Indian Buddhist Attitudes toward Outcastes: Rhetoric around caṇḍālas

Silk, J.A.

BRILL

INDO-IRANIAN JOURNAL 63 (2020) 128–187

IIJ

brill.com/iij

Indian Buddhist Attitudes toward Outcastes

Rhetoric around caṇḍālas

Jonathan A. Silk
Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands
J.A.Silk@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Abstract

Indian Buddhist literary sources contain both systematic and casual rejections of, broadly speaking, the caste system and caste discrimination. However, they also provide ample evidence for, possibly subconscious, discriminatory attitudes toward outcastes, prototypically *caṇḍāla*s. The rhetoric found in Indian Buddhist literature regarding *caṇḍāla*s is examined in this paper.

Keywords

caṇḍāla – caste – Buddhism – prejudice – ancient India – discrimination

1 General Issues

Much attention has been devoted both from scholarly and other points of view to the proposition that the Buddha (and implicitly Indian Buddhism *tout court*) propounded an anti-caste ideology.[1] Since I believe that we know precisely nothing about the Buddha as an individual, and moreover since serious questions may be raised about the earliest situation of Buddhism in India,[2] I am

1 There is no point to offer a bibliography here, but see for instance Chalmers 1894; Law 1937: 11–26; Barua 1959; Fujita 1953; Ellis 2019. The topic of *caṇḍāla*s in Indian Buddhism has also not been ignored; see for instance esp. Miyasaka 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995a; Ujike 1985.

2 I refer particularly to the questions raised by Johannes Bronkhorst (for a brief summary see Bronkhorst Forthcoming) about the unlikelihood of actual contact at the time of the Buddha between brahmanical communities and the region where the Buddha is held to have lived. Bronkhorst argues that there was, at the time of the Buddha, a cultural divide between the

 | DOI:10.1163/15728536-06302003

content in the following to understand all claims made about "the Buddha" to refer to the statements found in Indian Buddhist literature (of all periods), and in this respect, despite the wide chronological and doubtless also geographical range of their composition, we find there a largely consistent rejection of the validity (though not the social reality) of the caste system. The present study, being devoted to ideology and rhetoric, will therefore largely set aside questions about how and indeed even if such rhetoric was actualized in the daily life of Indian Buddhists or Indian Buddhist communities (a question concerning which, on the whole, we lack good evidence). Where we do have ample evidence is in regard to textual expressions, through which, I maintain, we can detect reflections of the attitudes of their authors. These then, rather than any actual socially embedded situation, form the central focus of this study. However, in the conclusion I will dare to offer some speculations about what relation there might be between attitudes and actions.

While there is a broad unanimity of opinion regarding at least Buddhist rhetorical attitudes toward the caste system (however that is understood, and keeping in mind that it was historically much less a "system" than it might now generally appear), those outside the four primary hierarchical divisions (*varṇa*)—the brāhmaṇas, kṣatriyas, vaiśyas and śūdras—have drawn less attention, and it is with this (real or imagined) group that the present remarks are centrally concerned. In order to provide a context, however, it is necessary to begin with a brief look at Indian Buddhist textual attitudes toward caste, and some of their complications, before we turn to the outcastes. Given that the survey of attitudes toward caste is well-trodden ground, there may be found here little that is new.[3]

---

brahmanical west and Greater Magadha, the heartland of Buddhism. Therefore, while half of this equation leads to the conclusion that the non-brahmanical east was the source of a number of notions later integrated completely into the brahmanical world-view, the correlate is that at the time of the Buddha, the east being as yet unbrahmanized, the Buddha (and others) could not have been responding (directly) to brahmanical ideas, practices or cultural and social structures. With regard specifically to caste, the implication is that it was simply not present in the form we see later, and of course much earlier but—and this is key—only in the Vedic-brahmanical west, not in Greater Magadha. A conclusion to be drawn is that the Buddha and earlier Buddhism was not responding to a social situation which, in their domain, did not yet exist. If correct, his hypotheses would imply the unlikelihood of brahmanical caste structures being an object of concern for the Buddha. However, even if they were not, they did certainly become so later for Buddhist communities, and this is my concern here.

