

**SOCIETY
AT THE
TIME OF
THE
BUDDHA**

NARENDRA WAGLE

**SOCIETY AT THE TIME
OF THE BUDDHA**

SOCIETY AT THE TIME OF THE BUDDHA

NARENDRA WAGLE

© NARENDRA WAGLE 1966

First published
September 1966/1888

Set in 8 point & 10 point Linotype Excelsior and Caledonia face

Printed in India

PRINTED BY G. G. PATHARE AT POPULAR PRESS (BOM.) PVT. LTD., 35 C, TARDEO ROAD, BOMBAY 34 WB (PAGES 1 TO 160) AND KRISHNA S. KURWAR AT MOHAN AUDRANALAYA, ACME INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, SEWRI BUNDER ROAD, SEWRI (EAST), BOMBAY 15 DD (PAGES i—xii & 161 TO 314) AND PUBLISHED BY G. R. BHATKAL FOR POPULAR PRAKASHAN, 35 C, TARDEO ROAD BOMBAY 34 WB.

To

My Parents

NARHAR SADASHIV WAGLE

MOHINIBAI NARHAR WAGLE

FOREWORD

MUCH has been written already about the historical content of the Pāli scriptures. Ever since this great body of ancient Indian literature was brought to light by pioneers such as Turnour, it has aroused great interest among scholars, not only for the profound religious message which it contains, but also for the light it throws upon a vigorous and expanding civilization. The Pāli canon reflects Northern India in the fifth century B.C. more vividly than does almost any other body of sources for any later period of her pre-Muslim history.

Great scholars, working mainly before the First World War, especially Rhys Davids and Fick, have analysed the immense mass of data which these sources provide. We cannot but admire the scholarship and patient labour which they put into their work. But it must be admitted that their handling of this material by the standards of modern historical criticism shows many shortcomings. One of the most outstanding of these is that both these great scholars and many others who succeeded them accepted the whole of the canon and also the commentarial literature ascribed to Buddhaghosa together with the prose Jātaka as all of equal validity, and all faithfully reflecting the culture of the Buddha's day.

Stylistic criteria and striking differences in such cultural features as their respective geographical backgrounds show clearly that the Vinaya Piṭaka and the four first Nikāyas of the Sutta Piṭaka are considerably older than the prose Jātakas, and that the civilization which they reflect is appreciably different from that reflected in the commentaries. For a reliable account of social conditions in the Buddha's day therefore, the Jātakas and the commentaries must be rejected out of hand. The study of Dr. N. K. Wagle is to the best of my knowledge the first effort at analysing the social structure of the period on the basis of those sources which were composed not long after the period in question. In this Dr. Wagle has shown great originality of approach.

Even more original is Dr. Wagle's method of treatment of his material. He has brought to bear upon his sources not only those techniques of criticism which are well-known to historians, but also those of the science of anthropology. He has subjected his data to minute analysis along these lines and produced many valuable conclusions which may compel us to revise in many respects our existing picture of the period.

Work such as Dr. Wagle's is tedious and slow, and he has so far only treated one or two themes in the social history of the period. There is scope for much further research on the contents of the older stratum of Pāli literature. When this is exhausted the Jātakas and the Pāli commentaries still remain virtually untapped, and the Epics, the Purāṇas and the great body of Jaina literature may also provide material for further research along these lines. This very important pioneering work of Dr. Wagle's will, I hope, be followed by many others of a similar type, both from Dr. Wagle himself and from other young Indian scholars who may find his treatment inspiring and stimulating.

London, 1963

A. L. BASHAM

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I WOULD like to express my thanks to Professor A. L. Basham for his kindness and guidance during my period of research and also for writing the foreword.

To Dr. J. G. de Casparis for his considerable help. To Dr. Michael Mendelson for his suggestions and the time he spent in elucidating various problems, together with the other members of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

London, 1963.

N. K. W.

CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PATTERNS OF SETTLEMENT	12
III. SOCIAL GROUPS AND RANKING	44
IV. KINSHIP AND MARRIAGE	78
V. OCCUPATIONAL DIVISIONS	134
CONCLUSIONS	156
<i>Abbreviations</i>	159
<i>References</i>	161
<i>Appendix</i>	191
<i>Bibliography</i>	303
<i>Index</i>	309

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

IN this study we present our observations on the social structure of the period which is so intimately connected with the personality of the Buddha. At this stage our research mainly centres on an analysis of the patterns of society. We follow the social scientists who study contemporary societies and maintain that the description of a society can best be made through assuming the existence of a "pattern". We are fully aware that, unlike some social scientists, we do not aim to draw from our studies any laws either of the society or human behaviour. We must be content, at least for the time being, with a description of society as depicted in the Pāli Canon, which helps us and others to understand it.

There are, of course, limitations to this kind of study. Our sources consist of a mass of literary material which is mainly religious in character. The formation of the Pāli Canon, which is our main source, is associated traditionally with at least two councils, one taking place at Rājagaha immediately after the death of the Buddha, and the other held at Vesāli hundred years later.¹ The canon was committed to writing in Ceylon under King Vaṭṭagāmaṇi (Cir. 100 B.C.).²

The bulk of the canonical literature, especially the major portions of the *Sutta* and *Vinaya Piṭakas*, belongs to the pre-Asoka period. Striking evidence in this connection is provided by the Bhabra Edict of Asoka, wherein he urges the Buddhist monks and nuns to make a special study of seven selected passages. Four of the passages have been identified as being in the first four *Nikāyas*, one in the *Vinaya*, and the rest in the *Sutta Nipāta*.³ The exact correspondence of the contents of the Edict and the Pāli texts, as we have them in their present form, is difficult to establish. Nevertheless, it certainly shows that Asoka knew a number of Pāli texts, some of which must have been identical with those found in the *Nikāyas* and the *Sutta Nipāta*.⁴

Speaking of the antiquity of the Pāli Canon whose contents may have been older than the 2nd century B.C., A. K. Warder remarks, "A comparison with the Prakrit inscriptions show that the Pāli language is closest to the earliest records (e.g. preservation of intervocalic consonants, without voicing) and it may therefore be regarded as having flourished in and probably before the Moriyān period. The canonical texts ... have the appearance of standing close to a living language rather than that of an artificial production in a dead language, like their commentaries, and therefore would seem to belong to the period when that language flourished."⁵

Our account of the social structure of this period is based mainly on the first four *Nikāyas*, the *Vinaya* and the *Sutta Nipāta* of the Canonical texts. Rhys Davids feels that the four *Nikāyas* and the *Vinaya* belong to the same chronological strata (about 100 years after the death of the Buddha). That this was so he has shown from the internal unity of the books demonstrable through material contained, formal structure and so on.⁶ The fifth *Nikāya*, which contains miscellaneous texts, does not appear to have been recognised by schools other than the *Theravāda* and is a supplementary *Nikāya*.⁷ Commenting on the usefulness of the *Nikāyas*, G. C. Pande says, "The *Nikāyas* ... appear to reflect the first and the earliest period of the history of Buddhist thought when the Saṅgha was, in appearance at least, doctrinally one." "It has, of course," he adds, "to be remembered that particular versions of the *Nikāyas* may be expected to contain much editorial retouching, addition and even expurgation."⁸

The *Vinaya Piṭaka* consists of (1) *Sutta Vibhaṅga* (2) *Khandakas* (3) *Parivāra* (4) *Pātimokkha*. It exists in different versions which belong to different sects. *Pātimokkha* is practically the same for all the sects. But the agreement is supposed to extend to the *Vibhaṅga* and even *Khandakas*.⁹ *Parivāra* is more or less an index to the *Vinaya* and is, therefore, later in time than the other sections of the *Vinaya*.¹⁰ Also in *Cullavagga* of *Khandakas* the chapters dealing with the convening of the two Buddhist councils are generally considered as later additions to the original book.¹¹

About the relationship between the *Sutta Nipāta* and the prose *Nikāyas*, apart from the evidence of passages common to both the sets of books, N. A. Jayawickrame comments, "The social condi-

tions reflected in the *Sutta Nipāta* regarding peoples and castes, countries and towns, brahmins and sacrifice are no different from those in the prose *Nikāyas*."¹²

The material contained in the *Nikāyas*, *Vinaya*, and *Sutta Nipāta*, for our purpose may roughly be taken as reflecting the condition of the period between 500 B.C.-300 B.C.¹³

Scholars like Richard Fick, Rhys Davids, A. N. Bose, and R. Mehta, in their study of the social history of the Buddha's time, have mainly relied on the *Jātakas*, though often they have included the evidence of the *Vinaya* and the *Nikāyas*.

Some of the *Jātaka* stories contain very old legends, but generally they represent an extensive period of development from the Buddha's time (500 B.C.) down to the 2nd or 3rd century A.D.¹⁴

Rhys Davids has analysed the internal evidence of the *Jātakas* and has shown that in the first two volumes the majority of the stories are simple narratives, but they become complicated and long-winded in the third, fourth, and fifth volumes.¹⁵ Commenting on this lack of homogeneity in the *Jātakas*, Maurice Winternitz says, "Not only every large section and every single narrative, but often also every single *gāthā* will have to be tested independently as regards its age."¹⁶ The *gāthās* (verses) of the *Jātakas* have been generally accepted as constituting the oldest stratum. On the other hand, the late prose portions show marked signs of editing, perhaps at the hands of the Buddhist monks.¹⁷ Having considered this vagueness in the chronology of the *Jātakas*, we have decided not to include them in the present study. However, the *Nikāya* and *Vinaya* material can safely be taken as a reliable guide to conditions during 500-300 B.C.¹⁸

As a rule, facts given in detail or the exposition of points in the commentaries have been left out entirely, or are mentioned only incidentally when the points are too obscure and need elucidating. In one or two places we have compared the findings of our texts with those of the commentaries.

We examine briefly the contents of our sources.

- (1) *Vinaya* books contain rules of behaviour for the monks and nuns as laid down by the Buddha. The rules are in the form of a number of stories in which a monk or a nun (a stock character) behaves improperly. There is gossip which ulti-

SOCIETY AT THE TIME OF THE BUDDHA

mately reaches the Buddha. The Buddha makes a rule.

- (2) *Digha Nikāya* contains discourses by the Buddha and other monks. They contain parables, similes and anecdotes giving sociological data, descriptions, objective observations and religious advice.
- (3) *Anguttara Nikāya* is mainly concerned with numerical categorisations. All items appearing here have from one to eleven sub-divisions, i.e. there are seven types of wives, five types of goals for a brāhmaṇa, eight paths of knowledge, four types of concentration, four ways of losing and gaining wealth.
- (4) *Majjhima Nikāya* contains religious and philosophical controversies. It also deals with the brāhmaṇic claim to social and ritual superiority.
- (5) *Samyutta Nikāya* deals with the behaviour of groups and individuals who were the associates of the Buddha. It provides descriptions of groups and life stories of individuals, and also the discourses they have with the Buddha and with one another.
- (6) *Sutta Nipāta* is a collection of verses containing religious doctrine.

Much of the sociological material which can be abstracted from these is in the form of similes, stories, direct verbal statements and objective observations. Very little material is directly in the form of sociological description and even that is highly formalised. It is also repetitive and occurs at several places. A significant point here is that the very incidental nature of our material increases its value as a historical source.¹⁹

As against this literary background, we have the solid testimony of archaeological finds which may be related to the period we examine. These are chiefly in the shape of cities, material objects²⁰ and inscriptions of Asoka. The city of Rājagaha had outer stone walls 25 to 30 miles in circumference on an average 8 ft. tall and 16 ft. wide, with superstructures of bricks and also several stone watch towers. A road made of stone, stone wells and a number of stone-foundations of buildings have been found at Rājagaha. The excavation at Rājagaha was conducted in the year 1905;²¹ many places and buildings have been identified since, on the basis of topo-

graphical material found in our texts. The recent excavations at Rājagaha have unearthed the foundations of the Jivakamravana²² (the monastery buildings donated by the famous physician Jīvaka). Recently the excavations at Kosambi (1957-59) have revealed the existence of Ghositārāma, a high rampart around the city and the stone fortress of Udayaṇa.²³ These and many other remains of the cities,²⁴ which belong to our period (500-300 B.C.), have helped us to visualize the state of society. The existence of these cities presupposes extensive agricultural lands to support them,²⁵ the use of cash economy, the division and specialisation of labour and a growing awareness of social stratification based on riches, power or ritual status, or combinations of these attributes. To a greater or lesser extent, these necessary accompaniments of urban life have been projected in our literature.

In our presentation of the data, we have used an analytical technique. As far as possible, we have made no primary statements which are not supported by internal evidence. The secondary statements are inferred from two or more primary statements and we have gone straight to the sources for our analysis.

We have used the principles of social anthropology, probably for the first time for this kind of historical research, only as a framework of reference under which "descriptions" will be subsumed. Each of our chapters has an introduction which broadly explains the nature of its contents. Some of them have summaries and conclusions. As far as possible we have avoided direct comparisons with modern data compiled in the sociological studies of the modern village-urban societies of India and elsewhere. However, we must understand the functioning of the modern Indian caste society in a city or a village in order to acquire a deeper insight into the past. It is equally incumbent on an anthropologist to know the "history" of our "time-honoured" institutions.

In the second part of our introduction we have outlined the use of social anthropological methods in the study of history. Some of the points or suggestions made there, have been used in our research. The others may prove to be useful in future research, or else may be considered as points of general illustration on methodology.

Anthropological framework and Historical analysis:

We postulated that it was our intention to use social anthropological methods—to be more precise the methods of social structural analysis—in our approach to historical data. This needs more elucidation. In connection with this two questions arise.

(1) What are the methods available to current anthropology in its study of societies and what has dictated our choice?

(2) What are some of the more detailed characteristics of the methods of social analysis?

1

Broadly speaking two different approaches are made nowadays to study social phenomena (a) We can study the social structure. (b) We can make a global approach and make a descriptive study of all the phenomena that we come across—social relations, art, religion, philosophy, material culture and so on.²⁶ This method does not enable us to isolate one set of social phenomena like social relations and correlate it with other sets like ideas and material culture and in this way link changes in one with changes in the other. But fundamentally this method is alien to our purpose, which is primarily to study the social structure of a given society at a given time and if possible to trace changes in the structural relationships. Hence the global method, the method of study of the “total culture”, as it is called, is ruled out for us by the very limits that we have set to our aims. There is, therefore, no question of arguing about which method is better in this context.

2

We have now to discuss some of the more detailed characteristics of the method of structural analysis and deal with certain criticisms of it. The method of structural analysis, generally speaking, deals with the isolation of regular patterns of behaviour as between persons and groups. In this way we try to see if there are, for instance, any regular patterns of behaviour between husband and wife, father and son, pupil and teacher, aristocrat and farmer. When we observe such regular patterns, we summarise the set of indivi-

dual relationships and describe it as a structural relationship. The word "norm" can be used in this context. But we have to be careful to distinguish between the two uses of the word "norm". It can be used in the sense of "the average" as above, or in the sense of the "ideal". In all cases where the "norm" as "an ideal" does not coincide with the "norm" as "the average" behaviour pattern we must note the difference. It may also be necessary to explain the difference. Thus the norm as ideal may be to uphold the joint family and the norm as average may be to set up the nuclear family. The theory of studying regular patterns between persons and group received its greatest initial impetus from Radcliffe-Brown.²⁷ His successors have discussed technical questions as to the level at which such studies should be conducted—lineage, extended family, nuclear family, interpersonal relationships.²⁸ Some have stated that only the larger groups like lineages, kinship groupings and political groupings should form the level of structural studies, as they represent more stable and larger groupings. Others have differed and included groupings like the nuclear family pattern. Here we must exercise judgement. A choice has to be made while endeavouring to gather data about the larger kinship and political groupings. We shall also include the nuclear family and smaller groupings. We shall exclude the study of groupings smaller than these, such as relations of friendship etc. We shall also leave out, generally, groupings larger than the political area we have circumscribed for our study. Our analysis will be conditioned by the limits we have set up for ourselves, and in assessing them note has to be made of these limits. Apart from discussions on the levels of structural analysis made above, the successors of Radcliffe-Brown discussed a number of other questions which are relevant to our inquiry.

I

The first is the concept of "role playing". We mentioned that structural anthropologists sought to find the more regular pattern of behaviour between persons and groups. This was more or less Radcliffe-Brown's statement of aims. Relationships between groups, however, Nadel explained, were achieved through individuals "playing roles". This was the case, of course, in interpersonal

relationships also. He tried to clarify the concept of "role playing" in order to make the technique of investigation more precise, "we arrive at the structure of a society through abstracting from the concrete population and its behaviour the pattern (network, system) of relationships obtaining between actors in their capacity of playing roles relative to one another".²⁴ From this "roleplaying" we can generalise what is the average or the "norm", as we discussed before, whether there are opposing "norms", and whether the 'average' conflicts with the "ideal" or not. This is really a deepening of our definition. But it is a useful technique in historical studies as it can show the emergence of divergences and social change, and perhaps the reasons for them. Historical data like ours consists of both the "average" and "the ideal". It is desirable to distinguish between the two. The brahmanical lawbooks set down the "ideal" rather than "the average". Much of Buddhist literature contains both. We can detect changes in "ideals" by changes in succeeding lawbooks. The historian then faces the question of explaining these changes and inferring social facts from them, provided data is available. His inference, of course, may range from the "more probable" to "the less probable".

II

The second theoretical issue taken up by social anthropologists after Radcliffe-Brown was the latter's concept of "function". It appears that he held *a priori* that all structural relationships existed to maintain and preserve existing society. Historians noting social change will naturally differ. The general trend among social anthropologists now is to take a more sophisticated view of function and note the existence of "disfunction", of trends which lead to changes in structural relationships.

There have been other views on the meaning of the word "function". Some have deprived it of any purposive connotation or effect and have merely regarded it as synonymous with activity. We shall not concern ourselves with these discussions on "function". For our purpose we shall try to discover whether there are activities which seek to preserve a certain structure and others which seek to change it. A question of interest to us in this context is: "Were there changes in relations to *Brāhmaṇas*, in our area and

period, and if so, to what extent?"

In connection with this we must state that our data, as well as the study of modern peasant societies, forces us to abandon the notion of a single closely related social structure. We find it more helpful to recognize the existence of a plurality of structures in a certain geographical area and time, and see if any relations exist between them or not. There may be two political states in an area otherwise structurally similar and consequently cannot be subsumed under the head of a single social structure. The area we have dealt with is *Majjhimadesa* which has been described more fully in Chapter II.

III

The third development in structural theory which is of considerable significance to us is the link between groups of persons (from which we abstract structure) and the aims and activities conducted by these groupings, i.e. institutions. For current anthropology merely to describe structure and leave out institutions is incomplete as description.³⁰ It also does not enable us to establish possible correlations. From the point of view of historical analysis "institutions" do form a large part of our data and have to be analysed and explained if possible. As data they are relatively more available than structural relationships, which have often to be inferred. The type of institutional data like "celibacy among monks" is relatively more plentiful than data on the organization of monasteries and the relationships between monks and laymen. The technique of analysis proposed by Nadel is helpful to our purpose, as it enables us to make use of inference where data is scarce.³¹ He postulates that in society we observe "individuals in co-activity". From this we mainly isolate two aspects:

- (1) Type of institutional activity
- (2) The social group which carries out this institutional activity and the relation within this group.

Analysis has to be conducted on both levels (1) and (2) and if possible linked. Where only groupings are mentioned in historical data we may try to search for institutional activity. Where insti-

tutional activity is mentioned we may search for the groups involved in it.

We may also classify institutions and relate them. For example, we may relate kinship to the economic structure.

In describing groupings we may examine (a) the e.g. internal order of groups and (b) the external order of groups.

Having briefly stated our scope, and the theoretical premises behind our approach and techniques, let us state more precisely what we do not intend to do. Current British structural anthropology has been criticized by others, particularly Americans, on a number of issues which include neglect of questions of child training, psychology, technology and linguistics and disinterest in history.³² We stated before that we have deliberately avoided the method of a "global" cultural study. We mention this criticism in passing in order that our use of structural analysis of groupings and institutions should not raise the same criticisms. Theoretically we are interested in questions of child training and psychology but are doubtful if the necessary data is currently available. We have deliberately left out that part of linguistics which deals with the history of words from our scope because we shall not be in a position to find any relations between it and social structure in our present enquiry. We have at the outset narrowed our field with respect to details of technological development. With respect to history, of course, our attempt is precisely to see if certain approaches and techniques used by this school of social anthropologists are applicable or not, i.e. to answer the criticism made.

The applicability of such techniques depends, of course, on their number, variety, relevance and refinement. Given a certain amount of data, analysis could be progressively deepened and widened. Thus we can proceed from level to level. We shall confine ourselves in this work to a certain level, if for no other reason than that of space. This does not, however, imply that a deeper analysis is not possible.

The second shortcoming has been mentioned before, but we can mention it again in this context, that, compared to current field data, historical data is always more or less limited. Inference can be resorted to—but it will inevitably be in terms of greater or lesser probability. This we believe is a task historians must now shoulder. The use of the approach and techniques outlined above,

we hope, may show a new and interesting aspect of historical research.

CHAPTER II

PATTERNS OF SETTLEMENTS

IN trying to understand the life of a community we must begin at some specific point. In our study we are faced with a large and, as it appears to us, nebulous society. Our aim is to trace the network of relationships, bounded ultimately only by the limits of the area covered by expansion of contemporary Aryan culture, which connects one individual, familial group or small settlement with others. Such a network of institutionalised relationships is present in every local group, whether it be a village, town or a city, for "the townsman and rustic dwell in the same community but lead somewhat different lives."¹ It is for this reason that we attempt to discover the patterns of settlements in the Buddhist society.

In the Pāli texts there are numerous references to cities, towns, villages, where the Buddha or his disciples stayed for a while and preached to the people. It is not unlikely that the records of these journeys are based upon a precise and detailed tradition and they can be substantially corroborated from present day topographical and historical knowledge. Jennings observes, "Though there is doubtless a superstructure of fictitious localities, claims and incidents set down among the *Sutta*, the conviction of the general truth of the itineraries, however, remains...."² Our primary interest, however, is not in the topography or the history of the specific towns, cities or villages, but only in the social characteristics of the settlements described. In so far as evidence permits us to contrast one town with another, one city with another and one village with another, we shall do so in order to discover any additional characteristics we may find.

There are a number of terms in the Pāli texts which refer to local groupings of one sort or another, the meanings of which are not always clear. We shall, therefore, attempt to attribute a meaning to each of them by analysing, among other things, its relationship with the social groups of which we have some knowledge.

Whenever possible, we shall also examine the economic aspect of the local groupings.

Gāma

We find the term *gāma* not infrequently used in our texts. The English rendering of *gāma* invariably as a village is inadequate, as the term has been used in more than one sense. For instance, it may mean a ward, a hamlet, a temporary settlement, etc. As we shall see, we have references to various types of *gāmas* and each type is a unit of social recognition.

Vinaya writers define a *gāma* which may consist of single *kuṭi*, two *kuṭis*, three *kuṭis* or four *kuṭis*.³ The term *kuṭi* is normally translated as a hut, usually made of sticks, grass and clay (daub and thatch).⁴ However, *kuṭi*, when mentioned as a *gāma*, cannot be a single cabin or little hut. A *gāma* of one *kuṭi* (*ekakuṭiko gāmo*) then, would probably refer to a hamlet of one large house perhaps surrounded by a few smaller buildings in which the dependants and servants of the family dwelt.⁵ Most likely, this and the *gāmas* of two or three or four *kuṭis* were dispersed settlements in the forests, outlying woodlands, hilly tracks and mountainous areas which surrounded the rich plains of the Gangetic valley. These hamlets had to be reckoned with because the Bhikkhus and other ascetics stayed in them or had to depend on them for their maintenance. That this was so can be seen from the fact that some of the Bhikkhus are described as forest-dwelling (*ārañṇako bhikkhu*)⁶ and some of them are specifically referred to as staying in the forest *kuṭis*.⁷ Aggika *jaṭila*, an ascetic of the type following orthodox Vedic practices of fire worship, lives in a *kuṭi* and comes out of his forest abode perhaps to replenish his provisions.⁸ The ancient brāhmaṇas go into the forest, build *kuṭis* of leaves and depend for their livelihood on the outlying *gāma-nigama-rājadhāni* and meditate.⁹ The Bhikkhus construct *kuṭis* in the mountains of Isigili, (near Rājagaha), spend four months of the rainy season in there, and when leaving, demolish the *kuṭis*.¹⁰

There are *gāmas* which are inhabited by the people and those which are devoid of them.¹¹ Miss I. B. Horner interpretes this type of *gāma* as "a village with human beings and a village with beings who are not human".¹² She supports her statement by

taking the word *amanussa* to mean a *yakkha*, spirit or ghost.¹³ It may be supposed that the deserted *gāmas* are often the haunts of *yakkhas* and in that sense they were inhabited by non-human beings. But these non-human beings seem to have been thought of as present in every *gāma*. Thus in one instance, the Buddha enjoins the *nāgas* and *yakkhas* that they should not maltreat *gāmas* and *nigamas* because if they did so they would not get hospitality and respect.¹⁴ It was reputed of the Buddha that in whatever *gāma* and *nigama* he stayed there the non-human beings did the humans no harm.¹⁵

We believe that the idea of the *gāmas* being deserted is the predominant one in the phrase *amanusso gāmo*. We are, therefore, inclined to translate *amanusso* as that which is without people, a deserted place, thus retaining its literal meaning. Examples of people deserting their *gāmas* are not lacking in the texts. We find *gāmas* burnt by fire or flooded by water.¹⁶ A man sees an empty *gāma*, and whatever house he may enter he finds empty, deserted and void. Thereupon that man might be told that this was so because of the fear of robbers.¹⁷ Because of the fear of robbers, a *gāma* comes to be removed and is split into two.¹⁸ *Angulimāla*, the robber, makes *gāmas* into *agāmas* (no *gāma*).¹⁹

There are *gāmas* with surrounding walls and some without walls. This is another of the definitions of *gāma* given by the *Vinaya* writers.²⁰ The walls seem to have been of three kinds, of bricks, stone and wood.²¹

The reference to the *gonisādiniviṭṭho gāmo* seems interesting.²² This term has been wrongly rendered by Miss I. B. Horner as "a village arranged fortuitously."²³ According to the Pāli dictionary the term *gonisādika* is an ox-stall and the word *gonisādi* has a similar sense.²⁴ *Gonisādiniviṭṭho gāmo*, therefore, would indicate an organised cattle establishment or farm which formed a *gāma*.²⁵ These permanent cattle camps are different from temporary ones, which are called *vaja*. Thus the monks spend the rainy season in a *vaja*. When the *vaja* is removed,²⁶ the monks go to another *vaja*.

A *Gonisādiniviṭṭho gāmo* was most probably inhabited by people who tended and lived with the cattle. Thus the brāhmaṇa Dhāṇanjāni managed his dairy outside the town. He was getting his cows milked when the monk Sāriputta visited him. Gopaka Moggallāna brāhmaṇa also indulges himself with the similar occu-

pation.²⁷ In the *Sutta Nipāta* we find a cattleman Dhaniya who says that "he lives by his own earnings and is nobody's servant".²⁸ He is to be distinguished from the ordinary herdsman known as *gopāla*²⁹ or *govinda*³⁰ who was a hand hired to look after the cattle.

A caravan camping more than four months is called a *gāma*.³¹ This is the last settlement to be defined in the *Vinaya* under the heading of *gāma*. Obviously, this indicates the practice of the caravans to stop at places for a considerable period. Some of the caravans belonged to merchants who conveyed their goods right across the country. Often the way was beset with dangers and it was a great relief to find inhabited areas after a long journey through deep forests.³² In the *Dīgha Nikāya* we find a caravan called *sakaṣa-sattho* (caravan of waggons) managed by a thousand men.³³ A regular caravan road is referred to in the *Vinaya*.³⁴ The Bhikkhus were allowed to pass the rainy season with a caravan.³⁵ It is but natural that some of the caravans, at least the larger of them, halted for a period lasting more than four months. These caravans had to extend the period of their stay presumably because of their considerable business transactions which involved buying and selling. Bad transport facilities may have been another cause for the prolonged stay. Even now in some parts of India in the rainy season the roads are laid waste.

There is yet another possibility that this type of settlement may also refer to wandering bands of gypsy-like people. The following instance suggests this.³⁶ Aggika *Jaṭila* knows a group of people who were migrating. The *jaṭila* goes to the caravan camp (*sattha-vāso*) with the intention of getting some food from them, not knowing that the caravan had moved on the previous night. However, he sees there an abandoned child lying on its back. With a compassionate heart, the *Jaṭila* carries this baby to his forest hermitage and rears it.³⁷ This reference to the young child left behind alone suggests that the wanderers followed the custom of child exposure which is still found in some of the wandering bands of India.

The evidence of the commentary on the Jain canonical literature, although it may not correspond to the age of our texts, is nevertheless worthy of notice. The Jain text mentions five types of caravan travellers (1) those who carried their goods by carts and waggons (*bhaṇḍi*), (2) who carried their goods by camels,

mules and bullocks, (3) who carried their own loads (*bhāravāha*), (4) wandering people who travelled to earn their livelihood and went from place to place (*odariya*) and (5) the *Kārapāṭika* ascetics.³⁸ When the *Vinaya* writers mentioned caravan settlements,³⁹ most probably they had in their minds the type nos. 1 and 4 of the Jain canonical literature.

Specialization seems to have been a particular feature of the age. We find, therefore, a growing tendency of the people of similar occupations and professions to group together and organize. The process of urbanization must inevitably lead people into this. This also led people of similar interests to live in settlements. The formation of a *gāma* out of the professional group is illustrated by an example from the *Vinaya*.⁴⁰ King Bimbisāra of Magadha expresses his wish to the monk Pilindavaccha to give an attendant for a park. But soon afterwards he forgets about this incident. Remembering after a time, he asks a minister who is concerned with all the affairs of state whether a park attendant whom he promised to be given to the Buddha has been given. The king is told that it has not been done, and it is 500 days since he last gave his promise to Pilindavaccha. Under the king's instruction, the minister hands over five hundred park attendants to Pilindavaccha. A distinct *gāma* establishes itself.⁴¹ They even call the settlement the *gāma* of park^{*}attendants and also Pilindagāma, after the monk.⁴²

The number five hundred, both for the people and the days, is doubtful. It may be conventional, implying a sizable group of park attendants with their families,⁴³ presumably attending to all the parks in the city of Rājagaha. A *gāma* of reedmakers (*ṇalākāra*) is situated near the city of Sāvatti,⁴⁴ and a *gāma* of salt-makers (*loṇakāra*) is to be found near Kosambi.⁴⁵

Although we do not have any direct reference to a *gāma* of actors (*naṭa*),⁴⁶ we can deduce from the fact that as the actors had *gāmanis* (headmen of the *gāmas*) they must have had *gāmas*. In the same way as we have *gāmas* of elephantry and cavalry,⁴⁷ they must have grouped themselves into a *gāma*. *Gāmas* in the above cases indicate a group of professional people settling in bands.

Gāma and kin-group:

A *gāma* may belong to one particular kin-group and may in

turn be known as the *gāma* of that group. Thus a kin-group may also acquire the name of a *gāma*. We can discern this from the following case:⁴⁸

Not far from Vesāli there is a *gāma* called Kalandakā. In that *gāma* Sudinna, the Kalandakaputta, is the son of a *seṭṭhi* (*seṭṭhiputta*).⁴⁹ Sudinna goes to Vesāli with many friends.

Sudinna becomes a monk and lives, dependant on a certain *gāma* of the Vajjis. At that time the Vajjian region is short of alms food, for there is a famine. Sudinna goes to Vesāli and stays there because he is sure that his *ñātis* in the city will give him food, which they do.

One fine morning he enters the *gāma* of Kalandaka for alms and comes to his parental residence (*sakapitu nivesanam*). A female slave of Sudinna's *ñāti* (*ñātidāsi*), while throwing away the previous evening's barley gruel, sees Sudinna and recognizes him. Immediately she runs to Sudinna's mother and tells her that Sudinna is back. In the meantime Sudinna is busy eating the barley gruel in the room provided for that purpose. Sudinna's father, coming from his work, sees Sudinna and requests him to go to his own house.

We may note few points from this case. (1)^{*} It is significant that Sudinna is known as Kalandakaputta as well as a *seṭṭhiputta*, but his *gāma* affiliation is recognized by his *ñātis* from Vesāli who refer to him as Sudinna Kalandakaputto. (2) When Sudinna approaches his parental residence, his *ñāti*'s female slave sees him. Also when Sudinna's father calls him home, he asks Sudinna to come to his own house (*sakam geham*). Thus the household was large and within it there was a *ñāti* who had a female slave. The slave did not belong to his own parents. The term residence (*nevesa*), in this connection should be taken to mean a residential area. We have thus within a unit of a *gāma*, which belonged to a *ñāti*, sub-units such as residential areas, most probably enclosed and attached to individual households.⁵⁰ Apparently the room provided for the almsgiving, called *kuddamūlam*, was common to all.

In the *Majjhima Nikāya* a somewhat similar case is to be found, but this has also other implications:⁵¹

A brāhmaṇa youth is described as Subha Todeyyaputta. He visits the Buddha, and during the talks, which took place in the city of Sāvatti, the Buddha addresses him as Subha and brāhmaṇa. After the discussions, while on his way, Subha Todeyyaputta meets the brāhmaṇa Jāṇussoṇi of Sāvatti. Jāṇussoṇi, however, addresses him as *Bhāradvāja* (i.e. by his *gotta* name).

We have here two systems of recognition of status operating side by side. In the secular circle, Subha was another brāhmaṇa, whose status was indicated by his *gāma* name.⁵² On the other hand, he was called by his *gotta* name, *Bhāradvāja* within his own group of the brāhmaṇas. The key to the explanation is to be found in the modern usage. In modern times in India, a brāhmaṇa who goes to another village is known as the brāhmaṇa of a certain village. But when he meets another brāhmaṇa, the sub-division of the brāhmaṇa comes into effect.

Brāhmaṇa gāmas:

The brāhmaṇa villages or settlements were mainly in the Magadhan and Kosalan regions. Brāhmaṇas such as Ekanāla,⁵³ Khānumata,⁵⁴ and Pañcasāla⁵⁵ were in Magadha. In Kosala we find Iccānaṅkala,⁵⁶ Vēḷudvāra,⁵⁷ Opasāda,⁵⁸ Nagaravinda,⁵⁹ Venāgapura,⁶⁰ Sālā,⁶¹ and Manasākata.⁶² The mention of these brāhmaṇa *gāmas* in the above two regions does not necessarily indicate that in other regions the presence of the brāhmaṇas was insignificant; these were places where the brāhmaṇas were presumably a dominant group both numerically and politically.

The reason for the presence of the brāhmaṇa *gāmas* in these two regions is likely to be found in the early development of *brahmadeyya* landownership in those areas. *Brahmadeyya* was the royal gift of land or an estate to well known brāhmaṇas and others, for the services, probably ritual in nature, which they rendered to the king. Some of the *brahmadeyya* lands are specifically described as brāhmaṇa *gāmas*. Khānumata and Opasāda,⁶³ which are given respectively by kings Pasenadi and Bimbisāra to the brāhmaṇa Kuṭadanta and Caṅki, are thus described. On the other hand, Campā, Ukkāṭha and Sālavatika,⁶⁴ although these places belong to the brāhmaṇa Soṇadaṇḍa, Pokkharasādi and Lohicca respectively.

are known only as *brahmadeyya* lands.⁶⁵ The ownership rights of the *brāhmaṇas* coupled with their residence seem clear in the first instance. In the second only the ownership rights seem to have been uppermost in the minds of the writers. We suggest that, the *brāhmaṇa gāmas*, at their inception, were the lands given as gifts to the *brāhmaṇas* by the kings. In course of time, because of the settlements of other *brāhmaṇa* families in those areas, they became known as *brāhmaṇa gāmas*. The mention of *brāhmaṇa gāmas* as existing only in Kosala, and Magadha, both under monarchical rule,⁶⁶ seems to support our view.

The predominance of *brāhmaṇas* in the *brāhmaṇa gāmas* is obvious. The following instances will elucidate our point. We have *brāhmaṇa-gaḥapatis*⁶⁷ mentioned in all the *brāhmaṇa gāmas* and although the latter are referred to elsewhere in the texts,⁶⁸ it is only in the *brāhmaṇa gāmas* that we find them addressed as *gaḥapatis*, thus seemingly emphasizing the role of the *brāhmaṇas* in these villages both as *gaḥapatis* and *brāhmaṇas*. Besides the *brāhmaṇa-gaḥapatis*, we find many hundreds of *brāhmaṇas* from various parts of the country residing temporarily in *Opasāda* and *Khānumata*.⁶⁹ Well known *brāhmaṇas* such as *Caṅki*, *Tārukkha*, *Pokkharasāti*, *Jāṇussoṇi* and *Todeyya* sojourn at *Manasākata* and *Iccānaṅkala*.⁷⁰ In *Pañcasāla*, *brāhmaṇa* householders do not offer food to the Buddha even at festival time.⁷¹ Incidentally, this is the sole reference in the text where the Buddha is refused food on his begging round. And that, too, very significantly in a *brāhmaṇa gāma*. In *Iccānaṅkala* the Buddha criticizes the claims of superiority of the *brāhmaṇas* over other classes on the basis of birth alone.⁷² In *Ekanālā*, the farmer *Bhāradvāja-brāhmaṇa* has so much land that he needs 500 ploughshares to plough it.⁷³

Possibly because of their riches, some of the *brāhmaṇa* villages seem to have been fortified. The Buddha, commenting on the luxurious way of life led by the *brāhmaṇas*, brings to the notice of the *brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha* that the ancient *bāhmaṇas* lived in jungles and led a chaste and unpretentious life. In contrast to this, the *brāhmaṇas* of the present day lived in fortified places, guarded by men with swords.⁷⁴ The names of the *brāhmaṇa gāmas* such as *Nagaravinda* (fort, *Vinda*) and *Venāgapura* (fort, *Venāga*)⁷⁵ assume significance in the light of the Buddha's criticism.⁷⁶

Gāma and Nigama:

In the sphere of common activities, the two terms *gāma* and *nigama* are often mentioned together. That which is applicable to *gāma*, is also generally applicable to *nigama*. This may be gleaned from the following cases. In some cases *gāma* and *nigama* are both described as situated close to *sāla* woods.⁷⁷ Men, oxen and cows might come and drink from the great lake near a *gāma* and *nigama*.⁷⁸ Boys and girls, coming out from the *gāma* and *nigama*, draw near to the pond, lift a crab from the water, and play with it.⁷⁹ A great heap of grain, presumably in a market place, happens to be near *gāma* or *nigama* from which people carry away corn on pingoos, in baskets, in their laps or in their hands. And if one should approach them and question them saying, "From where did you bring this corn?" the people would best explain the matter by saying, "We bring it from that great heap of grain near a *gāma* and *nigama*".⁸⁰ A monk comes to be dependent on a *gāma* or *nigama* for alms.⁸¹ The brahmanas build their fire-houses (*aggyāgāra*) near the boundaries of a *gāma* or *nigama* and worship the fire.⁸² A man who may have been absent a long time from his *gāma* or *nigama*⁸³ may see a man recently come from that *gāma* or *nigama*. On seeing him, the first man would enquire about the safety, the plentifulness of food and the absence of sickness in his former *gāma* or *nigama*.⁸⁴ The other man would gladly lend his ear to these enquiries, for these would arouse in him feelings of fellowship, and he would then willingly associate with the former.⁸⁵ Both *gāmas* and *nigamas* have *gāmanis* as their headmen.⁸⁶

In fact these two words *gāma* and *nigama* have been used more or less as synonyms. In one particular instance, they are even used as a compound. *Vegaṅga* is thus described as *gāmanigama*.⁸⁷

But the size of a *nigama* seems to be somewhere between that of a *gāma* and that of a *nagara* (city) or *rājadhāni*. Thus in his discourse to a brāhmaṇa, the Buddha advances a simile in which he says, "A man wanting to go to Rājagaha might approach the brāhmaṇa who knows the way leading to Rājagaha. The brāhmaṇa would direct the way by saying, "My good man, this road goes to Rājagaha; go along it for a while; when you have gone along it for a while you will see a *gāma*. Go further for a while and you will see a *nigama*. When you have gone still further,

you will see Rājagaha with its delightful parks and ponds."⁸⁸ .

The term *nigama* has been variously rendered as a market town,⁸⁹ a town,⁹⁰ a township⁹¹ and a district.⁹² The Pāli dictionary derives the meaning from the Sanskrit root *gāma* with the prefix *ni*, having the sense of meeting, coming together.⁹³ In the Vedic literature we have no equivalent term for *nigama*, which probably corresponds to the Sanskrit term *mahāgrāma*, which is found in the contemporary *Sūtra* literature⁹⁴ We feel that if we take *gāmas* as settlements of kin-groups or occupational and professional groups, the *nigama* should be taken as a *gāma* composed of members of various groups, more or less integrated. The *nigama*, therefore, should be considered as a large and complex *gāma*, a bigger economic unit.

That the *gāma* could form an integral part of the *nigama* is very apparent from the following case. In one of his important self-declarations the Buddha says, "Pursuing the good, seeking the supreme path of tranquility, I journeyed by stages among the Magadhas and came to Uruvela, the *nigama* of the army (*senā-nigama*). There I saw a fair grove, and a clear flowing river, delightful and easy of approach, and finally a *gāma* in which to beg food ... Here I settled, for here was everything needed for effort".⁹⁵ The *gāma* in army most probably refers to a settlement of a division of the army, references to which occur in the *Samyutta Nikāya*.⁹⁶ References to the traditional four-fold army are fairly frequent⁹⁷ and it is probable that different sections of the army settled in groups within a *nigama*.

The existence of the army *nigama* thus sets for us a pattern to further clarify the nature of the *nigama*, in which we should expect to find the "living together" of more than one social group. In a *nigama* of the Kurus, Thullakoṭṭhika, we find both brāhmaṇas and *gahapatis*, in this case identified as brāhmaṇa-householders. This is further supported by the fact that Raṭṭhapāla, who was present in the assembly of brāhmaṇas and *gahapatis* who had gathered to hear the Buddha preach, is mentioned as "the son of the leading family of Tullakoṭṭhika."⁹⁸ His father was a *gahapati*, not a brāhmaṇa.⁹⁹ In *Vegaṇṇa gāmanigama*, the brāhmaṇa Jotipāla is a friend of Ghaṭikāra, the potter, who stays with his blind and aged parents.¹⁰⁰ In *Kammāsaddham*, the Buddha puts up in the fire-house of a Bhāradvāja brāhmaṇa.¹⁰¹ In *Ātuma*, the barber asks his

sons to go round the community and gather food by offering their services, in order that he may give a meal to the Buddha.¹⁰² In Āpaṇa, Keṇiya *Jaṭila* has many brāhmaṇa sponsors. The Buddha is, therefore, doubtful of Keṇiya's ability to provide a meal for him and his 1200 monks.¹⁰³ In Khomaddusa, owing to sudden and unexpected rain, the Buddha enters the assembly hall (*sabhā*) while a meeting was in progress. The brāhmaṇa-*gahapatis* rebuke the Buddha for not knowing the laws of the assembly hall. The significant point in this passage is that this incident takes place in the *nigama* of the Sākyaas who are most likely to be the politically dominant group in that *nigama*. And yet the brāhmaṇa-*gahapātis* seem to maintain their separate existence.¹⁰⁴ We have dealt with this concept of dominance of extended groups in certain parts of our region elsewhere in this chapter.¹⁰⁵ In a *nigama* of the Mallas, the monk Ānanda has talks with the *gahapati* Tapussa, the subject of the conversation being the welfare of the householders.¹⁰⁶

The term *nigama* also appears in derivative nominal form *negama*, a body of persons connected with the *nigama*. This term occurs only with reference to cities like Rājagaha and Sāvattī, and in that context *nigama* would indicate a ward in a city. *Nigama*, as we have pointed out earlier, is a *gāma* composed of members of various groups more or less integrated.¹⁰⁷ In a city the *nigama* and the groups would have the same integrated relationship, but with one difference. Because of the urban complexities and the existence of the number of wards side by side, only a representative body, formed of the leading household heads (*gahapati*) could possibly effectively co-operate in the government of a city. Since the ruling council of a city came from *nigamas*, the word *negama* must have originated to denote the nature of that body.

The *negama* had access to the king. Twice they are recorded as presenting their cases before the king. The *negama* of Rājagaha, through the good offices of king Bimbisāra, instructs the physician Jivaka to cure a *seṭṭhi gahapati*.¹⁰⁸ In the second instance, at their behest, Bimbisāra installs the courtesan Sīlavatī, so that the city of Rājagaha may prosper through her fame.¹⁰⁹ As its members belonged to the well-to-do classes, it is but natural that the *negama* would help its class members. To the *gahapati* Anāthapiṇḍika they make offers of money to help him out of his difficulties when he invites the Buddha to a meal.¹¹⁰ They help the *seṭṭhi gahapati*

mentioned above because they think "he is very helpful to the *negama*".¹¹¹

Pura and Nagara:

The occurrence of the word *pura* is rare. In the *Sutta Nipāta*, a *yakkha* of Āḷavi declares that he will wander from *gāma* to *gama* from *pura* to *pura*.¹¹² Immediately after his enlightenment, the Buddha plans to go to the "*pura* of the *kāsis*" (*kāsīnam puram*) to beat the drum of deathlessness; it is further added that in due course he approaches Benares.¹¹³ These passages are considered to be amongst the earliest ones in the Pāli Canon and it seems clear that in these *pura* means a city.

The word *nagara*, which is so commonly used for city, is said to have a non-Aryan origin.¹¹⁴ "This term in early Vedic literature is found only in the derivative adjective, used as proper name *nagarin*. It appears in the sense of 'town' in the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* and is frequently used in the later language."¹¹⁵ As our subject does not include the origins of the word, we will confine our study to the nature of *nagara* in Pāli sources, where it is used to mean an inhabited place or area.

The *Vinaya* refers to a hypothetical case involving a theft.¹¹⁶ The one responsible for the theft, among other punishments, will be either imprisoned or banished. The imprisonment (*bandhey-yuṃ*) is defined as holding tight (the thief) by means of rope, fetters, and chains. He might be imprisoned within the *ghara* (house), *nagara*, *gāma* and *nigama*. The people might also appoint a guard of men to keep a watch on the thief.¹¹⁷ However, he might be banished (*pabbājeyyuṃ*) from the *gāma*, *nigama*, *nagara*, *janapada* and *janapadapadesa*. In the first instance the *nagara* means a fortified enclosure and is so used in its proper sequence, while on the other hand the territorial aspect of the *nagara* is apparent in the next one. This subtle distinction probably existed in the minds of the writers of the Canon and it seems to occur again in the passage where it is said that the robber Aṅgulimāla depopulated *gāmas*, *nigamas* and *janapadas*.¹¹⁸ The reasons for not mentioning *nagaras*, which imply fortifications, seem to be obvious. Aṅgulimāla would find it difficult to attack places which were well fortified. In the days of political turmoil, in which "fish ethics" (*matsya*

nāya) in politics was the order of the day, it is not surprising that the major powers in the country should take such care for their defences.

Nagara in some cases is clearly a fortress rather than a city. One such fortress is described in the *Dīgha Nikāya*.¹¹⁰ The king, it says, might have a frontier *nagara*, strong in its foundations, rampart¹²⁰ (*pākāra*) and towers, and with only one gate and a gate-keeper (*donārika*).¹²¹ The duties of the gate-keeper are specified. "He keeps off strangers and allows known persons to enter the fort. As he patrols all round the fort he might not notice a crevice in the wall or a hole big enough for a cat to slip through. But would know whatever creatures of any size entered or left this fort would all enter or leave by this gate." In the *Anguttara Nikāya*, the seven defences and the four kinds of supplies which make a king's frontier fortress impregnable, and the corresponding qualities in a monk who is unaffected by the evil insinuations of *māra*, are mentioned.¹²²

In the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*,¹²³ the monk Ānanda considers Kusināra as (1) a *kuḍḍanagaraka* (2) an *ujjaṅgala nagaraka* or (3) a *sākha nagaraka*. He suggests that the Buddha should not die in Kusināra but in a *mahānagara*, such as Campā, Rājagaha, Sāvatti, Sāketa, Kosāmbi and Benares. Rhys Davids renders these *nagarakas* as (1) a little wattle and daub town, (2) a town in the midst of jungle and (3) a branch township, respectively.¹²⁴ He seems to have caught the general sense fairly enough but his rendering may be somewhat off the mark. It does not give us, for instance, any idea of the forms of architecture of the *nagara* represented by the Pāli words. We are inclined to believe that these words also specify three types of fortifications by which the *nagara* was known.

In *kuḍḍa-nagaraka*, the word *kuḍḍa* is connected with the Sanskrit root *ksud*, to grind, and thus suggests a powdery substance of some kind used in construction.¹²⁵ It may, therefore, indicate a *nagara* with ramparts of mud bricks. *Ujjaṅgala* literally means hard, firm and barren soil. We prefer the explanation given in the *Peta Vatthu*¹²⁶ which says, "Ujjaṅgala is a very hard area of ground (*ativīya thadda bhūmibhāga*)," to its alternative meaning of "sandy and deserted place." *Ujjaṅgala nagaraka* thus would refer to the *nagaras* constructed on hilly terrains, as these afforded a natural protection. We might also find in such a *nagara* cyclopean walls.

Rājagaha, the capital of Magadha, had two distinct towns, of which the older called Giribajja was a hill fortress, while the later town at the foot of the hill was known as Rājagaha proper. The walls of Giribajja are among the oldest known stone buildings in India.¹²⁷

The third in the list of *nagarakas* mentioned above is *sākhā nagaraka*. The commonest meaning of *sākhā* is a branch of a tree.¹²⁸ The *sākhā nagaraka* may, therefore, be a type of *nagara* fortified by branches of trees which were presumably cut into stakes, sharpened at the end, and fastened together to construct a wall. Possibly this was the most common form of defence, owing to the ready availability of wood. That wood was widely used for fortification is clear from the following case. Dhaniya, a Buddhist monk of Rājagaha wants to build a house of wood; so he goes to the keeper of a wood-yard (*dārugahe gaṇakam*) to beg for wood. The keeper tells him that the wood was held for king Bimbisāra, serving to repair the *nagara* in case of accident.¹²⁹ The city of Pāṭaliputta had wooden walls, the remains of which have been excavated.¹³⁰

The relationship between *nagara* as a town and *nagara* as a fort or fortified enclosure is very close. In fact, the one cannot exist without the other. Thus, we find the brāhmaṇa ministers of the king of Magadha, Sunīdha and Vassakāra, building a *nagara* (fortress) at Pāṭaligāma to hold the Vajjis in check.¹³¹ However, we cannot say that the whole of Pāṭaligāma was fortified. The meaning which seems to be more probable is that a fortress was built near Pāṭaligāma and in course of time, as mentioned in the text, that *gāma* became an *agga-nagara*.¹³² Pāṭaligāma originally seems to have been a settlement of traders and a small market.¹³³ Since it was between Vesāli and Rājagaha, it also had an important strategic position. It was on the confluence of the Ganges and Sonā, one of its (Ganges) tributaries. In this passage, therefore, we seem to have the key to the understanding of a *nagara* as a city. This passage would indicate that in the beginning there is a *gāma*, a *nagara* comes to be built near it and, because of economic and other factors, the *nagara* is extended and grows into a city.

We may recall that Ananda identifies Kusināra as a *nagaraka*.¹³⁴ The word *nagaraka* is used as diminutive of *nagara*, and in this context it would mean a small town. The word *nagaraka* does not occur elsewhere in the texts, and its occurrence with the word

mahā-nagara indicates that the former was used only to bring about a sharp contrast between Kusināra and other cities such as Sāvattthi, Rājagaha, Kosāmbi etc. Kusināra seems to have been a town with a fort, and it is likely that surrounding *gāmas* and *nigamas* would be left uncovered by the walls of the fort. It is more likely that ruling families, in the case of Kusināra the Mallas, would stay in the area covered by the walls of the fort, to guard themselves from external enemies, to protect themselves from their own subjects, and to maintain a social distance from the other groups. We may discern some of the points made above from the following instance:¹³⁵

Just before his death the Buddha comes to Kusināra and stays in Upavattana, the *sāla*-grove of the Mallas. The Buddha instructs Ānanda to go and tell the Mallas of Kusināra the news of his sickness. Since the Buddha was staying in their land (*gāma-khetta*), the Buddha intentionally does this so that the Mallas should not feel hurt that they were not informed of the news of the Buddha's forthcoming death. The Mallas, on hearing the news from Ānanda, go to meet the Buddha.¹³⁶

The Mallas come with their sons, daughters-in-law, wives and entourage, forming their family circles (*kulaparivatta*). Ānanda thinks it useless to introduce the Mallas individually as that would have taken considerable time and instead he introduces them to the Buddha by family groups, each led by its head.

After the Buddha's death, the monk Anuruddha sends Ānanda to announce the news. Ānanda starts in the morning (*pubbaṇa-samayam*) and arrives in Kusināra just before mid-day (*attadutiyo*).

The Mallas mourn the Buddha's death, decorate his body and pay homage to it. On the seventh day they think of removing the body for cremation. They propose to take it with proper ceremony to the southern part of the *nagara* and to cremate it outside the *nagara* facing the south¹³⁷ However, they cannot lift the body as a *devatā* intended differently. According to the wishes of the *devatā*, they carry the body towards the north of the *nagara*, enter the *nagara* through the north gate, take the body to the centre of the *nagara*, leave by

the eastern gate, and finally cremate the body towards the east of the *nagara* near the Mukutabandhana, the ancestral shrine of the Mallas.¹³⁸

The Mallas of Kusināra preserve the funerary deposits and elaborately put them in their *Santhāgāra*. The other ruling powers of the region, when they hear the news of the Buddha's death in Kusināra, claim the remains of the body. The Mallas of Kusināra claim the body on the ground that the Buddha died in the area of their settlement (*gāma-khetta*).

It is clear from this that in the area known as Kusināra there was a fort (*nagara*) and surrounding areas which were distinct from the fort. The town of Kusināra covered both of these. The Mallas seem to have lived in the fort with their families. The area of the town as a whole seems to have been considerable. Ānanda took a few hours to cover the distance between that part of Kusināra where the Buddha's body lay dead and the residence of the Mallas, their *nagara*. The account of the funeral procession is interesting. At first the Mallas seem to show reluctance to carry the body of the Buddha into the *nagara*, the rights of which they probably reserved for their own kinsmen. A *devatā* had to intervene to take the body of the Buddha into the *nagara* and to give it a place of honour by installing the body near the Mallan shrine, outside the city. This clearly shows that the Mallas held the *nagara* as their exclusive enclosure.

Nagara and Mahānagaras:

The big cities are full of people and are great sources of wealth. In Ānanda's list of *mahā-nagaras*, we find six such cities mentioned—Sāvatti, Rājagaha, Sāketa, Kosambi and Benares. Ānanda seems to stress the importance of their wealth as he feels that the rich *gahapatis*, brāhmaṇas and khattiyas in these cities will do proper homage to the Buddha's body.¹³⁹ We find other cities such as Kapilavatthu and Vesāli which, although they do not come under the category of *mahā-nagara*, are sufficiently important. Vesāli is prosperous and flourishing, full of people and well off for food. It contains 7707 *pāsādas*, 7707 *kuṭāgaras*, 7707 parks and 7707 lotus ponds. In it dwells the courtesan Ambapālī,

beautiful and charming. She is clever at dancing, singing and lute playing, and much visited by the people, and through her Vesāli acquires fame.¹⁴⁰ Kapilavatthu, too, is rich and contains food and people in plenty. It is crowded with elephants, horses, chariots, carts and men, all swaying and rolling along.¹⁴¹ The ideal city of Kusāvati, as presented by the Buddha, is more or less the same as Vesāli and Kapilavatthu. It is full of rattle and din of elephants, horses, chariots, various musical instruments such as trumpet (*bheri*), *vīṇa*, and *muṇḍa* and singing. In addition to these noises, we find there frivolity and merrymaking, with much eating and drinking.¹⁴² Sudinna the monk goes to his relatives in Vesāli as he is sure that his *ñātis* in the city will give him food, which they do.¹⁴³ Vesāli is also known for its delightful shrines (*cetiya*) which were apparently popular pilgrimage centres for the people of Vajjis.¹⁴⁴

The cities are characterised by affluence. To cure a disease of his head, the *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha has to give 100,000 (coins) to the king and as many to the physician Jīvaka.¹⁴⁵ Jīvaka gets in all 16,000 *kaḥāpanas* and a few other gifts from the *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Sāketa for curing his wife.¹⁴⁶ The *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Benares gives 16,000 *kaḥāpanas* to Jīvaka for curing his son.¹⁴⁷ Soṇa Koli-visa of Campā renounces "80 cartloads of gold (*asītasakaṭavāha hiraṇṇam*)" and a herd of seven elephants and joins a monastery.¹⁴⁸ In Sāvatti we find *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa* and *gahapati mahāsālas*, men of authority, owning great treasure, great wealth, immense aids to enjoyment, immense supplies of goods and corn, deliberately telling lies through and because of and in connection with their wordly desires.¹⁴⁹ In Sāvatti the *seṭṭhi gahapati* dies intestate, leaving behind him gold, worth 100,000 (*kaḥāpanas*), to say nothing of silver.¹⁵⁰ In all these cases the figures may be exaggerated but they imply the existence of extensive cash economy and the comparatively greater affluence of the big cities with respect to other inhabited places.

There seems to be a tendency amongst the cities to vie with each other in respect of wealth and prestige. Seeing the prosperity of Vesāli because of her courtesan Ambapālī, the toast of society, the *negama* (urban council) of Rājagaha appoint Silāvati as their chief courtesan.¹⁵¹ While Ambapālī charged fifty (*kaḥāpanas*) this Silāvati took a hundred from her customers.¹⁵²

In the cities, the examples of people bestowing lavish gifts on the Buddhist Saṃgha and other religious orders are abundant. We give below but a few. The *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha gives a meal to the Buddha, whereas his brother-in-law from Sāvātthi, Anāthpiṇḍika gives the entire Jeta-vana.¹⁵³ The *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha presents sixty buildings for the monastery to the Buddhist Saṃgha.¹⁵⁴ Even a poor worker in Vesālī has the ability to give a meal to the Buddha and his Saṃgha, however, frugal it may have been.¹⁵⁵ In the city of Sāvātthi we find guilds (*pūga*) instituting a regular supply of food to the monks and nuns.¹⁵⁶ Cities were thus undoubtedly the great store-rooms of wealth, which attracted people of diverse interests, habits and origins.

The inhabitants of the cities seem to stay in quarters or wards (*nigama*), which they seem to have based on their own *nigamas* whence they originally came. We know very little about the relationship which existed between the people living in the city and in the *gāmas* and *nigamas* outside it. Kinship ties must have played a prominent part in deciding these relationships, but evidence to substantiate our hypothesis is lacking. At best we have a few hints which suggest this. Thus the monk Sudinna goes to his *ñātis* in case of difficulty. The *ñātis* fulfil their obligations by giving him food.¹⁵⁷ A nun who is in Sāvātthi sees *ñātaka* from her *gāma*.¹⁵⁸ Another nun from Sāvātthi quarrels with other nuns and goes to her *ñātikulāni* in a *gāma*.¹⁵⁹

It is significant that *seṭṭhi gahapatis* seem to be found only in the cities. *Gahapatis* are the household heads and well-to-do people. In the cities these household heads, or the more wealthy amongst them would be likely to categorise themselves into a class, or rather would be so categorised by the people. Thus the *seṭṭhi gahapatis* would mean the leading middle class *gahapatis* as distinct from the *brāhmaṇas* by birth and the members of ruling aristocracy. Nowhere in the text we are told of the profession of the *seṭṭhi gahapatis*, although they are generally taken as merchants. They are certainly wealthy enough to be able to afford costly gifts and fees.¹⁶⁰

Janapada:

Janapada is a term for a region comprising *gāma*, *nigama* and

nagara and is often combined with these smaller territorial units. An often quoted simile of the Buddha runs as follows:

A man sees a beautiful woman of the *janapada* (*janapada kalyāṇī*). He wants and desires her. Another man might say to the first man, "My good fellow do you know anything about her?" and asks various questions. The class of the *janapada kalyāṇī* is enquired about, whether she belonged to the *khattiya brāhmaṇa*, *vessa* or *sudda vaṇṇa*; her name and *gotta*; about her complexion, whether she is dark (*kāli*), fair (*sama*) golden (*maṅgura*); and the last query is to what *gāma*, *nigāma* or *nagara* she belonged.¹⁶¹

The order in which these questions about the *janapada kalyāṇī* are asked is interesting. It seems to reflect the whole structure of the *janapada* which should be understood as a socio-cultural region, a structural entity consisting of various sub-units which start from *vaṇṇa*, and end with residential units of *gāma*, *nigama* and *nagara*. In the *Samyutta Nikāya*¹⁶² it is said that people (*bahujana*) flock together, crying *janapada kalyāṇī janapada kalyāṇī*. Then that girl, displaying all her charms, dances and sings for them. Still more people might gather and bestow showers of praise upon her saying, "The *janapada kalyāṇī* sings and dances." This passage incidentally betrays the sense of unity which lies behind the use of the term *janapada*. This relation which existed between the *janapada* and the people is abundantly seen in the passage in the *Dīgha Nikāya*, where the *brāhmaṇa* chaplain of the legendary king Mahāvijita counsels the king on doing good to people:¹⁶³

The king's *janapada* is harassed and oppressed. The *gāmas*, *nigamas* and *nagaras* are being destroyed.¹⁶⁴ Roads are unsafe. So long as the *janapada* is in this state, it is most unwise to levy fresh taxes. Even if the king manages to stop the scoundrel's game by degradation, banishment and fines, and by putting some to death, their licence cannot be satisfactorily put a stop to. The remnant left unpunished would still go on harassing the *janapada*. The king should supply the farmers and cattlekeepers with seeds and fodder, should give capital to the trader and pay wages and food to the employees in his

service. Then these men, following each his own business, will no longer harass the *janapada*; the king's revenue will go up, the *janapada* will be quiet and at peace; and the people pleased with one another and happy, dancing their children in their arms, will dwell with open doors.

This is an idealized picture of a happy *janapada*. The term here is again used as a socio-economic unit in which the prosperity of the *janapada* depended on the economic welfare of the people. The usual components of the *janapada*, *gāma*, *nigama* and *nagara*, are also present.

