worshipped and hence Prajñāparamita deserves greater honour (Buddh. P 99). It is from this conception that the Prajñā-paramita is addressed as the mother of Buddhās.

HINAYANI SPECULATIONS

Whether Rūpakañja is Viṣṇuṣakja?

The kṣāya maintains that the Rūpakañja of the Buddha endowed with the ma-
jor and minor signs is the result 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 Sakya mundu. The Vadhya and the Vibhasa explain that it happened to sakya mundu only, and not to the other Buddhists, because in one of his former lives he sowed dissensions among the disciples of an ascetic, possessed of five Abhinana, (Kos'a, VII, 34, p. 86, 84, IV, 102, p. 212 th. 2). That the Buddhists enjoy or suffer the effects of Karma is also maintained by the Divya Vadaana, (Divya Vadaana, p. 416), and the Majjima Nikaya, (Majjima, II, p. 227). The Divya Vadaana refers to a saying of Sakya mundu that even the Jinas themselves are not free from their Karmas, while the Majjima Nikaya says that a Tathagata performs good deeds in his previous lives, and as a result of these, he enjoys in the present, pure and pleasant sensations (Vedana) only. Tradition says that when Buddha was hurt by the splinter of stone thrown by Devadatta, he said that ninety-one Kalpas ago he had hurt a person by a spear, and as the result of which evil deed, he now received a wound. The Milindapanha, however, takes a different view of this matter. Admitting that Devadatta created a schism in the Sangha, it says that the schism was not created by any act of the Buddha’s own, and as it was caused by an external influence, it should not be said that Buddha as the result his Karma had a divided assembly (Bhejajapiso). In a similar way, it explains away the wound or the illnesses, from which Buddha suffered. First it asserts that Buddha attained omniscience after uprooting all roots of evil (Akisasamudilas) so that he could not have any more sufferings through Karma. It then says that apart from Karma, there are other cause like the three humours, seasons etc., which produce Vedana (feelings). According to it, the wound that Buddha received was due to Opakammika (accidental) cause and his illnesses to cause other than Karma (Mil,pp. 134 F).

WAS THE BUDDHA A JARAYUJA OR UPAPADUKA ?

In order to remove doubt from the mind of the people as to the nature of the birth of so great and meritorious a being as the Bodhisatta in his last existence—a doubt expressed also in the Lalivistara, where a Ratnavyuha has been devised for the Bodhisattva’s abode in his mother’s womb— the Kosà (Kosà, III, 9), proceeds to show that the Bodhisattvas possess the power of choosing the manner of their birth (Upapatti Vasishta), and that Sakya mundu chose birth in a woonà (Jarayu) with two objectives:—One was to benefit the Salya clan and at the same time not to give an opportunity to the people to consider him as a magician or a god or a demon, and the other was to leave some relics of his body, by worshipping which men and other beings would go to heaven by thousands, or attain deliverance. The Mahasanghikas and their followers (e.g. the Vettuylaksa) insist that Sakya mundu was an Upapaduka (self born), and that even his son Rahula was also an Upapaduka for Bodhisattvas are possessed of ‘Adhishthani rddhi’ (i.e., the miraculous power
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of appearing anywhere and in any form), and by that power Sakyamunā made a
show of his existence in the womb of Maya. They considered Buddha as Lokottara
(transcendental), and Sakyamunī as only a created body (Nirmanakaya). The
transcendental Buddha has a Rupakaya, which is limitless, everlasting, and free
from all Sasrava dharmas. He is always in Samadhi, (cf. Lanka, p.240 Sada
Samahitas Catadhagata), never sleeps or dreams, and can know everything in
an instant of thought. He knows neither fatigue nor rest, and is ever busy in enlight-
ening 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
Mahasanghiyakas conceived Buddha as a totally supramundane being with limitless
powers and knowledge, who never desired to attain Nirvana, (see Mandsa’s
origin and Doctrines of Early Indian Buddhist schools, Asia Major, Vol.II.Fasc.
1; Aneški’s article in the ERE, SV Doctism Buddhism; Suzuki’s Outlines of Mahayana
and Buddhism, pp. 249-251. See also Rosa, III, 9, referring to Mu, 1 pp.145,154).