3 The same may be true even for the second part of this essay, at least in terms of overall understanding. Already Jha 1975: 28 could write (after observing that Buddhist sources are more severe than brahmanical ones regarding the *rathakāra*, on which see below), "In vain does one look to Buddhism for an effectively different attitude to caste and its most unseemly offshoot, the institution of untouchability, for it developed its own set of intensely prized

2 Indian Buddhism and Caste

A number of passages are routinely cited as evidence that Indian Buddhism rejects caste hierarchies. For instance, the *Majjhimanikāya* maintains that while two castes, the kṣatriyas and brāhmaṇas, are normally treated as superior, from the point of view of liberation all four castes are equivalent.[4] The *Aṅguttaranikāya* for its part holds that one of the prophetic dreams through which the bodhisatta Siddhattha realized his coming awakening spoke in fact of caste equality:[5]

---

taboos, besides those it shared with brāhmaṇism." It should be noted in passing that Jha on the whole restricts his attention to Pāli sources. It might also be noted that Jha repeatedly seeks to explain Buddhist negative attitudes toward low-caste marginals by associating their activities with those ideologically objectionable to Buddhists. Thus leather workers were "connected with the flaying of cattle," and cartwrights "simply because they built chariots for war which it [Buddhism–JAS] hated," (Jha 1979: 102), while "Presumably, in keeping with the traditional profession of the Baindas [an aboriginal tribe–JAS] the Veṇas [bamboo workers–JAS] continued as hunters, and as such incurred the antipathy of the Buddhist writers" (Jha 1978: 231). These assertions (or at best suggestions) of a sort of rational cause coherent with Buddhist doctrine seem to me entirely ad hoc and unprovable. Moreover, they seem contradicted by the kinds of evidence we do see, most particularly in the case of the paradigmatic marginals, the *caṇḍāla*s. An additional crucial point here is made clearly by Eltschinger 2012: 157: "To say that Indian Buddhism never was abolitionist [with regard to caste—JAS] moreover immediately requires an important nuance. For while it does not deny, nor hopes to abolish, the presence of statutory designations in the world, Indian Buddhism is, in theory and perhaps also in fact, uniformly abolitionist in its soteriology."

It should perhaps be emphasized here at the outset that I have no aspirations to completeness, and know of many interesting materials which I simply could not include, and doubtless there is much more of which I am simply unaware. Thus, I do not notice here stories in which *caṇḍāla*s may play even a central role, if I do not find that their status as *caṇḍāla*s is informative for the discussion here; as as example, see the story from the *Saṁghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya translated and discussed by Davidson 2017: 20–23. In view of these limitations, I take solace in the fact that Dr. Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber has kindly informed me of her plan to research the topic in detail, and I have little doubt that her investigations will prove much more exhaustive than my own.

A final additional point is that my aim here is to look exclusively at Indian materials. It would be a fascinating study to examine how culturally specific Indian ideas found an afterlife in, for instance, China and beyond in East Asia. At its perhaps most extreme, we find a total domestication of the notion of *caṇḍāla* in Japan, where the *sendara* 旃陀羅 = *eta* 穢多 = *hinin* 非人 (terms more recently replaced by *burakumin* 部落人) status was broadly accepted, and persists even until today. Among the very extensive literature, little of which is scholarly, however, see Vollmer 1994; Bodiford 1996; Hayashi 1997. Regarding monastic ordination of low status individuals in Tibet, see Jansen 2014.

4 MN ii.128,2–8; ii.129,27–28. See also T. 26 (22) (1) 793c11–17; D 1, *'dul ba*, *kha*, 88b3–5.

5 AN iii.242,14–22: *yam pi bhikkhave tathāgatassa arahato sammāsambuddhassa pubbeva sambodhā anabhisambuddhassa bodhisattasseva sato cattāro sakuṇā nānāvaṇṇā catūhi disāhi*

> When the Tathāgata, the Arahant, the Perfectly Enlightened One—before his enlightenment, while just a bodhisatta, not fully enlightened—[dreamt] that four birds of different colors (*vaṇṇa*) came from the four quarters, fell at his feet, and turned all white, [this was a foretoken] that members of the four classes (*vaṇṇa*)—khattiyas, brahmins, vessas, and suddas—would go forth from the household life into homelessness in the Dhamma and discipline proclaimed by the Tathāgata and realize unsurpassed liberation. This fourth great dream appeared to him [as a sign] that his awakening [was imminent].

The late canonical *Apadāna* poetically repeats a passage found earlier in the Vinaya and Sutta,[6] and speaks of the subsequent post-ordination non-differentiation of persons from the four castes, asserting that once they have renounced the world into the Buddha's community, all persons are equal:[7]

> The rivers Sindu and Sarasvatī, Candabhāgā,
> Gaṅgā and Yamunā, Sarabhū and then Mahī—
> The ocean receives these as they flow into it.
> They give up their former name, and are all known [only] as the Ocean.

āgantvā pādamūle nipatitvā sabbasetā sampajjiṁsu cattāro me bhikkhave vaṇṇā khattiyā brāhmaṇā vessā suddā te tathāgatappavedite dhammavinaye agārasmā anagāriyaṁ pabbajitvā anuttaraṁ vimuttiṁ sacchikaronti | tassa abhisambodhāya ayaṁ catuttho mahāsupino pāturahosi. Trans. Bodhi 2012: 814–815.