Sometimes *janapada* denoted an undefined and extensive region. We find a great caravan of a thousand carts going from the eastern region (*puratthimā janapada*) into the western region (*pacchiman janapadam*). While passing through the jungle, the leaders of the caravan encounter a *yakkhā* in the guise of a traveller. The leaders ask him, "From where do you come?" he replies, "From such and such *janapada*;" then, "Where are you going?" asks the *yakkhā*, "To such and such a *janapada*," replies the leader.¹⁶⁵ In the conversation between the caravan leaders and the *yakkhā*, the names of the *janapada* are not given, as this simile was meant to be a point of general illustration. But obviously both of them must have known the broad divisions of the region, and what they would be interested in asking each other would be the exact names of the *janapada*. Thus a two-fold meaning of *janapada* is apparent here. In the first part of the story it means a very wide and vague region, while in the conversation it implies a smaller specified one. In the second instance, a trustworthy informer of a king may tell him of a *janapada*, rich, full of gold, women, food etc., and which may be situated to the east, west, north or south or even overseas (*pārasamuddato*). The king would like to conquer and subjugate that *janapada* (*abhivijaya ajjhāvaseyyāma*).¹⁶⁶

On account of regional variations in social habits, the Buddha is said to have relaxed some of the rules which he had established for the monks in the *majjhima janapada* and which were difficult to apply in other regions. The peculiarities of the region *Avantidak-khinaṇṇāpatha* are noticed by the monk Mahākaccāna, himself a resident of Avanti. He even suggests the changes the Buddha should introduce in his *Vinaya* laws for that region. The following are

his arguments: (1) In the *Avantidakkhināpatha* the surface-soil is dark, hard, trampled by the hooves of cattle, and the Buddha should allow sandals with many linings in this region. (2) Since people there attach importance to bathing and to purification by water, the Buddha should allow constant bathing. (3) In the *Avantidakkhināpatha* coverings of sheep-hide, goat-hide and deer-hide are used, whereas in the *majjhima janapada* coverings of *eragu*, *moragu* *majjhāru* and *jantu* are used. The Buddha should allow hide covering. (4) The other changes deal with the *Vinaya* procedure which are not important at this juncture.¹⁶⁷ The Buddha concedes these requests of the monk Mahākaccāna.¹⁶⁷

Admittedly, the term *majjhima janapada* has been used by the monk in the sense of an extensive region. This looseness in the application of the term is to be seen in the passage when the *Vinaya* writers try to define the extent and the limits of the *majjhima janapada*. The only way they could do so was by pointing out what seem to be the rough sign posts which demarcated the boundary lines of the *majjhima janapada*. The boundaries of the *majjhima janapada* are described as follows:

“Kajāṅgala nigama is in the eastern direction, beyond it is Mahāsālā, further than that are outlying regions (*paccantima janapadā*), on this side are the middle (*orato majjhe*). The river Sallavatī is in the south-eastern direction further. . . . Setakaṇṇika nigama is in the southern direction further. . . . Thūṇa, the brāhmaṇa gāma is in the western direction. . . . The mountain slopes called Usiraddhaja is in the northern direction further. . . .”¹⁶⁸

The definition carries the implication that *majjhima janapada* was a more or less culturally homogeneous region vis-à-vis the others. *Majjhima janapada* is thus contrasted with outlying regions (*paccantimā janapadā*) which also apparently included in the region known as *avantidakkhināpatha*.¹⁶⁹ The customs of different regions are noted, only to be criticised or commented upon. Thus we are told that in the *dakkhina janapada*, they have a ceremony called *dhovana* celebrated by feasting, dancing and singing. Buddha, however, calls this custom of *dhovana* unaryan, vulgar and un conducive to the attainment of *nibbāna*.¹⁷⁰ In another instance the Bud-

dha refers to an ancient custom in a certain *janapada* where people throw dust, cowdung and ashes on newly wed girls without, however, knowing the import of such an action.¹⁷¹ By way of illustration the ignorance of the people of outlying regions (*paccantimā janapadā*) is brought forward thus:¹⁷²

A conch blower (*saṅkha-dhamo*), once goes to the outlying *janapada*. Early in the morning he goes to the *gāma* of that *janapada* and blows his conch. The people of that *gāma* apparently have never heard this instrument being played before, and when they listen to it they are charmed. They all gather and go to the conch blower who, in the meantime, has placed the instrument down and is sitting on the ground. The people experiment with the instrument, hoping that it will blow of its own accord, without realizing the fact that it is the blower who is responsible for creating the music. "How silly are these people born in the outlying *janapada*", remarks the conch blower, and while they look on, he takes his conch, blows it thrice and goes away.

This broad regional difference is manifested in the field of social interaction. In the *Majjhima Nikāya*, the brāhmaṇa Assalāyana advocates the claims to superiority made by the brāhmaṇas as regards their birth and status. Denying this claim, the Buddha tells Assalāyana how in Yona and Kamboja and other outlying regions there are two *vaṇṇas*, the master and the slave, and that it is possible for a master to become a slave or for a slave to become a master.¹⁷³

The unity of a region is expressed in terms of the stubbornness of its people in keeping to their regional dialects. Thus the Buddha admonishes the monks saying that one should not deviate from the common dialect of the region. In different *janapadas* they know different words for a bowl. They call it *pati*, *patta*, *vittha*, *sarāva*, *dhāropa*, *poṇa* and *pisāla*. A person knowing only one of these words will imagine that this only is right and all others are wrong.¹⁷⁴

We see this spirit of preservation of the unity of the *janapada* projected elsewhere and sometimes the differences in the nearby region within a broader cultural area are indicated and these are

worthy of consideration. At Devadaha, a *nigama* of the Sakyas, many Bhikkhus bound for the western land (*pacchābhūmagāmikā*) approach the Buddha and express their intention to go west (*pacchābhūmaṃ janapadam*) and make their residence there.¹⁷⁵ The Buddha asks them to consult Sāriputta over this matter. Sāriputta advises them saying, "Now friends, there are people who question a bhikkhu who goes from one place to another (*nāvāverajjagataṃ*). Wise men may enquire of him, saying, 'what doctrine does your teacher declare, what does he announce?' ". He then gives them a discourse on the Buddha's doctrine. That the Bhikkhus were liable to questioning by others about their teacher and the particular creed which they professed makes it clear that the western region was new to some of them and they had to face unforeseen difficulties. *Pacchābhūmaka janapada* seems to have been used in a very general way to mean any place lying west of Sakyan territory. Similarly we find *pacchābhūmaka brāhmaṇas* in Nālanda.¹⁷⁶ Whatever may be the origin of these *pacchābhūmaka brāhmaṇas*, they are considered different from the indigenous people of Nālandā. In modern India, especially in the north, the difference of "east" and "west" is fairly common. A person living on the upper Ganges above Prayāga will call a person living across the river, a man coming from the west and in doing so he will claim superior cultural traits. Of course, this feeling is usually reciprocal.

We have shown that the *janapada* is a loosely used term which denotes a territory or a region. The term *jana* is used in the sense of individuals or a group of individuals (*bahujana*), whereas *janapada* refers, among its other varied uses, to a people (in fact, the term *jānapada* means the people of a *janapada*) that is in our period to an extended kin-group or a socio-cultural group, presumably with a territory of their own, though not exclusively held by them. Thus any geographical area may comprise the territories of the two *jānapadas* interspersed. Such a situation is often to be found even in modern times, where the same geographical areas may be occupied by more than one tribe, all of them distinct social entities and having cultural contacts with each other. The relationships of these extended kin-groups will be more clearly understood after further examination of the data.

Janapada and extended kin-groups:

In discussing various groups in relation to the *janapada* we shall use the term "extended kin-group" for them in preference to other terms like "tribe" or "clan", which have been generally used hitherto. At this stage we may also clarify certain notions regarding tribal and caste society. As today, no doubt, tribes existed in this period. By tribal organisation we mean a society which is on the whole not based on occupational division. Caste society, on the contrary, is based on occupational division, though a society based on extended kin-groups need not necessarily develop all the features of caste. As we intend to show, the society of these books is not tribal, but is one in which an extensive division of labour has taken place, including the growth of trade.¹⁷⁷ Hence in describing kinship and allied features of this society we would prefer not to use terms like "clan", as they are often used in conjunction with tribal organisation. In their place we shall use the following terms: Family, extended family, lineage, kin-group, and extended kin-group.

Extended kin-groups, for our purposes, may have legendary or real common descent, a name and a common social structure peculiar to them, encompassing a definite group of people, common customs, folkways, mythology etc., and a common territory. The individual identifies himself with the group, while the group as a whole juxtaposes itself against other such groups within the larger social structure. As pointed out already, the same territory may contain two co-existing groups who maintain their separate identity by emphasizing their internal differences, though they have much in common otherwise. This will be made clear in the following pages.

We will first consider the 16 *mahājanapadas*, which are as follows: *Aṅga*, *Magadha*, *Kāśi*, *Kosala*, *Vajji*, *Malla*, *Ceti*, *Vaṃsa*, *Kuru*, *Pañcāla*, *Maccha*, *Surasena*, *Assaka*, *Avanti*, *Gandhāra* and *Kamboja*.¹⁷⁸ This list has been interpreted by scholars as indicating the political subdivisions of Buddhist India.¹⁷⁹ But this is of minor significance to the present study, where the significance of the *janapada* as socio-cultural regions is more important. Also this emphasis on the interpretation of *janapadas* as political entities, has led to much confusion resulting from

stretching the term's meaning to convey a wide range of political implications. We are inclined to believe that a socio-cultural interpretation of the word is more in accordance with the ideas of its original users. Rhys Davids feels that the main idea in the minds of those who drew up or used the above list was still "tribal and not geographical".¹⁸⁰ If this was so, it is difficult to explain the absence of the several important groups, such as Sakyas, Licchavis, Kālāmas and Koliyas who were distinct social entities and who had separate territories of their own. The list of the 16 *janapadas* most probably refers to broad geographical divisions, each occupied by one or more extended kin group. In this respect the order in which the sixteen are mentioned is noteworthy. In the *Janavasabha Sutta* of the *Digha Nikāya*,¹⁸¹ the Buddha spoke of the rebirths of his followers who had died in the *janapada* round about,¹⁸² mentioning the regions of Kāsi-Kosala, Vajji-Mallas, Ceti-Vamsa, Kurupāncāla and Maccha-Surasenā. But he did not mention those followers living in Aṅga-Magadha. Ānānda realized that there were also Magadhan followers (*Māgadhaka paricāraka*) who had died with profound faith in the Buddha's doctrine, and he thought, "One might think Aṅga-Magadha devoid of Māgadhan followers".¹⁸³ Two things appear from this passage: firstly, the regions are mentioned in pairs, and, secondly, Aṅga-Magadha denotes one territory and the Magadhans' are here mentioned as belonging to the Aṅga-Magadha territory. In another case, at the time of the great sacrifice of Uruvela Kassapa the *jaṇila*, a vast concourse of Aṅgas and Magadhas wished to attend it with plentiful provisions of food. Kassapa knew this and thought, "My great sacrifice is at hand and a vast concourse of Aṅgas and Magadhas wish to attend it; if on that occasion the Buddha should perform a marvel of power before the people (*mahājanakāya*) his gain and honour would increase".¹⁸⁴ The two territories are thus considered as one region and the people of these are proposing to engage themselves in common religious activity. In the light of this and the other passage mentioned above, the pairing of *janapadas* seems to have existed in the minds of the authors.

We may now consider some of the *janapadas* mentioned in the texts, including some of those referred to in the list of 16 *mahājanapadas*. As a choice has to be made in the selection of the *janapadas* for treatment, we shall mention only those of which we have suffi-

cient knowledge and which furnish us with further evidence of the characteristics of a *janapada*.

*Magadha*¹⁸⁵

We are inclined to believe that nowhere in the texts does the word *Magadha* specifically refer to an extended kin-group, although it may have been so used in the early Vedic period.¹⁸⁶ The implication of its being a territory seems clear in the text. Thus in the *Vinaya Mahavaggā*, the king of *Magadha*, *Bimbisāra*, together with a vast number of *brāhmaṇas* and *gahapatis* of *Magadha*, goes to see the Buddha, who had at that time recently arrived at *Rājagaha*.¹⁸⁷ Many distinguished sons of the families of *Magadha* (*Magadhika kulaputta*) led a holy life with the Buddha. Because of this, the people (*manussā*) become angry and disturbed and accuse the Buddha of breaking of the family (*kulapacchedāya*).¹⁸⁸

It is the stock phrase at many places that so and so was journeying among the *Magadhas* (*Magadhesu*), and this apparently suggests only that he was staying or journeying in the territory of *Magadha*. Thus in references to the Buddha's places of residence in *Magadha*, specific details of their location are often given together with the general location "among the *Magadhas* (*Magadhesu*),"¹⁸⁹ which seems here evidently to be thought of purely geographically. The expression of the name of regions and districts in the plural may also be found in Indian literature of much later date.

Magadha, with its capital *Rājagaha*, and kings *Bimbisara* and *Ajatasattu*, sometimes was known as a *mahājanapada*.¹⁹⁰ The same was the case with *Aṅga*. But in some passages *Magadha* and *Aṅga* taken together seem to comprise a single *mahājanapada*.

*Aṅga*¹⁹¹

We find the Buddha traversing the territory of *Aṅga* which was politically affiliated with *Magadha*. Two *nigamas* of *Aṅga* are mentioned, *Assapura*¹⁹² and *Āpaṇa*.¹⁹³ *Āpaṇa* is mentioned twice; in the first instance it is stated simply to belong to the territory of *Aṅga*, while in the next it seems that the texts more accurately mention it as in the territory north of *Aṅga* (*Aṅguttarapesu*).^{*} The capital of *Aṅga* was *Campā* and the residents of this city were known as

Campeyyakas.¹⁹⁵ A Bhaddiya *nagara* is mentioned, which seems to lie in between the territory of Aṅga and Magadha. Bimbisāra once referred to it as being in the "land conquered by us (*vijite*)".¹⁹⁶ However, there seems to be no indication as to whether it belonged to the territory of Magadha or Aṅga, as the name of this *nagara* occurs without the usual Pāli prefixes, such as *Aṅgesu* and *Magadhesu*. It seems most likely that the area occupied by that *nagara* was common both to Aṅgas and Magadhas, a cross-cultural zone brought about by the intermingling of the people of two distinct geographical areas; that presumably is the reason for the disconnection of the words suggesting the geographical entities.

*Kosala*¹⁹⁷

We find much more information about this *janapada* than any other. Sāvātthi, the capital of Kosala, was the centre of activity of Buddhism. Woodward calculated all the references of Sāvātthi in the four *Nikāyas*, and he states that 871 *suttas* are said to have been preached in Sāvātthi, of which 844 were delivered in the Jeta-vana, 23 in the Pubbārāma, and four in the suburbs. These *suttas* are made of six in the *Dīgha*, 75 in the *Majjhima*, 736 in the *Samyutta* and 54 in the *Aṅguttara*.¹⁹⁸ This clearly shows the familiarity with which the authors of the texts viewed Sāvātthi and its surrounding regions. The king Pasenadi of Kosala was more widely known than his contemporary kings, Bimbisāra, Ajātasattu, Pajjota and Udena. The whole of the third *Samyutta*, consisting of 25 anecdotes, each with a moral bias, is devoted to the king of Kosala, and there are about an equal number of references to him in other parts of the literature.¹⁹⁹ In contrast, there are in the first four *Nikāyas* only six *suttas* which mention the Magadhan king Bimbisāra, and Vidūḍabha of the commentaries is barely mentioned in the *Nikāyas*.²⁰⁰ The king of the Vacchas, Rājā Udena is mentioned twice,²⁰¹ and so also is king Pajjota of Avanti.²⁰² This again testifies to the fact that Kosala, with its capital and king, were favourite topics among the Buddhist writers.

In spite of this familiarity with the Kosalan region, the word Kosala does not seem to refer to a specific extended kin-group. The Kosala region abounded in brāhmaṇa *gāmas* alongside which were few *nigamas*. We have mentioned earlier the Kosalan brāhmaṇa

gāmas.²⁰³ Among the *nigamas* mentioned are: Daṇḍakappa, Caṇḍakappa, Paḥadhā and Nālakapāna.²⁰⁴ Sāketa, which was regarded as one of the six great cities of India, the others being Campā, Rājagaha, Sāvatti, Kosāmbi and Benares, was in the Kosala. King Pasenadi used to visit this city, which was a day's journey from Sāvatti, and which seems to have been his second capital.²⁰⁵ Ayojjha, another Kosalan city, is mentioned only once.²⁰⁶

Kosala and Sākyas:

It is noteworthy that we find in the Kosala *janapada* the *nigamas* and the *nagara* of the Sākyas. In the *Anguttara Nikāya* the Buddha while journeying in the Kosala region came to Kapilavatthu the capital of the Sākyas.²⁰⁷ The other instance tells us about the Buddha's stay in Kapilavatthu.²⁰⁸ In the first instance the Buddha is journeying (*cārikam caramāno*), not staying (*viharati*), in the Kosala region. Thus only a geographical sense of the word is implied, in that it gives a notion of a broad regional division. "Staying" in Kapilavatthu, however, implies a temporary residence there. In this context, therefore, although the territory occupied by the Sākyas came under the broad classificatory region known as Kosala, this difference in presentation of the words seems to bring out the vagueness of the term. This again is made clear in a passage in the *Sutta Nipāta*.²⁰⁹ The Buddha tells of his Sākyan origin to King Bimbisāra of Magadha in his capital Rājagaha. It appears from the passage that he probably knew Kosala region, but was, perhaps, unaware of the independent existence of the Sākyans. The Buddha says to the king: "There is a people dwelling just by the side of the Himalayas, in the Kosala region (*Kosalesu*), endowed with wealth and power. Their *gotta* is *Ādicca* and they are known as Sākyans by birth (*jātiya*). From that group (*kula*) I have accepted monkhood, forsaking all sensual pleasures". The general way by which the term Kosala is used here to help to establish the identity of the Buddha and his extended kin-group is noteworthy. In the *Majjhima*,²¹⁰ the Buddha stayed in the territory of the Sākyas in the *nigama* of the Sākyans called Medālumpa. Pasenadi, king of Kosala, met him there. Pasenadi gave many reasons why he showed signs of respect and affection to the Buddha, one being that the Buddha like himself was a *khattiya* and a Kosalan. It is most likely

that the Kosala king is referring to Kosala in the sense of its being a broad regional entity to which the Buddha and he, himself, belonged. The use of the word *khattiya* is also significant here, for *khattiya* is also a general term, a conceptual grouping wherein all the ruling groups could be accommodated without their losing identity. Presumably, in the same broad sense the Kosalan region was understood and used, and it does not necessarily allude to the political dominance of the Kosala King.

From the above passages it seems clear that the Sākyaans were distinctly identified as an extended kin-group. Their *nagara* Kapilavatthu is always mentioned along with their group's name. We also find references to their *nigamas*, such as Naṅgaraka, Medaḷumpa, Devadaha, Khomadussa²¹¹ etc. All these *nigamas* are specified as belonging to the Sākyaans (*Sakkānam*) and also being in the territory of Sākyaans (*Sakkesu*). But unlike the Kosala and Aṅga *nigamas* who are also mentioned similarly in the text, these *nigamas* seem to allude to the Sākyaan dominance in these *nigamas*.

Malla:

The region known as Malla, which is included in the list of *mahājanapadas*, was situated to the east and south-east of the territory of the Sākyaans.²¹² An extensive belt of the Himālayan forest, Mahāvana, covered some portions of Vajji and Malla territory. The Mallas are at some places addressed as *Vāseṭṭhas*, their *gotta* name.²¹³ Malalasekera wrongly thought that the Licchavis were also referred to by this *gotta*.²¹⁴ Later on, however, both the Mallas and the Licchavis are classified as *Vrātya kṣatriyas*.²¹⁵ Kosambi maintains that they were described as mixed castes by Manu because they did not follow brāhmaṇic rituals and this is proved by their not performing Vedic sacrifice.²¹⁶ Nevertheless, we have indications that the brāhmaṇas were active in this region in the Buddha's time. The funeral rites of the Buddha performed by the Mallan chiefs suggest the brāhmaṇic ritual described in the Kalpa Sūtra literature.²¹⁷ The fact that the Mallas were called *Vāseṭṭhas* may prove the increasing influence of the brāhmaṇas over this group. Manu seems to treat these extended kin-groups as castes, which suggests that, in course of time, these extended kin-groups were slowly ossified into castes. It is quite likely that the leading members of the

Licchavis and Mallas in the time of the composition of the *Manu-smṛti* were the followers of non-brāhmaṇic sects and had perhaps forsaken the brāhmaṇic rituals. Hence, though they were already under the influence of the brāhmaṇas at the time of the Buddha, they had become *Vrātyas* some centuries later, when *Manu* was composed.²¹⁸ The evidence of the latter period is not necessarily true of the former.

We find the Mallas in two centres, at Pāvā and Kusināra. Pāvā is specified as a *nagara* of the Mallas (*Pāvā nāma Mallānaṃ nagaram*),²¹⁹ whereas Kusināra is mentioned without such specification.²²⁰ We do not know about the relationships of these two groups, whether they belonged to the same stock of the Mallas or not. In this context the remarks made by the Mallas of Pāvā when claiming the relics of the Buddha, are worthy of notice. They claimed them on the ground that they were khattiyas and the Buddha was a khattiya. The Kusināra Mallas claimed them on the ground that the Buddha died on their land (*gāma khetta*).²²¹ Thus while claiming the relics, the Mallas of Pāvā do not seem to make use of any ties, kinship or otherwise, with the Mallas of Kusināra.

Vajji:

It has been maintained that the Vajjis included eight confederate clans of which the Licchavis and the Videhans were the most powerful.²²² The relation of the Videhans to the Licchavis or the Vajjis is not stated in the *Vinaya* or the first four *Nikayas*. We have the stock phrase "journeyed in the territory of Videhans" (*Videhesu*) mentioned twice in the text, and both times it is mentioned in connection with its capital Mithila, which was about 35 miles north-west from Vesālī.²²³ Indeed, it is difficult to establish the membership of the Videhans in the Vajjian confederacy at the time of the Buddha. The word confederacy implies a political league and in that sense we cannot be sure of the relation of the Vajjis with any other ruling extended kin-groups, as there is no direct or indirect proof of it in the text. The territorial implication of the term Vajji is less vulnerable to doubts. It has been mentioned as *mahājanapada* along with the land of the Mallas. The land of the Vajjis thus represented an area inhabited perhaps by an association of extended kin-groups. It may be conjectured that

the Videhans were taken as Vajjis in the sense that they belonged to the same region.

The identity of the Licchavis and the Vajjis is, however, clear in the text. In fact, the words seem to have been used as synonyms. Thus in the *Anguttara Nikāya* many Licchavis come to the Buddha, who speaks to them thus: "I will teach you Licchavis, seven conditions securing welfare. . . ." The Buddha concludes by saying, "As these shall (Vajji *dhammas*) endure among the Vajjians and the Vajjians shall be instructed in them, the prosperity of the Vajjians should be expected and not the decline."²²⁴ In the next discourse the brāhmaṇa Vassakāra, the Magadhan minister comes to the Buddha at the command of the King Ajātsattu to ask him about the means of destroying the Vajjis.²²⁵ In yet, another place, the Buddha instructs Vassakāra saying, "At one time I stayed at Vesāli at the Sarananada shrine; there I taught the Vajjians the seven conditions securing welfare. . . ."²²⁶ There is, however, a certain confusion in the minds of scholars concerning the term Vajji. B. C. Law thinks that it connotes a confederacy as well as a separate constituent clan of that confederacy and that "the confederacy is also associated with the name of Licchavis forming another constituent clan".²²⁷ Law, thus seems to consider Vajjis and Licchavis as two different constituent clans. But at another place he contradicts his own statement by mentioning "the Vajjis or Licchavis as possessing bright complexion."²²⁸ We have pointed out above that Licchavis are called Vajjians in the text, but that other extended kin-groups probably associated with them were incorporated in the Vajjian territory. This seems to be borne out by yet another passage. Young Licchavis who have been out hunting become meek and subdued and pay homage to the Buddha. Mahānāma the Licchavi on seeing this exclaims, "They will become Vajjis" (*bhavissanti Vajji*).²²⁹ Hare²³⁰ interprets this remark to show the cultural superiority of the Vajjis over the Licchavis, and presupposes the separate existence of the Vajjis as an ethnic entity for which we do not seem to have any adequate proof. The more appropriate explanation seems to be that offered by Malalasekera, when he points out that there was a prospect of these young men becoming true Vajjians practising the seven conditions of welfare taught by the Buddha which ensured their prosperity.²³¹ This is supported by the fact that these Licchavi youths were deprecated by Mahānāma for being greedy, ill-tempered

and rough hooligans. He was naturally pleased to see them acting so meekly before the Buddha.²³²

We do not find reference to a separate territory of the Licchavis. Among their *gāmas* were, Hatthigāma, Ambugāma, Bhaṇḍagāma,²³³ and Koṭigāma²³⁴ and all these are mentioned as belonging to the territory of the Vajjis (*vajjīsu*). Two place-names, Nātika and Bhoganagara, are referred to individually without any reference to Vajjian territory, although these are at times mentioned in connection with the other Vajji *gāmas*. Thus in the *Vinaya Mahāvagga*²³⁵ we read that the Buddha, after staying for some time at Koṭigāma went to Nātikas. There he lodged in the *nātika's* brick hall. The term *nātika* in all probability refers to an extended kin-group to which Mahāvira the Jain belonged.²³⁶ In the *Mahāparinibbāṇa Sutta*, a Bhoganagara is mentioned last in the list of place names, after Bhaṇḍagāma, Hatthigāma and Ambugāma.²³⁷ This order describes the Buddhas route between Vesālī and the Mallan country. Bhoganagara was perhaps common *nagara* belonging both to the Vajjis and the Mallas.

Miscellaneous ruling extended kin-groups:

In the *Digha Nikāya*, the following extended kin-groups among others, are mentioned: (1) The Bullis of Allakappa, (2) The Koliyas of Rāmagāma, (3) The Moriyas of Pippalivana, (4) The Bhaggas of Sumsimara, (5) The Kālāmas of Kesaputta.²³⁸ Besides the occasional reference to the Koliyas and Kālāmas, we have little or no knowledge of these groups. B. C. Law who considers them as tribes says, "They are mere passing shadows in the early Buddhist records, there being scarcely any data for an historical account."²³⁹ We may not agree with Law's use of the term "tribe" to designate these extended kin-groups, but his observations seem to be accurate.

CHAPTER III

SOCIAL GROUPS AND RANKING

Introduction:

IN this chapter we consider the inter-personal relationships found in the texts. They are to be found in the descriptions of instances of actual behaviour between various persons.¹ These descriptions, among other things, consist of a limited number of phrases and terms which recur in a large number of instances. We shall refer to these as "formalisation". We are concerned with the three main categories of formalisations found in the texts, viz.:

- (1) forms of salutation described by the writers of the texts,
- (2) the terms of address used by the persons involved and
- (3) the terms of reference used for the persons involved.

A particular formalisation may cover a different set of persons each time it occurs.

In each instance of inter-personal relationship the persons occupy two separate roles. A number of such roles, in which the same formalisations occur, taken together may indicate that all the persons involved fall into two interacting groups. The formalisation may in such an instance be taken to indicate the group affiliation of the persons involved. In the case of each formalisation there may be more than one set of opposing groups.

The formalisation, however, also indicates the specific nature of the relationship existing between the persons involved. Such a relationship may be characterised as either that between equals or that between an inferior and superior. The status of each person (and the group) vis-à-vis the other may be inferred from the actual words which comprise the formalisation.

We argue at this stage that from a study of formalisations, it is possible to discern a number of groups existing within those in social contact with the Buddha and his disciples. Furthermore, it is possible to order not only the opposing groups referring to a

single formalisation but all the groups formed through formalisations into a general system of ranking. This is what we attempt in this chapter.

We have dealt with the formalisations in two ways. On the one hand we have collected a number of instances in tabular form where the persons involved fall into two distinct groups and wherein a single set of formalisations occur. Through this we indicate the existence of various groups. It must be noted that the tables are illustrative of the group and may not contain all the instances of a group. On the other hand we have taken actual instances which significantly establish the nature of the relationship between the persons (and through them the groups) involved. It may be pointed out that in the second type of treatment we have assumed that the persons are representative of the groups to which they are affiliated. We have also dealt with those specific instances where the formalisations obtained do not conform to the group affiliation earlier indicated and hence need further explanation.

Coming to the actual material, we find it convenient to take the Buddha as one of the parties in each of the instances we examine. The advantages of such a practice are obvious. The Buddha is a central figure in the text in more ways than one. Every person or group finds his distance from the Buddha through the terms of address which the Buddha uses for him and which he uses for the Buddha, the way in which he greets the Buddha and is in turn greeted and that in which he refers to the Buddha and is himself referred to. The Buddha, in our analysis which follows, is at the centre of the social order. The social distances are measured in each case with reference to the Buddha and vary in each case. The degree of social distance varies with the group, and through the formalisation of their mode of address the groups themselves find their relationship with the Buddha.

Simultaneously, we also examine the relationship of the groups vis-à-vis each other, through formalisations but without the intermediacy of the Buddha, whenever this is possible.

The Buddha and the brāhmaṇas:

It will be noted from the table in appendix, that while addressing equals the commonest mode of address used by the brāhmaṇas

is *bho*.² In addressing the Buddha they invariably use the term *bho Gotama*, implying their equality with the Buddha. The term *bho Gotama* denies special status to the Buddha in that *bho*, which is a term used among the *brāhmaṇas* when addressing each other, denotes equality, whereas *Gotama* refers to the Buddha's *gotta* affiliation and not to his unique personality.

The exception to the rule, however, occurs when a *brāhmaṇa* addresses the Buddha in anger. A case in point is that of *Asurindakabhāradvāja brāhmaṇa*, who when angry addresses the Buddha as *samaṇa*.³ Another such case is that of *Paccanika brāhmaṇa* who deliberately insults the Buddha by calling him *samaṇa*.⁴ Another exception is in the case of the *brāhmaṇa* *Udaya*. Buddha goes to the *brāhmaṇa* *Udaya*'s house and begs for alms. The *brāhmaṇa* fills the Buddha's bowl with rice. The Buddha repeats it the next day. After he has done so the third time, *Udaya* says to the Buddha, "A pertinacious man is the *samaṇo Gotamo*⁵ that he comes again and again."

Only in one instance does the *brāhmaṇa* resort to the use of *bhante* to address the Buddha. A certain *brāhmaṇa* invites the Buddha to a meal in competition with others, thereby showing his obvious leaning towards the Buddha. In his formal invitation to the Buddha he addresses him as *bhante* along with *bho Gotama*.⁶ By addressing the Buddha as *bhante* the *brāhmaṇa* manifests his deep respect towards him; the additional *bho Gotama* indicates his retention of the membership of the *brāhmaṇa* group.

In another exceptional case, the *brāhmaṇa* *Piṅgiyāni* comes forward before the assembly of the *Licchavis* and addresses the Buddha as *Bhagavā* and *Sugata*.⁷ He utters an impromptu couplet in which he praises and compares the Buddha with the *Āṅgīrasa*, the sun. The *Licchavis*, however, reward him for this act by presenting him with 500 robes, which the *brāhmaṇa* gives to the Buddha.

The Buddha is referred to by the *brāhmaṇas* as *samaṇo Gotamo*.

The usual description of the salutation the *brāhmaṇas* use for the Buddha is *saddhim sammodi* (exchange of greetings), once again implying equality of status, whereas the behaviour of other classes towards the Buddha is described through the term *abhi-vādeti*. Like everyone else, the *brāhmaṇa* also sits and talks to the Buddha. However, in angry or insulting mood he does not do so.

Thus, the brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha was sent on an errand by his teacher Pokkharasādi to confirm the 32 marks which were on the Buddha's body. Ambaṭṭha, along with other young brāhmaṇas, enters the Buddha's chamber. They exchange greetings (s.s.), but while others sit down, Ambaṭṭha, walking about, says something polite in an offhand way. He stands and fidgets all the while, even though the Buddha is seated.⁸ When the Buddha points out his lack of respect for his elders, he replies that he reserved his good manners only for brāhmaṇas.⁹

In another case, Mānatthadha brāhmaṇa, being hotheaded, keeps quiet instead of exchanging greetings (s.s.) with the Buddha.¹⁰

The brāhmaṇa's behaviour changes, however, when a brāhmaṇa becomes an upāsaka. The case of the brāhmaṇa Soṇadaṇḍa illustrates this. Soṇadaṇḍa invites the Buddha for a meal after he becomes an upāsaka. After the meal he proposes a form of behaviour, alternative to the one customary for an upāsaka. He would join hands in salutation on entering the assembly only symbolically, by stretching forth his joined palms, and bow down low in salutation also symbolically, only by waving his hands whilst leaving.¹¹ Usually upāsakas, whether householders, monks, or kings salute (*abhi.*) the Buddha and keeping their right side to him circumambulate and take leave of him. Soṇadaṇḍa the brāhmaṇa acts less respectfully for fear of loss of status.

The behaviour of the brāhmaṇa Brahmāyu¹² is different. Like others of his group, he also initially exchanges greetings (s.s.) and addresses the Buddha as *bho Gotama*. But, after seeing the 32 bodily signs on the Buddha's body and listening to Dhamma, unlike other brāhmaṇas he falls at the feet of the Buddha, strokes and kisses his feet and pronounces his name.¹³ This is a most unusual spectacle to the onlooking brāhmaṇas. They are awestruck and repeat the formula, "Indeed, it is wonderful, indeed it is marvelous how great is the psychic power and the majesty of the recluse in virtue of which the brāhmaṇa Brahmāyu, well known and renowned, pays such deep respect".¹⁴

Such behaviour by a brāhmaṇa is extremely rare and one suspects the missionary bias of the Buddhist writers in describing the scene. In any case the account clearly implies that for a brāhmaṇa to pay such respect to a non-brāhmaṇa was looked on as very un-

usual.

The practice in the case of those who become arahats, or enter the Buddhist Saṃgha is very different, even when the converts are brāhmaṇas. Thus Sela brāhmaṇa who joins the order and becomes an arahat thenceforth addresses the Buddha as *bhante Bhagavā*.¹⁵ We also notice a change in terms of reference in the text. The prefix *āyasmā* is added to these brāhmaṇas who become monks.¹⁶

The Buddha-brāhmaṇa relationship, in terms of mode of address and salutation, is characterised by four stages of social distance. Farthest from the Buddha are those hostile brāhmaṇas who address him as *samaṇa*. Those favourably inclined address him as *bho Gotama*, but do so only through fear of the loss of status within the brāhmaṇic order. An upāsaka does not relinquish his former status on becoming a Buddhist. The nearest to the Buddha are the monks and Arahats who have renounced not only their faith in the brāhmaṇic teaching but also their membership of the brāhmaṇic order.

Buddha, on the other hand, in addressing brāhmaṇas, uses a number of terms which normally include the title brāhmaṇa. Sometimes in familiar cases he also addresses particular brāhmaṇas by referring to their *gotta*.¹⁷ Brāhmaṇa *gahapatis* when in a group are addressed by him as *gahapatayo*, stressing their role as heads of households. The brāhmaṇa youths, however, he addresses by their personal names or as *māṇava*.

The Buddha reciprocates the brāhmaṇas' salutation in the same terms (s.s.). He does not refer to them by personal names, but only by their *gotta*.

When a brāhmaṇa becomes a Buddhist monk, he is addressed by the Buddha with his *gotta* and never as brāhmaṇa. In the terms of reference the personal name and *gotta* are used. In addition, the usual forms of address and the titles used in addressing monks, such as *āvuso* and *āyasmā* respectively, also occur.

The Buddha and the Jains:

Very few Jains are actually mentioned in the text although their doctrine was known to the Buddha. A Nigaṇṭhaputta Saccaka has talks with the Buddha among others, in which he addresses the Buddha as *bho Gotama*. The Buddha, however, addresses Saccaka by his *gotta Aggivessana*. Saccaka's mode of address is coupled

with the usual exchange of greetings (s.s.).¹⁸

It is interesting to note Prince Abhaya's behaviour towards the Buddha and Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta. He salutes (*abhi.*) the Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta, sits down, and addresses him as *bhante*. Winding up the conversation he salutes him, circumambulates him and goes to the Buddha. He repeats the whole procedure when he approaches and takes leave of the Buddha. Both the Buddha and the Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta address him as *rājakumāra*.¹⁹ The activities of the prince Abhaya mentioned above suggest that he gave equal respect to these two religious heads.

The Buddha and the paribbājaka:

The type of recluses mentioned as *paribbājakas* can be grouped into three categories according to their attitude towards the Buddha: (1) those who consider the Buddha as their equal, (2) those who do so in the beginning and in the end are converted, thereby bringing about an essential change in their attitude towards the Buddha and (3) those who have already acknowledged him as their superior.

Generally the Buddha is addressed as *bho Gotama*; he in his turn uses either the personal names or the *gotta* names of the *paribbājakas*. The latter is illustrated by the case of Dīghanakha *paribbājaka*.²⁰ The name Dīghanakha is obviously a soubriquet, but the Buddha addresses him by his *gotta* *Aggivessana*. He does not resort to the term *āvuso*, which is used in addressing the Jains.²¹

Bho followed by *Gotama* (*gotta*) seems to have a formal bearing on the social relationships of the *paribbājakas* and the Buddha. Its use indicates that the *paribbājakas* thought that they were of at least an equal but separate status with the Buddha. The Buddha, however, does not show equal respect, and in many cases addresses them by their names without the title *bho*. It is also of great significance to note the exchange of greetings (s.s.) which is usually followed by the familiar *bho*, in the Buddha-*paribbājaka* relationship.

In angry mood the *paribbājakas* change their mode of address from *bho Gotama* to *samaṇa Gotama*. Thus the *paribbājaka* Vekhanassa addresses the Buddha as *bho Gotama*, and exchanges greetings with him. However, during the conversation with the Buddha,

the Buddha tells him that it is hard to understand "sense pleasure or the happiness in sense pleasure or the topmost happiness in sense pleasure" as the latter is not an arahat. The *paribbājaka* does not like this remark. He becomes angry and displeased, "scorning even the Buddha, despising even him, saying 'the *samaṇa Gotama* shall be disgraced.'" ²²

A certain amount of fluctuation in interpersonal relationships is bound to occur. Our second type of relationship in which the *paribbājaka* ultimately acknowledges the Buddha's greatness, is well illustrated by an example from the *Majjhima Nikāya*. Vacchagotta *paribbājaka*, at first, when he approaches the Buddha, exchanges greetings (s.s.) with him and addresses him as *bho Gotama*. Convinced of Buddha's doctrine, after his discourse, we find the *paribbājaka* Vacchagotta asking the Buddha for ordination. After he is ordained, Vacchagotta addresses the Buddha as *bhante, Bhagavā*. ²³ The transformation from *bho* to *bhante* thus shows the change in relationship, from mutual respect to the admission of the Buddha's superiority. In this particular instance the change in the term of address follows the change in the relative status of a man, here implied by the entry of Vacchagotta *paribbājaka* into the Buddhist Saṅgha. Thus Vacchagotta *paribbājaka* becomes *āyasmā* Vacchagotta. ²⁴

In the *Kassapa Sihanāda Sutta*, ²⁵ Acela Kassapa puts out a reported allegation against the Buddha, "that he reviles and finds fault with everyone who lives a hard life." Acela follows the usual procedure of exchange of greetings (s.s.) with the Buddha followed by the familiar *bho Gotama*. The Buddha refutes the charges made against him. Apparently pleased with the Buddha's arguments, Kassapa asks him another question, but this time he addresses him as *āvuso Gotama*. The formal ties with the Buddha expressed through *bho* are thus replaced by more relaxed and friendly terminology. His conviction of the truth of the Buddha's doctrine and his express desire to join the order are accompanied by a change in his mode of address to the Buddha who is now addressed as *bhante*.

By the use of the term *bhante, Bhagavā*, used in addressing the Buddha, the *paribbājakas* of the third type manifest their acknowledgement of the Buddha's superiority. The manner in which *paribbājakas* of this type receive the Buddha is formalised. The formula

runs as follows: "Let *bhante*, *Bhagavā* come, there is welcome for him, it is long since the *Bhagavā* made the opportunity to come here. *Bhante*, *Bhagavā*, let him be seated on the appointed seat".²⁶

Then the *paribbājakas* take a low seat and offer the high one to the Buddha. After this, throughout the conversation, *bhante* is used for the Buddha. In a sense, these *paribbājakas* are lay converts who have adapted their own rules to their change of faiths and outwardly express this by the use of the term *bhante*.

In general *paribbājakas* assume a status equal to that of the Buddha and these few examples are deviations from their normal pattern of behaviour towards him. The following case will bring out the point clearly. The householder Pessa, the son of an elephant rider, and Kandaraka *paribbājaka* call upon the Buddha. Pessa salutes the Buddha and sits on one side (*abhivadetvā ekamantaṃ nisīdi*), and afterwards addresses the Buddha as *bhante*, while on the other hand, Kandaraka the *paribbājaka* exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) and stands on one side (*ekamantaṃ aṭṭhāsi*) and introduces the conversation with *bho Gotama*, using this form throughout. Thus we find here two distinct relationships, the first one implies, by the term *bhante*, that for Pessa the Buddha stands high in ritual ranking; the second is the relationship of equality of status.²⁷

The Buddha and the monks:

Being the head of the Buddhist hierarchical system, the Buddha is always addressed as *bhante* by the monks.²⁸ The monks refer to the Buddha with a special term, *Bhagavā*, which they reserve for him to the exclusion of all other human and non-human beings. They salute (*abhi.*) the Buddha on meeting him and usually at the end of the conversation again salute (*abhi.*) him, circumambulate him, and take his leave.

There is only one instance of a departure from this mode. Once the Buddha is mistaken for an ordinary monk, and the monk Pukkusāti addresses him as *āvuso*.²⁹ On realizing the true identity of the Buddha, Pukkusāti, rising from his seat, arranging his robe over one shoulder and bowing his head to the Buddha's feet, speaks, "A transgression, *bhante*, has overcome me in that, foolish, errant and unskilled as I was, I supposed that *Bhagavā* could be addressed as *āvuso*. *Bhante*, may the *Bhagavā* acknowledge my transgression for

the sake of restraint in the future".³⁰ This incident indicates the relative importance of *bhante* and *āvuso* in speaking to a person. *Bhante* is certainly higher in terms of respect than *āvuso*.

In the *Vinaya Mahāvagga*, which is considered the oldest portion of the Pāli canonical text, we observe a notable change from *āvuso* to *bhante*, in relation to the Buddha. Just after his enlightenment the Buddha goes in search of the group of five monks who are residing at Benares.³¹ These monks had previously been his followers but had left him because he was reputed to be "living in abundance". They are now sceptical of the Buddha's views and when they see him coming (referred to as *samaṇa Gotama*), they agree among themselves not to show him respect. However, they do not keep their agreement and honour the Buddha, addressing him by his *gotta* name, *Gotama* and the term *āvuso*. The Buddha is a changed personality. He admonishes the monks for addressing him as *āvuso* for "he had become the Tathāgata, the holy, absolutely enlightened one".³² He tells the monks that he wants to preach the new way of life which he had discovered through his insight. At first the Bhikkhus (monks) pay no heed to him, and thrice they address him as *āvuso Gotama*. Only on the fourth occasion, they give in and address the Buddha as *bhante*.

The Buddha addresses the Bhikkhus (monks) as *Bhikkhave*, when they are in groups, and individual monks with their personal name or *gotta* name. The text refers to some monks by their ex-kin group's affiliations. Thus we find monks such as Visākha Pañcālaputta, Upasena Vaṅgataputta, Sākyaputta Upananda and Dabba Mallaputta.³³ Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja, Mahāmoggallāna, Kaccāyanagotta monks are mentioned by their *gotta* affiliations.³⁴ We notice, however, a difference in the mode of address used for them by the Buddha. Names indicating ethnic affiliations are dropped in addressing those monks possessing them, while the *gotta* is retained in the case of monks whose names indicate *gotta* affiliations. Thus Upananda Sakyaputta is addressed as *Upananda* by the Buddha³⁵ while Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja is addressed by him as *Bhāradvāja*.³⁶ The latter practice is strikingly shown in the following case. The Buddha addressed a novice referred to in the text as *samaṇaudessa Acirvata* as *Aggivessana*.³⁷ In this case, even when the *gotta* name is not alluded to in the initial description of the individual, it is revealed in the mode of address.

The Buddha and the gahapatis:

The formalised mode of address for the Buddha used by the *gahapatis* is *bhante*. The Buddha addresses them as *Gahapati*.³⁸ On meeting the Buddha they salute him (*abhi.*).

There is, however, one noteworthy case of a certain Potaliya, who resents being called merely *gahapati*.³⁹ He points out to the Buddha that it is improper and unsuitable that he should be addressed as *gahapati*. He had given up all avocations (*vohāra samuccheda*), handed over the property and wealth to his sons and totally withdrawn from giving advice and instructions to others.⁴⁰ Potaliya also claims that he lives on a minimum of food and covering. He addresses the Buddha as *bho Gotama*, thus assuming a status of equality for himself. Only after listening to the Buddha does he address him as *bhante*. The statement of the *gahapati* Potaliya indicates that he still assumed the full responsibility of household. Despite his austere way of life, he is still a layman.

The Buddha invariably addresses the *gahapatis* by their term of reference, *gahapati*. He does not address them by their names, although the term of reference contains *gahapati* coupled either with the personal names, nicknames or professional names.

Only in one notable case was this convention, of addressing the *gahapatis* in this manner, broken. *Gahapati* Anāthapiṇḍika, who is elsewhere addressed as *gahapati* by the Buddha,⁴¹ was only once addressed by his personal name Sudatta.⁴² The reaction on Anāthapiṇḍika was instantaneous. Anāthapiṇḍika was much elated and was overwhelmed with joy that the Buddha should call him by his personal name. The incident clearly indicates the obliteration of the social distance which existed between the *gahapati* and the Buddha. Buddha addresses the *gahapatiputtas*, however, by their personal names.⁴³

The Buddha and the King:

The respect given to the Buddha by kings is seen from their use of *bhante* and their offering of proper salutation (*abhi.*). Only once does the king Pasenadi of Kosala address the Buddha as *bho Gotama*, on his first visit to him. It must be noted that the king has only heard about the greatness of the Buddha and has yet to

see him. On seeing him, he exchanges greetings with the Buddha (s.s.); after listening to the Buddha he changes his mode of address from *bho* to *bhante*.⁴⁴ After this instance Pasenadi of Kosala uses *bhante* and salutes (*abhi.*) the Buddha, in most of his encounters with him.⁴⁵

The Buddha addresses the kings with their title *mahārāja*. For the princes he uses, *rājakumāra* and in turn is addressed as *bhante*.

The Buddha and the gāmaṇi:

In his conversation with the Buddha the *gāmaṇi* addresses him as *bhante* and salutes him (*abhi.*). The *gāmaṇi* is referred to in the text as *gāmaṇi*, and addressed as such by the Buddha.

In one particular instance, however, a change in the mode of address by the *gāmaṇi* to the Buddha, seems to have resulted in a change of status of the Buddha in the mind of the *gāmaṇi*.⁴⁶ Pālali the *gāmaṇi* once approaches the Buddha and asks him either to confirm or deny the rumours that the *samaṇa* Gotama knew magic. He addresses the Buddha as *bhante Bhagavā* and salutes him (*abhi.*). The Buddha replies that those who alleged that he knew magic spoke in accordance with his views. When the *gāmaṇi* hears this, he at once lapses into the familiar *bho Gotama*, and in anger he says, "So after all the *samaṇa*, *bho Gotama*, is a trickster (*māyā-ṛti*)". Thus the change in the attitude of the *gāmaṇi*, from one of respect to one of low esteem, is reflected in the change in the mode of address, from *bhante Bhagavā* to *bho Gotama*.⁴⁷

The Buddha and the ruling extended kin-groups:

The Buddha addresses the members of his Sākya group, whether members of his order or not, by their personal names. He follows the same practice while addressing the members of other extended kin-groups such as the Licchavis and others.

The case of the Oṭṭhāda the Licchavi, however, requires further explanation before we can show that it follows the rule. The Buddha addresses the Licchavi Oṭṭhāda as Mahali.⁴⁸ Rhys Davids believes this to be the name of the gotta.⁴⁹ It will, however, be seen from the table that other Licchavis, such as Bhaddiya, Viddha Nandaka and Sālāja, are addressed by their personal names.⁵⁰ The

Licchavis in groups, however, are addressed simply as Licchavis by the Buddha.⁵¹ It is, therefore, most likely that Oṭṭhada was a nickname arising out of some personal peculiarity, possibly a hare lip, and that Mahāli was his personal name. Rhys Davids, when he states elsewhere that it was not the practice to address others by their nicknames, thus seems to contradict his own statement.⁵² Our supposition is strengthened by the occurrence of another Mahāli Licchavi in the text.⁵³ It is quite likely that in order to distinguish the two Mahāli Licchavis in the text, one was referred to as Oṭṭhada and the other simply as Mahāli. In both the cases, the personal name Mahāli is retained.

It is noteworthy that the Mallas from Pāvā when in groups are addressed by the Buddha as Vāseṭṭhas;⁵⁴ the Sākyas, too, on one occasion are addressed as Gotama⁵⁵ (belonging to Gotama *gotta*). Buddha addresses his father as Gotama⁵⁶ and he is himself addressed as Gotama by others, as seen in the many cases above.⁵⁷ Without further elucidation at this stage we state that the use of the *gotta* term is considered a mark of respect and it seems to be used as a status symbol.⁵⁸ We cannot definitely say whether the use of the *gotta* term, takes into account the extended kin-groups following their brāhmaṇa teacher such as, Vāseṭṭa and Gotama. Presumably it was common among the non-brāhmaṇas to take their *gotta* from that of their *Purohita* or family priest. There is only one instance in the text where we find the use of a totemic name *Vyagghapajja*. The Buddha uses this to address a Koliyan.⁵⁹

Buddha is always addressed as *bhante*, followed by *Bhagavā*, by the members of extended kin-groups, and as a mark of respect they salute him (*abhi*).

Another exception is to be found in the case of Daṇḍapāṇi Sākya.⁶⁰ He greets (s.s.) the Buddha but stands at one side leaning on his stick.⁶¹ Addressing the Buddha as *samaṇa*, Daṇḍapāṇi asks the Buddha to declare his views and teachings. When the Buddha proclaims his teachings, Daṇḍapāṇi, "stick in his hand, shaking his head and wagging his tongue, departs leaning on his stick, his brow furrowed into three wrinkles". The Buddha also shows his social distance from Daṇḍapāṇi by addressing him as *āvuso* and not by his personal name.

The Buddha and the upāsakas:

In this we include the social relations of the Buddha with the remainder of his followers, who cannot be conveniently accommodated in the other groups. This residual category has no terms denoting group affiliations such as *gaḥapati*, *brāhmaṇa*, etc. The Buddha showed his intimacy by calling the Upāsakas by their names. One of them, Dighāvu Upāsaka, addresses his father Jotipāla with the epithet *gaḥapati*, though he is not referred to as *gaḥapati-putta*.⁶² The term *upāsaka* covers him, but also has a wider connotation and is applicable to any lay devotee or follower of the Buddha. We have also included in this category the royal minister and commander-in-chief of the army.⁶³

The upāsakas address the Buddha as *bhante* and *Bhagavā*, salute (*abhi.*) him, and, before leaving, circumambulate him.

In one notable instance, the Buddha addresses a poor worker (*daliddo kammakāro*), who is an upāsaka, as *āvuso*.⁶⁴ The text describes this poor man without mentioning his name. Buddha seems to have elevated his status by calling him *āvuso*. As the story goes, this man borrows money in order to give a sumptuous meal to the Buddhist monks. This may be another reason why he is addressed as *āvuso*.

The Buddha and the others:

Those who do not know the identity of the Buddha consider him to be *samaṇa* and address him as such. No salutation (*abhi.*) or exchange of greetings (*s.s.*) is indicated. When the Buddha goes to meet the ferocious robber Aṅgulimāla, cow-herds, goatherds, farmers, and travellers try to stop him and request him not to go further. They address him as *samaṇa*.⁶⁵ The Buddha faces Aṅgulimāla without any fear and steadily walks towards him. Aṅgulimāla, calling him a *samaṇa*, asks him to stop where he is.⁶⁶ This indicates that *samaṇa*, although a term of respect, denotes a certain indifference. Its use indicates the group status, which is that of an unorthodox ascetic. Although we have excluded any non-human beings such as *devas* and *yakkhas* in our study, we may mention here an instance where the Buddha converses with the *yakkhas*. The Buddha was once way-laid by two *yakkhas* who wanted to

know whether he was a *samaṇa* or *samaṇaka*. They stopped the Buddha with the mode of address *samaṇa* and asked him questions, till they were satisfied that he was a true *samaṇa*.⁶⁷

Monks and monks:

Before setting forth the actual mode of address between the monks and other monks, we point to the instructions the Buddha gave to Ananda before his final release (*parinibbāṇa*).⁶⁸ The Buddha said, "Ānanda, when I am gone, do not address one another in the way in which the monks have been addressing each other up till now, with the epithet *āvuso*. A younger monk may be addressed by an elder (*thera*) either with his name, his *gotta* or as *āvuso*. But an elder should be addressed by a junior monk as *bhante* or as *āyasmā*." However, the use of the *gotta* name to address the elder (*thera*) was later on permitted by the Buddha.⁶⁹

It will be noticed from the table that the commonest mode of address among the monks is *āvuso*. The term *āvuso* is usually followed either by the monk's personal name or by his *gotta* name.

It seems that the term *bhante*, which later became a common mode of address for the senior monks, came into vogue after the Buddha's death.⁷⁰ It is also worth noting that such monks as Anuruddha, Mahākassapa, Upāli, Mahākaccāna and Sāriputta, who are addressed as *bhante* by some of the monks, are of considerable seniority and importance in the Buddhist Saṃgha.

It is important to note that Anuruddha took charge of the assembly of monks immediately after the death of the Buddha. He consoled the weeping monks and sent Ānanda to convey the news of the Buddha's death to the Mallas of Kusināra on whose land the Buddha had died.⁷¹ Mahākassapa's role is equally important. On hearing the news of the Buddha's death he hurriedly started towards Kusināra, where the Mallan chiefs were trying unsuccessfully to set fire to the funeral pyre, on which lay the Buddha's body. The wood would not catch fire until Mahākassapa saluted (*abhi*.) the feet of the Buddha. Only after Mahākassapa did so, the funeral pyre miraculously caught fire and the Buddha's body was consumed. Mahākassapa was also the chief amongst those who convened the first council.⁷²

In the *Vinaya Cullavagga*, chapters xi and xii, the consistency

in the observation of the rules of seniority (through *bhante*) made Otto Franke feel⁷³ that these chapters were later added to the *Vinaya* as a form of exercise, according to the instructions of the Buddha as he laid them down to Ānanda in the *Mahāparinibbāna sutta* to which we referred above⁷⁴

Below the monks in the Buddhist hierarchical ladder were the novices, known as *samaṇuddesa*. They address the monks (referred to as *āyasmā*) as *bhante*, and salute (*abhi.*) them.

There are many regulations which affect the monk's behaviour within the Saṅgha. Some of these regulations paved the way for the internal classification of the monks and their gradation according to seniority. Paying of reverence, rising up in reverence, salutation (*abhi.*), proper respect and appointment of the best seat, serving of water and food, says the Buddha, "shall be done according to seniority".⁷⁵ At present, we are concerned with those descriptions dealing with the outward behaviour of the monks which indicate the scale of seniority within the monastic fold.

In most cases on meeting each other the monks exchange greetings (s.s.). In the case of the Buddha-Monk relationship, at the end of the conversation with him, the monk salutes (*abhi.*) circumambulates and leaves. Among themselves monks follow a different procedure. Thus the monk Yamaka approaches Sāriputta, exchanges greetings (s.s.) and in the end compliments (*abhinān-dati*) Sāriputta on his discourse.⁷⁶

Generally the texts refer to the monks with *āyasmā* prefixed to their names. During the conversation, sometimes, the monks refer to other monks similarly. Thus on meeting Ānanda, the monk Channa, exchanges greetings (s.s.) with him and they address each other as *āvuso*. Later on, in the religious conversation, Channa says to Ānanda "*Āvuso* may the *āyasmā* Ānanda teach me, so that I may see the Dhamma."⁷⁷ Sāriputta and Moggallāna, who are described at one place as staying in the same cell, are noted for their friendship. They exchange greetings (s.s.) and address each other as *āvuso*. In the course of conversation, however, they refer to each other as *āyasmā*.⁷⁸

There are exceptions where the monks are not referred to as *āyasmā*. For example, in the case of the monk Arittha,⁷⁹ whenever his name occurs, it is also added that he had formerly been a vulture-trainer and that he held pernicious views (*pāpakadiṭṭhi*).

*Chabbaggiya*⁸⁰ monks, who committed all sorts of crimes, and the monks Mettiya and Bhumija,⁸¹ also fall into the category of those who are disapprovingly referred to simply as *bhikkhu* and not as *āyasmā*. Devadatta,⁸² who joined the Buddhist order, and was responsible for sowing dissension in the community and who actually hatched a plot to defile and murder the Buddha, is mentioned without any sort of appellation. However, all these monks, considered bad by the compilers of the texts, are addressed as *āvuso* by other monks.

Monks and the paribbājakas:

The monks and the *paribbājakas* address each other with the epithet *āvuso* and also exchange greetings (s.s.).

The actual relationship between the monks and *paribbājakas*, however, is not always friendly. Thus a number of *paribbājakas* belonging to different schools (*aññatitthiya paribbājakā*) come to the monk Anurādha, exchange greetings (s.s.) with him and address him as *āvuso*. The *paribbājakas*, however, are dissatisfied at the end of the religious discourse and say of Anurādha, "This *bhikkhu* must be a novice (*navo*) not long ordained, or if he is an elder (*thero*), he is an ignorant fool".⁸³ Potaliputta the *paribbājaka* exchanges greetings (s.s.) with the monk Sammiddhi and uses the mutual term of respect *āvuso*. But soon after the conversation, Potaliputta takes leave of Sammiddhi, "neither rejoicing nor protesting against what Sammiddhi had said".⁸⁴

It is different, however, in the case of Ānanda and the *paribbājaka* Kokanuda.⁸⁵ Before knowing the identity of Ānanda as a Buddhist monk, Kokanuda addresses him as *āvuso*, but soon afterwards, realizing the true identity of Ānanda, he changes his mode of address from *āvuso* to *āyasmā*. Kokanuda thus uses the term of reference instead of *āvuso*, the usual mode of address. Although this incident does not result in a change of faith on the part of the *paribbājaka*, it may none the less reflect the growing respect felt for Ānanda by others.⁸⁶

Paribbājakas with *gotta* affiliation are addressed by their *gotta*, and the mode of address is somewhat different in that *āvuso* is omitted. The monk Moggallāna exchanges greetings (s.s.) with Vacchagotta the *paribbājaka* and addresses him as *bho Vaccha*, and

in reply Vaccha addresses him as *bho Moggallāna*.⁸⁷

The monks and the brāhmaṇas:

Brāhmaṇas behave towards the monks in much the same way as they do towards the Buddha. They address the monks with the term *bho* coupled with their names. In turn the monks address the brāhmaṇas as *brāhmaṇa*, without, however, using their personal or gotta names. Like the Buddha, the monks either address brāhmaṇa youths as *māṇava* or use their personal names. An exception is the case of the monk Nāgita, who exchanges greetings (s.s.) with the brāhmaṇa messengers from Kosala and addresses them as *āvuso*.⁸⁸

The form of salutation between the monks and the brāhmaṇas is that of exchange of greetings (s.s.). Although an equality of status is implied in this, the actual behaviour varies.

Thus in the case of the encounter between Ghoṭamukha the brāhmaṇa and the monk Udena, the customary greetings (s.s.) and form of address are exchanged (*bho-brāhmaṇa*). When, however, Udena sits down first on the best seat without offering one to Ghoṭamukha, the latter keeps standing till he is properly offered one.⁸⁹ Another case is that of the meeting of the brāhmaṇa woman teacher, Veraccāni, and the monk Udena. Greetings are exchanged (s.s.) and the proper forms of address used. After the meal the brāhmaṇa woman requests the monk to recite the Dhamma. She addresses him as *samaṇa*, occupies a higher seat, veils herself and wears sandals. The monk refuses her request and leaves the place. The incident is repeated thrice and only on the fourth occasion does the brāhmaṇa woman change her total behaviour. She addresses the monk by the term *bhante*, a very unusual act for a brāhmaṇi.⁹⁰

Monks and Kings:

Some of the kings who encounter the monks, exchange greetings with them (s.s.) and address them with the term *bho*. Probably because of their deep faith, kings such as Pasenadi of Kosala, Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha and Muṇḍa,⁹¹ address the monks as *bhante* and offer salutation (*abhi*). The monks address them with

their title *mahārāja*. The prince Jayasena is addressed as *rājā-kumāra* by the monk Bhūmija, who is in turn addressed as *bho Bhūmija*.⁹²

Monks and the Ruling Extended kin-groups:

The members of the ex-kin groups invariably address the monks as *bhante* and also offer salutations (*abhi.*). Like the Buddha, the monks address the members of the ex-kin groups with their personal names, but sometimes *āvuso* is added as a prefix to the names. While addressing the Mallas, the monks Anuruddha and Ānanda use the Mallas' *gotta* affiliation, *Vāseṭṭhā*;⁹³ in the case of the Koliyans Ānanda uses their totemic name, *Vyagghapajjā*.⁹⁴

Monks and gahapatis:

All the *gahapatis* address the monks as *bhante* and also salute them (*abhi.*). The monks in speaking to *gahapatis* use the term *gahapati*, which is also a term of reference.

Gahapatis generally do not distinguish between elder and junior monks. Dhasama the *gahapati* salutes (*abhi.*) and addresses as *bhante* a nameless *bhikkhu* (*aññātara bhikkhu*) as well as Ānanda, who is widely known in the Buddhist Saṃgha because of his nearness to the Buddha himself.⁹⁵ *Gahapatis* sometimes refer to the monks as *ayya* along with the name of the monk, usually preceded by the term *bhante*.

In the event of estrangement between monks and *gahapatis*, it is the monk, although ritually superior to the *gahapati*, who is made to change his behaviour and come to terms with the *gahapati*. The following case illustrates this:⁹⁶

A monk Suddhamma is described as a regular diner (*dhubhattika*) at the *gahapati* Citta's house. Suddhamma is also a constant advisor of the *gahapati* on matters concerning invitations to monks, either individually or in groups. Many well known elder monks such as Sāriputta, Moggallāna, Mahākaccāna and Anuruddha visit Citta and greatly please him by giving him religious talks. Following this, Citta invites them to a meal, without, however, consulting Suddhamma on this matter.

He only asks Suddhamma to come and join them at the meal. Suddhamma takes this as a deliberate affront and refuses the invitation. Out of jealousy, Suddhamma goes in the morning to Citta's house to see what has been prepared for the guests.

Citta welcomes him by saluting (*abhi.*) him and offers him a seat. But Suddhamma's mind is set on the food and he points out to Citta that out of the plentiful dishes the sesamum cake has been left out. This outrages the *gahapati* Citta, who remarks that for all the Buddha's doctrine, the monk could think only of sesamum cake. The monk takes this remark as an insult and directly accuses the *gahapati* of reviling him, threatening to leave the premises immediately. In a very restrained manner, the *gahapati* still addressing him as *bhante*, asks Suddhamma to calm down and to remain in his house, which is still open to him. In spite of this treatment, the monk goes away to the Buddha and tells him the story. The Buddha, however, rebukes the monk. "How can you, foolish man", the Buddha says, "over a low thing jeer and scoff at the *gahapati* Citta when he has faith in the doctrine, and is a benefactor, a promoter and a supporter of the Saṃgha".⁹⁷ The Buddha then asks the community to carry out a formal act of reconciliation (*paṭisāraṇīyakammaṃ*) for the monk Suddhamma, saying to him: "*Gahapati* Citta should be asked to forgive you". Suddhamma in the end asks for forgiveness and is in turn forgiven by the *gahapati*.

Monks and upāsakas:

As mentioned earlier,⁹⁸ in the category of the upāsakas we include the rest of the followers of the Buddha who cannot be grouped otherwise. The upāsakas are the lay devotees of the Buddha. They address them as *bhante* and salute him (*abhi.*). The monks in turn address the upāsakas as *āvuso*, occasionally using their personal names. Thus the monk Mahākaccāna addresses the upāsaka Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa as *Soṇa*⁹⁹ and the upāsaka Sālha is addressed by the monk Nanadaka as *Sālha*.¹⁰⁰ The appellation *ayyā* is used by the upāsakas as a term of reference following *bhante*.

However, in the case of misconduct on the part of the monks, the upāsakas look down upon them and criticise them. In such

cases the term of reference undergoes a change. The following will illustrate this. A certain widow salutes (*abhi.*) the monk Udāyi (referred to as *āyasmā* in the text) and addresses him as *bhante*. The monk asks her to co-habit with him and she consents. But afterwards Udāyi changes his mind and, calling her an evil smelling wench, departs. Udāyi's conduct enrages the woman. She shouts, "These *Sākyaputta samaṇas* are lecherous liars". In her anger, she refers to Udāyi as *samaṇa Udāyi*.¹⁰¹

Monks and others:

Generally the Bhikkhus in groups are identified by others as *sākyaputta samaṇas*. This is the stock term of reference in the *Vinaya* whenever the people are critical of the monk's doings in general.¹⁰² The people thus allude to their group affiliation, which is that of an unorthodox *samaṇa*. In the royal palace the monks were criticised because they were reported as receiving gifts of gold and silver from others. This allegation, however, was refuted by the *gāmaṇi Maṇicūḷaka*.¹⁰³ Here, too, the monks are referred to as *Sākyaputta samaṇa*. It may be remarked that the criticism only brings forth the true group affiliations of the Buddhist monks, as members of a large class containing many sects of unorthodox ascetics.