KAYA CONCEPTION AT THE BEGINNING OF MAHYAYANA

The Mahayanists incorporated the Nirmanakaya conception of the
Mahasanghiyakas into their Trikaya Theory, adding the two others, Sambhogakaya
dharmakaya, the former approaching the Mahasanghi 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
Suvastрабhūsā tried to erase from the minds of the people the lingering im-
pression about the historical existence of Sakyamunī. In the Pundarika (Sūd. p pp.
31ff), we find Maitreyā assuming the role of a sceptic and enquiring how Bud-
dha 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 condu-
cive to Buddhahood for many millions of years, as his disciples, appears para-
doxical. Maitreyā says further that in the minds of those Bodhisattvas, who re-
cently became Mahayanists (Navavamśamranaditah), there may be doubts of his
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 (Avakalpyadbhau
Abhiradaddham) and says: “it is not to be considered (Navā Drastavyam), that
Bhagavan Sakyamunī 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
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bets 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 expedients for imparting the dharma (Upaya-kausalya-dharma-disanañhitah-saranirnaya). 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, as the Tathagatas know that what the three dhatus really are; they know that the dhatus are neither born nor non-existing neither they are the same nor different, and they are neither true 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 disordered 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 Sravaka Sangha, and showed myself at Graharakuta, and explained to them how to attain the approbation”.

In the Susruta Prabhava (Suvarga-prabhava, R.T.s.ed.pp.4-8), Ruciraketa and Kaundinya the brahmaṇa play the role of sceptics. The former enquires why Sakyanimitta, 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. Ruciraketa is told by the Buddhas of all lokadhatus that they did not know any man or god who could calculate the length of Sakyanimittas 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 brahmaṇa, who only feigned ignorance, was told by Littavikarama that, just as it is absurd to expect coconuts from a rose-apple tree, so it is absurd to expect a relic from the Buddha’s hāya. The Tathagatas have no origin and they are ever existing and inconceivable. It is only the Nirmanakaya that is shown by them. How can a baby, in which there is no bone or blood, leave a śākha (relic)? The Buddhas have only Dharmakaya and there is only the Dharmacakaya.

Nirmānakaśya:- The Mahayana texts tried to show, on the one hand, that the Hinayanaists were wrong in their belief that Sakyanimitta was really a man of flesh and blood and that relics of his body existent, while on the other hand, they introduced the two conceptions of Nirmānakaśya and Buddhakaśya. Whoever is said to have been done by Sakyanimittas is accounted for by those texts as the apparent ōving of a created body of the Buddhakaya, a shadowy image created to follow the ways of the world (Lokotpaksa, of mta, 1 pp. 168, 1779 in order to bring...
conviction in the hearts of the people that the attainment of Buddhahood was not an impossibility.

As the Buddhas possess the knowledge of all that is to be done (bodhisattva jhan, one of the four jhanas peculiar to Buddha, see Nayut, p.2), they can take any form they desire for the enlightenment of the various classes of beings. The Mahayanaic conception of Nirmanakaya is essentially the same as that of the Mahasanghikas. The Prajna-Paramitah in their quaternion refer to the Nirmanakaya or Rupakaya. The Pancavimsati, says that a bodhisattva, after acquiring all the necessary dharmas and practising prajnaparamita, becomes a Sambuddha. Then he renders service to beings of all Lokadhatus (worlds) of the ten corners at all times by Nirmanakaya (Nimana clouds, pura, 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 Mus Prajnaparamita sutra and speaks of two kayas, Rupakaya and Dharma-kaya. 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 dharma-kaya was born at Rajagriha. The material body was necessary for “earthly truth”. It was for the deliverance of beings that Buddha assumed different kayas, different names, birthplaces and ways of emancipation. This interpretation of Rupa and Dharma-Kayas is also followed in the Chinese Parinirvanavas sutra and Sandhinirmocanasutra. (EB. 11, pp. 27 f).

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 then retiring from it, and ultimately attaining Nirvana by recourse to the ascetic practices.

The Vijayapramitah siddhi tells us that the Nirmanakaya is meant for Svaroids, Prateka-Buddhas, Prithgajasas (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 his other’s mind, as suit his purpose.

Not only could he transform himself into Saigyami, or Sariputra into a young girl, but also could create an altogether new apparitional body, not, of course, a living thinking being. Often he assumed the voice of Brahma or expressed himself through the mouth of Sariputra or Subhuti, and it was for this reason that we find Sariputra or Subhuti explaining some of the obscure Mahayana teachings which they themselves were not expected to understand. (Asst. 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 (Amaśavā). He could produce in mind any thought he liked, in fact, he appeared in his Nirmānakāya as Sakyaṃmu with a mind (citta) suited to the way of the world. He could also impose his thought on the mind of others.