6 Vin ii.239,14–21: *seyyathāpi bhikkhave yā kāci mahānadiyo seyyath' idaṁ | gaṅgā yamunā aciravatī sarabhū mahī tā mahāsamuddaṁ pattā jahanti purimāni nāmagottāni mahāsamuddo tv eva saṅkhaṁ gacchanti | evam eva kho bhikkhave cattāro' me vaṇṇā | khattiyā brāhmaṇā vessā suddā. te tathāgatappavedite dhammavinaye agārasmā anagāriyaṁ pabbajitvā jahanti purimāni nāmagottāni samaṇā sakyaputtiyā tv eva saṅkhaṁ gacchanti*. Trans. Horner 1938–1966: 5.334: "And even, monks, as those great rivers, that is to say the Ganges, the Jumna, the Aciravatī, the Sarabhū, the Mahī which, on reaching the great ocean, lose their former names and identities and are reckoned simply as the great ocean, even so, monks, (members of) these four castes: noble, brahmin, merchant and low, having gone forth from home into homelessness in this *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder, lose their former names and clans and are reckoned simply as recluses, sons of the Sakyans." See also AN iv.202,7–14.

7 316–318 = 3.1.177–179:

sindhū sarasvatī c'eva nadiyā candabhāgiyo |
gaṅgā ca yamunā c'eva sarabhū ca atho mahī ‖
etāsaṁ sandamānānaṁ sāgaro sampaṭicchati |
jahanti purimaṁ nāmaṁ sāgaro te'va ñāyati ‖
tath' ev'ime catuvaṇṇā pabbajitvā tav' antike |
jahanti purimaṁ nāmaṁ buddhaputtā ti ñāyare ‖

Compare the trans. of Jonathan S. Walters http://apadanatranslation.org/text/chapter-3/poem-001.html.

> In just the same way these persons of four castes, having gone forth before you [Buddha],
> Give up their former name, and are known as "Sons of the Buddha."

Such ideas are by no means limited to the Pāli literature. In the *Kuṇālāvadāna* (found within the *Divyāvadāna*), we encounter Aśoka's minister Yaśas, characterized as highly devoted to the Lord (*paramaśrāddho bhagavati*), who nonetheless finds the king's behavior of prostrating himself at the feet of Buddhist monks whenever he saw them[8] improper, and he says:[9] "Your Majesty, it is not proper that you bow down to renunciants who come from all castes. And indeed, the Buddhist novices (*śrāmaṇeraka*) have renounced from all four castes." A few lines below we find several verses in which the king in return addresses Yaśas:[10]

> Sir, you consider caste, but not the good qualities which inhere in the Buddhist monks. Thus, sir, out of pride and arrogance about caste you harm both yourself and others out of ignorance. Now, at the time of a wedding, a marriage, one [rightly] considers caste, but not at the time of [teaching] the Dharma. For the causes of the practice of the Teaching are good

8 *yatra śākyaputrīyān dadarśa ākīrṇe rahasi vā tatra śirasā pādayor nipatya vandate sma.*

9 *deva nārhasi sarvavarṇapravrajitānāṁ praṇipātaṁ kartuṁ | santi hi śākyaśrāmaṇerakāś caturbhyo varṇebhyaḥ pravrajitā iti.* Mukhopadhyaya 1963: 71.5–8, Cowell and Neil 1886: 382.5–10. A reviewer of the paper points to the apparently conflation here of *śrāmaṇeraka* and *śramaṇa*.

We might simply note here another narrative reference to the same idea. In the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*, a man asks Śāriputra to ordain him, but the latter, finding no roots of good from previous lives in the man, refuses, as do the other monks. The man refused ordination stands before the monastery gates and cries, complaining: "Persons from all four castes are offered renunciation, what evil have I done that you do not offer it to me?" T. 201 (IV) 311c11–12: 四種姓中皆得出家。我造何惡, 獨不見度. (See also Huber 1908: 284). The man then utters a stanza, the beginning of which runs, "As pure water is offered to everyone to drink, even to *caṇḍāla*s, everyone is offered renunciation" (T. 201 [IV] 311c14–15: 猶如清淨水一切悉得飲 / 乃至旃陀羅各皆得出家), and the Buddha ultimately saves him. For the same image of water, see below for the story of Nītha. The implication here that ordination is offered to *caṇḍāla*s is taken up below.