In one particular case, the monk identifies himself as a *Sākyaputta samaṇa*. Kokanuda the *paribbājaka* meets Ānanda at the Tapoda Park near Rājagaha, and he asks Ānanda, "Who are you *āvuso*?" "I am a *bhikkhu, āvuso*" replies Ānanda. "One of what bhikkhus?" Kokanuda again asks. "One of *Sākyaputta samaṇas*" says Ānanda.¹⁰⁴

The residual category, which include robbers, relatives, strangers on the high road and others, address the monks as *bhante* and are in turn addressed as *āvuso*.

The gahapatis and the Jains:

The *Majjhima Nikāya* describes Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta as being in a large company of householders (*gihi-parisāya*), headed by *gahapati* Upāli of Bālaka. *Gahapati* Upāli addresses the Nigaṇṭha as *bhante* and salutes him (*abhi*). Soon afterwards he becomes a

staunch devotee of the Buddha, so much so that he gives instructions that no alms should be given to the followers of the Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta. When, however, the latter comes to see him, Upāli addresses him with his customary *bhante*, but drops his usual mode of salutation (*abhi.*). Moreover, he does not offer Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta the best seat but keeps it for himself. The Nigaṇṭha takes this to be a deliberate insult.¹⁰⁵

In another instance we find that the *gahapati* Citta, a loyal devotee of the Buddha, addresses the Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta with *bhante*. However, he also does not salute him (*abhi.*), but exchanges greetings (*s.s.*).¹⁰⁶ The Jains address the *gahapatis* as *gahapati*.

The gahapati and the paribbājakas:

The *gahapati* Citta, a staunch follower of the Buddha whom we have mentioned above, addresses Acela Kassapa, an old family friend (*gihisāhaka*), as *bhante*; but he only exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) with him and does not salute him.¹⁰⁷

We mention here a group of religious mendicants (*sambahula titthiya*) and a certain *paribbājaka*, whom the *gahapati* Mendaḍḍaka and Vijayamāhita address as *bhante* and to whom they show their respect by saluting them. In return these *paribbājakas* address them as *gahapatis*.¹⁰⁸

The exception is in the case of the *gahapati* Sandhāna who addresses the *paribbājaka* Nigrodha as *bhonto* (plural of *bho*). The term *bhonto* may not be as high as *bhante* but it none the less shows respect. Nigrodha in turn addresses him as *gahapati*.¹⁰⁹

The gahapatis and the brāhmaṇas:

When the brāhmaṇa Subha Todeyyaputta¹¹⁰ comes to Sāvatti on some business, he stays with a certain *gahapati*. Subha expresses a wish to pay respect to the samaṇa-brāhmaṇas who were arhats, as he had heard that Sāvatti is frequented by them. The *gahapati* urges Subha to go and visit the Buddha in Sāvatti at Jetavana. The non-brāhmaṇa *gahapati* addresses the brāhmaṇa as *bhante* and refers to the Buddha as *Bhagavā*. It may be noted here that *Bhagavā* is a term mostly used by his upāsakas to refer to the Buddha. The others refer to him as *samaṇa Gotama*. It is,

therefore, quite likely that the *Gahapati* was an *upāsaka* of the Buddha.

The brāhmaṇa Subha refers to the *gahapati* as *gahapati* and addresses him as such.

The gahapati and the king:

The king refers to the *gahapati* Menḍaka with the term *gahapati*, which is mentioned with the latter's name. There seems to be only one instance of a talk between a *gahapati* and the king. The king Seniya Bimbisāra addresses the *gahapati* Anāthapiṇḍika as *gahapati*, while the *gahapati* addresses the king as *deva*.¹¹¹

Prince Jeta, a well known and distinguished man, (*abhiññāto nātamanusso*) owns Jetvana, a pleasure resort near Sāvatthi. Anāthapiṇḍika approaches him to buy the Jetavana, in order to give it to the Buddhist Saṃgha. Anāthapiṇḍika addresses prince Jeta as *ayyaputta* and in turn is addressed as *gahapati*.¹¹²

The gahapati and the gāmaṇi:

There is no actual case of conversation between a *gāmaṇi* and a *gahapati*. However, the *gāmaṇi* Asibandhakaputta shows his acquaintance with the doings of a *gahapati* who was a peasant (*kassaka*). Asibandhakaputta refers to him as *gahapati*.¹¹³

The gahapatis and others:

We give below the style of address used by the *gahapati* in conversation with his sons, his friends and relatives and his employees.

The young men of the family (*kulaputta*), such as Raṭṭhapāla and Sudinna, after they have become monks, address their fathers as *gahapati*, while the latter still retain the mode of address *tāta* for their sons. Dīghāvu, however, though still only an *upāsaka*, addresses his father Jotipāla *gahapati* as *gahapati*.¹¹⁴

The wives of the *gahapatis* also address their husbands as *gahapati*. Thus Nakula's mother addresses Nakula's father as *gahapati*.¹¹⁵

Gahapati Citta is sick, stricken with a sore disease. His friends,

acquaintances and agnates (*mittāmaccā nātisālohita*) come to see him. At their request *gahapati* Citta instructs them with Buddha's teaching. Throughout the conversation, the friends, acquaintances and agnates use the term *ayyaputta* to address him, and not *gahapati*.¹¹⁶

The *gahapati*'s employees address him as *bhante*. Thus *gahapati* Sirivaddha instructs a certain man (*aññatara puriso*) to deliver a message to Ānanda. He addresses the messenger as *ambho purisa*, and in turn is addressed as *bhante*.¹¹⁷ *Gahapati* Upāli's doorkeeper addresses him as *bhante*.¹¹⁸

Gahapati and gahapati:

On meeting one another, *gahapatis* exchange greetings (s.s.) and the mutual term of address is *gahapati*. Thus Anāthapiṇḍika *gahapati* addresses the Seṇhi *gahapati* of Rājagaha as *gahapati*; in reply he is addressed as *gahapati*. An exchange of greetings also takes place.¹¹⁹

Brāhmaṇas and brāhmaṇa:

The *brāhmaṇa* group falls into a number of sub-groups. As indicated in the table, *brāhmaṇas* such as Pokkharasādi Kuṭadanta and Soṇadaṇḍa, represent a sub-group who had sovereign rights over their lands, which were given to them by the kings. Another sub-group comprises students, householders and so on. Within the group status differences are played down, and the *brāhmaṇas* use *bho* to address each other. The *brāhmaṇa* Brahmāyu addresses his pupil Uttara as *tata*, a kinship term used between father and son. In return Uttara addresses him as *bho*.¹²⁰ This term of address is often coupled with either the personal name or the *gotta* name.

The brāhmaṇas and the king:

The *brāhmaṇas* address the king either with his title *deva* or with *bho*, but do not address the kings with the title *mahārāja*, commonly used by the monks, the Buddha and the *paribbājakas*. The king addresses them as *brāhmaṇa*. One exception is that of a young *brāhmaṇa* Sudassana, whom king Pasenadi of Kosala ad-

dresses as *tāta*.¹²¹

Another exception is when the king Pasenadi of Kosala, in his formal invitation to the brāhmaṇa Sañjaya of Ākaśagotta, addresses the latter as *bhante*. Later on, however, the king addresses the same brāhmaṇa with the epithet *brāhmaṇa*. The brāhmaṇa in turn addresses the king as *mahārāja* and not *deva*.¹²² We may note here that he is a well known brāhmaṇa whom the king and his army chief consult on religious and philosophical matters. The king extends to the brāhmaṇa an invitation to come and see him. In the meantime, the king consults the Buddha on his problems and is satisfied by the answers the Buddha gives him. So when Ākaśagotta arrives at his palace, he has no need for a consultation with the brāhmaṇa; hence the change of address from *bhante* to *brāhmaṇa*. This may thus show the gradual lowering of the status of the brāhmaṇa in the eyes of the king.

The brāhmaṇa, the prince and the barber:

The prince Bodhi instructs a brāhmaṇa youth, Sañjikāputta to deliver a message inviting the Buddha to a meal. The Prince asks the brāhmaṇa messenger to bow down and salute (*abhi*.) the Buddha (*bhante*, *Bhagavā*) on his behalf, and to address the Buddha thus: "Prince Bodhi bows down in salutation at the feet of *bhante*, *Bhagavā* and enquires whether he is free from sickness and suffering and is in enjoyment of ease and comfort and vigorous health. May *Bhagavā* together with Saṃgha, consent to take his meal with Bodhi tomorrow". The brāhmaṇa messenger, disregarding the instructions, exchange greetings (*s.s.*) and takes his seat. He repeats the formal invitation but not without substituting *bhoto Gotamassa*, *bhavam Gotamo* (grammatical variations of *bho Gotama*) for *bhante*, *Bhagavā*. Later on also, while announcing the meal, he retains the specific mode of address, *bho Gotama*. Prince Bodhi addresses Sañjikaputta as *samma Sañjikka*; in turn, he is addressed as *bho*.¹²³

In the second case, the brāhmaṇa Lohicca¹²⁴ instructs the barber Bhesika to deliver a message inviting the Buddha to a meal. The brāhmaṇa uses the term *bho Gotama* (*bhavantam Gotamam*, *bhavam Gotamo*) which is the same as above. Moreover, "the salutation and bowing down" at the feet of the Buddha are also absent

from his instructions as well as the message. Yet the barber substitutes his own mode of behaviour for that given in his instructions, addressing the Buddha as *bhante*, *Bhagavā*, and acting as a non-brāhmaṇa should. The brāhmaṇa Lohicca addresses the barber as *samma Bhesika* while the barber addresses the brāhmaṇa as *bhante*.

These two cases show how the brāhmaṇa and the barber retain their specific behaviour towards the Buddha which is determined by their affiliation to their respective groups. The fact that they are both messengers does not affect their behaviour.

Brāhmaṇa and paribbājaka:

Both the *paribbājaka* Māgaṇḍiya and the brāhmaṇa Bhāradvājagotta address each other as *bho*.¹²⁵ As mentioned earlier equality of status is denoted by the modes of address, *bho* used in the conversation between the *paribbājaka* and the brāhmaṇa.

In the encounter between the brāhmaṇa Jāṇussoṇi and the *paribbājaka* Pilotika, the former uses the latter's gotta name *Vaccāyana* to address him. The *paribbājaka* uses *bho*.¹²⁶

The brāhmaṇa and the ruling extended kin-group:

The brāhmaṇa Doṇa in the *Mahāparinibbāṇa Sutta* addresses, among others, the Mallas of Kusīnāra and Pāvā, as *bho* also (in the text plural *bhonto*). The brāhmaṇa Doṇa is addressed as *brāhmaṇa*.¹²⁷

Analysis:

We recall that at the beginning of this chapter we mentioned that it is possible to draw inferences about the outline of the social order through a study of the terms of address, reference and modes of salutation. We also maintained that the Buddha was in a central position inside this order. We shall now examine how far our contentions are justifiable, from the data which we have presented.

One of the results of our detailed examination of the data is the fact that it has been possible for us to discern the broad social groups under which we have presented the individual examples of interpersonal behaviour. These groups, obviously, are not mutually

exclusive categories and hence it is quite possible for individuals to belong to more than one group.

Before we proceed further, it will be useful to enumerate the groups. They are (1) The Buddha, (2) Brāhmaṇas, (3) Gahapatis, (4) Kings and Princes, (5) Gāmaṇis, (6) Monks, (7) The upāsakas, (8) Persons belonging to the extended kin groups, (9) Paribbājakas and Jains and (10) others. It is not difficult to see from this that the groups are neither of a uniform nature in terms of their functions, nor are they equal in size. Functionally, these groups are primarily (1) Social, (2) Religious, and (3) Political. We use the term *social* in a narrow sense here to cover those aspects of society which cannot be categorised as religious, political or economic. In the first category, of course, come (1) the Buddha, (2) the brāhmaṇas (3) the gahapatis, (4) the persons belonging to the extended kin-groups, and (5) the others. In the second category come (1) the Buddha, (2) the brāhmaṇas, (3) the upāsakas, (4) the persons belonging to ex. kin-groups, (5) the paribbājakas, (6) the Jains, and (7) the others. In the last category are: (1) the Buddha, (2) the kings and princes, (3) the gāmaṇis, and (4) the gahapatis. It is in terms of these functional groups that we shall attempt to establish ranking. It cannot be sufficiently emphasised that any single individual may occupy different positions which decide his actual inter-personal relationship. Reversing this argument, we propose that it is possible to analyse the instances of actual inter-personal behaviour in terms of these groupings. This is what we have done so far. Now we proceed further and attempt ranking of groups in terms of the functional categories outlined above.

Social Relationships:

In their relationship with the Buddha, the brāhmaṇas maintain an uncompromising attitude of equality, as can be envisaged from their modes of address (*bho*) and salutation (*saddhim sammodi*). On his part the Buddha recognises the special position of the brāhmaṇas in the society and their caste claims by addressing them as *brāhmaṇa*. The Buddha also refrains from addressing brāhmaṇas by their personal names and whenever possible uses their *gotta* names. In fact, *gotta* affiliation appears to be so important that whenever available it is used by the Buddha in preference to any

other forms of address. This can especially be seen from the instances where the Mallas of Pāvā and Kusināra¹²⁸ are addressed as *Vāseṭṭhās*, although in the ordinary course of events they would be addressed, when in groups, as *Mallas*. It appears that possession of a *gotta* name is a predominantly brāhmaṇic feature reserved mainly for the brāhmaṇas but also extended to the members of ex. kin-groups who have to some extent come under brāhmaṇic influence. Thus, as if in reciprocation of the Buddha's acceptance of this brāhmaṇic element, they also address the Buddha with his *gotta* name.

There is, however, an active conflict involved in the Buddha-brāhmaṇa relationship. Often, the brāhmaṇas take offence at some attitude or action on the part of the Buddha or his followers and lapse into addressing the Buddha as *samaṇa Gotama*. Sometimes the brāhmaṇa's hostility towards the Buddha and his order exists without any immediate cause. In such a case also, *samaṇa Gotama* is used and exchange of greetings (*saddhim sammodi*) is deliberately omitted. The angry and insulting nature of such behaviour is explicitly recognized in the text whenever such a situation is depicted. The connotation of *samaṇa* as a mode of address becomes apparent only when we realize that the robber, Aṅgulimāla, the social outcast, is the person who addresses the Buddha as such and omits to exchange greetings (*saddhim sammodi*) with him.¹²⁹ Presumably, there is no greater denial of the Buddha's central position within the society.

Towards brāhmaṇa youths, the Buddha's attitude is more mellow, yet no less formal. He uses the term *māṇava*, or in more familiar cases their personal names. The youths on their part do not treat the Buddha differently from their elders.

Though disrespectful as a term of address, as a term of reference, *samaṇa* is not necessarily derogatory. The brāhmaṇas refer to the Buddha and his monks by this term. In fact Ānanda once initially identifies himself as a *bhikkhu* but on further questioning does not mind describing himself as *Sākyaputta samaṇa*.¹³⁰ This was perhaps the common descriptive term for the Buddhist monks in circles outside that of their followers.

In comparison with the foregoing, the Buddha's relationship with members of various ex. kin-groups is definitely closer. The members of such groups address the Buddha as *bhante*, the

form used by all the followers of the Buddha, monks and others. They invariably salute him (*abhivādeti*).¹³¹ The Buddha on his part recognises the identity which they feel with him and addresses them by their personal names in most instances. Only when in groups, does he use their ex. kin-groups affiliation to address them. Even here, as we have pointed out before, he recognises their *gotta* affiliation, a brāhmaṇic element.

The relationships between the brāhmaṇas and the members of the ex. kin-groups are analogous to those existing between the brāhmaṇas and the Buddha. Whereas the brāhmaṇas address the members of the ex. kin-groups as *bho*, the latter use the term *brāhmaṇa*.¹³² There is the usual exchange of greetings (*saddhim sammodi*). But though there are several cases of hostility between brāhmaṇas and the Buddha, we can find no instances in which the brāhmaṇas show overt signs of hostility towards members of the ex. kin-groups. Apparently they do not feel any challenge to their secular position coming from these people.

The *gahapati* group consists of the heads of households, who only are accorded social recognition. In this sense they represent the whole household in its relationship to the other groups. If this is so, it becomes quite clear that as a group they do not exclusively belong to either the Buddhist or the brāhmaṇic order. It can be seen from the data that they include brāhmaṇas among others. We shall examine the full import of the role of the *gahapatis* in the fifth chapter. It is sufficient here to state that in social and political, as well as religious affairs, they form the basis of Buddhist Society. Respectful to the Buddha, the brāhmaṇas, the king and the members of the ex. kin-groups (in this context the members of the politically dominant groups), they address them all (and many others) as *bhante* or *ayyaputta*. Yet their social position is not necessarily low, as can be seen from the fact that brāhmaṇas may also belong to their group. In fact, when they do, the Buddha recognises this fact in addressing them as *gahapatayo* in preference to the more correct and formal *brāhmaṇas*. It is also significant that the brāhmaṇas do not take offence at this.

The term *gahapati* as a mode of address may also involve respect, since the *gahapati*'s son and *gahapati*'s wives, we have seen, address him as such. Only his servants, who are definitely inferior to him address him as *bhante*, a term denoting the greatest respect.

To sum up the social group ranking then, on the one side are the Buddha and the members of the ex. kin-groups, where the latter without exception recognize the Buddha's superiority. Their relationship to the Buddha is characterised by respect, apparent in the terms *bhante* and *Bhagavā*, and in salutation (*abhivādeti*). The Buddha on his part accepts his own membership of the group vis-à-vis the group itself as well as the society at large. Below them stand the non-brāhmaṇa *gahapatis*, who accept both the Buddha and the members of the ethnic groups as superior to them. Below them are their servants. On the other side are the brāhmaṇas (and brāhmaṇa *gahapatis*)¹³³ who do not accept the Buddha's claim to a superior social position. They insist on treating him solely as a member of an ex-kin group and address him as *bho Gotama*, as they would any other members of the group. Yet in their hostility and uncompromising attitude we see them recognising the Buddha's special position within the society, for the denial of the Buddha's position is, as it were, a negative recognition of it.

On the other hand the *gahapatis* also pay respect to the brāhmaṇas, whatever their individual persuasion. Thus, a *gahapati*, apparently inclined towards the Buddha, does not find any incongruity in welcoming a brāhmaṇa to stay in his home and even enjoining him to go and listen to the Buddha.¹³⁴ Both the Buddha and the brāhmaṇa, and for that matter even *paribbājakas*, command his respect, but none his exclusive attention.

We now turn to an examination of the religious relationships.

Religious Relationships:

The Brāhmaṇic, the Buddhist and the Jain are the three major religious traditions in existence at the time (we have excluded the Ājīvikas because of the scanty evidence, and have incorporated them into the *paribbājaka* group). Within each of these traditions are those members who have in varying measure renounced mundane considerations and thereby gained a specific position in society. The Brāhmaṇic order consists of the brāhmaṇas who are involved actively (perhaps vocationally) in religious and philosophical activities. Below them come the numerous *paribbājakas* who were the "professional mendicants", in search of true knowledge and living on alms, and also retired hermits in search of salvation. They were

not necessarily brāhmaṇas and often entered the 'Buddhist' order, convinced of the Buddha's doctrine, usually at the end of a discourse. Yet, as the stories of these conversions show, each of them usually at least initially maintained his position, which was that of equality with the other orders, by addressing the Buddha as *bho*. Even a *gahapati* who had turned a *paribbājaka* maintained his independence by addressing him thus.¹³⁵ This incident also shows that *gahapati* is an affiliation commanding a lower degree of respect than *paribbājaka*, presumably because being a *gahapati* did not involve exclusive attention to religion. That the *gahapati* occupies a definitely lower position in religious affairs than all classes of priests or mendicants can be seen by his use of *bhante* for all men of religion irrespective of their allegiance to any order.¹³⁶ Nigrodha *paribbājaka*, however, is an exception. He is addressed by Sandhāna *gahapati* as *bho* instead of the usual *bhante*.¹³⁷ But the implication of such an address becomes clear when we find that Nigrodha addresses the Buddha as *bhante*, thus acknowledging himself to be an *upāsaka* of the Buddha as well.

The position of the *upāsaka* was different from that of the *gahapati*. Being actively concerned with religious affairs the *upāsakas* were convinced of the Buddha's doctrine and became his lay devotees, according to the texts usually converted after an argument with the Buddha or a well-known monk. Among them were brāhmaṇas as well as others. Brāhmaṇa converts generally chose not to completely relinquish their membership of the brāhmaṇa order and become monks. But while the non-brāhmaṇa *upāsakas* found it easier to retain their membership of the orthodox social order, the brāhmaṇa *upāsakas* had to resort to various subterfuges in openly acknowledging the Buddha as their superior, even when they were intellectually convinced of his superiority.¹³⁸ The Buddha, however, became their professed superior if they became monks.

It is obvious that the monks are those nearest to the Buddha in the Buddhist religious order. However, as we have seen from the data, the monks are not a uniform group where everyone is equal. The Buddha himself recognises differences within the Saṃgha. In fact, we may say that even within the Saṃgha a person retains his past group affiliation to some extent. This is particularly true of the members of the two important groups, the brāhmaṇas and the ex. kin-group. Although both these groups

acknowledge the Buddha's superiority, the brāhmaṇa monks, even the distinguished ones, retain their *gotta* affiliations. Those belonging to the ex. kin-groups are invariably addressed more informally with their personal names. Addressing a monk by his *gotta* name, whenever it existed, was made a *Vinaya* rule.¹³⁹

We have already dealt with the different terms used by the monks among themselves. It is sufficient to point out here that *āvuso* denotes equality while *bhante* denotes the addressee's superiority. *Āyasmā* as a term of reference and in rare cases the term of address, denotes mutual respect, and is more formal than *āvuso*.

We have pointed out the nature of relationships between the Jains and the Buddha and his monks. They have both retracted from the brāhmaṇic order, yet there is no actual recognition of equality. Indeed, there is a fierce competition for a position of superiority.

The *gahapati*, as has been pointed out before, addresses all of them as *bhante*; but does not necessarily remain neutral in the "tripartite struggle" for religious superiority. Thus, Citta *gahapati* exchanges greetings (s.s.) with Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta and the Acela Kassapa, but salutes (*abhi.*) the Buddha. This and his other behaviour do not fail to infuriate the Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta.¹⁴⁰ In general, however, the Jains derive their form of behaviour from the brāhmaṇas, who are equally hostile to the Buddhist order. If at all, they go out of their way to engage in violent discussions with the Buddha and his monks.

To recapitulate then, there are three religious orders, each fighting against the other for superiority. To the brāhmaṇa order belong the brāhmaṇa, the *paribbājaka*, some *gahapatis* and others; to the Buddhist order belong the Buddha, the monks (brāhmaṇa and others) and the upāsakas. The ex. kin-groups are aligned in this struggle on the Buddha's side; the third is the Jain order, comparatively less significant but no less hostile to the others. Their following consists of Nigaṇṭhas such as Dīgha Tappasi, Saccaka and so on, and lay disciples.

All the three groups contend for superiority in the eyes of the *gahapati* who represents the bulk of society. He is respectful to all men of religion, but sometimes has his own preferences. His importance, from the point of view of the sources lies in his patronage of one or the other order. Whenever he changes his patronage, the

losing order takes it as an insult. That his importance is recognised is seen from the fact that the Buddha orders the monk Suddhamma to seek pardon from the *gahapati* Citta, even when in fact the *gahapati* behaved disrespectfully to the monk first.¹⁴¹

Political Relationships:

The king obviously is at the head of the political order. His subordinate and representative at the social level is obviously the *gāmaṇi*, the administrative chief of the village. He seems to be recruited from the *gahapati* group but by his political rank is outside them. Of the *gahapatis*, he alone has the courage to challenge the Buddha for being a magician. Conversely, he alone defends the Buddhist monks in the king's court from various charges.¹⁴²

The king is formal in his behaviour to the brāhmaṇas as well as to the Buddha. The King, like the Buddha, uses the term *brāhmaṇa* for the priestly class. The young brāhmaṇa he addresses as *tāta*, a term reserved for a son. On the other hand, his attitude towards the Buddha may vary from *bho Gotama* and *Saddhim Sammodi* to *bhante Bhagavā* and may thus indicate his religious sympathies.

Both by the Buddha as indeed by monks and *paribbājakas* (including the leaders of the well known schools of thought such as, Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta, Saṅjaya Belaṭṭhaputta, Makkhali Gosāla, Puraṇa Kssapa and so on), the king is addressed as *mahārāja*. The employees and the subjects of the king address him as *deva*.¹⁴³ Brāhmaṇas address him, among other modes of address, as *deva*. Ākasagotta, who addresses him as *mahārāja*, as we have seen,¹⁴⁴ is a brāhmaṇa of great spiritual renown, so much so as to be addressed as *bhante* by the king. In this sense he can be said to belong to *paribbājaka* group. While on the one hand, the Buddha, the monks, *paribbājakas* and their "fellow travellers" seem to deny any ritual status to the king by addressing him as *mahārāja* which emphasizes the earthly powers of the king; on the other hand, those who address him as *deva*, accept the king's divinity. In other words the king's divinity is not challenged by those within the bonds of the society; those outside it refuse to endow him with that special status.

The *gahapati*'s position vis-à-vis the king is not certain, but the former addresses a prince as *ayyaputta*, denoting not only respect but also some privilege. It is only here that we find the *gahapati* using neither *bhante* nor the less respectful *bho*. The king on his part, like others, refers to the *gahapati* by the title coupled with his personal name.¹⁴⁵

The *gāmaṇi* usually follows the *gahapati*'s practice in addressing the Buddha as *bhante* and in salutation (*abhi.*). Yet he may address the Buddha as *bho Gotama*, as in the case of Pāṭali *gāmaṇi*.¹⁴⁶ Nevertheless, the same *gāmaṇi* refers to the Buddha as *samaṇa bho Gotama*, suggesting that he may not go as far as the *brāhmaṇas* and the *paribbājakas* in disapproving of the Buddha and his order.¹⁴⁷

The *brāhmaṇa*'s attitude to the king is marked by the term of address to the latter, *bho*. Even when a *brāhmaṇa* is a minister, his behaviour scarcely changes very much. For instance, when king Ajātasattu sends the *brāhmaṇa* minister Vassakāra on a mission to the Buddha to find out ways and means of destroying the might of the Vajjis, he addresses Vassakāra as *brāhmaṇa*. Vassakāra addresses the king as *bho*. The message the king commands the *brāhmaṇa* to deliver is a formal one. The king instructs Vassakāra to bow down at the feet of the Buddha and convey his salutation (*abhi.*) and refer to the Buddha as *Bhagavā*. The *brāhmaṇa* Vassakāra substitutes his own behaviour for that of the king in his actual encounter with the Buddha. He exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) instead of saluting (*abhi.*), addresses the Buddha as *bho Gotama*, instead of *bhante Bhagavā* used by the king.¹⁴⁸

The legendary royal chaplain *brāhmaṇa* Mahāgovinda also behaves with King Reṇu with the same degree of respect as paid by the *brāhmaṇa* Vassakāra to the king Ajātasattu by addressing the latter as *bho*.¹⁴⁹

Sometimes, however, there is a deviation in the behaviour of the *brahmanas*. The *brāhmaṇa* Vassakāra addresses king Bimbisāra as *deva*.¹⁵⁰ By accepting the divinity of the king the *brāhmaṇas* tend to enhance their own position in society, as they also claimed divine origin in the text. It was an often repeated claim of the *brāhmaṇas* that they are the sons of god Brahmā, born out of his mouth.¹⁵¹

Summary:

In summing up, a number of conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, we have examined various modes of address, reference and salutation, found in the meetings of various persons. We have tried on the one hand to establish the various *de facto* social groups implied in such formulae, ascertaining the group affiliation of the persons involved. On the other hand, we have tried to bring out the meaning of various terms and establish a triple system of ranking. The meaning attached to these terms, we may point out, is specifically inter-actional, and the proof of its validity lies only in its consistency. We have demonstrated this throughout our presentation of the data as well as the conclusions.

On a different level, our conclusions mainly indicate a three-fold system of ranking. In the social sphere the brāhmaṇas successfully maintain their hostile equality with the Buddha. But in the religious and political fields, they are not as successful. In the religious field the Buddhist order more than holds its own and claims several distinguished brāhmaṇas within its fold. Politically, too, the Buddha is less encumbered than the brāhmaṇas. Unlike them, he is not servile to the King.¹⁵² Despite their actual humility in the king's presence, in their modes of address the brāhmaṇas recognise no superior in any system of ranking, but at the most only equals. They and the Buddhists have an equal hold on the *gahapatis*, who represent the more or less secular population, the prizes in the religious struggle.

CHAPTER IV

KINSHIP AND MARRIAGE

Introduction:

THE recognition that the study of Kinship is an important aspect of Indian social history goes as far back as Sir Henry Maine. He and many others after him have studied various elements of Kinship in India, such as *gotta*, caste, clanship, the institution of marriage and so on for different periods of history. These historians studied these elements (whatever number of these, they studied) each one isolated from the other. Sometimes they attempted to establish the presence of a particular element or its types at a given time. At others they studied particular elements over a long period and attempted to demonstrate social change over the period. They also studied the ritual, economic and political concomitants of these elements but in a more generalised setting. More modestly, in the course of their preoccupation with other aspects of history they provided data covering their own period which contributed to some current controversy about the existence or nature of some elements of kinship. Important as these studies are, they do not illustrate, if one might use the term, the more detailed structure of a particular region of Indian society in a given period and its functioning.

We propose to study the kinship and marriage as reflected in the Pali texts, not as various elements but as a system, i.e. in the manner in which it is studied by the present day social anthropologists. The meaning of this contention will be clear from the following remarks of Radcliffe-Brown. He writes:¹

“A system of kinship and marriage can be looked at as an arrangement which enables persons to live together and co-operate with one another in an orderly social life. For any particular system as it exists at a certain time we can make a study of how it works. To do this we have to consider how

it links persons together by convergence of interest and sentiment and how it controls and limits those conflicts that are always possible as the result of divergence of sentiment or interest. In reference to any feature of a system we can ask how it contributes to the working of the system. This is what is meant by speaking of its social function. When we succeed in discovering the function of a particular custom, i.e. the part it plays in the working of the system to which it belongs, we reach an understanding or explanation of how it came into existence. This kind of understanding of a kinship system as a working system linking human beings together in an orderly arrangement of interactions, by which particular customs are seen as functioning parts of the social machinery, is what is aimed at in a synchronic analytic study. In such an analysis we are dealing with a system as it exists at a certain time, abstracting as far as possible from any changes that it may be undergoing. To understand a process of change we must make a diachronic study. But to do this, we must first learn all that we possibly can about how the system functioned before the changes that we are investigating occurred. Only then we learn something of their possible causes and see something of their actual or probable effects. It is only when changes are seen as changes in or of a functioning system that they can be understood."

Of the treatment of kinship by some historians, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown has the following to say:

"The literature dealing with kinship is loaded with theories that can only be described as pseudo-historical. There are many varieties of such theories, but they all have one thing in common. Starting from some known condition in the present or in the historically recorded past, an 'explanation' of it is invented by imagining some condition or event in the unrecorded past and arguing on *a priori* grounds that the known condition might or must have had its origin in this way. The devotion to pseudo-history has had unfortunate results. It has led to the adoption of false ideas about the facts as they are, and has often influenced or vitiated observation and description."

But we have nothing to lose by applying the anthropological technique to our datable historical material in an attempt to study the contemporary structure of society without, however, theorising on earlier antiquity. To quote Radcliffe-Brown again:

"The reality of a kinship system as a part of a social structure consists of the actual social relations of person to person as exhibited in their interactions and their behaviour in respect of one another. But the actual behaviour of two persons in a certain relationship (father and son, husband and wife, or mother's brother and sister's son) varies from one particular instance to another. What we have to seek in the study of a kinship system are the norms . . . Actual observations of the way persons do behave will enable us to discover the extent to which they conform to the rules and kinds and amounts of deviation. . . ."2

"A kinship system thus presents to us a complex set of norms, of usages, of patterns of behaviour between kindred. Deviations from the norm have their importance. Where there is a marked divergence between ideal or expected behaviour in the actual conduct of many individuals this is an indication of disequilibrium; for example, when the rule is that a son should obey his father but there are notably frequent instances of disobedience."3

The main import of these lengthy quotations is that we should study kinship and marriage in their own right as functional wholes in which the persons are related by convergence of sentiment and interest. The contents of these wholes are: 1. Various interpersonal relationships comprising normative and actual behaviour. 2. Institution of marriage. 3. The various kinship groups which we can derive and the principles of such groupings. 4. The inter-group organisation. We shall deal with these in this chapter.

An additional point that A. R. Radcliffe-Brown makes is that an analytic study of the type he proposes must necessarily be synchronic and that the social change can be dealt with only at the end of such a study. What is more important is that there should be no *a priori* assumptions of conditions previous in time from which the present conditions should be derived.

Interpersonal relationships among relatives—stereotypes and actual behaviour:

Parents and sons:

The term for mother and father in Pāli is *Mātā-Pitā*. The relationship between parent and son is that of love and affection. Describing a son's attitude to his parents, the Buddha says, "Parents cannot be repaid even if a son should provide them with all the physical care and comforts that they may need and also earn for them all the power and riches on earth; this is because the parents bring their children into being and nourish them."⁴ "Parents are like Brahmā; they are the ancient teachers, they are worthy of gifts. The wise worship them, honour them and satisfy their material needs, for they are compassionate to their children".⁵ Of the six quarters, the parents are represented by the east, hence a son should support them, fulfil the duties which he inherits from his father; continue the lineage, be worthy of inheritance and pay homage to the ancestors.⁶

However, only some persons behave towards their fathers in this ideal way. On the one hand, we find persons who behave ideally. The brāhmaṇa Dhānañjāni, exploits the king and the *gahapatis* playing them off against each other in order to support his parents and family.⁷ Ghaṭikara, the potter, supports his blind parents.⁸ Another brāhmaṇa is nicknamed "a supporter of his mother" (*mātuposako*) because he maintains his parents by begging. The Buddha approves of him and says that he will go to heaven because of this.⁹ Sudinna Kālandaka, even after he has become a monk, succumbs to the plea by his mother that he should fulfil his duty towards her and his father by providing a son in order to continue the lineage.¹⁰ The doctor Jīvaka presents his substantial first earnings to his foster-father, prince Abhaya, in gratitude for having him brought up.¹¹ On the other hand we find Ajātasattu who admits before the Buddha that he has killed his father Bimbisāra, a righteous man, for the throne.¹² The brāhmaṇa Mānatthadda respects neither his parents nor his elder brother.¹³ The action of upāsaka who presented a store room to a group of nuns is challenged by his faithless son in a court after his death.¹⁴ When the Buddha sees a rich brāhmaṇa looking worn out and ill-

dressed, and inquires about his state, he says that it is his four sons and their wives who have driven him out of the house.¹⁵ Rāhula instigated by his mother addresses the Buddha (his father) as *samaṇa*, a term of indifference rather than affection, and asks for his inheritance.¹⁶

Ideally the parents desire a son to be born in the family because he will add to the possessions, perform the family duties, perpetuate the lineage, transmit the inheritance to his sons in turn and pay homage to the ancestors.¹⁷ The parents also restrain a son from vice and exhort him to virtue, train him in a profession, marry him suitably, and hand him over his inheritance in due time.¹⁸

In practice we find that the parents have deep love and affection for their sons. Aggīca Jaṭṭila, a mendicant, out of affection addresses the foundling he brought up as *tāta*; while the child addresses him as *pitā* (father).¹⁹ Yasa, the son of a *seṭṭhi gahapati*, Anuruddha and the Buddha, are all supported in great luxury by their parents. According to a stock formula repeated in each case, they are given three mansions each for a different season and many women to serve them.²⁰ Soṇa Koḷivisa, another son of a *seṭṭhi* is so delicately nurtured "that hair grew on the soles of his feet". When the king sends for Soṇa, his parents send him in a palanquin.²¹ Upāli's parents want to choose a suitable profession for him, so that he may live at ease after their death. They reject scribing (*lekhaṇa*) lest it may pain his fingers, counting (*gaṇana*) because it may hurt his chest, and money changing (*rūpam*) because it may weaken his eyes. Finally they choose monkhood for their son, because the monks live at ease, eat good meals, and take a siesta sheltered from the wind after the meals.²² A *gahapati* is so grieved at the death of his son that he stops eating, leaves his business and often visits the funeral ground shouting for him.²³ When Raṭṭhapālā wishes to join the order, his parents seek to stop him, by saying, "You are our only child, dear, beloved, you live in comfort. You are well cared for and you do not know suffering. Eat, drink and amuse yourself. You can do meritorious deeds and enjoy the pleasures of senses at the same time. If you were to die, we would become desolate. How could we then let you go when you are still alive."²⁴ The friends of Raṭṭhapālā intervene at the instance of the parents but fail. In the end, the parents give in on the condition that Raṭṭhapālā should visit them after he becomes a monk.²⁵ When

Sudinna Kalandaka wants to become a monk, his parents also seek to stop him in a similar way.²⁶ When Yasa leaves his house secretly, it is his mother who notices his absence first. Later, the *seṭṭhi gahapati*, Yasa's father, while pleading with him says, "Your mother is full of grief and laments. Give life back to your mother."²⁷ In the *Aṅguttara*, it is said that a mother cannot bear to see her son grow old. She says, "I am growing old; let not my son grow old". (The son likewise cannot bear to see his mother grow old).²⁸ When the Buddha leaves home, his parents have faces "with tears caused by crying".²⁹ Suddhodana Sākya, the Buddha's father requests him to make a rule that a son cannot join the order without his parents' consent. Describing his own feelings he says, "When you (Buddha) went forth there was great sorrow, the same happened when Nanda did so. But when Rāhula went it was extreme. The affection for a son is deeply set in the body. It cuts to the marrow and it goes deep in the bones."³⁰

In contrast to this melodramatic expression of affection towards the son we find the Buddha advising the brāhmaṇa *Mahāsāla* who was driven out of the house by his sons, to shame them in public. Accordingly the brāhmaṇa recites a verse taught by the Buddha, in a public hall. He says, "He (the father) was glad at the birth of sons while they (the sons) in concert with their wives drove him out of the house. These sons are shameless and impious. They call him *tāta* but really they are the demons in the guise of sons. They do not care for an old man just as they do not care for a horse. So they leave him in the lurch. He is their father, the senior of his children. Yet he begs at others' doors." The sons are duly ashamed when they hear this, and they clothe him anew and respect him.³¹

Among the family responsibilities of a son, that of maintaining the family lineage is very important. In the instance of Sudinna Kalandaka, we see concern with the continuation of the lineage.³² In addition, the Buddha is accused of making families sonless and thereby destroying them (*aṇṇakāṭṭhā . . . kulupacchedāya*).³³

The succession to office is from father to the son. Ajātasattu kills his father Bimbisāra in order to succeed him on his throne.³⁴ Inheritance is an important aspect of parent-son relationship. The property of both the mother and the father goes to their son, but where there is none, the property goes either to the next of

kin or to the state. Thus Sudinna Kalandaka's mother, in persuading her son who has become a monk to give them a child, argues that if he does not provide a son the property would go to the Licchavis.³⁵ Raṭṭhapāla as well as Sudinna are tempted by the offers of the wealth of their fathers, mothers and their paternal grandfathers.³⁶ Suddhodana Sākya is extremely pained at the ordination of Rāhula, his son's son, presumably because he has no heir left after him.³⁷ The property of a *seṭṭhi gahapati* who dies intestate is confiscated by King Pasenadi.³⁸ The importance of inheritance is demonstrated by the Buddha, who explains this happening by saying that in the previous life the intestate *gahapati* had killed his brother's only son for the sake of property.³⁹ That the inheritance was divided equally between all sons can be seen in the case of a brāhmaṇa who dies leaving a son by one of his two wives. When the other wife is pregnant the son goes to his mother's co-wife (*mātu sapattim*) and asks her to hand over the property. He says, "Whatever wealth there is, is mine. There is nothing here for you whatever; make over to me the inheritance of my father". She, however, replies, "Wait till a child is born to me; if it is a son he will share the property with you equally, if a girl she shall wait on you."⁴⁰ Hence it appears that both wife and daughter are excluded from inheritance which is patrilineal. It is natural, therefore, that we find King Pasenadi sad when a daughter is born to him instead of a son.⁴¹

Property can be transferred in the life time of the father. Thus, *gahapati* Poṭaliya has handed over the inheritance to his sons as befitting one who is concerned with spiritual affairs. He is no longer concerned with advising his sons.⁴² A *gahapati* of Vesālī gives property to his sister's son in preference to his own. He asks the monk Ajjuka to ascertain which of the two has faith and belief (in the Buddha). Ajjuka decides in favour of the sister's son, to the annoyance of the *gahapati*'s own son.⁴³ The latter appeals to the monk Ānanda and asks rhetorically, "Who is the father's heir (*pituno dāyājo*), the son or the sister's son?" Ānanda replies that the son is the heir to the father. Then the son of the *gahapati* blames the monk Ajjuka. In a final appeal, the monk Upālī while silent on the question of inheritance confirms that the monk Ajjuka is right in siding with the one who has faith.⁴⁴

The last factor is the ancestor worship which consists of pay-

ing homage to the ancestors by the son. Thus, when the parents are dead, among other things, the son has to make offering to the ancestors.⁴⁵ The son (*kulaputta*) has also to give a share (*bali*) of his hard-earned wealth to ancestors (*pubbapeta*).⁴⁶

Father-mother and daughters:

Daughters are the responsibility of the parents; like sons, daughters also need to seek permission of their parents in order to become nuns.⁴⁷ Daughters are protected by their parents (*mātura-kkhitā*, *pitura-kkhitā* and *mātāpitara-kkhitā*).⁴⁸ At proper age they are married to suitable husbands and sent to their new homes.⁴⁹ Sometimes widowed daughters come back and reside with their parents. Thus a poor Bhāradvāja brāhmaṇa, among other things, is encumbered by the presence of his seven daughters. All his daughters are widows each with one or two issues. The section concerning this brāhmaṇa itself is subtitled "*Bahudhiti*" i.e. concerning many daughters.⁵⁰

There is a close tie of affection between a mother and her daughter. A girl Kāṇā, who returns on a visit to her parents' home is referred to as going to her mother's house (*mātughara*) and not her father's.⁵¹ In the *Vinaya* another woman who quarrels with her husband also goes to her mother's house (*mātughara*).⁵² A former courtesan is unwilling to give her beautiful daughter in marriage to strangers from a distant village, but does so on the intervention of the monk Udāyi. When the daughter complains to her that her husband's household treats her harshly, the mother goes to her daughter's house to plead with the latter's husband and his parents.⁵³ It must be noted, however, that in this case the mother being a courtesan had to assume the role of a father as well as a mother.

We have seen that the father prefers a son to a daughter and also that she does not inherit her father's property if he has a son.⁵⁴ A father's attitude to his daughter is described by the Buddha when he consoles Pasenadi, who is disappointed by the birth of a daughter. The Buddha says, "A female child may prove an even better offspring than a male one. For she may grow up wise and virtuous. She will honour her mother-in-law (*sassudevā*) and be faithful to her husband (*patibbatā*). The boy that she may bear

may do great deeds.⁵⁵ In Buddha's words we also see the ideal of behaviour for daughters and wives.

A woman must please her parents. Thus the enamoured and lustful monks implore a woman to consent to their wishes by saying "When will your mother be reconciled? When will your father be reconciled?"⁵⁶

Brother and brother:

The elder brother commands respect from his younger brother. In this respect he is next to the parents. Thus, the brāhmaṇa Mānathaddha neglects to respect not only his parents but also his elder brother (*jeṭṭha bhātara*).⁵⁷ The elder brother reciprocates this behaviour by exercising authority and by caring for the younger brother. Mahānāma Sākya, on the death of his father, looks after the property and keeps his brother Anuruddha in luxury, so that the latter does not know how to replace his brother when he desires to become a monk.⁵⁸ We may also note that Yasa and Raṭṭhapāla, who are described as living in luxury, are mentioned thus by their parents.⁵⁹

Sometimes brothers are mentioned together without indicating the difference of age between them. They are also shown as following the same occupation. This suggests the solidarity of the brothers in their relationship with others. Puraṇa and Isidatta are both architects (*thāpati*).⁶⁰ Yemeḷu and Tekula, the two brāhmaṇa brothers, approach the Buddha with the suggestion that the latter should introduce a metre (*chanda*) to preach the *dhamma*.⁶¹ Two farmer brothers lie dead with their oxen, while the Buddha is meditating near by.⁶² The two *Jaṭala* brothers, who are fire-worshippers, follow the example of their elder brother in giving up the fireworship and joining the Buddhist Saṃgha.⁶³

The brothers share their father's property. Thus a brāhmaṇa woman who is pregnant at the time of her husband's death, asks her step-son to wait till her child is born. "If he is a boy", she says, "he will take half the share".⁶⁴ The "half share" indicates an equal share. An upāsaka presented a store-room to a group of nuns in his life time. His unfaithful son says to his faithful brother after the upāsaka's death, "Let us divide (*bhājāma*) the property, the store-room is ours."⁶⁵ Suddhoḍana Sākya, who is

grieved at the Buddha's going forth, is equally grieved at Nanda going forth, presumably because he has lost both his heirs.⁶⁰

Sometimes, the inheritance passes from one brother to another or from the son of brother to another brother. Thus, the King of the Sākya, Bhaddiya puts off going forth until he transfers the management of his estate to his sons and brothers.⁶⁷ A *seṭṭhi* dies without an heir, because he had in previous birth killed his brother's only son for the sake of property.⁶⁸

Sister and sister:

In describing a "sister-like wife" the Buddha says, "Like the respect which a sister gives to the elder sister (*jeṭṭha bhagini*), a "sister-like wife" respects her husband. Acting meekly she serves her husband's every wish."⁶⁹ Hence it is obvious that the elder sister was respected.

Solidarity between sisters is shown by the fact that Mahāpajāpati and her sister Māyā, the Buddha's mother, were both married to Suddhodana Sākya.⁷⁰ Moreover, it is Mahāpajāpati who serves the Buddha as his mother's sister, nurse and foster mother.⁷¹

Brother and sister:

The term of address and reference for a sister is *bhagini*. It is also used in a classificatory sense by the monks, who address all women as sisters. Since the monks should avoid all sexual relationships with women, this usage indicates that such relationships were prohibited between brother and sister. We find further proof of this in the fact that Raṭṭhapāla, Sudinna Kalandaka and others, when they become monks, address their former wives as sisters, to the despair of the wives.⁷² The monk Udāyin whose wife has also become a nun, addresses her as sister.⁷³ Similarly Ugga gahapati who is an upāsaka of the Buddha, addresses his wives as sisters at the time of his renunciation of worldly ties.⁷⁴

The brother-sister relationship is characterised by "avoidance".⁷⁵ The proof of this is a little complicated. On the one hand we find that the nuns address each other as *ayye*, a term denoting respect.⁷⁶ The lay followers also address the nuns as *ayye*.⁷⁷ On the other hand we find that the monks address all women as sis-

ters.⁷⁸ There seems to be no prohibition against normal relationship between either two nuns or between a nun and a lay follower. We also find that the relationship between a monk and woman is minimal. In one instance, the Buddha says, "It is better to talk with a man with a sword in hand than to be with a woman alone."⁷⁹ We may, therefore, presume that the minimal relationship is denoted in the use of the term "sister" by the monk. We find a further proof of this when the Buddha describes the seven types of wives to Sujātā⁸⁰ One of the type is a "sister-like wife." She behaves towards her husband as she would towards an elder sister (i.e. with respect) and not a brother. The implications of change in the sex of the husband, only in the case of a "sister-like wife", suggests that the brother-sister relationship could not provide a model of behaviour for a wife. The only reason we can imagine for this is that the brother-sister relationship was an avoidance relationship, which would not be feasible between a husband and a wife. This is not surprising in a society where customary divorce is practised and where the household unit is the polygamous extended family, so that we may find half-sisters and classificatory sisters within the household.

Husband and wife:

The terms of address for the husband are *ayya*, *ayyaputta*, *gahapati*, *sāmi* and the terms of reference are *pati*, *sāmi* and *gahapati*. Marriage is polygamous and the term for a co-wife is *sapatni*.

That the marriage is polygynous, we can see from a number of instances. The brāhmaṇa Mahāgovinda has forty wives,⁸¹ Raṭṭhapāla has many⁸² (the number is not specified) and Ugga *gahapati* has four.⁸³ In some cases marriage is monogamous, as in the case of Nakulapitā,⁸⁴ Mēṇḍaka *gahapati*,⁸⁵ Suppiya upāsaka,⁸⁶ Sudinna Kalandaka,⁸⁷ Rājā Muṇḍa⁸⁸ and a *seṭṭhi* of Rājagaha.⁸⁹ At least in the cases of Rājā Muṇḍa and Nakulapitā, monogamy is accompanied by mutual love between husband and wife. There is reason to believe that monogamy was associated with poverty, but not necessarily so. Thus the brāhmaṇa who has many widowed daughters has "one wife, a tawny and speckled one."⁹⁰ At another time, the Buddha says that it is much more difficult for a man with one wife, ugly and poor, to go forth (to join the order) than for a rich

man with wives.⁹¹

No special reason is given in the text as to why a man takes another wife, except in the case of Kāṇā, whose husband takes another wife out of pique because Kāṇā's mother would not send her back to him in spite of his repeated warnings.⁹²

If the husband is polygamous, the wife too; can obtain a customary divorce and even remarry. When Ugga *gahapati* renounces worldly ties, he offers his four wives a choice, "If there is any man whom you desire, I could give you to him." The eldest one chooses to take another man and is given to him by Ugga.⁹³ The brāhmaṇa *Purohita*, Mahāgovinda also offers the same choice to his forty wives, when he renounces the worldly ties, but they choose to follow him in the path of renunciation.⁹⁴ The mother of Nakula during the illness of her husband reassures him that after sixteen years of conjugal life she will not "go to another man."⁹⁵ In one case, however, divorce and consequent remarriage are forced upon the husband and wife by the wife's *ñātakas*. The husband unable to find any way out, kills the wife and commits suicide.⁹⁶

In the polygamous household wives are sometimes jealous of each other. Thus, in the *Vinaya*, there is a story of two co-wives, one fertile and another barren. The latter secures the death of the unborn child of the former by administering a drug through a monk.⁹⁷

A widow does not necessarily remarry. The mother of Nakula reassures her husband in the following words: "May be you think, when I am gone, the mother of Nakula may not be able to support the children nor to keep the household together. But by skill at spinning cotton and carding matted wool, she can support the children and run the household."⁹⁸ We also find that after their husbands become monks, the wives of the Buddha,⁹⁹ Sudinna,¹⁰⁰ Raṭṭhapāla¹⁰¹ and so on remain in their marital households. The only exception are the wives of Ugga *gahapati*.¹⁰² We do not know the social status of Ugga, but it seems that the wives of others did not leave their marital home because they belonged to families of high social status.

A wife does not inherit the property of her husband after his death. The son of a brāhmaṇa after the death of his father goes to his mother's co-wife and asks her to give him back the property of his father.¹⁰³ "

On an inter-personal level, there exists conjugal love and affection. Rājā Muṇḍā is so much afflicted by the death of his beloved queen that he gives up bathing, anointing, eating and all work and clings day and night to her body. He even asks his treasurer to preserve her body in oil.¹⁰⁴ King Pasenadi, when he heard the news of his queen Mallika's death, "was sorely grieved and sick, at heart, his shoulders drooped, his mouth fell and he sat brooding, unable to speak."¹⁰⁵ The mother of Nakula says to her husband, that they were married in young age and hence were not conscious of having transgressed even in thought, much less in action.¹⁰⁶ When he expresses the fear that she may take another man after his death, she replies that they have lived a chaste life together for sixteen years and that has satisfied her; so she would keep her virtue in full.¹⁰⁷ The woman whose *ñātakas* propose to give her in marriage to another man says to her husband, "My *ñātakas* have forcibly taken me from you, they want to give me to another man, but I do not want him." The husband in despair kills his wife and commits suicide, thinking that they will be together thereafter.¹⁰⁸ Monk Raṭṭhapāla's former wives desire him to go back to them.¹⁰⁹

Sometimes, however, the wife's devotion to her husband arises out of duty rather than love. Thus, former wife of the monk Sudinna sets out to seduce him at the behest of his mother.¹¹⁰ The brāhmaṇa Maṇāgovinda's forty wives desire to follow him into renunciation.¹¹¹

A woman is valued by her husband more than by her other relatives. Thus, when the wife of a *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha is cured by Jīvaka, the son, the son's wife and the woman herself, each give four thousand coins to Jīvaka in gratefulness. But her husband gives him four thousand coins, plus a male and a female slave and carriage.¹¹² In another instance, when a *seṭṭhi gahapati's* son is ill and is to be operated upon, the doctor Jīvaka permits only the wife to be present at the operation.¹¹³

There are also cases of wives who quarrel with their husbands or treat them contemptuously. In one case the wife, who has become a nun, scolds her husband who is a monk, for not accepting personal services from her as he used to do so.¹¹⁴ The wife of a poor brāhmaṇa with many daughters, wakes him up with her feet in the morning.¹¹⁵ An old brāhmaṇa who marries a young girl is very henpecked. He promises to present her with a pet monkey

(*makkaṭṭacchāpako*) if she gave him a boy. She is given the monkey before a child is born. Still dissatisfied, she sends him to the dyer to get the monkey dyed, pressed and smoothened, and thus makes a fool of him.¹¹⁶

Some wives are not chaste. One such wife who becomes pregnant by her lover when her husband is away gets medicine from a monk in order to secure an abortion.¹¹⁷ A Licchavi man consults the Licchavi *gaṇa* in order to get their consent to kill his wife for committing adultery.¹¹⁸

In contrast to the instances of actual behaviour outlined above, we find the following stereotypes of the husband-wife relationship. In *Sigālovāda Sutta*, it is said that the husband should treat his wife with respect, courtesy and faithfulness, hand over the authority to her and provide her with adornments. In turn, she should be hospitable and chaste, skilled and diligent in all work, and should safeguard the property of her husband.¹¹⁹ In another place the Buddha addresses the young women about to go to their husbands' house (*pati kulāni*). He says, "(1) A wife rises earlier than her husband and is the last one to retire. She willingly helps her husband, carries out his wishes and speaks with him affably. (2) She honours, reveres and respects all whom her husband reveres, such as his parents, *Samaṇas* and *Brāhmaṇas*. (3) She manages the household and those who live in it, the slaves, messengers and domestic servants. She cares for both the able and the sick and distributes food to every one according to his lot. (4) She is deft and nimble in the crafts of her husband's household and she knows how to get the work done and how to do it herself. (5) She safeguards her husband's property, his money, grains, silver and gold, and she is not like a robber, wastrel, or carouser." Only such a wife, the Buddha adds, can be reborn a *Deva* after death.¹²⁰

In another instance the Buddha advises Sujātā, the unruly daughter-in-law of Anāthpiṇḍika who comes from a rich family. He says there are seven types of wives, some approved and others not so. The first is "the slayer" (*vadhaka*) who is pitiless, corrupt, neglects her husband at night, and passes her time with others. She has been bought with money and is murderous. The second type is "the robber" (*corisamā*), who takes his money and longs to impoverish him. The third is "the mistress-like wife" (*ayyasamā*), who is lazy, indolent, expensive to maintain, who loves gossip and

talks with strident voice. She lessens her husband's zeal and industry. These three types are harsh and distrustful, and live in hell after their deaths. But the fourth type is "the mother-like wife" (*mātusamā*)¹²⁰ who has sympathy for her husband, cares for him as she would for an only son, and safeguards her husband's property. The fifth type is "the sister-like wife" (*bhagini samā*), who respects her husband as she would an elder. The sixth type is "the companion-like wife" who is full of joy on seeing her husband, just as one meeting a friend after a long time. She is of gentle birth, chaste, and faithful to her husband. The last type is "the slave-like wife" (*dāsi samā*) who does not fear to take beating from her husband and is calm, patient and obedient. These wives are virtuous and will go to heaven on death. Sujātā after the discourse prefers to become a "slave-like wife".¹²¹

Mother's brother and sister's son:

Outside the family and the household, the mother's brother (*mātula*) is the most important relative. He is affectionate towards his sister's son, educates him, gives him gifts and settles him in life. Even when the latter injures him directly, he still remains lenient. Soṇadaṇḍa the brāhmaṇa points proudly to his sister's son Aṅgaka, of whom he says, "He is born well, is studious, learned, handsome and of good character. He is truly a learned man."¹²² On another occasion he says, "He is born well on both the mother's and the father's side. I know his parents I gave him learning."¹²³ In another case¹²⁴ a man requests the monk Ajjuka to choose between his sister's son and his own and decide who is the more faithful. The monk chooses the sister's son. The mother's brother thereupon gives his wealth and settles his family,¹²⁵ to the annoyance of his own son. The son appeals to Ānanda who decides that a monk should not interfere in such matters and that inheritance should go to a son. The monk Upāli to whom the final appeal is addressed, however, absolves the monk of interfering in the rule of inheritance, by saying that the monk has only to decide who is the more faithful one. He is not responsible for the consequences. It is clear that although the sister's son has no right of inheritance, he can benefit economically from his mother's brother.

The king Ajātasattu attacks his mother's brother Rājā Pasenadi of Kosala and defeats him. But when they meet a second time in battle, Pasenadi captures him alive. Pasenadi, however, sets Ajātasattu free after taking his entire army as prisoners, thinking, "The king injures me without my doing so to him, yet he is my sister's son."¹²⁶

Even the Buddha recognises the importance of the mother's brother. A monk visits his mother's brother (*mātula*) who is ill in the army, although a visit to the army is an offence involving expiation. The Buddha after hearing a complaint about this makes an exception of the mother's brother who may be visited even in the army when ill.¹²⁷

Among female relatives with whom sexual relations are considered incestuous is the mother's brother's wife (*mātulāni*). In this, it ranks with mother (*mātā*), mother's sister (*mātuccha*), teacher's wife (*ācariya bhāriyā*), and preceptor's wife (*guru dārā*).¹²⁸

The Husband's parents and son's wife:

The terms of reference for the husband's father and mother are *sassura* and *sassu* respectively; that for a daughter-in-law is *suṇha*.

An important point about relationship between the husband's parents and daughter-in-law is that the latter derives her relationship through her husband, whom she must obey and respect. The husband in turn has the relationship of obedience and respect towards his parents. Thus, a daughter-in-law is in a doubly inferior position. That she sees her husband and his parents as a single category to whom she owes respect and obedience, is clear from the fact that in any reference to her, the husband's mother, his father and the husband are usually mentioned together in that order.

A bride on marriage goes to the family of her husband which is alien to her. She, therefore, tends to see it as a single unit. We find that a newly married woman (*vadhuka*) feels "extreme fear and bashfulness in the presence of her husband's mother, his father, and domestic servants."¹²⁹ The family also sees her as an alien coming to seek membership. Hence we find that in the *Vinaya*¹³⁰

the female members of the family are classified in descending order as, (1) woman of the family (*kula itthi*), (2) the daughters of the family (*kula dhītāyo*), (3) the young girls of the family (*kulaku-māriyo*), (4) daughters-in-law of the family (*kula sunhāyo*) and (5) the women slaves (*kula dāsiyo*).¹⁸¹ It is important to note that the daughter-in-law is at the end of the list of relatives in the family but just before the slaves who are obviously outsiders; and are considered as members of the family only because they stay in the household. It is not, therefore, surprising that the daughter-in-law is sometimes treated as a slave. A prostitute's daughter who married into a respectable family, complains that for a month she was treated as a daughter-in-law should be, but afterwards as a female slave.¹⁸² In the same story, however, we find a statement that some daughters-in-law are satisfied with their husbands' parents and husbands, while others are not.¹⁸³

That the daughter-in-law is a member of the family is not in doubt. Thus, *gahapati* Mēṇḍaka's household includes, his wife, his son, son's wife, slaves and domestic servants. However, among those who possess psychic power (*iddhi*) are Mēṇḍaka, his wife, his daughter-in-law and his slave.¹⁸⁴ The possession of psychic power indicates the full integration of the daughter-in-law as a member of the family. Among the persons who give gifts to the doctor Jīvaka on the recovery of the *seṇṇhi gahapati's* wife is her daughter-in-law. Like her mother-in-law and her husband, the daughter-in-law also pays four thousand coins.¹⁸⁵

In terms of ideal behaviour, the daughter-in-law should rise up and offer seats and water to her husband's parents.¹⁸⁶ The Buddha consoles Rājā Pasenadi on the birth of a daughter by saying that she will get married and will respect her mother-in-law.¹⁸⁷ Here, the mother-in-law is referred to as *sassudevā*.

The actual behaviour of the daughter-in-law varies from one instance to another. When Sudinna desires to become a monk, it is his mother and not his wife, who attempts to dissuade him. Sudinna seeks his parents' permission but not his wife's. When he returns, it is again his mother who persuades him to give the family a child. It is she who instructs her daughter-in-law to be ready to receive him. The wife herself plays only an instrumental and passive role.¹⁸⁸

But a daughter-in-law is not always obedient and respectful.

Once the monk Udāyi goes to a house,¹³⁹ where the mother-in-law sits at the entrance door (*nivesana dvāra*), while the daughter-in-law is in the living room (*āvāsatha dvāra*). The monk gives *dhamma* first to the mother-in-law and later to the daughter-in-law, separately and in private. As a result each of the women suspects Udāyi to be the lover of the other. It is, however, the mother-in-law who first asks her daughter-in-law a direct question to find out what the monk had said to her. The daughter-in-law replies suitably and in turn asks her mother-in-law and gets a similar reply. They both blame the monk for arousing their suspicions.¹⁴⁰ In this instance we find that, although the mother-in-law has a superior position, she obtains the *dhamma* first, and declares her suspicions first, there is familiarity on the part of the daughter-in-law and even contempt in her suspicions. At another place it is said that a daughter-in-law after living in her husband's family long enough and gaining confidence addresses her husband and his parents thus: "Away with you, what do you know?"¹⁴¹ Here also the daughter-in-law shows familiarity and contempt.

The Buddha, visiting the home of Anāthapiṇḍika, finds it full of high and loud voices. On enquiring he is told that the cause of the noise is Sūjātā, the daughter-in-law of the house (*ghara suṇha*) who is herself rich and has been brought from a rich family (*aḍḍha, aḍḍakulā ānitā*).¹⁴² The Buddha is also told, "she pays no heed to her husband's parents, to her husband or even to the Buddha." Anāthapiṇḍika requests the Buddha to advise her. At the end of his discourse Sūjātā becomes a "dasi-like wife"; respecting and serving all.

Lastly, we find that an old brāhmaṇa in torn cloths complains to the Buddha that his sons in collusion with his daughters-in-law have shown him the door.¹⁴³ It is clear that the daughters-in-law have gained power over their husbands as well as their father-in-law.

Other relatives:

Among other relatives mentioned in the text are the mother's sister (*mātuccha*),¹⁴⁴ mother's sister's son (*mātucchaputta*),¹⁴⁵ father's sister's son (*pituccha putta*),¹⁴⁶ father's brother (*pitā peyya*),¹⁴⁷ and father's mother (*ayyakā*).¹⁴⁸

As we have seen, the Buddha is brought up by his mother's sister, who is also his mother's co-wife.¹⁴⁹ A sexual relationship with the mother's sister is sinful as that with a mother, and is, therefore, incestuous.¹⁵⁰ Sudinna's parents attempt to dissuade him by pointing to his father's wealth which he will inherit.¹⁵¹ Rājā Pasenadi on the death of his father's mother says, that he would have given an elephant or a priceless horse or estates in order to save her life.¹⁵²

Marriage:

We find various forms of marriages and unions mentioned in the text. The most approved of them are the two forms *āvāha* and *vivāha*, invariably mentioned together. It is not very certain whether these are two ceremonies of one single form or two different forms. *Āvāha-vivāha* is arranged by the parents. The parties to the marriage are young and chaste (*kumāra-kumārikā*). Upon marriage the wife goes to live with her husband's family. The following case will make some of the points of this marriage clear:

The monk Udāyi sees an unmarried youth (*kumārakam vā apajāpatim*) and an unmarried girl (*kumārikā vā apatikam*). He praises the girl in the presence of the youth's parents. Udāyi says, "The girl is of such and such a family (*amukassa kulassa*). She is beautiful (*abhirūpā*), charming (*dassaniyā*), lovely (*pasādikā*), learned (*paṇḍitā*), accomplished (*vyuttā*), wise (*medhāvinī*), clever (*dakkhā*), and industrious (*anālasā*). She is suitable for the youth." The youth's parents reply, "They (the girl's family) do not know us—who and what we are. If you will induce them to give her, we may convey the girl to the youth."