The Abhidhamma Lankatātaṅka states that there are four kāyas, of which the Śabhāvīkā-kāya is real, and the three others, viz, Dharmasāvatārasvabhāgakāya, sambhogakāyakāya (parasambhoga kāya) and Nirmānakāya are samvatta (i.e. unreal) and these are meant for Bodhisattvas and Sāravasaka respectively. According to it, the Nirmānakāya was intended for Sāravasaka and Bodhisattvas who are not yet in one of the ten bhūmis. It describes the Nirmānakāya as a body unsevered from the real kāya and as the action performed by it are similarly unsevered from the kāya, they should be regarded as asamsāra (transcendental, i.e. not worldly). Then it proceeds to show that the thirty-seven kinds of purificatory actions performed by the Nirmānakāya are really the actions of the Dharma-kāya. The thirty-seven actions, explained by it, are the thirty seven steps, through which a Nirmānakāya passes after its inception. These are as follows: A Nirmānakāya (i) is unmindful of good or bad forms of existence; in other words, takes birth as an animal, human being or god as required is called Gaṭṭīpāsama; (ii) practices the four Samgrahavatasp (elements of popularity); (iii) enlightens himself about matter opposite and similar, good and evil, by the Srutamaya and such other means of knowledge, and than applies himself to the service of others, keeping himself unencumbered (i.e. having no ānāraya, like a magician for the things made by him magically); (iv) practises the six paramitas purified in three ways of Trīmunda Lavisuddha; (v) performs, and persuades other's to perform the ten kusala Karmāṇīthās (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 things and the all-pervasiveness of the Dhammattanu, and so on, until he reaches the Tathāgattabhumī after realising the absence of difference between things constituted and unconstituted (Karika, ch. viii, J.A. 1913, pp. 599, 600). In short, the Karika wants to say that the whole course of life of a Bodhisattva, extending through incalculable births is nothing but the Nirmānakāya, a thing not separate from the Dhammākāya, as in fact, according to the Mahāyāna philosophy, all creations are neither the same as, nor different from the Dhammattanu.

The Lankavatāra explains the relation of Nirmānakāya to Dhammākāya in the same way as the Karika. It states that Nirmātibuddhas are not produced by actions; the Tathāgata is neither in them nor outside them (sāvane hinnavata buddhava na karmagrabhava na tesu tathāgato na camyatabhyataḥ tathāgata) (Lankā. P.242, Iibd, P.73, Iibd, P.242, Iibd, P.57). It is only when the sons of the Jina
realise the visible world to have no existence apart from the spirit that they obtain, the Nirmanakaya is free from Kaya and Samshara, and endowed with Bala, Abhijna and Vashita. Like the Siddhi, it says that the Tathagata, by creating Nirmanakaya, perform the various duties of Tathagata (Tathagata Kaya). It also gives an interesting information that Vajrapani had served as an attendant on the Nirmamita Buddha, and not on the real Buddha. And that the function of such a Buddha is to preach and explain the characteristics of Dana, Dhana, Samadhi, Citta, Prajna, Jnana, Sakshi, Dhana, Jnana, Vino, and Vijnana.

Sambhoga Kaya: We have seen that the Rupakaya or Nirmamakaya was meant for the Swayam, Pratya Buddha, Prabhagunan and Bodhisattvas, who were not in one of ten Bhumi. So another Kaya had to be devised which should be very suitable kaya for the benefit of all Bodhisattvas. This is called Parasambhoga Kaya, as distinguished from Sambhoga Kaya which is described in the section of Sambhoga Kaya, as it is the most suitable body perceived by the Buddhists alone. It is a Parasambhoga Kaya, which plays the role of a preacher of the various Mahayana sutras being delivered either at Ge德拉, the only place in the three dhatus considered pure and suitable for the appearance of a Sambhoga Kaya, or at the Sakra, 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 Mahayanists were not yet able to forget or rise above the human conception of the Buddha of the Hinayanas.

They will gave Sakya atami the role of the presiding Buddha of the universe, to whom offered reverently with flower, incense, etc., all the Bodhisattvas, Swayams and Ghanapati of the various lokas of the ten directions, to hear from him the Prajna Paramita, the Suddharma Pundarika, or the gandhavatya.

