

Paṭipatti

Arhant Mahinda as Redactor of the *Buddhapūjāva* and the *Pañca-* *Aṭṭhangika-* and *Dasa-sīlas* in Sinhala Buddhism

Suwanda H J Sugunasiri

Abstract

Buddha Pūjā ‘Homage to the Buddha’ is a religious practice found in every Buddhist temple and many a Buddhist household around the world. Over the last two millennia or more, it has taken many a shape and turn. This treatment, however, relates to the *Buddha Pūjā* in the particular cultural context of Sinhala Buddhism, writing it as a single word, *Buddhapūjāva* (with a -va denoting the Sinhalizing suffix) to distinguish it from the ritual in other cultural contexts. It is as practiced in Sri Lanka, ironically, not in Sinhala but in *Pali*, Buddhism being introduced in the 3rd c. BCE by Arhant Mahinda during the reign of Devanampiya Tissa in the Anuradhapura period. It is not the *Buddhapūjāva* itself, however, that is the topic of this paper, but its authorship.

Finding no evidence of its authorship, or origin, in India, it comes to be located in Sri Lanka. Seeking evidence for its Redactor from within the ritual itself, we are led to none other than **Arhant Mahinda** who introduces the Buddhaddhamma to the island. It is also established how, in the very process of creating the *Buddhapūjāva*, the *pañca-*, *aṭṭhangika-* and *dasa-sīlas* also come to be systematized into a coherent pattern.

Two alternative dates for the possible launch of the ceremony are suggested, making it the oldest living *Buddhapūjā* ritual in the world.

In a concluding theoretical detour, a distinction is made between an **Etic** *Buddha Pūjā* and an **Emic** *Buddha Pūjā*.

*Trinity College,
University of Toronto;
Nalanda College
of Buddhist Studies
(Canada)*

*Canadian Journal of
Buddhist Studies,
Number Eight, 2012*

© 2012
by Nalanda College
Buddhist studies

A. Introduction

Buddha Pūjā is a religious practice found in every Buddhist temple and many a Buddhist household around the world. But the term itself seems to generate some confusion, since it is used in three different senses.

1. The general sense of a “common form of worship in the Buddhist world” literally “honoring the Buddha” (as e.g., in the *Encyclopedia* entry by Kinnard, 2005: 4330).
2. As a short form for *Buddhassa Pūjā* as in Pali, in the narrower sense of a *specific* ‘Offering to the Buddha’, as e.g., of incense, light, food and medicinal drinks at a temple, or in a home setting.
3. A label for a *whole ritual* that includes the narrow, second sense of a specific offering, but, as will be seen, entails much more.

In a formulaic sense, the three may be shown in the following manner: Honouring the Buddha (1) > whole ritual (3) > a specific offering (2), the sign > meaning ‘wider than’. (See section E.1 later for a theoretical perspective.)

The distinction made here between 1 and 3 on the one hand and 2 on the other may be understood with the example of ‘foot ball’ vs ‘football’ (in the sense of international ‘*soccer*’, and NOT the North American). ‘Foot ball’ is a ball which is played with the foot, as opposed to, say, ‘tennis ball’, whereas ‘football’, written as one word, refers to a game (c.f., volleyball, baseball, basketball) played with the foot. Like every other organized endeavour, football has its own rules: e.g., allowed is ‘head ball’ (hitting the ball with the head) but not ‘hand ball’ (i.e., touching the ball with hands); a referee blows the whistle to call foul play, etc.

To distinguish Meaning 3 (a complex ritual, as we shall see, with its own ‘rules’ and traditions) from the other two, then, we use, as in football, *Buddhapūjā* as a single word¹. The *Sinhala Buddhist* version of it comes to be written as *Buddhapūjāva*, with -va denoting the Sinhalizing suffix. It is as practiced in Sri Lanka (Fahsien’s “*simhala island*” (see later)), Buddhism being introduced in the 3rd c. BCE during

¹ While the single morphemic form, *Buddhapūjā*, is also what occurs in Buddhist texts (Canonical and post-canonical), please see Section E.1 for a discussion about how the two-word form (*Buddha Pūjā*) and the single-word (*Buddhapūjāva*) carry differential semantic connotations.

the reign of Devanampiya Tissa in the Anuradhapura period². It is not the *Buddhapūjāva* per se, however, that is the topic of this paper (see Sugunasiri, forthcoming, on this), but its *authorship*.

B. The Indian Historical Record

Given that India is the home of Buddhism, and had come to earn the epithet *Viśvaguru* ‘Teacher of the World’³, it is only but reasonable to envisage the origins of the *buddhapūjā*, too, in India. This is the direction that would be particularly suggested, given that the (Sinhala) *Buddhapūjāva* (better, *Buddhapūjāva* in Sinhala Buddhism) is rendered (both orally in the ritual as well as in writing) in **Pali**, not in Sinhala.

In search of such a possible origin in India, then, we consider four sources: (1) the Canon itself, (2) post-Canonical commentarial literature, (3) Art-historical analysis on Indian Buddhist sites, and (4) the accounts of Chinese pilgrims⁴.

B.1 The Canon

The term *buddhapūjā*, by itself, occurs but in a single work of the Canon, namely, the *Apadāna*, where we hear Asanabodhiya Thera saying, “by whom this bodhi [tree] was planted, and a *buddhapūjā* duly conducted, him I shall proclaim. Listen to my words.” (*yenāyam ropitā bodhi, buddhapūjā ca sakkatā; tamahaṃ kittayissāmi, suṇātha mama bhāsato*) (*KN Ap. 1 6 10*). Elsewhere we come across the usage *buddhapūjāyidam* in the standard line *buddhapūjāyidam phalam* ‘this the fruit of a / the *buddhapūjā*’ (*Ap. 1; Ap. 2*)⁵. Two other variations, *buddhapūjam* and *buddhapūjattham*, occur as well.

We may immediately note that these occurrences are in the *Khuddaka*, the last of the five Nikayas, which “always remained open for additions” (Hinuber, 1996, p. 76, # 156). And in the *Khuddaka*, too, they are in the

² See de Silva, 1981; Rahula, 1956 for extensive treatments.

³ An important outcome of the Third Council was the dispatching of emissaries to several countries. Hence the claim (VRI *Chaṭṭha sangāyanā* CD, Introduction).

⁴ I am thankful to a peer reviewer for directing me towards the last two sources in particular.

⁵ The fruits are shown to be in relation to birth (not coming by a miserable birth, another birth or birth into a family of low descent), experiencing no shortage of food, etc.

Apadāna, “the latest part” (Warder, 1970, p. 204), “if it was part...”. Confirming the later origins of the *Apadāna*, Perera (1966, p. 2-3) notes that “The reference in the *Apadana* to numerous Buddhas presupposes the legend of twenty-four previous Buddhas, which is only a later development of the older legend of six Buddhas contained in other parts of the canon such as the *Digha Nikaya*”. This late date for the *Apadāna* finds confirmation in its very text that “makes no attempt to teach the higher doctrines Its stories deal with the merits done by good people, laying much stress on the formal aspects of religion, *pūjā*, *vandanā*, *dāna*, etc. ...”. (ibid.) While, then, it would hardly be surprising to find the term *buddhapūjā* occurring in it, it is relevant to note the general consensus that it was composed “during the 1st and 2nd century BCE”⁶. (See also Hinuber, 1996, p. 61, # 121)⁷.

So the occurrence of the term *buddhapūjā* in the *Apadāna* does not, then, seem to encourage a view that the *Buddhapūjā*, as understood in this paper, predates Mahinda’s introduction of Buddhism to Sri Lanka (3rd c. BCE). This conjecture seems to be strengthened by the fact that the “bodhi [tree] ... planted” referred to by Asanabodhiya Thera (above) in relation to the *buddhapūjā* could be certainly none other⁸ than the one brought to Sri Lanka by Sanghamittā (Mv. ch. XVIII)⁹.

B.2 Commentarial Literature

When it comes to the *aṭṭhakathā*, the Commentarial literature, while there are no occurrences of *buddhapūjā*, there are seven occurrences of its grammatical variation *buddhapūjaṃ* in 5 books¹⁰. In the *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*, e.g., the attendants of Visakha (*visākhāya sahāyikayo*) say “*ayye, buddhapūjaṃ kātukāmamhā ...*” (Dhp-a III 101) ‘Respected One, we wish to do a *buddhapūjā*’ In the *Jātakaṭṭhakathā*, King Kosala’s wife says “*dhammaṃ va sotuṃ buddhapūjaṃ va kātuṃ*

⁶ <http://www.dhammadownload.com/index.php?title=Apadana>.

⁷ This, of course, explains why there is no entry for *buddhapūjā* in PED.

⁸ It may be noted that, for obvious reasons, the planting of the tree under which the Buddha attained Enlightenment, which would by definition be pre-Buddhian, or the identity of the planter, finds no significance in the literature.

⁹ See Section C later for some details.

¹⁰ See <http://www.tipitaka.org/>, and http://pali.sirimangalo.org:<chrome://digitalpalireader/content/search.htm?type=0&query=buddha_puja&MAT=mat&set=vdmsakxyxbg&book=1&part=1&rx=false.> and in VRI: www.Palitipitaka.org.

dānaṃ va dātuṃ” (Ja I 381), i.e., that she wants to ‘listen to the Dhamma, do a *Buddhapūjā* and offer alms” in the thought ‘rare is the birth of a Buddha’. The temple referred to is the Jetavana, where, as in the text, Ananda Thera lives. A third occurrence, *buddhapūjaṃ katvā*, is in the *Theraṭṭhakathā* (Th.a I 235).

There are other variants, too: *buddhapūjāyidaṃ* (69 occurrences, 64 in Th.a. and 5 in Thi.a), *buddhapūjādīṃ* (2 in 2 books), *buddhapūjādīni* (1), *buddhapūjāya* (1), *buddhapūjatthaṃ* (1), *buddhapūjādīpuññaṃ* (2 in 2) and *buddhapūjādivasena* (2 in 2)¹¹.

When it comes to the *ṭīkā*, while again there is no occurrence of *buddhapūjā*, there are four variants: *buddhapūjaṃ*, *buddhapūjampi*, *buddhapūjāya* and *buddhapūjāyapañho*.

Buddhapūjā does occur in texts that fall under the category ‘Other texts’, namely the *Visuddhimagga*, the well-known work by Buddhaghosa¹², and in the commentary on it, *Visuddhimagga mahāṭīkā*, as well as in the *paramatthadīpanī* by Dhammapala¹³. Nine other variants occur elsewhere¹⁴.

We may note again that, like the *Apadāna* itself, the three Commentaries – *Dhammpadaṭṭhakathā*, *Jātakatṭhakathā* and *Theraṭṭhakathā* are all post-Mahindian (see Adikaram, 1946 (1994), p. 1; 6-7)¹⁵. So, of course, is the *Visuddhimagga* (5th c.), as are all the rest in the

¹¹ VRI.

¹²aparassa maraṇasamaye ñātakā “ayaṃ tāta tavatthāya buddhapūjā kariyati cittaṃ pasādehi” ti ... ‘At the point of death, these are [your] friends, sirs. For your sake, do they do a *buddhapūja*. Be happy in [your] mind.’ (VRI // digitalpalireader/vol 2. page 180 (section 625).

¹³ He is, of course, “the second important commentator after Buddhaghosa” (Hinuber, 1996, p. 136, # 272) (ibid.)

¹⁴ Including the *Mahāvamsaṭṭhakathā* (Mv-a, 29.16-17), they are
buddhapūjamakārayi (1) (*Mv aṭṭhakathā*),
buddhapūjādīni (1) (*Visuddhimagga nidānakathā*),
buddhapūjānamatthaṃ (1) (*Rasavāhinī*),
buddhapūjāpattacīvarādīni (1) (*Visuddhimagga mahāṭīkā*)
buddhapūjāya (1) (*Saddanītipakaraṇaṃ*);
buddhapūjāyapañho (1) (*Milindapañha ṭīkā*)
buddhapūjāyi (1) (*Rasavāhinī*),
buddhapūjāyidaṃ (1) (*Rasavāhinī*),
buddhapūjena (1) (*Kaccānabyākaraṇaṃ*)

¹⁵ The “*Dhammpadaṭṭha-kathā*, according to its introductory verses, is the Pali translation of an original Sinhala commentary.” (Adikaram, 1994, p. 6). The *Jātakatṭhakathā* is “based on the Mahavihara recension of the Jataka collection.” (p. 7). While “the chronology of Th / Thi has not attracted much attention”, and

sub-commentary category - *mahāṭīkā*, *ṭīkā*, *anuṭīkā*, *nidānakathā*¹⁶. The same may be seen to hold in relation to the other texts (see footnote 15), such as, e.g., *Milindapañha* of the 2nd c. BCE (Hinuber, 1996, 83.172). *Kaccānabyākaraṇam* and *Saddanīti-pakaraṇaṇam*, the other two works in which the term occurs, are not even included in Hinuber's *A Handbook of Pali Literature* (op.cit).

The conclusion then has to be again that the occurrences in the Canonical and post-Canonical literature do not contribute to the possibility that the *buddhapūjāya* had pre-Mahindian¹⁷ and / or Indian origins.

However, the occurrence of *buddhapūjāya* in reference to King Aśoka in the *Nidānakathā* of the *Pañcappakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā* of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka* seems to tease us. In part it reads as follows:

...sāsane paṭiladdhasaddho asoko dhammarājā divase divase
buddhapūjāya satasahassaṃ **dhammapūjāya** satasahassaṃ
sanghapūjāya satasahassaṃ[,] attano ācariyassa
nigrodhattherassa satasahassa[,] catūsu dvāresu **bhesajjattāya**
 satasahassanti pañcasatasahassāni pariccajanto **sāsane ulāraṃ**
 lābhasakkāraṃ pavattesi...¹⁸ (bold and commas added).

We have here the term *pūjāya* not only in association with the Buddha (*buddhapūjāya*), but with the Dhamma and the Sangha (*dhammapūjāya*; *sanghapūjāya*) as well. The *pūjā* here thus seems to be in the sense of

“it is generally accepted that verses may have been added up to and including the third council, the *aṭṭhakathā* to the Theragatha (*Paramatthadīpanī*) is a work by Dhammapāla (see Adikaram, 1994, p. 1)” (Hinuber, 1996, p. 53, # 106).

¹⁶ In relation to the age of *Niddesa*, “the only commentary besides the *Suttavibhanga*... that has been included into the canon”, Hinuber (1996, p. 59, # 118) makes the observation that “a date after Aśoka does not seem unlikely”. Expanding it in a footnote (204), he quotes Norman's observation that it “cannot be later than the date of the fixing of the canon”, adding the closure, “This means not later than the 1st c.” (ibid.).

¹⁷ We use this as the watershed since it was Mahinda who introduced Buddhism to Sri Lanka formally.

¹⁸ ‘The Righteous King Asoka, with *saddhā* [confidence; respect] in the Dispensation, offers day in day out, a [total of] five hundred thousand [made up of] a hundred thousand in honour of the Buddha, a hundred thousand in honour of the Dhamma, a hundred thousand in honour of the Sangha, a hundred thousand for his teacher Nigrodha Thera, [and] a hundred thousand for the purpose of medicine at the four gates, for the great glory of the Dispensation’.

homage – in homage to the Buddha, in homage to the Dhamma, in homage to the Sangha. This seems to be confirmed when the *pūjā* of a hundred thousand (*satasahassaṃ*) comes to be given in honour / homage of his teacher (*attano ācariyassa nigrodhattherassa satasahassa*), too. Further, a similar donation is made ‘for the purpose of medicine at the four doors’ (*catūsu dvāresu bhesajjatthāya*), and all this is ‘for the glory of the *sāsana...*’ (*sāsane ulāram*). It appears, then, that in referring to Aśoka, the author is merely seeking to be historically relevant, but retrojecting, i.e., looking back from a later time, the *Pañcappakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā* itself being a historical work (Hinuber, 1996., p. 153, # 322).

Two other teasers are the attendants of Visakha and King Kosala’s wife (above) wishing to do a *buddhapūjā* at the Jetavana. The Buddha is known to have not encouraged rituals in honour of him. So it would be doubtful if Ven. Ananda or Upasika Visakha would have encouraged or welcomed devotees to engage in such an activity within the precincts of the Jetavana. Venerating the Buddha, listening to the Dhamma and offering alms, of course, are well within the tradition. If this then suggests that the *buddhapūjā* in the texts merely refers to paying homage to the Buddha, the positioning of it in an Indian context of the Buddha’s time may again be an attempt by the author to be historically relevant. Indeed it is more than likely that the *buddhapūjā* in both contexts, in fact, refers to the Sinhala *buddhapūjāva*. (See more later (D.2).)

B.3 Art-historical Analysis

When it comes to art history, the literature is so vast¹⁹ that to survey it all would constitute a study in itself. Despite the vastness, a library search²⁰ brought up only a single source containing the term *Buddha Pūjā*. And that was *The Encyclopedia of Religion*.

Interestingly, the entry under “Iconography: Buddhist Iconography” (Kinnard, 2005) in the Encyclopedia seemed to suggest an early presence of the *Buddha Pūjā* (shown as two words):

¹⁹ See <file:///C:/Documents and Settings/Compaq_Administrator/My Documents/The Buddhist Religion, Bibliography> for a highly informative source.

²⁰ This was at the University of Toronto Robarts Library, under “*Buddha Puja* [dropping the diacritics, and the Sinhalizing suffix –va (see above)], “India history 1st C. BC 2nd C. BC and 3rd C. BC”, the “earliest Buddhist carvings being of the 2nd c. BCE” (Craven, 1976, p. 50 (Plate 25: Queen Maya’s Dream) and 61 (Plate 32, “King Vidudhabha visiting the Buddha”). See also Khosa, 1998.

From the moment they appeared in the Buddhist world, visual images were intended to narrate aspects of the Buddha's life and teachings, and therefore function on the ground as visual texts to be read. In addition, they were very much intended to be objects of ritual worship. A wide range of texts are available for making and consecrating Buddhist images.... Perhaps the most common form of worship in the Buddhist world is Buddha Pūjā, literally "honoring the Buddha". This is a ritual that typically involves making some sort of offering to a Buddha image (or a relic or stupa), such as a flower, a small lamp, food, or even money (p. 4330).

Flowers, light and food (though not money²¹) which are very much part of the Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva* (see later (C.2)), then, may seem to suggest the possibility of the presence of the ceremony from the earliest times.

Indeed,

Many images, particularly the stelae that are abundantly produced in the medieval Indian milieu – although this also is an iconographic theme on **some of the very earliest Buddhist images**, actually depict such worship as part of the sculpture... The iconography in such cases [with depictions usually "along the base of the image, at what would in a ritual context be eye-level for the worshipper"], then, serves as a kind of visual guide to proper ritual action. (Kinnard, 2005, p. 4330) (bold added).

Further,

Frequently, Buddhist iconography is intended to focus the mind of the worshipper on the Buddha and his teachings, serving as a visual aid and helping the practitioner to engage in buddha anusmṛti, or "recollection of the Buddha". This important form of meditation involves contemplating the Buddha's magnificent qualities, and internalizing them, very often with the use of a sculpture or

²¹ Money is not part of the Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva*, undoubtedly keeping to the Canon. The Buddha points out how he is venerated by the masses for the reason of, among others, abstaining from "accepting gold and silver" (*Brahmajāla Sutta*, D I.10). Its inclusion seems to be indicative of a later practice.

painting. The iconography of such images, then, serves a mimetic function in that the meditator is to emulate the iconographically presented Buddha. In the process, the practitioner creates a mental image by internalizing the external iconographic form, thereby becoming like the image, and like the Buddha himself.

Early iconography was concerned with the life of the Buddha, and scenes such as Birth, Enlightenment and Parinibbana, Buddha's past lives, etc.

Commenting on Sanchi, home of the earliest extant Buddhist art, Craven (n.d.), in *A Concise History of Indian Art*, notes how

... stupas were erected to memorialize such things as the Buddha's enlightenment, miracles, death, or even a footprint, and to house the sacred texts, the 'word body' of the Buddha. Some stupas were solely objects of worship... (p. 38).

Discussing the Bharhut Stupa (2nd c. BCE), he refers to the "numerous birth stories of the Buddha's previous existence (Jataka) and the significant events of his life as Shakyamuni" (p. 60). Further,

The Buddha figure never appears, however. He is always represented by one of a series of symbols that allude to major events in his life.

The symbolic vocabulary includes such signs as the wheel, representing the first sermon ...; the Bodhi tree, representing the Enlightenment; and the stupa, representing the Buddha Great Release or Parinirvana. A riderless horse recalls the departure of the young Buddha-to-be from his father's royal house; a set of footprints displays the auspicious symbols of a spiritual Chakravartin...; a royal umbrella over a vacant space proclaims his holy presence. Each of these symbols established a focus for a pictorial event²².

Two plates relating to our topic are well described in Craven. The first is the "outstanding relief" of a scene of King Vidudhaba visiting the

²² See also Coomaraswamy, 1969, ch. 7.

Buddha (Plate 32, p. 61), featuring the ‘turning the wheel...’. To quote the sections relating to homage (pp. 61-2):

In a vaulted building with columns, upper railing and chaitya arches, four devotees pay homage to the preaching [of the] Buddha who is here represented as a giant wheel. ... The Buddha’s throne is strewn with flowers, and his presence is further established by the umbrella festooned with flower garlands. ...

... The occupant to the driver’s right appears to be the king, Vidudhabha. An honorific umbrella is held above his head, and he raises one hand in greeting...

The second is “Queen Maya’s Dream” (Plate 25, p. 50), where Queen Maya is shown “lying on a bed in the palace, attended by her ladies in waiting”. A figure on the top left shows a woman holding her two palms together chest high in a posture of respect.

Both these works of art are of the Shunga period, 2nd C. BCE²³, Bharhut being “one of India’s earliest and most significant monuments” (p. 65).

A painting “from the Great Stupa at Amaravati, Andhra”, much later in the 2nd c. CE, shows “women adoring the Buddha symbolized by a throne and footprints” (Craven, n.d., p. 77). Here we have not only female figures with palms held together in veneration, but another female figure as well, paying homage in the posture of a ‘five point touch’ (*pasaṅga pihiṭuvā* as in the Sinhala practice) - knees, elbows and head²⁴.

Handbook of Indian Art (a chronicle of Paintings and Sculptures), by Sunil Khosa (1998), the other title that appeared in the Google search under ‘Indian Art History’, sheds no additional light on our area of research.