The monk Udāyi then praises the boy in the presence of the girl's parents. He uses the same words of praise and advises that the girl is suitable for the youth. The girl's parents say to Udāyi, "They do not know us—who and what we are, nor do they know how much is the girl's property. If you will beg (*yācāpeyya*), we may give the girl to the youth." Thus Udāyi brings about "leading" (*āvāha*) of the bridegroom by the

bride's family and "leading away" (*vivāha*) of the bride and the marriage takes place (*vāreyyani pi vattāpeti*).¹⁵⁵

A number of points are noteworthy. Firstly, the individual opinions of the girl and youth are conspicuously absent, although compatibility is suggested by imputation of identical qualities to both the parties. Secondly, the families of both the parties are unknown to each other. Thirdly, it is the status and position in society of the families on both sides which are of importance. Presumably the families must be equal. However, when the marriage is being arranged the relationship between them is not equal but the youth's family is superior. We can see this through the way they appeal to the monk to bring about the marriage. While the youth's parents would like to induce the girl's parents, the latter would beg them to arrange the marriage. Also the youth's parents have to establish only the status and position, while the girl's parents have an additional obligation to pay dowry (*vatthu*). Fourthly, the marriages were arranged through an intermediary, in this case a monk. Lastly, *āvāha* literally means the leading of the bride (by the bride's family) and *vivāha* leading her away (by the bridegroom's family). The marriage is "virilocal". But the point is significant enough to give the form its nomenclature.

We have translated the term *mātā-pitaro* as parents; however, it appears that it may not necessarily refer to the mother and father only. It is perhaps of some significance that the parties to marriage are not son and daughter (*putta-dārā*) but youth and a girl (*kumāra and kumārikā*). This interpretation of *mātā-pitaro* is compatible with the meaning which we have assigned to it earlier.¹⁵⁶ We may, therefore, presume that the parents arranged the marriage, not only of their son's and daughter's but also all the charges under them within the extended family.

Another reference to *āvāha-vivāha* occurs in one of the Buddha's utterances. Contrasting supreme perfection to *āvāha-vivāha*, the Buddha says,¹⁵⁷ "There is no reference to the question either of birth (*jātivāda*), *gotta* (*gotta-vāda*) or the prestige (*māna-vāda*), which says, 'you are held as worthy as I or you are not held worthy as I', it is in the talk of marriage (*āvāha-vivāha*) that reference is made to these things."

Here once more the emphasis is on the status and prestige in

connection with *āvāha-vivāha*. This time, however, status is expressed in terms of birth and *gotta*.

Another reference to *āvāha-vivāha* is made when a *seṭṭhi* of Rājagaha, invites the Buddha for a meal. Anāthapiṇḍika, the husband of the host's sister mistakes the preparations for the meal with those for a great sacrifice, invitation to a king and a marriage (*āvāha-vivāha*).¹⁵⁸ This suggests that *āvāha-vivāha* involved considerable expense, particularly in the case of the rich.

There are ten forms of marriage mentioned in the text, all in one place.¹⁵⁹ These are: (1) When a woman is bought with money (*dhanakkhitā*). (2) When a woman stays of her own accord with a man (*chandavāsini*). (3) When a man gives her money (*bhogavāsini*). (4) When man gives her clothes (*paṭavāsini*). (5) When an ablution of water is performed (*odapattakāni*). (6) When she removes her head-wear (*obhatacumbā*). (7) When she is also a female slave (*dāsi-nāma*). (8) When she is also a servant (*kammakāri*). (9) When she is temporarily with a man (*muhuttikā*). (10) When she is captured in a raid (*dhajahaṭṭā*). It is obvious that the last four are no more than recognized unions. In the case *dhanakkhitā*, *paṭavāsini*, and *bhogavāsini* there is some economic exchange involved and presumably, this gives some permanence to the union. In the case of *odapattakāni* and *obhatacumbā*, a symbolic ceremony is emphasized. *Chandavāsini*, is the only form where any symbol in the form of economic exchange or a ceremony are conspicuously absent. The woman lives with her lover of her own will. This is the nearest we get to a free and willing union. In the case of *dāsi* and *kammakāri*, the union may not be temporary but in these cases the special position of the woman is a pre-requisite to the union. It is to be noted that not all *dasis* and *kammakāris* entered into union by virtue of their position; if anything, these forms of marriage may show the strength of the authority-obedience relationship between the master and the servant.

It seems that the above do not exhaust all forms of marriage.¹⁶⁰ Thus:

Some disciples of Ājīvikas coming from a distant village ask for the beautiful daughter of an ex-courtesan (*ganaki*) for their son. The ex-courtesan, however, at first refuses to give her daughter in marriage, but agrees after the interven-

tion of the monk Udāyi. The proposal is accepted only on the fourth time. The marriage is described in the following manner: "That *gaṇaki*, gave her daughter to the disciples of the *Ājīvikas*."¹⁶¹

It is to be noted that in this case, not the intermediary, but the family of the bridegroom makes the proposal, the intermediary also the monk in this case, mediates only when the refusal occurs. No *āvāha-vivāha* is mentioned, but the marriage is signified by the proposal *deyyami* and its compliance, *adāsi*. Both the terms denote the aspect of giving, presumably because in this form of marriage it is the girl's family who have a bargaining position.

In another case:

Monk Anuruddha once stays at an inn (*āvāsathagāra*) in a village. The keeper of the inn, a woman (*itthī*), properly adorned, makes a proposal for a union to the monk (*pajāpati bhaveyyam*). When the monk refuses, she tempts him by undressing. The monk still pays no attention. Thrice ignored, this time the woman offers wealth along with herself, but, of no avail. Surprised and shocked by the monk's refusal, she says, "Men have sent for me with a hundred or a thousand coins), but this monk in spite of my begging, did not desire to take me or my wealth (*sāpateyyam*)."¹⁶²

It is obvious that the woman at first proposes a temporary sexual union and only at last does she propose a permanent alliance. The term for union is *pajāpati bhaveyyam*. In this connection it may be noted that in the earlier case *kumāra* is described as *apajāpatim* (*kumāri* as *aptikam*).¹⁶³ The emphasis in the term *pajāpati* is obviously on the sexual aspect of the union and not on the procreation of children as the etymology of the term denotes. The woman here is *itthī* and not *kumāri*, hence the use of the term *pajāpati*. It is used here only euphemistically. It is to be noted that elsewhere the term *pajāpati* is also used to refer to wives.¹⁶⁴

Yet another form of marriage is described in the case of Uggā of Vesālī:¹⁶⁵

Of himself Uggā says, "I had four wives (*pajāpati*), all young (*komāriyo*), and I went and spoke to them thus, 'sisters (*bhaginiyo*) I have embraced the five rules of training. Who wishes may enjoy the wealth of this place, or may do deeds of merit, or may go to her own *nāti-kula*; or are there some men you desire to whom I may give you.' When I stopped speaking the eldest wife said to me, 'ayya, give me to such and such a man.' Then I sent for that man. Taking my wife by the left hand and holding a pot of water in my right, I poured water on their hands.¹⁶⁶ Yet I was not the least discomfited at parting with my wife (*dārām pariccante*)."

In this case the wife is given away by a ritual denoted by the term *onojesim*. This term occurs elsewhere, in connection with a gift.¹⁶⁷ The aspect of gift is also emphasized by *pariccante*, which denotes severance. The wives are described at first as *pajāpatiyo* and *komāriyo* thus emphasizing their sexual desirability. In the gift, however, the eldest wife is described as *dārā*, obviously a more socially correct term for a wife. The second marriage of the elder wife appears to be no less recognized than forms of marriage which involve ritual. Uggā's abandonment of any rights in his wife is doubly emphasized first on an emotional level through the term *bhaginiyo*, and second on a ritual level.

The brāhmaṇa practice of marriage:

There are five types of *brāhmaṇas* mentioned in relation to marriage.¹⁶⁸ (1) The celibate "Brahmā-like" (*brāhmaṇa brahmā-sama*). (2) "God-like" (*brāhmaṇa devā sama*). (3) Those who follow tradition (*brāhmaṇa mariyādā*). (4) Those who break tradition (*brāhmaṇa sabbhinnamariyādā*). (5) The *brāhmaṇa* outcaste (*brāhmaṇa caṇḍāla*). The first type of *brāhmaṇa* is obviously celibate like the god Brahmā. The second and third type must marry only *brāhmaṇa* women, and with a ritual in which water is poured on the woman (*udakūpassaṇham*). The fourth and fifth type of *brāhmaṇas* marry both *brāhmaṇa* and other women, *khattiya*, *vessa*, *sudda*, *caṇḍāla*, *nesāda*, *veṇa*, *rathkāra*, and *pukkusaka*. The ceremony in the last two types is through pouring of water (*udakūpassaṇham*) as well as through buying and selling (*kayena vā vik-*

kayena).

All types of brāhmaṇas, irrespective of their behaviour, are described as pure in lineage and also as versed in the vedas. The second and third type of marriage were for the procreation of children (*pajathāva*) and not for sexual enjoyment (*kāmattha*, *davattha* and *ratattha*), while the last two types were for all these.

It is obvious that only the first three types of brāhmaṇas carry some approval. The last two are disapproved of but do not lose their caste affiliation. All brāhmaṇas are pure in lineage. This is shown in the following case:

In an argument with the brāhmaṇa Assalāyana, regarding the claims of the brāhmaṇas to superiority on the basis of birth, the Buddha gives an example of the brāhmaṇa. He says, "In Yona-Kāmbhoja and other outlying regions there are two *vaṇṇas*, the master (*ayya*) and the slave and it is possible for the master to become a slave or for a slave to become a master."¹⁶⁹

The story assumes a meaning, when related to the explanation offered in *Majjhima Aṭṭhakatha*.¹⁷⁰ It says that if a brāhmaṇa and his wife go trading in an outlying *Janapada*, he may die there leaving no son. His wife may have previously had intercourse with a slave or servant (*dāso vā kammakāro*). In that case any son born would be a slave, although pure on his mother's side. This son goes to trade in a *majjhima janapada* and marries a brāhmaṇa woman. Any son born will be brāhmaṇa, though pure only on his mother's side. Whatever the truth of the commentary written a few centuries afterwards, a number of implications within the text and commentary are noteworthy. Firstly, the explanation offered in the commentary is social and not philosophical in its content, although the latter would be the easier to offer. Secondly, the term *vaṇṇa* is used to denote a two class hierarchy, supposedly existing in Yona-Kambojā and other outlying regions. Thirdly, the class affiliation of the brāhmaṇa woman in the commentary also applies to her son, whereas in Yona-Kamboja he is a slave, in *majjhima janapada* he is a brāhmaṇa, can marry a brāhmaṇa woman and also have a brāhmaṇa son. Lastly, the tracing of caste affiliation is through the mother when the father's lineage is partly or wholly

non-brāhmaṇic.

In this connection we also find the names of brāhmaṇas, such as brāhmaṇa Saṅjikāputta¹⁷¹ and Sāriputta¹⁷² significant. The names are derived through the name of the mother in each case.

In another controversy with Assalāyana, the Buddha gives an example of brāhmaṇa union outside the brāhmaṇa group.¹⁷³

The Buddha says: "A khattiya youth consorts (*saddhim samvāsam kappeyya*) with a brāhmaṇ girl. A son who is born out of this union is like his father and mother. He will be a *khattiya* and *brāhmaṇa*."

The implication of this case become clear in yet another one which we give below:

The Buddha argues with brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha¹⁷⁴. A khattiya youth consorts (*saddhim samvāsam kappeyya*) with a brāhmaṇa girl or a brāhmaṇa youth consorts with a khattiya girl. A son is born out of such a union, the brāhmaṇas offer him seat and water. They invite him to partake food of *sāddha*, *thālipāka*, *yañña*, and *pāhunaka*.¹⁷⁵ They also instruct him in sacred verses and do not prohibit his mingling with their women (*itthi*).

The khattiyas would not consecrate such a son, because he is not pure by birth by seven generations on the mother's side in one case and on the father's side in another.

In the above cases, it is apparent that the brāhmaṇas recognize the caste affiliation of a person who is a brāhmaṇa on either side and there is no stigma attached to partial non-brāhmaṇic origin. The khattiyas, however, are more rigid and refuse to accept in their own group a man who is not pure by birth for seven generations on both father's and mother's side. It may also be noted that the term for marriage in this case is not *āvāha-vivāha* but staying together (*saddhim samvāsam kappeyya*).

In earlier part of the last case, the Buddha tells the brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha that the Sākyas are pure in descent and the brāhmaṇas are of mixed descent. He then tells the following story:¹⁷⁶

The ancestors of the Sākyas Okkāka sends his sons into exile. The sons go to the Himalaya and through fear of breaking the purity of the line intermarry with their own sisters.

Ambattha's ancestor Kaṇhāyana is born of a slave girl of king Okkāka. Kaṇhāyana, having performed austerities, returns to king Okkāka and marries his daughter.

In this story, too, the emphasis is on the purity of line. The Buddha suggests that purity was maintained by brother-sister marriage, among the Sākyas. Brāhmaṇas on the other hand have a mixed origin, with a slave woman for an ancestress. The form of marriage here is the same as mentioned in other brāhmaṇa-khattiya unions.

The last type of marriage is among the Vajjis.¹⁷⁷ One among the seven *dhammas* recounted by the Buddha to the Vajjians prohibits the overpowering of young girls and women of the family.¹⁷⁸

Summary:

It would be useful to summarise the points we have made above. There are several forms of marriage, none of them exclusively recognized. At one end, the union is *muhuttikā*, a momentary sexual union; at the other end, we find *āvāha-vivāhā* with a ceremony elaborate enough to be mistaken for a royal feast. *Āvāha-vivāha* marriage seems to be the ideal one for the *gahapatis*, since the term occurs in connection with them. The religious brāhmaṇas on the other hand have a ritual ceremony prescribed for them. The Sākyas, however, seem to recognize the special situation created by the union between the brāhmaṇa and khattiya through the use of the special term describing such unions. The Vajjians and Sākyas do not disapprove of marriage between brother and sister. Although the myth of Sākyas' origin from brother-sister union is obviously an exaggerated claim to purity, the accumulative evidence does not rule out marriages with classificatory sisters. Hence the Buddha's injunctions to Vajjians not to overpower *kula kumārīs* and *kula itthīs*. We assume, of course, that the injunction was a rebuke to the Vajjians for a prevailing practice. That this is so, becomes more likely from the statement that "a Licchavi husband who wants to kill his wife because she has committed adultery goes to the *Licchavi Gana* for counsel before doing so."¹⁷⁹ The ex-

tended kin-group would be more interested in women who claimed affiliation on both sides than in those who claimed it only through the husband.

The brother-sister marriage should not be taken literally in view of the scanty evidence. It is quite possible that the brother-sister union does not imply anything more than ethnic solidarity. On the one hand the injunction is to marry within the extended kin-group (we can see this from the non-recognition of the son born of a union with an outsider). On the other hand, there is the insistence on the "fraternal-sororal" solidarity of the ethnic group. In this connection the story of a man from Vesāli is of great interest. With the approval of a monk he gives gifts (*dāna*) and establishes (*kutumbam santhāpesi*) his sister's son in preference to his own. No doubt, the son objects to such an act, referring to gift and settlement as inheritance (*dāyāja*).¹⁸⁰ Although we recognize the fact that mother's brother and sister's son relationship is important in some tribal and peasant societies, the story would assume a totally different meaning if either cross-cousin or parallel cousin marriages were practised.¹⁸¹

Lastly, it would not be out of place to mention the account given by Buddhaghosa of Licchavi origins:¹⁸²

An ascetic found a lump of flesh in a jar which turned out to be a boy and a girl. The two were attached to each other by the skin (*linā-chavi*) as if sewn together, so that they came to be known as Licchavis. The cowherds brought them up in the Vajji country. When they were sixteen years of age the king married the girl to the boy, and made a rule that no bride should be brought from outside, or a girl be given away outside. Sixteen pairs of twins were born to the couple (a boy and a girl each time). As those children grew up, there was not enough room for them. Hence a city grew up, and was named Vesāli (from *visāla*, large).

The story of origin is the same in its essence, as the one told by the Buddha of the Sākyas' origin.¹⁸³ The same credence may be attached to it, the only additional points are the sanctioning of the marriage and the resulting fertility of the union. If at all, this suggests a greater necessity to justify brother-sister marriage in

Buddhaghosa's time than it was in our period.

Kinship Grouping:

We now turn to the problem of ascertaining the kinship and quasi-kinship groups that may be found in the text. This is not an easy task, since they are not directly mentioned, but have to be inferred. We shall do this in two ways. Firstly, we shall examine a number of key terms and formalisations found in the text and impute to each of them some specific meaning. In doing this we shall no doubt find that some of these terms carry at various times different connotations, or that different terms denote the same group. But this should not prove an obstacle. On the contrary, we shall find, in the understanding of these connotations and denotations a true picture of the system of grouping. Secondly, we shall take the conceptual definition of the kinship groups most likely to be found in the Buddhist society (such as e.g. the household group, family, agnates) and find out how far they can be inferred from the data available from the text.

The household group:

Within this group, it seems, a man's first duty is to his wife (*dāra*). Buddha, in giving a simile, mentions that a man, who contracts a debt and sets up a business, should have a surplus (of income) to support his wife as well as to repay the debt.¹⁸⁴ In another case a rich *gahapati* and a *gahapatiputta* offer to lend money to a shopkeeper (*pāpaṇika*) so that he may enter the trade. They ask him to support his son and wife (*putta dāra*) and repay the debt by instalments.¹⁸⁵ The soldiers (*yodhajīva*), potters and silk-weavers carry on with their livelihood in order to maintain their sons and wives (*putta-dārā*).¹⁸⁶

After fulfilling the duty to support his wife and children, in other respects a man's mother and father (*mātā-pitaro*) take precedence over them. Such is the case when Dhānañjāni brāhmaṇa, accused of not being diligent, defends himself by saying that he should support (*poṣetabba*) mother and father, son and wife, slaves (*dāsa*), household servants (*kammakaraporiso*)¹⁸⁷ On another occasion a good man (*sappurisa*) is defined as one who cares for

the welfare of mother and father, son and wife, slaves, and household servants among others.¹⁸⁸ The Buddha advises that a man should work for the welfare of (*sakkaroti*) the members of his family defined in the same formula, as well as those who are employed by him in agriculture and trade and those who manage them (*khettakammanta sāmantasamvohāre*).¹⁸⁹ In all these examples mother and father take precedence over all others. These descriptions being formal, such precedence denotes the prime importance of the mother and father in the household group. This can also be seen from the following instances where son and wife (but not mother and father) are significantly excluded on two important occasions. In the first instance, the Bodhisatta enquires of his charioteer about a corpse they see. In the reply given, we find that it is the mother and father (*mātā-pitā*) and agnates (*ñāti-salohita*) who are grieved because they will not be able to see him (the dead man).¹⁹⁰ In the second instance in the *Vinaya*, a monk is permitted to visit only his mother and father (*mātā-pitā*), brother (*bhātā*), sister (*bhagini*) and *nātakas*, when they are ill.¹⁹¹ It is clear from the above that the mother and father are the most important members of the household group, in spite of the fact that a man's duty to support his son and wife rank first.

Before we proceed with the position of the other members within the household group, it is necessary to deal briefly with the implications of the sequences referring to kinship and quasi-kinship found in the text. Taken together, they apparently denote the total extent of a man's relationships. But this is not all. We find that the persons mentioned in the sequences vary from one instance to another depending on the context in which they are used. From this we may argue that in each of the sequences taken separately there is a gradually expanding circle of recognition of kinship and quasi-kinship, although the recognition itself depends on the context in which it is accorded. If we examine some of these contexts, we may find functional kinship and quasi-kinship groups that exist within the society. The following instances will make the arguments clear.

We suggest that the mother and father (*mātā-pitā*), son and wife (*putta-dārā*), slaves (*dāsī*) and household servants constitute the household group. In the instance where a good man (*sappuriso*) is defined as acting for the benefit and welfare of, the whole

sequence of beneficiaries consists of the mother and father (*mātā-pitunam*), son and wife (*putta-dāram*), slaves (*dāsa*), household servants (*kammakaraporisā*), friends and acquaintances (*mittā maccānam*), ancestors (*pubbapetānam*), the king (*raññanam*), the gods (*devatānam*), the recluses (*samaṇa-brāhmaṇānam*).¹⁹² In the case of Dhānañjāni quoted above we have already mentioned that he should support only the mother and father (*mātā-pitā*), son and wife (*putta-dārā*), slaves (*dāsa*) and household servants (*kammakaraporisa*). Apart from these, he should fulfil his obligations to (*karaniyam-katabbam*), friends and acquaintances (*mittā maccānam*), agnates (*ñātisālohitānam*), guests (*atithinam*), ancestors (*pubbapetānam*) and the gods (*devatānam*). He should also do his duty to the king (*raññāyam rājakaraniyam-kattabbam*).¹⁹³ There is thus a significant difference between the responsibility to support (*posetabba*) and to fulfil obligations (*karaniyam katabbam*).¹⁹⁴ In another instance when the wife of a merchant of Rājagaha is treated by the doctor Jīvaka, those who give gifts to the doctor in gratitude include the merchant's wife (*seṭṭhi bhāriyā*), her son (*putta*), her son's wife (*suṇha*) and the merchant (*seṭṭhi gahapati*) who gives the most.¹⁹⁵ Other subordinate members of the household, such as the gate keeper (*dvārapāla*) and slaves are mentioned, but they do not give gifts. Instead the merchant makes a gift of a male and female slave (*dāsa-dāsi*). Menḍaka, the *gahapati*'s house (*ghara*) consists of wife (*bhāriyā*), son (*putta*), son's wife (*suṇha*), slaves and household servants of these all, except the household servants, are described as possessing psychic power (*iddhī*).¹⁹⁶ The Buddha tells Anāthapiṇḍika that alms are given as thank-offering for the enjoyment of good food (*ulārāya bhattabhogāya*), clothing (*ulārāya vatthabhogāya*), vehicles (*ulārāya yānabhogāya*), for the five fold sensual pleasures (*ulāresu pañcesukāmaguṇesu*) and for having sons (*puttā*), wives (*dārā*), slaves (*dāsā*), messengers (*pessā*) and servants (*kammakarā*).¹⁹⁷ Son (*putta*), wife (*dārā*), brothers and cousins (*bandhavā*), acquaintances (*ammaccā*) and the caste group (*ñāti samghā*) are said to be dependent (*anujivino*) on a virtuous and believing head of the kula (*kulapati*).¹⁹⁸ We find that the two kings Seniya Bimbisāra and Pasenadi and the respected brāhmaṇa Pokkharasādi are mentioned as accompanied by sons (*saputto*), wives (*sabhāriyo*), servants (*sapuriso*) and acquaintances (*sāmacco*).¹⁹⁹ Ananda proposes to transmit the

last homage of the Malla families of Kusināra to the Buddha through a formula which mentions the individual Malla family head by name, accompanied by sons (*saputto*), wives (*sabhāriyo*), servants (*sapuriso*) and acquaintances (*sāmacco*).²⁰⁰

From the various sequences mentioned above, we can see that mother and father, son, wife, son's wife and slaves form the inner core of the household group. The household servants, although a part of the group, do not stand in the same relationship as the slave, since in the context of possession of psychic power, the former, but not the latter, are excluded.

That the friends and acquaintances (*mittāmacca*) do not form a part of the household group is clear from the fact that in other sequences, where the members of the household groups are not mentioned, they figure along with agnates (*ñātisālohita*). The following are some examples in point:

When Keniya, the *jaṇi*, invites the Buddha and the monks for a meal, he asks his friends and acquaintances (*mittāmacca*) and agnates (*ñātisālohita*) to help in the preparations.²⁰¹ When a *yakkha* in the guise of a man attempts to persuade a leader of a caravan to throw away the provisions, the leader argues with his followers that since the man is neither a friend and acquaintance (*mittāmacca*) nor a agnate (*ñātisālohita*) they should not act as if they trusted him.²⁰² In a third instance, an order to boycott Vaddha the Licchavi, is passed in the monastery when he accuses the monk Dabbha Mallaputta of committing adultery with his wife. When he "faints" on learning about the order, it is his friends and acquaintances (*mittāmaccā*) and agnates (*ñātisālohita*) who console him and promise to reconcile him with the Buddha.²⁰³ It is the friends and acquaintances (*mittāmaccā*) and agnates (*ñātisālohita*) who gather round the *gahapati* Citta who is sick.²⁰⁴ The friends and acquaintances (*mittāmacca*) and agnates (*ñātisālohita*) of a leper (*kuṇḍilapuriso*) procure the services of a surgeon to cure him.²⁰⁵ On one occasion the Buddha advises,²⁰⁶ "Listen to those with whom you have sympathy (*anukampeyyātha*) and to those who think you should listen to them (*ye ce sotabbam maññeyyaṃ*), whether they be friends (*mittā vā*), acquaintances (*amaccā vā*), "waste fellows" (*ñātivā*) or agnates (*sālohita vā*). In the last instance, the king (*rājā*), and the king's ministers (*rājāmahāmattā*), friends, acquaintances (*amaccā*) and agnates (*ñātisālohita*) are

mentioned as tempting the monks to return to lower life by offering them wealth (*bhoga*).²⁰⁷

From the above instances it is clear that although there is a constant and close relationship with friends and acquaintances, they are not a part of the household group but fall just outside it. That this is so, is apparent from the instance of the monk Channa, who committed suicide as a result of disease. In this case, the Buddha blames the families of friends (*mittakulāni*, *suhajjakulāni*) who, he thinks, instigated Channa to do so.²⁰⁸ The use of the term *mitta* in conjunction with the term *kula* leaves no doubt that the friends did not belong to the household group.

We suggest that the term *mittāmacca* covers those persons who come into close interpersonal relationship and yet are not related through kinship-ties. We may conjecture that these include not only friends and acquaintances in the modern sense of the term but also neighbours not related otherwise. Although there is little evidence, we may also argue that the term *mitta* refers to the neighbours of high or equal status and *amacca* to those of comparatively lower status than the person concerned.

In the context of kinship, more than one term is used to denote the household group. One such term, though rarely used, is *kuṣumbam*. In one instance we find it used in the case of a *gahapati* who establishes his sister's son by giving him gifts²⁰⁹ to the annoyance of his own son, who describes the gifts (*dānam*) as his inheritance (*dāyājja*). Obviously the term *kuṣumba* is related in some manner to the concept of *dāyājja*, which is the right of a son, but not of sister's son. In another instance, a man has two wives (*dve pajāpatiyo*) one barren and another fertile. It is said in this connection that if a wife becomes fertile she becomes the mistress of the whole *kuṣumba*.²¹⁰ The term *kuṣumba* refers, it seems, rather to the household group in its economic aspect, as is apparent from both these instances.

Another term sometimes used for a household group is *ghara*. Nakula's father²¹¹ who is ill is worried lest his wife should not be able to keep the household together (*gharāvāsam santharitun-'ti*). On learning of his worry his wife reassures him. She says, among other things, "Do not think; when I am gone the *gahapati's* ~~wife~~ (referring to herself) will go to another house (*gahapatīni macchayena aññanā gharam gamissati*)."²¹²

A third term for the household group is *kula*. The monks begging alms are usually described as ²¹³ being dependent on household (*kulūpako hotum*) or as going to many households. Thus Udayi is described as being dependent on households—going to many households.²¹⁴ The term *kula* has also been used to denote residence. Thus, in giving a simile to the hostile brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha, the Buddha says, “The quail, little bird (*sakuṇikā*) though she be in her own nest (*kulāvake*, residence), she can say what she likes; it is the same with the Sākyas in their own home in Kapilavatthu.”²¹⁵

Recapitulation:

The household group as we saw, includes such quasi-kin as the slaves (*dāsa*) and household servants (*kammakārapuriso*). We advisedly call them quasi-kin, although they are not related by kinship ties in any sense, because in terms of responsibility for support they rank with the closest relatives. This is particularly true of the slaves, who are obviously in a better position in this respect than the household servants.

We have only followed the convention in translating the term *dāsa* as a “slave.” We have contrasted it with the term *kammakārapurisa*, which may be literally translated as “worker-men.” We have, however, rendered this as “household servants,” for two reasons. Firstly, we intended thereby a separation of the two categories, *dāsa* and *kammakārapurisa*. Secondly, through the adjective “household” we emphasized their membership of the group. The notion of worker (*Kammakāra*), we felt, was sufficiently covered by the rendering “servants.” We hardly need to point out that what is of significance is the interactional difference which exists between *dāsa* and the *Kammakārapurisa*. Although in the modern senses of the terms “slave” and “servant”, the former has the inferior position vis-à-vis the master, it need not be necessarily so. In fact, it is obvious that the slave-master relationship was comparatively more privileged for the slave than the servant-master relationship was for the servant. In the important instance cited above, the slave receives the family’s *iddhi*, but not the servants.²¹⁶

The family:

Till now we have confined our attention to the household group. We turn next to the concept of family. An important difference between the concepts of "household" and "family" is that in the latter there is a greater emphasis on the recognition of kinship ties. Obviously, the members of the household group also consist of relatives but, as we have seen, other persons are also present. The family as a kinship group is a part of the kinship structure and hence bears relation to other parts.

The most important term denoting the family is *kula*. From the numerous instances we have discussed in relation to the household groups, it is obvious that *kula* denotes an extended family rather than a nuclear one. The former consists of mother and father (*mātā-pitā*), son, wife (*putta-dārā*), son's wife (*suṇha*), brother (*bhātā*) and sisters (*bhagini*) and possibly other relatives also.

Perhaps the clearest reference to the family (*kula*) is when it is stated that the mother and father "desire a son to be born in the family" so that he may add to the property what should be added, do what should be done, establish permanently the family line, receive and transmit the inheritance and give offerings to the departed ancestors.²¹⁷

That the term *kula* has been used to denote the family is also apparent from the following references found in the text. Thus, the brāhmaṇa Lohicca²¹⁸ inviting the monk Kaccāna says, "As Kaccāna visits the families of the lay devotees (*upāsaka-kulāni*) of Makkarakaṭṭha village, let him visit the family of Lohicca (*Lohicca kulam*)."²¹⁹ On another occasion the king puts the family of a keeper of a garden (*ārāmikakulam*) into prison. A little earlier, the keeper of the garden is described as having a wife and a daughter.²²⁰ On a fourth occasion the Buddha inquires of Anāthapiṇḍika whether alms are given in his family (*kula*) or not.²²¹ In a fifth instance a woman (*mātugāma*) is described as going to the family of her husband (*patikulam*) in tender age and "becoming without the *ñātakas*."²²² In a sixth instance, the Buddha is accused of bringing about barrenness (*aputtkatāya*), widowhood (*vedavyāya*) and destruction of the family (*kulu-pacchedāya*).²²³

The connotation of the family by the term *kula* is also apparen

in the use of such terms as *kulaputta*, *kulapati*, *kulajetiha* and so on. The term *kulaputta* refers to a junior male member of the family and stands in contradistinction to such terms as *kulapati* and *kulajetiha*. Thus the Buddha advises on different occasions *kulaputtas*, one of them, a Dīghajānu Koliya putta, and another a brāhmaṇa, Vijaya, to mix with the *gahapatis*, *gahapatiputtas* and elders (*Vuddha dahara*).²²⁴ The text advises that the *kulaputta* should engage in profession (*sippasthāna*) involving counting coins (*muddāya*), reckoning (*gaṇanāya*) and counting (*saṅkhāya*).²²⁵ In another instance, a son of a *seṭṭhi* when asked by the monk Upa-nanda for the robe which the former is wearing, refuses saying that, being a *kulaputta*, people will enquire about his wearing only one robe (instead of the usual two).²²⁶ In another instance, *kulaputtas* are described as going from the household to a state of houselessness (*agārasmā anagāriyam*).²²⁷ Since the Bhikkhus think about Brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha that he is of distinguished family and a pupil of the brāhmaṇa Pokkharasāti, the Buddha will not find it difficult to hold conversation with a *kulaputta*.²²⁸

The term *kulaputta* has the connotation of being a junior member of groups, based on the extended family or otherwise. Thus, as mentioned above, we find the Buddha referring to Dīghajānu Koliya putta as *kulaputta*.²²⁹ On another occasion the Buddha refers to his monks as *kulaputtas*.²³⁰ In yet another instance the Buddha's attendant, the monk Meghiya, refers to himself as *kulaputta*, thus acknowledging the headship of the Buddha.²³¹

The term *kulapati* definitely refers to the head of the family. Those under his tutelage (*antojano*) progress as a result of faith, chastity, knowledge and perception.²³² As we have seen earlier, those who progress under him are son and wife, brothers, acquaintances and members of the caste group (extended kin-group). (*putta-dārū, bandhava, amacca nāṭisaṃghā*).²³³

The relationship between the junior members of a family and the head are described in the following instances. In the first a good man (*sapuriso*), is described as among other things, one who defers to the elder of the family (*kula jetiha*).²³⁴ On the other hand, in a list of those who must act for the welfare of their charges is he who makes himself a power in the family (*kulesu pacche-kādhīpaccam*), coming as he does in the sequence after the consecrated king (*khattiya muddhāvasatha*), the head of a country

(*raṭṭhikassa petanikassa*), the chief of an army (*senāya senāpatikassa*), the chief of a guild (*puga gāmaṇikassa*) and the head of a village (*gāma gāmaṇikassa*).²³⁵ Here, however, the *kula* refers perhaps not so much to an individual extended family but to some larger kinship group.

Turning to the economic aspect of the family (*kula*), we find in the *Vinaya Suttavibhaṅga* that a village (*gāma*), a residence (*nivesana*), a stable (*uddhosita*), a verandah (*aṭṭho*), a watch tower (*māḷo*), a cottage (*hammiya*), a boat (*nāva*), an agricultural land (*khetta*), and a threshing floor (*dhāṇṇakaraṇiya*), may all belong to one family (*eka kulassa*), or to many separate families (*nānā kulassa*).²³⁶ In another instance, the Buddha says that families which have acquired great wealth do not retain it permanently due to four actions.²³⁷

A term denoting a group larger than the family and perhaps including the family is *kulaparivatta*. We find a reference to this when Ānanda transmits the last homages of the Mallas of Kusināra to the Buddha. Apprehensive that the night may pass before the Mallas are able to pay the homage individually, Ānanda thinks of causing the Malla families to stand in groups (*kulaparivattaso*) so that he may refer to them (in his announcement to the dying Buddha) through the name of the Malla (*itam nāmo Mallo*) and as accompanied by sons (*saputto*), wives (*sabhāriyo*), with servants and slaves (*saporiso*, which indicates household staff including *dāsas* and *kammakaras*) and acquaintances (*samacco*).²³⁸ The circle here is presumably larger than the family since it has among it the acquaintances. The friends (*mittas*) are conspicuously absent, presumably because they themselves, being of equal or higher status, form their own circle of families. *Kulaparivatta*, however, is only a temporary group, formed to meet the emergency, since we do not find any other reference to it elsewhere in the text.

Whereas the term *kula* denotes family in general, whether one's own or somebody else's, the term *ñātikulāni* denotes families other than one's own but belonging to the same "caste" or extended kin-group (*ñāti*). The following instances will make the content of the term clear. In the first instance, when a monk of Rājagaha arrives after a long time to the "caste families" (*ñātikulāni*),²³⁹ the people say, "The most respected one has arrived at last. Please keep the meal ready". Although the actual behaviour suggests

the affection and respect felt towards the monk by the members of his "caste-families," the term *manussā* (for the people) is highly general and significantly fails to indicate any specific relationship. In the second instance, however, the relationship is more specific. Ugga *gahapati*, renouncing secular life, suggests that his wives should have the option of going to their caste families (*ñātikulāni*).²⁴⁰ In a third instance, the brāhmaṇa Mahāgovinda, who actually accepts the life of a *samaṇa*, makes a similar suggestion to his forty wives before leaving the household.²⁴¹ In a fourth instance, a nun, a pupil of Bhaddakāpilini, having quarrelled with other nuns, comes to the village of her caste families (*gāmakam ñātikulam āgamāsi*).²⁴² In a fifth instance a brāhmaṇa invites monks for a meal. The monks eat at the brāhmaṇa's house to their satisfaction and yet go to their "caste-families" (*ñātikulāni*) with alms bowls, where some of them eat and some receive alms. Only when the annoyed brāhmaṇa talks to his neighbours (*paṭivassaka*) does the matter reach the Buddha, who makes such conduct an offence involving expiation.²⁴³ It is clear that some of the monks found it in order to receive alms and even eat a second time in the houses of "caste families." The Buddha made it an offence in order that the monk may not over-eat and not annoy the first host. There is no injunction against either eating with "caste families" or receiving alms from them. On the contrary, the first and the last instances taken together, suggest that such action constitutes privileged behaviour welcome to both—the monks and the "caste families". It should, therefore, be avoided only when it annoys a host who has already entertained the monk concerned.

Ñātisālohita:

The only kinship term to be found in the texts which refers etymologically to the blood tie is *ñāti-sālohita*. Obviously it denotes the agnates. It occurs on most occasions in conjunction with and immediately after the term for friends and acquaintances (*mittāmacca*) and hence we may take it that the relationships are similar in both cases and as such are evoked on the same occasions. The following references make the agnatic relationship clear.

From the case of brāhmaṇa Dhānañjāni, we find that one should oblige the agnates.²⁴⁴ The Buddha advises that one should listen

to the agnates, for one has sympathy with them and they think that one should listen to them.²⁴⁵ Keṇiya, on his part, calls upon his agnates to help him when he invites the Buddha and his monks to a meal.²⁴⁶ Vāseṭṭha, a lay disciple wishes that his agnates may also keep a fast along with him so that they, too, may obtain merit.²⁴⁷ The caravan leader, whose charges have been persuaded by a ill-meaning *yakkha* to throw away the provision in the midst of a forest, calls upon his men to ignore the *yakkha* on the ground that the latter is not an agnate and hence should not be listened to.²⁴⁸

That the agnates on their part have an affection and responsibility for the person is seen through the following examples. A *devatā* (presumably the dead ancestor) who is the agnate of Tapussa and Bhallika asks them to carry food to the Buddha and thus acquire merit.²⁴⁹ On a man's death, apart from the mother and father, it is the agnates who grieve since they will not see the dead man again.²⁵⁰ In the case of a leper it is his agnates who procure the service of a surgeon, to cure him of the disease.²⁵¹ Similarly when the *gahapati* Citta is ill, his agnates, among others, gather round him.²⁵² In his quarrel with the monk Dabbha Mallaputta, Vaddha Licchavi is assured by his agnates that they will intervene to reconcile him.²⁵³ The text mentions on two occasions that it is the king and his ministers, friends and acquaintances and the agnates who tempt a monk to lower life by offering him riches.²⁵⁴

It is significant that the agnates loom large in sickness and in death and even thereafter especially ritually. Apart from the instances noted above, there is another one in which prince Dīghāvu finds the dead bodies of his parents, King Dīghiti of Kosala and his queen, in the ground where they were executed. The Prince Dīghāvu makes the funeral pyre for them and lights it. King Brahmadatta of Kāśi who observes the scene from his palace and does not know the identity of the son, concludes that the lighter of the funeral pyre must be an agnate (*ñāti vā sālohito vā*) of those who were on the funeral pyre.²⁵⁵ In yet another instance we find that a brāhmaṇa, explaining to the Buddha, maintains that the purpose of the *sāddha* (*śrāddha*. *skt.*) is that the gifts (*dāna*) made therein should reach the agnatic ancestors (*ñātisālohitānaṃ petānaṃ*).²⁵⁶

The Nātakas:

If *nātisālohita* refers to the patrilineal side, the term *nātaka* recognises the bilineality of the kinship group. On several occasions in the text, a *nātaka* is defined as one who is related "on the mother's side or on the father's side, back through seven generations".²⁵⁷ That the affines are not included under *nātaka* is apparent from two separate instances. In the first one, a woman who goes to the family of her husband (*patikulam*) is described as "becoming without the *nātakas* (*nātakehi vinā hoti*)."²⁵⁸ In the second one the monk Udāyi on being questioned by the Buddha whether a particular woman is his *nātaka* or not, denies that she is one although she is his wife.²⁵⁹ From these two instances as well as the definition, it becomes clear that even a wife remains outside the bilineal kinship group (of her husband).

The *nātaka* relationship is analogous to that of the agnates. Thus we find that a warrior (*yodhājiva*) wounded by his enemy dies being carried on his way to his *nātakas*²⁶⁰ and that a man whose limbs were severed lives surrounded by his *nātakas*.²⁶¹ Similarly when a monk falls ill, his *nātakas* send a message offering to nurse him during the illness. More significantly, the *Vinaya* rule permits a monk to go to his *nātaka*'s home in such a case.²⁶² That the *saṃgha* should recognise the *nātaka* ties even after a person becomes a monk is repeatedly made clear. Thus, *Vinaya* elsewhere permits a monk to visit his sick mother, father, brother, sister and *nātakas* if he is sent for.²⁶³ A monk can accept as much curry from a *nātaka* as he wants, but from others he must take half in solid food and only half in curry.²⁶⁴ Similarly, from the incident between the monk Upananda and the *seṭṭhi*'s son, when the former asks the latter for the robe that he is wearing, the Buddha makes a rule that to insist on getting such a robe from anyone who is not a *nātaka* would mean an offence involving expiation (*pāccatiya*).²⁶⁵ On the positive side, when the monk Sudinna goes to Vesāli, his *nātakas* give him sixty offering of food, a costly but willing recognition of the relationship.²⁶⁶ In the instance involving Udāyin and his wife (who is a nun), the Buddha observes, "One (a woman) who is not a *nātaka* does not know what is suitable and what is unsuitable, what is pleasant or what is unpleasant whatever monk should get a soiled robe, washed,

dyed or beaten by a nun who is not a *ñātaka*, there is an offence involving forfeiture (*nissaggiya*).²⁶⁷ Ordinarily, a monk may not get a robe washed or dyed by a nun, ask for a specific cloth from householders,²⁶⁸ ask for many robes²⁶⁹ or a robe for which he makes specifications,²⁷⁰ or ask for dying, combing and washing of wool by a nun²⁷¹ or accept food (alms) from a nun,²⁷² or give robe material to her²⁷³ or sew or cause to be sewn a robe for a nun.²⁷⁴ But in all such instances these acts are permitted if they occur between the *ñātakas*. On the other hand the Buddha disapproves of a nun who met in private her *ñātaka puriso* who came from a distant village. The Buddha rules that a third person must be present at such meetings.²⁷⁵

The above references to the *ñātaka* group are concerned solely with extending or limiting recognition to it in so far as the Saṃgha was concerned. The group as such is recognised by the monks as well as the saṃgha, but the son and wife (whom one's prime duty is to support) are conspicuously omitted, lest the renunciation be meaningless. But we have no evidence whether in secular affairs, when monkhood and the saṃgha were not directly involved, *putta-dārā* were included under the term *ñātaka* or not.

That *ñātisālohita* is a group covered under the bilineal *ñātaka* is clear from the following instance. It is said that the man who loses his "caste" (*ñāti*) feels, "Formerly I had many friends and acquaintances and agnates (*ñātisālohita*) . . . now these *ñātaka* have diminished (*ñātaka parikkhayaṃ gacchati*). So it is not easy for me to acquire more wealth or to use what is already with me."²⁷⁶

Summary:

We have isolated four kinship and quasi-kinship groups viz., the household group, the family, the agnatic group and the bilineal. We saw that the household consists of a number of primary relatives, the wives of these relatives who are affines and the dependents such as slaves, household servants and so on. We found that the family is a somewhat different unit from the household in that in the latter case the emphasis is on living together, while in the former it is on its recognition in society as a kinship unit. Thus we found that *kula* approximated to the concept of family in which not only the members of a household but also others such

as friends and acquaintances were sometimes included. The unity of the kula was recognized by the use of such terms as *kulaputta*, *kulapati* or *kulajeṭṭha*, the former meaning the junior member of the family and the latter the head of the family, or by the use of such expressions as *Kulupako hoti* referring to the dependence of monks on certain families for alms and other purposes.²⁷⁷

While the total membership of the above two groups is understandably vague, that of the agnatic and the bilineal group is definite. The membership of the agnatic group is indicated through the reference to the blood tie contained in the term as well as the contexts in which it has been used. The membership of the *ñātaka* group on the other hand has been explicitly defined in the text and the definition indicates the bilineality.

In this connection we may note that there is no separate term for the affinal group, although a number of affines are separately mentioned, as can be seen from the inter-personal relationships outlined at the beginning of this chapter. This does not necessarily mean that the affines outside the family group, i.e., with the spouse's parents and siblings, were rarely or never recognised. Though, of the many possible affines, we find only two mentioned in the texts. The first is in connection with an encounter between Anāthapiṇḍika, the *seṭṭhi* of Sāvatti, and his sister's husband, when the former goes to Rājagaha.²⁷⁸ The second one is when an ex-courtesan goes to plead on behalf of her daughter, married at a long distance, with the latter's husband's parents.²⁷⁹ Another set of relatives are the mother's brother (*mātula*) and his wife (*mātulāni*). According to a strict interpretation of the term *ñātaka*, the mother's brother and his wife stand outside the group. Whatever their position, it must be remembered that in almost all societies which make an extensive use of kinship organization, the mother's brother and his wife occupy a special position. That this is so, is seen from the instances of interpersonal relationship among the sister's son and mother's brother and his wife described above, especially the fact that sexual intercourse with the mother's brother's wife is classed as incest.²⁸⁰

~~Inter~~-group organisation:

We have already shown in some detail the*membership of the

kula and how it represents an extended family unit. It is then inevitable that the kula should also figure in the organization at the inter-group level (i.e. in social stratification). To start with, we may note some of the instances which illustrate the kula as a unit of inter-action at a group level.

One such instance is when the brāhmaṇa Lohicca requests the monk Kaccāna to visit the Lohicca's family (*Lohicca kulam*) as the latter visits the upāsaka's families (*upāsaka kulāni*) of the Makkarakata village.²⁸¹ Another instance is that of a horse-trainer who destroys an untrainable horse lest his teacher's family (*ācariyakula*) should lose status²⁸² (*avaṇṇo ahoṣiti*, literally means become without *vaṇṇa*). A third instance is when the junior member of an ancient family (*porāṇakulaputta*) is described as having lost status²⁸³ (*khīṇa koliṇṇam*, literally weakened quality of kula). In the fourth instance the parents desire a son to be born in the family (*kule jāyamānam*) so that he may establish the family line permanently²⁸⁴ (*kulavamso ciraṃ thapassati*). In the fifth instance we find various reasons given why the kula "having attained great possessions does not maintain wealth in permanence (*kulāni bhogesu mahantam pattāni na ciraṃ ṭhakānam bhavanti*)."²⁸⁵ We need hardly point out that in all these instances the different kulas are thought of as units and that in each case we may infer a preoccupation (however vague) with status or prestige. •

There are a number of ways in which the kula figures as a unit in the system of stratification of the Buddhist society. One such way is when the term is used in conjunction with the basic conceptional (sometimes also real) social groups such as the brāhmaṇa, khattiya, vessa, sudda, gahapati, and so on. Thus we find the following statement: "there are four kulas, they are khattiya, brāhmaṇa, vessa, sudda" (*kulā nāma, cattāri kulāni*).²⁸⁶ In another instance those who are born in high kula (*uccakala pacchājāto*), are identified as the khattiya, brāhmaṇa and gahapati, and described as being bright (*joti hoti*) but likely to go into darkness (*tamo parāyaṇo*) or brightness (*joti parāyaṇo*). Those born in low kula (*nīca kula pacchājāto*) are the *caṇḍāla*, *nesāda*, *yeṇa*, *rathakāra*, and *pukkusaka*, who are in darkness (*tamo hoti*) but likely to go into darkness or brightness.²⁸⁷ In the third instance the Buddha refers to the khattiyakula, brāhmaṇakula, and rājāññakula and contrasts them with caṇḍalakula, nesādakula, yeṇakula, rathakāra-

kula, and pukkusaka kula.²⁸⁸ Ekusāri, the brāhmaṇa claiming the superiority of his class refers to their kula and maintains that everyone, i.e. the khattiya, vessa and sudda should serve the brāhmaṇa.²⁸⁹

The brāhmaṇakula seems to be of special importance. Thus, the Buddha in his conversation with the brāhmaṇa Vāseṭṭha refers to the latter as being born of a brāhmaṇa (*brāhmaṇa jaccā*) belonging to a brāhmaṇa (*brāhmaṇa kulino*) going from a brāhmaṇa kula house to houselessness (*brāhmaṇakulam agāram anāgaāriyam pabbajito*).²⁹⁰

On another occasion a group of nuns passing through a village in Kosala Janapada is described as approaching a brāhmaṇakula, i.e. the house of a brāhmaṇa.²⁹¹ In another instance the Buddha refers to brāhmaṇakula whilst enquiring about the “*paccārohaṇa*” ceremony of the brāhmaṇa.²⁹² When others come to know of the low ancestry of the brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha they call him ill-born (*dujāto*), not a junior member of the kula (*akulaputto*) but the son of a slave mother (*dāsiputto*).²⁹³ The brāhmaṇa Pokkharasādi addresses the Buddha as “the son of *Sākyas*” (*Sakyaputto*), one who has left the *Sākya* kula (*Sakyakula pabbajito*).²⁹⁴ Elsewhere the Buddha is referred to similarly.²⁹⁵

All these instances go to show that Kula affiliation was more important to the brāhmaṇa and those of the high status; those of low status were imputed kula affiliation in order to assert their status rather than to express their unity.

In the above instances the Kulas are identified through their affiliation with the larger social groupings, such as the khattiya, brāhmaṇa, vessa, sudda, *gahapati*, *rājañña*, *caṇḍāla*, *nesāda*, *veṇa*, *rathakāra*, and *pukkusaka*. Although some of these groups overlap each other, and others such as *rājaññas* are a category, the aim is to categorise the kula into them and assign them either high or low status. Our interest lies in the fact that it is not the individual but the kula which is the unit of reckoning.

The term kula of high status (*uccakula*) is also used in order to indicate the economic status of the family. Thus, we find that the Buddha is referred to as belonging to a kula of high status (*uccākulā*), which is resolved gradually into (I) prime khattiya kula (*ādina khattiyakulā*), (II) rich kula (*addha kulā*). *Addha* kula is, however, resolved into great riches and great for-

tunes (*mahaddhanā mahā bhogā*).²⁹⁶ On one occasion the Buddha talks about men from (I) kula of high status (*uccā kulā*), (II) great kula (*mahā kulā*), (III) kula of great riches (*mahābhoga kulā*) and (IV) kula which is extremely wealthy (*uḷarabhoga kulā*).²⁹⁷ On another occasion the kulas of high status (*uccākulāni*) are resolved into prosperous (*mahāsāla*) khattiya kula, brāhmaṇa kula, and *gahapati* kula.²⁹⁸ In this reference, prosperity is obviously associated with membership of the three social groups with high status, viz. khattiya, brāhmaṇa and *gahapati*.

That the high status of the kula and the individual belonging to it is correlated to the fact of birth is clear from the following examples. The Buddha apparently not liking the brāhmaṇa Sundarika's enquiry as regards his origin says, "Do not ask of the origin (*jāti*), ask of the behaviour. Just as fire can be born out of any wood, so can a saint be born in a kula of low status (*mā jātim puccha caravaṇca puccha kaṭṭhā have jāyati jātavedo; nīcākulino pi munī dhitimā*)."²⁹⁹ The famous saying, "not by birth one becomes a brāhmaṇa but by deed (*na jaccāhoti brāhmaṇo. . . . kammuno hoti brāhmaṇo*)" expresses a similar attitude. The Buddha gives explanation as to why some human beings belong to low families (*nīcākulino hoti*) and some to high families (*uccākulino hoti*). He says that a woman or a man who is callous (*thaddho*) conceited (*atimānī*) and who does not respect and honour, wherever the honour and respect is due, is born after death in a low family. Whereas a woman or a man who behaves properly by doing exactly the contrary to what is stated in the case of a behaviour of a low born, is born in a high family.³⁰⁰ However, the fact that a person is born in a low family may not hinder his spiritual growth. Thus here the Buddha refutes that *jāti* affiliation was of any ultimate importance. On the other hand the brāhmaṇa³⁰¹ Soṇadanda describes his sister's son, Aṅgaka as well born (*sujāto*). We have already seen how the brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha is found to be of low status (*dujāto*).³⁰² That the origin is recognised from both the parents is apparent when a well known brāhmaṇa or the Buddha is described as born well from both the sides, mother's as well as father's (*ubhato sujāto mātito ca pitito*).³⁰³ This leads us to the general issue of status ascribed on account of the birth ~~of a~~ particular social group.

Jāti:

Jāti is only one of the several concepts found in the texts which ascribe status on account of birth. Like the kula, jāti is also resolved into khattiya, brāhmaṇa, vessa and sudda groups.³⁰⁴ The *Vinaya* elsewhere states that there are two jātis: the low jāti (*hīnā jāti*) and the excellent jāti (*ukkhaṇṇā jāti*). The low jāti are, *caṇḍāla jāti*, basketmaker jāti (*veṇa jāti*), hunter jāti (*nesāda jāti*), charioteer jāti (*ukkhaṇṇā jāti*), and sweeper jāti (*pukkusa jāti*). The excellent jāti are the khattiya and the brāhmaṇa.³⁰⁵ On another occasion also there are said to be two jāti, the high (*ucca*) and the low (*nīca*), and they are resolved into the khattiya-brāhmaṇa and *vessa*, *sudda*, *caṇḍāla* and *pukkusa jāti* respectively.³⁰⁶ The third grouping based on jāti is attributed by the Buddha to his contemporary Pūraṇa Kassapa. According to Pūraṇa Kassapa there are six jātis. The first one is the black jāti (*kaṇhābhi jāti*) and consists of mutton butchers (*orabbhikā*), pork butchers (*sūkarikā*), fowlers (*sākuṇikā*), hunters (*māgavikā*), violent men (*luddhā*), fishermen (*macchaghātakā*), robbers (*corā*), robber-killers (*coraghātakā*), jailers (*bandhanāgārikā*) and all who follow a bloody trade (*kurūrakammantā*). The blue jāti (*nīlābhi jāti*) consists of: *bhikkhus* who live as though with a thorn in the side (*kaṇḍakavuttikā*) and all other who profess the deed and doing theory (*kammavadakiriyavada*). The red jāti (*lohitabhi jāti*) include the Jains with one cloth (*nigaṇṇihā ekasāṇakā*). The yellow jāti (*haliddābhi jāti*) consists of white robed householders (*gihī odātavasanā*) and followers of naked ascetics (*acelakasāvaka*). Ājīvakas and their followers are the white jāti (*sukkābhi jāti*). The purest white jāti consists of the Ājīvaka leaders, Nanda Vaccha, Kisa Saṅkicca and Makkhali Gosāla.³⁰⁷ The Buddha, however, refutes the six-fold groupings made by Pūraṇa Kassapa and maintains that there are two jātis, the black and the white. Even these are decided by birth since the black jāti may breed a black one or white one and white jāti may do the same. On another occasion the Buddha denies that any reference can be made to the theory of jāti (*jātivāda*) when supreme perfection in wisdom and righteousness are being considered. The Buddha says, *jātivāda*, *gottavāda*, *mānavāda* theories of jāti, gotta, and māna (prestige) which says you are held as worthy as I, you are not held as worthy as I, it is only in marriage (*āvāha-*

vivāha) that a reference is made to such matters.³⁰⁸ On another occasion the text states that a king would enlist as bowmen the *khattiyakumāra*, *brāhmaṇakumāra*, *vessakumāra*, and *suddakumāra*, irrespective of their birth (*jāti*).³⁰⁹

The grouping made through the use of the concept of *jāti* is interesting in many ways. Firstly, it recognises the two-fold division of the society, the low and high, the low and excellent, and the black and white. Even the Buddha accepts the last division though he uses it to refute the concept of *jāti* in the matters of spiritual attainments. In doing so the Buddha expressly recognises the operation of *jāti-gotta* and *māna* in social interaction. Pūraṇa Kassapa on the other hand is obviously interested in conceptualising the existing divisions (groups and categories) within the society based on occupation, trade, caste and sect affiliations. He is in that sense a forerunner of Manu. The textual resolution of the low *jāti* into occupational groups starting with *caṇḍāla* and ending with *pukkusaka* should be taken to indicate an order of lowness in which *caṇḍāla* is the lowest and *pukkusaka* is the highest.³¹⁰ We may also point out that *jāti* was sometimes used as an identification in conjunction with other criteria such as name, *gotta* and *manta* (vedic learning) in the case of a *brāhmaṇa*.³¹¹ The Buddha on one occasion has been identified with the Sākya *jāti* by the *brāhmaṇa* Ambaṭṭha.³¹² Suṇḍarika *brāhmaṇa* asks the *jāti* of the Buddha not recognising him at first. The Buddha answers that he is of Sākya *jāti*.³¹³ That both sides, the mother's and father's, are important, is illustrated from Soṇadaṇḍa *brāhmaṇa*'s claim, that his sister's son is born well on both sides,³¹⁴ and Ambaṭṭha's stigmatisation as *dāsi putta*.³¹⁵ The Buddha as well as the well known *brāhmaṇas* such as Soṇadaṇḍa, Kūṭadanta, Canki are described among other things as "born well on both sides" and recognised according to the theory of *jāti* (*anupakkuṃho jātivādena*) literally meaning not ignored by the theory of *jāti*.³¹⁶

Gotta

Gotta has been used mainly as a diacritical mark (i.e. for the purpose of identification). Thus a *brāhmaṇa* woman is described as belonging to Veracchāni.³¹⁷ Aṅgulimāla, the robber who turned a monk, claims that he is of Gaggeya *gotta* by his father and of

Mantāni gotta by his mother.³¹⁸ A man who sees a beautiful country woman (*janapada kalyāṇī*) should enquire of her gotta among other matters.³¹⁹ A man shot by a poisoned arrow insists on knowing the identity of the bowman and enquires of his gotta among other things.³²⁰ As we have already seen, a man remembering his previous births comes to know of his earlier gotta.³²¹ Ambaṭṭha who is thought to be of Kaṇhāyana gotta is found to be *dāsiputta* of the Sākyas, when he follows the name and gotta of his ancestors (*mātāpettikam nāmagottam anuśarato*).³²² Other gottas mentioned specifically are Bhāradvāja,³²³ Kassapa,³²⁴ Ākāsa.³²⁵ The Buddha acknowledges himself to be of Gotama gotta.³²⁶ Sometimes gotta name is preferred to the first name of a person when he is addressed. Thus, brāhmaṇa Saṅgārava, is addressed by the Buddha as Bhāradvāja.³²⁷ Buddha addresses his father Suddhodana as Gotama.³²⁸ The gotta in this sense (from the above cases) denotes lineage affiliation.

However, the text maintains that gotta affiliation is rendered valueless in spiritual affairs. Thus it says, "The mortals are purified by deeds, knowledge and dhamma, not by gotta or wealth."³²⁹ On another occasion it is said, "As rivers lose their name and gotta when reaching the ocean, so the four vaṇṇas, lose their name and gotta when they accept dhamma and join the order; they are known as *samaṇa sākyaputtiyās*."³³⁰ Thus, the gotta is used in the sense of a diacritical mark here. On becoming monks persons lose their lineage affiliation and acquire a new one.³³¹

However, gotta is also used to indicate status. Thus, the *Vinaya* states, "There are two gottas, the low (*hīna*) and the excellent one (*ukkaṭṭa*). Kosiya gotta and Bhāradvāja gotta, are low in this *janapada*; Gotama, Moggallāna, Kaccāna, Vāseṭṭha are high."³³² The implications of the gotta and its brāhmaṇic influence has been discussed elsewhere.³³³

The *Vinaya* definition follows immediately after the definition of *jāti*³³⁴ and hence it is not difficult to see why gotta has been categorised into high and low. However, as we see, even the text recognises the impossibility of using gotta in the two-fold division and hence limits the observation to "this *janapada*" (presumably meaning *majjhima janapada*).³³⁵ We may safely conclude that though gotta, through indication of lineage affiliation does carry status and prestige with it, it does not reinforce the two-fold stratification of

society into high and low. It is also significant that there are almost no references to the affiliation of the low group. Presumably they did not possess one. The only exception is *Angulimāla*. But he is not only a robber but also a *brāhmaṇa*. Moreover, there is something of the prodigal son returning home in him.³³⁶

The Vaṇṇa:

Like *jāti* and *gotta*, the *vaṇṇa* too has been used as a diacritical mark. A description of true *brāhmaṇa* contains a reference to his *vaṇṇa*.³³⁷ The monk who remembers his previous births also remembers his *vaṇṇa*.³³⁸ A man desires a beautiful woman (*jana-pada kalyāṇī*), but cultivates an imaginary interest in her without, however, knowing about her *vaṇṇa*, that is whether she is of black (*kāḷo*), brown (*sāmo*) or pale (*maṅguṇo*) complexion (*vaṇṇa*).³³⁹ The man shot down by the poisoned arrow inquiring about the identity of his assailant wants to know, among other things, whether he is of black, brown or pale *vaṇṇa*.³⁴⁰ In a guest house (*āgantukāgāre*) the people, namely *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, *vessa* and *sudda*, come from four directions and take up their residence there.³⁴¹

The term *vaṇṇa* has also been used to indicate the four-fold division of the society. It is often stated that there are four *vaṇṇas* and they are *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, *vessa*, *sudda*.³⁴² In conversation with the Buddha, Rājā Pasenadi asks, "I am asking about a future state. There are four *vaṇṇas*, *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, *vessa*, *sudda*, and they are possessed of five qualities of striving. Now, Lord (the Buddha), could there be any distinction, any difference between the four *vaṇṇas*." The Buddha answers through a simile, "It is as if there may be among elephants, horses, or oxen to be tamed, two elephants, two horses or two oxen that are well trained and well tamed, and two of each that are not tamed and trained. What do you think about this? Would these two elephants, horses and oxen that are to be tamed, when so tamed and trained, reach the tamed state? Would they attain a tamed rank?"³⁴³ The Buddha explains to the King Ajātasattu that there are four *vaṇṇas*, *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, *vessa* and *sudda*. Among these the *khattiya* and the *brāhmaṇa* are pointed to as chief; that is to say in the way of addressing them, rising up from one's seat for them, saluting them with joined palms and rendering them service.³⁴⁴ It is clear that the

Buddha like the text recognises the four-fold division, which is real and yet through his simile, professes an eventual extinction of it, when the lower *vaṇṇa* (presumably) will reach the standards of the higher, through the five qualities of striving. That the Buddha accepts the four-fold division is clear from another instance. The *brāhmaṇas* of *Sāvattthi* hear of the Buddha that "Gotama teaches the purity of four-fold *vaṇṇa* (*gotamo cātuvāṇṇim suddhim paññāpeti*) and these *brāhmaṇas* come to verify this statement.³⁴⁵ On another occasion the Buddha in describing his dreams says that four birds of different *vaṇṇa* come from four directions and sit at his feet; likewise the monks from four *vaṇṇas*, *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, *vessa*, *sudda*, come within his fold.³⁴⁶ When a man joins the Buddhist order, he becomes without a *vaṇṇa* (*vevaṇṇiyanti*).³⁴⁷ A *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, *vessa* and *sudda*, if he exerts himself may attain the supreme purity.³⁴⁸

There are instances where the term *vaṇṇa* is absent, though the four-fold division on the society into *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, *vessa*, *sudda* group often occurs. We have referred to some of these before, and we refer to further cases here. Thus we find that a man who gives gifts to a *samaṇa*-*brāhmaṇa* in the hope of some return concentrates (so that he may obtain them) on wealthy *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, and *gahapati* (*khattiya mahāsāla*, *brāhmaṇa mahāsāla* and *gahapati mahāsāla*).³⁴⁹ While instructing the monks, *Sāriputta* tells them that during their wanderings in various *janapadas*, they are likely to be asked questions by *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, *gahapati*, and *samaṇa* scholars (*paṇḍita*).³⁵⁰ King *Pasenadi* complains to the Buddha that as a judge he saw a wealthy *khattiyas*, *brāhmaṇas* and *gahapatis* (*khattiya mahāsāla*, *brāhmaṇa mahāsāla* and *gahapati mahāsāla*) deliberately lying in order to fulfil wordly desires.³⁵¹ Queen *Mallika* says to the Buddha that in the *rājas* family (*rājakula*) there are *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa* and *gahapati* maidens (*kaññā*) and over them she holds supremacy (*issarādhīpaccam kareṃ*).³⁵² Elsewhere a *khattiya* is described as one whose aim is wealth, quest is wisdom, resolve is power, ideal is domination, want is territory. The *brāhmaṇa* is one whose aim is wealth, quest is wisdom, resolve is Vedic learning, ideal is sacrifice and want is the fruit of sacrifice. The *gahapati* is one whose aim is wealth, quest is wisdom, resolve is craft and want is the fruit of work (*kammantopuyoja*, enterprise).³⁵³ Whereas there are four *vaṇṇas* there are eight assem-

blies (*parisā*). They are *khattiya parisā*, *brāhmaṇa*, *gahapati*, *samaṇa*, *cātumahārāja* (four divine kings), *tāvatisa* gods (thirty three gods), *māra*, and the assembly of the *Brāhmā* gods.³⁵⁴

From the above instances and those throughout the chapter, it is apparent that the four-fold division of society into *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, *vessa*, *sudda* group is sometimes replaced by a three-fold one consisting of *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa* and *gahapati*.