These Bodhisattvas again had their own tutelary Buddhas, who according to the Mahayana metaphysics, possessed the same Dhamakaya as that of Sakya atami. They also came or were sometimes sent by their Buddhas, with message of greetings and flowers as tokens of their regard to Sakya atami Buddha, whose Buddhistateria was then the Sahadakadhata. Sometimes the descriptions go so far as to say that the Buddhas themselves came to hear discourse from Sakya atami Buddha and the concourse of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas became so great that the sana Loka was completely filled with all kinds of mountains, seas, rivers, and cities as well as of gods, men and other beings. As we read in the Lankaya texts that monks used to come to meet Buddha, bringing with them one or two Samanaras, so also we read in the Suddharmapundarika that on account of insufficiency of space the countless Buddhas could not have with them more than one or two Bodhisattvas as attendants (upasamaharks,uda p p.2/4-245).

Now let us see what was their conception of the Kaya of this Buddha. According to the Samsahandrika and the Panchavitasahandrika, (Satt p.8-29, Patca, pp.6-11, Samadhi rajaputra B.T.S ed.p. 10), it is an exceedingly refulgent body, from
every pore of which streamed forth countless brilliant rays of light, illuminating the lokadattis as innumerable rays of light issued forth from it, and on each ray of light was found a lotus of thousand petals on which was seated a Tathagata Vigraha (an image of the Tathagata, a sort of Nirmanakaya), preaching to Bodhisattvas, Grushthas (householders), Prajñarajitas (recluses) and other the dharma consisting of the six Paramitas.

After a Simhatvikridita Samadhi his body illuminated the Trisahasra Mahasakhasa Lokadhanu just as the bright clear sun or the full moon illuminates the World. The Buddha then showed his prakrtiyamahabhava (=real form) to all the Worlds. The several classes of gods as well as the men of the four continents, Jambudvipa, Apragodana, etc. saw this Prajnyatymahabhava 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 Lokadhanus saw Sakyamuni Buddha Preaching the Prajnaparamita to his Sangha of monks and congregation of Bodhisattvas. Though this conception of the refrangible body of that Buddha had found currency in the prajnaparamitas, the expression Sambhogakaya was still unknown to them.

It was usually called by them as Prajnyatymahabhava (natural body) or Ascanakarmahabhava (all-diffusing body). As a matter of fact, the Ascasasrikas is not even aware of the Prajnyatymahabhava or Ascanakarmahabhava, showing clearly its priority to the other Prajnaparamitas. It speaks only of Rupakaya and Dharmakaya. (Asta, pp.358, 497,513), and the long glorious description of Bodhisatva, which appears in the Sata and Pancavinsati Painting 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, (Panca, A.S.B Ms, Leaf, 359a; Bi Sambhogika-Kaya). Is it the Sambhogakaya is described thus: "Bodhisattvas, after attaining both of 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 refrangible Kaya as Nirmala (crested) and as such it included in it Rupakaya and did not feel the necessity of introducing the conception of a third kaya, the Sambhogika, Achara Nagarjuna was interested in giving an exposition of the real Kaya (i.e. Dharmakaya or Sambhadharaya only). To him the distinction of Sambhogakaya and Rupakaya was unimportant, as both of them were unreal (Eastern Buddhist, 11pp. 17ff.). The rupa of both the Sambhogakaya is exceedingly subtle and expansive without limit, yet it is Saktipada (possessed of the quality of obstruction). Nevertheless, the subtle bodies of countless Buddhas are interpenetrable. The recast version of the Pancavinsati, (Panca A.S.B Ms, Leaf 359 a, cf Sikou p. 159, Bodic pp. I 4, 30
Mru, ill pp. 344, 452), refers to the Sambhogakaya, and does not, like the karika, distinguish between Dharmakaya (Svavishhoga) and Parasambhogakaya, the reason being that in the original version of the Pancavimsati, there must have been, as in the other Prajnaparamitas, the conceptions of only two kayas, and not of three or four. The Karika in fact, supports the Siddhi in regard to the conception of kaya by using only somewhat different names. The conception of the Svavishhoga-ka-ya shows a tendency of the Yogacara school to posit something like the Isvara of the Upanishads behind the Phenomenal universe. The Dharmakaya corresponds to the impersonal absolute of the Vedanta of the Brahman, and the Sambhogakaya to the Isvara when Brahman assumes name and form. Every Buddha, it should however, be noted has his own Sambhogakaya but all Buddhas have one Dharmakaya. The Lankavatara also gives hints to this effect. It says that Abhara (absence of anything) is not Tathagata and again, as Tathagata is described as “Anupada-amrodha”, it has some meaning. It then describes the Manomaya-dharmakaya (For the definition of Manomaya Kaya and its three subdivisions see Lanka, p. 81, Suzuki, E.B. iv pp. 284-5).