Out of the works of art referred to above, Sanchi, of course, is the only one that pre-dates Mahinda. But just as there is no occurrence, in the discussion, of the term or concept *Buddha Pūjā*, it does not occur in relation to the later works either. So in the end, art history provides no evidence to suggest an Indian origin to the *Buddhapūjā* per se.

²³ BCE here stands for ‘Before the Common Era’, and CE (later) for ‘Common Era’

²⁴ The carving does not actually show the head or the elbows touching, but the posture is indeed suggestive of it.

B.4 Accounts of Chinese Pilgrims

When it comes to the records of Chinese pilgrims, we are fortunate to find in them “meticulous accounts of the nature of Buddhist doctrines, rituals, and monastic institutions” (Sen, 2006, p. 24).

We begin with **I-Tsing** (Takakusu, Tr., 2006), also spelt Yijing (Sen, 2006) (635 -713 CE), the last of the three major pilgrims in Sen’s treatment, where we hit upon a gold mine of information on ceremonies and rituals. Three sections in particular stand out for their detail, and relevance: “Rules about the reception at the Upavasatha-day” (ch. ix), “Concerning the pravaraṇa-day” (xv) and “The ceremony of chanting” (xxxii)²⁵. In Sinhala Buddhism, these are three high profile ceremonies of which the *Buddhapūjāva* is an essential part.

The Upavasatha (*uposatha* in Pali) day is described as “the fast-day; it is a day of religious observance and celebration for laymen and priests²⁶, and is a weekly festival²⁷ when laymen see a priest and take upon themselves the Upavasatha-vows, i.e., to keep the eight Silas during the day²⁸” (Takakusu, 2006, p. 35, footnote 1). *Pavāraṇa* Day, using the Pali term here, of course, is the End of the *Vassāna* retreat for the ordained (see Takakusu, 2006, p. 86 ff for details).

At both *uposatha* and *pavāraṇa*, the offering consists of “lamps, incense and flowers” (153), the last two featuring as well in both washing or bathing an image (87) and at “The Ceremony of Chanting” (meaning

²⁵ To give the reader a sense of how detailed, we list some of the contents: xvi. About spoons and chop-sticks. xvii. Proper occasion for salutation. xviii. Concerning evacuation. xix. Rules of ordination. xx. Bathing at proper times. xxi. Concerning the mat to sit on. xxii. Rules of sleeping and resting. xxiii. On the advantage of proper exercise to health. xxv. Behaviour between teacher and pupil. xxvi. Conduct towards strangers or friends. xxvii. On symptoms of bodily illness. xxviii. Rules on giving medicine. xxx. On turning to the right in worship. xxxi. Rules of decorum in cleansing the sacred object of worship. xxxiv. The method of learning in the west [India being west of China]. xxxv. The rule as to hair. xxxvi. The arrangement of affairs after death. xxxvii. The use of the common property of the sangha. xxxviii. The burning of the body is unlawful. xxxix. The bystanders become guilty. (Takakusu, Tr., 2006).

²⁶ While the term ‘priests’ as in the original is retained, we may note that it is a misleading translation of Bhikkhu /Bhikkhuni.

²⁷ It appears that in Sri Lanka today, the practice of *uposatha* on a weekly basis has now died out.

²⁸ This should be understood as a full day of 24 hours, for the additional three Training Principles – abstaining from (6) taking solids, (7) high beds and (8) dance, music, etc., basically relate to night time.

Paritta) (pp. 152. ff).

Interestingly, “there is no religious ceremony after a meal” at the *uposatha* (or *pavāraṇa*) (41), this in Sinhala Buddhism being the occasion for the delivery of a sermon (*baṇa*), transferring of merit to the departed, etc.. The religious ceremony prior to offering meals to the Sangha, another occasion for a Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva*, relates to applauding “the power of the deity”, the deity being “*Mahākāla* or the great black deity”, “before which abundant offerings of food were made” (p. 39), and “All shouted ‘Good!’ and applauded the power of that deity”.

We find I-Tsing providing minute details in other activities such as what a teacher and a young novice actually say to each other upon meeting... (enquiring after health, e.g.,) (116), how a monk worships (122), welcoming a visitor (124), the practice of *pradakshina* [Pali: *padakkhinā*] (140-146), bathing a Buddha image (149), etc.

In “the ceremony of chanting”, we have more details: the practice of repeating the Buddha’s name, “the custom of praising the Buddha by reciting his virtues”, which I-Tsing laments “has not been in practice” in “the Divine Land (China)” (152).

Following a *padakkhinā* of three rounds, and offering incense and flowers,

They all kneel down, and one of them who sings well begins to chant hymns describing the virtues of the Great Teacher with a melodious, pure, and sonorous, voice, and continues singing ten or twenty slokas.

Returning to the monastery,

A Sutra-reciter ... reads a short Sutra. The Lion-seat of well-proportioned dimensions ... is placed near the head priest.

Among the scriptures to be read on such an occasion is the “Service in three parts” – Triratana, selection [“by the venerable Ashvaghosa”] of the Buddha’s words, and “hymns of more than ten slokas... that express the wish to bring one’s good merit to maturity” (153).

Then there are details relating to the very process of honouring the Buddha: ...knees resting on the ground (123), bhikkhus exclaiming “subhasita!”, and sometimes “‘sadhu’ ... instead of the other”(153), etc.

The five and ten precepts find mention, too (157), as also the ringing of the bell ‘*ghaṇṭā*’ (written as *Ghanta*) (147).

Having learned Sanskrit at Nalanda, we find I-Tsing explaining the

meanings of terms: *ārogya* (115), *upādhyāya* (125), *pradakshinā* (140), etc.

For all the details we have from I-Tsing, and the ceremonies noted by him, the term *Buddha Pūjā* itself finds no mention.

The records of **Fa-hsien** (see Legge, 2006, for details), the first of the three Pilgrims to have made it to India (399-414), who spends three years (in Patna) “learning Sanskrit books and the Sanskrit speech, and writing out the Vinaya rules” (ch. XXXVI), seem less helpful in our search. Perhaps because the story of his travels was written, not by himself but by a third party, what we find in the Records is more of an overall picture - of Buddhas, disciples – *Bhikkhu/Bhikkhuni* and lay, Buddha’s detractors, kings, people (clothing, language, etc.), cities, legends, mythology, monuments, etc. Accordingly, the record appears short on detail when it comes to ceremonies.

There are, of course, the many references to flowers and incense:

On the day mentioned, the monks and laity within the borders all come together; they have singers and skilful musicians; they pay their devotion with flowers and incense. (Ch. XXVII).

Likewise, a king, making “offerings with the flowers and incense”, also “lighted the lamps when the darkness began to come on” (Ch. XXIX).

We have a little more detail in relation to “a monastery called Gomati, of the mahayana school”:

Attached to it there are three thousand monks, who are called to their meals by the sound of a bell. When they enter the refectory, their demeanour is marked by a reverent gravity, and they take their seats in regular order, all maintaining a perfect silence. No sound is heard from their alms-bowls and other utensils. When any of these pure men require food, they are not allowed to call out (to the attendants) for it, but only make signs with their hands (Ch III).

In relation to the ‘Festival of Buddha’s skull-bone’ (Ch. XIII),

Every day, after it has been brought forth, the keepers of the vihara ascend a high gallery, where they beat great drums, blow conches and clash their copper cymbals. When the king hears them, he goes to the vihara, and makes his offerings of flowers and incense.

Touching upon a legend – and there are many of them - we read,

Going on further for two days to the east, they came to the place where the Bodhisattva threw down his body to feed a starving tigress. In these two places also large topes have been built, both adorned with layers of all the precious substances. The kings, ministers, and peoples of the kingdoms around vie with one another in making offerings at them. The trains of those who come to scatter flowers and light lamps at them never cease (Ch. XI).

And then, there are the general statements:

The chiefs of the Vaisyas also make their offerings before they attend to their family affairs. Every day it is so, and there is **no remissness in the observance** of the custom (bold added, here as well in the next few quotes) (Ch. XIII).

In “simhala island” (Seng-ho-lo), also referred to as “‘Lion Island’ (Shih-tzu-chou)”²⁹, Fa-hsien uses phrases and sentences such as “other rituals”, “prescribed services” (ch. xxxviii), “...as the regular rules prescribed” (ch. xxxiv) and “the forms of ceremonial reverence are observed according to the rules”, and so on, all relating to the ceremony surrounding Buddha’s Tooth Relic (Ch. XXXVIII)³⁰.

Elsewhere, “The regular business of the monks is to perform acts of meritorious virtue, and to recite their Sutras and sit rapt in meditation” (ch. XVI). Here is how visitors are looked after:

When stranger monks arrive (at any monastery), the old residents meet and receive them, carry for them their clothes and alms-bowl, give them water to wash their feet, oil with which to anoint them, and the liquid food permitted out of the regular hours. When (the stranger) has enjoyed a very brief rest, they further

²⁹ The country is identified by I-tsing by the same name, too (Takakusu, 2006)

³⁰ The fuller version regarding the last quote runs as follows:

They burn incense, light lamps, and perform all **the prescribed services**, day and night without ceasing, till ninety days have been completed, when (the tooth) is returned to the vihara within the city. On fast-days the door of that vihara is opened, and the forms of ceremonial reverence are **observed according to the rules**. (Ch. XXXVIII).

ask the number of years that he has been a monk, after which he receives a sleeping apartment with its appurtenances, according to his regular order, and everything is done for him which the rules prescribe.

In another chapter we read, that

From the nirvana of Buddha, the forms of ceremony, laws, and rules, practiced by the sacred communities, have been handed down from one generation to another without interruption.

Fa-hsien's (or the scribe's) attitude is perhaps reflected in the line, "The rules observed by the Sramans are remarkable, and **too numerous to be mentioned in detail.**" (ch. V).

But, as can be seen from the few excerpts from Fa-hsien, nothing more is added, in the context of India or "*simhala island*", relating to *Buddhapūjā*, and certainly not the term itself, this just as in the case of I-Tsing.

B.5 Interpretation of Data

It has been noted that all of the occurrences in the Canon, and the commentarial literature relate to a *post-Mahindian period* (i.e., 3rd c. BCE +). Writing on art history, the contemporary scholar Kinnard (2005) uses *Buddha Pūjā* as two words, in the literal sense of "honoring the Buddha", and with no reference to a *Buddhapūjā* ceremony. Pointing to the theme of homage to the Buddha in the images of "the medieval Indian milieu" (underline added), he notes that "this also is an iconographic theme on some of the very earliest Buddhist images" (underline added). But, except for Sanchi, the "very earliest" iconographic evidence does not pre-date the 2nd c. BCE³¹.

And, of course, the travels by the Chinese pilgrims take place in the fourth (Fa-hsien, 399 CE, "perhaps the oldest Chinese monk to travel to India." (Sen, op.cit.)), and the seventh centuries (Xuanzang in 629 CE (Beal, Tr. 1884); I-Tsing in 670 CE (Takakusu, op.cit., xxvii)).

On the basis of the above³², then, it would be reasonable to adopt

³¹ See e.g., Plate numbers 25 "Queen Maya's Dream", and 32 "King Vidudhaba visiting the Buddha", both from "the Bharhut stupa, Shunga, 2nd C. BC" (Craven, n.d., pp. 50 and 61 respectively)).

³² We have left out references to Xuanzang, since the other two pilgrims, Fa-hsien

the position that the ‘*buddhapūjā*’, **as a cohesive concept as understood in our treatment**, did not exist in India in the pre-Mahinda era. Even if a rudimentary form of it may have existed (see later for a discussion of this possibility), the *buddhapūjā(va)* **as in practice among Sinhala Buddhists** of Sri Lanka, *can be thought to have emerged in a Lankan milieu*, holding it tentatively, of course, as we await further exploration. It is pursuant to this train of thought, then, that we now turn to explore the issue in the context of Sri Lanka.

If one may get the sense that the somewhat lengthy discussion of the historical sources that argues for the absence of a *buddhapūjā* in pre-Mahindian times could have been dispensed with, replaced by a shorter treatment, the details can be seen to play a valuable role. They establish how, not only in early times, but even in later times, a *buddhapūjā*, in its comprehensiveness as in the Sinhala *buddhapūjā(va)*, never did materialize in the Indian milieu. Additionally, the research provides a valuable contrastive basis for a theoretical discussion later (see Section E).

C. Seeking Origins of *Buddhapūjāva* in the Sri Lankan Milieu

C.1 The Sri Lankan context

The *Mahāvamsa* tells us that King Devanampiya Tissa ‘came unto the (three) Refuges’ (*saranesu paṭiṭṭhahī*) at the end of Arhant Mahinda’s first Discourse (Mv xiv.23). On the thirteenth day of the arrival of Mahinda, Mahāriṭṭha, the King’s nephew, seeks *pabbajjā* ‘ordination’, and comes to be duly ordained, along with 55 elder and younger brothers (Mv xvi. 10-11). Told by Arhant Mahinda that “It is not allowed to us, O great king, to bestow the *pabbajjā* on women” (Mv xiv.20-21), sub-Queen Anula, consort of his younger brother, “takes to the *ten precepts* ... (wearing) the yellow robe, waiting for the *pabbajjā*” (xviii, 9-10). There is even mention of *upasampadā* (Mv xvi.16). But nowhere in all the details about Arhant Mahinda and the conversion of Tambapanni (as Sri Lanka is referred to) is there mention of a *Buddhapūjā*.

We may assume, then, that either no such ceremony occurred, or that author Mahanama made no mention of it for some reason. Leaving for later a discussion on Mahanama’s silence (see Section C.6), we pursue the thought that the *Buddhapūjāva*, in the form we have in Lanka today, was not part of the spiritual toolbox brought with him to Lanka by Arhant Mahinda, or at least not in the shape or form it would come to be. This

and I-Tsing, provide sufficient and relevant information to which Xuanzang adds nothing more.

also provides an additional basis to consider that the ritual that is so much part of Sinhala Buddhist life today did not originate in India but on Lankan soil.

But then the question is when, by whom and within what context did it make its appearance within the Lankan milieu?

There is no Sri Lankan paleographic evidence (see Wickremasinghe, 1912, and Paranavitana, 1970) of the term *buddhapūjā* occurring in the earliest centuries. The term *pūjā* occurs in the inscription of Kirti Nissanka Malla (1189-1198 CE), which says that he “celebrated a great *pūjā* at the cost of seven lakhs of money” (Wickremasinghe, 1912: 135). *Pujæ* (with an æ ending) occurs in the slab inscription of Kassapa V (929-939 CE) which records that the king “caused Abhidhamma discourses to be transcribed on plates of gold [and therewith] made a great offering” (p. 50). (*[T]unuruvanat*) *puja* ‘offerings to the (Triple Gem)’ occurs in the slab inscription of Mahinda IV (956-72). But, as can be seen, none of these occurrences relate to the ritual under discussion, directing us to seek its origin elsewhere and in other contexts.

It would be reasonable to assume that what we consider to be a novel³³ ritual like the *Buddhapūjāva*, noting the Sinhalizing –va ending, could likely emerge only in the context of a heightened period of religious renaissance. A period of such heightened spiritual vigour, just recovering from the South Indian Cola invasion of the 11th c. (see de Silva, 1981, pp. 60-61), can be said to be when Parakramabahu I (1153-1186) came to be successful in “achieving purification and unity” (Mv vxxviii.27) of the three sectarian temples that had come to exist by that time - Mahavihara, Abhayagiri and Jetavana. But while this was certainly a high point, it still related to purifying the Sasana when the undesirable elements in all three temples were got ridden of (Mv vxxviii.12-30). If there is, then, no mention of the *Buddhapūjāva* in the Mv description of the reign of King Parakramabahu I, it is totally understandable. Developing a spiritual tool for use by the laity in particular does not seem to fit in as a priority of the King whose primary concern was the unity of the Sangha.

Working backwards from the end of the Anuradhapura period (11th c.) (going past the paleographic and the inscriptional records researched as above) then, the next highest point of religious activity could be said to be the time of Buddhaghosa (5th c. CE), when the Commentarial works in Sinhala came to be translated into Pali. So, was the *Buddhapūjāva* born at that time? If so, it would be surprising that there is no mention of it in the

³³ We use the term ‘novel’ to capture two notions. One is that it was new, given no occurrence in the Canon. Secondly it points to a creativity.

Cūlavamsa in its reference to Buddhaghosa (Cv. xxxvii.226-246). Indeed there is reference to his composing a commentary on the *Paritta* while still in India (Cv. xxxvii.226). Given that *Paritta* falls within the category of ritual, it might have come as no surprise if indeed the *Buddhapūjāva* had come to be composed while in Sri Lanka. But here, Buddhaghosa's total effort seems to have been in translating the Sinhala Commentaries. Most tellingly, that there is indeed a reference to the *Buddhapūjā* in the *Visuddhimagga* (as noted above) indubitably rules out the hand of Buddhaghosa³⁴.

Moving further back in history, then, the next contending time period with enough spiritual creative energy³⁵, and suitable conditions, would be that of the writing of the Tipitaka (1st c. BCE). However, the committing to writing of the Canon was "in order that the true doctrine will endure" (*ciraṭṭhitam dhammassa*) (Mv. Xxxiii, 100-101), this in the face of the advance of Sanskrit Buddhist literature in India, making advances in Lanka as well³⁶. So it was the threat to the continuity of the Dhamma that was uppermost in the minds of the scribes of the Tipitaka. The underlying associated issue was the continuity of the (Sangha) *sāsana*, the living guardian of the Dhamma. A ritual like the *Buddhapūjāva*, intended primarily for the laity, may have been the furthest in their minds. Even more tangible is the fact that the term *Pañcasīla* (connected as we shall see with the *Buddhapūjāva*) does occur, as we have seen, in the *Apadana* (e.g., KN 10.26), a post-Mahindian work (1st and 2nd c. BCE). What it suggests is that it was already in vogue by that time.

Indeed conditions were such that a *new* ritual like the *Buddhapūjāva* might not have even found universal acceptance by the lay community under the conditions that had come to prevailed. The schism in the Sangha during this period (as between Abhayagiri and Mahavihara) would have likely resulted in a loss of cohesiveness within the lay community itself. The hostility of the ruler (the compilation of the Tipitaka being done secretly, away from the capital (see fn. 36)), can be expected to

³⁴ The appearance of the term in the *Visuddhimagga mahāṭīkā*, and in the *paramatthadīpanī* by Dhammapala (as above) confirms that by this time, the ritual was indeed already in vogue.

³⁵ By 'creative' here is not meant going against tradition but the creative juices to undertake such a venture.

³⁶ "Sensing insecurity" as a result of "... the founding of the Abhayagiri Monastery, its secession and the schism", the Great Monastery took the precaution to commit the Tripitaka for the first time to writing, doing it "in the provinces", away from the hostile "King Vattagamini Abhaya's (104-88 BCE) presence" (Nanamoli, 1975, xii).

serve as yet another condition to render the lay community disunited, not wanting to be seen taking sides, in fear of earning royal wrath. Under such less-than-optimal religio-political conditions, the laity could hardly be expected to be in an optimum ethical mind-set either.

This, then, pushes us further back in time in search of a heightened spiritual environment. We seem to find it with King Dutugaemunu who brings the country under one rule for the first time (Mv. xv.75). And it is with interest that we note in this context a possible reference to the actual *Buddhapūjā* itself, in the phrase *buddhapūjāpayogena* (xxix.16-17). Saying that “tomorrow I shall have the foundation-stone laid for the Great Cetiya”, the King invites the “entire Sangha, intent on the welfare of the people” (*mahājanahitattthiko*) (xxix.15-16), to assemble “for conducting a ceremony in homage of the Buddha” (italics added) (Guruge (tran.), 1990, 175-6)³⁷. Instead of the paraphrase, ‘a ceremony in homage of the Buddha’, we could simply say ‘*Buddhapūjā*’, as allowed for in the Mahavamsa original (*buddhapūjāpayogena*), and as also preferred by Wimalajoti (Ed.) (2004, 119) in his Sinhala translation.

The King calls upon the people as well: “Let the people, having observed the Uposatha Precepts [*uposathiko*], take incense, garlands and so on..” (*gandhamālādi*)³⁸.

The association of the term ‘*buddhapūjā*’ with the offerings of incense and garlands [of flowers] seems to make it reasonably clear that the reference is to the ritual under discussion here, namely, the *Buddhapūjāva*. To explore this further, it was for ‘the welfare of the people’ that the Sangha had been invited to conduct a ceremony. So what kind of ceremony might the Sangha have conducted? And if it was not a *Buddhapūjāva*, what would the people have done with their flowers and incense? At the end of the ceremony, Arhant Piyadassi preaches Dhamma to the King, and the sermon, which “was [again] to the benefit of the people” (... *janassāhosi sātthikā*) (65-66). So did the people benefit simply by listening to the Dhamma? Or was it by watching the bricks being laid by the King and his Ministers? Or indeed watching the King pay homage with incense and flowers to the Sangha, “circumambulating

³⁷ In this section we fall back on the more recent translation of Mahavamsa by Guruge (1990) since it seems to be more accurate and more culture-sensitive, Geiger (1912; 1950: p. 192) translating it as ‘to the end that a festival may be held.’

³⁸ ‘So on’ (*ādi*) here likely meaning anything else, in addition to fragrance and flowers, people may choose to pay homage with, such as, possibly, oil lamp, as e.g., we have it today at a *Buddhapūjāva*, and noted by Fa-hsien in early post-Buddhist India (see above).

them thrice” (48)?

The welfare of the people, in a religious context such as here, can be expected to entail enhancing their *saddhā* in the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha. An active personal participation alone can be said to be promotive of such *saddhā*. A more likely scenario, therefore, may be outlined as follows:

1. The King shows his respects to the Sangha, standing “around the site of the Great Cetiya leaving in the middle an open space for the King” (46).
2. A Sangha leader, possibly Arhant Piyadassi himself, or one deputized by him, administers the Three Refuges, and the Five TP’s to all assembled – the King, and the public (excluding those who had already taken to the Eight TP’s (*uposatha*)).
3. The King and the Ministers lay the bricks, to a roaring *sādhhu sādhhu* of the laity, and possibly the chanting of *Paritta* (see 3.4.1, Fig. 1 below) by the assembled Sangha.
4. Following the brick laying, the public (all or some) place their flowers and incense at each of the eight bricks, as the Sangha continues to chant *Paritta*.
5. Placement of offerings done, the laity return to where they were (behind the Sangha), and the *gāthā* offering incense and flowers (see 2.3.1 and 2.3.3 in Fig. 1), and likely light (as possibly falling under ‘so on’) (2.3.2), too, come to be administered, with everyone - Sangha, King, the *Upasathika* and the public, participating in the Homage. Merit gained, the *Buddhapūjāva* continues through ‘Transference of Merit’ (3.1 in Fig. 1), ‘Seeking protection’ (3.2.1), ‘Seeking forgiveness’ (3.3.3), etc.