Ñāti:

We argue that *ñāti* or extended kin-group functions as an effective caste and in that sense, therefore, is nearer to the modern sub-caste.

The Buddha gives a special permission to former members of another sect (*aññatitthiyo pubbo*) who are *sākyas* by birth (*jātiyāsākiya*), because they are the same *ñāti* as Buddha.³⁵⁵ For others, however, there is a probationary period. When the Buddha died, remains of his body (*sarira bhāga*) were claimed by the Licchavis of Vesāli, the Koliyas of Rāmagāma, the Mallas of Pāvā, the Bullis of Allakappa and the Moriyas of Pippalivana, on the ground that they were *khattiyas* and the Buddha was also a *khattiya*. Ajātasattu of Magadha claimed the body on the ground that he was a *khattiya* and the Buddha was also a *khattiya*. It is claimed by the *brāhmaṇa* of Veṭṭhadipa on the ground that he was a *brāhmaṇa* whereas the Buddha was a *khattiya*. But the Sakkas of Kapilavatthu claimed it on the ground that the Buddha was the greatest one in their *ñāti* (*amhākaṃ ñātiseṭṭho*).³⁵⁶ The monk Sudinna during the famine goes from Vajjian territory to Vesāli so that he may get alms-food from his *ñāti*, and by giving food his *ñāti* may achieve merit. Roja Malla says to Ānanda, "I am not impressed by the Buddha, *Dhamma* or *saṃgha*, but a rule was made among the *ñāti* (*ñātihi saṃgaro kato*) that whosoever does not go to meet the Buddha will be fined five hundred (coins). It is due to fear of punishment from *ñātis* (*ñātiṃ dāḍabhayār*) that I go."³⁵⁷ Among the four kinds of losses which cause renunciation, loss of *ñāti* (*ñātipārijuññaṃ*) is one. The loss of *ñāti* is further explained as reduction in the *ñātakas* (*ñātakā anupubbena parikkhayaṃ gacchanti*).³⁵⁸ A man of low character lies when he is asked to go as a witness before a meeting (*sabhāgato*), an assembly (*parisagato*), *ñāti* (*ñāti majjha*

gato), a royal family (*rājakulamajjhagato*).³⁵⁹ The brāhmaṇa Sona-dāṇḍa refers to the Buddha as "the samāṇa Gotama who has left his home after giving up a great *ñāti* group (*mahantam ñātisaṃgham ohāya pabbajito*)."³⁶⁰ The *gahapati*, *gahapatiputta* or others leave home after giving up a small or great circle of *ñātis* (*appam vā ñātiparivaṣṣam pahāya, mahantam vā ñātiparivaṣṣam pahāya pabbajito hoti*).³⁶¹ A woman (*itthi*) is protected by *ñāti*, among others. Here the text explains that it is the *ñātakas* who protect her.³⁶² The Buddha, if he becomes a householder he will be a king who will have abundance of wealth and corn, land and property fourfooted animals, strong and able *ñātis*.³⁶³ There are five losses (*vyasanāni*) among which the loss of *ñāti* and of wealth are given precedence over the others.³⁶⁴

The powers of a respectable woman (*mātugāma*) are the power of beauty (*rūpabalam*), of wealth (*bhogabalam*), of *ñāti* (*ñātibalām*) of having a son (*puttabalam*) and of chastity (*silabalam*).³⁶⁵ A man with faith (*ariyasāvaka*) who obtains riches through work and diligence must give five shares (*balis*). These are shares to *ñāti* (*ñātibalim*), to a guest (*atithi balim*), to ancestors (*pubbapettabalim*), to the king (*rājabalim*) and to the gods (*deva balim*).³⁶⁶ Among the various topics prohibited to a monk is the gossip about *ñāti* (*ñātikathā*).³⁶⁷ The man whose limbs have been cut off is surrounded by his *ñātaka* in the house belonging to the *ñāti* (*ñātighare ... ñātakehi saṃparikinno hoti*).³⁶⁸ When the monk Sudinna goes to his own village, his *ñātidāsi* sees him and reports the matter to his mother.³⁶⁹

The term *ñāti* is sometimes used in conjunction with *kula* (family) as can be seen from the following instances. The *gahapati* Ugga of Vesālī permits his wives to go to their *ñāti-kula* if they so desire.³⁷⁰ Likewise, the brāhmaṇa Mahāgovinda permits his forty wives to go to *ñātikula* and seek another husband (*ñātikulāni gacchantu, aññam bhattāram pariyesatu*).³⁷¹ When a monk of Rājagaha arrives after a long time to his *ñātikula*, people say, "At last the reverend has come, keep the meal ready."³⁷² The monks rejected by the brāhmaṇa go to their *ñātikula* even after they are satisfied by him, some of them with alms bowl to beg food.³⁷³ A nun, a pupil of Bhadda Kāpilāni, who quarrels with nuns, goes to her *ñāti kula* in a village (*gāmakam ñātikulam āgamasi*).³⁷⁴

At this stage, it would be useful to point out the significance

of various usages of the term *ñāti* mentioned above and at the same time compare *ñāti* with the modern concept of caste. Thus we can see from the above usages that when the term *ñāti* has been used by itself, it denotes like the modern caste a social group. At other times it is coupled with the terms such as *saṃgha* or *parivaṇṇa* (circle) which themselves indicate grouping. It is significant that *Sakya-jāti* (those born of Sakka) are the same *ñāti* as the Buddha who is also born a Sākya. The Buddha, instead of disregarding this affiliation (as he does in the case of other conceptual or "status imputing" groups such as *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa* and *sudda* or high and low, low and excellent, *jāti*, *vaṇṇa* or *gotta*) specifically recognises it in rules of recruitment in the *saṃgha*. The Buddha is acknowledged by the Sākyaas of Kapilavatthu as their *ñātiseṇṇho*, whereas the other extended kin-groups (ruling) claimed identification with Buddha on the grounds of their common *khattiya* origin. This shows that *ñāti* is a smaller group than the *jāti* or *vaṇṇa* groups which are normally mentioned as *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, *vessa*, *sudda*, or as *khattiya brāhmaṇa* and *gahapati*. It is also significant to note that the term *ñāti* is not used to indicate status. There is no arrangement of *ñāti* in the same manner as in *jāti*. The last is due to the fact that where a status is associated with social functions, there is an absence of a general caste system in the modern sense.

Like the modern caste *ñāti* may take evidence, make rules and impose punishment in the form of a fine. A man must offer a share to the *ñāti* when he obtains wealth. The loss of *ñāti* is serious and may lead to renunciation. A woman may rely on her *ñāti* and consider it a power. A nun may go to *ñāti* on account of a quarrel. A monk may resort to it at the time of a famine. Women on being forsaken by their husbands can go back to their *ñāti* families. And the people welcome a monk of their *ñāti* with food. The monks have to be prohibited from gossip about *ñāti*, (*ñātikathā*).³⁷⁵

There is no direct reference as to the composition of the *ñāti* group. But the use of the term in conjunction with the term *kula* suggests that it possibly consisted of a number of *kulas*. In the term *ñāti-kula*, *ñāti* is used as an adjective qualifying *kula*. The intention of such a use is clear; it seeks to point only to a certain *kula*, not one's own, from which help may be sought.

In one of the instances mentioned above, *ñāti* is resolved into

ñātaka, to bilineage. Buddhaghosa³⁷⁶ defines *ñāti* as the spouse's parents (i.e. affines). But in view of the above illustrations, Buddhaghosa's explanation does not stand. The text as well as the Buddha are in clear agreement that *ñāti* is a kinship group, equated with *ñātaka* by text, with affines by Buddhaghosa. To take the textual explanation as correct, would mean the existence of two terms for the same real (as opposed to conceptual) group, which is not a very tenable situation. The only way out is to accept that Buddhaghosa by indicating affines sought to show that the *ñāti* group was larger than *ñātaka* and also included the affines. In such a case, we are not confronted with the existence of two terms for one real group. The text would be right in having two terms especially as we have shown that *ñātaka* obviates the necessity of a separate term for affines. Buddhaghosa too would be partially justified in pointing out that the specific affines, the spouse's parents that are difficult to subsume under the term *ñātaka* are the *ñāti*. Thus Buddhaghosa's explanation is correct in so far as he sought to indicate a larger group than the *ñātaka*, wrong in so far as he limited *ñāti* to specific affines.

The equation of the Buddha's *ñāti* to Sākya in fact suggests, that although *ñāti* was a kinship group, it was larger than the sum total of actual kinship generally recognised under terms such as *ñātaka*, *ñātiṣālohita*, *kula* and so on.

The conceptual and real social groups:

It would be appropriate to discuss the general issues of the kinship groupings. This can be done by isolating and pointing to the real from the conceptual groups mentioned in the text. The reality of a group lies in the fact that such a group can be isolated on the basis of the functions it performs. Secondly, a real group is related to other such groups which are within the society. Thirdly, the actions of the members of a real group are governed by the knowledge of the membership of it. Conceptual ~~groups~~ are those which categorise the society in terms of some sociological criteria usually for the purpose of understanding the working of a society. They may or may not be real. In so far as they are not real, they will be categories rather than groups. The validity of categorisation will depend on the concept used. An elementary

use of concept of high and low in order to understand the stratification is an example in point.

We have found that the concepts of household, family, *ñātisālohita*, *ñātaka*, *vaṇṇa*, *jāti*, *gotta*, and *ñāti*, have been used in the text. The concept of household is chiefly expressed through the mention of relatives and quasi-relatives in given order. Sometimes the term *kuṇumba* also bears the meaning of household. The term for the family group is *kula* and its variations; *ñātisālohita*, *ñātaka* and *ñāti* are the larger kinship groups we have been able to discover. All these groups are real. In contrast *vaṇṇa* and *jāti* and its subdivisions are the concepts found in the text in relation to social stratification. It occurs where a status-position is claimed or denied because of it. We may conclude from this that the very claims and their denial suggest the absence of settled grouping in terms of *jāti* and *vaṇṇa*. The most we can claim about the reality of *jāti* and *vaṇṇa* is that they were the criteria in terms of which, high and low status was contested by an individual. As criteria of grouping we must deny their reality.

Conclusions:

1. Nature of the extended family:

From our study of the inter-personal relationships at the beginning of the chapter it is apparent that the family unit was larger than the nuclear family (man, wife and unmarried children). The extended family unit, as we would like to call it, consisted of a man and his mother-father, son, wife, son's wife, brothers, sisters and other dependent relatives. The household group on the other hand was even larger, and included slaves and household servants. It perhaps included friends and acquaintances, agricultural workers and their superintendents.

From the extensive use of the term *kula* and various meanings that we have been able to discern from its usage it is clear that there were no hard and fast divisions in day to day affairs between the family and the household group.

The family with which the literature deals in its kinship aspect was a patrilineal group with a head known as *kulapati* or *kula-jeyṭha*. The junior male members of the family were known by the

generic term *kulaputta*. Ideally the behaviour of the family members towards the head was marked by respect and obedience, and the head on his part exercised wisdom and authority.

The position of women in the family was definitely inferior to that of men. A woman was respectable only if she was protected by some one. She had her immediate relatives, her mother, father and husband as protectors. The residence on marriage was patrilocal.

Descent was patrilineal and so was inheritance. Only in one case do we find a sister's son preferred to one's own. However, from the importance attached to the *ñātaka* group, and also from certain specific references, the mother's lineage has some bearing on the social status of a person. In a ritual context on the other hand the family was a patrilineal unit. The evidence of ancestor worship and the extended nature of the family are sufficient to indicate this. Succession was also patrilineal.

The family was also an economic unit. As we shall see in the next chapter in the economic and non-kinship aspects, the head of the family was generally described as a *gahapati*. We shall also show that the term *gahapati* was not restricted to one caste but could apply to any householder in non-kinship and economic affairs.

2. Caste

We have mentioned that *ñāti* is the largest kinship group in the Buddhist society. However, the term, by itself and when it is used in conjunction with the term *kula*, fails to indicate any definable inter-actional relationship between it and the person concerned. The term is very much unlike *ñātaka* or *ñātisālohita*, both of which have been defined in the text directly or otherwise. Much as we may try we cannot arrive at any specific definition of the term *ñāti* in terms of actual kinship relationship. This leads us to believe that the term which is obviously a kinship term refers not to actual kinship relationships but to potential ones. This fits in with the idea of caste as we know it.

The presence of caste-like elements in Buddhist society, however, does not necessarily imply the presence of a developed caste system. By a caste system we mean a system of social stratification, in which caste was used as a unit of ranking. So far as we

can see, endogamy and commensality, the two fundamental characteristics of modern caste, are absent. Such evidence as we have, point to the fact that marriage with a non-*ñāti* was permissible outside caste especially when the two category-stratification was not violated thus, we find marriage between *khattiya* and *brāhmaṇa* mentioned without any strong disapproval. On the other hand when a *brāhmaṇa* is married to a *dāsi* there is a definite stigma attached to it.

3. *Social stratification:*

A number of systems of stratification have been used, of which *vaṇṇa* is one. To stress the obvious, it is based on the four categories, *khattiya*, *brāhmaṇa*, *vessa*, *sudda*. As we have seen, however, only the *brāhmaṇa* and *khattiya* are social groups in any true sense. The *vessa* and *sudda* categories are residual and cannot be identified with the real social groups.

From the evidence presented we can see that *vaṇṇa* is a two category system with *brāhmaṇa* and *khattiya* forming the upper category, and *vessa* and *sudda* forming the lower. The struggle for status was confined mainly to *khattiya* and *brāhmaṇa* groups. They form the two opposing sub-categories, each one aspiring for a ritually superior status. It seems that the *brāhmaṇa*s in fact do occupy a status superior to that of *khattiyas*, and the latter challenge it through the person of the Buddha and through their political power. We repeat that the *khattiya* is a category and at best a diacritical mark; the real social groups are the ruling extended kin-groups which bear this mark. The *vessas* and *suddas* form the lower category which do not participate in the *khattiya-brāhmaṇa* struggle for superior social status.

CHAPTER V

OCCUPATIONAL DIVISION

IN this chapter we examine some of the implications of the kinship system, which is described in the last chapter. Firstly, we attempted to demonstrate the fact that kinship plays a vital part in the ordering of social relationships in the Buddhist society. Secondly, we showed that the extended family is an important social group within the kinship system. We may, therefore, expect with some justification that kinship relationships and particularly the family, influence the ordering of economic relationships. That this is so, we demonstrated partly in the last chapter by stressing the mutual economic obligations of the relatives and by pointing out that the family was both a consuming and property-holding unit. In this chapter, however, we shall be mainly concerned with productive and distributive activities and, therefore, will attempt to find out whether the family operates as a group in these economic activities as well, and if so how. We shall deal with this in due course. For the moment we turn to the immediate task of ascertaining the nature of productive and distributive activities and how they are organised. We shall describe these activities and consider how many of them are organised as occupations. It is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory definition of occupation but we may define it for our purpose as a set of activities designed to produce a livelihood. But in deciding whether or not an activity (or a set of activities) may be called an occupation, we shall use the following criteria. Firstly we shall ascertain the specialisation involved in it. Such specialisation usually involves the acquisition of skill or of a period of apprenticeship. But it may also be based on the possession of the appropriate ritual or social status by the person who engages in it. This status may again be achievable or ascribed. Secondly, we shall consider whether a number of separately mentioned activities, which are similar in other respects (though not identical) and carry the same ritual and social connotations, can in fact be grouped under a single occupational

lable or not. This would be useful, especially where the prolificity of terms indicating activities denotes variety in material culture but not so much in the social organisation. For example, *ambapālaka* (keeper of a mango orchard) and *jambupālaka* (keeper of a rose-apple orchard) mentioned in one single social context do not enhance our knowledge even if we differentiate between *Amba* and *Jambu*. In such cases, it would indeed be more sensible to group both together and call it one occupation. What we are concerned with in our analysis is not so much the variety of fruits as with the social position of the *pālakas* (the keepers) of fruit orchards vis-à-vis other occupations.

A variety of productive and distributive activities is mentioned in the texts through the descriptive terms which refer to the men engaged in such activities. For example, pottery as an activity is shown through the term *kumbhakāra*. Our task is then made simple if we make a list of such terms and proceed with their material and socio-economic implications through examining the various contexts in which they occur. We shall call these "activity-denoting" terms occupations. But those terms which do not add to our knowledge in the socio-economic context, we shall group under one generic occupation and deal with as such.

Of the variety of such occupations, food producing (i.e. *kasi-gorukkha*) and trading (*vāṇijja*) are more or less open to all. But as they need to be dealt with in some detail, we shall turn to them later. For the moment, we deal with the other terms.

The most important of the terms concerned with occupations is *sippa*. It is sometimes translated as craft.¹ That the term is a generic one can be seen from its use in the instance where a brāhmaṇa living by various crafts (*puthusippena*) is called a *sippiko*.² In another place *sippas* are divided into high and low. The high *sippas* are specified as counting coins (*muddā*), accounting *gaṇānā* and writing (*lekhā*); the low ones are those of the (*cam-makāra*) leatherworker, the reed-worker (*naḷakāra*), the potter (*kumbhakāra*), the tailor (*pesakāra*) and the barber (*nahāpita*).³ Also Jivaka in desiring to learn a *sippa* chooses medicine.⁴ In yet another context a low caste acrobat, while talking to his assistant (*antevāsi*), calls their activity a *sippa*.⁵ With reference to this, farming and cattle rearing (*kasi, gorakkhā*) and trading (*vāṇijjā*) are referred to as vocations (*kammam*).⁶ In yet another place

sippa is differentiated from farming (*kasiyā*), trading (*vaṇijjāya*), cattle-rearing (*gorakkhena*), bowmanship (*issitthena*), the king's service (*rājaporisena*) and mendicacy (*bhikkhācariyāya*).⁷ It is clear, therefore, that the term denotes what may be called professions, manufacturing crafts such as those of the potter and reed-worker, the service crafts such as that of the barber, and lastly entertaining, which is better described as an art. In our opinion, therefore, *sippa* is a term which covers both manual and non-manual skills and hence is a more inclusive term than craft when craft is used to denote a manual skill only. We may, therefore, translate it as occupation. But in doing so we must also remember that the texts do not necessarily always identify all occupations as *sippa*, and that there are some occupations at least which may not be identified as *sippa*.

Service occupations:

Seen in the above manner we find that the washerman-dyer (*rajaka*), the painter (*cittakāra*), the barber (*nahāpita*, *kappaka* *kasāvaṇṇa*), the tailor-weaver (*pesakāra*, *tantavāya*, *tuṇṇavāya*), and cook (*ālārīka*, *sūda*) are the persons who follow service occupations. The *rajaka* washes the clothes and returns them to the owner.⁸ He also dyes cloth, and perhaps paints on it as well.⁹ The *cittakāra* also paints but does so on well polished panels, walls and cloth.¹⁰ That of *nahāpita* (also known as *kappaka*, and *kasāvaṇṇa*) is perhaps the most recorded of the service occupations. His sons, who follow the same craft when he is old, go round the local community giving their services in exchange for food to be used in giving a meal to the Buddha and the monks.¹¹ He acts as a messenger for a brāhmaṇa.¹² When the Sākya youths go out of their country to join the order, he is their servant-companion and the recipient of the personal effects (*alaṃkāra*) of his masters.¹³ His occupation is listed as a low *sippa*¹⁴ and he is abused by angry nuns as lowborn (*nihīna-jacco*) and the remover of dirt (*malamajjano*).¹⁵ Yet his craft may not have been very low, because the brāhmaṇa Lohicca uses him as a messenger and even the king Makhadeva addresses him as *samma*,¹⁶ a term which denotes familiarity, instead of *bhane*, the term more appropriately used by a master for a servant. The fact that he is used as a messenger at all shows his role to be grea-

ter than denoted by his occupation. That this is so, can also be seen from the fact that he betrays king Dīghiti, who was at one time his master, to the king of Kasi, where he stays.¹⁷ On another occasion, he receives the gift of a village (*gāma varam*) from the legendary king Makhadeva for being his personal attendant.¹⁸

The occupation of a *pesakāra* is also described as low *sippa*.¹⁹ He is described as *tantavāya* and from the description of his activities he is a weaver.²⁰ In another place a *tunnavāya* or tailor is described as poor (*daliddo*) where he attempts to build a house for the monks without the proper material for building and without the proper guidance on how to build it.²¹ The cook (*sūda*) is seen in the king's service and receives payment (*vetana*), clothing (*acchādana*) and gratuity (*abhihāra*) for good service.²²

The last service occupation in our list is that of the *nahāpaka* or the bath attendant. We do not know much about him except the detailed description of his craft.²³ However, he has an assistant (*antevāsi*). This last point is of interest since this is in contrast to the *rajaka* and the *nahāpita* both of whom have *putta* working for or instead of them.

Artisans:

In the second category of occupations those of the artisans are, the reed-worker (*naḷakāra*), the potter (*kumbhakāra*), the vehicle-maker (*yānakāra*), the needle-maker (*sucikāra*), the goldsmith (*suvanṇakāra*), the metal smith (*kammāra*), the carpenter (*palagaṇḍa*), the ivory-worker (*dantakāra*), the garland-maker (*mālākāra*) and the silk manufacturer (*kosiyakāra*).

The *naḷakāra* is a basket-maker but is to be differentiated from another class of basket-maker, the *veṇa*. His craft is a *sippa*²⁴ albeit a low one.²⁵ Unlike the other artisans in the group, the *naḷakāras* have the distinction of living in their own settlement (*naḷakāra gāma*).²⁶ The story in which this is mentioned also puts forward the possibility of a *naḷakāra* who has never left his settlement. However, the meaning of this statement is not very clear. In another place a monk, committing suicide from the Gijjakūṭa peak near Rājagaha, accidentally falls on a *naḷakāra* and kills him.²⁷ It may be conjectured from all this that the *naḷakāra* families lived in their own settlements on the border of the cities. With their

need for collecting reeds from the forest they could hardly live in the middle of the other city population without creating a subsidiary occupation of reed-collecting. Of this, however, we find no mention. Our conjecture is, therefore, not unjustified.

The next craftsman is the potter (*kumbhakāra*) who is the most important of all the artisans. His craft consists of making earthenware on the banks of rivers and ponds.²⁸ The King Ajātasattu identifies the potter's activities as a *sippa*.²⁹ His occupation is a low *sippa*.³⁰ He is not a rich man and seems to live solely by his craft. This can be seen from the fact that the monks who take the gift of bowls from him reduce him to a position where his family and occupation³¹ (perhaps business) suffers. On the other hand his ritual position is not very low. Dhaniya Kumbhakāra is a monk³² and Ghatikāra Kumbhakāra is a faithful devotee of the Kassapa Buddha.³³ The Buddha Kassapa addresses him as *Bhaggava*, a term denoting gotta. Although he is poor and can offer only rice and curry he is held in deep affection by the Buddha Kassapa; so much so that the latter declines the king's invitation to spend the rainy season at his residence and prefers instead the Ghatikāra, the *kumbhakāra*'s meagre alms. The same *kumbhakāra* addresses a brāhmaṇa youth Jotipāla as *samma*, a term denoting familiarity. He pulls him by the waist and later by the hair when the latter is in a state of ritual purity. One explanation of this behaviour is that he is a favoured and religious devotee of the Buddha Kassapa and that he wants at all cost to convert Jotipāla in Buddha's faith. We believe, however, that such familiarity and flouting of brāhmaṇa ritual purity cannot be possible if the *Kumbhakāra* has a very low ritual position. What is more likely is that the *Kumbhakāra*'s ritual position, although low, is perhaps mitigated in some way either because of the antiquity of his craft or because of his historical importance. About this, however, we know nothing but the fact that he is the bearer of the gotta *Bhaggava* which is derived from the name of one of the ten *risis* mentioned in the text serially.³⁴ In the text Bhagu from which the *Bhaggava* gotta is derived is at the lower end of the series. But in the Vedic period he is associated with the *Āṅgirasa*.³⁵ In one place the Buddha is compared to an *Āṅgirasa*.³⁶ On another occasion the Buddha goes to stay in the *kumbhakāra*'s home. On this occasion the potter is referred to as *Bhaggava kumbhakāra* and

is so addressed.⁸⁷ King Dīghiti of Kāsi, when in hiding, seeks refuge in a *Kumbhakāra*'s house only to be betrayed by a barber.⁸⁸ The monk Dhaniya, who was formerly a *kumbhakāra*, is a man of patience. The women collecting reeds break his hut made of grass and sticks. When this happens he builds one made of earth. He is frustrated even in this effort because a monk may not kill germs in the process of kneading mud. At last he builds a hut made of wood. But even here, he involves himself in trouble with the king. He obtains cut wood from the king's store-keeper (*dārugahaganaka*) on the strength of the king's general proclamation that monks may take freely what is not privately owned. He is found misinterpreting the king's proclamation and goes unpunished only because he is a monk.⁸⁹

Of the vehicle-maker (*yānakāra*) we know very little except that he is shown as repairing a fellow of the wheel.⁴⁰ Instead of an *antevāsi*, which we find in other crafts, in this context, it is a *yānakāra putta*, who does the work.

The fourth artisan is the needle-maker (*sucikāra*)⁴¹ who is differentiated from the needle-vendor (*sucivāṇijja*). This apparently reflects the existence of some trading in needles. *Sucikāra* must also be differentiated from the needler (*sūcaka*) who presumably uses needles to goad the animals and consequently suffers in hell.⁴²

The next artisan is the metal-smith (*kammāra*). In one context, he is the person to whom a man finding a gold ring may go in order to check the worth of it.⁴³ He is thus equated with *suvanṇakāra*, the goldsmith. Cunda, who is a *kammāra-putta*, is a rich man owning a mango grove. It was at his place that the Buddha ate his last meal.⁴⁴ Cunda's opulence was not unnatural since his craft involved dealing in gold, the most prized metal at that time. In another place a bronze vessel (*kamsapāti*) is sold in a smith's shop.⁴⁵ He is also shown as a possessor of a family (*kammāra-kula*), a distinction which is usually reserved for a man of substance or status (except in cases where poverty and low status are contrasted with wealth and high social status).⁴⁶ The *palaganḍa* is a carpenter. Apart from the fact that he is so and that he has an assistant (*antevāsi*), we do not know anything about him.⁴⁷

The ivory-worker (*dantakāra*) is another craftsman who suffers because the monks take away too many needle cases from him.⁴⁸ Like the carpenter, he, too, has an assistant.⁴⁹

The garland-maker's (*mālākāra*) craft is described by the king as a *sippa*.⁵⁰ Whether he is an artisan in our sense is doubtful since the work of the flower-cutter (*pupphachandaka*) is described as low (*hīna kamma*).⁵¹ Of the last artisan manufacturer, the silk-worker (*kosiyakāra*), only the technique of worm rearing and silk making is indicated. He works against the ritual injunction not to kill in order to support his wife and children.⁵²

Professions:

For want of a better substitute, we may describe the next group of occupation as professions. Within this group are the occupations of the doctor of medicine (*vejja*, *bhisakka*) and surgery (*sallakata*), and the professions involving writing (*lekha*), accounting (*gaṇanā*) and money changing (*muddā* or *rupam*).

Of all the occupations, the doctor's profession appears to be socially valued the most. This may be seen from the frequent appreciative mention of activities of the doctor Jīvaka. He is the son of the courtesan Silāvatī and his paternity is unknown.⁵³ The monk Upāli formerly a barber, who later became an expert in *Vinaya*, and the doctor Jīvaka are two important persons in the Buddhist society whose status ascribed to them through low birth is not compatible with that achieved by them through their actions. But whereas the barber Upāli⁵⁴ is abused at times by the ignorant nuns, Jīvaka does not meet with even a trace of insult. On the contrary at one place he is specifically stated to be one who is "much liked by the people" (*puggalappasannānam*).⁵⁵ About Jīvaka's professional capacities we have a variety of material into which it is unnecessary to go in details.⁵⁶ He is not only the best doctor but also one of the chief Buddhist lay devotees⁵⁷ who uses his professional activities in order to convert people to the Buddhist way of life.⁵⁸ He is the king's physician⁵⁹ and a trusted friend of king Ajātasattu of Magadha.⁶⁰ It took him seven years of training and a visit to Taxila to become the good doctor that he was.⁶¹ In this connection it is noteworthy that seven years is the ideal period of training; for example, Dabbhā Mallaputta after seven years of training in the Buddhas doctrine (as a monk) becomes an arahat. The Buddha considers him fit to hold a responsible position, that of looking after the lodging and boarding of the

Buddhist monks.⁶² In contrast to this the pupil of nun Uppalānanda, spends seven years in mastering the Dhamma, but she could not remember it.⁶³ The only other doctor mentioned by name in the text apart from Jīvaka is Ākāsgotta *Vejja*, who performs a surgical operation on a monk. Unlike Jīvaka, he seems to be a brāhmaṇa. He is hostile and even insulting to the Buddha and addresses him in the style of all brāhmaṇas as *bho*.⁶⁴ The actual task of an ordinary *bhisakka* or *sallakata* or doctor of medicine or surgery, is described as that of removing poisoned arrows from the body.⁶⁵

Money changing and counting, accounting in general, and writing are identified positively as the only high *sippas* in the text.⁶⁶ In a society where intellectual occupations are necessarily the preserve of the few, who only can find the requisite opportunity and capacity, it is natural that such occupations are considered very high, if not the highest. It is for this reason that young Upāli's parents when planning their son's career think of writing (*lekha*), accounting (*gaṇanā*) and money-changing (*rupam*). Yet almost immediately they come to the conclusion that even these occupations, predominantly intellectual as they are, involve some physical pain for their young and delicate son. They choose monkhood for him only because they think it does not involve any mental hardships for him and provides all the essential physical comforts, or at least a guaranteed livelihood without manual work.⁶⁷ Whatever may be the wisdom of Upāli's parents in their choice of monkhood, there is no doubt that after it (though it is hardly a profession), they considered writing, accounting and dealing in money to be the best of professions.

The Entertainers:

The actor (*naṭa*), dancer (*naṭaka*), acrobat (*laṅghika*), magician (*sokaṭṭhāyika*), drummer (*kumbhathunika*), woman fortune-teller (*ikkhaṇṇikā*), courtesan (*gaṇikā*) and common prostitute (*vesī*) are the chief entertainers. The first four of the entertainers showed their arts mainly at fairs (*samāja*)⁶⁸ but also at other times and places as well.⁶⁹ Although they obviously lived on the spontaneous but conventional or perhaps traditionally prescribed remuneration for their acts from their audience, their position does not seem contemptible in Buddhist society. They have *gāman*'s to

look after their interests and who also preach the virtues of the *naṣas* profession. One such *gāmaṇi* asks the Buddha whether it is true that actors if they exert themselves in the performance will be reborn in the *deva* world.⁷⁰

A low caste entertainer (*caṇḍāla vamsika*) and his assistant (*antevāsi*),⁷¹ apparantly acrobats of a different type, seem to be poorer and socially more inferior. The term literally means born of the *caṇḍāla* lineage and if anything indicates extremely low ritual status. His art is the only one described. It did require some skill and apprenticeship, a fact which is shown by the presence of the assistant. It is a commonplace that at the lowest level of the social hierarchy, the sophisticated rules which differentiate social status in inter-personal behaviour seldom apply. It is perhaps for this reason that we find that the *caṇḍāla vamsika* and his assistant address each other as *sammā*, a term denoting familiarity which is used by two people of the equality of status.⁷² It may also be that the physical risk involved in their performance and their mutual interdependence during it may have engendered a feeling of equality.

The courtesan (*gaṇikā*) does not seem to be despised. They could become nuns.⁷³ An ex-courtesan (*purāṇa gaṇikā*) does not find great difficulty in getting her daughter married. In the marriage negotiations, she is addressed by her affines as *ayye* a term used for a respectable woman.⁷⁴ Ambapālī, the famous courtesan of Vesālī, is the pride of the city, so much so that the local council (*negama*) Rājagaha find Silāvatī in order not to fall behind in the reputation which the courtesan brings to a city.⁷⁵ Ambapālī is the first to invite the Buddha and the 1250 monks in his entourage for a meal and even refuses to relinquish that privilege in favour of Licchavis of Vesālī for all the wealth of the city. She is obviously rich and has her own chariot. She dedicates an *ārāma* for the order.⁷⁶ Yet she does not have an untarnished social status, for Licchavis in their verbal conflict with her over the privilege of being the first to invite the Buddha and his monks for a meal, address her as *je* a term which is used solely for a *dāsī*, a woman slave.⁷⁷ Moreover, however high it may be, she also has a price for her body; fifty coins for a night. Silāvatī, who is a mere shadow of the glamour of Ambapālī, has the misfortune of being pregnant. But she may not keep her child or even publicise the fact

of pregnancy and childbirth.⁷⁸ Hence she abandons her child. In a society where *Visākhā Migāramātā* receives her status and dignity through the presence of her many children and grandchildren, the social status and the glamour attaching to a courtesan seem a little hollow.⁷⁹

The common prostitute (*vesī*) by comparison is a more unsophisticated woman and forthright in her activities. When invited through a messenger to a picnic by men she refuses to go to them on the ground that she does not know what sort of men they are. "I am rich", she says, "and have many ornaments and, therefore, would not go out of the city to meet strangers."⁸⁰

In the ritual context, the fortune-teller (*ikkhanika*) is the most despised woman in Buddhist society. According to the texts she will go to hell because of her odious and despicable practices.⁸¹ And yet in fact her status may not have been so low. She may have been despised and yet respected overtly through the fear of the supernatural. But on this point we do not have any evidence.

The King's services:

Next we consider the various kinds of warriors who are employed in the king's service. These warrior servants are known symbolically through the art of bowmanship (*issithena*), and under the term *yodhājīva* which literally means those who live by fighting battles.⁸² Elsewhere they are referred in greater detail by the king Ajātasattu, who described their occupation as *sippa*. They are the elephant riders (*hatthārohā*), the cavalier (*assārohā*), the charioteer (*rathikā* as distinct from *rathakāra*), archers (*dhanuggahā*), standard bearers (*celakā*), billeting officers (*calakā*), supply corps (*piṇḍadāvikā*), fierce warriors (*uggā*), princes (*rājaputtā*), veteran warriors (*pukkhandino*), warriors brave as *nāgas* (*mahā-nagā*), the heroes (*surā*), warriors in buckskin (*cammayodhino*), and body disposers (*kāraṇikā*).⁸³ It also consisted of the chief of the army (*senāpati*)⁸⁴ and the four fold army (*caturang senā*).⁸⁵ That this extensive specialisation in warfare was necessary, can be seen from the accounts of several wars which we find in the text. In contrast to this there was perhaps an equal degree of specialisation in the king's civil administration. Those who were in the king's service were known as *rājaporisā*. This consisted among others

the king or the consecrated khattiya (*khattiya muddhāvasath*), the different ministers (*mahāmacca*), the territorial governors (*raṭṭhi-kas*), the estate holder managers (*pettanikas*), the royal chamberlain (*thūpati*), elephant trainer-rider (*hattiroha*), cavaliers (*assā-roha*), the horse trainers (*assadamaka*, *assadamaka sārathi*), the policemen (*rāja bhaṭṭa*), the gaoler (*bandhanāgārika*), the village head man (*gāma gāmaṇi*, *gāmaṇi*) the village overseer (*gāmika*), spies (*carū*), and the messengers (*dutā*), batmen (*khattā*), park-keepers (*ārāmikā*), the store keeper of wood used for the purpose of maintaining fortifications (*dārugaha gaṇaka*), the slaves and their families (*dāsa*, *dāsi*, *dāsakaputta*), personal messengers (*pessa*) and workers (*kammakārā*). Over and above these, there were often a number of service occupations such as the barber, the tailor, the cook and so on, who were in the king's employment.

The importance of the king in the economic sphere evidently lies in the fact that he is the largest single employer of the persons doing the greatest variety of jobs. He may have derived from this fact much of his political power and social prestige. A third important fact is that the king himself and many of his servants fulfilled the managerial and proprietary functions only in the processes of production. They may have provided some capital, but hardly contributed to non-managerial labour.

Coming back to the actual description of the king's servants we find that ministers (*mahāmaccas*) possess the highest degree of power. It is natural, therefore, that there is some division of labour among the ministerial group. In support of this we find that in the text the minister of justice (*voḥāramahāmacca*),⁸⁶ the treasurer (*gaṇaka mahāmatta*) and the minister of all affairs (*sabbhatthakam mahāmatta*)⁸⁷ are mentioned. They possess delegated authority and power, which are as strong as those of the king.

Kammikas, *gāmikas* and *rājabhaṭṭa* are the next important group since they interfere directly by influencing the economic activities. *Kammikas* act as customs officers. Thus a caravan from Rājagaha going south intends to evade the tax. *Kammikas* come to know of this plan and they infest the way, seize the caravan and confiscate it.⁸⁸ The tax collecting centres of the King have been referred to as situated in a mountain pass or at a fold in a river, or at the gate of a *gāma*.⁸⁹ The functions of a *gāmikā*, the overseer

of a village, is not specified but these seem to be important ones. He receives personal instructions from the King and seems to have been chosen from leading families. King Bimbisāra had 8,400 *gāmas* and *gāmikas* of equal number to whom he gives instructions.⁹⁰ Amongst those who receive instructions is Soṇa, a son of a *seṭṭhi*.⁹¹

The roads between the big cities were not unfrequented by highwaymen (*corā*). Even the monks who by their professions, follow a moneyless creed, are deprived of their goods and sometimes their lives.⁹² The road between Sāketa and Sāvatti is mentioned as being infested with highwaymen. *Rājabhāṣas* from Sāvatti catch them, return the stolen goods to the owners and even lead the robbers to execution.⁹³ The importance of *rājabhāṣas* is recognized by the Buddhist Saṃgha and it makes it an offence if one were to ordain them.⁹⁴ Although *rājabhāṣas* safeguard the property of the people, they are rough in dealing with them and are described as evil men (*dussile pāpadhamme*).⁹⁵ The profession of a *rājabhāṣa* does not seem to be low. We find a brāhmaṇa making his living as a *rājabhāṣa* (*nibbiṣṭharājabhāṣo*). However, he is angry at the behaviour of a nun who accidentally throws rubbish on his head with the result that he is prepared to set fire to the nunnery. This brāhmaṇa receives wages in cash from the king.⁹⁶

Trading and Commercial Activities:

Vaṇijja is a broader term for commercial or trading activities and is mentioned together with agriculture and cattle-keeping.⁹⁷ To earn money through trading was considered very natural. The impact of these activities in the society was felt even by the Buddha. Criticising certain religious mendicants on their mode of thinking the Buddha says that these maintain that they will be such and such in the next world. "It is as though a trader who has gone out trading (*vāṇijassa vāṇijjāya*) should think, 'I will have this from there, I will get this from there'.⁹⁸ In another instance, the monk Sāriputta sets before the Buddha the four probable outcomes for persons engaged in trade (*vaṇijjā payutta*). For some persons either it turns out to be a failure (*chedagāminī hoti*), or does not turn out as intended (*na yāthādhippāya*), or turns out as he intended (*yathādhippāya*) or there is prosperity beyond his expecta-

tion (*parādhippāyā hotiti*). The Buddha explains this phenomena by resorting to the principles of *Kamma*, the act and its retribution. He says that a person's prosperity or failure in trade in present life depends on a proportionate ratio as to how much more or less a person offers in his previous life to religious mendicants.⁹⁹ In yet another instance, the Buddha compares agriculture to trading. "Agriculture", he says, "is an occupation where there is a great deal to do, many duties, large administration, great problems, which, if succeeded in, yields great profit." On the other hand trading involves far less duties, administration and problems and yet a successful venture brings in a great profit.¹⁰⁰

Thus it is not surprising that, along with agriculture and cattle-keeping, the occupation of trading is considered high (*ukkaṭṭha-kammaṃ*).¹⁰¹ However, the Buddhist ethics do not permit an *upāsaka* to undertake certain trades, namely, trade in weapons (*satthavaṇijjā*), trade in human beings (*sattavaṇijjā*), trade in flesh (*maṃsavaṇijjā*), trade in intoxicants (*majjavaṇijjā*) and trade in poisons (*visavaṇijjā*).¹⁰² The need to classify these trades as bad obviously arises out of Buddhist considerations not to hurt human beings, nevertheless, it testifies to the prevalence of certain trades. A *brāhmaṇa*, a *gahapati* or even a member of an extended kin-group could follow this occupation. Thus in his advice to the *brāhmaṇa* Ujjaya the Buddha expects *kulaputtas* to follow anyone of these vocations — that of trading, cattle-keeping and agriculture.¹⁰³ Similar advice is given to *Dīghajanu Koliyaputta*, a member of the ruling extended kin-group.¹⁰⁴ A *gahapati* or a *gahapatiputta* also, as we shall see elsewhere, engages himself with trading or commercial activities.¹⁰⁵

Trade by water:

We have several references to trade by land but the evidence to support sea trade is also not altogether lacking. The Buddha talks of sea merchants who, on their voyage, taking with them a bird to sight land (*tiradassim sakunaṃ gahetvā*). When the ship is out of sight of land they free the bird which flies all round the ship. And if the bird sights land nearby it goes away for good; but if it sees no land, it returns to the ship.¹⁰⁶ In another instance we find a sea going ship (*sammuddikāya nāvā*) rigged with a mast

which is beached on the shore for the winter. Affected by wind, rain and heat, the hull of the ship weakens and rots away, if not properly looked after.¹⁰⁷ Although the term *samudda* generally refers to sea it may also mean a large river, for instance the Ganges.¹⁰⁸ In this connection we may note that the geographical limits of *majjhima-janapada* do not include any sea ports of western or eastern India.¹⁰⁹ We have virtually no reference to sea port in our texts.

Trade by land:

Trade by land was evidently more common than trade by sea. We find many land routes between the cities referred to in the text. The information we get of these routes is likely to be precise and perhaps accurate for the Buddha, his monks and his followers would most likely traverse the same roads which the traders long since had been following. Jivaka, the physician, was indeed a widely travelled man. He gets his education at Takkasila. He goes to Sāketa from there and ultimately returns to Rājagaha. From Rājagaha he is sent to Benares on the king's summons to cure a *seṭhi*. To cure King Pajjota of Avanti he goes to Ujjaini via Kosambi.¹¹⁰ From Savatthi the *gahapati* Anāthapiṇḍaka goes to Rājagaha where he stays in his brother-in-law's place.¹¹¹ He also has a *kammanta gāma* (business estate) in Kāsi.¹¹² The merchants from Ukkala, Tappussa and Bhallika, while they were on their way to Benares see the Buddha and give him food.¹¹³ But the most travelled man of all, as it appears from the texts, was the Buddha himself. Sāvatti and Rājagaha were his more or less headquarters from where he used to go to a number of places which are faithfully recorded in the texts. We may mention here one of his journey, which took him to Kusināra from Rājagaha. He started from Rājagaha and from there he went to Ambalaṭṭhikā - Nālanda - Pāṭaligāma - Koṭigāma - Nādikā - Vesali - Bhandagāma - Hatthigāma - Ambagāma - Jambugāma - Bhoganagara - Pāva-Kusināra.¹¹⁴

People also travelled in caravans. We find caravans with 1,000 carts going from one *janapada* to another and which had to pass through deserted areas.¹¹⁵ A caravan halting more than four months has been designated as a *gāma*.¹¹⁶ Also a caravan road is referred to in the *Vinaya*.¹¹⁷ A monk can spend his full rainy

season with a caravan.¹¹⁸ Caravans had to pay taxes to King's men and thus were a source of income to the King.¹¹⁹

Besides these references to caravans we find carts full of goods going from one place to another. One such group of 500 carts is mentioned as passing by a stream, where the Buddha was meditating.¹²⁰ The Buddha was once journeying from Andhakovinda to Rājagaha. On the way he met Belaṭṭha Kaccāna, who was going towards Andhakovinda with 500 waggons, all filled with jars of sugar.¹²¹ The point to note here is that Belaṭṭha was going from Rājagaha (a city) to Andhakovinda (a town). He is presumably a sugar dealer, selling sugar in the countryside. Merchants from distant lands come to sell their goods in *majjhimajanapada*. Thus horse dealers from *Uttarapathaka* (*uttara kuru?*) come to Verañja with 500 horses.¹²² Within the broader region of *Majjhimajanapada* certain economic products were known by the region in which they were manufactured, for example, the products of Kāśi, such as Kāśi cloth and Kāśi sandalwood.¹²³ The bronze dishes of Kosala (*Kosālikā kaṃsapāti*) also seem to have been popular as the term was used in a metaphor where it was compared with the shining eyes of a serpent king.¹²⁴

Small traders:

Under this heading we include shopkeepers who sell all sorts of merchandise including meat and wine. In the *Vinaya* a group of nuns who practised the following trades are prohibited to do so in future. They set up a tavern (*pānāgāraṃ ṭhapenti*), a slaughter house (*sūnaṃ ṭhapenti*), offered things for sale in a shop (*āpaṇaṃ pasārenti*), engaged in usuary (*vaḍḍhiṃ payojenti*), engaged in trade (*vaṇijjaṃ payojenti*) and dealt in greens and leaves (*haritakapaṇṇakam pakiṇanti*).¹²⁵ It is significant to note from this that women could occupy themselves with these petty tradings. What is prohibited for nuns is not for those women outside the nunnary. Also the term *vaṇijja* is differentiated from setting a shop or engaging in usuary. In another instance, the nuns made a hoard of many bowls. People saw this and questioned, "Will these nuns do a trade in bowls (*patta vaṇijjaṃ karessanti*) or will they set up an earthenware shop (*āmattikepaṇaṃ pasāressantīti*).¹²⁶ In this and previous passage *vaṇijja* is separated from setting up of a shop. However,

the considerable accumulation of goods are the prerequisites for both. The probable explanation to this is that *vaṇijja* or trading refers to wholesale transactions of goods and setting up of a shop indicates retail selling of goods.

The shopkeeper (*pāpaṇiko*), it is said, must have three characteristics, shrewdness, capability and the ability to inspire confidence, in which case in a short time he becomes wealthy. "This article, brought for so much and sold for so much, will bring in so much money, such and such profit." That is how he is shrewd. He is clever at buying and selling goods. He becomes known to a rich *gahapati* or *gahapatiputta* and they think, "this shopkeeper is shrewd, capable and resourceful, competent to support his son and wife and from time to time pay us interest (*amhākañ ca kālena kālaṃ anuppadātum ti*)."¹²⁷ They make him offers of wealth (*bhogehi nimantanti*).¹²⁷ In his skill in raising finance, buying and selling things this shopkeeper seems to resemble a modern *antropeneur* and the *gahapati* or *gahapatiputta* who give him loans appear similar to modern bankers.

The shrewdness of the shopkeeper is again seen in the *Vinaya*. An *upāsaka*, having bought ghee for a *kaḥāpaṇa* from the house of a certain shopkeeper, gives it to nun Thullananda. Thullananda says that she is in need of oil and not of ghee. The *upāsaka* goes to the shopkeeper and tells him to give in exchange the oil for the ghee. The shopkeeper replies, "If we take back again goods that were bought, when will our goods be sold? Ghee was taken owing to the purchase of ghee; give money for the purchase of oil and you shall take oil." The existence of such business ethics, however crude, shows the transition from barter economy to an established monetary economy in big cities like Sāvatti where the incident took place, if nowhere else.

The social status of persons who sold meat, at least in the eyes of the Buddhist writers, does not seem high. The killing of animals is considered a cruel occupation (*kurūrakammanta*).¹²⁰ The Buddha says that a fisherman who sells his fish will remain poor here and hereafter.¹³⁰ A butcher suffers in hell.¹³¹

Miscellaneous commercial trading activities:

Sometimes the texts are not specific about certain types of

trading activities. In the *Dīgha Nikāya*, it is said that if a man should start an enterprise (*kammante payojeyya*) after contracting a loan and if his business should succeed, he should not only be able to pay off the old debt he had incurred, but there should be surplus over to maintain a wife.¹³² A clever and energetic man starts earning $\frac{1}{2}$ *kaḥāpaṇas* a day in some business or other (*yen kenaci kammaññhānena*). Energetically such a man gradually makes 50 *kaḥāpaṇas* a day. And thereby daily earning 100 or 1,000 *kaḥāpaṇas* and hoarding what he had got he would soon be a rich man.¹³³

The specialization of occupations which we have noted earlier in the chapter and the development of large and small scale trade confirm that this society is not a simple undifferentiated tribal society.

Agriculture and cattle-keeping:

In a peasant society where agriculture is the most important productive source it is but natural for people of diverse social groups to participate in this activity. Mahānāma Sākya describes to his younger brother Anuruddha the duties incumbent on a person who is engaged in agricultural activities. The entire agricultural operations from ploughing the field to winnowing the chaff and separating the grains have been described by Mahānāma. "The operations", Mahānāma explains to his brother, "do not stop, they are unending. Even when our fathers and grandfathers passed away the operations were not stopped." Mahānāma was a member of the ruling extended kin group, and it is most likely that he would be performing only managerial and proprietary functions in his ancestral farm. The income from his farm must have been substantial so as to be able to let his younger brother live in luxury (*sukhumālo*), and also therefore must indicate a big land holding.¹³⁴ We find the Mallas of Kusināra referring to their *gāma khetta* (agricultural lands).¹³⁵ Dīghajānu Koliyaputta is told amongst others about this occupation of *kasi* which a young man could follow.¹³⁶ We find brāhmaṇa farmer Bhāradvāja ploughing his land, which requires 500 ploughshares. Proudly he says to the Buddha that he ploughs, sows and eats. Perhaps Bhāradvāja wanted to imply from this statement that the Buddha was incapable of doing constructive work such as agriculture.¹³⁷ A *kaṣṣaka gahapati* tends

his *sāli*—rice farm with great care in order to reap a rich harvest.¹³⁸ When Meṇḍaka the *gahapati*'s slave ploughs with one ploughshare seven furrows miraculously come from it.¹³⁹ We find two farmer brothers who, while ploughing the land, are struck by lightning and consequently die along with their four oxen.¹⁴⁰ In this instance, we may note that ploughing is carried by free men farmers and not by a slave as in the earlier case. In another instance we find a brāhmaṇa farmer experiencing bad days. His seasamum farm has gone bad, leaving only one or two stalk of seasamum. His farm is empty and he is deeply in debts.¹⁴¹ *Kasi* (agriculture) is considered a high vocation.¹⁴² Whenever these three occupations — agriculture, trading and cattle-keeping — are mentioned, agriculture is always given precedence over the others.¹⁴³ We have mentioned earlier that according to the Buddha agriculture requires elaborate preparations.¹⁴⁴

In the *Vāseṭṭha Sutta*¹⁴⁵ one who lives by cattle-keeping (*gorakkham upajīvati*) is called a *kassaka* (a farmer). This may have been so since both the vocations are connected with food producing activities. However, cattle-keeping for some at least seems to have been a specialized vocation. Gopakamoggallāna brāhmaṇa and Dhaniya are the two examples in point. Both of them make their living by keeping cattle.¹⁴⁶ We have dealt with the existence of cattle camps and of cattle farming in the Chapter II.¹⁴⁷

Gahapati:

Miss I. B. Horner renders the *Vinaya* definition of *gahapati* as "he who lives in a house" (*yo koci agāraṃ ajjhāvasati*).¹⁴⁸ The term *ajjhāvasati* however, has the distinct sense of ownership. Thus king Bimbisāra rules over *Kāsikosala*.¹⁴⁹ The brāhmaṇa Lohicca has ownership rights over *sālavatika* (*sālavatikam ajjhāvasati*) and also he has many persons dependent on him for their livelihood.¹⁵⁰ Brāhmaṇa Soṇaḍaṇḍa and bāhmaṇa Caṅki are also owners of the lands donated to them by the kings.¹⁵¹ A king is informed of a rich country which he could attack, conquer and rule over (*ajjhāvaseyyāmāti*).¹⁵²

In the light of above meanings of the term *ajjhāvasati*, which denotes ownership rights, it is most likely that the definition of *gahapati* given in the *Vinaya* refers not so much to "one who lives in

a house" but to "one who has the full ownership rights of the household". The term *gahapati* is thus applied to a household head. In this it corresponds to its meaning as found in Vedic texts.¹⁵³ Also he has to bear the full responsibility of the household. A *gahapati* according to the *Anguttara* has to preserve a sacred fire (*gahapatiaggi*).¹⁵⁴ Also a *gahapati* had to hand over the responsibilities to his successors before his retirement. Potaliya *gahapati* says that he has handed over to his sons as their inheritance, all that he had of his property and has now retired from the active participation in the day-to-day affairs. This idea of giving up is denoted by the word "*vohārasamucchedam*"¹⁵⁵ Buddha says that a *gahapati* or *gahapatiputta* has to forsake his fortune, small or great and his circle of extended kin group, however few or many and don the yellow robe.¹⁵⁶ He has thus to cleave all secular ties.

But this is not the only sense in which the term *gahapati* is used. The *Vinaya* gives another definition of the word. It says, "Excepting the king and he who is in the king's service, and the brāhmaṇa, he who remains is called a *gahapati*".¹⁵⁷ But this definition is also contradicted by the actual use in which the term has been used in the text. Thus we find the existence of brāhmaṇa *gahapatis*.¹⁵⁸ With respect to the king's servants and the *khattiyas* (the ruling extended kin groups), the term is associated with them never as a term of reference to an individual. They are included in a broad scheme of classification. Thus in the *Samyutta* and *Anguttara Nikāyas*, under the sub-section of the *gahapati* (*gahapati vagga*) following are mentioned. (1) Rājā Udena (2) Soṇa *gahapatiputta* (3) Ghosita *gahapati* (4) Upāli *gahapati* (5) Ugga *gahapati* of Hatthigama (6) a *gahapati* of Haliddika (7) Nakulapitā *gahapati* (8) Lohicca brāhmaṇa (9) Veracchani brāhmaṇī (10) Ugga *gahapati* of Vesali (11) Hatthaka of Alavi (12) Mahānāma Sākya (13) Jivaka Komārabhacca.¹⁵⁹ However this scheme of classification is not applied in actual practice. Thus it can be said that the term *gahapati* is not generally applied to *khattiyas* and king's servants. The general application of this term appears to be to persons whose growing wealth and influence marks them out as separate from their extended kin groups. We see this borne out in the following examples, which also give us a number of characteristics of the persons labelled *gahapatis*. We have seen earlier in our Chapter III, that the term *gahapati* is much used as a mode

of addressing such people.

We may give here the case of *Meṇḍaka gahapati*. He is a resident of *Bhaddiya Nagara*. *Meṇḍaka* and his family are known for their eminence in psychic power. All *Meṇḍaka* has to do is to wash his head and sweep his granary so that, as a result of his psychic power, soon a shower of grain will fall down and fill the granary. Sitting down besides only one bowl of the capacity of an *ālaka* measure and one helping of curry and condiments, his wife served food to his household employees (*dāsa-kammakāra-porisam*). Not until she gets up is it exhausted. His son, using only one purse containing a thousand (coins), gives six months wages (*chammāsikam vetanam*) to each of his employees. His daughter-in-law provides food for six months wages in kind (*bhattam*) to the employees of *Meṇḍaka*, only by sitting next to one basket of the capacity of *doṇa* measure. Lastly when the slave of *Meṇḍaka gahapati* ploughs with one ploughshare seven furrows come from it. *Meṇḍaka* feeds the king's entire army and gives them wages in kind and in cash and also orders 1250 cowherds (*gopālika*) to give fresh milk to the Buddha and his Saṃgha.¹⁰⁰

The description of *Meṇḍaka* and his family, although very unusual and improbable, symbolises his role as a tax-giver — he pays the king's army's wages — as a donor — he institutes 1250 cowherds to serve the Buddha and the saṃgha. Above all we are struck by the affluence of this *gahapati*. Indeed it is for his role as a producer of wealth that he and his family is characterised. It is noteworthy that *Meṇḍaka* is not referred to as a *setthi gahapati* and from the description of psychic powers and from the nature of his gift to the Buddha, his occupation is connected with agriculture and cattle keeping and he is not purely a trader. Also in their relationship with others the whole household of *Meṇḍaka* seems to act as a unit.

There are a number of other *gahapatis* who are known in the text for their affluence. *Anāthapiṇḍika* though not in the possession of psychic power, yet is capable of paying a fabulous price for *Jetavana*, a plot of land which he donates to the Buddha.¹⁰¹ His brother-in-law, a *setthi gahapati* of *Rājagaha*, prepares a huge meal for the Buddha. *Anāthapiṇḍika*, on seeing this, mistakes it for a meal prepared for a marriage ceremony, or a big sacrifice or for the king and his army.¹⁰² When *Anāthapiṇḍika* intends to give a

meal to the Buddha, the king, as well as the urban Council of Rājagaha to show their willingness to help him in doing so.¹⁶³ To physician Jivaka, a *gahapati* of Sāketa gives 16000 coins, a male and a female slave and a horse chariot. We may note here that *gahapati*, his son, wife and his daughter-in-law, each contributed to this reward.¹⁶⁴ In another instance a *gahapati* of Benaras has to give 16000 for curing his son.¹⁶⁵ While another *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha, for his brain operation, gives 100000 coins to the king and 100000 to Jivaka.¹⁶⁶ When a *seṭṭhi gahapati* dies without any heir to the property, king Pasenadi gets a very substantial amount in gold and silver.¹⁶⁷ *Gahapati* is mentioned as one of the seven jewels of the king. This jewel of *gahapati* draws gold from the midst of the Ganges and gives it to him.¹⁶⁸ This incidence of giving gold to the king is supposedly a symbolic representation of the *gahapati*'s ability to give the king taxes in kind or in cash. *Gahapati* Dasma of Aṭṭhaka *nagara* gives Ananda, many robes and a building for the monastery which was worth 500 coins.¹⁶⁹ As a financier *gahapati* lends money to promising shop-keepers.¹⁷⁰ The brāhmaṇa Dhānañjāni exploits *gahapatis* and kings by setting each against the other and thus makes his living.¹⁷¹ The men are covetous of *gahapati*'s wealth and wish him harm and he has to keep a strong bodyguard to defend himself.¹⁷² Also slaves and labourers are envious of his position.¹⁷³

There are a number of cases where we find *gahapatis* extending their patronage to the Buddhist order. They provide them with food and lodging and thus nourish their philosophical fancies. In our Chapter III we have dealt with many of these *gahapatis* and to some extent examined their position vis-a-vis the Buddhist Order. In the cities *gahapatis* are often associated with dealings which involve money transactions. We have pointed this out in our chapter on the Settlement Pattern.

The emergence of *gahapati* from the Vedic householder to a comparatively wealthier head of the household may represent the growing disparity of wealth within the society. The evidence in the texts is not altogether blind to this. It could not ignore the living conditions of the poor and the needy. *Vinaya*, with its usual cryptic manner says, "life is called evil (*pāpakam nāma jīvitam*)."¹⁷⁴ The life of the poor is evil compared to the life of the rich; life of the unwealthy is evil compared to the life of the wealthy; the life of

mankind is evil compared to the life of devas.¹⁷⁴ The Buddha observes that a poor man with an ugly wife, dilapidated hut and with little or no store of grain might see a monk in a monastery. This monk is sitting in the cool shade intent on higher thought. He has just washed his hand and feet and has had a delicious meal. It might occur to the poor man, "Indeed monkhood is pleasant and healthy, suppose I should go forth from home into homelessness." But he is not able to give up his present condition, his ugly wife etc., because for him it is a strong bond, like a thick log of wood which does not rot away. As opposed to this poor man, the Buddha puts forward the case of a rich *gahapati* or *gahapatiputta*. *Gahapati* or *gahapatiputta* sees the monk in exactly the same manner in which the poor man has seen him earlier and thinks of joining the order. He might be able to bring himself to give up his abundant gold ornaments, his wealth and property. Because for him that is a weak bond that rots away.¹⁷⁵

Again commenting on the condition of the poor and realities of their situation, the Buddha says, "A certain man has to go to prison for theft of half a *kaḥāpaṇa*, a *kaḥāpaṇa*, a hundred *kaḥāpaṇas*. Another person does not have to go to prison, though he steals the same amount." "This was so", the Buddha explains, "Because the former is a poor fellow of small means (*bhoga*). The man who does not go to prison is a rich man of great means." In another instance it is said that a butcher has power to strike or bind or slay or treat as he pleases certain man who steals a goat but not another man who does the same. In the first case a poor man suffers at the hands of the butcher if he should steal a goat. But in the case of rich man, a man of great means, such as *rājā* or *rājā's* minister cannot be taken to task by the butcher. There is nothing for the butcher to do but to beg him with clasped hands saying: "Give me back my goat or the price of it..."¹⁷⁶

However, people do not seem to like men who spend beyond their means and those who talk foolishly about riches. Thus a man borrows money, a smart carriage, rare jewels and earnings and parade in the market. People may see him and say of him that he must be a wealthy man for wealthy men employ their wealth like that. However, the owners of those borrowed things if they see him thus will expose him of his borrowed splendour.¹⁷⁷ In another instance, it is said, a man quite poor should prate of

wealth (*daliddo vā samāmo adḍhavādaṃ vadeyya*) one lacking possession should prate of possession (. . . *adhano dhanavādaṃ vadeyya*) and one without property should prate of property (*abhogavā bhogavādaṃ vadeyya*) and when an occasion to acquire wealth, possession and property arises, he fails to do so. People criticise such a man.¹⁷⁸

As it appears to us the society was aiming at an equipoise in the developing economy. That at least seems to be the idea the Buddha had in mind while giving advice to Dīghajānu Kōḷiyaputta. The Buddha says: "A *kulaputta*, while experiencing both gain and loss in wealth, should continue his business calmly, without being unduly overjoyed over gains and worried about the losses. He should think, 'this is how my income, after deducting the loss, will stand and my outgoing will not exceed my income.' If a *kulaputta* have but small earnings and if he should live on a grand scale, the people will say of him that he eats his wealth like a fig tree glutton (*udumbarakhādikaṃ*). If his earnings be great and he lives meanly, people will say of him 'this *kulaputta* will die like starveling (*ajadhūmārikaṃ*)'. Just as one holding the balance or his assistant knows on holding up the balance that either by so much it has dipped down or so much it has lifted up so a *kulaputta* should adjust his earnings. He should lead a balanced life (*samā-jīvita*) . . ."¹⁷⁹

Conclusions

In this region of North India we find a peasant society with growing specialization of skill and artisanship etc. with expanding trade, knowing the use of money, and with increasing disparity of wealth within the extended kin-groups. The more prosperous heads of households are called *gahapati*. The emergence of this *gahapati* appears to be an interesting feature of this period and region. Two social groups are repeatedly mentioned, the *brāhmaṇas* and the *khattiyas* more specifically the Licchavis, Mallas, Sākyans etc. The *brāhmaṇas* were ritually superior to the members of the ruling extended kin-groups or *khattiyas* but were politically subservient to them. Whereas the term *gahapati* seems never to have been applied to the *khattiyas*, the *brāhmaṇas*, on the other hand seem to have allowed themselves to be referred to

by this term. There is evidence of some rivalry between the khat-tiyas and brāhmaṇas.

The bulk of the population was landowning and land-farming peasants, but the typical vaisya of the Hindu texts was not yet sharply differentiated from the poorer groups of peasants and artisans. The poorer groups were perhaps lumped together in the conceptual framework of the Suddas.