10 Mukhopadhyaya 1963: 73.1–6 (Cowell and Neil 1886: 383.10–17):

> *jātiṁ bhavān paśyati śākyabhikṣuṣv antargatāṁs teṣu guṇān na ceti |*
> *ato bhavāñ jātimadāvalepād ātmānam anyāṁś ca hinasti mohāt ‖*
> *āvāhakāle 'tha vivāhakāle jāteḥ parīkṣā na tu dharmakāle |*
> *dharmakriyāyā hi guṇā nimittā guṇāś ca jātiṁ na vicārayanti ‖*
> *yady uccakulīnagatā doṣā garhāṁ prayānti loke 'smin |*
> *katham iva nīcajanagatā guṇā na satkāram arhanti ‖*

> qualities; good qualities do not pay attention to caste. If those belonging to high-status families, having faults, are censured by everyone, how is it that those belonging to a low status, having good qualities, do not merit reverence?

As one final example, we may return to Pāli sources and quote a few verses found in the *Aṅguttaranikāya*:[11]

> So too, among human beings it is in any kind of birth—
> among khattiyas, brahmins, vessas, suddas, caṇḍālas, or scavengers—
> among people of any sort that the tamed person of good manners is born:
> one firm in Dhamma, virtuous in conduct, truthful in speech, endowed with moral shame;
> one who has abandoned birth and death, consummate in the spiritual life,
> with the burden dropped, detached, who has done his task, free of taints;
> who has gone beyond all things [of the world] and by non-clinging has reached nibbāna:
> an offering is truly vast when planted in that spotless field.

Alongside these assertions of equality, however, it is equally plain that Buddhist sources are emphatic in holding that kṣatriyas, the so-called warrior class and the class into which the Buddha is held to have been born,[12] are superior to the brāhmaṇas, the so-called priests. Brahmanical sources, of course, begin-

---

11 AN i.162,16–23, trans. Bodhi 2012: 256 (the same at AN iii.214,6–13, trans. Bodhi 2012: 794–795):

> *evam eva manussesu yasmiṁ kasmiñci jātiyaṁ |*
> *khattiye brāhmaṇe vesse sudde caṇḍālapukkuse ‖*
> *yāsu kāsuci etāsu danto jāyati subbato |*
> *dhammaṭṭho sīlasampanno saccavādī hirīmano ‖*
> *pahīnajātimaraṇo brahmacariyassa kevalī |*
> *pannabhāro visaṁyutto katakicco anāsavo ‖*
> *pāragū sabbadhammānaṁ anupādāya nibbuto |*
> *tasmiṁ yeva viraje khette vipulā hoti dakkhiṇā ‖*

12 References to the Buddha having belonged to the kṣatriya class are found in DN 1.115,31–32, 133,9–10, and MN ii.167,9–10. The *Mahāvadānasūtra* (parallel to the Pāli *Mahāpadāna*, DN ii.2,29–3,11) offers the following (Fukita 2003: 38.18–21): *Vipaśyī samyaksaṁbuddhaḥ kṣatriyo jātyābhūt Śikhī samyaksaṁbuddhaḥ kṣatriyo jātyābhūd Viśvabhuk ca | Krakasundaḥ samyaksaṁbuddho brāhmaṇo jātyābhūt Kanakamuniḥ Kāśyapaś ca | asmākam apy etarhi kṣatriyā jātir bhavati iyam atra dharmatā*. Here three former buddhas were

ning with the *Ṛgveda*, maintain that the brāhmaṇas are the highest caste, and kṣatriyas the second.[13] Buddhist sources, clearly aware of this claim, maintain on the contrary that while this may sometimes be true, in our age, the inverse is rather the case. The *Majjhimanikāya* says: "The khattiya is the best among those who rely on lineage; the one endowed with knowledge and [good] conduct is the best among gods and men,"[14] and the *Dīghanikāya* maintains that "Even when a khattiya has fallen into utmost degradation, still then just the khattiyas are superior and brāhmaṇas inferior."[15] This idea is found also for instance in the *Lalitavistara*, in a context to which we will return below:[16]

> Why, monks, did the bodhisattva examine [his future] family? Bodhisattvas are not born into inferior (*hīna*) families, neither into *caṇḍāla* families, nor bamboo-worker[17] families, cartwright families, nor *pukkasa*[18]

---

kṣatriyas, three brahmins, and the Buddha speaks of himself as a kṣatriya. Levman 2013: 159 is wrong, therefore, when he claims that "the Buddha never calls himself a khattiya."

13 It may be apposite to mention that naturally Brahmanical (aka Hindu) attitudes toward caste are also not entirely uniform. For some of the complexities of the notions involved with tantric Śaivism, see Sanderson 2009b.

14 MN i.358,28–29: *khattiyo seṭṭho jane tasmiṁ ye gottapaṭisārino | vijjācaraṇasampanno so seṭṭho devamānuse*. The verse is common, for instance DN i.99,8–9; iii.98,4–5; 99,1–2, and a number of other instances. It was noticed already by Chalmers 1894: 344.