It could now be truly said that the welfare of the people has been looked after, not just materially as with “bath-attendants, barbers, hairdressers....and food” (Mv 20-21), but also spiritually, which is why the Sangha had been invited.

Whether or not the scenario took place exactly as described here, the fact of the Sangha being invited to conduct a *Buddhappūjā* and/or the public being asked to bring incense and flowers “in preparation for a *Buddhappūjā*” (as above) indeed seems to suggest having a ceremony. This then speaks to the real possibility that the *Buddhappūjāva* as in the sense used in the paper, was already in vogue by the time of Dutugaemunu.

This then pushes us back in search of the origin of the *Buddhapūjāva* still further in time...

Might this point in time, then, be the very point of introduction of the Buddha's Teachings itself to the land by Arhant Mahinda (Mv xiii)?

But we have noted above how the historical record related to the event makes no mention of the ritual, nor provide any other clues. So, given the absence of any historical evidence, we have found it useful to try a different tack. And that is, instead of going the route of historical evidence, to look for some *internal evidence*, relating to the possible redactor / author.

Might the *Buddhapūjāva* itself provide any such internal evidence? It is to this we now turn.

C.2 Seeking Evidence of Origin from Within the *Buddhapūjāva*

What kind of evidence is there in the *Buddhapūjāva* itself that will tell us just what kind of qualifications we should be looking for in the Redactor or Redactors? To help us answer the question, we begin with an outline of the ceremony as it has come to be:

- i. Salutation to Buddha.
- ii. Going for Refuge.
- iii. Five-fold Training Principles.
- iv. Reflections of the Buddha:
 - Homage to the Cetiya Reliquary.
 - Homage to the Bodhi Tree.
- v. Offerings:
 - Flowers, Light, Incense.
 - Water, Food, Medicinal Drink.
- vi. Transference of merit:
 - To deities, sentient beings and all else in nature.
 - To relatives.
- vii. Seeking protection:
 - For Teachings, Dispensation, Me and Others.
 - For self, away from bad company, and for good company.
- viii. Seeking Forgiveness.
- ix. Personal Aspiration.
- x. *Paritta*: Protection and Blessings (optional).
- xi. Homage to Parents.
- xii. Meditation (optional).
- xiii. *Baṇa*: Homily (optional / situational) ³⁹.

³⁹ While the details may vary, from region to region or temple to temple or teacher

(see Dhammananda, 1991; Narada, 1963, for details, and Sugunasiri, forthcoming, for a detailed treatment.)

To begin with, as can be seen from the outline, many of the concepts and the practices that constitute *Buddhapūjāva* are drawn directly from the Pali Canon. Examples would be Salutation, Refuge, Training Principles (i-iii), Offerings (v) (though only of flowers, and food (Water, Food, Medicinal Drink), Transference of merit (vi), Seeking Forgiveness (viii) (as part of the Vinaya kamma of the Sangha at the end of the Rains Retreat), *Paritta* (x), Meditation (xii) and *Baṇa* 'Homily' (xiii). But the Redactor(s) can be seen to extend the Canonical material into the ritual domain. Examples would be Reflections of the Buddha (i.e., Homage to Cetiya and the Bodhi) (iv), extending the Offerings to include Light and Incense (v), Seeking protection (For Teachings, Dispensation, Me and Others) (vii), Personal Aspiration (ix), etc.

So we may consider the first qualification of the Redactor(s) to be (1) *possessing a deep knowledge of the Doctrine, as in the Canon and the Commentaries*.

A second feature stems from the *ethical* nature of the *Buddhapūjāva*, as primarily reflected in the *sīla* component, the Five-fold Training Principles⁴⁰ (iii) (TP's hereafter), reminding us of the tripartite division of the Noble Eightfold Path, *sīla*, *samādhi*, *paññā*. However, it is not a mere knowledge of, but a commitment to a personal practice of *sīla*. This then suggests a second criterion: (2) *one who has personally taken to the disciplined life* - a commitment to walk the talk⁴¹, so to speak.

Given that the *Buddhapūjāva* also includes meditation (xii), one can expect that the Redactor(s) would have to know the importance of meditation for a disciplined life. This suggests that s/he would also have to be, at least ideally, (3) *a Meditator*.

to teacher, the outline can be said to be pretty universal, except perhaps for xi and xii, the latter on the rise in contemporary Sri Lanka and the former perhaps losing ground.

⁴⁰ We use this literal translation of *sikkhāpada* (with thanks to Bhante Punnañi, 2001), in preference to the more common term 'Precepts', since it captures the concept, and intent, of a self-discipline and a voluntariness, better. While there is indeed an *āmisā* component (offering flowers, food, etc.) to the *Buddhapūjāva*, it is optional, as e.g., when doing a homage retiring to bed or just waking up, as a devout practitioner is wont to do, or in a school setting at a social level, when an assembly may begin with a Homage. Thus it is the TP's that can be said to constitute the core.

⁴¹ The reference here is to the Buddha's personal example 'I do as I say; I say as I do' (*yathāvādī tathākārī yathākārī tathāvādī*) (D II.224).

The *Buddhapūjāva*, as will be seen, is clearly a reformatory instrument intended for the laity. So, the Redactor(s) would also have to be (4) a **Visionary, with a missionary zeal, for cultivating a spiritually healthy[er] community.**

If these would be some of the critical *personal* skills that the Redactor(s) can be said to have brought to composing the *Buddhapūjāva*, there also seems to be reflected a sensitivity to the existing religio-cultural practices and ethos of the people for whom it was intended. We could count ‘transference of merit’ (vi) among them, not only to ‘sentient beings (*sattā*) (including the departed relatives) but to *devas* and ‘all else in nature’ (*bhūta*), too. There is in turn a seeking of protection for ‘Teachings, Dispensation, Me and Others’ and for ‘self, away from bad company’ (vii), this ‘from the powerful (*mahiddhikā*) *devas* and *nāgas*’ (see Sugunasiri, forthcoming, for such details as being shown here and elsewhere) throwing of a safety net around themselves.

While all this goes beyond the Canon, it may be seen as an accommodation to the religio-spiritual practices of a people, likely distinct from those of the mainland though with possible overlap, for whom the ritual was intended. What this, then, calls for in the Redactor(s) is (5) an ‘Anthropologist’⁴² and (6) a ‘Sociologist’, both labels, of course, understood in their informal sense.

But such a socio-religious sensitivity also shows a combined ‘Psychologist’ (7) *cum* ‘Educator’ (8) who, ‘psyching out’ the mind-set of the intended audience, goes beyond meeting their psycho-spiritual *wants* to meeting their psycho-spiritual *needs*. One dimension of this is adapting the existing religio-spiritual practices of veneration of non-humans, extending it to the veneration of the more tangible humans. This comes to be done by bringing to mind the qualities of the Buddha (*buddhānussati*) by way of a model. Symbolically, this is through Homage to the Cetiya (iv), ‘verily like the Buddha body’ (*buddharūpaṃ sakalaṃ sadā*), and then to the Bodhi tree sitting under which ‘victory was won over all enemies’ (*sabbāri vijayaṃ akā*). Here the participants are given the opportunity to earn merit (*puñña*), not to mention *muditā* ‘joy in other’s happiness’, as the recipients benefit from the merit. Paying homage to parents (*mātāpitaro* as in the Canon) (xi) can be seen as a way of meeting both the psychological need for love and the physical need for comfort.

Perhaps the most critical way the *Buddhapūjāva* continues to provide for the not-yet-perceived psycho-spiritual *needs* is through

⁴² We may note in this connection how the religious aspect of a culture comes to be studied under Anthropology. See e.g., Ruth Benedict, 1934, *Patterns of Culture*.

the incorporation of the TP's (iii) towards *self-discipline*, introducing a brand new praxic dimension. Weaving the Doctrine, and all these other dimensions into the ritual, effectively, of course, is also where we see the hand of the Educator.

The *Buddhapūjāva* also shows attention to detail. One such is the use of hand positions to signal a change in the activity, serving also as a reminder of the new activity (see Sugunasiri, forthcoming, for details). While, e.g., the Homage begins with a 'five point touch' (*pasaṅga pihituvā*, in Sinhala), the two palms are clasped at the head in offering flowers (v). But signaling transference of merit (vi), the devotee can be seen to have their open palms resting on the lap.

Then there is, with each transition, the verbal intervention, in Sinhala and/or Pali, of the Bhante, the Sangha Lead-hand, with words such as e.g., "You may now say the Opening Homage (*namaskāraya*)" at the beginning (i), or "Completed is the going for the Refuge" (*tisaraṇa gamanaṃ sampuṇṇaṃ*) (end of ii). And then there is the response of the congregation with the words of acceptance "Yes, Venerable Sir" (*āma bhante*). If all this is to be cognizant of the mind, body and word as the three doors (*mano dvāra kāya dvāra vacī dvāra*) doctrinally, it would also be to pay attention to detail strategically. In light of this, we may now be looking at, in the Redactor(s), an Educator turned *Strategic Planner* (9) who pays attention to detail, giving that little extra touch.

Responding to the Bhante verbally, changing hand positions, etc. are also indicative of the good Educator, taking the participants towards learning by doing. This would also be (10) *an efficient Communicator*, kinesics being a dimension of good communication.

While the thirteen items of the *Buddhapūjāva* as above may be seen as a mere list, we may also note in it a systematic organization as follows:

STAGE	CONTENT	ACTIVITY	NO. IN LIST
I SADDHĀ 'Faith'	1. Establishing in <i>saddhā</i> in the Triple Gem	1.1 Salutation to Buddha	i
		1.2.1 Going for Refuge	ii
		1.2.2 Qualities of the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha	ii
II SĪLA 'Discipline'	2.1. Establishing in Discipline	2.1.1 Five Training Principles	iii
	2.2 Reflections on the Buddha	2.2.1 Homage to <i>Cetiya</i> Reliquary	iv
		2.2.2 Homage to Bodhi Tree	iv
	2.3 Offerings to Buddha	2.3.1 Flowers	v
		2.3.2 Light	v
		2.3.3 Incense	v
		2.3.4 Food (solids/liquids)	v
III ATTHA-CARIYA 'Social good'	3.1 Other Care: Transference of Merit	3.1.1 To deities, sentient beings and all other beings	vi
		3.1.2 To relatives	vi
	3.2 Other-care: Seeking Protection	3.2.1 Seeking Protection for Teachings, Dispensation, Me & Others	vii
	3.3 Self-care:	3.3.1 Seeking Protection for self	vii
		3.3.2 Seeking to be away from bad company & seeking the good	vii
		3.3.3 Seeking forgiveness	viii
		3.3.4 Personal Aspiration	ix
	3.4 Self-care & Other-care	3.4.1 <i>Paritta</i> : Protection and Blessings	x
	3.5 Homage to parents	3.5.1 Homage to mother	xi
		3.5.2 Homage to father	xi
IV MOKKHA 'Liberation'	4.1 Self-care	4.1.1 Meditation (non-verbal - silent)	xii
	4.2 Other-care	4.2.1 Meditation (verbal - silent)	
	4.3 Self-care/ Other-care	4.3.1 <i>Baṇa</i> : Homily (optional / situational)	xiii

Fig. 1: The Organizational Structure of a Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva* in terms of Stage, Content and Activity (excerpted from Sugunasiri, forthcoming.)

If Columns 3 and 4 of the figure should be self-explanatory, the four-stage organization (Col. 1) of the *Buddhapūjāva* shows its structure. While all the steps - *saddhā* 'faith' and *sīla* 'discipline', *atthacariya* 'social good' and *mokkha* 'Liberation' are Canonical, what the structure clearly shows is the hand of a (11) good *Conceptualizer*, with a clarity of mind.

Given that, as may be seen from the above organizational chart, the *Buddhapūjāva* is comprehensive as a schema while also retaining the ethos of the Teachings, our Redactor can be said to be (12) *an effective Dhamma Messenger (dhammadūta)* as well.

While the *Buddhapūjāva* is an efficient, and intelligent, spiritual tool, it is also brief. Judging from how it is practiced today, it could take as little as a quarter of an hour in a home setting, though up to an hour or more in a formal temple or public setting. Not too cumbersome, it is obviously long enough to make a psychological impact on the participants. What this gives us, then, in the Redactor(s) is (13) *a Pragmatist* who is fully cognizant of the reality of the busy householder who can allow only so much time for the spiritual life, particularly when intended as a daily activity.

If the *Buddhapūjāva* is an innovation to meet a certain need, what we also see is the hand of (14) *a Go-getter*, who will somehow make things happen.

Finally, for the same reason, we are also looking at (15) *an Authority Figure* who would not have to be concerned about ruffling feathers, if any, in an ecclesiastical task. Equally importantly, it should also be a figure with enough authority to win the confidence, and respect, too. Such alone would ensure the chance of acceptance of the new ritual by the intended users.

To make a summary list, then, what the internal criteria drawn from the *Buddhapūjāva* suggests is that we would be looking for a Redactor (or Redactors) who (1) has *a deep Knowledge of the Doctrine*, (2) has *personally taken to the Disciplined life* and is (3) *a Meditator*, (4) *a Visionary*, (5) *an Anthropologist*, (6) *a Sociologist*, (7) *a Psychologist*, (8) *a strategic Planner*, (9) *a good Educator*, (10) *an efficient Communicator*, (11) *a clear-headed Conceptualizer, with a clarity of mind*, (12) *an effective Dhamma Messenger*, (13) *a Pragmatist*, (14) *a Go-getter* and finally (15) *an Authority Figure*.

C.3 Arhant Mahinda as the Redactor of the *Buddhapūjāva*

Daunting as it may be even to think that there would be anyone with such a wide range of qualifications, the criteria generated by the *Buddhapūjāva* seem to lead us in a definitive direction. This becomes immediately evident when we take the last criterion (15), *an Authority Figure*. We have identified above the likely time frame for the initial appearance of the *Buddhapūjāva* to be the time of the introduction of the Buddhaddhamma to the island itself. Could there be anyone – a single historical persona, with more authority at this point in time than **Arhant Mahinda** himself?

His source of authority, of course, stems first, and primarily, from being a member of the Sangha. Being an Arhant elevates him, beyond a ‘conventional monk’ (*sammutithera*), or even a mere ‘elder monk’ (*jātiithera*), to a ‘*dhammathera*’, i.e., one with moral attainments (D III.218). Mahinda may not have been unaware either that the Pali term *rājā*, meaning ‘king’, but derivable from the root *ranj-* ‘to make happy’, was used by the Buddha, as Kalupahana (1999: 66-67) points out, to infuse the idea of “one who delights others with morality” (*dhammena pare ranjati* (D iii.93)). He may also have been fully cognizant of the point in the *Sigalovada Sutta* (M III. 264) that one of the six duties of a monk towards the laity is “to show the way to heaven” (*saggassa maggā ācikkhati*) (Rahula, 1956, p. 251), *sagga* itself being translatable as “a state of happiness” (footnote 5).

Secondly, he has already earned the respect of the King himself, and of the Royal Household. They had listened to his sermons and had liked them enough to embrace the new faith immediately. Strengthening this political clout is that he had as well the blessing of his father, King Aśoka, who had specifically sent him to spread the Dhamma. One with more authority to formulate and introduce a new spiritual activity like the *Buddhapūjāva* would be hard to come by.

As for a **Vision for a healthier community and having a missionary zeal** (4), the inspiration certainly comes straight from the Buddha himself who sends his first 60 disciples to take the message ‘for the good of the many, for the comfort of the many, and in compassion for the world’ (*bahujaṇahitāya bahujaṇasukhāya lokānukampāya*) (D III.211).

As for Arhant Mahinda’s zeal, we may note the hectic schedule he was to pursue in the period of the first 26 days before retiring for the Rains Retreat: “During this period, things moved rapidly and great changes took place” (Rahula, 1956, p. 56). He delivers a number of sermons, accepts the Mahamegha Park (Mv xv.25), identifies places suitable for a cetiya, bodhi tree, bathing tank for the ordained, etc. (xv.27-55), suggests that sister *Saṅghamittā* be invited to facilitate the establishment of the Bhikkhuni ordination, arranges for the branch of the Bodhi Tree at Buddhagaya to be brought, suggests the idea of having a cetiya built (xvii.1ff) and arranges to bring the right collar bone for enshrining (ibid., 19-21). He wins over not only the King and the women of the Royal household, but also the masses (see later).

And his eyes are also, as we shall see, set on the entire island (Mv. xiv.35). When, after donating Mahameghavanna, the King asks if the *Sāsana* has been established, and further, “When will the roots go deep?”,

Mahinda says⁴³ that it will be established only “when a son is born in *Tambapannidīpa*, of *Tambapannidīpa* parents, [and] becomes a monk in *Tambapannidīpa*, studies the Vinaya in *Tambapannidīpa* and recites it in *Tambapannidīpa*, then the roots of the *Sāsana* are deep set” (cited in Rahula, 1956, p. 54). Clearly, it was the next generation that Arhant Mahinda had in mind. So only by spreading the Dhamma among the masses far and wide would then be the only way of ensuring that many a son of the soil would come to the *Sāsana*. Paranavithana (1970, cii) speaks to the success of his mission: “The chronicles, as well as other early literature of Ceylon, indicate that the success of the missionaries led by Saint Mahinda was not confined to the capital city of Anuradhapura, but that the Dhamma was propagated throughout the length and breadth of the island.”

Again, having arrived in the island at age 32, Mahinda continues to live there until the age of eighty when he dies. Need we say more of Mahinda’s Vision and missionary zeal?

Now to go back to the first three criteria, we see how Mahinda seems to fit the bill to a tee. As for deep knowledge of the Doctrine (1), he comes to the island fresh from the Third Council at Pataliputra (Rahula, 1956, 12-13), carrying the Buddhaddhamma (not yet committed to writing) with him, in his memory. The first 26 days in the island is emblazoned with Discourses (Mv xii and xiv).

As an Arhant, he would be, by definition, a Meditator (3). But we get an internal hint that confirms this as well. The *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* sets up *ātāpī* ‘being ardent’, *sampajāno* ‘clearly comprehending’ and *satimā* ‘being mindful’ (M I 56) as watchtowers to ensure that the practitioner is well kept on the path. Establishing the devotee in the path of *Saddhā* may then be seen as the parallel frame of mind in relation to the *Buddhapūjāva*. It is the devotion to Buddha that keeps the devotee mindful at each step of the exercise. The comprehension built into the *Buddhapūjāva* may be considered the parallel to ‘clearly comprehending’. Although nothing specifically speaks for being ‘ardent’, it would be obvious that it would be only a continuous practice day in day out that will help keep the devotee mindful of the TP’s. The presence of the three features, then, confirms the candidacy of Mahinda, the knowledgeable practitioner, with a life-long commitment to walking the Dhamma of a Disciplined life, guided by a strict Sangha Vinaya Code.

As recorded, following the initial teaching to King Devanampiya Tissa and the Royal Household, Mahinda opts to retreat to the bush, and

⁴³ That is, if we were to accept the answer given in the *Samantapāsādikā*, Buddhaghosa’s commentary on the Vinaya.

continues to live there, in a place which has now come to be identified as the Mahinda Cave (*mihiṇḍu kutiya* in Sinhala), at the edge of a cliff, obviously to find space (psychological and physical) for meditation. In his earliest sermons, Rahula (1956, p. 52) notes how Mahinda introduces a new theme: “emphasis.. on the moral side of religion as a requisite for a happy life”. *Buddhapūjāva*, then, with the *Pañca-sīla* at its core, seems to be his attempt to incorporate the same ethical emphasis as entailed in meditation.

While there is indeed an *āmisā pūjā* ‘offering through donation (of alms)’ component (offering flowers, food, etc.) in the *Buddhapūjāva* (2.3.1 in Fig. 1), the centrality of *sīla* renders it more of a *paṭipatti pūjā* ‘offering through conduct’. Coming with the experience of seeing the benefits of self-discipline - peace and harmony within oneself, and among the Sangha, Arhant Mahinda seems to build in the self-discipline component as the answer, and the way, to a healthy society. So he can be said to come to the task not only with a knowledgeability *about* the Dhamma, but also a commitment to *walk the talk*, in emulation of the Buddha (see above). And the *Buddhapūjāva* can be seen as his way of taking that ethical emphasis to the masses, attending by now in increasingly large numbers to listen to his Discourses.

As for the *Anthropologist* (5) and the *Sociologist* (6) in him, we see it immediately in his choice of the *Petavatthu* and the *Vimānavatthu* as the Discourse to be given to the women of the Royal Household (Mv xiv 58), texts that deal with the spirits of the dead in the *peta*-world and in the *deva*-loka (heavenly world) according to their past karma. “This must have appealed to the audience already possessing faith in the spirits of the dead.” (Rahula, 1956, p. 51). Thus we find e.g., the devotee in the *Buddhapūjāva* transferring merit to not only devas and sentient beings (3.1.1 in chart), but as noted, to *bhūtas* as well. While the term, literally meaning ‘that which has come to be’ (as in e.g., *yathābhūta*), interestingly has the meanings of both ‘animate nature’ and ‘inanimate nature’, giving us ‘All else in nature’ as in the Chart, it also has the meaning of ‘ghosts’ (*amanussa*). Even though *bhūtavijjā* ‘ghost lore’ (or ‘sorcery’, literally ‘the science (or art) of the ghosts’), is considered a ‘base art’ for the ordained (D I.9), it is with the linguistic dexterity of the communicator and the savvy of the Educator / Anthropologist, then, that the term comes to be used as a *double entendre*, in the knowledge that the life of the occult is very much part of the belief system of the intended audience.

Another example of Mahinda the Anthropologist is when protection is sought for ‘the dispensation, me and others’ (3.2.1 in Fig. 1), from not only the ‘powerful devas’ but ‘powerful *nāgas*’ (*devā nāgā mahiddhikā*) as well. This may well be drawn upon another local belief - of the ‘*nāga*

king *Aravāḷa* of wondrous powers' (*mahiddhiko aravāḷo nāgarājā*) (Mv 12. 9), who 'at that time did cause the rain called 'Hail' to pour down upon the ripe crops', and 'cruelly' overwhelming 'everything with a flood'⁴⁴. So why not protection from a powerful force? The association of a Naga providing shelter to the Buddha following Enlightenment may have been a consideration as well.