It cannot be seen by the non-Buddhists, Srvakas, Pratyeka-Buddhas and even Bodhisattvas in one of the first seven bhumi. Just as different names of one things or one person like Hasta, Karu, Puni or Indra, Sukra, Purandara indicate different aspects of the same thing, so also the different name of Sāleśamuni Buddha in the Sahālokadhata, eg. Svayambhū, Nāyakā, Trsabhā, Visnū, Isvara, Pradhanā, Kapila, Soma, Bhrisūra, Rama, Vyasa or Sunyata, Tathāta, Bhūtakoti, Nirvāna, Sarvajña, etc., indicate the different aspects of Sāleśamuni Buddha (Lanka, pp. 192-3, of Dasa p. 55). People being subjected to the conceptions of two extremes “is” or “is not” (Dvyāntaptatāya) do not know that Buddha is like a reflection of the moon on water which neither appears nor disappears. In this passage there is a clear hint that this Manomaya Dharmakaya existing in the Sahā Lokadhata, is the same as the Svaśambhogakaya or the Siddhi and the Asecanka-atmahata or Prakṛtyātmahata of the Prajñāparamitas and it corresponds to the Upanisadic conception of Isvara.

Dharmakaya: The three Kayas of which we have so far spoken, belong strictly to the realm of Samvrti, worldly and transcendental and as such they were treated as Rupa or Nirmanakaya by the early Mahāyānists including Nāgarjuna. The only real Kaya 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 Battambang, a stanza in salutation of Buddha brings out this idea, see le Muscion, vol. vii). Though an attempt to define it by the current words and expressions is bound to be not only incorrect but misleading, the Mahayanic texts however tried to give an idea of it as far as the language permitted. The Karika and the Siddhi call it Svabhūsika or Svabhūvakāya. It is according to them, immeasurable and illimit-
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able. It fills all space. It is the basis of the Sambhogha and Nirmanakaya. It is devoid of all marks (i.e. Mahapurushalakasanas) and is incroppressible (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. vts. 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). Sūrdhi, 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 Nagarjuna’s 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 Astasahasrikā 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 “Tathatavisāra nirvikarikalpa nirvikalpa”, (suchness is immutable, inchangeable, beyond concept and distinctions) show rather a positive conception of the Reality than a purely negative one (Asta, p. 307, cf. the passage: Ya ca tathata ekavivesa tathata duya, dvidhidhara dyaya tatha na kaivacat tathata yaish na sa kanyacita tathata tath sa tathata duya dwadhic Karavyata tatha. That which is Tathagata; tatha tatha 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 Astasahasrikā 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 dharmas. (Asta, p. 514 the dharmakaya tathagatam prajnati, cf. m. Yr. p. 448 dharmato haddhi dhasaythah). The Buddhakaya, that people speak of, arises through cause and condition like the sound of flute; it involves really no appearance or disappearance, Those, who run after the form and voice of the Tathagata and conceive of his appearance and disappearance are far from the Truth (Asta. p. 515). No further statements than this are can be made about the reality, for that would be again Prapancha. When the Astasahasrikā asserts that the Tathagata does not exist, it refers to that Tathagata as conceived by one on reading the Mahayan texts. Even the Bodhisattvas, unless and until they reach the tenth bhumi, cannot extricate themselves from a concep-
ion of the Tathagatakaya, however, subve it may be (eg. the Svasambhokakaya). They are still under a delusion and it is this delusion that the Prajnaparamitas endeavour to remove by asserting that there is no Tathagata.

Nagarjuna by denying the existence of a so-called Tathagata does nothing more than what the Prajnaparamitas endeavour to establish. His point is that, if Bhavasat tati (series of existence) he admitted then the existence of a tathagata should also be admitted for the Tathagata represents the ultimate state of this Bhavasat tati. 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 Bhavasat tati does not exist, (Tathagato nihsvabhava navt svabhavam idam jagat, Tathagato nihsvabhava nihsvabhavam idam jagat).