15 DN i.99,3–5: *yadā pi khattiyo paramanihīnataṁ patto hoti tadā pi khattiyā va seṭṭhā hīnā brāhmaṇā*. This occurs just before the verse just cited.

16 Hokazono 1994: 306.13–19 (Lefmann 1902–1908: 20.1–8): *kiṁ kāraṇaṁ bhikṣavo bodhisattvaḥ kulavilokitaṁ vilokayati sma | na bodhisattvā hīnakuleṣūpapadyante caṇḍālakuleṣu vā veṇukārakule vā rathakārakule vā pukkasakule vā | atha tarhi kuladvaya evopapadyante brāhmaṇakule kṣatriyakule ca | tatra yadā brāhmaṇaguruko loko bhavati tadā brāhmaṇakule upapadyante | yadā kṣatriyaguruko loko bhavati tadā kṣatriyakule upapadyante | etarhi bhikṣavaḥ kṣatriyaguruko lokaḥ tasmād bodhisattvāḥ kṣatriyakule upapadyante*.

17 Some sources suggest that *veṇukkāra* refers to a worker in reeds or basketry, but for instance *Mahāvyutpatti* 3798 *smyug ma mkkhan* suggests that the understanding as a worker in bamboo is more likely to have been what was understood (and notice in nn. 67, 86 below the Chinese rendering 竹工作). For a detailed discussion see Jha 1978.

18 Functionally, *pukkasa* is roughly equivalent to *caṇḍāla*. It is the Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit equivalent of Sanskrit *pulkasa*/*paulkasa*, which appears along with *caṇḍāla* (and *niṣāda*, Pāli *nesāda*) already in the Vedic literature referring to non-Āryan tribal peoples (Parasher-Sen 2006: 420, "The really despicable people in the early Vedic texts were the Caṇḍāla and Paulkasa who, as objects of spite and abhorrence, were considered the lowest ritually and socially"). For etymological complications related to *pulkasa* see Kuijper 1991: 54–57. For the *niṣāda*, see Jha 1974a. In the *Amarakośa* (Śūdravarga II.10.19–20ab) we find a listing of the terms considered to belong to the same category as *caṇḍāla*: *dakṣe tu caturapeśalapaṭavaḥ sūtthāna uṣṇaś ca | caṇḍāla-plava-mātaṅga-divākīrti-janaṅgamāḥ || nipāda-śvapacāv antevāsi-cāṇḍāla-pukkasāḥ*. For a few observations based on Pāli sources see Horner 1938–1966: II. 173–174, in the notes. I am not sure that Matsunami 1992 adds much.

> families. Instead, they are born into only two families: brāhmaṇa families and kṣatriya families. In that regard, when the brāhmaṇas hold sway in the world, then they are born into a brāhmaṇa family, and when the kṣatriyas hold sway in the world, then they are born into a kṣatriya family. Therefore, monks, since the kṣatriyas hold sway in the world [now], bodhisattvas are born into a kṣatriya family.

We should not overlook the specific concern of Buddhist authors with the Buddha's caste lineage. This is clear in the story of his ancestral line, found throughout Buddhist texts belonging to various traditions, according to which the sons of king Okkāka (Sanskrit Ikṣvāku) were banished, and sent into exile along with their sisters.[19] The version in the *Ambaṭṭhasutta* of the *Dīghanikāya* says that "out of fear of the mixing of castes (*jātisambhedabhaya*), they cohabited together with their own sisters."[20] It is the offspring of these incestuous sibling unions who become the Buddha's forebears. This refers to a concern about the offspring of "mixed marriages" (see below n. 29), and in this case the concern that by failing to locate women of appropriate caste, the princes would produce inferior children. This concern with caste purity is paralleled in the clichéd stock phrase that begins many Indian Buddhist narrative (*avadāna*) tales, in the notice of an initial marriage carried out between two families, namely that a man "took a wife from a suitable family" (*sadṛśāt kulāt kalatram ānītam*), signifying that the family of the bride had an appropriate caste relation to that of the groom.[21] Although we might think here of the message we encountered above in the *Kuṇālāvadāna* that in marriage one rightly considers caste, it is striking that the insistence on caste lineage in the *Ambaṭṭhasutta* refers specifically to the Buddha's antecedents. For the family ancestors of the Buddha, this concern for caste suitability is so overwhelming that it seems to trump even the otherwise dominant, if not virtually ubiquitous, taboo against close-kin marriage. Clearly, for those who composed the story of the Buddha's life, caste status was very important indeed.