It may also be noted with interest how the Educator in him *leaves out* the yakhas, even though *yakkha* cult worship was also part of the belief system of the people (see Rahula, 1956, pp. 34-42). They, too, designate "certain supernatural beings". But, in the context of Lanka, it is relevant to note that "the aboriginal inhabitants of Ceylon are frequently called Yakkha" (*Mahavamsa*, Geiger (trans.), 1912, 297). Indeed, upon arrival in Lanka, Vijaya takes *yakkhini* Kuvaṇṇā as his spouse (Mv vii.29). How would you take the exclusion of yakhas in the *Buddhapūjā* ritual other than as a shrewdness of an Anthropologist / Sociologist showing sensitivity to history and culture?

But, then, it would be legitimate to wonder how the newcomer Mahinda would have known what the belief system of the people was in the country he has just set his foot on? We may remember that joining Mahinda into the *Vassa* period was Mahā Ariṭṭha, the Minister in the Devanampiya Tissa government, and 55 of his brothers. So we may say that Mahinda, participant observer *par excellence*, was to have a rich resource for his fieldwork, in his very backyard, so to speak! Indeed Maha Ariṭṭha may well have been his research assistant!! During the *Vassa*, Mahinda was also to have contact with the king (Mv xviii.2). So we may consider that he had a full three months for his research. If, indeed, there were by this time Buddhist monks in the island who had arrived from India (Adikaram, 1994), they may have brought their insights as well if indeed contact had been made with them, the *Mahavamsa* being silent on it.

Mahinda the Psychologist (7), of course, comes to the task based in the knowledge of the general condition of sentience - *bhava taṇhā* 'thirst for existence'. Everybody loves life. Nobody wants to let go of it. Sentient beings are also happiness-loving (*puriso ... sukhakāma* (M I 315)), this emanating from the 'thirst for sense-pleasure' (*kāma taṇhā*). Buddha tells us that 'Happiness is the greatest wealth' (*santutṭhī paramaṃ dhanam*). In selecting the Discourses, for the King (*Cūlahatthipadopama*), Queen Anula (*Petavatthu*; *Vimānavatthu*) and the masses (*devadūta suttanta*), we see Arhant Mahinda making ample use of both his psychological skills

⁴⁴ It may not be insignificant that the context of the quote is North India (Kasmira and Gandhara). Vijaya, the progenitor of the Sinhalas, hails from that region of India, arriving about two centuries earlier.

and doctrinal knowledge. In selecting the Discourse dealing with spirits and devas, e.g., for his female listeners as noted, he was undoubtedly drawing upon his psychological insight that women as nurturers would be more effectively impacted upon in the affective domain, of the right brain hemisphere. But in adding the Discourse dealing with the Four Noble Truths, he is clearly drawing upon their reason and intelligence as well, the left brain hemisphere. In the *Devadūta suttanta*, the masses would hear about the results of good and bad action, the misery that awaits criminals and the descriptions of the tortures in hell⁴⁵.

Including a *paritta* component in the *Buddhapūjāva*⁴⁶ speaks to another psychological insight on the part of Mahinda. While the rest of the *Buddhapūjāva* may rely heavily on mim-mem, i.e., mimicry-memorization as in second language learning, if also on the meaning of words, the additional value of the *paritta* is that it adds a joyous dimension, calming the senses with its ‘vowel intoning’ (*sarabhañña* (V.3.2)) (see Sugunasiri, forthcoming, for details). This, of course, would be another example of the deep knowledge of the Teachings on the part of the Redactor, given that *paritta* does not constitute a primary doctrine.

In picking the different Discourses for the differential audiences - different strokes for different blokes, so to speak, what we find is the Psychologist combined with the Educator (9) the Communicator (10) and the Strategist (8). In the context of the *Buddhapūjāva*, e.g., we may note how it begins with a preparatory *saddhā*, making the activity a happy event right off the bat. The level of happiness would be rendered even higher when reflections upon the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha serve as models to emulate. This is when we also see the good *Educator* in Mahinda who would well know that a happy and elevating mindset and environment would make for better learning.

There could perhaps be no better indicator of the good Educator than linking happiness to a moral life, as noted above. And in this connection, we see him enthusiastically drawing upon the Training Principles, digging into his doctrinal strengths.

We may also remind ourselves in this connection how Educator

⁴⁵ The Canonical characterization of an Arhant includes ‘higher insight’ (*abhiññā*), one of them being the skill to know others’ minds (*paracittaviijānañña*). So while Mahinda can be said to have been a psychologist in this super-sense as well, we limit ourselves to the historical evidence.

⁴⁶ The *paritta* is shown as being optional as in today’s practice, but there is nothing to say that it was not part of the original *Buddhapūjāva*. It is entirely possible that the optionality is an accommodation to the time constraints of contemporary life, urban or rural.

Mahinda organizes the *Buddhapūjāva* entailing *self-learning* in a manner to ensure that the devotees are not lost on the way during the ritual, and their *saddhā* is maintained throughout. This is done by placing a Bhante not only in the leading role but, as noted, in an interventional one at each transition with lines such as ‘Please repeat after me’ (*yamahaṃ vadāmi taṃ vadetha*), ‘Completed is Going for Refuge’ (as above), and with audience participation when one member (often self-appointed, such as the father if in a family setting, or a chief benefactor in a public setting) acknowledges with the words, “Yes, Sir” (*āma bhante*).

Then there are the directions in Sinhala: “Now, please say the (opening) Homage” (*namaskāraya kiyanna*), ‘We may now transfer merits’ (*deviyaṇṭa piṃ denṇa*) preceding each relevant segment of the homage, etc. The smooth transitions, again as noted, are personalized as well through the changing hand positions (holding palms together at the head or the chest in veneration of the Triple Gem; keeping hands on the lap in transferring merit), body postures (falling prostrate in a five-point touch, sitting on haunches or cross-legged), etc.

Continuing, at the end of the offering of alms, is the personal offering in Sinhala: “May my offering of flowers, light, incense, water, food and medicinal drinks be offered to my noble Buddha the father, for the first, second and third times” (*māge me mal pūjāvada pahan pūjāvada suwaṇḍa pūjāvada paen pūjāvada āhāra pūjāvada gilampasa pūjāvada māge budupiyānanvahanseṭa ekvenuvat devenuvat tunvenuvat pūjā vevā pūjā vevā pūjā vevā*) (see Appendix in Sugunasiri, forthcoming).

If this is to maximize audience involvement, and generate *saddhā* in the devotee, one may even see the women devotees, particularly in a rural context, bringing their palms together when during a *Dhamma* discourse that may follow, the very mention of the word Buddha brings out a *sādhu*. It is as if to say, in their own way, ‘How wonderful’, ‘How fortunate I am to have you as my Teacher’, ‘How happy I become even at the mention of your very name’, etc.

As in the Organizational Structure of the *Buddhapūjāva* (Fig. 1), an intended final goal of the *Buddhapūjāva* is to lead towards liberation (*mokkha*) (IV). While this would be openly evident in the silent meditation (4.1.1), it is the ingenuity of Mahinda to help the devotee take the first informal step in this direction at the point of ‘Seeking Protection for Self’ (3.3.1). Here, one wishes to be kept away from the company of fools (*bāla*) (3.3.2), and to be in the company of ‘good ones’ (*satam* < instrumental of *sat*-). It surely is not accidental that *sat*- ‘good ones’ has associations with the term *kalyāṇamitta* ‘morally good friend’. Not only is such an association considered, for a Bhikkhu, one of the things conducive to his welfare (D III.212), it is also “the sign that the Bhikkhu

will realize the seven *bhojjhangas* [aspects conducive to liberation']” (S v.78). And “it is to be expected that” a Bhikkhu who has a ‘good friend’ “will develop and cultivate the Noble Eightfold Path “ (S I. 88). Can it be different for the laity?

The inclusion of aspiration to an association with good ones can then be seen as a subtle way of incorporating a liberative element in the life of the lay devotee, even as s/he seeks the social good entailing both the self-good and the other good. The intent of the Arhant seems indubitable when this protection for ‘me’ comes to be sought a second time, this time exclusively (3.3.1), when already earlier, ‘me’ had been included in seeking protection (3.2.1). It can be seen to be confirmed when the protection sought is ‘until Nibbana come’ (*yāva nibbāṇa pattiya*).

If the above speaks to the attention to detail in terms of content, Educator Mahinda ensures that the devotee is kept in the realm of knowledge, too, though not too far removed from *saddhā*. We find him, e.g., giving a Discourse after accepting alms (Mv xv.197)⁴⁷. By way of following his example, a typical practice today would be for a *Buddhapūjāva* to be followed by a Discourse (*baṇa*) (4.1.3), during which one or another Teaching comes to be explained.

And, of course, we get a sense of the Educator in Arhant Mahinda even outside of the *Buddhapūjāva* when he puts the King to the test with what Rahula (1956, p. 50) calls “the first intelligence test recorded in history”. It is this field research that would help him tailor his first Teaching in the new land in such a way that it doesn’t go over the head of the host. And then he chooses carefully. His pick for the initial delivery, *Cūlahatthipadopama Sutta* (M I, 185), includes all the components he likes to see gotten across to his new audience (see below as well). Like any good teacher, he seeks to be comprehensive without overwhelming the audience.

We get evidence of the Arhant’s attention to detail (as *Strategic Planner* (8)) when, going around identifying where in the Mahamegha Park the different facilities (*thūpa*, *mālaka*, etc.) were to be located, he identifies a place that “will be the tank with the room for warm baths (*jantāghara*)” (Mv xv.31) for the Sangha. Who says that hot tubs are a modern invention!

Perhaps a good example of the strategist Mahinda at work, combining the Educator and the Communicator, is the careful way he works his way down from the King to the masses. There is no more evidence needed to show that his strategy worked when at each level, we find more and more

⁴⁷ This was the *Gomayapindī-sutta* ‘the Discourse on the clod of cow-dung’ (S III, p.143 ff).

people asking to go for Refuge and seek ordination (see later for details).

If the *Cūlahatthipadopama Sutta* gives a clear idea of the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha, all the principal Teachings such as the Four Noble Truths, another part of it describes the life of a Bhikkhu and how to become one. The strategic significance of this should be obvious. As noted above, there would be no establishment of the Dispensation without the personal recluship of local Tambapannians. Thus we find the master strategist arriving with four other ordained, to ensure that the *pabbajjā* ‘ordination’ requiring five ordained members, may be authentically offered, if, as he was sure it would be, requested.

If we needed any more evidence for his strategic skills, let us take the timing of his arrival in Lanka. It begins when he “pondered over the fitting time” (Mv xiii 2), arriving in the month of *Jeṭṭha* (May-June, in what Sinhala Buddhists know as Poson), one month following the month of *Vesākha* (Vesak in Sinhala, in May), Buddha’s Enlightenment. Looking into the future, this would, of course, become significant, since a grateful people will come to the celebration of the event of the arrival immediately following a month of spiritual fervour⁴⁸.

Still strategically, we find that he comes not only with four other theras, but also a layperson in the person of Bhaṇḍuka, “son of a daughter of [Mahinda’s mother] Devi’s sister”. Though he was one who had “obtained the reward of one who shall return no more unto life [= *anāgamin*]” (Mv xiii. 17), he comes to be ordained (having the requisite number of 5) the night of the first sermon, in the very presence of the King (Mv xiv.28). We may see a threefold strategy here. First, the Tambapannians get to see an ordination first-hand. If it would undoubtedly be (a) an inspiring experience, it would also (b) help to ‘de-alienize’, if I may be allowed to coin a term, the men in an unfamiliar attire⁴⁹, and reduce the distance between himself in robes and the host community. And (c), it could also serve as a model to be emulated, as indeed we see Maha-Ariṭṭha and his brothers, and Anula, seeking *pabbajjā*. We also see Mahinda rendering his model inspiring, when he retreats to the bush, declining the King’s

⁴⁸ Indeed today, Wesak is the greatest time of celebration when the major cities raise ‘pandals’ (*torana*), offer free food in *dansaḷas* (<*dāna sālā*), observe the 8 Training Principles, etc.

⁴⁹ Even though, as noted by Adikaram (1994.), there may have been Bhikkhus in the island by this time, having come over from India on their own. And as for providing a model, we may assume that they, as individual seekers, likely living in rural, if not forest, settings, the sight of one or more of them in robes may not necessarily have been a familiar one for the general public, any more than for the royalty.

invitation for an evening meal (Mv xiv.24), showing the self-discipline and the ‘little wanting’ (*appiccha*) of an Ordained.

Another strategy seems intended as a confidence-builder for the King. Told by Mahinda following the first Discourse that he and his retinue would be retiring to the bush for the night, the King asks to at least keep with him Bhaṇḍuka, the layman who had accompanied the Theras to the island. Saying that he is one who “shall return no more unto life” (see above), he comes to be, as noted, ordained the very first night of their arrival. But before the ordination, the King “took Bhaṇḍu aside and asked him what the Theras intended (to do). And he told the king all..... And now the King, whose fear had left him because Bhaṇḍu was a layman, knew that these were human beings.” (Mv xiv.31). Again, the strategy worked.

In a continuing strategy, Mahinda retires for *Vassa* on the 27th day. But before he does so, he ensures that, following the hectic schedule, the fires of enthusiasm are set ablaze, among the royalty and the masses alike. Not only are many a Discourse given to increasing numbers⁵⁰, but he helps the King lay out the future City of Anuradhapura (as noted). It would not be unknown to him that his unavailability for three months could only but crank up the enthusiasm, propelling an aura of mystery around the Arhant as word about him and other Theras begin to make the rounds. But he ensures that he maintains contact with the community as well, going on his alms rounds during the Retreat (xvi.13). If this was by way of following the Vinaya rules, it was also presumably to help maintain the level of *saddhā* among the people. Additionally, it was to keep the people reminded of his presence (just a phone call away, as we might put today) and what he stood for and what the Saddhamma had to offer. It was also undoubtedly to provide a living model for potential recruits what the life of a Bhikkhu / Bhikkhuni would be.

Offering a spiritually hungry Anula⁵¹ hope of ordination can be said to be another aspect of his careful strategy. It is surely not the case that Sanghamittā could not have joined him in coming to Lanka. But arriving by invitation would not only be to be respectful of tradition, namely offering only if asked, but also would make the *Bhikkhunī* mission that much more in demand, and exciting (from the point of view of the hosts).

⁵⁰ While the rounded numbers given in the Mahavamsa – 500, 1000, 40000, etc., may lack credibility as representing actual figures, there is no doubt that they reflect an increasing interest.

⁵¹ Out of all the women in the Royal household, it is Anula that King Devanampiya-Tissa summons in particular. This surely must speak to her spiritual orientation and commitment to the religious life.

If all of this speaks to the quality of the Arhant as a strategist, limiting the comprehensive and sophisticated event of the *Buddhapūjāva* to no more than a quarter of an hour in its very basic version speaks to his *pragmatism* (13). If brevity allows for the busiest household to engage in it regularly as part of the daily life, in a home setting, it also provides the spiritual opportunity for the family to come together. In a temple setting, it helps bring the community together in a regular happy common cause, with the duration of the ritual varying from occasion to occasion. Here then we see his successful attempt to serve both the family and the community at the same time, showing the hand of the pragmatist and the strategist.

Having a good product, of course, is one thing, but getting it to the market, to put it in contemporary though perhaps spiritually crass terms, is another. But we see Arhant Mahinda more than ready for the challenge, being not only a planner, but a real a go-getter (14) as well. Divested of the “miracles, myths, poetic embellishments and exaggerations” of the chronicles, we see Mahinda going around in the Mahameghavana along with Devanampiya Tissa locating the sites “for a *mālaka* for Acts of the Sangha, for a tank with a room for warm baths..., for the planting of the Bo-tree for the Uposatha Hall of the Sangha for a place where gifts offered to the Sangha would be divided for a refectory for the brotherhood and for the Maha thupa” (Rahula, 1956, p. 53).

We see, then, that Arhant Mahinda is clearly an effective Dhamma Messenger (12). Of course he had a good model, his father, King Aśoka, who was a ‘Resourceful organizer and psychologist himself’ (Rahula, 1956, p. 54). Indeed there is nothing to say that he himself was not behind his father’s attempts – as instigator, and/or perhaps even as ghost writer, at bringing happiness to his people. Mahinda may, then, only have been an improvement on his father, with the additional benefit of the experience of being an Arhant.

We have then seen how the Arhant more than meets the criteria generated by the internal structure of the *Buddhapūjāva*. Rahula’s (1956, p. 53) characterization of Mahinda may be instructive here:

There was no one at the time in Ceylon better educated, cultured and refined, more widely travelled and better informed than Mahinda himself. He had lived in large cities, like Pāṭalīputra, the magnificent capital of the Magadhan empire; he had seen great monasteries like Asokārāma built by his father and Cetiyaḡiri (modern Sāñchi) in Vidisa built by his mother.

So is he not that rare person who comes with inspiration towards

spiritual uplift not only from father but also from mother?

It is with some sense of confidence, then, that we could conjecture **that Arhant Mahinda indeed may well be accredited with the authorship of the *Buddhapūjāva* in Sinhala Buddhism.** In this he had a model: his own father's listing of seven "Dharma texts" that the "largest number of bhikkhus and bhikkhunis should constantly listen to and reflect on" (MRE 1, cited in Guruge, 1993, 551). His inspiration could well have been the *Khuddakapāṭha* itself, if it is not post-Mahindian⁵². However, neither Asoka's nor the Khuddaka listing can be said to be anywhere close to Arhant Mahinda's *Buddhapūjāva* in complexity, comprehensiveness and sophistication.

Needless to say, the other four members of the Sangha of his retinue, would have had their input as well. This is not to forget the inspiration of Ven. Moggaliputtatissa, the Head of the Council following which Mahinda arrives in Lanka.

C.4 The Context of Emergence

C.4.1 'Stirring masses at the palace-gates' and Queen Anula as Joint Catalysts for the *Buddhapūjāva*

We have found above (Section A) external evidence to situate the origins of the *Buddhapūjāva* in Lanka, and not in India. There were several contextual supportive conditions as well. The closely knit community of the small island could be said to have provided a fertile soil for conscious community building through the Dhamma. First, while there were in pre-Mahindian Lanka followers of just about all the religious communities – Brahmins, Nighanṭhas, Saivaites, Paribbajaks, Ajivikas and Tapasas, and practices such as cult worship (Rahula, 1956, 43-47), "there is no evidence that any of them was so systematically organized" (47). By contrast, the demand for Buddhadhamma came to be now nearly universal across social class and gender. If the conversion of King Devanampiya Tissa ensured that the citizenry would be united in their religious fervour, the arrival of Sanghamitta, following Mahinda, and the ordination of Queen Anula, meant that the women were brought into the fold as well. All this meant that if the involvement in the new religion was initially limited to

⁵² I am thankful to Dr Guruge for drawing my attention to this. *Khuddakapāṭha*, the first book of the *Khuddaka Nikāya* of the *Suttapitaka*, is also, as captured in the title itself, a collection of short nine pieces gleaned from the Canon and "put together most probably for practical purposes as a kind of handbook" (Hinuber, 1996, p. 44).

the Royal family and the citizens attending his Discourses, the community of believers now came to be, potentially at least, total – men and women, ruler and subject, and indeed whole families.

But what was the specific catalyst that might have moved Mahinda, assuming that he is the likely Redactor, to compose the *Buddhapūjāva*?

At the point of introducing the Buddhadhamma to the island, Arhant Mahinda, along with his retinue of four, served as the only spiritual guides to the community. But soon, it would become a challenge. In addition to the “40,000” who were with the King at his initial encounter (Mv xiv. 2) (while the rounded figure may be an exaggeration, there is no doubt that what it suggests is a large number) and the women of the royal household who had come to listen to him (xiv.46 ff.), there came to be an increasing interest in the Buddhadhamma among the masses. On the second day itself of his arrival, e.g., we are told that “the many people from the city, hearing from persons who had seen them the day before, of the virtues of the Theras, came together desirous to see the Theras and *made a great stir at the palace-gates*” (xiv.59-60) (italics and bold added). While the elephant’s hall was enough to accommodate them initially (xiv.61), the next day, the venue comes to be moved to the Nandana-garden (xv.1-2). On the fifth day, Mahinda preaches “to a great multitude of people” (xv.196). And within seven days, “he had brought eight thousand five hundred persons to conversion” (xv.201).

Even after discounting the rounded numbers and the exaggerations⁵³, there is no question that increasing numbers were coming in search of the Buddhadhamma. He had never seen such an enthusiasm, not even under his father King Aśoka. And so it was becoming clear that, having struck a chord, he and his retinue of four would not be able to meet the spiritual needs of the increasing numbers single-handedly. Of course, there were the 56 local sangha led by Mahāriṭṭha. But the task was beginning to be too much even for a total of 62 Bhikkhus, the majority of them still rookies, meaning novices.

And it was also clear that the *dhammadūta* eyes of Mahinda were set on the entirety of the island. When, e.g., asked to “announce... the time of preaching the Dhamma” (Mv xiv.34) the day following the arrival, Sāmaṇera Sumana asks, “How far, Sir, shall I make the time to be heard when I announce it?” (xiv.35), “Over all Tambapanni” comes the answer. **It may be at this point - in response to this perceived, and actual, need, that it would have occurred to the Arhant, or the thought would have come to crystallize in him, then, that only a spiritual tool that could**

⁵³ All the women of the royal household, e.g., is said to have attained to first stage of sanctification upon hearing the first sermon.

be available personally to one and all, with or without the presence of a Sangha member, would be the answer. Now we may see the germ of the *Buddhapūjāva* coming to reside in the mind of the clear-minded strategist.

But, strategist that he was, it is possible that he was not totally unprepared for it. Even in planning his visit, the possibility of the need for a ritual may have entered his mind, but he had likely decided to see the reality on the ground before he would proceed with it. The Psychologist-Educator-Communicator in him would have wanted to make sure that such a ritual was as meaningful, and relevant, as possible to the populace. So it would make sense to wait until he hit the ground and come to see the reality first hand.