Candrakirti, in support of Nagarjuna’s arguments, quotes a passage from the Astasahasrika (p.472) in which Buddha and his dharma are compared to Maya or Stupa, but at the same time he says that they do not assert the nonexistence (Nastive) of the Tathagata in every way, for then they would be guilty of Apavada (denial) and yet being desirous of describing the Tathagata by means of Vyavahara-satya (conventionally) and by taking recourse to super-impositions (Samarupa) they say that he is Sunya or Asunya, Sunyasyunya or Naiva Sunya Nasunya. But he who endeavours to realise the true Tathagata by having recourse to statements and denial will never know him. Chandrakirti, in support of the above, quotes the verses from the Vajradhikika, 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 buddhastra mayvadharmaka ha mayakah, dharma-cup avijnayena tv aha vijanitum. A Buddha is to be seen in the sense of dharmato (nature of dharmas), for the leaders (of men) have only Dharmakaya. That dharmata is unknowable so also is the Tathagata, (Vr. p. 418, 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 yatvadhavastat svabhavamidam jagat), or nature itself and asserting that the Tathagata, whom people or even Bodhisattvas have in view, is only a Bimba (image) of Kosala dharmas and is not the real Tathata or Tathagata, (om, Ve. pp. 448-49). 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.
(Prapancayanitve buddham prapancatittamakrayan, Te prapancahatai sarvegavastute-Tathagatam. M. Vr. p. 534).

The conception of Dharmakaya was of special interest to the Yogacarins. The Lankavatara, pp. 57, 60, in describing it, says that (Dharmata) Buddha is without any substratum (Niralamba) and lies beyond the range of functioning of the organs of sense, proofs or signs and hence beyond the vision of Sravakas, Pratyeka Buddhas or the non-Mahayanists. It is to be realised only within one's own self. The Sutrantasya sūtra, p. 48, calls it Svabhuvaka dharmaikayā. It is one and the same kaya in all Buddhas, very subtle, unknowable and eternal.

The Trimsika, p. 44, explains the Dharmakaya as the transformed Aṣṭaṇga (substratum)-the alayavijnana-transformation being effected by knowledge (Jnana) and the suppression of the two evils (Duṣṭahṛtya), viz., Klesavarana and Jhaya varana. The Aloka on the Athismamayalankara Karika also explains the Dharmakaya in the similar way. According to it, there are two kinds of Dharmakaya, one being the Bodhipaksika and the other dharmas, which are themselves pure and productive of clear knowledge (niprāpancajñanamana) and other the transformed Aṣṭaṇga of the same, which is then called Svabhavakaya. Professor Stcherbatsky, con of N.P. 185 n, supplies us with nearly the same information that we find in the Aloka of some sources which he does not mention. He says that "according to the early Yogacaras, the Dharmakaya is divided into Svabhavakaya and Jhanakaya of which the first is the motionless (Nitya) substance of the universe and the second is Anitya i.e., changing, living." Evidently, what the Professor means by Jhanakaya is the Dharmakaya, consisting of the Bodhipaksika and other dharmas of the Aloka. The Svabhavakaya is the Nityakaya, as pointed out by him, is also supported by the Svavarnābhasa and other texts, (Svavarnābhhasa B.T. S.P. 8, laka, p. 78, Sutra, p. 46). The Chinese commentators on the Śīlyā state that Dharmalaya is the metaphysical principle of real Gita and Rupa of the Tathagata. It is the real nature of things, and can be equated with Tathata, Dharmadhatu or Tathagatagarbha, (Lanka, pp. 77,78). The goal of Bodhisattvas is to realise the Dharmakaya. Every being has the Dharmakaya, or the Dharmakaya comprises all beings of the World, but as they are blinded by avidya, they do not realise this fact. What the Bodhisattva aims at is the removal of this avidya and the realisation of the fact that he is the same as the Dharmakaya. The Aloka on the Karika enumerates the steps through which Bodhisattva passes and points out that the last step of a Bodhisattva is to realise the Dharmakaya (Dharmakayopapārambhena bhaviṣya), after which it becomes easy for him to assume any one of the four kayas. In the Lankavatara we notice that Mahamati is anxious to know how are Bodhisattvas, after completing the ten bhūmis, can attain the Tatagatagarbha or Dharmakaya and go to any one of the buddha soils or heavens. The Lankavatara also describes in rosy colours the prospect of attuin-
ing the Mahadharmamegha of the ninth bhumi, who is adorned with many jew-
els, 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 Buddhahood by realising within himself the Dharmas Naisatmya and confronts the Dharmakaya (Lanka, pp. 51, 70). The Trimsika says that just as Vimalakirti is the goal of the Arhat, so Dharmakaya is the goal of the Bodhidatta. It shows that as the arhat by getting rid of Klesavarna obtains a purified kaya, so also a Buddha by getting rid of both Klesavarna and Dhyavarna obtains the Dharmakaya (Trimsika, p. 49). The world of experience is phenomenal. It may be compared to a magical illusion or dream. In the Astasahasrika Prajnaparamita (R. Mitra’s ed. p. 39) the following passage appears:-