Perhaps in some contrast to this, arguments about the meaninglessness of caste are also, finally, found theorized in very careful ways in the works of

19 For a detailed discussion, see Silk 2008.

20 DN i.92,21–22 (III.1.16).

21 This expression is common in the *Divyāvadāna* (see Hiraoka 2002: 157) and elsewhere. For the Pāli *Jātaka*, see Fick 1920: 52. In *Kathāsaritsāgara* VI.33.26c, a suitable wife, "equal to himself," is indicated with the term *ātmānurūpā bhāryā*. The term *ātmānurūpā* is also found in *Kumārasambhava* I.18d, commented by Mallinātha *ātmānurūpāṁ kulaśīlasaundaryādibhiḥ sadṛśīṁ*. There is no explicit reference here to *jāti* or *varṇa*, but the reference to *kula* seems to imply this.

scholars belonging to the epistemological (*pramāṇa*) tradition, particularly Prajñākaragupta. This material has been discussed in a masterly fashion by Eltschinger, who explores what he terms the "naturalization of caste," through which the Buddhist thinkers argue against their brahmanical opponents that caste is not something which belongs to the nature of the world but is rather an imposition on the world, a human fiction.[22] Eltschinger (2012: 170–171) concludes that, from a philosophical perspective, "All the Buddhist arguments indeed converge in affirming that caste is not an ontological determination of the human being. It does not condition, nor does it affect, his mode of being or psychophysical constitution."

All of this concerning the status of the four castes may be taken as well established and relatively uncontroversial, leaving aside nuances and questions as to whether and how this rhetoric of equality was actualized in daily life. Concerning this last point, however, there is some evidence that Buddhists were perceived to actually act in accord with this rhetoric, or at least they are (at least once) presented that way for what may well be no more than polemical reasons. The Kaśmīri scholar Bhaṭṭa Jayanta (last quarter of the 9th c.) authored a play, the *Āgamaḍambara*, in which we find the claim that the Buddhists treat all castes equally, and moreover even in that most sensitive of settings, the meal. Sanderson writes: "Note the distaste expressed by the brahmin Saṁkarṣaṇa in the *Āgamaḍambara* … when, in a Kashmirian monastery, he notices that Buddhist monks do not form separate lines according to caste when they eat together: 'Persons of all the four caste-classes (*varṇa*) and even from the mixed castes (*varṇasaṁkara*) are eating together in a single line'."[23] While this might indicate an observed practice, the satirical nature of the passage is emphasized by the fact that immediately following it, it is said that the monks are served food by "buxom slave girls,"[24] which at least *prima facie* does not seem very

22 See Eltschinger 2012, and now also 2017. This formulation is not intended of course to deny the Buddhist (nearly?) universal committment to karma as one of the key operative principles. And this applies in the present case as much as anywhere. While the doctrinal nuances are complex (but ably dissected by Eltschinger), there is more than ample evidence that Indian Buddhist texts explicitly attribute "inequalities," if not caste as such, to one's past karmic acts. In a 4-fold category in the *Karmavibhaṅga* (Lévi 1932: 68.15–17; Kudo 2004: 138.13–15, 139.13–15, 270–273), someone who is merely not generous, but does not perform any evil act (*sa dānaṁ na dadāti | na ca tena kiṁcit pāpakaṁ karma kṛtaṁ bhavati*), ends up born into a poor family, without sufficient food (*sa yadā manuṣyeṣūpapadyate daridreṣu kuleṣūpapadyate | alpānnapānabhojaneṣu*).

23 Sanderson 2009a: 290n693, quoting the line: *catvāro varṇā varṇasaṁkarā api vā sarva evaikasyāṁ paṅktau bhuñjate*; see Dezső 2005: 1.81 for the line in context.

24 *thorathaṇamaṁḍalāṇa dāsīṇā* = **sthūlastanamaṇḍānāṁ dāsīnām*.

plausible. This passage, then, may perhaps indicate something about the actual social situation of Buddhist monasteries in Kaśmīr, but it might equally well suggest how one not well-disposed opponent wanted to portray them. Yet, at the same time, even if the depiction is not factually accurate, it must demonstrate that the author Jayanta felt that his audience in Kaśmīr would find it plausible that the Buddhists avoid caste distinctions, even in eating. We should, finally, not forget that even if the observations are factually correct for their author's Kaśmīri situation, it need not follow that the same situation prevailed elsewhere in South Asia at any particular time.

3 Outcastes

Granting the overwhelmingly consistent Buddhist rhetoric about caste equality (or at least non-discrimination), and even its possible instantiation in institutional settings,[25] it is plain that what applies to the four castes need not necessarily extend to those considered *beyond* and, without a shred of doubt *below*, this classification, namely those belonging to the category, or categories, we all too vaguely refer to as "outcaste," among whom the very lowest of the low are the *caṇḍāla*s, the outcastes *par excellence*.[26] That is to say, it may be that those within the four recognized castes—brāhmaṇas, kṣatriyas, vaiśyas, and śūdras—are thought of in one way, and those outside this four-fold division in another.[27]

25 Perhaps a propos of this, I have not run across mentions of caste in discussions of the "uninterrupted begging round" (Skt. *sāvadāna*, Pāli *sapadāna*), in which monks go from house to house begging, not skipping any house, rich or poor. See Lamotte 1976: 50n19. At best however this is negative evidence, and thus hard to assess.