C.4.2 Emergence of the *Pañca-*, *Aṭṭhangika-* and *Dasa- Sīla*

In the context of what he had been charged with by his father and Moggaliputtatissa Thera (Mv xii.7), and of his own vision of the spread of the Dhamma over the whole island (as above), it would not have been difficult for Arhant Mahinda, with his clarity of mind – this by definition of an Arhant, free of defilements (*kilesa*), to figure out what would best serve the needs of the masses. Not only were the people not living an easy life, not all of them would be of high intelligence either. So what was needed would be something the masses could find solace in on a regular basis amidst their daily life struggle but which would also help bring them happiness, held by the Buddha to be the paramount wealth (*santuṭṭhī paramaṇṇaṃ dhaṇaṃ*). Thus we have the *Buddhapūjāva* incorporating the *pañca-sīla* component, seeking to ensure, just as in his early sermons to the increasing royal audiences, that the basis for a happy life was living the moral life.

He would come to see the functionality of the *Buddhapūjāva* in the light of another phenomenon – the increasing number who were taking to the robes. By the time of the arrival of relics (three months later, at the end of *pavāraṇa*) (xvii.1), e.g., there had come to be thirty thousand Bhikkhus “from within and without the city” (xvii.61). Soon there would be 500 Bhikkhunis as well, Queen Anula and her retinue receiving *pabbajjā* (xv.65) upon the arrival of Sanghamittā. But, of course, these Bhikkhus and Bhikkhunis were themselves new to their responsibilities, and did not have the vast knowledge of the Dhamma that Arhant Mahinda had. So a spiritual tool like the *Buddhapūjāva*, one that could be readily used with the laity, would be a handy blessing in their new vocation.

The fact that it was also a ritual would make it even more valuable and functional, given the pre-Buddhist rituals the populace had been used

to. If the newly ordained were, as novices, not yet well versed in the Teachings – a task that would entail learning Pali, studying the texts, etc., they would at least have something spiritual to be shared with devotees, or the inquisitive, who might come to them simply out of curiosity if nothing else, seeing them in their yellow robes. The ritual would give the masses something meaningful, and something to take home, so to speak. It would also ensure continuing Dhammic contact between the Sangha and the laity, helping build a *parisad* ‘collective’ of *saddhāvat upāsaka upāsikā* (to use a phrase in Sinhala), ‘faithful male and female devotees’, now complementing the *parisad* of *Bhikkhu Bhikkhunī* who had already come to be. There could be no better way of ensuring the building of the *catuparisad* ‘the four-fold collective’, and the continuity of the *Sāsana*.

In addition to being a spiritual tool for use by the masses on a daily basis, and for the Sangha as a handy guide, it appears that Arhant Mahinda had come to see in the *Buddhapūjāva* a context within which to meet a yet higher level spiritual need as well.

Upon their very first encounter, we see the women of the royal household attaining to “the first stage of sanctification” (xiv.5), Queen Anula herself coming by the second stage a little while later (xv.18). Soon a thousand women of noble families would also attain to the first level of sanctification (xv.5). While the Five Training Principles may be all that the average person living a daily life could handle, women like Anula, and other men yet to appear, are likely to look for a more rigorous practice of *sīla*. Indeed we note Queen Anula putting on the yellow robe, “waiting for the *pabbajjā*” (xviii, 9-11).

So what could he offer such spiritual seekers while they awaited their ordination? We may find the possible answer in the context of Anula. It is “having taken to” (*samādāya*) the *Dasasīla* (10 TP’s) that she comes to wear the robes (ibid.). But, of course, **there is no such practice in the Canon** (see later for a discussion). So we may conjecture that Mahinda had come to see the *Buddhapūjāva* as an instrument within which the *Dasasīla* could be incorporated as well. This is indeed today’s practice, the *Buddhapūjāva* providing the foundational text and context not only for the *dasa-sīla*, but judging from contemporary practice, the *Aṭṭhangika-sīla* (8 TP’s) (again see later) as well. So it was the genius of Arhant Mahinda that he came to see the *Buddhapūjāva* as a catch-all tool, meeting the spiritual needs of not only the masses but of the more serious seekers among them as well. We may see in all this a Hierarchy of Training Principles, as captured below:

LEVEL	TYPE OF SĪLA	DURATION/ FREQUENCY
3	<i>Dasasīla</i> '10 Training Principles'	Lifetime / long-term
2	<i>Aṭṭhangikasīla</i> '8 Training Principles'	Monthly
1	<i>Pañcasīla</i> '5 Training Principles'	Daily

Fig. 2: Hierarchy of *Sīla* for the Laity, in terms of the number of 'Training Principles'

We see here that while the *pañca-sīla* 'Five Training Principles' is the standard everyday ritual, the *Aṭṭhangikasīla* 'Eight Training Principles' (see later for its make-up), is the next step up⁵⁴. But while this would still be a temporary practice, taken up just for a day once a week as noted in the context of India by I-Tsing (see above, B.4), or once a month as it is today – although it may be taken for three days, Mahinda may have figured that that would not still meet the needs of the even more faithful and committed individuals like Anula. It is thus that we have the *Dasasīla* 'Ten Training Principles', as the highest for the laity, and to be taken as a life-time vow, with or without eventually going for ordination.

If the thinking behind the need to build in a Hierarchy of Training Principles in the context of the new community seems logical enough, the content of the three levels is, of course, not original to the Arhant. A study of the three levels of *sīla* will show that all of the basic ingredients of the *pañcasīla*, *Aṭṭhangikasīla* and the *Dasasīla* are clearly drawn from the Canon.

The *pañca-sīla*, it may be noted, exists in the Canon under the different name *pañca-dhammā* (A III.203). "Without a special title, they are mentioned in connection with the '*saranam gata*' formula" (Davids & Stede, 1979, 712). So the novelty is that it gets re-named as *pañca-sīla*, serving as the foundational basis, as we shall see, for the next two levels. It may also be noted that in some Suttas, as e.g., Brahmajala (D.1.10), the fifth TP finds no mention.

⁵⁴ The Eight TP's may have been to meet the needs of perhaps some of the women of the Royal Household, and other men and women among the masses who were more serious about their spiritual life beyond the Five TP's, but could not, for one reason or another – family responsibilities, personal health, etc., take to a lifelong vow of the Ten TP's.

As regards the eightfold *sīla*, again, it does not occur in the Canon under the name *sīlas* or *sikkhāpada*, but as *aṭṭhanga-samannāgata* (or *Aṭṭhangika*) *uposatha* ('the fast day with its eight constituents') (Davids & Stede, 1979, 713). But, at the organizational hands and the conceptual mind of Mahinda, it gets the name *Aṭṭhangika-sīla*, becoming also the next level with the addition of three more TP's⁵⁵.

The innovation regarding the *Dasasīla* is deeper. As we shall see, it comes to be the outcome of a series of changes, modifications and additions. Unlike the first two levels, the concept of *dasa-sīla*, in relation to the laity, does not occur in the Canon (see PED, under *sīla*). But what does occur is *dasa-kusala* '10 skillfuls', which are not identical to the constituents of the *dasa-sīla*. So on the model of that, the Arhant creates the *dasa-sīla*, dividing the 8th Training Principle (see [a] and [b] in footnote 55) of the *aṭṭhangika-sīla*, as in the Canon itself (D.1) - abstaining from the visual, namely, (8) dance, singing, instrumental music, mime (*nacca gīta vāḍita visūkadassanaṭṭhānā*), and the personal, namely, (9) garlands, perfume and ointments, and ornaments, finery and adornment (*mālā gandha vilepana dhāraṇa maṇḍana vibhūsaṇaṭṭhānā*), making it nine now. The list is completed by adding an abstention, listed in the Canon for the Sangha, namely, [10] from handling of money (*jātarūparajatapaṭiggahaṇā*), as we see in the *Cūlahatthipadopama Sutta*. This is as if to build the bridge between lay life and ordination.

C.4.3 Concluding Discussion

From our discussion, then, it appears to be clear that both the *Buddhapūjāva* on the one hand, and the three levels of *sīla*, are the result of the Arhant Mahinda's creative thinking. So we may credit Arhant Mahinda the Educator for cooking up, with apologies for the mundane metaphor, and systematizing all three of them within the *Buddhapūjāva*, entirely afresh. That is the creativity and the originality, as would be of a good cook who brings the available ingredients together in a novel fashion to create a new dish, adding to, or elevating, the culinary experience.

The 'Palace gates' (*rājadvāra*) in the title (C.4.1) refers to the location where the masses initially would throng and make "a great stir"

⁵⁵ The additional three are: ... abstaining from (6). untimely intake of food, (7). high and comfortable beds and dance etc. and (8). [a] dance, singing, instrumental music, mime, [b] garlands, perfume and ointments, and ornaments, finery and adornment. There is also a variation in the third of the first Five TP's, this as in the Canon, from abstinence from 'sexual misconduct' (*kāmesu micchācārā*) to a total abstinence in sex (*ab(b)rahmacariyā*).

(*mahāsaddam akarum*) (Mv xiv.59-60). But the ‘gates’ could well stand for symbolically, though perhaps not intended by Mahanama, the gates to Saddhamma itself, of the ‘Respected King the Buddha’ (*budurājanan vahanse*), as in Sinhala Buddhism. It could also well mean ‘gates to Nibbana’ itself. In that sense, what we may surmise by ‘gate’ is a yearning for the Saddhamma on the part of the public, both for spiritual as well as pragmatic reasons. So with Anula and her retinue, not to mention the King himself.

And so we may, then, see ***Queen Anula and the Masses as the joint Catalysts for the Buddhapūjāva.***

If this discussion, then, serves as another possible confirmation of Arhat Mahinda’s authorship of the *Buddhapūjāva*, it also argues for the concomitant emergence of the *Pañca*-, *Aṭṭhangika*- and *Dasa-Sīlas* at his hands.

It was noted that, following the first Discourse itself, King Devanampiya Tissa comes unto “the Refuges”, but without any mention of *Pañcasīla*⁵⁶. However, a reference to *Dasasīla* is made in reference to Anula (Mv xviii.9-10), this in the context of receiving the Bodhi tree (Mv xvii.1), well over three months after the arrival of Mahinda. What this then seem to suggest is that the emergence of the *Dasasīla* comes to be some time between the time of arrival of Mahinda and the arrival of the Bodhi tree.

If any evidence is needed for Arhant Mahinda’s vision of two millennia ago, in creating the *Buddhapūjāva*, one only has to note how deeply the Five, Eight and Ten Training Principles have taken root in the Sinhala Buddhist psyche, and religious practice today⁵⁷. The orthodoxy of

⁵⁶ It may be noted that, in a different context, we do find in the Mahavamsa, the phrase *saraṇesu ca sīlesu ṭhitā* (Mv i.32, fn. 6), literally ‘established in the Refuges and the *sīlas*’, this being a clear reference to *pañca sīla* ‘Five Training Principles’. But that is in connection with the Visit of the Tathagata, predating the arrival of Mahinda. But if this were to be taken as historical fact, then, at least one aspect of our hypothesis would fall by the wayside, for it suggests that the Five TP’s (if also the Refuges) were in vogue in Sri Lanka in pre-Mahindian times. However, that would contradict Mahavamsa’s own claim that it was Mahinda who introduced Buddhism to the land! It would also fail to explain why King Devanampiya Tissa was administered only the Three Refuges and not the Five TP’s, as is the standard practice today that signals conversion. So we will have to assume that coming unto the ‘precepts of duty’ was again a retrojection on the part of Mahanama.

⁵⁷ Heard over the radio and TV on a daily basis, the *Pañcasīla* ‘Five TP’s’ are standard practice at all public events, such as temple services, funerals, alms givings, parittas, etc., not to mention personal and individual homage in a home

Theravada, and the strict Vinaya Code, spearheaded by the Mahavihara in ancient times, and now maintained by the Sangha, have ensured that tradition endures, with only some changes in the details, while the core remains as it has been historically practiced⁵⁸.

C.5 Launching of the *Buddhapūjāva* and the *Sīla* Trio

It is in describing the arrival of Sanghamittā and her retinue, this in the context of receiving the Bodhi Tree (Mv xviii, 1ff.), that queen Anula is said to have taken to the *Dasasīla*. But there is no indication as to when exactly Anula had taken to it. There is, e.g., no suggestion by Mahinda to her, at the point when she beseeches ordination, that she take to the *Dasasīla* in the interim. The term *samādāya* ‘taken to’ (translated by Geiger as ‘has accepted’, and by Guruge’s (1990, 117) as ‘observed’) seems ambiguous. Are we to understand it as meaning ‘self-administered’ or as ‘other-administered’?

Regarding ambiguity, even though no other details are given regarding Mahārīṭṭha receiving his *pabbajjā* ‘ordination’ either, we are specifically told that it was administered by Arhant Mahinda. But since there is no mention of at whose hands *Dasasīla* had been received by Anula, could it be that it was self-administered by the highly enthusiastic Anula, with no tradition to live up to? As noted by Geiger (Mv tr., 1912, 122-3, footnote 3), “there are frequent references [in the Canon] to the five or eight pledges which *one may take oneself*” (italics added). This is equally true even today, certainly when it comes to the *Pañcasīla* (Five Training Principles), although not, at least formally, regarding the *Aṭṭhangikasīla* (Eight Training Principles)⁵⁹.

But, several points argue against a self-administration by Anula. It

setting. While those who take to the Ten are rare, for the primary reason that family life doesn’t allow for the practice of the strict code, *aṭṭasil* (*aṭṭhāngika sīla*) is a practice followed regularly on Full Moon Days, not just in the country but in overseas settings as well –London, Los Angeles, Melbourne, Toronto, etc., where there is a temple. Of significance is that children, too, come to take to it, indicating how strongly it is embedded in the culture. This, of course, is not to mention its practice in other Theravada countries such as Burma and Thailand.

⁵⁸ Begging for alms would be a living example, as is also the practice of the laity offering alms to Sangha. The Rains Retreat (*Vassāna*) and *Kaṭhina* (offering of new robes) following the Retreat would be other examples.

⁵⁹ But, of course, as in today’s practice, there is nothing to stop a devotee, on a poya (Full Moon) or other day, committing oneself to a day of serious practice in a home setting, self-administering the eight TP’s in the presence of a Buddha statue.

is not, of course, that the TP's are inherently non-self-administrable.⁶⁰ After all, they are self-directed abstentions. But, in the case of Anula, things were different. To begin with, it was the ten pledges, and not the five or the eight, that were being committed to. It is not only the highest available to a layperson, and the most austere, but also a life-long vow, to be replaceable only by the higher vow of ordination itself. And judging by today's practice, in the Sinhala *Theravāda* tradition, it is certainly never self-administered. And contemporary practice in itself may be taken as strong evidence of the historical, Theravada by definition and practice being of the orientation of orthodoxy, meaning, retaining tradition as closely as possible.

Secondly, however trendsetting Anula may have been, as she certainly appears to be, to be able to self-administer, she would have to have been conversant with the contents of the *Dasasīla* in the first place. But this would have been highly unlikely. Unlike today, when the TP's are known within the community (or at least among the more spiritually bent) having being part of the culture for two millennia, they were an unknown at the time. Anula's first encounter with Buddhism was on the second day of the arrival of Mahinda. It was on the fourth day she asks for ordination. And she had not been present either at Mahinda's very first discourse to King Devanampiya Tissa, *Cūlahatthipadopama sutta*⁶¹, which indeed included references to the TP's. But even if she had been present, the Discourse refers only to *dasa-kusala* – skills that 'should be cultivated' (*sevitabbo*), and not to a specific ready-made '*dasa-sīla*'. To make matters even muddier, the abstentions talked about in the Sutta, incidentally *going beyond the ten*, are in relation to an ordained and not the laity. Additionally, there would have been not enough time for anyone

⁶⁰ Even putting on robes by oneself happens today (personal knowledge in the context of Canada, and in relation to Korean, and Anglo-Saxon ethnicity). We may in this context note a Canonical characterization that seems to allow for it: "A householder or householder's son or one born in some other clan hears that Dhamma. On hearing the Dhamma he acquires faith in the Tathāgata. Possessing that faith, he [the householder] considers thus: 'Household life is crowded and dusty; life gone forth is wide open. It is not easy, while living in a home, to lead the holy life utterly perfect and pure as a polished shell. Suppose I shave off my hair and beard, put on the yellow robe, and go forth from the home life into homelessness.' (M 17.179).

⁶¹ The women of the royal household "hearing from the king the virtues of the Theras, desired to see them..." (Mv xiv., 46). Thus, following the meal offered by the King the next day, "he ... sent for Anula ... who dwelt in the royal palace." (55-56). It was at this point that Mahinda delivered the *Petavatthu*, *Vimānavatthu* and the *Sacca-samyutta* to the women (Anula and her retinue) (58-59).

attending the first Discourse – everyone being new to the Teachings, to master them and pass them along to Anula.

The difficulty is not overcome even if we were to take the term ‘*samādāya*’ (given in the context of the arrival of the Bodhi tree, three months after the arrival of Mahinda (xviii, 9-10)) to mean not a repetition of the TP’s verbatim, after a leader as is the practice today, but simply an understanding of its intent. The task would have been rendered particularly challenging, given that the pledges were, even as they stand today, in Pali, and not in Sinhala (i.e., ‘language of the island’ (*dīpa bhāsāya*)). The closeness between the two languages, as has been noted by many a scholar, could have rendered things a bit easier, but it still doesn’t make someone new to both the religion and the language able to master the TP’s in the original, in so short a period as three days, on one’s own, nothing to say of having a grasp of the implications. So it is highly unlikely that Anula would have self-administered it, upon hearing that she would have to wait for Sanghamittā.

Finally, there had been no model of self-administration, both the Triple-gem in relation to the King, and the Ordination in relation to Bhanduka, being administered by Mahinda.

So what we see is the good possibility that the *Dasasīla* **was indeed administered by Arhant Mahinda himself**, even though there is no mention of it in the Mahavamsa description.

But we still don’t have a clue as to when the *Buddhapūjāva* itself might have had its initial launch, nor the *Five-* and the *Eight-sīla*. Might it have been at this very point in time that the *Dasasīla* was administered to Anula?

As for the *Aṭṭhangika sīla*, the middle step of the series, we know that the practice was already in existence by the time of King Dutugaemunu (as above). To review it briefly, in preparation for the ceremony of laying the foundation bricks for the Great Cetiya, the people are invited to come, “having observed the Uposatha Precepts” (*uposathiko*).

So if it was already there 150 or so years after Mahinda, when did the practice emerge?

Moving backward again, we are told in the *Mahavamsa* that Anula was “with five hundred maidens and five hundred women of the royal harem” (Mv xviii.9-10), when she had taken to the ‘ten precepts’. The text says that these thousand women, too, had accepted the Ten TP’s along with her. The reference to a ‘Vihara of the Lay Sisters’ (*Upasikāvihāra*) (Mv xviii.12), so labelled, because it comes to be “inhabited by these lay sisters”, indeed seems to confirm that there was more than Anula who had taken to the Ten TP’s.

But in addition to the likelihood that the rounded number simply

refers to a fairly large number, it is highly unlikely that all thousand, to a woman, would have taken to a life-long vow, which the *Dasasīla* entails. The more likelihood is that while some of the most fervent in her retinue joined Anula in the lifelong vow, a good number, perhaps the majority, may have taken to the *Aṭṭhangikasīla*, the Eight TP's, entailing only a 24-hour long vow. After all, the nunnery had to be maintained, and the needs of Anula and the community had to be met. Taking the Eight, rather than the Ten, then, seems likely to have been the more probable route to go for most. And so it might have been to meet the needs of Anula's retinue who were not yet ready for the Ten that the Eight *Sīla* might have been introduced at the same event.

So when exactly, then, were all this can be said to have been launched?

Following the *pavāraṇa* ceremony upon the completion of the Rains Retreat, Mahinda and his 61-strong cadre of monks⁶² return (MV xvii.1). And present with the King to welcome them⁶³ undoubtedly would have been, although there is no mention of it, Anula and her retinue. And there would also have been a multitude of citizens as well. Mahinda could have found no more of a golden opportunity to introduce the new ritual of the *Buddhapūjāva*. Here was a willing lay community, already taken to the Refuges, who could be expected to be more than happy to receive, with the greatest of *saddhā*, a handy gift of Dhamma that could help them, guide them, in their daily living. Happier would they be to find one, as they would discover over time, that could be self-administered, even in the absence of a Bhikkhu / Bhikkhuni, particularly at a time when the ordained were still in short supply.

And if we were to conjecture an actual date, then, it would have to be **at the end of Vassāna, and to be exact, the day FOLLOWING the FULL MOON day of KATTIKA [Oct-Nov⁶⁴] (xvii.1), in the year 247 BCE.**

⁶² It is interesting that the total number of the initial cadre of Sangha, at the point of vassana, in addition to Mahinda, and the local leader Mahariththa, turns out to be 60 – 4 from the original Indian contingent, Bhanduka – the lay person ordained on the first night in Lanka, plus Mahariththa's brothers (55 – a rather odd number) who join him in *pabbajjā*. Given that Buddha also initially had 60 disciples, one is given to wonder whether the number was concocted by author Mahanama to add additional sanctity to Mahinda's mission.

⁶³ It may be noted that while the *pavāraṇa* ceremony is limited to the retreatants, we are told, in the same line, that "he spoke ... to the king".

⁶⁴ **Calculated in the current year, 2012, it happens to be October 1.**

The year here has been arrived on the following basis:

- Asoka's Consecration: 265 BCE (Guruge, 1993:465)⁶⁵; Devanampiya Tissa Consecration: 248 BCE (ibid., xxxvii).
- Third Council: 248 BCE (ibid., lvi) (ending in October (ibid. lvii)) - 17th year of King Aśoka (Mv 5.280) (Geiger Introduction lvii); 265-17 = 248); Mahinda 12 years as a monk (Mv xiii.1).
- Mahinda's Arrival in Tambapanni: 247 BCE, *Jeṭṭha* [June] uposatha day (Mv xiii.18)⁶⁶, this clearly immediately following the Council in 248 BCE; Mahinda spending 6 months visiting kinsfolk (Mv xiii.5); so, arrival has to be the following year.

As for the date, the calculation would be as follows:

1. Mahinda arrives in Tamnbapanni on Full Moon Day of *Jeṭṭha* (*Poson* in Sinhala).
2. In Anuradhapura, 26 days (Mv. xvi.2), Mahinda retreats for *Vassāna* on the 27th day.
3. *Vassāna* begins on *Āsālha* (*Esala*) Full Moon Day.
4. End of *Vassāna*: *Kattika* (*Il*) Full Moon Day.
5. Day following⁶⁷.