Though there was considerable division of labour and much active trade, trade differentiation also does not seem to have crystallised into a rigid caste system as yet. People might often change their occupations.

We find different social groups often existing side by side. There seems to be greater emphasis on the role of kinship as compared with later Indian caste society where, of course, kinship is still a very vital element. At the same time, society is not tribal. On the other hand caste has not yet developed to its full extent. The term *ñāti* (*Pāli* = *ñāti*)¹ seems to have implied a group broadly similar to a modern sub-caste and implied a kinship grouping, whether real or imagined.

At a stage when increasing differentiation of social functions was taking place on the basis of kin-groups, it was quite natural for people to stress rather the kinship aspect to the functional one. This perhaps explains the puzzling terminology of our texts involving the use of *ñāti* and *gahapati* with conditions very different from those of their Sanskrit equivalents in orthodox Hindu sources. We find alternative use of the word *ñāti* and *jāti* for an extended kin-group, just as we find the synonymous use of the word *jñāti* and *jāti* in modern times, for instance amongst the people of Mahārāṣṭra where both terms denote sub-caste.

Some of these kinship terms such as *ñāti* and *ñātaka* are found in the inscriptions of Asoka. Asoka often pointedly refers to these, but never seems to use the more orthodox conceptual terms like *vaṇṇa* and *Jāti*, which denote social groupings. It seems that Asoka wrote his edicts to display his prowess as a mighty and benevolent king. At the same time they were meant for people of all ranks of his empire. He was admonishing them in the language they understood. From the edicts it appears that Asoka believed that kinship ties were the sources of the strength of the people,² and that to foster them was in their best interests.

At this time *Vaṇṇa* and *Jāti* were the concepts of the theorists. The actual state of society was one in which blood relationship functioned as a more important social bond.

ABBREVIATIONS

A.O.	Archiv Orientalni
A.A.	Aṅguttara Aṭṭhakatha
Abhi.	Abhivādeti (a form of salutation)
Ang.	Aṅguttara Nikāya
A.S.I.	Archaeological Survey of India
B.O.D.	Book of the Discipline
B.I.	Buddhist India
C.H.I.	Cambridge History of India
D.O.B.	Dialogues of the Buddha
Dh.A.	Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā
Dig.	Dīgha Nikāya
D.P.P.N.	Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names
Ex.Kin.	Extended Kin
G.S.	Gradual Sayings
I.A.	Indian Archaeology
I.E.T.	India as described in early texts of Buddhism and Jainism
J.B.B.R.A.S.	Journal of Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society
J.P.T.S.	Journal of Pāli Text Society
J.R.A.S.	Journal of Royal Asiatic Society
K.S.	Kindred Sayings
M.A.	Majjhima Aṭṭhakathā
Majj.	Majjhima Nikāya
Manu	Mānava Dharma Sāstra
M.L.S.	Middle Length Sayings
P.E.D.	Pāli English Dictionary
P.T.S.	Pāli Text Society
R.E.	Rock Edicts of Asoka
S.S.	Saddhim Sammodi (a form of exchange of greetings)
Sam.	Samyutta Nikāya
S.B.B.	Sacred Books of the Buddhists
S.B.E.	Sacred Books of the East

Su.Ni.	Sutta Nipāta
T.A.I.	Tribes in Ancient India
Vin.	Vinaya Piṭaka

REFERENCES

CHAPTER I

1. J. Przyluski, *Le Council de Rājagṛha*, Paris, 1926.
2. E. W. Adikaran, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, pp. 73-79. He goes into some detail as to how the texts came to be written—their political and religious background.
3. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, II. p. xiii; *Cambridge History of India* I, p. 193; Maurice Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, pp. 16, 606-609; B.M. Barua, *Asoka and His Inscriptions*, pp. 31 ff. see also Bhattacharya, *Buddhist text as recommended by Asoka*.
4. Cf. Winternitz, *loc.cit.*; G. C. Pande, *Origins of Buddhism*, p. 15.
5. A.K. Warder, *A study of the Evolution of Early Middle Indian Metre, based on the verse preserved in the Pāli Canon*, pp. 5-6. Unpublished Thesis, University of London, Ph.D., 1954.
6. Rhys Davids, *Cambridge History of India*, I, pp. 192-197; see also B. C. Law, *History of Pāli Literature*, II, p. 42, where he differs from the stratification suggested by Rhys Davids but accepts the pre-Moriyan dating of the *Nikāyas* and the *Vinaya*, *ibid.*, pp. 15, 30-33. .
7. G. C. Pande, *Op.Cit.*, p. 7; Etienne Lamotte, "problèmes concernant les textes canoniques, Mineurs", *Journal Asiatique*, 1956, pp. 249-263.
8. G. C. Pande, *Op.Cit.*, p. 13.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
10. Cf. Winternitz, *Op.Cit.*, p. 33; B. C. Law, *History of Pāli Literature*, II, pp. 13-14.
11. Winternitz, *Op.Cit.*, p. 25.
12. Jayawickrame, *Analysis of Sutta Nipāta*, p. 10; Unpublished Thesis, University of London, Ph.D., 1947.
13. Cf. G. C. Pande, *Op.Cit.*, p. 16.
14. Cf. Winternitz, *Op.Cit.*, pp. 115 ff; Gokuldas De, *Calcutta Review*, July 1930, pp. 83-84; R. Mehta, (*Pre-Buddhist India*, pp. xxi ff.), has assigned a pre-Buddhist dating to some of the poems and prose narratives; but D. D. Kosambi, (*An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, pp. 259-260 and also his "Early Stages of the Caste System in Northern India", *J.B.B.R.A.S.*, 1946, p. 33) suggests that the *Jātakas* represent a state of society which provided suitable conditions for trade during the Sātavāhana period (2nd century A.D.) and that they do not represent the social structure of Magadha at the time of the Buddha. The view that the *Jātakas* belong to the Sātavāhana period has been

criticised by R. S. Sharma (*Sudras in Ancient India*, p. 85), on the ground that regulations regarding trade in Kautilya presuppose an extensive economy. Sharma following Fiser's "The problem of Setṭhi in Jātakas", A.O. pp. 338 ff, believes that "the stories of the present", are the younger element of the *Jātakas* (late in chronology) and that they occur in the cities of Eastern India, Sāvatti and Rājagaha, whereas "the stories of the past" form the older *Jātakas* (early in chronology) the scenes of which lie in the central or western part of India. Sharma considers these "stories of the past" as belonging to pre-Asokan period. We may note that in the *Vinaya* and the *Nikāyas* we have rarely a mention of the western or central parts of India. Benares, although important because of its connections with the Buddha's enlightenment, is occasionally mentioned. The same is the case with Gāndhāra, Taxila and Avanti, which are considered as distant lands. Jennings (*Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha* p. xxxiii) refers to this fact while describing the Buddha's journey; see also Winternitz *Op.Cit.*, pp. 119-120.

15. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 208.
16. Winternitz, *Op.Cit.*, p. 122.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 119-124.
18. See above n. 13.
19. Cf. Rhys Davids, *Cambridge History of India*, I, pp. 172-174.
20. Cf. R. S. Sharma, *Op.Cit* p. 85, who makes a note of punch marked silver and copper coins coupled with a large number of objects which are associated with Northern Black Polished Ware (cir 600-250 B.C.)
21. A.S.I., Annual Report, 1905-06, pp. 86-102; New Imperial Series, Vol. LI, 1931, pp. 112-131.
22. I.A., A Review, 1953-54, p. 9; 1954-55, p. 16; and 1957-58 p. 11.
23. G. R. Sharma, *The Excavations at Kauśāmbi* (1957-59), pp. 26, 37 ff.
24. For example, Vesāli, Sāvatti, Pāṭaliputta, Ujjain etc.; see I.A., loc. cit., 1957-58, 34-36; 1959-60, p. 14 and 1960-61, p. 6; A.S.I., 1907-08, pp. 81-131; 1912-13, pp. 53-86.
25. Cf. D. D. Kosambi, "Early Stages of the Caste System in Northern India", *J.B.B.R.A.S.*, 1946, p. 44. He maintains that at the time of the Buddha, except for a few who still had tribal organisations, "the tribes have dissolved into loose organisations of landholding and land farming overlords".
26. A. L. Kroeber, *Anthropology*, 1948.
M. J. Herskovits, *Man and his works*, 1949.
27. Radcliffe Brown, *Structure and Function in Primitive Societies*, 1952.
28. Raymond Firth, (Ed.) *Man and Culture*, pp. 157-187, 1957.
29. Talcott Parsons, *Essays in Sociological Theory*, p. 34, quoted by S. F. Nadel, *Theory of Social Structure*, p. 12, 1958.
30. Raymond Firth, *Elements of Social Organisation*, pp. 34, 1951.
31. S. F. Nadel, *Foundations of Social Anthropology*, p. 78 ff, 1958.

32. J. P. Murdock, "British Social Anthropology", *American Anthropologist*, vol. 53, pp. 465-473, 1951.

CHAPTER II

1. Robert Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture*, p. 11.
2. Jennings, *Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha*, p. xxxii.
3. Vin. III, p. 46, cf. *Dhammapada*, I, p. 313 where a *gāma* of eight *kuṭis* is mentioned *aṭṭhakuṭiko gāmo*.
4. Miss I. Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, III, p. 74; *P.E.D.*, S. V. *kuṭi*.
5. The size of the *kuṭi* cannot be determined from the available references. In the forest hermitage of the *Jatilas* we find separate rooms for performing fire worship. See Vin. I, pp. 24 ff.
6. Ang. III, pp. 100-102; IV, pp. 21-22; V, p. 60.; Vin. I, p. 92.
7. Sam. I, p. 61; III, p. 116; IV, p. 380.
8. Dig. II, pp. 339-40.
9. *Ibid.*, III, p. 94 *te araṇṇāyatane paṇṇa-kuṭiyo karitvā paṇṇa-kuṭisu jhāyanti . . . gāme-nigama-rājadhāniyo osaranti ghāsam esanā*.
10. Vin. III, p. 41 *tiṇakuṭiyo karitvā*, *kuṭis* of *tiṇa* (grass).
11. *Ibid.*, p. 46 *samanusso pi gāma amanusso pi gāmo* (Note that this is the definition of the *gāma*.)
12. Miss I. B. Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, I, p. 147.
13. *Ibid.*, note 2.
14. Dig. III, p. 203.
15. *Ibid.*, I, p. 116.
16. Vin. I, p. 149.
17. Sam. V, p. 173.
18. Vin. I, p. 149.
19. Majj. II, pp. 97, 100.
20. Vin. III, p. 46.
21. *Ibid.*, II, p. 121.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
23. Miss I. B. Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, I, p. 74.
24. Rhys Davids and Stede, *P.E.D.*, p. 84; see also Vinaya texts (S.B.E.), II, p. 121 n. 1. where *gonisādika* is translated as an ox-stall to be used as a provision room for the monks; cf. *gosālā*, cow-stable, Ang. I, p. 188; also *gogaṇa*, herd of cattle, Majj. I, p. 220; Ang. I, p. 229.
25. *Gonisādinivittṭho go + nisādi + nivittṭho Go* which is used in plural sense means cattle. *Nisādi*, *ni + sad*, = lying down, encamped, well arrayed. *Nivittṭha*, which is an adj. pp. of *nivesa*, used in the locative case, would mean, bent upon, devoted to.
26. Vin. I, p. 152 *vajo vuttṭhāsi*.
27. Majj. II, pp. 185-6, for Dhāṇanjāni brāhmaṇa. *gorakkha*, the cattle keeping is usually combined with *kasi* (agriculture) and in the *Vinaya* it is given as a superior profession, Vin. IV, p. 6.

28. Su. Nipāta, 24-25 vs.
29. Vin. I, pp. 152, 243; Majj. I, p. 79; Sam. IV, p. 181.
30. Ang. III, p. 373; Majj. I, p. 85.
31. Vin. III, p. 46 *sattho atirekacatumāsaniviṭṭho gāmo*.
32. *Ibid.*, I, p. 73; Majj. I, p. 276; see Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 98.
33. Dig. II, p. 344.
34. Vin. IV, p. 63 *sattha gamaniya maggo*.
35. *Ibid.*, I, p. 152.
36. Dig. II, pp. 338 f.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 344.
38. *Bṛhatkalpa Bhāṣya*, I, 3066 ff. (quoted in J.C. Jain, *Life in the Jain Canonical literature*, p. 117.).
39. Vin. III, p. 46.
40. *Ibid.*, I, p. 207; III, pp. 147-249.
41. *Ibid.*, III, p. 249, *pāṭiyekkho gāmo nivisi*.
42. *Ibid.*, *Arāṃikagāmaṃko ti pi nam āhamsu Pilindagāmaṃko ti pi nam āhamsa*.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 250; a park attendant's wife and daughter is mentioned.
44. Majj. II, p. 205.
45. Vin. I, p. 350; Ang. II, p. 182.
46. Sam. IV, pp. 306-8.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 310
48. Vin. III, p. 11 ff.
49. *Ibid.*, *Sudinno nāma Kalandakaputto seṭṭhiputto hoti*.
50. Cf. Vin. III, p. 200 where a *gāma* belonging to one *kula* is mentioned.
51. Majj. II, pp. 208-209.
52. *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā*, III, p. 250 mentions Todeyyagāma—a *gāma* between Sāvatti and Benares.
53. Sam. I, p. 172.
54. Dig. I, p. 127.
55. Sam. I, pp. 113-4.
56. Dig. I, p. 87.
57. Sam. V, p. 352.
58. Majj. II, p. 164.
59. *Ibid.* III, p. 290.
60. Ang. I, p. 180.
61. Majj. I, p. 400.
62. Dig. I, p. 235.
63. *Op. cit.*
64. Dig. I, pp. 111, 87 and 224 respectively.
65. These *gāmas* are not mentioned as *Brāhmaṇa gāmas*
66. *Op. cit.*
67. The two terms, *brāhmaṇa* and *gahapati*, have often been used as a compound. Depending on the context, these may refer to two distinct

entities or groups or to one single group. This ambiguity is due to the fact that the brāhmaṇas were also *gahapatīs*—the well-to-do people, the heads of households—and yet different from the latter because of their birth in brāhmaṇa families. In the brāhmaṇa *gāmas* the term *bhāhmaṇagahapati* refers to the brāhmaṇ householders. They address the Buddha as *bho Gotama*.

68. See for instance, Vin. I, pp. 36-37; Majj. II, pp. 141-2, 55; Dig. I, pp. 111-112.
69. Majj. II, pp. 164-5 and Dig. I, pp. 128-9.
70. Dig. I, p. 235; Majj. II, p. 462 (Nālandā Edition).
71. Sam. I, pp. 113-4.
72. Majj. II, p. 462 ff (Nālandā Edition)
73. Sam. I, p. 172.
74. Dig. I, pp. 104-5.
75. Majj. III, p. 290; Ang. I, p. 180.
76. See page 56.
77. Majj. I, pp. 124, 235, 366; III, p. 130.
78. Ang. III, p. 395.
79. Sam. I, pp. 123, 126.
80. Ang. IV, p. 163 *gāmassa vā nigamassa vā avidure mahādhaññarāsi*.
81. Sam. II, p. 271.
82. Dig. I, p. 102.
83. Majj. II, pp. 253-4.
84. *Ibid.*, *tassa gāmassa vā nigamassa vā khemattam vā subbhikkhatam co appā bhādhatam ca samseyya*.
85. *Ibid.*
86. Sam. IV, 309 ff.
87. Majj. II, p. 45.
88. *Ibid.*, III, p. 5.
89. Miss I. B. Horner, *Middle Length Sayings*, II, p. 30; III, p. 39; *Book of the Discipline*, II, p. 63 n. 2, she argues that word *nigama* comes from *nadī-gāma*, which she renders as market town or little town. She feels that originally commodities were sent by water rather than by land and hence villages on rivers became the centres of trade. However, Pāṭaligāma which was situated near the river Sonā is not called a *nigama*. The *nigamas* mentioned in the texts are not specifically said to have been near rivers. We are also not sure whether commodities were originally sent by water. We have frequent mention of land routes in our texts, but hardly any river routes. Thus the association of the word *nadī* (river) with *gāma* to form *nigama*, which in any case seems etymologically very irregular, is improbable.
90. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, p. 126; E.M. Hare, *Gradual Sayings*, III, p. 186.
91. Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Kindred sayings*, I, p. 233.
92. F. L. Woodward, *Gradual Sayings*, I, pp. 171, 216.

93. Rhys Davids and Stede, *P.E.D.*, p. 190.
94. Cf. Ram Gopal, *India of Vedic Sutra*, p. 150 ff.
95. Majj. I, pp. 166-7.
96. Sam. IV, pp. 308-10.
97. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 83-4; Vin. II, p. 83; IV, p. 105, where the army *senā* is defined as consisting of elephants, horses, chariots and foot-soldiers, and is also sub-divided into sections.
98. Majj. II, p. 55 *Thullakotṭhike aggakulikassa putto*.
99. *Ibid.*, p. 62.

100. *Ibid.*, pp. 45. 52.
101. *Ibid.* I, p. 501.
102. Vin. I, p. 248.
103. *Ibid.*, p. 246.
104. Sam. I, p. 184.
105. See pages 35, 40.
106. Ang. IV, p. 438.
107. See page 21.
108. Vin. I, p. 273.
109. *Ibid.*, p. 269.
110. *Ibid.*, II, p. 157.
111. *Ibid.*, I, p. 273 *bahupakāro. . negamassa ca*.
112. Su. Ni. 976, 991 vs.
113. Vin. I, p. 8; Majj. I, p. 171.
114. *P.E.D.*, *nagara* s.v.
115. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, I, p. 432.
116. Vir. III, p. 47.
117. *Ibid.*, *bandheyyum purisguttim kareyyum*.
118. Majj. II, p. 97.
119. Dig. II, p. 83; Ang. V, pp. 194-5.

120. *Ibid.*, *pākāra*, an encircling wall, rampart, a fence; cf. Majj. III, p. 11; Sam. IV, p. 194; Ang. IV, p. 107; Vin. II, p. 121; IV, p. 266.
121. *Ibid.*, *rañño paccantimam nagaram daḷuddāpam daḷha-pākāraṇam eka-dvāram tatra assa dovāriko*.
122. Ang. IV, p. 106 ff.
123. Dig II, p. 147.
124. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*. II, p. 161.
125. The explanation of *kuḍḍa* at *Visuddhimagga* 344 which is *gehabhittiya etam adhivacanam*, "this is an epithet of a house wall", seems to support our contention; cf. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, II, 161 n. 1, where he thinks that the word *kuḍḍa* is perhaps *kudya* (mud).
126. *Peta Vatthu*, II, p. 9.
127. Rhys Davids, *B.I.*, pp. 37-38.
128. *Sākhā*, see Vin. I, p. 28; Majj. I, p. 135; Ang. I, p. 152.
129. Vin. III, p. 43 *devagahadāruṇi nagarapaṭisaṃkhārikāni āpadatthāya*

130. See Chapter I, note 24.
131. Dig. II, pp. 86-7 *Sunidhacassakāra Magadho mahāmatto Pātaligāma nagaram māpeti Vajjinam paṭibāhāya*; cf. Majj. III. p. 9 *Rājagaham paṭisaṃkhārapeti rañño Pajjotassa asaṃkhamāno*, distrusting king Pajjota, the king Ajātasattu was having Rājagaha strengthened.
132. *Ibid.*
133. Pātaligāma became known as Pātaliputta. The text explains this by the phrase *Pātaliputta puṭabhedanam*.
134. See page 24.
135. Dig. II, p. 147 ff.
136. *Ibid.*
137. *Ibid.*, p. 160 *dakkhinena dakkhiṇam nagarassa haritvā bāhirena bāhiram dakkhiṇato nagarassa Bhagavato sarīram jhāpessāmīti*.
138. *Ibid.*, *uttarena uttaram nagarassa haritvā, uttarena dvārena nagaram pavesetvā, majjhena nikkhamitva puratthimato nagarassa Mukutabandhanam nāma Mallānam cetiyam ettha Bhagavato sarīram jhāpessāmīti*.
139. *Ibid.*, p. 147.

140. Vin. I, p. 268.
141. Sam. V, p. 369.
142. Dig. II, p. 147.
143. Vin. III, p. 15.
144. Dig. II, pp. 102-3; Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 75, where the Buddha urges the Vijjis to regularly pay homage to the Vajji *cetiyas*.
145. Vin. I, p. 275.
146. *Ibid.*, p. 276.
147. Vin. I, p. 272.
148. *Ibid.*, p. 185.
149. Sam. I, p. 75.

150. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
151. Vin. I, pp. 268-9.
152. *Ibid.*
153. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 154-59.
154. *Ibid.*, p. 147.
155. *Ibid.*, pp. 75-76.
156. *Ibid.*
157. *Ibid.*, III, p. 15.
158. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 268.
159. *Ibid.*, p. 227-28.

160. See page 28.
161. Dig. I, p. 93; Majj. II, p. 33; cf. Ang. III, 90 where certain *gāma* and *nigama* are known for lotus-like beautiful girls.
162. Sam. V, pp. 169-70.

163. Dig. I, p. 135: Translation after Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, p. 114.
164. *Ibid.*, Rhys Davids, translates here that the villages, towns and cities are pillaged by the decoits. But there is no such indication in the text which reads *gāma ghātā pi nigama ghātāpi nagara ghātāpi disanti*. Probably the people living in it were harassed by the king and his officers.
165. Dig. II, pp. 342-3.
166. Majj. II, p. 72.
167. Vin I, pp. 195-96.
168. Vin. I, p. 197. Attempts have been made to identify these places mentioned as boundaries of *majjhima Janapada*, but as yet no satisfactory explanation is available. It is noteworthy that the Buddha was halting at Sāvatti when he defined these boundaries. In the Jain Canonical literature, (*Brhatkalpasutra*, I, 50 quoted in J. C. Jain, *Social conditions in the Jain Canonical literature*, p. 250) Mahavira, when he was at Sāketa, gave the following instructions to his disciples. "The monks or nuns may wander towards the east as far as Āṅga-Magadha, towards the south as far as Kosāmbi, towards the west as far as Thūṇa and towards the north as far as Kuṇāla (Uttara Kosala)." It is interesting to note that Kajaṅgala was situated towards the east of Campā, the capital of Āṅga, and that *Usiradhvaṇṇa* mountain slopes are north of Kaṅkhal, see B. C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. 34. Kaṅkhal was in the Himalayan region, so, too, Uttara Kosala. Thūṇa seems to be identical with brāhmaṇa *gāma*, Thūṇa.
169. The term *dakkhiṇāpatha* occurs in *Sutta Nipāta* verses 1011, where it is used as descriptive of a settlement known as Assaka. Together with Avanti, Assaka is to be found in the list of 16 great *janapadas*. B.C. Law (*Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. 60) identifies it as the whole tract of land lying to the north of the river Godavari and to the south of the Ganges.
170. Āṅg. V, p. 206.
171. Dig. III, p. 89.
172. *Ibid.*, II, p. 337.
173. Majj. II, p. 149.
174. *Ibid.*, pp. 134-5.
175. Sam. III, pp. 5-6.
176. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 312.
177. See Chapter V, pp. 45-49.
178. Āṅg. I, p. 213.
179. Ray Choudhari, *Political History of India*, pp. 95 ff.
180. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 23.
181. Dig. II, pp. 200-202.
182. *Ibid.*, 200 *parito parito janapadesu*.
183. *Ibid.*, 202.

184. Vin. I, p. 27.
185. Rhys Davids, *Cambridge History of India*. I, p. 182, gives as probable boundaries of Magadha, the Ganges to the north, the Sonā to the west, the country of Aṅga to the east and the dense forest reaching plateau of Chota Nagpur to the south; B.C. Law, *Tribes in Ancient India* p. 198, says that Magadha corresponded at the time of the Buddha to the modern district of Patna but with the addition of northern half of the modern district of Gayā. In recent times the inhabitants of this region called it Maga, obviously derived from Magadha.
186. B. C. Law, *Tribes in Ancient India*, p. 194.
187. Vin. I, pp. 35-36.
188. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
189. Dig. I, p. 111.

190. Sam. I, p. 172.
191. B. C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, pp. 6-7.
192. *D.P.P.N.*, Assapura, s.v.
193. *Ibid.*, Āpaṇa, s.v.
194. *Ibid.*, Campā, s.v.
195. B. C. Law, *op. cit.*
196. Vin. I, p. 240.
197. The northern frontier of Kosala included hills of Himalayas, the present day Nepal. Its southern boundary was the Ganges and its eastern boundary was in the eastern limit of the Sākya territory, see *Cambridge History of India*, I, pp. 178, 190.
198. Woodward, *Kindred Sayings*, V, p. xviii; Mrs. Rhys Davids conjectures from this that either the Buddha "mainly resided there or that Savatthi was the earliest centre for the collection and preservation of the talks." The first alternative is preferred by Malalasekera. *D.P.P.N.*, II, p. 1127.)
199. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 8.

200. Jennings, *Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha.*, p. 262 n. 4.
201. Majj. II, pp. 110, 127.
202. Vin. I, p. 276 and Majj. III, p. 7.
203. See page 18.
204. *D.P.P.N.*, Daṇḍakappa, Caṇḍakappa, Pakadhā & Nālkapāna, s.v.
205. B. C. Law, *Op.Cit.*, p. 5.
206. Sam. III, p. 140.
207. Ang. I. p. 276, *Kosalesu cārikam caramāno yena Kapilavatthu tad avasari.*
208. *Ibid.*, p. 277, where the Buddha stays (*Viharati*) overnight in Kapilavatthu.
209. Sutta Nipāta, pp. 15-19.

210. Majj. II, pp. 18 ff.
211. *D.P.P.N.*, Naṅgaraka, Medaḷumpa, Devadaha, Khomadussa, s.v.

212. Cf. Rhys Davids, *Psalm of the Brethren*, p. 10 where she refers to the account of Chinese chroniclers who locate the region on the mountain slopes eastward of the Sākya region; *Buddhist India*, p. 26.
213. Dig. II, pp. 47, 159; III, p. 207.
214. Malalasekera, *D.P.P.N.*, II. p. 454; he does not substantiate his statement with proofs from *Nikāyas* and *Vinaya* texts.
215. Manu, X. 22.
216. D. D. Kosambi, *Introduction to Indian History*, p. 147.
217. Cf. Kane, *History of Dharmasastra*, IV, p. 235.
218. Buhler, *Laws of Manu*, SBE, Introduction, p. CXVII, advocated that the recension of Manu's code was made during the period 200 B.C.-200 A.D.
219. Dig. III, p. 207.

220. Ang. V, p. 70; II. p. 79.
221. Dig. II, p. 165.
222. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 25, 26; B.C. Law, *India As Known in the Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism*, pp. 121-22; Malalasekera, *D.P.P.N.*, Vol. II, pp. 813, 879, also takes for granted that at the Buddha's time the Videhans were a part of Vajjis. However, he disregards the statement about the *aṭṭhakulaka*, which for some scholars implied heads of eight clans (confederate). Malalasekera believes that as there is no other evidence regarding the number of clans except that of DA p. 591, the conjectures of scholars is doubtful. We agree with his suggestion that *aṭṭhakula* were a judicial committee; cf. Dig. II, p. 160, where eight Mallan chiefs (family heads?) officiate at the funeral of the Buddha.
223. Majj. II, pp. 73, 133. The territory of Videha bordered on the Ganges, on one side of which was Magadha and on the other Videha. Adjacent to it were Kasi and Kosala. It is noteworthy that at the time of the redaction of the *Brāhmaṇas* the Kosala-Videha occupied an important position and was situated to the east of the Madhyadesa. See Julius Eggeling, SBE., Vol. XII, Introduction, pp. XLII, XLIII.
224. Ang. IV, p. 16.
225. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
226. *Ibid.* III, p. 75.
227. B.C. Law, *India As Known in the Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism*, p. 123.
228. *Ibid.*, p. 124.
229. Ang. III, p. 75.

230. Hare, *Gradual Sayings* III. p. 62, ns. 1 and 3.
231. *D.P.P.N.*, II, p. 814.
232. Ang. III, 75 f.
233. Dig. II, p. 123.
234. Sam. V, p. 431.
235. Vin. I, pp. 231-232.

236. This may be the reason why Mahāvira was called *Nātaputta*, the son of the *Nātas*, by the Buddhist writer; cf Jacobi, SBE, *Jain Sutra* Vol. I, Introduction p. x.
237. Dig. II, p. 123.
238. *Ibid.*, pp. 164 ff.
239. B. C. Law, *Tribes in Ancient India*, p. 281.

CHAPTER III

1. In the appendix we have tabulated 339 cases of modes of address, terms of reference and salutation. The tables are, therefore, a vital part of this chapter.
2. Vocative of *bhavant*. In the *Sutta Nipāta* vs. 620, a brāhmaṇa is called *bho-vādin*, (one who utters *bho*) in contrast to a good brāhmaṇa. See also *Dhammapada*, vs. 396.
3. Sam. I, p. 163.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 179.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 173.
6. Vin. I, pp. 212-213, also exchange of greeting take place (s.s.)
7. Ang. III, pp. 239-40.
8. Dig. I, pp. 89-90 *kañci katham sārūṇiyam vitisāreti, thito pi nisinnena bhagavatā kañcikañci katham sārūṇiyam vitisāreti.*
9. *Ibid.*, p. 90.
10. Sam. I, pp. 177-78.
11. Dig. I, pp. 125-126.
12. Majj. II, pp. 143-44.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 144; *Brahmāyu brāhmaṇo utthāyāsanaṁ ekamasam uttarāsaṅgaṁ karitvā bhagavato pādesu sirasā nipatitvā bhagavato pādāni mukhena ca paricumbati pañhi ca parisambāhati nāmaṁ ca sāveti.*
14. *Ibid.*
15. Majj. II, pp. 401-2 (Nalanda Ed.)
16. See appendix item Nos. 22, 25, & 31.
17. *Ibid.*, item Nos. 43, 47.
18. Majj. I, pp. 229-30.
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 392-94.
20. *Ibid.* I, p. 497.
21. See page 48.
22. Majj. II, pp. 40, 41-44.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 43; *samaṇo Gotamo pāpito bhavissati.*
24. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 489, 493 ff.
25. Dig. I, 163 ff. Acela Kassapa is not mentioned as a *paribbājaka* but may be included in the group because of similar attitude of the Buddha towards the *paribbājakas* and this Acela Kassapa, cf. Vin IV p. 91, where the Acela is defined as *paribbājakasamapanno* "has reached the stage of wanderer."

26. Dig. I, 179, *etukho bhante Bhagavā, sāgatam bhante Bhagavato, criassam kho bhante Bhagavā imam pariyāyam akāsi yadidaṃ idh' āgamanāya, nisidatu bhante Bhagavā, idaṃ āsanam paññattan ti.*
27. Majj. I, pp. 339-342.
28. On occasions *bhadante*, a variant of the form *bhante*, is used by the monks for the Buddha. The monks usually use this term when they are in groups, see Dig. III, pp. 142; Ang. V, p. 354.
29. Majj. pp. 238 ff.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 246-47, *accayo me bhante accagamā yathābālam yathāmūlham yathākusalam yoham Bhagavantam āvuso vādena samudācaritabbam tassa me, bhante, Bhagavā accayam accayato paṭiggaṇhātu āyatim samvarāyā ti.*
31. Vin. I, pp. 8-10.
32. *Ibid.*, I, p. 9 *araham bhikkhave tathāgato sammāsambuddho.*
33. Ang. II, p. 51; Vin. III, p. 230; Vin. III, p. 211; Vin. II, p. 75, respectively.
34. Vin. II, p. 112; Vin. III, p. 7; Sam. II, p. 17, respectively.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Ibid.*
37. Majj. III, pp. 129-130.
38. The authors of the *Pāli English Dictionary* (p. 77) suggest a possible English rendering of the term *gahapati* in vocative singular as *sir*, and vocative plural as *sirs* (*gahapatayo*). But these English substitutions do not seem to carry with them the full force of the original Pāli sense. For that reason it would be best to retain the original Pāli form.
39. Majj. I, pp. 359-360.
40. *Ibid.* I, p. 360 *anovādi anupavādi.*
41. Ang. IV, p. 91.
42. Vin. II, p. 156.
43. See appendix item nos. 139-141.
44. Sam. I, pp. 68-69 (*Kosala-Samyutta*).
45. *Ibid.*, 69 ff.
46. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 340.
47. See, Woodward, *Kindred Sayings*, IV, p. 244, n. 5, who notes this change in the mode of address but feels that, as in the sentence below the *gāmami* says *bhante* again, the reading should be *bho* instead of *bhante*. However, Woodward fails to notice the change in the term of reference which occurred simultaneously. As is seen, *bhante Bhagavā* is replaced by *bho Gotama*. Thus a definite effort is made to distinguish the two terms.
48. Dig. I, p. 151.
49. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, p. 199, n. 2.
50. See Appendix, items nos. 157, 158.
51. *Ibid.*, item no. 161.

52. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha* p. 196 Rhys Davids observes, "it would seem that the nicknames when once generally known tended in speaking of a person to drive the others out of use. But it is never used in speaking to the person referred to by it."
53. Sam. III, p. 69 f.; Ang. V, p. 86.
54. Dig. III, p. 20.
55. Sam. IV, pp. 182-183.
56. Vin. I, p. 82; cf. vin. II, pp. 253, 255, where the Buddha addresses his mother's sister (*matucca*) who had married his father, as *gotami*.
57. See appendix item nos. 1-55.
58. In hunting and good gathering stage we generally find a totemic organisation that is a certain kin-group identified as totem. When they become pastoral or agricultural, this method of identification is often retained in spite of other methods of identification having been developed. Thus we get a linking up of a tortoise (*Kassapa*) group or (*Bhāradoāja*) partridge group with a cowpen (*gotta*). At a later stage certain *gotta* names have greater status than others and seem to have been adopted by many irrespective of their affiliations. See also p. 123.
59. Ang. IV, p. 281.
60. Majj. I, p. 108.
61. *Ibid.*, *daṇḍam oḷubbha ekamantaṃ atthāsi*.
62. Sam. V, p. 344.
63. See Appendix item no. 183.
64. Vin. III, 76.
65. Majj. II, p. 98.
66. *Ibid.*
67. Su. Ni., p. 48 (PTS Edn.).
68. Dig. II, p. 154.
69. Vin. I, p. 92, where Ānanda, unable to pronounce his elder's name, Thera Mahakassapa, was in difficulty. Buddha then introduced a new rule allowing the monks to make use of the *gotta* name to address the elders. This also shows the importance of the *gotta* as a symbol of status; wielding its influence, so to say, outside the pale of society, in the Buddhist Saṃgha.
70. Otto Franke, "The Buddhist Council of Rājagaha and Vesali," *Journal of Pali text Society*, 1908, pp. 32.
71. Dig. II, p. 158.
72. *Ibid.*, pp. 162-163; Vin. II, pp. 284 ff.
73. Otto Franke, *op.cit.*, pp. 32. ff.
74. See p. 57.
75. Vin. II, pp. 31 ff.
76. Sam. III, p. 120.
77. *Ibid.*, p. 133 f.
78. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 276-277.
79. Vin. II, p. 25.

80. *Ibid.* IV, p. 44, where these monks bully other monks and throw them out of their lodging.
81. Vin. III, 160 ff.
82. *Ibid.*, 171 ff. He refers to the Buddha as *samano Gotamo*.
83. Sam. III, p. 116, *socāvam bhikkhu navo bhavissati acirapabbajito thero vā pana bālo avyottoti*
84. Majj. III, p. 207.
85. Ang. V, pp. 196-98.
86. *Ibid.*
87. Sam. IV, p. 391.
88. Dig. I, pp. 150-151.
89. Majj. II, p. 158.
90. Sam. IV, pp. 122, 124.
91. Majj. II, pp. 101-102, 113; Vin. III, p. 248 f. and Ang. III, pp. 59-62, respectively.
92. Majj. III, p. 138.
93. Dig. II, pp. 159-60.
94. Ang. II, p. 194.
95. *Ibid.*, V, pp. 342-343.
96. Vin. II, pp. 15-18.
97. *Ibid.*, II, p. 18; *gahapatim pasannamdāyokam kārakam samghupatṭhāha-kam hinena khīnasessasi hīnena vambhessasi*.
98. See p. 56.
99. Vin. I, p. 194.
100. Ang. I, p. 193.
101. Vin. III, 131-32; cf. Vin. III, p. 119.
102. See for example Vin I, p. 209; II, p. 212; IV, pp. 164, 167 and 169; III, 119, 131-32.
103. Sam. IV, p. 325.
104. Ang. V, p. 196.
105. Majj. I, p. 374 ff.
106. Sam. IV, p. 298 f.
107. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 300 f.
108. Vin. I, p. 241; Ang. V, p. 189.
109. Dig. III, p. 37.
110. Majj. II, pp. 196-197.
111. Vin. II, p. 157.
112. *Ibid.*, p. 158.
113. Sam. IV, p. 315.
114. Majj. II, p. 62; Vin III, p. 17; Sam. V, p. 344.
115. Ang. III, pp. 296-7.
116. Sam. IV, p. 303.
117. *Ibid.* V, pp. 176-77.

118. Majj. I, p. 375-376.
119. Vin. II, p. 155.

120. Majj. II, p. 134.
121. Sam. I, p. 82.
122. Majj. II, p. 127.
123. *Ibid.*, p. 91.
124. Dig. I, p. 225.
125. Majj. I, p. 502.
126. *Ibid.* I, p. 175.
127. Dig. II, p. 66.
128. *Ibid.* 160.
129. Majj. II, p. 99.

130. Ang. V, p. 196.
131. See page 55.
132. See page 68.
133. See page 46, 47.
134. See page 64.
135. See page 53.
136. See pages 61, 63-64.
137. Dig. III, p. 37.
138. See page 47.
139. See note 63 of the Chapter.

140. Sam. IV, pp. 298-99.
141. See pp. 143-44.
142. Sam. IV, pp. 325-26.
143. Cf. Oig. I, 47, 49; Sam. I, 82, 86; Majj. II, 75, 118; Vin. I, 273.
144. See page 67.
145. Vin. I, p. 240.
146. See page 54.
147. For example See pages 46-49.
148. Dig. II, pp. 72-73.
149. *Ibid.* II, p. 237.

150. Vin. III, p. 43.
151. Majj. I, pp. 148.
152. See page 69 where the brāhmaṇa acts as a messenger to a prince.

CHAPTER IV

1. A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and Daryll Forde, *African systems of kinship and marriage*, Introduction, p. 3.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

4. Ang. I, p. 62, *mātā-pitaro puttānam āpādakā posakā imassa dassetarotī*
5. *Ibid.*, II, p. 70.
6. Dig. III, p. 189.
7. Majj. II, pp. 185-186.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 50 ff.
9. Sam. I, p. 181.

10. Vin. III, pp. 10, 16 and 18.
11. *Ibid.*, I, p. 272.
12. Dig. I, pp. 85-86.
13. Sam. I, p. 177.
14. Vin. IV, pp. 223-224.
15. Sam. I, p. 176.
16. Vin. I, p. 82.
17. Dig. III, p. 189.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*, II, p. 340.

20. Vin. I, p. 15; Vin. II, p. 180; Ang. I, p. 145.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 179.
22. *Ibid.* p. 77.
23. Majj. II, p. 106.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 56-57.
25. *Ibid.*, II, p. 60.
26. Vin. III, pp. 13-14.
27. *Ibid.*, I, p. 17.
28. Ang. I, p. 179.
29. Majj. II, p. 166; Dig. I, p. 115.

30. Vin. I, pp. 82-83.
31. Sam. I, pp. 176-177.
32. Vin. III, p. 18.
33. *Ibid.* I, p. 43.
34. Dig. I, p. 85.
35. Vin. III, p. 18.
36. Majj. II, p. 63; Vin. III, p. 16; *Majjhima* account has this. *mattikam dhānam, aññam pettikam aññam pitāmaham*; whereas in the *Vinaya* we have an addition of the words, *mātu* before *mattikam* and additional, *itthikāya itthīdhānam*. Thus mother's wealth is specified as woman's wealth.
37. Vin. I, pp. 82-83.
38. Sam. I, pp. 89-90.
39. *Ibid.* I, pp. 92.

40. Dig. II, p. 331.
41. Sam. I, p. 86.

42. Majj. I, p. 360.
43. Vin. III, p. 66.
44. *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.
45. Dig. III, p. 189; *petānam Kālakatānam dakkhiṇam anupādassati.*
46. Ang. II, pp. 67-68.
47. Vin. IV, pp. 334-335.
48. Ang. V, p. 264.
49. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 265.

50. Sam. I, p. 171.
51. Vin. IV, p. 79.
52. *Ibid.* III, p. 144.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 135.
54. Dig. II, p. 331.
55. Sam. I, p. 86.
56. Vin. III, p. 128.
57. Sam. I, p. 177.
58. Vin. II, pp. 180-181; Here taking Mahānāma as an elder brother we have relied on the fact that his name invariably preceds that of Anuruddha.
59. See pages 32-83.

60. Majj. II, p. 123; Ang. III, p. 348.
61. Vin. II, p. 139; *Chandas* has been taken to mean Sanskrit by D.P.P.N. S.V. *chandas*.
62. Dig. II, p. 131, *dve kassaka bhātarū*
63. Vin. I, pp. 33-34.
64. Dig. II, p. 331.
65. Vin. IV, p. 223.
66. *Ibid.* I, p. 82.
67. *Ibid.*, II, p. 182, *yāvāham putte ca bhātare ca rajjam niyyādemūti.*
68. Sam. I, p. 92, *bhātuca pana ekaputtawam sāpateyyassā kāraṇā jīvītā voropesi.*
69. Ang. IV, p. 93.

70. D.P.P.N., Suddhodana, S.V.
71. Ang. IV, p. 276, *bahupakārū mahāpajāpati Gotami Bhagavato mātuccha āpādiko posikū.*
72. Majj. II, p. 64; Vin. III, p. 17; see also Vin. IV, 263.
73. Vin. II, p. 205.
74. Ang. IV, p. 210.
75. An "avoidance" relationship calls for a minimisation of actual contacts. It is opposed to "normal" relationship in that individual temperaments of the persons do not play a great role. The sexual relationship between persons is prohibited but where it occurs, there is no incest. In fact, it is to avoid the sexual relationship that "avoidance" is practised. An

example of avoidance relationship in modern Indian society is that between a daughter-in-law and a father-in-law.

76. Vin. IV, pp. 332-333, where a senior nun addresses a probationer as *ayye*. They also refer to other nuns as *ayyā*; Vin. IV, 326.
77. *Ibid.* IV, pp. 318, 211.
78. The exception is, however, made in the case of Prajāpati Gotami who is addressed by the monk Ānanda as *Gotami*. It may be remembered that it was she who admitted women into the Buddha's sangha; See Vin. IV, p. 254.
79. Ang. III, p. 69, *sallape asihatthena*
80. *Ibid.* IV, p. 93.
81. Dig. II, pp. 239, 245.
82. Majj. II, p. 64.
83. Ang. IV, p. 210.
84. *Ibid.* III, pp. 295-298.
85. Vin. I, pp. 240-241.
86. *Ibid.*, pp. 216-217.
87. *Ibid.*, III, p. 17.
88. Ang. III, p. 57 ff.
89. Vin. I, p. 272.
90. Sam. I, p. 170.
91. Majj. I, pp. 450-51.
92. Vin. IV, pp. 78-79.
93. Ang. IV, p. 210.
94. Dig. II, p. 245.
95. Ang. III, p. 296; II, 61.
96. Majj. II, p. 110.
97. Vin. III, p. 83.
98. Ang. III, p. 296.
99. Vin. I, p. 82.
100. *Ibid.*, III, p. 17.
101. Majj. II, p. 64.
102. Ang. IV, p. 210.
103. Dig. II, p. 331.
104. Ang. III, p. 58.
105. *Ibid.*, p. 57.
106. *Ibid.* II, p. 61.
107. *Ibid.* III, p. 296.
108. Majj. II, p. 110.
109. *Ibid.* II, p. 64.
110. Vin. III, pp. 17-18.
111. Dig. II, p. 246.

112. Vin. I, p. 272.
113. *Ibid.* I, p. 276.
114. *Ibid.* IV, p. 263.
115. Sam. I, p. 170.
116. Majj. I, pp. 384-385.
117. Vin. III, p. 83.
118. *Ibid.* IV, p. 225.
119. Dig. III, p. 190.

120. Ang. III, pp. 36-38.
121. *Ibid.*, IV, pp. 92-93.
122. Dig. I, p. 123.
123. *Ibid.*, 123, *aham̐ assa mātūpitaro jānāmi...aham̐ assa mante vāceta*
124. Vin. III, pp. 66-67.
125. *Ibid.*, p. 66.
126. Sam. I, p. 85, *rājā māgadho Ajātasattu Vedehiputto adubbhantassa dub-*
bhati, atha ca pana me bhāgineyyo hoti.
127. Vin. IV, p. 105.
128. Dig. III, p. 72.
129. Ang. II, p. 78.

130. Vin. III, p. 120.
131. *Ibid.*
132. *Ibid.* III, pp. 136-37.
133. *Ibid.*, p. 137.
134. *Ibid.* I, pp. 240-41.
135. *Ibid.*, p. 273.
136. Ang. III, p. 37.
137. Sam. I, p. 86.
138. Vin. III, pp. 13-18.
139. *Ibid.* IV, pp. 20-21.

140. *Ibid.*; It is significant to note that mother-in-law addresses in a suspicious mood the daughter-in-law as *Je*, a term of address which is elsewhere used for slaves.
141. Ang. II, p. 78.
142. *Ibid.* IV, pp. 92-93.
143. Sam. I, p. 176.
144. Vin. II, p. 254.
145. Sam. II, p. 281.
146. *Ibid.*
147. Ang. III, p. 347.
148. Sam. I, p. 97.
149. Ang. IV, p. 276.

150. Dig. III, p. 72.
151. Vin. III, p. 16.
152. Sam. I, p. 97.
153. Vin. III, p. 135.
154. *Ibid.*, *amhe na jānanti ke vā ime kassavāti, kismim viya kumārikāya vatthum.*
155. *Ibid.*, p. 135.
156. See pages 81, 82.
157. Dig. I, p. 99.
158. Vin. II, pp. 154-155.
159. *Ibid.* III, pp. 139-140.

160. *Ibid.*, pp. 135-136.
161. *Ibid.*, p. 136; *atha kho sā gaṇakī tesam ājīvaka sāvakanam dhītaram adāsi.*
162. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 18.
163. See page 96.
164. Ang. I, p. 137; IV, p. 210; Vin. I, p. 23; II, p. 25; Sam. II, p. 243.
165. Ang. IV, p. 210.
166. *Ibid.*, *tam purisam pakkosāpetva vāmena hatthena pajāpatim gahetvā, dakkhiṇena hatthena bhīṅgūram gahetvā, tassa purissassa oṇoesim.*
167. For the term *oṇoesam*, see Majj. I, p. 236; Vin. I, p. 39.
168. Ang. III, pp. 223-230.
169. Majj. II, p. 149.

170. *Majjhima Aṭṭhakathā*, III, p. 409.
171. Vin. II, p. 139.
172. Majj. I, p. 185, see also D.P.P.N. S.V., sariputta.
173. *Ibid.* II, p. 153.
174. Dig. I, p. 97.
175. Festive occasions of the brāhmaṇas.
176. Dig. I, p. 92.
177. Ang. IV, pp. 18-19.
178. *Ibid.*, p. 19, *Vajjī, yā tā kulitthiyo kulakumāriyo, tā na okkassa pasayha cāsessanti. . . .*
179. Vin. III, p. 225.

180. *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.
181. It is interesting to note that a number of Himalayan tribes in Assam and Nepal practice, "matrilateral cross-cousin" marriage today.
182. A.A. I, p. 158 ff.
183. See pages 102, 103.
184. Dig. I, p. 71.
185. Ang. I, p. 115.
186. Vin. III, pp. 224, 244; IV, p. 107.
187. Majj. II, p. 186.

188. Ang. IV, p. 244.
189. *Ibid.* III, p. 76 f.
190. Dig. II, p. 26.
191. Vin. I, pp. 147-148.
192. Ang. IV, p. 244; see *Ibid.*, 245 where in the verse it is said *rañño hito, devahito-ñāṭṭinam sakhinam hito*.
193. Majj. II, p. 186.
194. *Ibid.*
195. Vin. I, p. 272.
196. *Ibid.*, p. 240.
197. Ang. IV, p. 393.
198. *Ibid.* I, p. 152.
199. Dig. I, pp. 116, 133.
200. *Ibid.* II, p. 148.
201. Majj. II, p. 397 (Nālanda Edition).
202. Dig. II, pp. 345-346.
203. Vin. II, p. 126.
204. Sam. IV, pp. 302-303.
205. Majj. I, p. 506.
206. Ang. I, p. 222.
207. Sam. IV, p. 190; V, pp. 300-301.
208. *Ibid.*, p. 59.
209. Vin. III, pp. 66-67; *kuṭumbaṇca santhā pesi dānaṃ ca paṭṭhapesi*.
210. *Ibid.*, *sabbassa kuṭumbassa issarā bhavissati*.
211. Ang. III, p. 295.
212. *Ibid.*, p. 296.
213. Sam. II, p. 200; Vin. III, p. 83, 248-249.
214. Vin. IV, p. 20; *kulūpako hoti bahukāni kulāni upāsam kāmāti*.
215. Dig. I, p. 91.
216. Vin. I, pp. 240-241.
217. Dig. III, p. 189 f.
218. For Lohicca brāhmaṇa, see Dig. I, p. 110.
219. Sam. IV, p. 121.
220. Vin. III, pp. 249-250.
221. Ang. IV, p. 393.
222. Sam. IV, p. 239.
223. Vin. I, p. 43.
224. Ang. IV, pp. 282-287.
225. *Ibid.*
226. Vin. III, p. 211.
227. Ang. II, p. 123.

228. Dig. I, p. 89.
 229. Ang. IV, P. 282.
230. *Ibid.* V, p. 89.
 231. *Ibid.* IV, p. 355 f.
 232. *Ibid.*, I, p. 152.
 233. *Ibid.*
 234. *Ibid.* IV, p. 244.
 235. *Ibid.* III, pp. 76, 300.
 236. Vin. III, p. 200.
 237. Ang. II, p. 249, *Kulāni bhogesu mahantāni pattāni na cirraṭṭha kāni bhavanti.*
 238. Dig. II, p. 147.
 239. Vin. IV, p. 67.
240. Ang. IV, p. 212.
 241. Dig. II, p. 249.
 242. Vin. IV, p. 227.
 243. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
 244. Majj. II, p. 186 f.
 245. Sam. V, p. 365.
 246. Majj. II, p. 397 (Nālanda Edition).
 247. Ang. IV, p. 259.
 248. Dig. II, p. 345.
 249. Vin. I, p. 4; *ñātisālohita devatā.*
250. Dig. II, pp. 26-27.
 251. Majj. I, p. 510.
 252. Sam. IV, pp. 302-303.
 253. Vin. II, p. 126.
 254. Sam. IV, p. 190.
 255. Vin. I, p. 345.
 256. Ang. V, p. 269.
 257. Vin. III, pp. 206, 212, 214, 216, 219, 235; IV, pp. 60-61.
 258. Sam. IV, p. 239.
 259. Vin. III, p. 207.
260. Ang. III, p. 96.
 261. Vin. I, pp. 147-148.
 262. *Ibid.*, III, p. 198.
 263. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 147-148.
 264. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 190.
 265. *Ibid.*, III, p. 211.
 266. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
 267. *Ibid.*, p. 207; see also *Ibid.*, p. 258.
 268. *Ibid.*, p. 211.
 269. *Ibid.*, p. 216.

270. *Ibid.*, p. 234.
271. *Ibid.*, p. 235.
272. *Ibid.*, III, p. 209.
273. *Ibid.* IV, p. 60.
274. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
275. *Ibid.*, p. 268 f.
276. Majj. II, 67-68.
277. See page 110.
278. Vin. II, p. 154 ff.
279. *Ibid.*, III, p. 138.

280. See page 93.
281. Sam. IV, p. 121.
282. Ang. II, p. 112.
283. Vin. I, p. 86.
284. Ang. III, p. 35.
285. See page 113.
286. Vin. III, pp. 184; IV, pp. 80, 177, 272.
287. Ang. II, p. 85.
288. Majj. II, p. 183.
289. *Ibid.*, p. 178.

290. Dig. III, p. 81.
291. Vin. IV, p. 274.
292. Ang. V, p. 234.
293. Dig. I, p. 95.
294. *Ibid.*, p. 87.
295. See, for instance, Dig. I, pp. 88, 224; Majj. II, pp. 134, 164.
296. Dig. I, p. 115.
297. Majj. III, pp. 37-38.
298. *Ibid.*, III, p. 177; cf. Ang. I, p. 107.
299. Sam. I, p. 166.

300. Majj. III, p. 205.
301. Dig. I, p. 123.
302. See page 120.
303. Dig. I, pp. 113, 131.
304. Vin. III, p. 169.
305. *Ibid.* IV, p. 6.
306. Ang. I, p. 162.
307. *Ibid.*, III, pp. 383-84.
308. Dig. I, p. 99.
309. Sam. I, pp. 99-100.

310. Vin. IV, p. 6.
311. Dig. I, pp. 99, 123.

- 312. *Ibid.*, pp. 90-92.
- 313. Sam. I, p. 168.
- 314. Dig. I, p. 123.
- 315. *Ibid.*, p. 95.
- 316. *Ibid.*, pp. 113, 130; Majj. II, p. 165 respectively.
- 317. Sam. IV, p. 122.
- 318. Majj. II, p. 102.
- 319. Dig. I, p. 193.

- 320. Majj. I, p. 429.
- 321. Dig. III, p. 111; Ang. I, p. 164.
- 322. Dig. I, p. 92.
- 323. Sam. I, p. 170.
- 324. Ang. II, p. 238.
- 325. Majj. II, p. 127.
- 326. Dig. II, p. 51.
- 327. Majj. II, pp. 210-11.
- 328. See page 55.
- 329. Dig. I, p. 99.

- 330. Ang. IV, pp. 198 f.
- 331. *Ibid.*, p. 373; V, p. 23.
- 332. Vin. IV, p. 7.
- 333. See pages 69, 70.
- 334. Vin. IV, p. 6.
- 335. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- 336. Majj. II, pp. 97, 100.
- 337. *Ibid.*, p. 165.
- 338. Dig. I, p. 82.
- 339. *Ibid.*, p. 193.

- 340. Majj. II, p. 429.
- 341. Sam. IV, p. 218.
- 342. Majj. II, pp. 128-29.
- 343. *Ibid.*
- 344. Majj. II, p. 128.
- 345. *Ibid.*, p. 147.
- 346. Ang. III, p. 242.
- 347. *Ibid.* IV, p. 210.
- 348. Sam. I, p. 166.
- 349. Ang. IV, p. 239.

- 350. Sam. III, p. 8.
- 351. *Ibid.* I, p. 74.
- 352. Ang. II, p. 205.
- 353. *Ibid.*, III, p. 363.

354. Dig. II, pp. 85, 109.
 355. Vin. I, p. 71, *bhikkhave imāham . . . ñātinam āveṇiyam parihāram das-samīti*.
 356. Dig. II, p. 165.
 357. Vin. I, p. 247.
 358. Majj. II, p. 67.
 359. Ang. V, p. 264.
360. Dig. I, p. 115.
 361. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
 362. Majj. III, p. 46; Vin. III, p. 139.
 363. Dig. III, p. 165.
 364. Ang. III, p. 147.
 365. Sam. IV, p. 246.
 366. Ang. II, p. 45.
 367. Vin. III, p. 164.
 368. *Ibid.* I, pp. 147-48.
 369. *Ibid.* III, p. 15.
370. Ang. IV, p. 210.
 371. Dig. II, p. 249.
 372. Vin. IV, p. 227.
 373. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
 374. *Ibid.*, pp. 227-28.
 375. Ang. V, pp. 128-29.
 376. *Sārathappakāsini*, III, p. 286.

CHAPTER V

1. I. B. Hōrner, *B.O.D.*, II, p. 176.
2. Su. Ni. 613 vs.
3. Vin. IV, pp. 6, 7.
4. *Ibid.* I, p. 369.
5. Sam. V, p. 169.
6. Vin. IV, p. 6.
7. Ang. III, p. 225.
8. Sam. III, p. 131.
9. *Ibid.* II, pp. 101-102.
10. *Ibid.*
11. Vin. I, p. 249.
12. Dig. I, p. 225.
13. Vin. II, pp. 182-83.
14. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 7.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 308.

16. Dig. I, p. 225; and Majj. II, pp. 75-76.
17. Vin. I, p. 344.
18. Majj. II, pp. 75-76.
19. Vin. IV, p. 7.

20. *Ibid.* III, p. 259.
21. *Ibid.* II, p. 159.
22. Sam. V, p. 149.
23. Dig. I, p. 74.
24. Vin. IV, p. 6 f.
25. *Ibid.*
26. Majj. II, p. 206.
27. Vin. III, p. 72.
28. Majj. II, p. 51.
29. Dig. I, p. 51.

30. Vin. IV, p. 7.
31. *Ibid.*, III, pp. 244-45.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.
33. Majj. II, pp. 48-53.
34. Dig. I, p. 104.
35. See McDonnell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, S. V. Āṅgīrasa.
36. Ang. III, pp. 239-40.
37. Majj. III, pp. 237-38.
38. Vin. I, p. 344.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

40. Majj. I, pp. 31-32.
41. Sam. II, p. 215.
42. Vin. III, p. 106.
43. Ang. IV, p. 120.
44. Dig. II, pp. 135-36.
45. Majj. I, p. 25.
46. *Ibid.*
47. Ang. IV, p. 127.
48. Vin. IV, p. 167.
49. Dig. I, p. 78.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
51. Vin. IV, p. 6.
52. *Ibid.* III, pp. 224-25.
53. *Ibid.* I, p. 269.
54. *Ibid.* IV, p. 308.
55. Ang. I, p. 26.
56. See, for instance, Vin. I, p. 270 ff.

57. Ang. III, p. 451.
58. Vin. I, p. 72.
59. *Ibid.*, 273.

60. Dig. I, pp. 48-50.
61. Vin. I, p. 270.
62. *Ibid.* II, p. 74.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 261.
64. *Ibid.* I, p. 215.
65. Majj. I, p. 429.
66. Vin. IV, p. 6.
67. *Ibid.* I, p. 77.
68. Cf. Vin II, pp. 107, 150; IV, p. 267; *see also* Dig. I, p. 6.
69. For example the big cities are known for their varied interests in dancing, singing and instrumental musical performances; *see* Dig. II, p. 147; Sam. V, p. 369.

70. Sam. IV, p. 306.
71. *Ibid.*, V, p. 168.
72. Suddinna, son of a *seṭṭhi* and Ratṭhapāla, a son of a *gahapati*, are addressed by their friends as *samma*. *See* Vin. III, pp. 13-14; Majj. II, p. 59.
73. Aḍḍhakāsi, a courtesan, wishes to become a nun and could not be so because others prevented her and not the *saṃgha.*, *see* Vin. II, p. 276.
74. Vin. II, p. 136.
75. *Ibid.* I, p. 268-69.
76. Dig. II, pp. 96-97.
77. for instance, *see* Vin. III, p. 15.
78. Vin. I, pp. 268-69.
79. *Ibid.* III, p. 178.

80. *Ibid.*, p. 237.
81. *Ibid.*, p. 107.
82. Majj. II, p. 465 (Nālanda Edition).
83. Dig. I, p. 59.
84. Ang. III, p. 76.
85. Vin. II, p. 83.
86. *Ibid.* IV, pp. 223-24.
87. *Ibid.* I, p. 240.
88. *Ibid.* IV, p. 131.
89. *Ibid.* III, p. 52.

90. *Ibid.* I, p. 179.
91. *Ibid.*
92. *Ibid.*, p. 38; IV. pp. 120.
93. *Ibid.*
94. *Ibid.*, p. 93.

95. Sam. IV, pp. 341-342; The *bhaṭas* mentioned here are not working for any king but for the ruling extended kin-group known as Koliyas and they are distinguished by their long hair (*Koliyānaṃ lambacūlake bhaṭe*).
96. Vin. IV, p. 265.
97. Majj. I, p. 85.
98. *Ibid.*, II, p. 232.
99. Ang. II, pp. 81-82.

100. Majj. II, pp. 197-199.
101. Vin. IV, p. 6.
102. Ang. III, p. 208.
103. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 285; see also Ang. III, p. 225 f., where brahmanas follow this occupation.
104. *Ibid.*, p. 281.
105. See page 156.
106. Ang. III, p. 368.
107. *Ibid.* IV, p. 127.
108. P.E.D., S.V. *Samudda*.
109. See page 32.

110. Vin. I, p. 272 ff.
111. *Ibid.* II, p. 154 ff.
112. *Ibid.* IV, p. 162.
113. *Ibid.* I, p. 4.
114. Dig. II, pp. 72-168; see Jennings, *Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha*, p. 157, where he records the Buddha's journeys. The economic importance of these routes has been more or less overlooked.
115. Dig. II, p. 344.
116. Vin. III, p. 200.
117. *Ibid.* IV, p. 63.
118. *Ibid.* I, p. 151.
119. *Ibid.* IV, pp. 131-132.

120. Dig. II, p. 128.
121. Vin. I, p. 224.
122. *Ibid.* III, p. 6.
123. Majj. II, p. 111; Ang. I, p. 247-48.
124. Sam. I, p. 106.
125. Vin. II, p. 267.
126. *Ibid.* IV, p. 243.
127. Ang. I, pp. 116-117.
128. Vin. IV, p. 248.
129. Ang. III, p. 383.

130. *Ibid.*, pp. 301-2.
131. Vin. III, p. 105.

132. Dig. I, p. 71.
133. Ang. V, p. 83. The Buddha gives this example to Sākyans of Kapila-vatthu.
134. Vin. II, p. 179-80, compare Dig. III, p. 93, where the definition of khattiya is "Lord of the field", *khattānam patīti kho khattiyo*.
135. Dig. II, p. 166.
136. See page 146.
137. Sam. I, p. 172.
138. Ang. I, pp. 241-42.
139. Vin. I, p. 240, *eken naṅgalena kasantassa satta sītāyo gacchantī*.

140. Dig. II, p. 131, *dve kassakā bhātaro hatā cattāro ca balivaddhā*.
141. Sam. I, pp. 170-171.
142. Vin. IV, p. 6.
143. Majj. I, p. 85; Vin. IV, p. 6.
144. See page 146.
145. Majj. II, p. 464 (Nālanda Edition).
146. See pages 14, 15.
147. *Ibid.*
148. B.O.D., II, p. 47.
149. Dig. I, p. 209.

150. *Ibid.*, p. 208.
151. *Ibid.*, p. 111; Majj. II, p. 164.
152. Majj. II, pp. 71-72.
153. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, s.v., *grahapati*.
154. Ang. V, pp. 44-45.
155. Majj. II, p. 359.
156. Dig. I, p. 61.
157. Vin. III, p. 222; B.O.D., II, p. 67.
158. See pages 19, 53 and 71.
159. Sam. IV, pp. 109-124; Ang. IV, pp. 209-235.

160. Vin. I, p. 240-44.
161. *Ibid.*, II, p. 158.
162. *Ibid.*, p. 154.
163. *Ibid.*, p. 157.
164. *Ibid.*, I, p. 172.
165. *Ibid.*, p. 276.
166. *Ibid.*, p. 274.
167. Sam. I, p. 89 ff.
168. Majj. III, pp. 175-176.
169. Ang. V, pp. 342-343.

170. *Ibid.*, p. 117.
171. Majj. II, p. 185.

- 172. Sam. II, pp. 112-113.
- 173. Ang. V, p. 40.
- 174. Vin. III, p. 73.
- 175. Majj. I, pp. 450-451, 452.
- 176. Ang. I, pp. 231-52.
- 177. Majj. I, pp. 365-66.
- 178. Ang. V, p. 43.
- 179. *Ibid.* IV, pp. 282-83.

CHAPTER VI

1. *Ṣāti* in Pāli is used sometimes as nominative singular and at other time as plural. We may compare the modern terms for sub-caste, such as *ātmiya* (Bengali), *bhaibandha* (Hindi), and *jñāti* (Marathi), which are used in singular. For the term *ṣāti* in Asokan Edicts see R.E. 3 (Junagada) L.3,4 (Junagada), L.4,3 (Shabazgarhi) L.6,13 (Girnara) L.4,5 (Girnara) L.8,11 (Kalsi), Ls, 37, 38,5 (Kalsi) L.16, etc. The contents of these and many others, show a remarkable affinity to those of Pali passages cited above pp. 105-120 (References to the inscription are from the Ed. Hultzsch).