26 The *caṇḍāla* is not the only type of outcaste, but he is the paradigm, and therefore rhetorically speaking it is the *caṇḍāla* who is referred to. It would take a more comprehensive study than the present one to evaluate whether any of the other categories found systematized in the so-called Hindu Law Books are actually taken into account in extant Indian Buddhist literature in anything other than a tangential manner (that is, for instance, as anything other than as items in standard lists). On the category one may read with profit for instance Jha 1975, 1986.

27 It is perhaps needless to say that we must exercise care in our reading of possible evidence, and not imagine references where none exist. For instance, despite considerable disagreement among modern scholars, the appearance in AN v.210,9 of the word *vevaṇṇiya* has nothing to do with caste. It parallels the Sanskrit *vaivarṇika*, and refers to physical appearance, unrelated to *varṇa* in the sense of caste or class. Likewise, in Goodman's translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (2016: 114, and 380nlvii), in a quotation from the *Ratnameghasūtra*, he imagines a reference to untouchables in the text's *caṇḍā vā kukkurās*, citing Tib. *khyi za ba*, but in fact both the Sanskrit and Tibetan mean "vicious dog." (Unfortunately,

Much has been written about the *caṇḍāla*s, who they were, where they came from, and what their status was.[28] It seems clear that the concept originated with marginal tribals, that is, those who lived in "uncivilized" zones, whose habits and practices were perceived to be barbarian (a term with a similar background), and thus despicable.[29] Indeed, this association of outsiders

according to the kind information of Vinītā Tseng, now editing the *Ratnameghasūtra*, the manuscript folio on which this passage would occur is lost.) It occurs in precisely this equivalence and meaning for instance in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, in the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, and perhaps elsewhere. Moreover—and this is important—the categories of *caṇḍāla* and untouchable are not, strictly speaking, the same, and thus the former term should not be translated by the latter. See n. 97, below.

28 Thieme 1994: 326 suggests that the very word, signifying "the name of a member of a rather despised caste, may go back to an adjective **caṇḍa + ala-* 'of horrible food.'" Note that the word is also sometimes spelt *cāṇḍāla*. (Miyasaka 1995a: 32n1, conveniently lists Chinese transcriptions and translations of *caṇḍāla*, though the latter may need some closer attention as identifying exact equivalents for closely related terms can be difficult.) The *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā* (date unknown, but perhaps a Nepalese composition, and thus to be used with caution as evidence for Classical Indian Buddhism), taking advantage of the apparent etymology, states "We call *caṇḍāla*s those men who, bloodthirsty and showing no pity, harm beings and behave cruelly." Ed. Speyer 1906–1909: II.lviii, vs. 186: *tato ye mānavāḥ krūrā nirdayāḥ sattvahiṁsakāḥ | caṇḍavṛttipracārāś ca caṇḍālā iti te smṛtāḥ*, trans. Eltschinger 2012: 14.

Concerning what might in some sense be thought of as a related category, the *mleccha*, my impression is that it is an exaggeration to write, as Parasher 1979: 111 does, that "In early Buddhist and Jaina writings, the *milakkhas* were simply known for their unintelligence, ignorance and a way of life that was unconducive to the attainment of *nibbana*." My impression rather is that the category is almost entirely absent, at least in Buddhist literature, and when mentioned passed over in only a few words.

29 Over time, the concept of the *caṇḍāla* was theorized in Indian treatises, and ultimately, as expressed most clearly in the Dharma tradition, came the rationalization that *caṇḍāla*s come from "mixed marriages," specifically a form of *pratiloma* (inverse) relationship, in which the woman's family has a higher status than the man (the opposite form of marriage, the *anuloma*, confers the father's status on the child). According to some, then, a *caṇḍāla* results from the union of a śūdra man with a brāhmaṇa woman (but as Jha 1986: 5 clarifies, "The Caṇḍālas as a veritable social group were in any case never the actual mixed progeny of śūdra males and brāhmaṇa women"). See the convenient schemes in Parasher-Sen 2006: 447–451. Note that some texts go even farther, however, with the result (which probably is in this respect, even more than the system itself, a theoretical artifact) that as an extreme case, procreation between a *caṇḍāla* man and a brāhmaṇa woman produces a child whose status is even lower than that of a *caṇḍāla*; Yamazaki 2005: 197. I do not know of this status appearing in non-Dharmaśāstric literature.