Given that the *Dasasīla* is embedded within the *Buddhapūjāva*, this would also, then, have been the date when the newly minted *Dasasīla* saw the light of day as well, Anula being the first recipient.

But what about the *Pañca*- and the *Aṭṭhangika*-? Following the first Discourse itself, King Devanampiya Tissa comes unto "the Refuges", but with no mention of *Pañcasīla*. However, as noted, there is the reference to Anula, along with five hundred of her retinue, "having come to take to the ten precepts" (*dasasīlaṃ samādāya*), this in the context of receiving the bodhi tree, following the end of the *pavāraṇa* ceremony (Mv xvii.1), i.e., well over three months after the arrival of Mahinda. What this, then, suggests is that the emergence of both the *Pañca*- and the *Aṭṭhangika*-

⁶⁵ It may be noted here that we have opted for the dating by Guruge, which is one year earlier than the Geiger date (264 BCE) (Geiger Mv. Trans, xlvii).

⁶⁶ "Thera Moggaliputta ...had beheld the founding of the religion in adjacent countries.. in the month of Kattika" (Mv xii.1-3).

⁶⁷ Calculated again for the current year, 2260 years later [247 BCE + 2012 (counting by the Lunar Year, Full Moon falling on Sept 30)], the actual dates for items 1 to 5 would be as follows: (1) June 4, 2012; (2) July 1, 2012; (3) July 3, 2012; (4) Sept. 30, 2012; (5) Oct 1, 2012.

sīla (the middle step of the *sīla* series) comes to be sometimes between the time of arrival of Mahinda and the arrival of the bodhi tree. **This, then, allows the possibility of the launch date of the *Pañcasīla* (Five-TP's) and the *Aṭṭhangikasīla* (Eight-TP's), too, simultaneously with the *Dasasīla* and the *Buddhapūjāva*, given that the *Dasasīla* is an expansion upon the *Pañcasīla*.**

However, it is also possible that the *sīla* trio and the *Buddhapūjāva*, may have been introduced even earlier, in fact **42 days earlier.**

The first reference to Anula as having taken to the *Dasasīla* comes after the reference, a mere 10 verses earlier, to “a certain day in the rain-season” when the King, remembering “the words spoken by the Thera”, entrusts “his own nephew, his Minister named Ariṭṭha, with this business” (Mv xviii.1-2) to send a message to King Aśoka to invite Sanghamittā over. And we are also told that the King “was sitting in his own city with the Thera”, the Ministers in attendance. Showing up among the laity during the *Vassa* retreat is not a general practice of the Sangha. So Mahinda coming to be in the company of the King on this day, then, suggests that it must have been a very special occasion. Is it possible, then, that this was **for the purpose of administering the *Dasasīla* to Anula?** Given that administering the *Dasasīla* is in the context of Homage to the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha, not to mention offerings that may have come with it, **this would also have been the date when the *Buddhapūjāva* sees the light of day**, with the Royal retinue being its first participants and beneficiaries, this despite the fact, as noted earlier, that ‘nowhere in all the details about Arhant Mahinda and the conversion of Tambapanni ... is there mention of a *Buddhapūjā*’⁶⁸. And then it may have been introduced to the masses following the *pavāraṇa*.

And if we were to now conjecture an actual revised time and date, it may have been **the morning of the first day of the bright half (*sukkapakkha* (Mv. xviii.7)) of the month of Assayuja (*vap* in Sinhala) (September-October), 247 BCE.**

This date has been arrived at on the basis that Mahārīṭṭha leaves (to fetch Sanghamittā) on the *second* day “of the bright half of the month of Assayuja” (op.cit., 7)⁶⁹. It is most likely that it was the morning when the

⁶⁸ See later re Mahanama’s silence (C.6).

⁶⁹ Again, as a rough indicator in 2012, the calculation would be as follows:

- Assayuja (*Vap*) Full Moon Aug. 31, 2012
- Mahārīṭṭha leaves on 2nd day of ‘Bright half’ of Assayuja Aug. 19, 2012
- Day before Mahārīṭṭha leaves Aug. 18, 2012.

So on this basis, the equivalent Launch Day this year would be Aug. 18, 2012.

King came to be “sitting in his own city with the Thera” (above), since it would allow a *dāna*, the only meal of the day, to be offered to the Theras.

We have noted that the *Buddhapūjāva* in all its comprehensiveness may not have been part of Arhant Mahinda’s tool box at the point of arrival. But if it is this earlier day that it comes to be introduced – a mere 42 days or so into Vassana, we may conjecture that he had already had the *doctrinal* framework (see Column 1 of Fig. 1) for it in his mind before he arrived. Indeed it has practically the same components as we find in the *Cūlahatthipadopama Sutta* which begins with *saddhā*, to be followed by *sīla*. Its last two components, *samādhi* ‘concentration’ and *paññā* ‘wisdom’, together fall under the 4th component of the *Buddhapūjāva*, namely *mokkha*⁷⁰. So, upon arrival, all that was needed was to fill in the details (last two columns), a task that could be accomplished by an erudite Arhant without much difficulty within 42 days.

C.6 Mahanama’s Silence

But why is the *Mahavamsa* author silent on *Buddhapūjā* in the context of the advent of Mahinda⁷¹, in particular in relation to the King being established in the Three Refuges and the context of Anula taking to the Ten TP’s, or the ordination itself? In the case of Anula – we will come to the King momentarily, was it some patriarchal Sangha bias perhaps, giving not much importance to a woman’s spiritual life that explains Mahanama’s silence, given that, as conjectured here, the ritual comes to be launched in relation to Anula?

This clearly doesn’t appear to be the case. For we have a detailed outline of events relating to Anula – being summoned by the King to be present at the first alms-giving to Arhant Mahinda and his retinue, to her asking for *pabbajjā*, to taking to the Ten Training Principles to donning the yellow robes to living in a nunnery, to listening to the Suttas delivered to the women of the royal household (Mv xiv.55-58), to receiving *pabbajjā* eventually from Sanghamittā (Mv xix. 65). We are even told of her spiritual attainments, from the “first stage of sanctification” (xiv. 58) to arhantship (xix. 65). Author Mahanama gives some mundane detail as well: “When the queen Anula had come with five hundred women and had bowed down and made offerings to the theras, she stepped to one

⁷⁰ It is possible that Mahinda would have benefited from father Aśoka’s attempts in establishing a Dharma Rajya ‘Just Society’ (see Sugunasiri, forthcoming, for a detailed treatment).

⁷¹ But, of course, as noted above (C.1) the term appears in the later context of Dutugaemunu.

side” (xiv. 57). So patriarchy can be ruled out as having had a hand in the omission of details relating to ‘taking to the *Dasasīla*’.

Perhaps Mahanama is saying nothing more of the *Dasasīla* (or *Pañcasīla*) context for the same reason that nothing more is said of the *pabbajjā*, the male ordination either, as e.g., at the point of Mahāriṭṭha receiving ordination, or the *upasampadā*. It needs be noted that there is no elaboration either when King Devanampiya-Tissa ‘came unto the (three) refuges’ (*saranesu patiṭṭhahi*) at the end of Mahinda’s first Discourse (see Mv xiv.23). So what then is that reason?

Both the *pabbajjā* for males or females (in the *Vinaya*), and the content that later comes to constitute *Dasasīla* for the laity, come, as noted, from the Canon, and were, *in situ*, well-known at the time of the writing the Mahavamsa (5th c. CE), eight centuries later. It was a *sine qua non* that it needed hardly be mentioned. To make a rather mundane analogy, when a child takes the first steps, the parents are likely to excitedly announce to neighbours, friends and relatives, “Johnny took his first steps today”. But when Sarah begins to run, the parents will say nothing of her beginning to walk. To extrapolate from the media as another analogy, not “all the news that’s fit to print”, ‘fit to print’ also meaning “only the news that are not repeats”.

Thus Mahanama can be said to be silent on the *Buddhapūjāva* in the context of Anula because it was, by his time, implicit in the context of taking to the *Dasasīla*. It was no longer news⁷²! But he mentions the *Dasasīla* since that was the news ‘fit to print’, so to speak. She was not only the first woman, but also the first one ever, male or female, to take to it, and it was the highest of the three.

Mahanama’s focus seems to have been the establishment of the Dispensation, and any details not directly relevant may well have been ignored. We know of at least one well-known development that finds no mention in the *Mahavamsa*, or indeed in any other Sinhala source, but well retained in the Chinese sources. And that is the momentous event of the Sinhala Bhikkhuni Devasāra taking the *pabbajjā* to China, accompanied by enough Bhikkhunis, to make up the complement required for a valid women’s ordination.

Be that as it may, his silence about the *Pañcasīla* and the *Buddhapūjāva* in the context of the King’s conversion may be explained

⁷² Of course, it is entirely possible that he was unaware that it was an innovation, and may even have assumed it to have been routine in India and was simply brought over, like the Tipitaka itself. This would hardly be surprising in a generally conservative tradition. Indeed the authorship of the ritual may not even have been of any concern to him, just as it is the case today.

by way of a yet different reason, namely, there being no such ritual at that time, both emerging, as we have sought to establish, a few months later.

Even though there may be no reference to *Pañcasīla* or the *Buddhapūjā* in the context of the King and Anula, it is, of course, not as if either one of them is unknown to Mahanama. There is the reference to *Pañcasīla* in relation to the first visit of the Tathagata to the island (see footnote 56). The single but clear reference to *Buddhapūjā* in the *Mahavamsa* has been noted above, in the context of King Dutugaemunu inviting the citizens with incense, flowers, etc., ‘in preparation for a *Buddhapūjā*’ (*buddhapūjāpayogena*).

D. Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva* as the Culmination of a Process

D.1 The Sociological Context

The historical record, as we have seen, shows no development of a formalized *Buddhapūjā* in an Indian context *even in the post-Mahindian era*, our enquiry extending up to the sixth century. The failure may perhaps be explained in terms of the historical time period. The main concern of the Sangha upon the Buddha’s *Parinibbāna* was the retention of the Dhamma in its purity, a concern that continues, as we can see from the three Councils, up to the time of Aśoka.

An associated preoccupation of the Sangha was the minimizing of the impact of schisms, if indeed they could not be totally avoided. There were enough members of the Sangha itself giving different interpretations of the Teachings. The threat of competing spiritual expressions (see e.g., *Brahmajāla Sutta*), and the associated ongoing debates, meant a focus not only on maintaining purity, but also on ensuring the maintenance of high standards pertaining to the Vinaya.

In the lay, social context, there would have been the conflicts arising within castes or social classes as more and more among Brahmins and Kshatriyas sought *pabbajjā* ordination. Not insignificant were the conflicts even within families, as e.g., we know from the case of Buddha’s benefactress Visakha, whose husband, and father Migara, were “firm adherents of naked ascetics”⁷³.

All this, then, meant a continuing emphasis on the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha, in the context of which cultivating a ‘Buddhist community’ may not have been in the plans of the Elders. Nor might there have been suitable conditions. While, of course, there were any number of

⁷³ See Obeyesekere, 2001:92 for her interesting story as it appears in a work in a Sinhala work of the 13th c., *Saddharmaratnāvalīya*.

individuals who continued to be attracted to the Teachings, from near and far, there may not have existed an identifiable, and cohesive, and solid lay ‘community’ of ‘Buddhists’, in any given part of India. Fahsien e.g., notes how Kapilavastu, “where stood the old palace of king Sudhodana”, is “a great scene of empty desolation” where “inhabitants are few and far between. On the roads people have to be on their guard against white elephants and lions, and should not travel incautiously” (Ch. XXII). Again, in the city of Kusinagara, “the inhabitants are few and far between, comprising only the families belonging to the (different) societies of monks.” (Ch. XXIV).

Even if any ‘solid’ lay communities did exist, there may not have been a Sangha leader who had any interest other than in the Canonical Teachings themselves. The Buddha’s words, “Be a lamp unto yourself” and his advice to “strive with diligence” might still have been the exclusive message in those early years when the Sangha saw their responsibility as explaining the Dhamma towards such an end, and not so much as towards forming strong Buddhist social entities.

However, despite the absence of a formalized *Buddhapūjā* as per above, it would be remiss not to grant that there could well have existed even in the pre-Mahindian Indian context many an *aspect* of what constitutes the *Buddhapūjā* in Sinhala Buddhism. There is, e.g., the concept of *anussati* (Sk. *anusmṛti* (as in Kinnard (op. cit.) above) fr. *anu* + *smṛti* (Pali *sati*)), literally, ‘remembrance’, ‘recollection’, ‘thinking of’ and / or ‘mindfulness’ (PED⁷⁴). This is in relation to the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha (as in *buddhānussati*, *dhammānussati*, *sanghānussati*), implying also as it does ‘reverence’ and ‘faith’, or even a sentiment such as ‘reflections on the Buddha...’⁷⁵. So is even the concept of receiving merit from an act of merit, as the Buddha tells Aggivessana⁷⁶. Of course, the

⁷⁴ It is also accessible on URL: <<http://dsal.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/philologic/getobject.pl?c.0:1:1197.pali>>

⁷⁵ A late list of subjects to be kept in mind comprises six *anussati-ñhānāni*, viz. *Buddha*, *Dhamma*, *Sangha*, *dāna*, *cāga*, *devatā* (D III.250, 280), expanded to ten subjects elsewhere: the above plus *āṇāpāna-sati*, *marāṇa-sati*, *kāyagatā-sati*, *upasamānussati* (A I.30, 42).

⁷⁶ As translated by Ñānamoli & Bodhi (1995, 331), the full quote is as follows:

“Master Gotama, may the merit and the great meritorious fruits of this act of giving be for the happiness of the givers [here meaning the Lichhavis who had given him food to be offered to the Buddha].”

“Whatever comes about from giving to a recipient such as yourself - one who is not free from lust, not free from hate, not free from delusion - that will be for the givers. And whatever comes about from giving to a

term *pūjā* itself is no stranger to the Canon, this in the sense of ‘honour’⁷⁷.

But we could also *retroject* the features identified in the Historical Record (Section B above) – Canonical and post-Canonical literature, observations of the Chinese pilgrims and the iconographic evidence. In addition to honouring the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha, we may recall the offering of alms, paying veneration at a thupa, offering of flowers, incense and lamps and chanting *paritta*, among others.

However, the focus, and emphasis, during these early centuries of Indian Buddhism appears to have been on the *pūjā* dimension in the literal sense of ‘honouring’ (as in *Buddha Pūjā* in the *Encyclopedia of Religion* entry (meaning 1 above)) and exclusively so. This focus on *pūjā* can be seen to be captured grammatically in a phrase like *buddhassa pūjā* ‘honour / offering to the Buddha’, as e.g., in the *namaskāraya*, opening homage (in the Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva* as elsewhere), i.e., *namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa. Buddhassa pūjā* is an adjectival phrase (noun turned adj + N), with the primary accent, in pronouncing it, falling on *pūjā* (the noun), the adjectival *buddhassa* ‘of the Buddha’ being implicit. But in the Sinhala compound morpheme *Buddhapūjāva*⁷⁸, by contrast, the primary accent may be seen as falling on ‘Buddha’⁷⁹.

The position of the accent, however, is no mere grammatical nicety. What the primary accent on ‘Buddha’ implies is that what is meant is not simply the persona of the Buddha, as in the literal meaning of honouring (or veneration or homage). It captures the whole gamut of what the Buddha

recipient such as myself - one who is free from lust, free from hate, free from delusion - that will be for you.”

“*yamidaṃ, bho gotama, dāne puññañca puññamahīca taṃ dāyakānaṃ sukhāya hoti ti.*”

“*yaṃ kho, aggivessana, tādisaṃ dakkhiṇeyyaṃ āgama avūtarāgaṃ avītaḍosaṃ avītamohaṃ, taṃ dāyakānaṃ bhavissati. yaṃ kho, aggivessana, mādisaṃ dakkhiṇeyyaṃ āgama vūtarāgaṃ vītaḍosaṃ vītamohaṃ, taṃ tuyhaṃ bhavissati ti.*” (*Cūlasaccaka sutta*, M 35).

I thank Bryan Levman for this reference.

⁷⁷ This is as e.g., in relation ‘to other families’ (*parakulesu*) (*Dhammapada* 73). *Pūjaye* and *pūjanā*, derivatives of *pūjā*, come to be used in the same sense of ‘honor, reverence, devotion’, too (*Dhammapada*, 106-7). Further, “The Samyutta, the Anguttara and the Khuddaka Nikayas of the Pali canon refer to the different derivatives of the word *puja* such as *pujita*, *pujaniya*.” (Saibaba, 2005).

⁷⁸ It may be noted, however, that in Sinhala, it makes no semantic difference whether the two words are written together or separately, but the emphasis on ‘buddha’ is not lost on either graphemic manifestation.

⁷⁹ ‘Accent’ is not a semantic feature in Sinhala. Its use here is for the benefit of the English reader. However, emphasis does play a role in Sinhala.

stands for, and his Teachings in their comprehensiveness, as captured in *saddhā* ‘faith’, *sīla*, ‘(self-)discipline’, *attha-cariyā* ‘social good’ and *mokkha*, ‘Liberation’ as in the *Buddhapūjāva* (see Fig. 1).

The focus on the *pūjā* dimension in early Buddhism can be said to fall under the first of the four dimensions of the *Buddhapūjāva*, namely, *saddhā*. Thus it comes to be only a fragment of the *Buddhapūjāva* of Sinhala Buddhism in which *sīla* comes to occupy a position of centrality. This is, as e.g., in the Noble Eightfold Path, with *sīla* leading the way in the tri-fold division, to be followed by *samādhi* and *paññā*. Both ‘liberation’ and the ‘social good’ also come to be based in *sīla*.

If in early Buddhism the emphasis was still on retaining the purity of the Dhamma, and *pūjā*, the goal encouraged for the devotees as for disciples remained the ‘path to liberation’ (*mokkha magga*). But with King Aśoka we see a second emphasis, the *sagga magga* ‘path to heaven’ (see next para), to be understood as life on earth or the realm to be born into after death. This is to be lived through the *application* of the Teachings towards behavioural change, i.e., orthopraxis, individually as well as collectively, that would be good for both self and the other (*atta-hita para-hita*), as is the ideal advocated by the Buddha (D. III. 233).

One of his edicts, e.g., bears testimony to this. In RE XIII, characterized as “the most moving document of any dynastic history” (van Buitenan, 1977, cited in Guruge, 1993, p. 161), Aśoka’s directive to his progeny (as to everyone else in other inscriptions), runs as follows: “Conquest by righteousness is for both this world and the next” (*yo dhramavijayo so hidalokiko paralokiko*) (165). Indeed, recommending to “both the elite and [the] commonfolk” the continuation of their effort (*pakama*) towards a righteous life, he postulates “the attainment of great heaven as the goal” (*vipule svage ārādheta*). Encouraging his subjects, in more than one inscription, to direct their energies towards inculcating ‘virtuous qualities’ (*dhammaguṇa*), they come to be listed as (as e.g., in MRE II),

- “obeying mother and father”, and “elders”;
- Being “steadfast towards living beings”;
- “Adher[ing] to the truth”;
- “Teacher should be honoured by the pupil”;
- “Proper behaviour towards relatives”

(Guruge, 1993, 167)⁸⁰.

While “Aśoka felt that he had succeeded in bringing about a moral

⁸⁰ Even though these values were not uncommon in the Indian culture, there is no question that they are very much contained in the Buddha’s Teachings, too, dots 1, 4 and 5 clearly attributable to the Sigalovada Sutta.

regeneration among the people” (Guruge, 1993, 167), still lacking was a ready-made, and handy, instrument that the Buddhist citizenry could carry in one’s shirt pocket, so to speak. And it was this niche, then, that Arhant Mahinda, arriving in Sri Lanka, could be said to have filled. This could well have been in Mahinda’s mind, the context of the new milieu in Sri Lanka serving as the trigger under which the *Buddhapūjāva* would have emerged.

And the conditions were right, too -- a single solid community under a single ruler, a supportive royalty, an equally enthusiastic public, the possible presence of Buddhism itself (Adikaram, 1994, 46)⁸¹ (even if by individual practitioners), the absence of any widespread or deeply rooted spiritual system in competition⁸², and a good role model in the person and persona of Arhant Mahinda in terms of both spiritual and praxic leadership⁸³. Here, then, he can be said to have found a splendid opportunity to build ground up, to get those who had newly embraced the Teaching on the *sagga magga* - a path to heaven, without undermining the *mokkha magga* ‘path to liberation’.

If father Aśoka sought to inculcate virtues through royal edict⁸⁴, Arhant Mahinda could be said to have attempted it through an internalization at the hands of individuals themselves, in a good fit with the Buddha’s last words, ‘Strive with diligence’. This approach could be characterized as an attempt at a ‘self-discipline’ over a ‘decreed discipline’. It surely is of

⁸¹ Commenting on the tradition of the Buddha visiting Lanka, Adikaram (ibid.) notes that it “may probably have arisen from the arrival, before the advent of Mahinda, of some Buddhist missionaries from India and also from the existence in Ceylon of a considerable number of Buddhists among the earlier inhabitants, namely, the Yakkhas and Nagas”. It is also pointed out that “long before Mahinda’s day, there were at least a few Buddhist monks in Ceylon”.

⁸² Offering “a general idea of the pre-Buddhist religious beliefs in Ceylon”, Adikaram (1994, 43) notes, “the religions practiced by the inhabitants were mainly Brahminism – if we may use this inclusive though somewhat inaccurate term, worship of Yaksas and tree-deities, Jainism and a few other cults. It is, however, likely that the new colonists could not devote themselves much to religious pursuits as their time must have been fully occupied in making habitable and improving their newly acquired territory...”.

⁸³ Can we fail to see that Arhant Mahinda was no mere holy person, but an animated provocateur and main actor in a high spiritual drama?

⁸⁴ The possibility of Mahinda’s hand behind the Edicts should not be ruled out. Even if this were not the case, there is little doubt about his involvement in furthering the King’s intent. And as a district ruler, he may have had enough experience insighting what would and wouldn’t work when it came to providing leadership to the masses, particularly in the area of spirituality.

symbolic importance that Mahinda, arriving by air (presumably using the *iddhibala*), lands on the *sīlakūṭa* ‘sila peak’ of the Mihintale mountain (Mv XIII.20), *sīla*, of course, meaning ‘discipline’. The kind of citizen Mahinda would have wanted to see emerge in the land of his father’s esteemed friend interestingly is perhaps well exemplified by Fa-hsien himself in relation to a Buddhist monk:

On one occasion he was cutting rice with a score or two of his fellow-disciples, when some hungry thieves came upon them to take away their grain by force. The other Sramaneras all fled, but our young hero stood his ground, and said to the thieves, “If you must have the grain, take what you please. But, Sirs, it was your former neglect of charity which brought you to your present state of destitution; and now, again, you wish to rob others. I am afraid that in the coming ages you will have still greater poverty and distress; I am sorry for you beforehand.” With these words he followed his companions into the monastery, while the thieves left the grain and went away, all the monks, of whom there were several hundred, doing homage to his conduct and courage.
(in Legge’s ‘1 Introduction’, para 4⁸⁵).