APPENDIX

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
1	Bhagavā	Buddha	Soṇadaṇḍa	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
2	Bhagavā	Buddha	Pokkharsādi	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
3	Bhagavā	Buddha	Kuṭadanta	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
4	Bhagavā	Buddha	Caṅki	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
5	Bhagavā	Buddha	Uggatasarīra	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
6	Bhagavā	Buddha	Uṇṇābha	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
7	Bhagavā	Buddha	Jāṇussoṇī	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
8	Bhagavā	Buddha	Ujjaya	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
9	Bhagavā	Buddha	Pingalakoccha	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
10	Bhagavā	Buddha	Ekusāri	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
11	Bhagavā	Buddha	Tikaṇṇa	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
12	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sangārava	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
13	Bhagavā	Buddha	Vassakāra	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
14	Bhagavā	Buddha	Doṇa	Brāhmaṇa	Doṇa Brāhmaṇa
15	Bhagavā	Buddha	Udāyi	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
16	Bhagavā	Buddha	Nālijaṅgha	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos</i>
Soṇadaṇḍa Brāhmaṇa	—	The brāhmaṇa becomes an Upāsaka	Dīg. I. 119 ff.	1
Pokkharasādi Brāhmaṇa	—	The brāhmaṇa becomes an Upāsaka	Dīg. I. 108 ff.	2
—	—	- do -	Dīg. I. 134 ff.	3
—	—	We do not know whether he becomes an upāsaka or not	Majj. II. pp. 165-68.	4
—	—	He becomes an upāsaka	Ang. IV. pp. 41-46.	5
—	—	He does not become an upāsaka	Sam. V. pp. 217-219	6
—	—	He becomes an upāsaka	Ang. II. pp. 173-76; IV. pp. 54-56 Majj. I. 16 ff.	7
—	—	- do -	Ang. IV pp. 285-89	8
—	—	- do -	Majj. I. pp. 198-208	9
—	—	- do -	Majj. II. 177 ff.	10
—	—	- do -	Ang. I. pp. 163-66	11
—	—	- do -	Ang. I. pp. 168-73	12
—	—	Vassakāra does not become an upāsaka	Ang. II. pp. 172-73	13
—	—	Becomes an upāsaka	Ang. III. pp. 223-30	14
—	—	Does not become an upāsaka	Ang. II. pp. 43-44	15
—	—	He does not become an upāsaka	Majj. II. pp. 108-10	16

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
17	Bhagavā	Buddha	Verañja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
18	Bhagavā	Buddha	Devahita	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
19	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sikha Moggallāna	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
20	Bhagavā	Buddha	Gaṇaka Moggallāna	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
21	Bhagavā	Buddha	Kasi Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
22	Bhagavā	Buddha	Jaṭā Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
23	Bhagavā	Buddha	Suddhika Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
24	Bhagavā	Buddha	Navkammika Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
25	Bhagavā	Buddha	Asurindaka Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
26	Bhagavā	Buddha	Akkosaka Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
27	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bilangika Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
28	Bhagavā	Buddha	Ahimsaka Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
29	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mānatthadda Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
30	Bhagavā	Buddha	Paccānīka	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	Becomes an upāsaka	Ang. IV. pp. 173-79	17
—	—	- do -	Sam. I. p. 175	18
—	—	Does not become an upāsaka	Ang. II. pp. 232-33	19
—	—	Becomes an upāsaka	Majj. III. pp. 1-7	20
—	—	- do -	Sam. I. pp. 172-173	21
—	—	The brāhmaṇa joins the Buddhist Saṃgha and becomes arahat. He is then referred to in the text as āyasmā Bhāradvāja	Sam. I. p. 165	22
—	—	- do -	Sam. I. p. 166	23
—	—	Becomes an upāsaka	Sam. I. pp. 179-80	24
—	—	Becomes an arahat. See above item no. 22	Sam. I. pp. 163-4	25
—	—	- do -	Sam. I. pp. 162-3	26
—	—	- do -	Sam. I. p. 164	27
—	—	See item No. 25	Sam. I. pp. 164-5	28
—	—	Becomes an upāsaka	Sam. I. pp. 178-9	29
—	—	- do -	Sam. I. p. 179	30

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
31	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bhāradvāja-gotta	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
32	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sundarika	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
33	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
34	Bhagavā	Buddha	Aggika	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
35	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
36	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mātuposaka	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
37	Bhagavā	Buddha	Paribbājaka	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
38	Bhagavā	Buddha	Lokāyata	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
39	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bhikkhaka	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
40	Bhagavā	Buddha	Huhunka-jātika	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
41	Bhagavā	Buddha	Brahmāyu	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
42	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mahāsāla	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
43	Bhagavā	Buddha	'Aññatara'	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
44	Bhagavā	Buddha	Two Brāhmaṇas	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
45	Bhagavā	Buddha	120 years old	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
46	Bhagavā	Buddha	Lohicca	Brāhmaṇa	Lohicca
47	Bhagavā	Buddha	Assalāyana	Brāhmaṇa	Assalāyana
48	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sangārava (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Bhāradvāja
49	Bhagavā	Buddha	Kāpathika (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Bhāradvāja
50	Bhagavā	Buddha	Vāsetṭha (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Vāsetṭha

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	Becomes an arahat. See above item no. 22	Sam. I. pp. 160-61	31
—	—	- do -	Sam. I. pp. 167-171	32
—	—	- do -	Sam. I. pp. 166-7	33
—	—	Becomes an upāsaka	Sam. I. pp. 181-2	34
—	—	- do -	Ang. I. pp. 157-58	35
—	—	- do -	Sam. II. p. 77	36
—	—	Becomes an upāsaka	Sam. I. p. 182	37
—	—	Does not become an upāsaka	Vin. I. pp. 2-3	38
Brahmāyu	—	Becomes an upāsaka	Majj. II. pp. 142-45	39
Brāhmaṇa	—	Becomes an upāsaka	Sam. I. pp. 176-7	40
—	—	- do -	Ang. I. pp. 156-7	41
—	—	- do -	Ang. I. p. 155	42
—	—	- do -	Dīg. I. pp. 224-7, 234	43
—	—	- do -	Majj. II. pp. 147-48, 157	44
—	—	- do -	Majj. II. pp. 210-11, 213	46
Kāpaṭika māṇava	—	See item No. 40	Majj. II. pp. 168-69, 177	47
—	—	- do -	Majj. II. pp. 462-3, 468. (Nālanda ed.)	48
		- do -	Dīg. I. pp. 236-237, 252	

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
49	Bhagavā	Buddha	Subha Todeyyaputta (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Subha-1 Māṇava-2
50	Bhagavā	Buddha	Uttara (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Uttara
51	Bhagavā	Buddha	Māgha (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Māgha
52	Bhagavā	Buddha	Ambaṭṭha (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Ambaṭṭha
53	Bhagavā	Buddha	Brāhmaṇa- gahapati of Sāla	Brāhmaṇa	Gahapatayo
54	Bhagavā	Buddha	Brāhmaṇa- gahapati of Verañja	Brāhmaṇa	Gahapatayo
55	Bhagavā	Buddha	Brāhmaṇa- gahapati of Veludvāra	Brāhmaṇa	Gahapatayo

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	Becomes an upāsaka of the Buddha	Majj. II. pp. 197-208	49
—	—	Uttara māṇava sees the 32 marks of greatness on the body of the Buddha and reports it to the Brahmāyu brāhmaṇa. But does not become an upāsaka	Majj. II. pp. 141-42	50
Uttara māṇava	—	—	Su. Ni. pp. 87-91	51
—	—	He does not become an upāsaka of the Buddha. While taking leave of the Buddha, he says that 'he is busy and has much work to do'	Dīg. I. pp. 89-90, 106	52
Ambaṭṭha māṇava	—	They become the upāsakas of the Buddha	Majj. I. pp. 285-290	53
—	—	- do -	Majj. I. pp. 356-59 (Nālanda Ed.)	54
—	—	- do -	Sam. V. pp. 352-356	55

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		<i>Term of Address</i>
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	
56	Bhagavā	Buddha	Brāhmaṇa- gahapati of Nagaravinda	Brāhmaṇa	Gahapatayo

THE BUDDHA AND THE JAINS

57	Bhagavā	Buddha	Dīghatapassī	Jain	Tapassi
58	Bhagavā	Buddha	Nigaṇṭhā	Jain	Tapassi
60	Bhagavā	Buddha	Saccaka Nigaṇṭhaputta	Jain	Aggivessana

THE BUDDHA AND THE PARIBBĀJAKAS

61	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mandissa & Jāliya	Paribbājaka	āvusā
62	Bhagavā	Buddha	Ālāra Kālāma	Paribbājaka	āvusā Kālāma
63	Bhagavā	Buddha	Uddaka Rāmaputta	Paribbājaka	āvuso Rāma
64	Bhagavā	Buddha	Acela Kassapa	Paribbājaka	Kassapa

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	—	Majj. III. pp. 291-93	56
—	—	—	Majj. I. 371 ff.	57
—	—	—	Majj. II. 243 f.	58
—	—	He does not become an upāsaka, but invites the Buddha for a meal	Majj. II. pp. 228-30, 236	60
—	—	They do not become upāsakas	Dīg. I. pp. 157-58	61
Alāra Kālāma	—	—	Majj. I. pp. 163-65	62
Rāma	—	—	Majj. I. pp. 165-66	63
—	—	Acela Kassapa becomes a monk and an <i>arahat</i> by stages. After he has become a monk, he is referred to as <i>āyasmā Kassapa</i>	Sam. II. pp. 19-22	64

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
65	Bhagavā	Buddha	Vacchagotta-1	Paribbājaka	Vaccha-1
			Vacchagotta-2		Vaccha-2
			Vacchagotta-3		Vaccha-3
66	Bhagavā	Buddha	Dīghanakha	Paribbājaka	Aggivesana
67	Bhagavā	Buddha	Vekhanassa	Paribbājaka	Kaccāna
68	Bhagavā	Buddha	Magandīya	Paribbājaka	Magandīya
69	Bhagavā	Buddha	Moliya Sīvaka	Paribbājaka	Sīvaka
70	Bhagavā	Buddha	Timbaruka	Paribbājaka	Timbaruka
71	Bhagavā	Buddha	Potaliya	Paribbājaka	Potaliya
72	Bhagavā	Buddha	Nandiya	Paribbājaka	Nandiya
73	Bhagavā	Buddha	Uttiya	Paribbājaka	Uttiya
74	Bhagavā	Buddha	Ajita	Paribbājaka	Ajita
75	Bhagavā	Buddha	Kandaraka	Paribbājaka	Kandaraka
76	Bhagavā	Buddha	(sambahula paribbajaka) 1. Antabhara, 2. Varadhara, 3. Sakuludayi	Paribbājaka (group)	Paribbājaka
77	Bhagavā	Buddha	Subhadda	Paribbājaka	Subhadda
78	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bhaggavagotta	Paribbājaka	Bhaggava

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		He becomes an upāsaka.	Dig. I. pp. 167-177	65
		Becomes a monk and an arahat.	Majj. I. pp. 484-88 Majj. I. pp. 489-497	"
		He does not become an upāsaka	Majj. I. pp. 481-83	"
		He becomes an upāsaka	Majj. I. pp. 497-501	66
		- do -	Majj. II. pp. 40-44	67
		He becomes an arahat. Referred to as āyasmā Māgaṇḍiya	Majj. I. pp. 503-513	68
		Becomes an upāsaka	Sam. IV. pp. 230-31	69
		- do -	Sam. II. pp. 22-23	70
		- do -	Ang. II. pp. 100-101	71
		- do -	Sam. V. pp. 11-12	72
		Does not become upāsaka	Ang. V. pp. 193-94	73
		- do -	Ang. V. pp. 229-230	74
		- do -	Majj. I. pp. 339-40	75
		- do -	Ang. II. pp. 176-77	76
		He becomes an arahat. Referred to as āyasmā Subhanda	Dig. II. pp. 148-153	77
		Does not become an upāsaka	Dig. III. pp. 1-2, 35	78

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
79	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sakuludāyi	Paribbājaka	Udāyi
80	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sutavā	Paribbājaka	Sutavā
81	Bhagavā	Buddha	Nigrodha	Paribbājaka	Nigrodha
82	Bhagavā	Buddha	Poṭṭhapāda	Paribbājaka	Poṭṭhapāda
83	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sajjha	Paribbājaka	Sajjha
84	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sabhiya	Paribbājaka	Sabhiya

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	Does not become an upāsaka However, in the Majj. II. 39 ff. expresses his desire to join the Buddhist Samgha, only to be dissuaded by his fellow paribbājakas	Majj. II. pp. 1-2, 22 39 ff.	79
—	—	He does not become an upāsaka	Ang. IV. pp. 369-371	80
—	—	- do -	Dīg. III. pp. 38, 39	81
—	—	He becomes an upāsaka of the Buddha	Dīg. I. 179 ff, 202	82
—	—	But unlike the other paribbājakas who address the Buddha as <i>bho</i> Gotama while becoming the upāsakas, Potthapāda addresses the Buddha as <i>bhante</i> <i>Bhagavā</i>		83
—	—	Sabhiya joins the Samgha and becomes an arahat	Su. N. pp. 101-102	84

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
THE BUDDHA AND MONKS					
85	Bhagavā	Buddha	Ānanda	Monk	Ānanda
86	Bhagavā	Buddha	Rāhula	Monk	Rāhula
87	Bhagavā	Buddha	Tissa	Monk	Tissa
88	Bhagavā	Buddha	Nanda	Monk	Nanda
89	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bāhuna	Monk	Bāhuna
90	Bhagavā	Buddha	Puṇṇiya	Monk	Puṇṇiya
91	Bhagavā	Buddha	Upāli	Monk	Upāli
92	Bhagavā	Buddha	Upavāna	Monk	Upavāna
93	Bhagavā	Buddha	Udāyi	Monk	Udāyi
94	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bhaddāli	Monk	Bhaddāli
95	Bhagavā	Buddha	Susimā	Monk	Susimā
96	Bhagavā	Buddha	Subhūti	Monk	Subhūti
97	Bhagavā	Buddha	Uttiya	Monk	Uttiya
98	Bhagavā	Buddha	Anuruddha	Monk	Anuruddha
			Kimbila		
			Nandiya		

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		—	Majj. III. pp. 253-58, Sam. II. pp. 92-98; Ang. V. p. 108 etc.	85
		Buddha's son	Majj. I. pp. 414-420	86
		Buddha's father's sister's son (pitucchāputto)	Sam. II. p. 282	87
		Buddha's mother's sister's son (mātucchā- putto)	Sam. II. p. 281	88
		—	Ang. V. p. 151	89
		—	Ang. V. p. 154	90
		—	Ang. V. p. 70	91
		—	Sam. II. p. 41	92
		—	Sam. V. pp. 89-90	93
		—	Majj. I. pp. 437-38	94
		—	Sam. II. pp. 127-28	95
		—	Ang. V. p. 337	96
		—	Sam. V. p. 22	97
		Anuruddha is addressed in plural. At another place, Bhagu, Kuṇḍa- dhān, Revata & Ānand are added to the list but the mode of address is the same. This shows the seniority of Anuruddha	Majj. I. p. 205 and Majj. I. pp. 462-63	98

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Terms of</i>
99	Bhagavā	Buddha	Visākha	Monk	Visākha
100	Bhagavā	Buddha	Pañcālaputta	Monk	Upsena
101	Bhagavā	Buddha	Upsena	Monk	Upsena
102	Bhagavā	Buddha	Vaṅgataputta	Monk	Dabbhā
103	Bhagavā	Buddha	Dabbhā	Monk	Dabbhā
104	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mallaputta	Monk	Kaccāna
105	Bhagavā	Buddha	Kaccānagotta	Monk	Kaccāna
106	Bhagavā	Buddha	Upananda	Monk	Upananda
107	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sakyaputta	Monk	Bhāradvāja
108	Bhagavā	Buddha	Piṇḍola	Monk	Bhāradvāja
109	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bhāradvāja	Monk	Kassapa
110	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mahākassappa	Monk	Kassapa
111	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mahā-	Monk	Moggallāna
112	Bhagavā	Buddha	moggallāna	Monk	Moggallāna
113	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sāriputta	Monk	Sāriputta
114	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mālukya-	Monk	Mālukya-
115	Bhagavā	Buddha	putta	Monk	putta
			Moliya-	Monk	Phaggunā
			phaggunā		
110	Bhagavā	Buddha	—	—	—
111	Bhagavā	Buddha	Aritṭha	Monk	Aritṭha
112	Bhagavā	Buddha	Kokālika	Monk	Kokālika
113	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sāti	Monk	Sāti
114	Bhagavā	Buddha	Kevaṭṭha-	Monk	Thera
115	Bhagavā	Buddha	putta	Monk	Cuṇḍā
			Thera		
			Mahācuṇḍa		

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	—	Sam. II. p. 280; Ang. II. p. 51	99
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 230	100
—	—	—	Vin. I. p. 74 f.	101
—	—	—	Sam. II. p. 17	102
—	—	Buddha uses <i>gotta</i> name	Vin. III. p. 211	103
—	—	- do -	Vin. II. p. 112	104
—	—	<i>gotta</i> used	Sam. V. p. 78	105
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 7	106
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 7	107
—	—	—	Sam. IV p. 72	108
āvuso Phagguṇa	—	The Buddha re- fers to him by this term, while the monks refer to him as āyasmā Phagguṇa	Majj. I. p. 122	109
—	—	—	—	110
āvuso Ariṭṭha	—	The text refers to him as <i>bhikkhu</i> Ariṭṭha	Majj. I. pp. 130-1	111
—	—	—	Ang. V. p. 170; Sam. I. p. 150	112
āvuso Sāti	—	The text refers to him as <i>bhikkhu</i>	Majj. I. p. 256 c.	113
āvuso Thera	—	—	Sam. II. p. 283	114
—	—	—	Majj. I. p. 40	115

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
116	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bhagu	Monk	Bhikkhu
117	Bhagavā	Buddha	Kumāra-kassapa	Monk	Bhikkhu
118	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bhikkhus	Monk	Bhikkhave
119	Bhagavā	Buddha	Dhammika	Monk	Brāhmaṇa
120	Bhagavā	Buddha	Aciravata	Monk	Aggivesana
121	Bhagavā	Buddha	Samañuddesa	(junior)	Brāhmaṇa
122	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mahākappina	Monk	Brāhmaṇa
			Angulimāla	Monk	

THE BUDDHA AND GAHAPATIS

123	Bhagavā	Buddha	Ugga of Vesālī	Gahapati	Gahapati
-----	---------	--------	----------------	----------	----------

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	Buddha had newly arrived in Kosambi and it is likely that he did not know the name of this monk. Hence the mode of address	Majj. III. p. 155; Vin. I. p. 350	116
—	—	The answers which the Buddha gave to the riddles of the monk were very general, and meant for all bhikkhus	Majj. I. p. 142	117
—	—	—	Sam. III. p. 5 g. Sam. II. p.l. ff. Majj. I. p. 12	118
—	—	—	Ang. III. p. 366 f.	119
—	—	—	Majj. III. pp. 129-130	120
—	—	—	Vin. I. p. 105	121
—	—	Monk Aṅgulimāla was about to become an <i>arahat</i> .	Majj. II. p. 104	122
Bhagavā	Abh:	Uggha is noted for his gifts to the Buddha	Ang. III. p. 49 Sam. IV p. 109	123

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
124	Bhagavā	Buddha	Ugga of Hatthigāma	Gahapati	Gahapati
125	Bhagavā	Buddha	Citta of Macchika-saṇḍa	Gahapati	Gahapati
126	Bhagavā	Buddha	Dārūkāmika (woodworker)	Gahapati	Gahapati
127	Bhagavā	Buddha	Seṭṭhi	Gahapati	Gahapati
128	Bhagavā	Buddha	Upāli	Gahapati	Gahapati
129	Bhagavā	Buddha	Nakulapitā	Gahapati	Gahapati
130	Buddha	Bhagavā	Paṭaliya	Gahapati	Gahapati
131	Bhagavā	Buddha	Anāth-paṇḍika	Gahapati	Gahapati
132	Bhagavā	Buddha	Pañcakāya Thāpati	Gahapati-1 Thāpati-2	Gahapati-1 Thāpati-2
133	Bhagavā	Buddha	Isidatta-purāṇa	Gahapati-1 Thāpati-2	Thapatayo
134	Bhagavā	Buddha	Pāṭaligāmaka Upāsakas	Gahapati-1 Upāsakas-2	Gahapatayo

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	Abhi	This gahapati and one mentioned above are identified by their place names and not by profession	Ang. IV. p. 212	124
Bhagavā	Abhi	—	Sam. V. p. 281 Vin. II. 18 ff	125
—	—	He salutes in the end and then goes away	Ang. III. p. 391	126
—	—	To seek his lost son he comes to the Buddha. He does not salute the Buddha in the beginning	Vin. I. p. 16	127
—	—	Formerly a devotee of Jains.	Majj. I. p. 376; Sam. IV. p. 110	128
—	—	—	Sam. III. p. 1 ff	129
—	—	—	Majj. I. p. 359	130
—	—	—	Sam. I. p. 212; Vin. II. p. 156	131
—	—	The direct mode of address is absent as he does not converse with the Buddha	Majj. II. p. 24	132
—	—	—	Sam. V. p. 348 ff.	133
—	—	—	Vin. I. p. 227 f.	134

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
135	Bhagavā	Buddha	Brāhmaṇa-gahapati of Sāla	Gahapati-1 Brāhmaṇa-2	Gahapatayo
136	Bhagavā	Buddha	Brāhmaṇa-gahapati of Nagaravinda	Gahapati-1	Gahapatayo
137	Bhagavā	Buddha	Brāhmaṇa-gahapati of Veraṅga	Gahapati-1 Brāhmaṇa-2	Gahapatayo
138	Bhagavā	Buddha	Brāhmaṇa-gahapati of Veludavāra	Gahapati-1 Brāhmaṇa-2	Gahapatayo
139	Bhagavā	Buddha	Group of men and women	Gahapati	Gahapatayo
140	Bhagavā	Buddha	Keveṭṭha Gahapati-putta	Gahapati	Keveṭṭha
141	Bhagavā	Buddha	Soṇa Gahapati-putta	Gahapati	Soṇa
142	Bhagavā	Buddha	Singālaka Gahapati-putta	Gahapati	Gahapati-putta-1 Singālaka-2

THE BUDDHA AND KINGS

143	Bhagavā	Buddha	Pasenadi of Kosala	King	Mahārāja
-----	---------	--------	--------------------	------	----------

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	—	—	135
—	—	See items 52, 53, 54, 55.	—	136
—	—	—	—	137
—	—	—	—	138
—	—	They were travelling between Veraña and Madura	Ang. II. p. 53	139
—	—	Kevaddha = Kevatṭha Fisherman's son?	Dīg. I. p. 211	140
—	—	—	Sam. III. pp. 48-49	141
—	—	Singālaka does not salute him in the beginning. Later on he becomes an upāsaka	Dīg. III. pp. 180-81	142
—	—	—	Ang. V. pp. 65-66; Sam. I. p. 64 ff.	143

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
144	Bhagavā	Buddha	Ajātasattu of Magadha	King	Mahārāja
145	Bhagavā	Buddha	Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha	King	Mahārāja
146	Bhagavā	Buddha	Abbhaya Rājakumāra	King (prince)	Rājakumāra
147	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bodhi Rājakumāra	King (prince)	Rājakumāra

THE BUDDHA AND GĀMAṆIS

148	Bhagavā	Buddha	Caṇḍa	Gāmaṇi	Gāmaṇi
149	Bhagavā	Buddha	Talaputa Naṭagāmaṇi	Gāmaṇi	Gāmaṇi
150	Bhagavā	Buddha	Yodhājiva	Gāmaṇi	Gāmaṇi
151	Bhagavā	Buddha	Assāroha	Gāmaṇi	Gāmaṇi
152	Bhagavā	Buddha	Hattiroha	Gāmaṇi	Gāmaṇi
153	Bhagavā	Buddha	Asibandhaka-putta	Gāmaṇi	Gāmaṇi
154	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bhadrakaka	Gāmaṇi	Gāmaṇi
155	Bhagavā	Buddha	Pāṭali	Gāmaṇi	Gāmaṇi

THE BUDDHA AND THE RULING EXTENDED KIN GROUPS

156	Bhagavā	Buddha	Maṇicuḷaka	Gāmaṇi	Gāmaṇi
157	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mahānāma Licchavi	Ex. Kin. group	Mahānāma
158	Bhagavā	Buddha	Nandaka Licchavi	Ex. Kin. group	Nandaka
159	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sālha Licchavi	Ex. Kin. group	Sālha
160	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mahāli Licchavi	Ex. Kin. group	Mahāli
161	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sunakkhatta Licchaviputta	Ex. Kin. group	Sunakkhatta

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		—	Dig. pp. 50-51	144
			Vin. I. p. 74	145
		—	Sam. V. pp. 126-29	146
		—	Majj. II. p. 93	147
			Sam. IV. p. 305 f	148
		—	Sam. IV. p. 306 f.	149
		—	Sam. IV. pp. 308-309	150
		—	Sam. IV. pp. 310-311	151
		—	Sam. IV. p. 310 f.	152
		—	Sam. IV. p. 312 f.	153
		—	Sam. IV. p. 327	154
		Explained in the text	Sam. IV. pp. 430-41	155
		—	Sam. IV. p. 325	156
		—	Ang. III. p. 76	157
		—	Sam. V. p. 389	158
		—	Aug. II. p. 200 ff.	159
		Explained in the text	Sam. III. p. 69 f.	160
		—	Dig. III. p. 2 f.	161

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
162	Bhagavā	Buddha	Licchavī (in group)	Ex. Kin. group	Licchavī
163	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mahānāma Sakka	Ex. Kin. group	Mahānāma
164	Bhagavā	Buddha	Nandiya	Ex. Kin. group	Nandiya
165	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sambahula Sakkā upāsa- kas (many sak- yan upāsakas)	Ex. Kin. group	Sakkā
166	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sakkas of Kapilavatthu	Ex. Kin. group	Gotama
167	Bhagavā	Buddha	Suddodhana Sakka	Ex. Kin. group	Gotama
168	Bhagavā	Buddha	Mallās of Pāvā	Ex. Kin. group	Vāsetṭhā
169	Bhagavā	Buddha	Pukkusa Mallaputta	Ex. Kin. group	Pukkusa

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		—	Ang. III. p. 168.	162
		—	Ang. I. p. 276 ff.	163
		—	Ang. V. p. 335;	164
		The Buddha addresses <i>Sākya</i> <i>upāsakas</i>	Ang. V. p. 83	165
	—	In this, as against above, he is invited to open a <i>Sākya</i> <i>Santhāgāra</i> , their assembly hall. Thus the occasion is formal. That is why, presumably, he uses their gotta affiliation to address them.	Sam. IV. pp. 182-83	166
—	—	The Buddha uses his gotta. Is he respecting his father?	Vin. I. p. 82.	167
	—	The Buddha has talks with them in a <i>Santhāgāra</i> , assembly hall of the Mallas. Here again the use of gotta name to address them.	Dīg. III. pp. 208-9.	168
	—	—	Dīg. II. pp. 130-31.	169

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Terms of Address</i>
170	Bhagavā	Buddha	Kālāmas of Kesaputta	Ex. Kin. group	Kālāmā
171	Bhagavā	Buddha	Dīghajānu Koliyaputta	Ex. Kin. group	Vyagghapajja Punṇa
172	Bhagavā	Buddha	Punṇa Koliyaputta	Ex. Kin. group	Punṇa

THE BUDDHA AND UPĀSAKAS

173	Bhagavā	Buddha	Hatthaka of Āḷavi	Ex. Kin. group-1 Upāsaka-2	Hatthaka-1 Kumāra-2
174	Bhagavā	Buddha	Pahārāda Asurinda	Upāsaka	Pahārāda
175	Bhagavā	Buddha	Vāsetṭha upāsaka	Upāsaka	Vāsetṭha
176	Bhagavā	Buddha	Dīghāvu Upāsaka	Upāsaka	Dīghāvu
177	Bhagavā	Buddha	Jivaka Komārabhacca	Upāsaka	Jivaka

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		—	Ang. I. pp. 188-89.	170
		The Buddha's use of Totemic name?	Ang. IV. p. 281 f.	171
		Here the Buddha does not use Koliya's totemic name but uses Puṇṇa but we may note here that Puṇṇa is an ascetic following "cow" practices Govatiko and is thus outside the bonds of the society.	Majj. I. p. 387.	172
		—	Ang. I. p. 136; IV. p. 216.	173
		—	Ang. IV. pp. 197-204.	174
		—	Ang. IV. pp. 258-59.	175
		The Buddha meets him on his death bed.	Sam. V. p. 345.	176
		—	Majj. I. p. 368 ff.	177

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
178	Bhagavā	Buddha	Dhammadina Upāsaka	Upāsaka	Dhammadinaa
179	Bhagavā	Buddha	Cunda Kammāraputta	Upāsaka	Cunda
180	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bhaggava Kumbhakāra	Upāsaka	Bhaggava
181	Bhagavā	Buddha	Kesi Assadama- sārathi	Upāsaka	Kesi
182	Bhagavā	Buddha	Pessa Hatthisāraka- putta	Upāsaka	Pessa
183	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sudinna Kalanadaka- putta	Upāsaka	Sudinna
184	Bhagavā	Buddha	Belatṭha Kaccāna	Upāsaka	Kaccāna
185	Bhagavā	Buddha	Sīha Senāpati	Monk	Sīha
186	Bhagavā	Buddha	Uggā Rājamahā- matta	Upāsaka	Ugga
MONKS AND MONKS					
187	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Āyasmā Ajjuka	Monk	āvuso
188	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Āyasmā Revata	Monk	āvuso Revata

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	He comes with 500 <i>upāsakas</i> to see the Buddha.	Sam. V. p. 407.	178
—	—	The Buddha ate his last meal at his place.	Dīg. II. p. 126 f.	179
—	—	The Buddha goes to his place, hence no salutation on the part of Bhoggava. He is a potter.	Majj. III. p. 237.	180
—	—	—	Ang. II. pp. 112-13.	181
—	—	—	Majj. I. p. 339 ff.	182
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 11 ff.	183
—	—	A gotta name used for a merchant?	Vin. I. pp. 224-25.	184
—	—	—	Ang. IV. p. 79 f.	185
—	—	—	Ang. IV. pp. 6-7.	186
—	—	He disputes with him on certain legal points.	Vin. III. p. 67.	187
—	—	—	Majj. I. p. 212 f.	188

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
189	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Āyasmā Udāyi	Monk	āvuso Udayi
190	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Āyasmā Channa	Monk	āvuso Channa
191	Bhagavā Ānanda	Monk	Āyasmā Bhaddaji	Monk	āvuso Bhaddajī
192	Bhagavā Ānanda	Monk	Āyasmā Kāmabhū	Monk	āvuso Kāmabhū
193	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Āyasmā Bhadda	Monk	āvuso Bhadda
194	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
195	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Āyasmā Samiddhi	Monk	āvuso
196	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Sambahulā Bhikkhu	Monk	āvuso āyasmanto
197	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Āyasmā Mahācunda	Monk	āvuso Cunda
198	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Āyasmā Mahākotthita	Monk	āvuso Kotthita
199	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Āyasmā Mahākassapa	Monk	āvuso Kassapa
200	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Āyasmā Anuruddha	Monk	āvuso Anurudha
201	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Āyasmā Savitttha	Monk	āvuso Savitttha
202	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Āyasmā Upavāna	Monk	āvuso Upavāna
203	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Āyasmā Vaṅgīsā	Monk	āvuso Vaṅgīsā
204	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	āvuso
205	Āyasmā Mahā- moggallāna	Monk	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	—	Ang. IV. p. 449.	189
—	S.s.	—	Sam. III. p. 133 f.	190
—	—	—	Ang. III. p. 202.	191
—	—	—	Sam. IV. p. 165.	192
—	S.s.	—	Sam. V. p. 15.	193
—	—	—	Ang. III. p. 201; II. p. 167.	194
—	—	—	Majj. III. p. 208.	195
—	—	—	Majj. I. pp. 160-61.	196
—	—	—	Sam. IV. pp. 55-56.	197
—	—	—	Ang. IV. p. 382 ff.	198
—	—	—	Sam. II. p. 195 f.	199
—	S.s.	—	Sam. V. p. 298.	200
—	S.s.	—	Ang. I. pp. 118-19.	201
—	—	—	Sam. V. p. 76.	202
—	S.s.	—	Sam. I. p. 190.	203
—	—	—	Ang. II. p. 160.	204
—	S.s.	They are described as great friends.	Sam. II. pp. 276-77.	205

Item Nos.	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
206	Āyasmā Mahā-moggallāna	Monk	Āyasmā Piṇḍol-bhāradvāja	Monk	āvuso Bhāradvāja
207	Āyasmā Mahā-moggallāna	Monk	Āyasmā	Monk	āvuso Lakkhaṇa
208	Āyasmā Mahā-moggallāna	Monk	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	āvuso Bhikkhavo
209	Āyasmā Nārada	Monk	Āyasmā Savitṭha	Monk	āvuso Savitṭha
210	Āyasmā Savitṭha	Monk	Āyasmā Musīla	Monk	āvuso Musīla
211	Āyasmā Yamaka	Monk	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso
212	Āyasmā Mahācundo	Monk	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	āvuso Bhikkhava
213	Āyasmā Mahākassapa	Monk	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	āvuso Bhikkha
214	Āyasmā Candikāputta	Monk	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	āvuso
215	Āyasmā Nandiya	Monk	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	āvuso
216	Āyasmā Puṇṇa-Mantāniputt	Monk	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso
217	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	āyasmanto
218	Āyasmā Anuruddha	Monk	Āyasmā Nandiya & Kimbila	Monk	āyasmanto

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	—	Vin. II. p. 111.	206
—	—	—	Vin. III. pp. 104, 105.	207
—	—	—	Ang. V. p. 155.	208
—	—	—	Sam. II. p. 115 f.	209
—	—	—	Sam. II. p. 117 f.	210
—	—	—	Sam. III. p. 109 f.	211
—	—	—	Ang. III. p. 355.	212
—	—	—	Ang. V. pp. 161-62.	213
—	—	—	Ang. IV. p. 402.	214
—	—	—	Ang. IV. p. 362.	215
—	—	Note the use of <i>āyasmā</i> at the end of conversation.	Majj. I. p. 147-51.	216
—	—	—	Majj. I. pp. 160-61.	217
—	—	—	Ang. V. pp. 41-42.	218

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
219	A Bhikkhu	Monk	Āyasmā Mahā-kacchāna	Monk	āvuso Kaccāna
220	Sattaravaggiya Bhikkhus	Monk	Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus	Monk	āvuso
221	Sāti Kevatṭha-putta Bhikkhu	Monk	A Bhikkhu	Monk	āvuso
222	Ariha Bhikkhu	Monk	A Bhikkhu	Monk	āvuso
223	Āyasmā Mahā-kassapa	Monk	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda
224	Āyasmā Mahā-kassapa	Monk	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	āvuso
225	Āyasmā Anuruddha	Monk	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda
226	Āyasmā Anuruddha	Monk	Āyasmā Abhiya kaccāna	Monk	āvuso Kaccāna
227	Āyasmā Anuruddha	Monk	Bhikkhus	Monk	āvuso
228	Āyasmā Thera	Monk	Āyasmā Isidatta	Monk	āvuso Isidatta
229	Āyasmā Thera	Monk	Āyasmā Mahaka	Monk	āvuso Mahaka
230	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Āyasmā Samiddhi	Monk	āvuso Samiddhi
231	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Vesālīka Vajjiputtakā bhikkhus	Monk	āvuso
232	Āyasmā Upāli	Monk	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
			Majj. I. p. 210.	219
			Vin. IV. p. 44 f.	220
			Majj. I. p. 258.	221
			Vin. II. p. 25.	222
		He is the preceptor of Ānanda cf. Vin. I. pp. 92-93.	Sam. II. p. 215 ff.	223
		—	Majj. I. p. 205.	224
		Anuruddha takes charge of the Saṃgha immediately after the death of the Buddha	Dīg. II. p. 158.	225
		—	Majj. III. p. 148 ff.	226
		—	Dīg. II. p. 158.	227
		—	Sam. IV. p. 284.	228
		—	Sam. IV. p. 289.	229
		—	Ang. IV. p. 385.	230
		—	Vin. III. p. 23.	231
		Ānanda consults him on a dispute.	Vin. III. p. 67	232

Item Nos.	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	Identification	Group Affiliation	Identification	Group Affiliation	Term of Address
233	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Āyasmā Channa	Monk	āvuso Channa
234	Āyasmā Revata	Monk	Yasa Kākaṇḍa-kaputta	Monk	āvuso
235	Āyasmā Dalhika	Monk	A Bhikkhu	Monk	āvuso
236	Āyasmā Mahākaccāna	Monk	Āyasmā Soṇa	Monk	Soṇa
237	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Cuṇḍa Samaṇuddesa	Monk (novice)	āvuso Cuṇḍa
238	Āyasmā Nāgita	Monk	Sīha Samaṇuddesa	Monk (novice)	Sīha
239	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Channa	Paribbājaka	āvuso
240	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Sāmaṇḍakāni	Paribbājaka	āvuso
241	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Susīma	Paribbājaka	
242	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Uttiya	Paribbājaka	āvuso Uttiya
243	Āyasmā Samiddhi	Monk	Poṭaliputta	Paribbājaka	āvuso Poṭaliputta
244	Āyasmā Upananda Sakyaputta	Monk	Aññatara Paribbājaka	Paribbājaka	āvuso

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
	—	The reference occurs in the <i>Cullavagga</i> which is late.	Vin. II. p. 292.	233
—	—	He is a very senior monk when Yasa consults on the disputed points. Account in the <i>Cullavagga</i> .	Vin. II. p. 300.	234
—	—	He absolves this monk of his guilt of stealing a turbon.	Vin. III. p. 67.	235
—	—	He was his upāsaka, he ordained him as a monk.	Vin. I. p. 197 f.	236
—	—	—	Majj. II. p. 244 ff.	237
—	—	—	Dīg. I. p. 151.	238
—	—	—	Ang. I. p. 215.	239
—	—	—	Ang. V. pp. 121-22.	240
—	—	—	Sam. II. 120 ff.	241
—	—	—	Ang. V. p. 194.	242
—	—	—	Majj. III. p. 207.	243
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 240.	244

Item Nos.	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	Identification	Group Affiliation	Identification	Group Affiliation	Term of Address
245	Āyasmā Anurādha	Monk	Sabahula aṇṇatitthiyā paribhājaka	Paribbājaka	āvuso
246	Āyasmā Mahākassapa	Monk	Aṇṇatara Ājīvaka	Paribbājaka (Ājīvaka)	āvuso
247	Āyasmā Bakkula	Monk	Acela Kassapa	Paribbājaka	āvuso Kassapa
248	Āyasmā Assaji	Monk	Saccaka Nigaṇṭhaputta	Paribbājaka (jain)	Aggivesana
249	Āyasmā Mahā- moggallāna	Monk	Vacchagotta	Paribbājaka	Vaccha
250	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Sandaka	Paribbājaka	Sandaka
251	Āyasmā Sabhi- yakaccāna	Monk	Vacchagotta	Paribbājaka	Vaccha
252	Āyasmā Udena	Monk	Ghoṭamukha	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
253	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Dhānañjāni	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
254	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Gopaka- Moggallāna	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
255	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Vassakāra	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
256	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Uṇṇābha	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
257	Āyasmā Mahākaccāna	Monk	Lohicca	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
258	Āyasmā Mahākaccāna	Monk	Kaṇḍarāyana	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
259	Āyasmā Mahākaccāna	Monk	Arāmaḍaṇḍa	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
260	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Subha Māṇava Todeyyaputta	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa- māṇava-2
261	Bhikkhus	Monk	Amabatttha māṇava	Brāhmaṇa	Ambatttha
262	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Aṇṇatara Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		—	Sam. III. p. 116.	245
		—	Dīg. II. p. 162.	246
		—	Majj. III. p. 124.	247
		—	Majj. I. pp. 227-28.	248
		—	—	249
		—	Majj. I. p. 531.	250
		—	Sam. IV. p. 401 ff.	251
		—	Majj. II. p. 158.	252
		—	Majj. II. p. 186.	253
		—	Majj. III. p. 78.	254
		—	Majj. III. p. 13.	255
		—	Sam. V. p. 272-73.	256
		—	Sam. IV. 118-19.	257
		—	Ang. I. pp. 67-68.	258
		—	Ang. I. p. 66.	259
		—	Dīg. I. p. 89 f.	260
		—	Dīg. I. p. 205-6.	261
		—	Vin. I. p. 247.	262

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
263	Āyasmā Udāyin	Monk	The brāhmaṇa with his wife	Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa
264	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Roja Malla	Extended kin-group	Roja
265	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Abhaya Licchavi	Extended kin-group	Abhaya
266	Āyasmā Nāgita	Monk	Oṭṭhaddha Licchavi	Extended kin-group	Mahāli
267	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Mahānāma Sakka	Extended kin-group	Mahānāma
268	Āyasmā moggallāna	Monk	Vappa Sakka	Extended kin-group	Vappa
269	Āyasmā savaṅgīsa	Monk	Mahānāma Sakka	Extended kin-group	āvuso Mahānāma
270	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Vaḍḍhā Licchavi	Extended kin-group	āvuso Vaḍḍhā
271	Āyasmā Anuruddha	Monk	Mallas (in group)	Extended kin-group	Vāsetṭhā
272	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Mallas (in group)	Extended kin-group	Vāsetṭhā
273	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Koliyaputta of Sāpūga	Extended kin-group	Vyagghapajja
274	Āyasmā Angulimāla	Monk	Pasenadi of Kosala	King	Mahārāja
275	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Pasenadi of Kosala	King	Mahārāja
276	Āyasmā Pilindavaccha	Monk	Seniya Bimbisāra	King	Mahārāja
277	Āyasmā Piṇḍo-labharadvāja	Monk	Udena	King	Mahārāja

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		—	Vin. III. p. 119.	263
		—	Vin. p. 247.	264
		—	Ang. I. p. 220 f.	265
		—	Dīg. I. p. 151.	266
		—	—	267
		—	Ang. II. p. 196 f.	268
		—	Sam. V. p. 327.	269
		—	Vin. II. pp. 125-26.	270
		The occasion is Buddhas funeral. A very formal ceremony. Hence the use of the name <i>Vāsetṭha</i>	Dīg. II. p. 160.	271
		Ānanda is sent to convey the news of the death of the Buddha	Dīg. II. p. 159 f.	272
		—	Ang. II. pp. 194-95.	273
		—	Majj. II. pp. 101-2.	274
		—	Majj. II. p. 113.	275
		—	Vin. III. p. 248 f.	276
		—	Sam. IV. p. 110.	277

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
278	Āyasmā kaccāna	Monk	Madhura of Avanti	King	Mahārāja
279	Āyasmā Ratthapāla	Monk	Koravya	King	Mahārāja
280	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Udena	King	Mahārāja
281	Āyasmā Bhūmija	Monk	Jayasena Rājakumāra	King (prince)	Rājakumāra
282	Aciravata Samānuddesa	Monk (novice)	Jayasena Rājakumāra	King (prince)	Rājakumāra
283	Āyasmā Mahākaccāna	Monk	Gahapati of Haliddika	Gahapati	Gahapati
284	Āyasmā Mahaka	Monk	Citta	Gahapati	Gahapati
285	Āyasmā Kāmabhu	Monk	Citta	Gahapati	Gahapati
286	Āyasmā Godatta	Monk	Citta	Gahapati	Gahapati
287	Āyasmā Isidatta	Monk	Citta	Gahapati	Gahapati
288	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Dasama of Atthakanagara	Gahapati	Gahapati
289	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Anāthpiṇḍika	Gahapati	Gahapati
290	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Anāthpiṇḍika	Gahapati	Gahapati
291	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Sirivaddha	Gahapati	Gahapati
292	Āyasmā Dabba Mallaputta	Monk	Kalyāṇa-bhattika	Gahapati	Gahapati
293	Bhikkhus	Monk	Dasama of Atthakanagara	Gahapati	Gahapati
294	Bhikkhus aññatara	Monk	Ugga of Hatthigāma	Gahapati	Gahapati

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		—	Majj. II. p. 84 f.	278
		—	Majj. II. p. 66 f.	279
		—	Vin. II. p. 291.	280
		—	Majj. III. p. 138 ff.	281
		—	Majj. III. 138 ff.	282
		—	Sam. IV. p. 113.	283
		—	Sam. IV. p. 290.	284
		—	Sam. IV. p. 291 ff.	285
		—	Sam. IV. p. 296 f.	286
		—	Sam. IV. pp. 283-88.	287
		—	Ang. V. p. 343.	288
		—	Sam. V. p. 385.	289
		—	Sam. V. p. 381 f.	290
		—	Sam. V. pp. 176-77.	291
		—	Vin. III. p. 161.	292
		—	Ang. V. pp. 342-43.	293
		—	Ang. IV. p. 213.	294

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
295	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Ājivakasāvaka (follower of Ājivikas)	Gahapati	Gahapati
296	Āyasmā Ratthapāla	Monk	To his father	Gahapati	Gahapati
297	Āyasmā Sudinna	Monk	To his father	Gahapati	Gahapati
298	Āyasmā Udāyi	Monk	Pañcakaṅga	Gahapati-1	Gahapati
299	Āyasmā Anuruddha	Monk	Pañcakaṅga	Gahapati-1 Thāpati-2	Gahapati
300	Āyasmā Ānanda	Monk	Gahapati's son	Thāpati-2	āvuso
301	Āyasmā Sāriputta	Monk	Upāsakas of Campa	Upāsaka	āvuso
302	Āyasmā Upainanda Sakyaputta	Monk	Aññātara Purisa	Upāsaka	āvuso
303	Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus	Monk	Pūga (a guild)	Upāsaka	āvuso
304	Āyasmā Nandaka	Monk	Sālha Migaranatta	Upāsaka	āvuso
305	Āyasmā Mahākaccāna	Monk	Soṇa Kuṭṭikaṇṇa	Upāsaka	āvuso
306	Āyasmā Upananda Sakyaputta	Monk	Setthiputta	Upāsaka	āvuso
307	Āyasmā Dhaniya Kumbhakāra- putta	Monk	Dārugaha Gaṇaka	Upāsaka	āvuso
308	Āyasmā Sāgata	Monk	80 thousand Gāmikās	Upāsaka	āvuso
309	A Bhikkhu	Monk	Aññātara Purisa (a thief)	Others	āvuso

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		Gahapati becomes a lay follower of the Buddha through Ānanda.	Ang. I. pp. 217-19.	295
		Ratthapāla goes to his father's house.	Majj. II. pp. 62, 63.	296
		Sudinna goes to his father's house.	Vin. III. p. 16.	297
		—	Majj. I. pp. 396-97.	298
		Monk sits on a higher seat.	Majj. III. p. 145 ff.	299
		—	Ang. IV. p. 59.	300
		—	Vin. III. pp. 66-67.	301
		—	Ang. IV. p. 59.	302
		—	Vin. III. p. 215 f.	303
		—	Vin. III. p. 265.	304
		—	Ang. I. p. 193 f.	305
		—	Vin. I. pp. 194-95.	306
		—	Vin. III. p. 211.	307
		—	Vin. III. p. 62.	308
		—	Vin. II. p. 217.	309

Item Nos.	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	Identification	Group Affiliation	Identification	Group Affiliation	Term of Address
310	A Bhikkhu	Monk	His Nātakā	Others	āvuso
311	Bhikkhus	Monk	Corā	Others	āvuso
312	A Bhikkhu	Monk	Manussā (men on the high road)	Others	āvuso
313	Citta	Gahapati	Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta	Jain	bhante
314	Citta	Gahapati	Acela Kassapa	Paribbājaka	bhante
315	Anāthpiṇḍika	Gahapati	Paribbājakas	Paribbājaka	bhante
316	Vijyamāhita	Gahapati	Paribbājakas	Paribbājaka	bhante
317	Meṇḍaka	Gahapati	Sambahulā Titthiyā	Paribbājaka	bhante
318	Upāli	Gahapati	Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta Puraṇakasappa-1 Makkhali-Gosāla-2 Ajita-Kesakambalī-3 Pakudha	Jain	bhanto
319	Seṭṭhi of Rājagaha	Gahapati	Kaccāyana-4 Saṇjaya Belaṭthiputta-5 Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta-6	Paribbājakas (of different school)	bhante
320	Ānāthpiṇḍika	Gahapati	Negama of Rājagaha	Others	ayyo
321	Aññatara Gahapati	Gahapati	Akkhadutā (gamblers)	Others	bhonto
322	Upāli	Gahapati	Dovārika (doorkeeper)	Others	samma dovārika
323	Anāthpiṇḍika	Gahapati	Aññatara Purisa (a messenger)	Others	Ambho purisa
324	Vāsetṭha māṇava	Brāhmaṇa	Bhāradvāja māṇava	Brāhmaṇa	bho Bhārad-dvāja

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
			Vin. III. p. 104.	310
			Vin. I. pp. 179-80.	311
			Vin. III. p. 181.	312
			Sam. IV. p. 198 f.	313
			Sam. IV. p. 300 f.	314
			Ang. V. pp. 185-86.	315
			Ang. V. p. 189.	316
			Ang. V. p. 242.	317
			Majj. I. pp. 374-75.	318
			Vin. II. pp. 110-11.	319
			Vin. II. p. 157.	320
			Majj. II. p. 107.	321
			Majj. I. p. 380.	322
			Sam. V. p. 380.	323
	S.s.		Dīg. I. p. 236.	324

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
325	Mahāgovinda	Brāhmaṇ	700 Brāhmaṇa mahāsālas and 700 graduates	Brāhmaṇa	bho
326	Soṇadaṇḍa	Brāhmaṇ	500 Brāhmaṇas from various parts of the country	Brāhmaṇa	bho
327	500 Brāhmaṇas from various parts of the country	Brāhmaṇ	Assalāyana	Brāhmaṇa	bho Assalāyana
328	Caṅki of Opasāda	Brāhmaṇ	500 Brāhmaṇas from various parts of the country	Brāhmaṇa	bho
329	The students of the brāhmaṇa Lohicca	Brāhmaṇ	Lohicca	Brāhmaṇa	Bhavaṃ
330	Uttara māṇava	Brāhmaṇ	Brahmāyu	Brāhmaṇa	bho
331	Ambaṭṭha māṇava	Brāhmaṇ	Pokkharasādi	Brāhmaṇa	bho
332	Sela	Brāhmaṇ	Keṇiya Jaṭila Jāṇussoṇi	Brāhmaṇa-1 Paribbajaka Brāhmaṇa	Bho Keṇiya bho
333	Subha Todeyya-putta	Brāhmaṇ	Pasenadi of Kosala	King	Mahārāja
334	Saṅjaya of Ākāsagotta	Brāhmaṇ	Rājā Reṇu	King	bho
335	Mahāgovinda	Brāhmaṇ	Rājā	King	bho
336	Jotipāla māṇava	Brāhmaṇ	Disampati	King	Deva
337	Sudassana māṇava	Brāhmaṇ	Pasenadi of Kosala	King	Deva-1 bho-2 bho
338	Vassakāra	Brāhmaṇ	Ajātasattu	King	Deva-1 bho-2 bho
339	Saṅjikāputta	Brāhmaṇ	Bodhi Rājakumāra	King (prince)	bho

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		—	Dīg. II. p. 248.	325
		—	Dīg. I. p. 113.	326
		—	Majj. II. 247 ff.	327
		—	Majj. I. p. 165.	328
		—	Sam. IV. p. 118.	329
		—	Dīg. I. p. 89.	330
		—	Majj. II. p. 134.	331
		—	Majj. II. p. 298. (Nalanda ed.)	332
		—	Majj. I. pp. 208-9.	333
		—	Majj. II. pp. 127-32.	334
		—	Dīg. II. pp. 234-35.	335
		—	Dīg. II. p. 232.	336
		—	Sam. I. p. 82.	337
		—	Vin. III. p. 43.	338
		—	Dīg. II. pp. 72-73.	
		—	Majj. II. pp. 91-92.	339

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
1.	Soṇadaṇḍa	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
2.	Pokkharasādi	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
3.	Kuṭadanta	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
4.	Caṅki	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
5.	Uggatasarīra	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
6.	Uṇṇābha	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
7.	Jāṇussoṇī	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
8.	Ujjaya	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
9.	Piṅgalakoccha	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
10.	Ekusāri	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
11.	Tikaṇṇa	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
12.	Saṅgā.ava	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	After the initial exchange of greetings an alternative form of behaviour.	Dig. I. pp. 118-26.	1.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	He sends his student to confirm the greatness of the Buddha.	Dig. I. p. 108 ff.	2.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	He asks the Buddha about the correct procedure of sacrifice.	Dig. I. p. 134 ff.	3.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	He goes to see the Buddha but has no direct conversation with him on the religious subjects.	Majj. II. pp. 165-68.	4.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	—	Ang. IV. pp. 41-46.	5.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	He is delighted with the words of the Buddha, rises from his seat, salutes the Buddha by the right and goes away.	Sam. V. pp. 217-19.	6.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	—	Ang. II. pp. 173-76; IV. pp. 54-56; Majj. I. p. 16 ff.	7.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	—	Ang. IV. pp. 285-89.	8.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	—	Majj. I. pp. 198-208.	9.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	—	Majj. II. pp. 177 ff.	10.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	—	Ang. I. pp. 163-66.	11.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	—	Ang. I. pp. 168-73.	12.

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
23.	Suddhika Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
24.	Navakammika Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Gotama ti Bho Gotam
25.	Asurindaka Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Samana Bho Gotam
26.	Akkosaka Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
27.	Bilaṅgika Bhāradvāja	Bhagāva	Brāhmaṇa	Buddha	Bho Gotama
28.	Ahimsaka Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
29.	Mānatthadda Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
30.	Paccānīka	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Samana Bho Gotam
31.	Bhāradvāja- gotta	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
Samana Gotama	S.s.	—	Sam. I. p. 166.	23.
Samana Gotama	S.s.	In the verse the brāhmaṇa addresses as <i>Gotamāti</i> (belonging to the <i>Gotama gotta</i>), of the Gotamas.	Sam. I. pp. 179-80.	24.
Samana Gotama	S.s.	He meets the Buddha, vexed and displeased, and abuses and reviles the Buddha.	Sam. I. pp. 163-4.	25.
Samana Gotama	S.s.	—do—	Sam. I. pp. 162-3.	26.
—	S.s.	He keeps silent and stands aside in anger.	Sam. I. p. 164.	27.
—	S.s.	—	Sam. I. pp. 164-5.	28.
—	S.s.	He keeps silent and stands aside.	Sam. I. pp. 178-9.	29.
—	S.s.	He visits the Buddha with the intention of maintaining the opposite of what Buddha would have said.	Sam. I. p. 197.	30.
—	S.s.	In anger he refers to the Buddha as <i>samana munḍaka</i> (shaven headed recluse), to his wife.	Sam. I. pp. 160-1.	31.

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		<i>Term of Address</i>
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	
32.	Sundarika Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
33.	Aggika Bhāradvāja	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
34.	Mātuposaka	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
35.	Paribbājaka	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
36.	Lokāyata	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
37.	Bhikkhaka	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
38.	Huhun̄kajātika	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
39.	Brahmāyu	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
40.	Mahāsāla	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
41.	'Aññatara'	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
42.	Assalāyana	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
43.	Lohicca	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
44.	Two Brāhmaṇas 120 years old	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
45.	Sangārava (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	S.s.	Not knowing the identity of the Buddha he refers to the latter as <i>muṇḍo</i> (shaven headed).	Sam. I. pp. 167-71.	32.
—	S.s.	Buddha goes to his house to beg for food.	Sam. I. pp. 166-7.	33.
—	S.s.	—	Sam. I. pp. 181-82.	34.
—	S.s.	—	Ang. I. pp. 157-58.	35.
—	S.s.	—	Sam. II. p. 77.	36.
—	S.s.	—	Sam. I. p. 182.	37.
—	S.s.	—	Vin. I. pp. 2-3.	38.
Samana Gotama	S.s.	—	Majj. II. pp. 142-45.	39.
—	S.s.	—	Sam. I. pp. 176-7.	40.
Samana Gotama	S.s.	—	Ang. I. pp. 167-8.	41.
—	S.s.	—	Ang. I. p. 155.	42.
Samana Gotama	S.s.	Lohicca asks the Buddha and his Samgha for a meal. The Buddha sits on the high seat and the brāhmaṇa occupies a low seat. No exchange of greetings take place.	Dig. I. pp. 224-7, 234.	43.
—	S.s.	—	Majj. II. pp. 147-48,	44.
Samana Gotama	S.s.	—	Majj. II. pp. 210-11,	45.

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Terms of Address</i>
46.	Kāpathika (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
47.	Vāsetṭha (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
48.	Subha Todeyyaputta (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
49.	Uttara (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
50.	Māgha (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
51.	Ambatṭha (māṇava)	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
52.	Brāhmaṇa- gahapati of Sāla	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	The brāhmaṇa interrupts the conversation that the Buddha was holding with old and respectable brāhmaṇas. The Buddha reprimands him for this.	Majj. II. pp. 168-69, 177.	46
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	—	Majj. II. pp. 462-3, 468. (Nālanda ed.)	47.
—	S.s.	—	Dig. I. pp. 236-7, 252. Majj. II. pp. 197-208.	48.
Samāṇa Gotama	S.s.	—	Majj. II. pp. 141-42.	49.
—	S.s.	—	Su. N. pp. 87-91.	50.
Samāṇa Gotama	—	Ambaṭṭha does not exchange greetings for he considers this act as not suitable in the presence of the Buddha.	Dig. I. pp. 89-90, 106.	51.
—	—	{ The following is the group behaviour of the brāhmaṇa g a h a patikā : Some salute and sit (abhivādetvā)	Majj. I. pp. 285-290.	52.

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		<i>Term of Address</i>
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	
53.	Brāhmaṇa- gahapati of Veraṇja	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
54.	Brāhmaṇa- gahapati of Veḷudvāra	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
55.	Brāhmaṇa- gahapati of Nagaravinda	Brāhmaṇa	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
56.	Dīghatapassi	Jain	Bhagavā	Buddha	āvuso Gotama
57.	Nigaṇṭhā	Jain (group)	Bhagavā	Buddha	āvuso
58.	Saccaka Nigaṇṭhaputta	Jain	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
59.	Mandissa & Jāliya	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	āvuso Gotama

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos</i>
—	—	Some exchange greetings and sit (<i>saddhim sammodimsu</i>). Some fold their hands towards the Buddha (<i>paṇāmetvā</i>) and sit.	Majj. I. pp. 356-59 (Nālanda ed.)	53.
—	—	Some pronounce their names and gotta (<i>nāma fotam sāvetvā</i>). And some remain silent (<i>tunhībutā</i>) and sit.	Sam. V. pp. 352-56.	54.
—	—	—	Majj. III. pp. 291-93.	55.
—	S.s.	—	Majj. I. p. 371 ff.	56.
—	S.s.	—	Majj. II. p. 243 ff.	57.
—	S.s.	He comes along with the group of Licchavis for a debate with the Buddha. The Buddha uses his gotta name.	Majj. II. pp. 228-30, 236.	58.
—	S.s.	They regale on what Buddha had said (<i>Bhagavato bhāsitam abhinanditi</i>).	Dig. I. pp. 157-58.	59.

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
60.	Ālāra Kālāma	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	āyasmā,
61.	Uddaka Rāmaputta	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	āyasmā,
62.	Acela Kassapa	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama bhante
63.	Vacchagotta-1 Vacchagotta-2 Vacchagotta-3	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama- Bho Gotama bhante-2 Bho Gotama
64.	Dīghanakha	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
65.	Vekhanassa	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
I	I	The Buddha goes to this paribbājaka to become his disciple. The term <i>āyasma</i> is used in third person. The Buddha refers to him as his teacher <i>ācariyo</i> .	Majj. I. pp. 163-65.	60.
I	I	—do—	Majj. I. pp. 165-66.	61.
I	S.s.	Acclakassapa joins the Saṃgha.	Sam. II. pp. 19-22; Dig. I. pp. 161-177.	62.
I	S.s.	1-Vacchagotta from Sāvatti subtitled in the text as <i>Aggivacchagotta</i> . 2-This one is from Rājagaha subtitled in the text as <i>Mahāvaccagotta</i> . 3-The Buddha visits this Vacchagotta subtitled in the text as <i>Tevijjavacchagotta</i> . He is from Vesali.	Majj. I. pp. 484-88. Majj. I. pp. 489-97. Majj. I. pp. 481-83.	63 " "
I	S.s.	Buddha uses his gotta name, <i>Aggivessana</i> .	Majj. I. pp. 497-501.	64.
I	S.s.	Buddha uses his gotta name, Kaccāna.	Majj. II. pp. 40-44.	65.

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
66.	Māgaṇḍiya	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	— Bho Gotama, bhante
67.	Kuṇḍaliya	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
68.	Moliya Sīvaka	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
69.	Timbaruka	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
70.	Paṭaliya	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
71.	Nandiya	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
72.	Uttiya	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
73.	Ajita	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
74.	Kandaraka	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
75.	Annabhara-1 Varadhara-2 Sakulaudāyi-3	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama
76.	Subhadda	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama, bhante

Terms of Preference	Terms of Salutation	Remarks	References	Item Nos.
—	S.s.	—	Majj. I. pp. 503-13.	66.
—	S.s.	—	Sam. V. pp. 73-75.	67.
—	S.s.	—	Sam. IV. pp. 230-31.	68.
—	S.s.	—	Sam. II. pp. 22-23.	69.
—	S.s.	—	Ang. II. pp. 100-101.	70.
—	S.s.	—	Sam. V. pp. 11-12.	71.
—	S.s.	The Buddha does not reply to the question raised by this paribbājaka but keeps quiet.	Ang. V. pp. 193-94.	72.
—	S.s.	The Buddha does not reply but instead he is shown to address the monks.	Ang. V. pp. 229-30.	73.
—	S.s.	—	Majj. I. pp. 339-40.	74.
—	S.s.	The Buddha visits the <i>ārāma</i> of these paribbājakas.	Ang. II. pp. 176-77.	75.
—	S.s.	At first he exchanges greetings with the Buddha. The Buddha says to him that he will teach him <i>dharma</i> . From then onwards, Subhada addresses the Buddha as <i>bhante</i> .	Dīg. II. pp. 148-153.	76.

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
77.	Bhaggava-gotta	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante, Bhagavā
78.	Sakulaudayi	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante, Bhagavā
79.	Sutavā	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante, Bhagavā
80.	Nigrodha	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante, Bhagavā
81.	Poṭṭhapāda	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante, Bhagavā
82.	Sajjha	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
83.	Sabhiya	Paribbājaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	Bho Gotama, bhante Bhagav
84.	Ānanda	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
	S.s.	Buddha visits his place. Bhaggavagotta welcomes him. Buddha sits on a high seat; paribbājaka on a low seat.	Dig. III. pp. 1-2, 35.	77.
—	S.s.	Buddha visits his place. He welcomes the Buddha.	Majj. II. pp. 1-2, 22; Majj. II. p. 39 ff.	78.
—	S.s.	He had apparently met the Buddha before and had come to the Buddha to clarify certain doctrinal points.	Ang. IV. pp. 369-371.	79.
—	S.s.	He welcomes the Buddha and occupies a low seat.	Ang. III. pp. 38-39.	80.
—	S.s.	He welcomes the Buddha.	Dig. I. pp. 179 ff, 202.	81.
—	S.s.	—	—	82.
—	S.s.	—	Su. N. pp. 101-102.	83.
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. III. pp. 253-58; Sam. II. pp. 92-98, Ang. V. p. 108 etc.	84.