“Ayusman Subhrithi ‘tan devaputram etal avocat mayapamas te Sattrah. Svapnopamas te Sattrah iti he myaca Sattra ca adavya advibhikara. Evam Sakrdagamim pi arhatteni pi Samyaksambhidham pi mayapama Svapnopama. Ayusman Subhuti said to the Devaputra 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 (Sakrdaganit) and the perfect Arhat and even the worldly figure of Gautama Buddha are illusion or dream. The absolute, i.e. the Dharmakaya of Buddha, is indescribable. It is the only reality that Buddha realised at Bodhgaya. All things of the world has three aspects: viz. (i) quintessence, (ii) attributes and (iii) activity. Take for example, 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 unflagging and immovable, i.e. unconditioned. The whole Universe has two aspects, i.e. changed and unchanged. The latter is known as 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 Upasadas. This is identical with the Dharmakaya of Buddha. Dharma is the supreme principle of life. Adi-Buddha happens to be the first conception of the paramaratma of Dharm. It is a metaphysical conception. It is a non-existent body of the world.

The leaders of men possess true body or nature, which is unknowable. It cannot be known except within one’s own self (Pratyavatnaveida). In the Astasahasrika Prajnaparamita (R. Mitra’s ed. p. 94) appears the following passage:-'Mdhahu iham bhiksavah satkaryam kavyam manyudihvaṃ. Dharmakaya Parisupattito mam bhiksaso 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 Tathagata. 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 Tathagatas 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 amiity (maitri) and compassion (karuna) to rescue beings from the fires of misery on account of birth and death. In the saddharmapundarika, (ch.III) appears an episode as to the ways and means (Upara-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., Srovakayana, Pratyeka buddhayana and Bodhisattvayana.

Buddhahood, which fulfils 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 c-division of all Mahayanaists, that the realization of the cognitive norm through intelligent appreciative of discrimination which intuitively apprehends the profound nature (nothingness) of all, i.e., the realization of the two operational norms, comes through unbounded activity and that insight and action must forever work together because they are unable to effect anything if they are divorced from each other. Intelligence which apprehends the profound nature of all that is, is the same in Mantrayana as it is in the two lower courses (Hinayana and Paramatrayana), 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 Paramatrayana 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 Paramatrayana 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 Paramita and Mantrayana is more effective than any course pursued alone, although each course has its goal achievement. It has been said that one is liberated from Samsara when one knows properly both the Mantrayana and Paramita methods. Common to both is the idea that, failing to understand the nature of mind as not existing as a self, and by believing it to be a self, all other emotional upsets are generated, and through them, in turn, Karmic action are performed, and because of these actions they remain about in Samsara. The contemplation of nonexistence in the first stage is a most important factor. Once the developing stage you become a stable experience and the necessary preliminary experience is present, the fulfillment stage can be entered upon. This passed through five steps, each of which is a purely psychological process even if it is described in terms of physical locations. After detachment from the preoccupation with the body has been established the first step (i) is one of an awareness of motive which is the cradle of cogitable mind. From this awareness develops an experience (ii) which is likened to an emptying of the mind and which is in itself not determinet at all. It is not just nothing, but an intensive mode of existing and acting, which underlies all actual cognition. When it achieves determination, its objective pole (iii) is of the nature of an apparitional being, while its subjective pole (iv) is the cognition of its nothingness. The last step (v) is the unity of apparitional existence and nothingness. It is a means to realize Buddhahood which is the most sublime idea man can have of man.