We may, then, conclude this overview by saying that the Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva* is emblematic of a *culmination of a process* that had roots in India. There may have been in the India of the three centuries between the Buddha and Arhant Mahinda, the many strands of what have eventually come to constitute the Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva*. But the innovative genius of the Arhant Mahinda can be said to lie in coming up with the *Buddhapūjāva*, bringing the historical strands together in a creative way and in a particular relationship between and among the parts, as a handy spiritual tool for the pragmatic use by the people of Tambapanni.

⁸⁵ <<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/2124/2124-h/2124-h.htm>>

The fact that the single politico-spiritual kingdom that Aśoka sought to develop came to be disintegrated within a short period after his death can be said to be indicative of some foresight on the part of Mahinda in thinking up a better strategy.

The other-caring attitude can be said to extend to the natural world as well reflected in the counsel given by Arhant Mahinda to King Devanampiyatissa:

O great king, the birds of the air and the beasts have as equal a right to live and move about in any part of this land as thou. The land belongs to the people and thou art only the guardian of it.

This, of course, only confirms that everything is conditioned, as in the Buddha's Principle of Conditioned Co-origination (*paticcasamuppāda*). But once there comes to be 'something', resulting from the many things (conditions) that were once disparate, it is no longer simply many things just hanging loose on a string, but a cohesive composite. Bricks and mortar and wood go to make a house, but a house is not simply some bricks and mortar and wood sitting around. *Buddhapūjāva* in Sinhala Buddhism can then said to be such a house, composite and well-built (see again Sugunasiri, forthcoming, for its sophisticated structure).

D.2 The Textual Context

Thus far, the case for a Sri Lankan origin and a Mahindian hand in the *Buddhapūjāva* has been made on the basis of internal evidence. But the Canonical and the post-Canonical literature encountered above seems to provide some external evidence, too.

First, let us consider the fact that the term *buddhapūjā* and its variants all occur in texts that are post-Mahindian. These texts are also most likely of Lankan origin. Notes Rahula (1966, xxv):

The Sinhalese commentaries did not remain static in the same form; they began in the 3rd c. BC, but kept on growing and accumulating new material as they passed through the centuries. ... The newly added material was, naturally enough, drawn from local incidents and social and religious life of the people of the Island. ..

But since they all come to be committed to writing by the 1st c. BCE, these texts seem to point to the *time period* of the origin of the formalized ceremony as under discussion, namely the period between the 3rd and the 1st c. BCE.

Certain references in such texts seem to provide evidence for the presence of the ceremony by that time. There is, e.g., the intriguing reference to a *buddhapūjā* that comes to be performed for the sake of a dying person, by the relatives: 'Following death, these relatives will have a *buddhapūjā* performed, sir, for your sake. Be happy in [your] mind.' (*aparassa maraṇasamaye ñātakā ayam, tāta, tavatthāya buddhapūjā karīyati, cittaṃ pasādehi* (Vibha. a. 227), the same line, as noted, appearing in the Visuddhimagga. Mention is also made in this connection to items such as, e.g., flowers, flags, incense, sweet drinks, musical instruments, etc., and listening to the Dhamma, these identified in relation to the senses.

What is interesting in this example is that the practice of having a *buddhapūjāva* done – in full or in part, for the benefit of a dying (or ill) relative is so much of the practice in contemporary Sinhala Buddhist homes. This would be either for the patient to listen to, or even perhaps to touch the offerings prior to being placed on an altar. And, of course, it is done by ‘relatives’ as in the post-Canonical reference above, and the patient would invariably have been told that it is ‘for your sake’.

In the grammatical treatise⁸⁶ *Saddanītippakaraṇa*, the author writes a *gāthā* (*gāthāracaṇā*) to explain their meaning (*tesamatthānam sādhiḱā*):

imāya buddhapūjāya, bhavantu sukhitā pajā
bhave’hañca sukhappatto, sāmacco saha nātibhi.

‘By this offering, may the community be well. May I, too, be of happy countenance, as well as friends, along with relatives.’

Again, the transference of merit, following Homage to Buddha and the Training Principles, is an essential component of the Sinhala *buddhapūjāva* even today (see Fig. 1, 3.1).

‘May all beings benefit from / rejoice in (*anumodantu*) the merits thus accrued by us’⁸⁷.

Likewise the benefit to both self and others (see 3.1 to 3.4 in Fig. 1). This is clear in another line in the Sinhala ceremony, where, as noted, the ‘*devā nāgā mahiddhikā*’ are invoked to protect the ‘Teaching, Dispensation, me and others’ (*desanaṃ sāsanaṃ maṃ paraṃ*), having benefited from the Merits (*puññantaṃ anumoditvā*)⁸⁸.

Of course, the Grammarian is not talking about the *buddhapūjāva* per se as a ceremony, but simply making a grammatical point. However, it is apparent that he is drawing upon a contemporary practice, drawing

⁸⁶ *Anyā byākaraṇa ganthasaṃgaho saddanītippakaraṇaṃ (padamālā) 3. Pakiṇṇakavinicchaya.*

⁸⁷ In full it reads:

ettāvatāca amhehi, sambhatam puñña sampadam
sabbe sattā anumodantu sabba sampatti siddhiyā
(see Sugunasiri, forthcoming for this, and the next fn.)

⁸⁸ In full it reads,

ākāsatthāca bhummaṭṭhā, devā nāgā mahiddhikā
puññantaṃ anumoditvā ciraṃ rakkhantu desanaṃ
sāsanaṃ maṃ paraṃ tī.

upon a sentiment of bringing good health (*sukhappatto*), benefiting from merit, to the community (*pajā*), ‘me, too’ (*bhave’hañca*), and friends and relatives (*sāmacco saha nātibhi*).

In the *Jātakatṭhakathā*, King Kosala’s wife seeks to ‘listen to the Dhamma, do a *buddhapūjā* and offer alms’. Interestingly, this sounds very much like what a devotee might do in a temple setting even today, participating in a morning activity, particularly on an Uposatha day. If the day begins with a Dhamma discourse, by a resident (or visiting) Sangha member, both the Sangha and the lay community next coming together to do a homage to the Buddha, which entails the totality of the *buddhapūjāva* as in i to xiii in C2 (above). This is then followed by an offering of alms to the Sangha, and the ‘Eight TP Observants’ (*uposathika*)⁸⁹.

The only Canonical occurrence in the *Apadāna* (see above) also seems to provide some external evidence when we note that Asanabodhiya, talking about a tree, is not talking about a ‘*bodhipūjā*’, veneration to the Bodhi Tree that has come to gain a contemporary high profile⁹⁰, but the *Buddhapūjāva* itself of which the *Bodhipūjā* is very much part of.

The *buddhapūjā* and its variants as in these contexts, and other texts discussed above – *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*, *Jātakatṭhakathā*, *Theraṭṭhakathā*, *Visuddhimagga*, *Visuddhimagga mahāṭikā*, *Paramatthadīpanī*; *Milindapanha*, *Kaccānabyākaraṇaṃ* and *Saddanītipakaraṇaṃ*, *Nidānakathā* of the *Pañcappakaraṇa aṭṭhakathā* of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*, etc., may then well be the actual Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva*, newly minted and apparently still fresh in the Buddhist milieu and in the minds of the Commentators and the scribes. Again, a third c. BCE origin for the ceremony thus seems to be within the range of distinct possibility.

This early timing may also explain why *Buddhapūjā* finds no mention in the account of Fa-hsien (fifth century), even in the context of “*sinhala island*”. The ceremony can be said to have come to be so ordinary by that time, and such a regular event, that it did not call for special mention. It was everywhere! The same was noted in relation to the silence of Mahanama in the *Mahavamsa* as well, when it does not find mention in the description of events relating to the introduction of the Buddhaddhamma itself.

This may, then, be seen as some textual evidence that corroborates the evidence as to the origin of the *buddhapūjāva* as indeed the work of

⁸⁹ The alms offering ends with the participating devotees themselves partaking of the meal.

⁹⁰ See Gombrich & Obeyesekere (1988, 384-410) for a detailed description of a more recent manifestation of it.

Mahinda in the 3rd c. BCE.

However, to repeat, this need not suggest that the entirety of the *Buddhapūjāva* exactly as we have it today was minted in all its details at that point in time. E.g., the ritual entails homage to the Bodhi Tree. While at this point in time, the branch of the tree had not yet arrived, there was the original tree in India. So it is reasonable to think that the homage to the Bodhi tree would have been part of the original *Buddhapūjāva*. But the ritual also entails homage to the cetiya. Clearly at this point in time, the cetiya had not emerged even in India, the earliest Bharhut Stupa being of the 2nd C. BC., even though the idea of relics already occurs in the *Mahaparinibbana Sutta* itself. So it is possible that the homage to the cetiyas “standing everywhere” (*sabbathānesupatiṭṭhitam*) (as in the Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva*) would most likely have been added later. Within any given temple precincts today, as it was already by the fifteenth c. (as e.g., in the *Maha Saman Devalaya Sannasa*, cited in Ilangasingha, 1992:223), the devotee pays homage at three different locations, called ‘*tumbodhi*’ or in Sinhala, ‘*tunbo*’, the third, in addition to the Bodhi tree and the cetiya, being the ‘image house’ (*buduge*). Clearly there was no image house at the point of Mahinda’s introduction either, the earliest images in India again, as noted, being post-Mahindian. However, homage to parents at the end of the ritual might well have been part of the original *Buddhapūjāva*, respect for parents being of Canonical origin. The Sinhala wording in the *Buddhapūjāva* (see C.3 for examples) is the most likely to have undergone change, Prakrit Sinhala of ancient times giving way to contemporary usage of a given later period.

So, just as the Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva* was, as noted, a culmination of a process in relation to India, it should hardly be surprising that the process would continue. However, what needs to be noted is that all such additions occurred within the broad framework provided for by Arhant Mahinda as postulated in Fig. 1 above.

E. Some Methodological Concluding Remarks

E.1 Etic *Buddha Pūjā* and Emic *Buddha Pūjā*: a Theoretical Detour

In our discussion above, we have come to make a distinction between *Buddhapūjāva* and *Buddha Pūjā*, though both with the intent of “honouring the Buddha”. To establish the distinction firmly, we take a theoretical detour, introducing a binary division, **Emic *Buddha Pūjā*** and **Etic *Buddha Pūjā***⁹¹.

⁹¹ This discussion is drawn upon Anthropology, as introduced by Kenneth Pike

Given that the ‘emic / etic’ distinction has its origins in Linguistics⁹², we can begin by noting that a given language is systematic, following certain rules of order and hierarchy, and with specific meanings (as arrived at tacitly), in the context of a given population⁹³. A language is comprehensive, meaning that it allows for the expression of whatever idea a speaker wishes to express (borrowing, if necessary, from another language, but nativising it).

It is in this same sense, then, that the Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva* (-va being the marker) qualifies as an *Emic Buddha Pūjā*. As noted, it is comprehensive, and meets the spiritual needs of the devotees, in a systematic way, beginning with *saddhā*, followed by *sīla* followed by *attha-cariyā* before being invited to the realm of *mokkha*. In terms of

(1954) and supported by Marvin Harris (see Lett, <http://faculty.irs.edu/>... for a discussion), itself is drawn on Linguistics (the earliest linguist being Panini (see Cardona, 1988, for a study)). In relation to a language, *phonetic* sounds constitute a range universally available to human beings (as e.g., shown in the IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) (see Gleason, 1955, 254)) while *phonemic* sounds are specific to a given language constituted of phonemes specific to the language.

⁹² “In contrast to the *etic* approach, an *emic* one is in essence valid for only one language (or one culture) at a time; it is an attempt to discover and to describe the pattern of that particular language or culture in reference to the way in which the various elements of that culture are related to each other in the functioning of that particular pattern, rather than an attempt to describe them in reference to a general classification derived in advance of the study of that particular culture.” (Pike, 1954. i. ii. 8/1).

⁹³ For the benefit of scholars of Religion who may not be familiar with the theoretical domain of Linguistics, we revisit, with apologies, some relevant basic concepts of Linguistics, which the knowledgeable scholar may dispense with. A phoneme (from which -eme is extracted, and of which Emic is an extension), is defined as ‘a minimum meaningful unit of sound’, and is identifiable only in a specific linguistic context following definite rules. Thus e.g., the aspirate alveolar sound -th- comes to be identified as a phoneme in Pali., because its presence gives the particular meaning of the word. The ‘minimal pair’ *atta* ‘soul’ and *attha* ‘meaning’ would be an example. The ‘rule’ at the phonemic level in this context is that -th in *attha* cannot precede -t (for etymological reasons, -t being a replacement for Sanskrit -r, as in *artha.*), and never vice versa. Likewise, taking *atthacariya* (see Fig. 1) at the next, morphemic, level, *cariya* cannot, for semantic reasons, precede *attha*. (It can’t be *‘*cariya-attha*’, the asterisk indicating ‘does not occur’). Similarly at the syntactic level. In *namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa*, e.g., *namo* ‘homage’ (implying the longer form *namassāmi* ‘I pay homage’), the ‘subject’ precedes *tassa*, *sammāsambuddhassa* (in the dative), etc., the ‘object’.

intent, and strategy, it first helps prepare the mind of the devotee by evoking faith and confidence in the Buddha, helping her to be initiated into a self-discipline. It is this mindset, then, that is intended to help the devotee to look for mundane benefits (such as e.g., seeking protection for oneself as well as others (see Fig 1 for details)). Then only, on the basis of merits accrued and the mind purified, that the devotee is directed towards liberation.

Recalling that phonemes find meaning in the context of a specific community of speakers, *Buddhapūjāva* can be said to find its ‘meaning’ (and purpose) also in the context of the given population (Sinhala). Despite the fact that the language of the ceremony is Pali, the devotee gets a sense of the meaning, particularly since the homage includes, in addition to ‘oral communication’ (*vacī viññatti*), ‘body communication’ (*kāya viññatti*)⁹⁴ - change of hand position (as e.g., palms at the chest for homage, palms on the lap in transferring merit), and postures (sitting up or falling prostrate ‘establishing a five-point contact’ (*pasaṅga pihituvā*)).

As an example of detail in the ordering of items within a given section, *saddhā*, homage to the *tiratana* (i.e., Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha) cannot precede the *namaskāraya* ‘Homage to the Buddha’, given that there would be no *tiratana* if not for the Buddha.

So we may then define an *Emic Buddha Pūjā* as ‘a systematized participatory activity in the context of a given community of Buddhists with the specific intent of ‘honouring the Buddha’. *Buddhapūjāva* in Sinhala Buddhism (written as a single morpheme), then, constituted of the four elements of *saddhā*, *sīla*, *atthacariya* and *mokkha*, can be said to be an example, a case study, of an *Emic Buddha Pūjā*.

By contrast, an *Etic Buddha pūjā* would be literally any practice that is intended to honour the Buddha. As retrojected from our historical records, e.g., we have seen that several of the practices in the *Sinhala Buddhapūjāva* were present in early India, including the Buddha’s time. But there was nothing like a *systematized* ritual, at the level of complexity as we have seen, in the context of a given community. It is in this sense, then, we may call those individual, multiple or collective rituals of that early India as examples of an *Etic Buddha Pūjā*. This is in the sense as defined by Kinnard (op. cit) above: “... a ritual that typically involves making some sort of offering to a Buddha image (or a relic or stupa), such as a flower, a small lamp, food, or even money”. The casual, unsystematic nature of all such *Etic* varieties is well captured in the words “some sort of”. These were an eclectic series of devotional practices, not necessarily

⁹⁴ *kāya viññatti* can be said to be expanded into proxemics, kinesics and oculusics in modern linguistic theory (see Gleason, 1961).

in relation to any particular given community but as an available universal wellspring, to be appropriated, or adopted, by any individual or group or community, once or any number of times.

Such an Etic *Buddha Pūjā* may appear even in contexts outside of a religious ritual, even though the intent remains the same - 'honouring the Buddha'. A case in point is the Tovil, an exorcistic dance ceremony of Sri Lanka (see Kapferer, 1991, for a study)⁹⁵. While the ceremony is to expel evil forces afflicting a sick person, this in Sinhala Buddhism having nothing to do with 'religion', just about each segment of the Tovil begins with homage to the Buddha. E.g., notes Sauris Silva⁹⁶ (1970, 12), the exorcist, taking some *dummala* powder in hand (to be thrown at the 'hand-torches' (*pandama*) in the other hand), "first pays homage to the Buddha", with the words, "*buddho pūja saraṇānaṃ*"⁹⁷.

Returning to the distinction between the emic and the etic *Buddha Pūjā*, we now seek to capture the discussion thus far in chart form:

⁹⁵ "The Sinhalese exorcism rituals are perhaps the most complex and the most magnificent in performance still extant. ... the techniques of healing in Sri Lanka and the aesthetics of this healing cannot be reduced to Western psychoanalytic or psychotherapeutic terms, and develops new and original approaches to ritual and the aesthetic in general." Publisher blurb (<http://www.bergpublishers.com/?tabid=1692>).

⁹⁶ He is the pioneer who committed to writing the oral tradition of Tovil (personal knowledge). See Silva, 1966; 1970.

⁹⁷ Of course, for the folk healer, it little matters that the grammar may not be all that accurate!

DETAIL	a1 Fa-hsien	a2 I-Tsing	a3 Plate 25 Maya's Dream	a4 Pl 32 Vidudabha visit	b Sinhala <i>Buddha- pūjāva</i>
SADDHĀ					
• Triple Gem	+	+	-	-	+
• Recalling Buddha's virtues	+	+	-	-	+
• Flowers	+	+	-	+	+
• Incense	+	+	-	-	+
• Lamp	+	+	-	-	+
• 'Other services'	+	-	-	-	+
• Folded palms	-	?	+	+	+
• Kneeling	-	+	+	+	+
SILA					
• <i>Pañcasīla</i> '5 Training Principles'	+	+	-	-	+
ATTHA-CARIYA	-	-	-	-	+
MOKKHA	-	-	-	-	+

Fig. 3: Selected *Etic* Items of Homage as Systematized under the *Emic* Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva*

This chart shows the presence (+) or absence (-) of selected items (Col. 1), under each of *Etic* (a1 to a 4) and *Emic* categories, drawn upon the four sources discussed above - *Fa-hsien*, *I-Tsing*, *Maya's Dream* (Plate 25) and *King Vidudabha's visit to the Buddha* (Pate 32). They are shown in relation to the different 'intents' – *saddhā*, *sīla*, *atthacariya*, *mokkha*, to use the categories of the framework of the Sinhala *Buddhapūjāva*. Though admittedly selective, and limited, each of the items can be said to represent instances of an *Etic Buddha Pūjā*, individual communities picking and choosing from among them, perhaps with overlap, but with no necessary consistency. In the *Emic Buddhapūjāva* (Col. b), by contrast,

all are part of a cohesive practice, in a particular order, with a particular intent, in relation to a particular community, the meaning understood by the given community.

This characterization suggests that over time, there may have perhaps emerged many an Emic *Buddha Pūjā*. In the context of 6th c. India, e.g., judging by the detailed descriptions of I-Tsing (B.4), the Mahakala cult could have been an integral part of one such. Another Emic *Buddha Pūjā* may seem to be in the Tibetan context which entails, as e.g., 10,000 bow downs, and includes the cult of Tara. These examples are intended to suggest that any particular formalized ritual, with the intent of Homage of the Buddha, in the context of any given cultural community – Chinese, Japanese, Thai, Western, etc., or sub-community, would qualify as an Emic *Buddha Pūjā*. Indeed it may have a specific cultural name, such as *nembutsu* ‘bathing of the Baby Buddha’ or repeated chanting of ‘*amitafo*’ (Chinese) or ‘*namo amidabutsu*’ (Japanese) as the visible marker.

E.2 Methodology Overview

It was with some frustration⁹⁸ that we set out on this phase of the research that has resulted in this paper. A close scrutiny of the text of the *Buddhapūjāva* I had completed earlier (see Sugunasiri, forthcoming) showed it to be a sophisticated instrument (see Fig. 1), rich and extensive. So how is it that the authorship of such a widespread practice as the *Buddhapūjāva* could be unknown?

I started out with two related hunches. One was that the *Buddhapūjāva* is of some antiquity, this based on both my experience as a practitioner since my childhood in the context of Sri Lanka, as well my observations in Canada, in my Buddhist Community leadership role⁹⁹. And two, that it must be of Sri Lankan origin, although with nary a clue as to what that origin might be.

However, my beginning source of enquiry was the Canon, given its imprint all over the ritual as I had come to see in my analysis. But it was not a comprehensive study of the Canon in relation to every single item in the ritual. Rather it was a limited one, checking to see if the term *Buddha*

⁹⁸ We had made some informal enquiries as to the authorship of the *Buddhapūjāva*, from many a Pali and Buddhist scholar, both lay and ordained, in Sri Lanka and overseas but to no avail.

⁹⁹ This was on the basis of an informal sense I had, having never encountered anything as comprehensive and rich in any other tradition, as I had come to know in my 30 years of community leadership in the context of Canada (see Hori & McLellan, 2010, for a study).

Pūjā, as one or two words, occurred in it. I was to find no evidence of it.

So I wondered, if it is post-Canonical, is it, then, of Indian origin, given that the (Sinhala) *Buddha Pūjāva* is in Pali? But we saw no suitable conditions for a ritual like it to emerge in an Indian context.

One of the main reasons may be that, in Brahmanical India, there appears to have been no given single cohesive community who was seeking to soak in the Saddhamma. We have a story like that of Buddha's disciple *Puṇṇa* converting a large number of people in his hometown of *Sunāparanta* (S IV.63), a "morally backward country, notorious for its wicked people". But there is no evidence that there was to be a continued enthusiasm, even though the Buddha himself was to visit it later. Needless to say, in the community would have been as well people of the several other faiths alive and kicking in the time of the Buddha.