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		<i>Term of Address</i>
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	
85.	Rāhula	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
86.	Tissa	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
87.	Nanda	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
88.	Bāhuna	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
89.	Puṇṇiya	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
90.	Upāli	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
91.	Upavāna	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
92.	Udāyi	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
93.	Bhaddāli	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
94.	Susimā	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
95.	Subhūti	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
96.	Uttiya	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
97.	Anuruddha	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
	Kimbila				
	Nandiya				
98.	Visākha	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
	Pāñcālaputta				
99.	Upsena	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
	Vaṅgataputta				
100.	Dabhā	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
	Mallaputta				
101.	Kaccānagotta	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
	Abhi.	Rāhula sees the Buddha, prepares a seat and water for washing the feet. In the next <i>Sutta</i> , Rāhula follows close after the Buddha when the latter was commencing his alms tour.	Majj. I. p. 414 and p. 421 ff.	85.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. II. p. 282.	86.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. II. p. 281.	87.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. V. p. 151.	88.
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. V. p. 154.	89.
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. V. p. 70.	90.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. II. p. 41.	91.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. V. pp. 89-90.	92.
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. I. pp. 437-38.	93.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. II. pp. 127-28.	94.
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. V. p. 337.	95.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. V. p. 22.	96.
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. I. p. 205 and Majj. I. pp. 462-63.	97.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. II. p. 280;	98.
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. II. p. 280.	
—	Abhi.	—	Vin. III. p. 230.	99.
—	Abhi.	—	Vin. I. p. 74 ff.	100.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. II. p. 17.	101.

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		<i>Terms of Address</i>
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	
102.	Upananda Sākyaputta	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
103.	Piṇḍola- Bharadvāja	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
104.	Mahākassapa	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
105.	Mahāmog- gallāna	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
106.	Sāriputta	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
107.	Mālukiya-putta	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
108.	Moliya- phagga	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
109.	Gulissāni	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
110.	Aritṭha	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
111.	Kokālika	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	Abhi.	He commits an offence and is called before the Buddha. He uses the term of reference <i>Bhagavā</i> while addressing the Buddha.	Sam. II. p. 17.	102.
—	Abhi.	—	Vin. II. p. 112.	103.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. V. p. 78.	104.
—	Abhi.	—	Vin. III. p. 7.	105.
—	Abhi.	—	Vin. III. p. 7.	106.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. IV. p. 72.	107.
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. I. p. 122 ff.	108.
—	Abhi.	—	—	109.
—	Abhi.	Ariṭṭha was formerly a vulture trainer <i>gaddhabādhī</i> who doubts about the Buddha's doctrine. The text refers to him as <i>bhikkhu Ariṭṭha</i> and not <i>āyasmā Ariṭṭha</i> .	Majj. I. p. 130.-31.	110.
	Abhi.	He accuses Sāriputta and Moggallāna "that they are ruled by evil desires". Referred to as <i>bhikkhu Kokālika</i> .	Ang. V. p. 170; Sam. I. p. 150.	111.

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
112.	Sāti Kevaṭṭhaputta	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
113.	Thera	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
114.	Mahācūṇḍa	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
115.	Bhagu	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
116.	Kumārakassapa	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
117.	Bhikkhus	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante -1 bhadante -2
118.	Dhammika	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
119.	Aciravata	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
	Samaṇuddesa	(Junior)			
120.	Mahākappina	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
121.	Āṅgulimāla	Monk	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
122.	Ugga of Vesālī	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
123.	Ugga of Hatthigāma	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
124.	Citta of Macchika- sanda	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
125.	Dāruḱammika (woodworker)	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
126.	Seṭṭhi	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
127.	Upāli	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
128.	Nakulapitā	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	Abhi.	He is a fisherman's son, the next refers to him as <i>bhikkhu</i> .	Majj. I. p. 256 ff.	112.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. II. p. 283.	113.
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. I. p. 40.	114.
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. III. p. 155; Vin. I. p. 350.	115.
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. I. p. 142.	116.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. III. p. 5 ff; Sam. II. p. 1 ff; Majj. I. p. 12.	117.
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. III. p. 366 f.	118.
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. III. pp. 129-30.	119.
—	—	—	Vin. I. p. 105.	120.
—	—	—	Majj. II. p. 104.	121.
—	Abhi.	Ugga is noted for his gift to the Buddha	Ang. III. p. 49; IV. p. 208, f; Sam. IV. p. 109.	122.
—	Abhi.	This and the one mentioned above, <i>gahapatis</i> , are identified by place name and not by professions.	Ang. IV. p. 212 f; Sam. IV. p. 109.	123.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. IV. p. 281 ff; Vin. II. pp. 18 f.	124.
—	Abhi.	He is a dealer in wood.	Ang. III. p. 391.	125.
—	Abhi.	He salutes in the end and goes away.	Vin. I. p. 16. Sam. IV. p. 110.	126.
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. I. p. 376;	127.
—	Abhi.	Salutes in the end.	Sam. III. p. 1 ff.	128.

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
129.	Poṭaliya	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
130.	Anāthpiṇḍika	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante, Bhagavā
131.	Pañcakāya	Gahapati	-1 Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
	Thāpati	Thapāti	-2		
132.	Isidatta- purāṇa	Gahapati	-1 Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
		Thapāti	-2		
133.	Pāṭaligāmaka Upāsakas	Gahapati	-1 Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
		Upāsakas	-2		
134.	Brāhmaṇa- gahapati of Sāla	Gahapati	-1 Bhagavā	Buddha	bho Gotama
		Brāhmaṇa	-2		
135.	Brāhmaṇa- gahapati of Nagaravinda	Gahapati	-1 Bhagavā	Buddha	bho Gotama
		Brāhmaṇa	-2		
136.	Brāhmaṇa- gahapati of Verañja	Gahapati	-1 Bhagavā	Buddha	bho Gotama
		Brāhmaṇa	-2		
137.	Brāhmaṇa gahapati of Veludvāra	Gahapati	-1 Bhagavā	Buddha	bho Gotama
		Brāhmaṇa	-2		
138.	Group of men and women.	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
139.	Kevaṭṭha Gahapati- putta	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
		Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
140.	Soṇa Gaha- patiṇṇa	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
141.	Siṅgalaka Gaha- patiṇṇa	Gahapati	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	S. s. and Abhi.	Explained in the text	Majj. I. p. 359.	129.
—	Abhi.		Sam. I. p. 212 and Vin. II. p. 156.	130.
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. II. p. 24.	131.
—	Abhi.	Royal Chamber- laine	Sam. V. p. 348 ff.	132.
—	Abhi.	They invite the Buddha to open their <i>āvāsatha- gāra</i> .	Vin. I. p. 227 f.	133.
—		See items 52-55		134.
—		—		135.
—		—		136.
—		—		137.
—	Abhi.	Their mode of ad- dress is not men- tioned	Ang. II. p. 53.	138.
—	Abhi.	—	Dīg. I. p. 211.	139.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. III. pp. 48-49.	140.
—	Abhi.	Proclaims himself an <i>upāsaka</i>	Dīg. III. pp. 180-81.	141.

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
142.	Pasenadi of Kosala	King	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
143.	Ajātasattu of Magadha	King	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
144.	Seniya-Bimbisāra of Magadha	King	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
145.	Abhaya Rājakumāra	King (prince)	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
146.	Bodhi Rājakumāra	King (prince)	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
147.	Caṇḍa	Gāmaṇi	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
148.	Talapuṭa Naṭagāmaṇi	Gāmaṇi	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
149.	Yodhājīva	Gāmaṇi	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
150.	Assāroha	Gāmaṇi	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
151.	Hattiroha	Gāmaṇi	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
152.	Asibaddhaka-putta	Gāmaṇi	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante

<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos</i>
Abhi.	He salutes and kisses his feet and pronounces his name.	Ang. V. pp. 65-66; Sam. I. p. 64 ff.	142.
Abhi.	He salutes him but only greets the assembly of monks by raising joined palms.	Dig. I. pp. 50-51.	143.
Abhi.	—	Vin. I. p. 74.	144.
Abhi.	—	Sam. V. pp. 126-129.	145.
Abhi.	He sends a messenger to invite the Buddha to inaugurate his palace.	Majj. II. p. 93.	146.
Abhi.	Becomes an <i>upāsaka</i>	Sam. IV. p. 305 f.	147.
Abhi.	He joins the order and becomes an Arahāt. Referred to in the text after joining the order as <i>āyasmā Tālapuṭa</i> .	Sam. IV. p. 306.	148.
Abhi.	Becomes an <i>upāsaka</i>	Sam. IV. pp. 308-309.	149.
Abhi.	, ,	Sam. IV. pp. 310-11 f.	150.
Abhi.	, ,	Sam. IV. p. 310.	151.
Abhi.	, ,	Sam. IV. pp. 312 f., 323.	152.

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
153.	Bhadragaka	Gāmaṇi	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
154.	Pāṭali	Gāmaṇi	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
155.	Maṇicūlak	—	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
156.	Mahānāma Licchavi	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
157.	Nandaka Licchavi	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
158.	Sālha Licchavi	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
159.	Mahāli Licchavi	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
160.	Sumakkhatta Licchavi- putta	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
161.	Licchavi (in group)	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
162.	Mahānāma Sakka	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
163.	Nandiyā Sakka	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
164.	Sumbhula Sakkā Upāsakas emmy sakyan upāsakas.	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
165.	Sakkas of Kapilavatthu	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
166.	Suddodhana Sakka	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
167.	Medis of Tāvā	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos</i>
—	Abhi.	Does not become an upāsaka in the end.	Sam. IV. p. 327 f.	153.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. IV. pp. 340-341 ff.	154.
—	Abhi.	He defends the Buddha in the King's Court.	Sam. IV. p. 325 ff.	155.
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. III. p. 76.	156.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. V. p. 389.	157.
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. II. p. 200 ff.	158.
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. III. p. 69 f.	159.
—	Abhi.	—	Dīg. III. p. 2 f.	160.
—	Abhi.	Compare the behaviour of the <i>brāhmaṇa-gaḥapatis</i> items 52-55.	Ang. III. p. 168.	161.
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. I. p. 276 ff.	162.
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. V. p. 335; Sam. V. p. 397.	163.
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. V. p. 83.	164.
—	Abhi.	Compare items 52-55.	Sam. IV. pp. 182-83.	165.
—	Abhi.	He is Buddha's father.	Vin. I. p. 82.	166.
—	Abhi.	Compare items 52-55.	Dīg. III. pp. 208-9.	167.

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
168.	Pukkusa Mallaputta	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
169.	Kālāmas of Kesaputta	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
170.	Dāghajānu Koliyaputta	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
171.	Puṇṇa Koliyaputta	Extended Kin-group	Bhagavā	Buddha	bnante
172.	Hatthaka of Āḷavi	Extended Kin-group Upāsaka	Bhagavā -1 -2	Buddha	bhante
173.	Pahārāda Asurinda	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
174.	Vāsetṭha upāsaka	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
175.	Dīghāvu upāsaka	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
176.	Jīvaka Koṇḍrabhacca	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
177.	Dhammadina upāsaka	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
	Abhi.	—	Diḡ. II. pp. 130-31.	168.
	Abhi.	Differential treatment in their manners of receiving him (cf. items 52-55) but the mode of address is <i>bhante</i> , as opposed to <i>brāhmaṇa-g a h a-patis' bho gotama</i>	Ang. I. pp. 188-89.	169.
	Abhi.	—	Ang. IV. p. 281 f.	170.
	Abhi.	—	Majj. I. p. 387.	171.
	Abhi	In the Ang. (I.26) he is described as chief among disciples who gather a following.	Ang. I. p. 136; IV. p. 216.	172.
	Abhi.	—	Ang. IV. pp. 197-204.	173.
	Abhi.	—	Ang. IV. pp. 258-9.	174.
	Abhi.	He sends his father, is a gahapati to call the Buddha to attend to him on his death bed.	Sam. V. p. 345.	175.
	Abhi	—	Majj. I. p. 368 ff.	176.
	Abhi.	—	Sam. V. p. 407.	177.

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
178.	Cunda Kammāra- putta	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
179.	Bhaggava Kumbhakāra	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
180.	Kesi Assadama- sārathi	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
181.	Pessa Hatthisāraka- putta	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
182.	Sudinna Kālandaka- putta	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
183.	Belattha Kaccāna	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
184.	Sīha Senāpati	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
185.	Uggā Rājamahānatta	Upāsaka	Bhagavā	Buddha	bhante
MONKS AND MONKS					
186.	Āy. Ajjuka	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda
187.	Āy. Revata	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda
188.	Āy. Udāyi	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda
189.	Āy. Channa	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda
190.	Āy. Bhaddaji	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	Abhi.	He is a metal worker.	Dig. II. p. 126.	178.
—	Abhi.	Buddha asks for a shelter at his place. He uses his gotta, Bhag-gava, to address him.	Majj. III. p. 237.	179.
—	—	He is a horse trainer.	Ang. II. pp. 112-113.	180.
—	—	He is elephant trainer's son.	Majj. I. p. 339 ff.	181.
—	—	He is a son of a <i>Setṭhi</i> and becomes a monk.	Vin. III. p. 11 ff.	182.
—	—	A sugar dealer. He has 500 wag-gons of sugar which he distributes to monks.	Vin. I. pp. 224-25.	183.
—	—	Army Chief	Ang. IV. p. 79 f.	184.
—	—	A King's minister	Ang. IV. pp. 6-7.	185.
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 67.	186.
—	—	In his conversation he uses both <i>āyasmā</i> & <i>āvuso</i>	Majj. I. p. 212.	187.
—	S s.	—	Ang. IV. p. 449 f.	188.
—	S. s.	—	Sam. III. p. 133 f.	189.
—	S. s.	Both use <i>āyasmā</i> in their conversation.	Ang. III. p. 202.	190.

WHO ADDRESSES			WHO IS ADDRESSED		
Item Nos.	Identification	Group Affiliation	Identification	Group Affiliation	Term of Address
191.	Āy. Kāmabhū	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda
192.	Āy. Bhadda	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda
193.	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
194.	Āy. Samiddhī	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
195.	Sambahulā bhikkhu	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
196.	Āy. Mahācunda	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
197.	Āy. Mahākotthita	Monk	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
198.	Āy. Mahākassapa	Monk	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
199.	Āy. Anuruddha	Monk	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
200.	Āy. Savitṭha	Monk	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
201.	Āy. Upavāna	Monk	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
202.	Āy. Vāṅgisa	Monk	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
203.	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso Sāriputta
204.	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	Āy. Mahāmo- ggallāna	Monk	āvuso Moggallāna
205.	Āy. Pindola- Bhāradvāja	Monk	Āy. Mahā- moggalāna	Monk	āvuso Moggallāna
206.	Āy. Lakkhaṇa	Monk	Āy. Mahā- moggalāna	Monk	āvuso Moggallāna
207.	Bhikkhus (monks in groups)	Monk	Āy. Mahā- moggalāna	Monk	āvuso

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
	S. s.	—	Sam. IV. p. 165.	191.
	S. s.	—	Sam. V. p. 15.	192.
	S. s.	During the conversation Sāriputta resorts to <i>āyasmū</i> , <i>Ānanda</i> .	Ang. III. p. 201.	193.
	S. s.		Majj. III. p. 208.	194.
	—		Majj. I. pp. 160-61.	195.
	—	—	Sam. IV. pp. 55-56.	196.
	S. s.	—	Ang. III. p. 382 ff.	197.
	S. s.	—	Sam. II. p. 195 f.	198.
	—	—	Sam. V. p. 298.	199.
	—	—	Ang. I. pp. 118-19.	200.
	—	—	Sam. V. p. 76.	201.
	—	—	Sam. I. p. 190.	202.
	—	—	Ang. II. p. 160.	203.
	—	—	Sam. II. pp. 267-77.	204.
	—	—	Vin. II. p. 11.	205.
	—	In the same conversation the term reference <i>āyasmā</i> and the mode of address <i>āvuso</i> is used.	Vin. III. pp. 104, 105.	206.
	—	—	Ang. V. p. 155.	207.

Item Nos.	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	Identification	Group Affiliation	Identification	Group Affiliation	Term of Address
208.	Āy. Savitṭha	Monk	Āy. Nārada	Monk	āvuso Nārada
209.	Āy. Musīla	Monk	Āy. Savitṭha	Monk	āvuso Savitṭha
210.	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	Āy. Yamaka	Monk	āvuso
211.	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	Āy. Mahākassapa	Monk	āvuso
212.	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	Āy. Mahākassapa	Monk	āvuso
213.	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	Āy. Candikāputta	Monk	—
214.	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	Āy. Nandiya	Monk	—
215.	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	Āy. Puṇṇa- mantāniputta	Monk	āvuso
216.	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso
217.	Āy. Nandiya & Kimbila	Monk	Āy. Anuruddha	Monk	—
218.	Āy. Mahā- kaccāna	Monk	Āy. Bhikkhu	Monk	—

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	—	Sam. II. p. 115 f.	208
—	—	—	Sam. II. p. 117 f.	209
—	—	—	Sam. III. p. 109 ff.	210
—	S.s.	—	Ang. III. p. 355.	211
—	—	—	Ang. V. pp. 161-62.	212
—	—	But see Vin. (II. pp. 284-5), where they use <i>bhante</i> (<i>cullavagga xi</i>)	Ang. IV. p. 402 ff.	213
—	—	—	Ang. IV. p. 362.	214
—	—	At the end of the discourse the monk Sāriputta asks: "What is āyasmās name?" A similar question is asked by Sāriputta.	Majj. I. pp. 147-151.	215
—	S.s.	—	Majj. I. pp. 160-61.	216
—	—	—	Ang. V. pp. 41-42.	217
—	—	—	Majj. I. p. 210.	218

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		<i>Terms of Address</i>
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	
219.	Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus	Monk	Sattaravaggiya Bhikkhus	Monk	āvuso
220.	A Bhikkhu	Monk	Sāti Kevatṭha-putta Bhikkhu	Monk	āvuso Sāti
221.	A Bhikkhu	Monk	Aritṭha Bhikkhu	Monk	āvuso Aritṭha
222.	Āy. Ānanta	Monk	Āy. Mahā-kassapa	Monk	bhante
223.	Bhikkhus (monks in group)	Monk	Ay. Maha-kassapa	Monk	bhante
224.	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	Āy. Anuruddha	Monk	bhante
225.	Āy. Ābhiyakaccāna	Monk	Āy. Anuruddha	Monk	bhante
226.	Bhikkhus	Monk	Āy. Anuruddha	Monk	bhante
227.	Āy. Isidatta	Monk	Āy. Thera	Monk	bhante
228.	Āy. Mahaka	Monk	Āy. Thera	Monk	bhante

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	The group of 17 monks repair a large building to reside in the rainy season. The group of six monks bully them and throw them out. The mode of address remains the same.	Vin. IV. p. 44 f.	219
—	—	—	Majj. I. p. 258.	220
—	—	—	Vin. II. p. 25.	221
—	—	—	Sam. II. p. 215 ff.	222
—	—	—	Majj. I. p. 205.	223
—	—	—	Dīg. II. p. 158.	224
—	—	—	Majj. III. p. 148 ff.	225
—	—	—	Dīg. II. p. 158.	226
—	—	He is addressed in the text as novice of all <i>Sabbana-vako hoti</i> .	Sam. IV. p. 284.	227
—	—	The same as above	Sam. IV. p. 289.	228

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
229.	Āy. Samiddhi	Monk	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	bhante
230.	Vesālika Vajjiputtakā Bhikkhus	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante
231.	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	Āy. Upāli	Monk	bhante
232.	Āy. Channa	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante
233.	Yasa Kākaṇḍaka- putta	Monk	Āy. Revata	Monk	bhante
234.	A Bhikkhu	Monk	Āy. Dalhika	Monk	bhante
235.	Soṇa	Monk	Āy. Mahā- kaccāna	Monk	bhante
236.	Cuṇḍa saṃpuddesa	Monk	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante
237.	Siha saṃpuddesa	Monk	Āy. Nāgita	Monk	bhante

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	Sāriputta calls him a youth. He entered the order young (Sam. I. p. 14). In the Majj. (III. p. 208) he is chaffed by the wanderer Potaliputta for pretending to expand dharma after 3 years in order.	Ang. IV. p. 385.	229
—	—	They were bad monks who were engaged in all sorts of activities which violated the rules of chastity.	Vin. III. p. 23.	230
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 67.	231
—	—	—	Vin. II. p. 292.	232
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 300.	233
—	—	This monk confesses to him.	Vin. III. p. 67.	234
—	—	—	Vin. I. p. 197 f.	235
—	—	—	Majj. II. p. 244 ff.	236
—	—	—	Dīg. I. p. 151.	237

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
238.	Channa	Paribbājaka	Āy. Ananda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda
239.	Sāmaṇḍakāni	Paribbājaka	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	āvuso
240.	Susīma	Paribbājaka	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	āvuso Ānanda
241.	Uttiya	Paribbājaka	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	—
242.	Potaliputta	Paribbājaka	Āy. Samiddhi	Monk	āvuso Samiddhi
243.	Aññatara	Paribbājaka	Āy. Upananda	Monk	āvuso
	paribbājaka		Sakyaputta		
244.	Sambahulā	Paribbājaka	Āy. Anurādha	Monk	āvuso Anurādha
	aññatitthiyā				
	paribbājaka				
245.	Aññatara	Paribbājaka	Āy.	Monk	āvuso
	Ājivika		Mahākassapa		
246.	Acela	Paribbājaka	Āy. Bakkula	Monk	āvuso Bakkula
	kassapa				
247.	Saccaka	Paribbājaka	Āy. Assaji	Monk	Aggivesana
	Nigaṇṭhanāta-				
	putta				
248.	Vacchagotta	Paribbājaka	Āy. Maha-	Monk	bho Moggallāna
			moggallāna		
249.	Sandaka	Paribbājaka	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bho Sandaka
250.	Vacchagotta	Paribbājaka	Āy. Sabhiya-	Monk	bho Kaccāna
			kaccāna		
251.	Ghoṭamukha	Brāhmaṇa	Āy. Udena	Monk	bho Udena
252.	Dhānañjani	Brāhmaṇa	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	bho Sāriputta
253.	Gopaka-	Brāhmaṇa	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bho Ānanda
	Moggallāna				
254.	Vassakāra	Brāhmaṇa	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bho Ānanda
255.	Uṇṇābh	Brāhmaṇa	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bho Ānanda
256.	Lohicca	Brāhmaṇa	Āy. Mahā-	Monk	bho Kaccāna
			kaccāna		

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	S.s.	—	Ang. I. p. 215	238
—	S.s.	—	Ang. V. pp. 121-22	239
—	S.s.	—	Sam. II. 120 ff.	240
—	—	—	Ang. V. p. 194.	241
—	S.s.	—	Majj. III. p. 207.	242
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 240.	243
—	S.s.	—	Sam. III. p. 116.	244
—	—	—	Dīg. II. p. 162.	245
—	—	—	Majj. III. p. 125	246
—	S.s.	—	Majj. I. pp. 227-28	247
—	—	—	—	248
—	—	—	Majj. I. p. 513.	249
—	S.s.	—	Sam. IV. p. 401 ff.	250
—	—	—	Majj. II. p. 158.	251
—	—	—	Majj. II. p. 186.	252
—	—	—	Majj. III. p. 78.	253
—	—	—	Majj. III. p. 13.	254
—	S.s.	—	Sam. V. pp. 272-73.	255
—	S.s.	He becomes an Upāsaka	Sam. IV. pp. 118-19.	256

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
257.	Kaṇḍarāyana	Brāhmaṇa	Āy. Mahā-kaccāna	Monk	bho Kaccāna
258.	Ārāmadanḍa	Brāhmaṇa	Āy. Mahā-kaccāna	Monk	bho Kaccāna
259.	Subha māṇava Todeyyaputta	Brāhmaṇa	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bho Ānanda
260.	Amabatṭha māṇava	Brāhmaṇa	Bhikkhus	Monk	bho
261.	Aññatara Brāhmaṇa	Brāhmaṇa	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bho Ānanda
262.	The brāhmaṇa with his wife	Brāhmaṇa	Udāyin	Monk	bho Udāyi

THE RULING EXTENDED KIN-GROUPS AND MONKS

263.	Roja Malla	Extended kin-group	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante Ānanda
264.	Abhaya Licchavi	Extended kin-group	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante
265.	Oṭṭhaddha Licchavi	Extended kin-group	Āy. Nāgita	Monk	bhante Nāgita
266.	Mahānāma Licchavi	Extended kin-group	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante
267.	Vappa Sakka	Extended kin-group	Āy. Mahā-moggallāna	Monk	bhante
268.	Sakka Mahānāma	Extended kin-group	Āy. Lomasavaṅgisa	Monk	bhante
269.	Vaddhā Licchavi	Extended kin-group	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante
270.	Mallas (in group)	Extended kin-group	Āy. Anuruddha	Monk	bhante Anuruddha
271.	Mallas (in group)	Extended kin-group	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante Ānanda
272.	Koliyaputta of Sāpūga	Extended kin-group	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	S.s.	—	Ang. I. pp. 67-68.	257.
—	—	—	Ang. I. p. 66.	258
—	—	—	Dīg. I. p. 89.	259
—	—	—	Dīg. I. pp. 205-06.	260
—	—	—	Vin. I. p. 247.	261
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 119.	262
—	Abhi.	—	Vin. I. p. 247.	263
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. I. 220 f.	264
—	Abhi.	—	Dīg. I. p. 151.	265
—	—	—	—	266
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. III. p. 196 f.	267
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. V. p. 327.	268
—	—	—	Vin. II. pp. 125-26.	269
—	—	—	Dīg. II. p. 160.	270
—	—	—	Dīg. II. p. 159.	271
—	Abhi	Ānanda uses their totemic name	Ang. II. pp. 194-95.	272

Item Nos.	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	Identification	Group Affiliation	Identification	Group Affiliation	Term of Address
THE KINGS AND MONKS					
273.	Pasenadi of Kosala	King	Āy. Aṅgulimāla	Monk	bhante
274.	Pasenadi of Kosala	King	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante Ānanda
275.	Seniya Bimbisāra	King	Āy. Pilinda-vaccha	Monk	bhante
276.	Udena	King	Āy. Piṇḍol-bhāradvāja	Monk	bho Bhāradvāja
277.	Madhura of Avanti	King	Āy. Mahākaccāna	Monk	bho Kairāna
278.	Koravya	King	Āy. Raṭṭhapāla	Monk	bho Raṭṭhapāla
279.	Udena	King	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bho Kaccāna
280.	Jayasena Rājakumāra	King	Āy. Bhūmija	Monk	bho Bhūmija
281.	Jayasena Rājakumāra	King (prince)	Aciravata Samuddesa	Monk	Aggivessana
282.	Gahapati of Haliddika	Gahapati	Āy. Mahākaccāna	Monk	bhante
283.	Citta	Gahapati	Āy. Mahaka	Monk	bhante
284.	Citta	Gahapati	Āy. Kāmaḥhu	Monk	bhante
285.	Citta	Gahapati	Āy. Godatta	Monk	bhante

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	—	The king also uses an epithet <i>ayyo</i>	Majj. II. pp. 1-2.	273
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. II. p. 113.	274
—	Abhi.	Bimbisāra gives him park attendant.	Vin. III. p. 248	275
—	S.s.	Becomes an upāsaka	Sam. IV. p. 110	276
—	S.s.	-do-	Majj. II. 84 ff.	277
—	S.s.	Becomes an upāsaka	Majj. II. p. 66 f.	278
—	S.s.	In the beginning of his conversation the king is hostile towards him.	Vin. II. p. 291.	279
—	S.s.	—	Majj. III. 138 ff.	280
—	—	—	Majj. III. 138 ff.	281
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. IV. p. 113.	282
—	Abhi.	He demonstrates his <i>iddhi</i> to him. And refers to him in his talks with him in third person as <i>ayyo</i> .	Sam. IV. p. 290.	283
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. IV. p. 291 ff.	284
—	Abhi.	—	Sam. IV. p. 296 f.	285

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
286.	Citta	Gahapati	Āy. Isidatta	Monk	bhante
287.	Dasama of Aṭṭhakanagara	Gahapati	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante Ānanda
288.	Anāthpiṇḍika	Gahapati	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante Ānanda
289.	Anāthpiṇḍika	Gahapati	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	bhante Sāriputta
290.	Sirivaddha	Gahapati	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante
291.	Kalyāṇa- bhaddika	Gahapati	Āy. Dabba- Mallaputta	Monk	bhante
292.	Dasama of Aṭṭhakanagara	Gahapati	Bhikkhus	Monk	bhante
293.	Ugga of Hatthigāma	Gahapati	Bhikkhus aññatara	Monk	bhante
294.	Ājivakasāvaka (follower of Ājivikas)	Gahapati	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante Ānanda
295.	Ratṭhapāl's father	Gahapati	Ay. Ratṭhapāla	Monk	tāta Ratṭhapāla

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
—	Abhi.	A term of reference <i>ayyo</i> is used in the conversation.	Sam. IV. pp. 283-88.	286
—	•Abhi.	He goes to Vesāli and to Sāvattthi only to see Ānanda.	Ang. V. p. 343.	287
—	—	—	Sam. V. p. 385 f.	288
—	—	—	Sam. V. p. 381 f.	289
—	—	—	Sam. V. pp. 176-77.	290
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 161.	291
—	—	—	Ang. V. pp. 342-43.	292
—	—	No salutation is indicated. It was the monk who goes to the gahapati.	Ang. IV. p. 213.	293
—	Abhi.	Gahapati becomes a lay follower of Buddha through Ānanda.	Ang. I. pp. 217-19.	294
—	—	Before he becomes a monk he addresses his parents as <i>amma-tātā</i> . The father retains his mode of address before and after the latter becomes a monk.	Majj. II. pp. 62-63.	295

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Terms of Address</i>
296.	Suddinna's father	Gahapati	Āy. Suddinna	Monk	tāta Suddinna
297.	Pañcakaṅga	Gahapati-1 Thāpati -2	Āy. Udāyi	Monk	bhante Udā
298.	Pañcakaṅga	Gahapati-1 Thāpati -2	Āy. Anuruddha	Monk	bhante
299.	Gahapati's son	Gahapati	Āy. Ānanda	Monk	bhante
300.	Upāsakas of Campa	Upāsaka	Āy. Sāriputta	Monk	bhante
301.	Aññātara Purisa	Upāsaka	Āy. Upananda	Monk	ayyo
302.	Pūga (a guild)	Upāsaka	Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus	Monk	bhante
303.	Sālha Migāraṇṭṭa	Upāsaka	Āy. Nandaka	Monk	bhante
304.	Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa	Upāsaka	Āy. Mahā-kaccāna	Monk	bhante

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos</i>
—	—	The same as above.	Vin. III. p. 16.	296
—	Abhi.	—	Majj. I. pp. 396-97.	297,
—	—	Thāpati sends the invitation for a meal through a messenger. In it he requests Anuruddha to arrive punctually as he is very busy and has much to do that is to be done for the King.	Majj. III. p. 145 ff.	298
—	—	There is no proper beginning to the discussions between both. This incident has to deal with <i>Vinaya</i> laws.	Vin. III. pp. 66-67.	299
—	Abhi.	—	Ang. IV. p. 59.	300
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 215 f.	301
—	—	—	Vin. III. p. 265	302
—	—	—	Ang. I. p. 193 f.	303
—	Abhi.	He becomes a monk, as <i>āyasmā soṇa</i> .	Vin. I. pp. 194-95.	304

WHO ADDRESSES			WHO IS ADDRESSED		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
305.	Setthiputta	Upāsaka	Āy. Upananda Sakyaputta	Monk	bhante
306.	Dāruḡaha gaṇaka	Upāsaka	Āy. Dhaniya kumbhakāra- putta	Monk	bhante
307.	80 thousand gāmakas	Upāsaka	Āy. Sāgata	Monk	bhante
308.	Aññatara purisa (a thief)	Upāsaka	A Bhikkhu	Monk	bhante
309.	Nātaka of a Bhikkhu	Upāsaka	A Bhikkhu	Monk	bhante
310.	Corā (robbers)	Upāsaka	Bhikkhus	Monk	bhante

PARIBBĀJAKAS AND GAHAPATIS

311.	Manussā (men of the high road)	Upāsaka	A Bhikkhu	Monk	bhante
312.	Nigantha Nātaputta	Jain	Citta	Gahapati	gahapati
313.	Acela Kassapa	Paribbājaka	Citta	Gahapati	gahapati
314.	Paribbājakas	Paribbājaka	Anāthpiṇḍika	Gahapati	gahapati
315.	Paribbājakas	Paribbājaka	Vijayamālitā	Gahapati	gahapati
316.	Sambahulā Tittthiyā	Paribbājaka	Meṇḍaka	Gahapati	gahapati
317.	Saṇjaya	Setthiputta	Paribbājaka	Meṇḍaka	Gahapati
318.	Nigantha Nātaputta	Jain	Upāli	Gahapati	gahapati

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		Also uses <i>ayyo</i> to address him.	Vin. III. p. 211.	305
		—	Vin. III. pp. 42, 43.	306
		—	Vin. III. p. 62.	307
		—	Vin. II. p. 217.	308
		—	Vin. III. p. 104.	309
		They honour him more than the Buddha in the initial stages of the conversation.	Vin. I. pp. 179-80.	310
		They also address him as <i>ayyo</i> .	Vin. III. p. 181.	311
		—	Sam. IV. 198 f.	312
		—	Sam. IV. p. 300 f.	313
		—	Ang. V. pp. 185-86.	314
		—	Ang. V. p. 89.	315
		—	Ang. V. p. 242.	316
		—	—	317
		—	Majj. I. pp. 374-75.	318

<i>Item Nos.</i>	<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>		<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
319.	Putanakaśśapa-1 Makkhali- Gosāla-2 Aṇḍa- kesakambali-3 Pakudha Kaścā- yana-4 Sañjaya Belatthi- putta-5 Nigaṇṭha Nāta- putta-6	Paribbājakas of different schools	Setṭhi of Rājagaha	Gahapati	gahapati

OTHERS AND GAHAPATIS

320.	Negama of Rājagaha	Others	Anāthpiṇḍika	Gahapati	gahapati
321.	Akkhadutā (gamblers)	Others	Aññātara Gahapati	Gahapati	gahapati
322.	Dovārika (doorkeeper)	Others	Upāli	Gahapati	bhante
323.	Aññātara purisa (a messenger)	Others	Anāthpiṇḍika	Gahapati	bhante

BRĀHMANAD AND BRAHMANAS

324.	Bhāradvāja māṇava	Brāhmaṇa	Vāsetṭha Māṇava	Brāhmaṇa	bho vāsetṭh
325.	700 Brāhmaṇa mahāsālas and 700 graduates	Brāhmaṇa	Magāgovinda	Brāhmaṇa	bhavam Govinda
326.	500 Brāhmaṇas from various parts of the country	Brāhmaṇa	Soṇadaṇḍa	Brāhmaṇa	bhavam Soṇadaṇḍa

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
			Vin. II. pp. 110-11.	319
		—	Vin. II. p. 157.	320
		—	Majj. II. p. 107.	321
		—	Majj. I. p. 380.	322
		—	Sam. V. p. 380.	323
		—	Dīg. I. p. 236.	324
		—	Dīg. II. p. 248.	325
		—	Dīg. I. p. 113.	326

<u>WHO ADDRESSES</u>			<u>WHO IS ADDRESSED</u>		
<i>Item Nos.</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Group Affiliation</i>	<i>Term of Address</i>
327.	Assalāyana	Brāhmaṇa	500 Brāhmaṇas from various parts of the country.	Brāhmaṇa	bho
328.	500 Brāhmaṇas from various parts of the country.	Brāhmaṇa	Cāṅki of Opasāda	Brāhmaṇa	bhavam Cāṅki
329.	Lohicca	Brāhmaṇa	The students of the Brāhmaṇa Lohicca	Brāhmaṇa	bhavam Lohicca
330.	Brahmāyu	Brāhmaṇa	Uttara māṇava	Brāhmaṇa	tāta
331.	Pokkharasādi	Brāhmaṇa	Ambatṭha māṇava	Brāhmaṇa	tāta
332.	Keṇiya jaṭila	Brāhmaṇa-1 paribbājaka-2	Sela	Brāhmaṇa	bho Sela
333.	Jāṇudonī	Brāhmaṇa	Sela Subha Todeyya-putta	Brāhmaṇa	bhavam Bhāradvāj

THE KINGS AND THE BRĀHMAṆAS

334.	Pasenadi of Kosala	King	Saṅjaya of Ākāśagotta	Brāhmaṇa	brāhmaṇa
335.	Rājā Reṇu	King	Mahāgovinda	Brāhmaṇa	bho bhav Govinda,
336.	Rājā Disampati	King	Jotipāla māṇava	Brāhmaṇa	bho bhav Jotipāla
337.	Pasenadi of Kosala	King	Sudassana māṇava	Brāhmaṇa	tāta
338.	Ajātasattu	King	Vassakāra	Brāhmaṇa	brāhmaṇa
339.	Bodhi	King (prince)	Saṅjikāputta māṇava	Brāhmaṇa	samma Sā kāputta

<i>Terms of Preference</i>	<i>Terms of Salutation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Item Nos.</i>
		—	Majj. II. p. 147, ff.	327
		—	Majj. II. p. 165.	328
		—	Sam. IV. p. 118.	329
6 		—	Dīg. I. p. 89.	330
		—	Majj. II. p. 134.	331
		—	Majj. II. p. 398. (Nālanada ed.)	332
		—	Majj. II. pp. 208-9.	333
		—	Majj. II. pp. 127, 132.	334
		—	Dīg. II. pp. 234-35.	335
		—	Dīg. II. p. 232.	336
		—	Sam. I. p. 82.	337
		—	Vin. II. p. 43.	
		—	Dīg. II. pp. 72-73.	338
		—	Majj. II. pp. 91-92.	339

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PĀLI TEXTS

Aṅguttara Nikāya

Ed. R. Morris and E. Hardy, 5 vols., PTS London, 1885-1900.

Tr. F. L. Woodward and E. M. Hare, *The Book of the Gradual Sayings*, 5 vols., PTS London, 1932-1936.

Buddhaghosa

Dhammapad' - aṭṭha-katha ed. H. C. Norman and L. S. Tailang, 5 vols., PTS London, 1906-15.

Tr. E. W. Burlingame, *Buddhist Legends*, 3 vols., Harvard Oriental Series, vols. xxviii-xxx., Cambridge, Mass., 1921.

Papañca-Sūdanī (Comm. to Majjhima Nikāya), ed. J. H. Woods, D. Kosambi, and I. B. Horner, 5 vols., PTS. London, 1922-38.

Paramattha-Jotika II (Comm. to Sutta Nipāta), ed. H. Smith, 3 vols., PTS London, 1916-18.

Samanta-Pāsādikā (Comm. to Vinaya Piṭaka), ed. J. Takakusu and M. Nagai, 7 vols., in progress. PTS. London, 1924-47.

Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī (Comm. to Dīgha Nikāya) ed. T. W. Rhys Davids, J. Estlin Carpenter, and W. Stede, 3 vols., PTS. London, 1886-1932.

Dhammapada

The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon, Part I, SBB. Vol. 7, *Dhammapada* etc. Ed. and tr. Mrs. Rhys Davids, London, 1931.

Dīgha Nikāya

Ed. T. W. Rhys Davids and J. Estlin Carpenter, 3 vols., PTS. London, 1890-1911. Tr. T. W. and Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, 3 vols., SBB. London, 1899-1926.

Jātaka

Ed. V. Fausböll, 6 vols. and index, London, 1877-97.

Tr. by Various Hands, ed. E. B. Cowell, 6 vols. and index, Cambridge, 1895-1907.

Majjhima Nikāya

Ed. V. Treckner and Lord Chalmers, 3 vols., PTS. London, 1888-1899. Ed. P. V. Bapat, R. Sankritayana, Bikkhu Kashyap, 3 vols., Nālandā-Devanāgarī-Pāli - Series, Nālandā, 1958.

Tr. I. B. Horner, *The Collection of the Middle length Sayings*, 3 vols., PTS. London, 1954-59.

Petavatthu

Ed. Minayett, PTS. London, 1888. Tr. H. S. Gehman, PTS. London, 1942.

Samyutta Nikāya

Ed. L. Feer, 6 vols., PTS. London, 1884-1904. Tr. C. A. F. Rhys Davids and F. L. Woodward, *The Book of Kindred Sayings*, 5 vols. London, 1917-30.

Sutta Nipāta

Ed. V. Fausböll, 2 vols., PTS. London, 1885-94.

Tr. V. Fausböll, SBE. X, (Second edition, revised) London, 1924.

Vinaya Piṭaka

Ed. N. Oldenberg, 5 vols., London, 1879-83.

Tr. I. B. Horner, 5 pts., SBB, London, 1938-52.

OTHER SOURCES

Adikaram, E. W.

Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, Colombo, 1953.

Barua, B. M.

Asoka and his Inscriptions, Calcutta, 1946.

Bhattacharya, V.

Buddhist text as recommended by Asoka, Calcutta, 1948.

Bose, A. N.

Social and Rural Economy of Northern India (Cir. 600 B.C.-200 A.D.), 2 vols., Calcutta, 1945.

Bühler, G.

Laws of Manu, SBE, xxv. Oxford, 1886.

De Gokuldas

Significance of the Jātakas, *The Calcutta Review* (July, 1930), Calcutta, 1930, pp. 83 ff.

- Dutta, N. K. *Origin and Growth of Caste in India*, vol. i, (Cir. B.C. 2000-300 A.D.), London, 1931.
- Fick Richard *The Social Organisation in North-East India in Buddha's time*, Calcutta, 1820.
- Fiser, Ivor "The problem of the Setṭhi in Buddhist Jātakas," *Archiv Orientalni*, Prague, 1954, pp. 238-265.
- Firth Raymond *Elements of Social Organization*, London, 1951.
Man and Culture, London, 1957.
- Frank Otto "The Buddhist Councils of Rājagaha and Vesāli," *J.P.T.S.* 1908, pp. 18-53.
- Ghosh, A. *Indian Archaeology—A Review*, New Delhi, 1953-1961.
- Herskevits, M. J. *Man and his works*, New York, 1949.
- Holtzsch, Eugen *Inscriptions of Asoka, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. I, Oxford, 1925.
- Jacobi, Hermann *Gaina Sūtras*, SBE. xxii. Oxford, 1884.
- Jain, Jagdish Chandra *Life in Ancient India as Depicted in the Jain Canons*, Bombay, 1947.
- Jayaswal K. P. *Hindu Polity*, 2 pts., Calcutta, 1924.
- Jayawickrame N. A. *Analysis of Sutta Nipāta*, Unpublished Thesis, London University Ph. D, 1947.
- Jennings, J. G. *Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha*, London, 1947.
- Kane, P. V. *History of Dharmasāstra*, Vol. II & IV, Poona, 1941.
- Kosambi, D. D. *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, Bombay, 1956.
"Early Stages of the Caste System in Northern India," *JBBRAS*, 1946, pp. 32-48.
- Kroeber, A. *Anthropology*, London, 1948.
- Lamotte, Etienne *Historie du Bouddhisme Indien*, Lourain, 1958.
"Problèmes Concernant les textes Canoniques Mineurs," *Journal Asiatique*, Paris, 1956, pp. 249-263.

- Law, B. C. *Kṣatriya clans in Buddhist India*, Calcutta, 1922.
Geography of Early Buddhism, London, 1932.
A History of Pāli Literature, Vol. I, London, 1933.
India as Described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism, London, 1941. .
Tribes in Ancient India, Poona, 1943.
- Malalasekera, G. P. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, 2 vols., London, 1937-38.
- Mandlik, V. N. *Manu Smṛiti or Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, Bombay, 1886.
- Marshall, J. H. "Rājagṛha and its Remains," *ASI*, Calcutta, 1905-6, pp. 86-106.
- Mehta, R. N. *Pre-Buddhist India*, Bombay, 1939.
- Murdock, J. P. "British Social Anthropology," *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 53, pp. 465-73.
- Macdonell, A. A., and Keith, A. B. *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, 2 Vols., London, 1912.
- Nadel, S. F. *The foundations of Social Anthropology*, London, 1958.
- Pande, G. C. *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*, Allaha-
bad, 1957.
- Przyluski, J. *Le Councile de Rājagṛha*, Paris, 1926.
- Ram Gopal *India of Vedic Kalpasūtras*, Delhi, 1959.
- Rapson, E. J. *The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, Cambridge, 1922.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. and Forde Daryll *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*, Oxford (Paperback ed.), 1960.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*, London, 1952.
- Raychaudhari, H. C. *Political History of Ancient India*, 6th Edn., Calcutta, 1953.
- Rhys Davids, C. A. "Note on Early Economic Conditions in Northern India," *J.R.A.S.*, 1901, pp. 859-888. *Psalms of the Brethren*, London, 1913.

- Rhys Davids, T. W. *Buddhist India*, London, 1903.
- Sharma, G. S. "The Excavation at Kauśāmbi (1957-59), Allahabad, 1960.
- Sharma, R. S. *Sudrās in Ancient India*. Patna, 1958.
- Spooner D. B. "Mr. Ratan Tata's Excavation at Pāṭali-putra," *ASI*, Calcutta, 1912-1913, pp. 53-86.
- Vogel, J. "Excavations at Sahéth Maheth," *ASI*, Calcutta, 1907-8, pp. 83-131.
- Warder, A. K. *A study of the Evolution of Early Middle Indian Metre, based on the Verses preserved in the Pāli Canon*. Unpublished Thesis, University of London, Ph.D., 1954.
- Winternitz, M. *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. 1. Tr. from German by Mrs. S. Ketkar, Calcutta, 1933.

INDEX

- Ahaya, 49
 Acela-Kassapa, 50, 64, 74
 Aggika Jaṭila, 13
 Ajātasattu (K), 37, 38, 42, 76, 81, 83, 93, 125, 138, 140
 Ajjuka (M), 84, 92
 Ālavi (PL), 23
 Ambagāma (PL), 147
 Ambalaṭṭhikā (PL), 147
 Ambapālī (P), 27, 28, 142
 Ambaṭṭha (BR), 19, 47, 102, 110, 112, 120, 121, 123
 Ambagāma (PL), 43
 Ānanda (M), 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 36, 57, 58, 59, 63, 66, 70, 84, 92, 107, 113, 154
 Anāthapiṇḍika (P), 22, 28, 53, 65, 66, 67, 95, 98, 107, 111, 147, 153
 Aṇḍhakavinda, 148
 Aṅgaka (P), 92, 121
 Aṅga, 35, 36, 37-38
 Aṅgulimāla, 23, 56, 123
 Anguttara Nikāya, 4, 38, 39, 42, 152, 153
 Anurādha (M), 59, 61, 99
 Anuruddha (M), 26, 57, 86
 Āpaṇa (PL), 22, 37
 Ariṭṭha (M), 58
 Asibandhakaputta, 65
 Artisans, 137-140
 Asoka (K), 1, 4
 Assaka (R), 35
 Assalāyana (BR), 33, 101, 102
 Assapura (PL), 37
 Asurīṇḍakabhāradvāja (BR), 46
 Ātumā (PL), 21
 Avanti (PL), 31
 Avapti (R), 35
 Belaṭṭha Kaccāna (P), 148
 Benaras (PL), 23, 24, 27, 52, 147
 Bhabra, Edict of Asoka, 1
 Bhaddā Kapilānī, 114
 Bhaddiya (K), 54, 87
 Bhaggas of Sumsimāra, 43
 Bhallika (PL), 115, 147
 Bhaṇḍagāma (PL), 43, 147
 Bhāradvāja, 150
 Bhesikā (P), 67
 Bhoganagara (PL), 43, 147
 Bhūmija (M), 59, 61
 Bimbisāra (K) of Magadha, 16, 18, 22, 25, 37, 38, 39, 60, 76, 81, 83, 145, 151
 Bodhi, Prince, 67
 Bodhisatta, 106
 Bose, A. N., 3
 Brahmaddatta (K) of Kasi, 115
 Brahmadeyya, 18, 19
 Brāhmaṇa Gāmas, 18-19
 Brāhmaṇās & Brahmaṇa, 66
 Brāhmaṇās & the King, 66-67
 Brāhmaṇa Prince, Barber, 67-69
 Brāhmaṇās & Paribhājakas, 68
 Brahmāyu (BR), 47, 66
 Brother & Brother, 86-87
 Brother & Sister, 87
 Buddha, 1, 12, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 61, 64, 67, 69, 71, 75, 76, 77, 81, 83, 85, 86, 88, 91, 93, 95, 96, 105, 106, 108, 111, 112, 115, 116, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 129, 136, 138, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 154, 155, 156
 Buddha & the Brāhmaṇās, 45
 Buddha & Gahapatis, 53

Buddha & Gāmanīs, 54
Buddha & the Jains, 48-49
Buddha & the King, 53
Buddha & the Monks, 51-52
Buddha & Others, 56-57
Buddha & the Paribbājīka, 49-51
Buddha & the Upāsaka, 56
Buddhaghosa, 104, 130
Buddha Kassapa (P), 138
Bullis of Allakappa, 43

Campā (PL), 18, 24, 37
Caṅki (BR), 19, 151
Caste, 132-133
Ceti (R), 35
Channa (M), 58, 109
Citta (P), 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 74, 75, 108, 115
Cullavagga, 2

Dabba Mallputta (M), 52, 108, 115, 140
Daṇḍapāṇi (P), 55
Dasama (P), 154
Devadāha (PL), 34, 40
Devadatta (M), 59
Dhānañjāni (BR), 81, 105, 107, 114, 154
Dhaniya (M), 15, 25, 139, 151
Dīghajānu Koliya Putta, 112, 146, 150
Dīghanakha (P), 49
Dīgha Nikāya, 4, 15, 36, 38, 43, 150
Dīgha Tapassi (P), 74
Dīghāvu Upāsaka, 56, 65, 115
Dīghiti (K) of Kosala, 115, 137, 139
Doṇa (BR), 68

Edicts-Bhabra, 1
Ekanāla, Village, 18
Ekanāla (PL), 19
Ekusāri (BR), 120
Entertainers, 141-143

Father, Mother & Daughter, 85-86
Fick, Richard, (Author), 3

Gahapatis, 53, 61, 76, 152
Gahapatis & the Brāhmaṇas, 64-65
Gahapatis & the Gahapati, 66
Gahapatis & the gāmaṇi, 65
Gahapatis & the Jains, 63-64
Gahapatis & the King, 65
Gahapatis & Others, 65
Gahapatis & the Paribbajīkas, 64
Gāma, 13-16, 23
Gāma & the Kin-group, 16-18
Gāma & Nigama, 20-23
Gāmaṇīs, 54
Gāndhāra (R), 35
Ganges, River, 25, 147
Ghosita (P), 152
Ghositārāma (PL), 5
Ghoṭamukha (BR), 60
Giribajja (PL), 25
Gonisādinivīṭṭho gāma, 14
Gopaka Moggallāna (BR), 14, 151
Gotama, 46, 47, 48, 49
Gotta, 123-125

Hatthaka (P), 152
Hatthigāma (PL), 43, 147
Horner, Miss I. B., 13
Household Group, 105-110
Husband & Wife, 88-92
Husband's Parents & Son's Wife, 93-95

Icchāmaṅkala, (PL), 19
Inter-Group Organization, 118-121
Isidatta (P), 86
Isigili, (Mountain), 13

Kaccāna (M), 111, 119
Kajāṅgala (PL), 32
Kālāmas (PE), 36, 43
Kalandaka (P), 17
Kalpa Sūtra, 40
Kamboja (R), 33, 35
Kammāsaddamma (PL), 21
Kānā (P), 85
Kandaraka (P), 51
Kaṇḍhavyāna (P), 103

- Kapilavatthu (PL), 27, 28, 29, 40
 Kāsi (R), 35, 147, 148
 Kassapa (P), 36
 Kassapasihanāda Sutta, 50
 Keṇiya Jaṭila (A), 22, 108, 115
 Khaṇḍakas, 2
 Khānumata, Village, 18, 19
 Khomadussa (PL), 22, 40
 King-group, 43
 Kings Service, 143-145
 Kinship grouping, 105
 Kisasankicca, 122
 Kokanuda (P), 59, 63
 Koliyas, 36
 Koliyas of Rāmagāma, 43
 Kosala (R), 19, 35, 38-39, 60, 148
 Kosala & Sākyas, 39-40
 Kosambi (PL), 5, 16, 24, 26, 27, 147
 Kosambi (author), 40
 Koṭigāma, 43, 147
 Kūḍapagaraka, 24
 Kuru (R), 35
 Kusāvātī (PL), 28
 Kusinārā (PL), 24, 25, 26, 27, 41, 57, 147
 Kūṭadanta, 18, 66, 123
 Kūṭi, 13

 Law, B.C., 42, 43
 Licchavis (PE), 36, 40, 42, 46, 54, 55, 156
 Licchavi-origin of, 104
 Lohicca (BR), 18, 68, 111, 119, 136, 151

 Magadha (PL), 18, 19, 35, 37
 Magadhas (PE), 21
 Māgandiya (P), 68
 Mahākaccāna (M), 31, 32, 57, 61, 62
 Mahāgovinda (BR), 76, 88, 89, 90, 114, 128
 Mahājanapadas, 35
 Mahākassapa (M), 57
 Mahāmoggallāna (M), 52
 Mahāmaṇḍana (P), 42, 150, 152
 Mahāparinibbana Sutta, 24, 58, 63
 Mahāpajāpati (P), 87
 Mahāsāla (PL), 32
 Mahāsāla (BR), 83
 Mahāvijita (K), 30
 Maine, Sir Henry, 78
 Majjhima Aṭṭhakathā, 101
 Majjhima Nikāya, 4, 17, 33, 38, 39, 50
 Makhadeva (BR), 136, 137
 Makkarakāṭa, 111, 119
 Makkhali Gosāla, 75, 122
 Makuṭabandhana, 27
 Mallās, 22, 26, 27, 35, 40, 41, 43, 55, 57, 68, 70, 108, 113, 150, 156
 Mallika, (Queen), 90, 126
 Manasākāṭa (PL), 19
 Mānattaddha (BR), 47, 81, 86
 Mañicūḷaka, 63
 Manu, 40
 Manusmṛiti, 61
 Marriage, 96-100
 Marriage, Brahmin Practice of, 100
 Māyā (P), 87
 Meḍaḷumpa (PL), 40
 Meghiya (M), 112
 Mehta R., 3
 Meṇḍaka (P), 64, 65, 88, 94, 151, 153
 Mettiya (M), 59
 Moggallāna (M), 58, 59, 61
 Monks & Brāhmaṇas, 60
 Monks & Gaṇapatis, 61-62
 Monks & Kings, 60-61
 Monks & Monks, 57-59
 Monks & Others, 63
 Monks & Paribbājjakas, 59-60
 Monks & Ruling Extended kin-group, 61
 Monks & Upāsakas, 62-63
 Moriyas of Pippalivana, 43
 Mother's Brother & Sister's son, 92
 Muṇḍa, 60

 Nadel (P), 7, 9
 Nādikā, 147

Nakulapitā (P), 88, 152
 Nagara, 23, 24
 Nagaravinda (PL), 19
 Nagara & Mahānagara, 27-29
 Nālanda (PL), 34, 147
 Nanadaka (M), 62
 Nanda (K), 83, 87
 Nanda Vaccha, 122
 Naṅgaraka (PL), 40
 Nāgita (M), 60
 Nātakas, 116-117
 Nāti, 127-130
 Nātika (PL), 43
 Nātisālohita, 114
 Negama, 22, 23
 Nigamas, 14, 20
 Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta, 49, 64, 74, 75
 Nigrodha, 64, 73
 Nikāyas, 1, 2, 3
 Nikāyas Aṅguttara, 2, 24
 Nikāyas Dīgha, 2, 24
 Nikāyas Majjhima, 2, 17
 Nikāyas Samyutta, 2, 21

Okkāka (K), 103
 Opasāda, Village, 18, 19
 Otthaddha (P), 54, 55
 Otto Frank, 58

Paccanika Brāhmaṇa, 46
 Pajjota (K) of Avanti, 38, 147
 Pāñcāla (R), 35
 Pañcasāla, a Village, 18, 19
 Pande, G. C., 2
 Paribbājaka, 49, 51
 Parents & Sons, 81-85
 Parivāra, 2
 Pasendi, (K), of Kosala, 18, 38, 39, 53, 66, 67, 84, 85, 90, 93, 96, 107, 125, 126, 154
 Pāṭaligāma, 25, 147
 Pāṭaliputta (PL), 25
 Pātimokkha, 2
 Pāvā (PL), 41
 Pessa (P), 51
 Peta Vatthu, 24
 Pilindavaccha (M), 16

Pilotika (P), 68
 Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja, (M), 52
 Pingiyūni (BR), 46
 Pokkharasādi (BR), 18, 19, 66, 107, 120
 Poṭaliputta (P), 59
 Poṭaliya (P), 53, 84, 152
 Prayāga (PL), 34
 Professions, 140-141
 Pubbārāma (PL), 38
 Pukkāsāti (M), 51
 Pura & Nagara, 23-27
 Pūraṇa (P), 86
 Pūraṇa Kassapa (P), 75, 122

Radcliffe-Brown, 7, 8, 78, 79, 80
 Rāhula (P), 82, 83, 84
 Rajagaha (PL), 1, 4, 5, 16, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 37, 60, 63, 90, 118, 137, 147, 148, 154
 Rājā Muṇḍa, 88, 90
 Ratthapāla (P), 65, 82, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90
 Reṇu (K), 76
 Rhys Davids, 2, 3, 24, 36, 54, 55

Saccaka (P), 48, 74
 Sāketa (PL), 24, 27, 145, 147
 Sākhā Nagaraka, 25
 Sākyas (PE), 22, 35, 39, 55, 102, 156
 Sākyaputta Upananda (M), 52
 Salaja (P), 54
 Sālha (P), 62
 Sālavatikā (PL), 18
 Samiddhi (M), 59
 Samyutta Nikāya, 21, 30, 38, 152
 Sandhāna (P), 64, 73
 Saṅjaya (BR), 67
 Saṅjikāputta (P), 67, 102
 Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, 60, 65, 107
 Setakaṇṇika (PL), 32
 Setthi, 66
 Sigālovāda Sutta, 91
 Silāvati (P), 22, 28, 142
 Sirivaddha (P), 66

- Sister & Sister, 87
 Sonā River, 25
 Soṇa (*P*), 145, 152
 Soṇadaṇḍa (*BR*), 18, 47, 66, 92, 121, 123, 128, 151
 Soṇa Kolivisa, 28, 82
 Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa (*P*), 62
 Subha Todeyyaputta (*BR*), 64, 65
 Sucassana (*BR*), 66
 Sudatta (*P*), 53
 Suddhamma (*M*), 61, 62, 75, 89
 Suddhodana Sākya (*P*), 83, 84, 86, 87, 124
 Sudinna (*M*), 17, 29, 65, 90, 94, 129
 Sudinna Kalandaka, 81, 83, 84, 87, 88
 Sūjātā, 88, 90, 92, 95
 Sundarika (*BR*), 121, 123
 Sunidha (*P*), 25
 Surasena (*R*), 35
 S'vopiyā (*P*), 88
 Sutta Nipāta, 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 23, 39
 Sutta Vibhaṅga, 2

 Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, 23
 Takkaṣilā (*PL*), 147
 Tapoda Park, 63
 Tapussa (*P*), 115, 147
 Tārakkha (*BR*), 86
 Tekula (*BR*), 86
 Theravāda, 2
 Thullakoṭṭhika (*PL*), 21
 Thullananda, 149
 Thūṇa (*PL*), 32
 Todeyya (*BR*), 19
 Trading & Commercial Activities, 145-150

 Udayana, 5
 Udāyī (*M*), 63, 85, 95, 96, 99, 110, 116
 Udena (*K*), 38, 152
 Udena (*M*), 60
 Ugga (*P*), 87, 88, 89, 114, 128, 152
 Ujjaya (*BR*), 146
 Ujjaini (*PL*), 147
 Ukkalā (*PL*), 147
 Ukkatṭhā (*PL*), 18
 Upāli, 57, 64, 66, 84, 92, 140, 152
 Upananda (*M*), 112, 116
 Upāsakas, 56, 62
 Upasena Vaṅgataputta, 52
 Uruvela (*PL*), 21
 Uruvela Kassapa (*P*), 36
 Usīraddhaja, 32
 Uttara (*P*), 66

 Vacchagotta, 50
 Vaddha (*P*), 108, 115
 Vajji (*R*), 35, 41-43
 Vajjis (*PE*), 17, 28, 42, 43, 103
 Vamsa (*R*), 35, 42
 Vaṇṇa, 125-127
 Vāseṭṭha (*BR*), 55
 Vāseṭṭha Sutta, 115, 151
 Vassakāra (*P*), 25, 42, 76
 Vaṭṭagāmanī (*K*), 1
 Vegālinga (*PL*), 20, 21
 Vekhanassa, 49
 Venāgapura (*PL*), 19
 Veracchāni, 60, 152
 Verañja (*PL*), 148
 Vesāli (*PL*), 1, 17, 27, 28, 42, 84, 104, 147
 Vijaya (*BR*), 112
 Vijayamāhita (*P*), 64
 Vinaya Cullavagga, 57
 Vinaya Mahāvagga, 37, 43, 52
 Vinaya Piṭaka, 1, 2, 3, 14, 15, 16, 23, 32, 63, 74, 85, 89, 93, 106, 116, 122, 124, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 154
 Vinaya Suttavibhaṅga, 113
 Visākha Pāñcālaputta (*M*), 52
 Vrātyas, 41
 Vrātyakshatriyas, 40

 Warder A. K., 2
 Winternitz, Maurice, 3

Yakkha. 14

Yamaka. 58

Yasa (*P*), 82, 83, 86Yamelu (*BR*), 86Yona (*R*), 33Yona Kamboja (*R*), 101

Abbreviations:

A = Ascetic

K = King

P = Proper Name

PL = Place, Name of

BR = Brahmana

M = Monk

PE = People

R = Region

Note: Words in italics indicate the topics.

Index prepared by S. A. Vinekar.

Popular Books

BRAHMA-SUTRA SHANKARA BHASHYA

(Translation in English)

V. M. Apte **Rs. 45.00**

CULTURAL HISTORY OF GUJARAT

M. R. Majmudar **Rs. 75.00**

RELIGIOUS CONSCIOUSNESS

G. S. Ghurye **Rs. 45.00**

INDIAN COSTUME

G. S. Ghurye **Rs. 90.00**

CASTE, CLASS AND OCCUPATION

G. S. Ghurye **Rs. 20.00**

INDIAN SADHUS

G. S. Ghurye **Rs. 25.00**

BHARAT NATYA AND ITS COSTUME

G. S. Ghurye **Rs. 4.50**

HINDU SOCIAL ORGANISATION

P. H. Prabhu **Rs. 20.00**

EVOLUTION OF HINDU MARRIAGE

Nilakshi Sengupta **Rs. 20.00**

MYTH AND REALITY

by D. D. Kosambi

These studies in the formation of Indian culture from the pen of one of the foremost scholars and original thinkers of India, are based upon profound study of literary material and carefully planned field work—a unique combination of sources of study. Prof. Kosambi has raised and solved many questions of vital importance to all those interested in the study of Indology. The date of Karla caves, the background of Kalidasa's plays, the significance of the great Pandharpur pilgrimage, social and economic aspects of Bhagvad Gita, the background of the Goan struggle for reunion with India, are some of the many fascinating problems analysed by the author.

"Though some of his theories are open to criticism, Professor Kosambi's book is very well written and interesting. It is also well produced."

—*Man*

Crown 4to, pp. 187

Rs. 12.50

SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS LIFE IN THE GRIHYA SUTRAS

by V. M. Apte

"This is a very interesting, informative and scholarly book on the social and religious life of the Hindus as gathered from the various Grihya Sutras. The subject is dealt with under twenty heads like the caste system, marriage, family life, occupations, trade, education, religion, outlook in life, and so on.

We cannot but admire the inordinate patience and the tremendous labour involved in wading through the ancient literature and gathering the material for a book of this kind and arranging it under appropriate heads so as to make it readable and interesting."

—*The Hindu*

Demy 8vo pp. 280

Rs. 15.00

THE BUDDHA AND HIS MESSAGE

by N. Gangulee

This book sums up in a brief compass the main historical evidence on the life and times of the Great Teacher, the evolution of the Buddhist doctrine in its main branches through the last 2500 years, the present position of Buddhism in the various countries of Asia followed by a comprehensive selection of excerpts from the sayings of the Teacher and the writings of the most famous Buddhists in the various languages of the world.

Crown 8vo, pp. 206

Rs. 4.50

POPULAR BOOKS