

Rāhula to Venerable Sāriputta to be ordained as a *sāmaṇera* (Vin. 1.82).

The *Vinaya Mahāvagga* (Vin. 1.78) records the story of a father and his young son who was below the age of fifteen joining the order of monks due to some calamity in the family. The young *sāmaṇera*'s childish behaviour in the *vihāra* annoyed some of the other bhikkhus in the *vihāra* and they complained the matter to the Buddha. The Buddha thereupon set down the rule that a child who was below the age of fifteen should not be ordained. But this rule had been subsequently set aside by the Buddha himself on account of different circumstances. It is said that a family who were benefactors of elder Ananda and were great supporters of the Order were stricken with a deadly disease and the parents and other elders of the family had succumbed to the disease, only two young children of the family were surviving, Elder Ananda reported to the Buddha that the two children who were under 15 years of age cannot be recruited as *sāmaṇeras* to the Order to save them from peril as the Buddha himself had laid down the injunction that children below the age of fifteen should not be recruited to the Order as *sāmaṇeras*. The Buddha at this situation relaxed the previous injunction to accommodate even very young children in the Order as *sāmaṇeras* (Vin. 1.79).

New recruits or *sāmaṇeras* in the community of bhikkhus are to practise ten precepts constantly. (A.1.83). They are : to refrain from killing or injuring living beings (*pāṇātipātā viramaṇa*), to refrain from theft (*adinnādānā viramaṇa*), to refrain from sexual behaviour (*kāmesu micchācārā viramaṇa*), to refrain from falsehood (*musāvādā viramaṇa*), to refrain from taking intoxicating drinks (*surāmeraya majjhapaṇādaṭṭhānā viramaṇa*), to refrain from eating at improper times (*vikāla bhojanā viramaṇa*), to refrain from seeing shows of dancing, singing and music and using garlands scents, unguents and wearing finery (*naccagītāvādita visūka dassana mālā ghandā vilepana dhāranamaṇḍana vibhūsanāṭṭhānā viramaṇa*), to refrain from using high and luxurious beds (*uccāsāyana mahāsāyana viramaṇa*) and to refrain from accepting gold and silver (*jātarūpa rajata paṭṭigghanā viramaṇa*).

Persons with physical defects (cripples, eunuchs and hermaphrodites etc.) were not allowed to become

sāmaṇeras. Also persons with serious moral defects (patricides, matricides, murderers of arahants, persons guilty of raping women etc.) were also not recruited as *sāmaṇeras* (Vin. 1.73f). It is prohibited to admit children as *sāmaṇeras* to the Order without the consent of their parents or elders (Vin. 1.82-83).

D. Saddhasena

SĀMAÑÑAPHALA SUTTA, the 'discourse on the fruits of recluse-ship', is the second discourse in the *Dīgha Nikāya* (D. I, 47). Two versions of this discourse have been preserved in the Chinese *Āgamas*, occurring as the twenty-seventh discourse in the *Dīrgha Āgama* (Taishō I. 107) and as the seventh discourse in the forty-third chapter of the *Ekottara Āgama* (Taishō II. 762)¹. The same discourse has also found its way into the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, where it occurs in the context of Devadatta's attempt at creating a schism in the *Saṅgha*, included probably in order to document how Devadatta lost his main supporter king *Ajātasattu* through a change of heart of the latter after the present discourse².

The *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* reports the patricide *Ajātasattu*, king of *Magadha*, visiting the Buddha and inquiring after visible fruits of living the life of a recluse, a question he had on an earlier occasion posed to several other renowned religious teachers. Beneath the king's inquiry into the purpose of living the life of a recluse, in contrast to the productive life of a craftsman, two underlying aspects can be discerned. One aspect, related to king *Ajātasattu* being an active part of a growing tendency towards political centralization in ancient India, would seem to be a wish to inquire into the rationale and to some extent also the right of the growing number of wandering ascetics roaming his kingdom and demanding support. The other aspect, on a more personal level, could be related to his feeling of guilt at having murdered his father, being to some extent a question about the fruit of action in general and thereby implicitly also about the fruits of his patricide.