Of course, there were many individuals who had sought out the Buddha – like Angulimala, Patacara, Ambapali and others. And there were many Kings, too. But, the Buddha being an 'itinerant bhikkhu', traveling from place to place, there was no well-established single community in a given locale where all members were united in seeking out the Buddha. Not even at Savatthi where the Buddha spent the last 26 years of his life can this said to have happened, because India of the Buddha's time was fertile soil for a diversity of spiritual expression. Not only were there the eighteen Teachers of the Samana persuasion (D I), there was also the dominant Brahmanism, each again with its own branches – as e.g., Digambara and Svetambara within Jainism (Samana) and Vaishnavism and Saivism within Brahmanism, etc. The outcome of the presence of differential spiritual teachings was that within a given community, there would have been followers of any number of gurus.

Buddha's challenge in his lifetime was primarily to establish his Teachings as being both distinct from all others, and as making more sense. Thus we find him engaged in many a dialogue with any number of spiritual seekers who either sought to outsmart him or try to sort out in their heads the many claims being made by the different gurus. So we find him explaining his Teachings again and again, in many a varied form, depending on the audience. Again, rituals were not to be part of his Teachings either, his exercise being to bring to the people the discoveries he had made relating to reality in terms of Truths (as e.g., Four Noble Truths). Rituals, entailing a belief system, would not find a comfortable place in his chosen agenda.

So for reasons such as the above, the Buddha can be said to have not been so much into 'community building'. The only conscious community building he was engaged in, of course, was establishing the Sangha as a well-disciplined body worthy of respect. And so a good part of his life was

also spent on this task.

If this explains why the *Buddha Pūjāva* did not originate in the time of the Buddha, the period following provided no better conditions. While now the Sangha continued with the work of the Buddha, namely the teaching of the Dhamma, there were beginning to be internal dissension in the interpretation of his Teachings. This was exacerbated by the inroads made by Brahmanism, sort of fighting back to regain ground lost to Buddhism. The result again was the absence of any given solid community that was united in seeking out the Saddhamma.

This is not to say that the sensibilities relating to the *Buddha Pūjāva* may not have been present in a sentiment such as 'Reflections on the Buddha' (*Buddhānussati*). Even if a rudimentary form of *Buddha Pūjā* may have existed (as we have seen), the *Buddha Pūjāva* as in practice among Sinhala Buddhists of Sri Lanka did not, then, seem to be present in the context of India.

Turning our eyes back to Sri Lanka, then, the next source we were to search was the archeological in relation to Sri Lanka (see under C.1 for some details). Again, no light was to be shed.

Frustrated again, my next source was the Mahavamsa, the 'Great Chronicle'. But again, a standard literary reading of it, in English (Geiger's translation), gave no clues.

Continuing, however, in the thought that the origin of the ritual must be in Lanka, I continued to look for a heightened period of religious renaissance that might have given rise to it.

Working backwards, then, from the end of the Anuradhapura period (11th c.) to which belonged the paleographic sources examined by me, the highest point of religious activity could be said to be the time of Buddhaghosa (5th c. ACE), when the Commentarial works in Sinhala came to be translated into Pali. The next was the time of the writing of the Tipitaka (1st c. BCE) (see for details above C.1).

Still finding no external clues as to authorship or origin in any of the sources examined, it was then that it dawned upon me to abandon the standard research paradigm – of seeking external evidence, and to explore if any internal evidence would be found.

The sophisticated nature of the Sinhala Buddhist ceremony had told me that it could not have emerged haphazardly or unintentionally (see C.2). What I suspected was an active hand behind it. So just whose hand could it be? This was the question that led to the breakthrough (see C.3) that nudged us towards the hypothesis of an authorship by Arhant Mahinda.

But this was still at a logical level. Unorthodox as the method may have been, it was still theoretical. Having now come to the tentative determination of the authorship, arrived at internally, it was my next

attempt to look again for any possible external validation.

It was in this context that I was next directed to look again at a wider Indian scene – Canonical, Post-Canonical literature, Art History and Travels of the Chinese Pilgrims (B.1 to B.4).

But finding no evidence again, I was to return to the Sri Lankan scene again, this time reading the Mahavamsa in consultation with the Pali original. Were there any hidden clues that were missed?

And it was to my pleasant surprise, then, that I would find that indeed there was at least one clue that I had missed, as a result of reading the text only in English translation. And this was an actual occurrence of the term *Buddhapūjā*, this in the context of Dutugaemunu.

It had been there all along for all to see. Yet my reading eyes had not been critical, exploratory or intuitive enough, to see it. “Beauty lies in the eye of the beholder”, has it not been said?¹⁰⁰ It is, then, this re-reading, with a particular hypothesis in mind, that helped dig out the evidence. While it came out painstakingly, the steps would pan out as follows:

1. Even though the term *Buddhapūjā* had not occurred in the Mv description in relation to the introduction of Buddhism by Mahinda (Chap. xiv), the single but clear reference to it – *buddhapūjāpayogena* (Mv xxix.16) ‘in preparation for a *Buddhapūjā*’.¹⁰¹ in the context of King Dutugaemunu (101 -77 BCE.) having the ‘Great Thupa’ built unequivocally established the presence of the ritual by the second c. BCE¹⁰². This being a mere century and a half after the arrival of Mahinda (as noted above, 247 BCE (Mv xiii.18))¹⁰³, the

¹⁰⁰ In an extended sense, this view reminds us as well of the Buddha’s analysis of perception, which requires not only an object but a ‘working eye’. In this case, while my eye was working alright in the ordinary sense, it was not ‘working’ at a critical, deeper level. So it is that the ‘object’ – the information that would eventually come to be gleaned out, was, in a sense, ‘not available’ either. It is intriguing in this context to note that indeed this can be said in relation to any discovery, including the Buddha’s. Before the night of Enlightenment, the Four Noble Truths were obviously ‘there’, but his mind’s eyes had not seen it. Hence he calls his Enlightenment experience a ‘discovery’.

¹⁰¹ Geiger’s translation here, “to the end that a festival may be held for the Buddha” was not helpful.

¹⁰² It was towards the very end of our research, it may be noted, that this single occurrence came to find its full significance.

¹⁰³ This seems to confirm our explanation why Mahanama makes no mention of the *buddhapūjā* in connection with the introduction of Buddhism. By the 5th c. CE, it was so widespread in Sinhala society that it attracted no particular attention.

window of opportunity for the emergence of the sophisticated instrument now came to be narrowed. This immediately took us back to the most heightened period of spirituality prior to the period, namely the very point of introduction of Buddhism.

2. According to that account, King Devanampiya Tissa comes by the *Three Refuges* (xiv.23) after the very first Sermon by Mahinda. But there is no mention of the Five Training Principles (*pañcasīla*), the standard practice today of one coming to conversion, and also a key ingredient of the *Buddhapūjāva*. Yet, three months later, Queen Anula comes to take to the Ten Training Principles (*Dasasīla*).
3. A closer scrutiny of the *Dasasīla* led to the finding that there is no such thing in the Canon, the exploration leading to a similar finding in relation to both the *Pañca-* and the *Aṭṭhangikasīla*.
4. This triggered the question in my mind whether they might all have been then newly minted, explaining as well why there was no mention of the the *Pañcasīla* being administered to the King¹⁰⁴.
5. This then provided us with some credence as to the possibility of the hand of Mahinda, which our earlier study had determined to be versatile, erudite and pragmatic. The *Buddhapūjāva* being an initiative of Mahinda now gained more credibility, given that each of the *sīla* trio finds a place within the ritual, to meet the needs of the differential clientele.
6. If this then firmed up a tentative authorship, it led us to the issue of the launching of the *sīla* trio as well as the *Buddhapūjā*. This led us back to point number 2 (above), narrowing down the window to a period of three months.
7. Looking closer at the Mahavamsa accounts, the presence of Arhant Mahinda in the company of the King during the *vassana* season (Mv xviii.1-2) suggested the possible earliest date for the launch.

It is in following the above steps that we came to ascribe, with some confidence, the authorship to none other than Arhant Mahinda who introduces the Buddhadhamma to the island.

But, of course, our conclusion as to authorship may still have to be

¹⁰⁴ An initial thought was that the absence of mention of *pañcasīla* was for the same reasons that *buddhapūjā* finds no mention, namely that it had come to be so taken for granted by the time of Mahanama. But that came to be dismissed in light of the next two points.

considered conjectural, since all we have is circumstantial evidence.

The great difficulty in this kind of research, in arriving at any firmer evidence, of course, is that many a source relating to the topic, in both India and Sri Lanka, may still not be located, or indeed have been destroyed. Another daunting challenge is reading every source available that may even be remotely associated with our topic.

Thus we may point to a major methodological shortcoming of this study. For one, the entire Canon has not been scoured against each item of the ritual to see their Canonical origins. For another, the entirety of the Sinhala sources – both religious and literary, have not been examined either.

E.3 Mahinda, Asoka and Adam Smith

If our finding holds, the *Buddhapūjāva* could be seen as the single most valuable inheritance left behind by Arhant Mahinda to the Buddhist world. While the immediate, and direct, beneficiary of his creativity was certainly the Sinhala Buddhist, other Theravada countries such as Burma, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand have come to be the beneficiaries as well. But, judging from a Google search, it appears that it has come to be widespread, at least as a concept, though not necessarily in the cohesive sense of the Sinhala ritual, with its make up, and interpretation, possibly even going beyond the intent and understanding brought to it by its Redactor. This would hardly be surprising given the twists and turns the Buddha's Teachings themselves have gone through over time and territory.

Arhant Mahinda's systematization and centralization of the elements into a single cohesive *Buddhapūjāva* could be seen as the Dhammic parallel to what father Aśoka had done in the field of politics: bringing together the different political elements, scattered both geographically and historically, under one umbrella.

An interesting 18th C. economic parallel here may be Adam Smith (1723-1790), "widely cited as the father of modern economics and capitalism," and "founder of free market economics"¹⁰⁵. His *magnum opus*, *The Wealth of Nations*, is considered the first modern work of economics. But it is not that the aspects and dimensions of his systematization had not existed in any number of human populations, or had not been dealt with by other scholars whom he had met on his European tour¹⁰⁶. His concept of unproductive labour, e.g., had been a

¹⁰⁵ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adam_Smith#The_Wealth_of_Nations.

¹⁰⁶ Such as Benjamin Franklin, Turgot, Jean D'Alembert, André Morellet, Helvétius and, "in particular, François Quesnay".

“French insight”, but he expanded on it by proposing that “productive labor should be made even more productive by deepening the division of labor”. He had studied moral philosophy at the University of Glasgow, and “shared closer intellectual and personal bonds” with David Hume. Alan Greenspan points out that, while Smith did not coin the term *laissez-faire*, “it was left to Adam Smith to identify the more-general set of principles that brought conceptual clarity to the seeming chaos of market transactions”.

So it is not that Smith came out with his principles of capitalism *in vacuo*. But what he did was to organize the concepts making the intellectual circles of the time into a cohesive system, taking ten years to do so.

And this is precisely what can be said of what may be called Arhant Mahinda’s *magnum opus*, the *Buddhapūjāva*, too. It is not that he came out with it in a vacuum. But what he did was to organize the concepts, mostly from the Canon, and the several dimensions of praxis making the spiritual circles in the Indian Buddhist milieu (ordained and lay), into a cohesive system with meaningfulness to the potential users. Theoretically put, what is entailed is a conceptual clarity (*sammā dīṭṭhi* ‘right view’) arrived at in his own mind, resulting in a ‘right conceptualization’ (*sammā saṃkappa*)¹⁰⁷.

And, as noted by Rahula (1956: 54), Arhant Mahinda is no shy patsy (as above), when it comes to boldness in creating something new and fresh. Asked by King Devanampiya Tissa, “When will the [Buddhist]

¹⁰⁷ ‘Intent’ comes to be the more common translation of *saṃkappa* (see PED). While there was indeed good intent on the part of Mahinda, I see in this case the step following ‘Right View’ as being one of praxis, though still in the thought domain. This understanding finds some support from the fact that the next three steps of the Noble Eightfold Path are all in the physical praxis domain: *vācā*, *kammanta*, *ājīva* (word, conduct, livelihood). My interpretation of *saṃkappa* here as ‘conceptualization’ stems from an understanding generated by linguistic analysis. In speaking, before a word is uttered (*vācā*), there is conceptualization both in content and structure (e.g., statement or question, intonation and stress, which vocabulary items best express, etc.). (It needs to be noted here, of course, that ‘before’ needs to be understood in terms of mindmoments, as in Buddhist *Abhidhamma* (see Bodhi, Gen. Ed., 1993, 1999, for a treatment), or nanoseconds as in western science, and also with reciprocal causality (as in Conditioned Co-origination (see Rahula 1956, for a discussion) in mind, where it would be futile to look for a first cause.) But preceding (still as in the above sense) such conceptualization, however, is the ‘view’ that is going to be expressed, though, of course, this view has no necessary spiritual, philosophical or truth dimension as in Right View. This interpretation of *saṃkappa* as ‘conceptualization’ seems to find support in the Commentaries, where it is defined in the DhsA 124 as “(*cetaso*) *abhiniropanā*, i.e., application of the mind” (PED, under *saṃkappa*).

roots go deep?”, “Mahinda’s answer is most remarkable”:

When a son born in Ceylon (Tambapannidīpa) of Ceylonese parents, becomes a monk in Ceylon, studies the Vinaya in Ceylon and recites it in Ceylon, the roots of the Sāsana are deeply set.

On what authority Mahinda made this bold statement we do not know....

And we have no difficulty agreeing that “His sole concern was that the religion of the Buddha should secure a firm hold in the Island and continue to develop for the benefit of the people.” (Rahula).

Further, “If his achievement could be called a conquest, it was only a moral, spiritual and cultural conquest of the highest order conceivable.” The *Buddhapūjāva* created for the people of Tambapanni could, then, be considered the definitive instrument through which Mahinda sought to achieve his goal.

If father Aśoka’s kingdom lasted no more than a hundred years after his demise (see Guruge, 1993, 506-508 in his “definitive study” and 482 – 506 for his “Place in History”), and Smith’s economic kingdom two centuries old and counting, it is to Arhant Mahinda’s credit that it has lasted (by our calculation) 2260 years, and is still counting, at least in the Sinhala Buddhist tradition for which it was originally intended¹⁰⁸. In this sense, then, Arhant Mahinda stands in the annals of history as an innovator *par excellence*, alongside his father in the political domain and Adam Smith in the economic domain.

¹⁰⁸ Even if, as seen from our historical evidence, the *Buddhapūjāva* of the Sinhala type may not have caught on in the context of India, as it has in the context of Theravada countries such as Burma and Thailand, it is to be noted that the Five, Eight and Ten *Silas* had found their way to India, as early as the time of I-Tsing (7th c.) (see footnote 30).

REFERENCES

- Adikaram, E W, (1946), 1994, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Dehiwala, Sri Lanka: Buddhist Cultural Centre.
- Anguttara Nikaya*.
- Beal, Samuel (Tr), 1884, *Xuanzang's Record of the Western Regions* (BOOK ONE), composed by the Buddhist pilgrim in 646 at the request of the Tang Emperor.
- Benedict, Ruth, *Patterns of Culture*, 1934, A Mentor Book.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu, Gen. Ed., 1993, 1999, *A Comprehensive Manual of Abhidhamma*, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.
- Cardona, George, 1988, *Panini: His Work and its Traditions (Vol. 1, Background and Introduction)*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Clarke, Arthur C., "Sri Lanka's Wildlife: a Personal Perspective", *National Geographic*, 1983.
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K, 1969, *Introduction to Indian Art*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Craven, Roy C., n.d., *Concise History of Indian Art*, Oxford University Press.
- Dauids, Rhys & William Stede, *Pali-English Dictionary*, 1979, London: Pali Text Society.
- de Silva, K. M., 1981, *A History of Sri Lanka*, Oxford University Press.
- Dhammananda, Ven K Sri, *Daily Buddhist Devotions*, 1991, Malaysia, Buddhist Missionary Society.
- Dhammapada*.
- Digha Nikaya*.
- Fa-Hsien, The Project Gutenberg EBook of Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms; *Life of Fa-Hien; Genuineness and Integrity of the Text of his Narrative; Number of the Adherents of Buddhism*.
file:///C:/Documents and Settings/Compaq_Administrator/My Documents/The Buddhist Religion, Bibliography.
- Geiger, Wilhelm (tr.), 1912, *The Mahavamsa or the Great Chronicle*, Colombo: Information Department.
- Gleason, H A, (1955), 1961, *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Gombrich, Richard & Gananath Obeyesekere, 1988, *Buddhism Transformed: Religious Change in Sri Lanka*, Princeton University Press.
- Guruge, Ananda W. P., (tran.), 1990, *Mahanama, The Mahavamsa*, Translated from the Pali, Calcutta, Birla Foundation.
- Guruge, Ananda W. P., 1993, *Asoka: a Definitive Biography*, Sri

- Lanka: Ministry of Cultural Affairs and Information.
- Hinuber, Oskar von, 1996, *A Handbook of Pali Literature*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Hori, Victor & Janet McLellan, 2010 in Harding, Hori & Soucy (Eds.), *Wild Geese, Buddhism in Canada*, Queen's – McGill University Press.
- <http://dsal.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/philologic/getobject.pl?c.0:1:1197.pali>.
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adam_Smith#The_Wealth_of_Nations
- http://pali.sirimangalo.org.chrome://digitalpalireader/content/search.htm?type=0&query=buddha_puja&MAT=mat&set=vdmsak yxbg&book=1&part=1&rx=false.
- <http://www.dhammadownload.com/index.php?title=Apadana>.
- <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/2124/2124-h/2124-h.htm>.
- <http://www.tipitaka.org/> (Pali Tipitaka, VRI (online)).
- Ilangasingha, H B M, 1992, *Buddhism in Medieval Sri Lanka*, India: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Jayawickramam N A , trans., 1990, *The Story of Gotama Buddha – The Nidana-Katha of the Jatakathakatha*, Pali Text Society.
- Kalupahana, David, *The Buddha and the Concept of Peace*, 1999, Moratuwa, Sri Lanka: Visvalekha.
- Kapferer, Bruce, 1991, *A Celebration of Demons: Exorcism and the Aesthetics of Haling in Sri Lanka*, Berg Publishers (<http://www.bergpublishers.com/?tabid=1692>).
- Khosa, Sunil, 1998, *Handbook of Indian Art (a chronicle of paintings and sculptures)*, New Delhi: Sundee Prakashan.
- Kinnard, Jacob N, 2005, “Iconography: Buddhist Iconography”, in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, Vol. 7, Jones, Lindsey (Ed. in Chief), pp. 4327 -4331.
- Legge, James (tr.), *A Record Of Buddhistic Kingdoms: Being an Account by the Chinese Monk Fa-Hsien of his Travels in India and Ceylon (AD. 399-414) in Search of the Buddhist Books of Discipline* (Translated and annotated with a Corean recension of the Chinese text); eBook or online at www.gutenberg.org: Title: Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms; Author: Fa-Hsien; Translator: James Legge; Release Date: March 28, 2006 [Ebook #2124].
- Lett, James, “Emic/Etic Distinctions”, <http://faculty.irs.edu/FACULTY/JLett/Article%20on%20Emics%20and%20Etics.htm>).
- Mahavamsa* (Pali).
- Mahavamsa* (b), (by Mahanama), (ed. Geiger), 1958.
- Majjhima Nikaya*.

- Nanamoli, Bhikkhu, (tr.), 1975, *The Path of Purification*, Kandy, Sri Lanka: Buddhist Publication Society.
- Nanamoli, Bhikkhu & Bhikkhu Bodhi (tr.), 1995 / 2001, *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*, Wisdom.
- Narada Thera and Bhikkhu Kassapa, *Mirror of the Dhamma: A Manual of Buddhist Chanting and Devotional Texts*, 1963 (Revised by Bhikkhu Khantipalo) (Fifth Edition, 2003), The Wheel Publication # 54 A/B, Kandy, Sri Lanka: Buddhist Publication Society; Online Edition © (2008).
- Obeyesekere, Ranjini, 2001, *Portraits of Buddhist Women: stories from the Saddharmaratnavaliya*, Albany, New York: SUNY
- Paranavitana, Senarat, 1970, *Inscriptions of Ceylon*, Ceylon: Department of Archeology.
- Perera, H R, 1966, vol. II, pp. 2-3, in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Ed., G P Malalasekara, Govt. of Ceylon.
- Pike, K. L., 1954, *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*, part 1. Glendale, Calif.: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Punnaji, Bhante Madawela, 2001, *Awakening Meditation / Sambodhi Bhavana*, Edmonton (Canada), Puremind Publishers.
- Rahula, Walpola, 1956, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Dehiwala: Buddhist Cultural Centre, 125 Anderson Road , Nedimala, Dehiwala, Sri Lanka.
- Saibaba, V. V. S., 2005, *Faith and Devotion in Theravada Buddhism*, D K Printworld Limited.
- Samyutta Nikaya*.
- Sen, Tansen, 2006, *The Travel Records of Chinese Pilgrims Fa-hsien, Xuanzang, and Yijing: Sources For Cross-Cultural Encounters Between Ancient China And Ancient India* <http://afe.easia.columbia.edu/special/travel_records.pdf>.
- Silva, Sauris S H, 1966, *pahatarata naetum (Low Country Dancing)* [(in Sinhala) phtrx n[x<mf]], Colombo: Gunasena.
- , 1970, *Sooniyam Shantiya* [a ritual by that name] [(in Sinhala), Colombo: Gunasena.
- Sugunasiri, Suwanda H J, forthcoming, *Arhant Mahinda - Redactor of the Buddhapūjāva in Sinhala Buddhism (with Pali Text, Translation and Analysis)*, Nalanda Publishing Canada.

- Takakusu, J. (Tr.), 2006 (b), I-Tsing, Cosmo, 2006, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion: As Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695)*; also, Takakusu: Home>> Buddhism >> A Record of the Buddhist Religion: as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671- 695).
- VRI *Chaṭṭha sangāyanā* CD / www.Palitipitaka.org.
- Warder, A K, 1970, *Indian Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Wickremasinghe, Don Martin de Zilva, 1912, *Lithic and Other Inscriptions of Ceylon*, Epigraphia Zeylancia, Vol. 1, 1904-1912, Ceylon: Department of Archeology.
- Wimalajothi, Ven. Kirama, Ed., 2003, 2004, *Mahavamsaya, Sinhala*, Dehiwala, Sri Lanka, Buddhist Cultural Centre.