The other teachers he had approached earlier had not been able to give a full answer to all aspects of this question. Quite probably being aware of his patricide, they had to some extent addressed the question of action and its fruit, with *Pūraṇa Kassapa* pointing out

that there is not evil in killing, Makkhali Gosāla telling the king that there is no cause for the moral purity or impurity of beings, Ajita Kesakambali explaining that there is no retribution for good and bad deeds, Pakudha Kaccāyana even proclaiming that there is no such thing as 'killing' at all, Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta advocating the restraint of action and Saṅjaya Belaṭṭhaputta presenting what could be a form of scepticism as to the possibility of stating anything definitely. None of these answers was able to satisfy the king, since they did not respond to the evident and practical aspect of his question after a visible fruit of the life of a recluse, a failure the king compared to discarding a mango when being asked about breadfruit. Their replies also did not tackle the political implications of his question, nor were they able to allay his feelings of guilt.

In contrast to the other teachers, the Buddha directly replied to the king's question by bringing up the practical example of a servant of the king who, on going forth as a monk, will no longer have to obey the king's commands but rather receive the king's worship. With this example the Buddha succeeded not only in showing a practical and visible benefit of the life of a recluse to the king, but also made the king right away reaffirm the right of a recluse to be independent of the king, thereby addressing the political aspect of the king's question.

This much achieved, the Buddha turned to a detailed description of the gradual path of training that comes into being once a *Tathāgata* arises in the world and proclaims the *Dhamma*, a description recurring in several other discourses in the *Dīgha Nikāya*. During his description of the gradual path, the Buddha highlighted the different types of happiness gained with progressive mental purification, 'fruits' of the life style of a recluse standing in stark contrast to the guilt ridden conscience of the king. This description of gradual mental purification thus directly addressed the third and more personal aspect of king Ajātasattu's question.

The Buddha's reply did satisfy the king, with the result that he expressed his regret at having murdered his own father in order to gain the throne and moreover proclaimed himself a lay follower of the Buddha.

The *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* takes its importance not only from the successful conversion of king Ajātasattu, but also as a source for the philosophical positions taken by the other contemporary religious teachers to

whom the king had posed his question. The various versions of this discourse do however differ in regard to the positions assumed by these teachers³. In relation to the account found in the Pāli version of the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta*, two points can be made:

Concerning the position taken by Makkhali Gosāla, all versions agree with the Pāli discourse on attributing to him the denial of causality in relation to the purification of beings. The Pāli discourse stands however alone in also having him teach a fixed *samsāric* process through which all beings have to pass before going beyond suffering, a doctrine which according to some other versions should rather be attributed to Pakudha Kaccāyana. Such a fixed *samsāric* process would seem to fit well with Pakudha's other propositions, which were based on a set of firmly fixed principles, while it would seem to be to some extent at odds with Makkhali's earlier denial of any causal principle⁴.

Concerning Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta, the Pāli discourse stands alone in having him teach a fourfold restraint⁵. Some of the other versions have him explain that one's present condition is the result of past action, through penance previous karma is eradicated and through refraining from doing new deeds one puts an end to suffering, a view which does seem to accord well with what is known about the *Jaina* teachings from other sources and as such also recurs in the Pāli discourses (e.g. at *M. I*, 93).

These two points are not the only instances where the various versions differ on what doctrine should be attributed to which teacher, a more detailed discussion of which would however go beyond the scope of the present article. Such differences can also be found in the Pāli discourses, which sometimes attribute aspects of Makkhali Gosāla's view to Pūraṇa Kassapa (*S. III*, 69 and *A. III*, 383). Similarly, while according to the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta*'s account Makkhali Gosāla proclaimed various types of *kamma*, another discourse attributes the denial of *kamma* to him (*A. I*, 286). Since this discourse begins with a reference to the custom of wearing a blanket made of human hair (*keskambala*), it could be referring to Ajita Kesakambali instead. In relation to the same Ajita Kesakambali it could be noted that even though according to the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* he explicitly denied rebirth, another Pāli discourse includes him among a list of teachers making a pronouncement on the rebirth of their disciples (*S. IV*, 398).

Despite these differences, the general picture to be gained from an examination of these various philosophical propositions recorded in the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* remains the same, namely that at the time of the Buddha various teachings denying causality, action and *karma* were in vogue. These form the philosophical background of the Buddha's affirmation of karmic retribution and his teaching of dependent origination (*paṭicca samuppāda*).

Anālayo

References

- ¹ In addition to these two, an individual Chinese translation of this discourse can be found as discourse number 22 at Taishō I, 270.
- ² The Sanskrit version of this account has been edited by Gnoli, R.: *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu*, Rome 1978, vol. II p 216-253; a translation of the corresponding Tibetan version can be found in Rockhill, W.W.: *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of his Order*, London 1907 (1883), pp 95-106.
- ³ Comparative studies of the different versions of the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* have been undertaken by Bapat, P.V.: "The *Śrāmaṇyaphala-Sūtra* and its different versions in Buddhist Literature", in *Indian Culture* 1948, vol XV, pp 107-114; Macqueen, G.: *A Study of the Śrāmaṇyaphala-Sūtra*, Wiesbaden 1988; Meisig, K.: *Das Śrāmaṇyaphala-Sūtra*, Wiesbaden 1987; and Vogel, C.: *The Teachings of the Six Heretics*, Wiesbaden 1970.
- ⁴ On this inner contradiction see also Jayawardhana: "Determinism" in *Ency. Bsm.* Vol IV p 399.
- ⁵ On this fourfold restraint see Guruge: "Mahāvira" in *Ency. Bsm.* Vol VI p 512.

SAMANTAKŪṬA. From the central highlands of Sri Lanka rises Adam's Peak which is one of the highest peaks in the land. It is also called Sri Pāda (in common parlance) which means "the sacred footprint". It is also called Samanala-kanda (Peak of god Saman). This peak is also regarded as the water shed of Sri Lanka for the reason that four of the principal rivers in the island have their source in this mountain. These rivers fall to the sea on eastern, western and south eastern coasts. Sri Lanka has also been given the name Ratnadvīpa which means 'the island of gems'. Districts lying

in the neighborhood of Adam's Peak produce gems such as rubies, sapphires and emeralds etc. Therefore the ancient appellation 'Ratnadvīpa' is justifiable.

This mountain has become sacred for religious reasons. The indentation on its summit in the form of a footprint has been a place of worship by Buddhists, Hindus as well as Muslims. The Buddhists regard the footprint as of the Buddha. The Muslims believe that it is of Adam and Hindus regard it as of god Śiva. Every year devotees belonging to these faiths perform the difficult ascent to the summit of the mountain for purposes of veneration. There is also the belief among Buddhists that this mountain is the abode of God Saman (P. Sumana). He is regarded as one of the four guardian deities of Sri Lanka. The other three are Uppalavaṇṇa, Skanda and Vibhīṣaṇa. The Pāli word Uppalavaṇṇa is the same as Upulvan.

The Pāli chronicle named *Mahāvamsa* which deals with the traditional history of Sri Lanka narrates how the Buddha visited Sri Lanka on three occasions and placed his footprint on its summit on the third occasion. When the Buddha arrived in Sri Lanka, a prominent deity who greeted Him was Mahā Sumana of the Sumanakūṭa mountain. When he begged for an object of worship, the Buddha gave him a lock of hair from his head. This was enshrined in a *stūpa* at Mahiyaṅgana. Later, when the Buddha visited Sri Lanka for the third time, he arrived at Sumanakūṭa and placed his footprint there.

It is in the reign of Vijayabāhu I (1055-1111) that a village named Gilimale was dedicated for purposes of providing facilities for the pilgrims proceeding to Sumanakūṭa. He also granted villages on two routes to the peak for the same purpose and recorded the donation in a stone inscription. He also caused to be constructed rest houses on the way. These inscriptions are from Gilimale and Ambagamuva. The king himself is said to have ascended the peak and worshipped the footprint. Nissankamalla who ascended the throne in 1187 A. C. is also said to have gone up the peak and worshipped the footprint with great devotion.

Nissankamalla's inscription at Bhagavālena confirms this visit to the sacred mountain. It is apparent that by about the 12th century, much importance was attached to the cult of the footprint. During this period, a Pāli poem of 802 stanzas named

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF BUDDHISM

Founder Editor-in Chief

G. P. MALALASEKERA, M. A., Ph. D., D. Litt., Professor Emeritus

Editor-in Chief

W. G. WEERARATNE, M. A., Ph. D.

VOLUME VII

FASCICLE 4 : Saddhammapakāsinī – Sāsanavamsa



2006