That the concept of the *caṇḍāla* represents an extreme is shown already by passages in which it is evoked to demonstrate the inexplicable power of some notion. For instance, the quite early *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* refers to the "person embraced by the self (*ātman*) consisting of knowledge [*prajñā*]" (4.3.21), and goes on, "Here a father is not a father, a

with low practices is an understandable idea, and one that continues to have potency in a somewhat more metaphorical sense even down to today (one might think here of the English word "outlandish," or the polyvalency of the French "étranger").

4 Status and Spiritual Potential of Outcastes

In one of our very earliest Buddhist sources, the *Suttanipāta* (136, 142), we find the assertion: "Not by birth does one become an outcaste (*vasala*),[30] not by birth does one become a brāhmaṇa. By one's action one becomes an outcaste,

---

mother is not a mother, worlds are not worlds, gods are not gods, and Vedas are not Vedas. Here a thief is not a thief, an abortionist is not an abortionist, an outcaste is not an outcaste, a pariah is not a pariah, a recluse is not a recluse, and an ascetic is not an ascetic. Neither the good nor the bad follows him, for he has now passed beyond all sorrows of the heart." *atra pitāpitā bhavati mātāmātā lokā alokā devā adevā vedā avedāḥ | atra steno 'steno bhavati bhrūṇahābhrūṇahā cāṇḍālo 'caṇḍālaḥ paulkaso 'paulkasaḥ śramaṇo 'śramaṇas tāpaso 'tāpasaḥ | ananvāgataṁ puṇyenānanvāgataṁ pāpena | tīrṇo hi tadā sarvāñ chokān hṛdayasya bhavati*. Text and trans. in Olivelle 1998: 114–115.

30 *vasala* = Skt. *vṛṣala*; in Chinese (T. 99 [102]) represented by the apparently otherwise unattested *lingqunte* 領群特, (OMC after Schuessler 2009: reŋʔ gwən dâk; if it is a transcription, I cannot suggest an origin) which remains obscure to me (as it did to Miyasaka 1992: 102n15). See also Choong 2009: 375–376, Miyasaka 1992: 82–84. The term *vasala* does not frequently reappear in Buddhist literature; here as in much else, the *Suttanipāta* stands apart from later Buddhist literature.

I owe the following to the kindness of Rafal Felbur: The Chinese monk-scholar Yinshun 1954: 55 claims that *lingqunte* 領群特 is a translation of *vasalaka*. He speculates that the translator(s) may have arrived at it by reading *vasa* as "cow" (牝牛). Hence, *vasalaka* being originally a slightly derogative term for "someone from Vesālī," [I have no idea where this idea comes from—JAS] became "cow that leads the masses." In opting for this term the translator(s) may have been trying to convey the honorific idea of the Buddha being like a "strong cow that leads the people" with his teachings. There are serious problems with this, including the fact that there is nothing at all in the sūtra in question that suggests such an honorific depiction of the Buddha (the interlocutor brāhmaṇa never shows any respect for the Buddha throughout, until the final moment of conversion, and whenever he addresses the Buddha directly, before the very end of the text, he does so with a sense of disdain). Second, in the verse section, in which the Buddha delivers a teaching on the "dharma of the *vasalaka*" 領群特法, the *lingqunte* is presented as having only negative qualities—all a result of his negative karma. Finally, Yinshun correctly observes that in the parallel passage in the *Bieyi za ahan jing* 別譯雜阿含經 (T. 100 [268] [11] 467b27) the same underlying term is given in transcription as *zhantuoluo* 旃陀羅, *caṇḍāla*. The same transcription occurs also in the T. 99 text, in the verse section, 29a19: 生旃陀羅家.

I (JAS) think we must conclude that Yinshun's speculations do not lead us anywhere and *lingqunte* 領群特 remains a mystery.

by one's action one becomes a brāhmaṇa."[31] The context of this is the chapter of the *Suttanipāta* called Vasalasutta. Here a brahmin attacks the Buddha calling him *vasalaka*, outcaste (the suffix *-ka* adds a further element of contempt).[32] Just as he has famously redefined the term *brāhmaṇa*, removing it from the brahmanical hierarchy system and making it a spiritual denomination, here the Buddha redefines *vasala*, asking "Do you know, brāhmaṇa, what an outcaste is, or the things that make one an outcaste?"[33] When the brāhmaṇa confesses that he does not, the Buddha explains, in essence saying that an outcaste is one who is angry and so on, commits violence, steals, lies, engages in sexual misconduct, is unfilial, gives bad advice, conceals his misdeeds, is inhospitable, is arrogant, criticizes the Buddha or his community, or falsely claims to be an arhat. This catalogue of negative actions (not incidentally closely convergent with basic Buddhist vows and prohibitions) thus entirely redefines the status of outcaste from one that is birth-based to one that is deed-based. The composer of the verses (who may or may not be the same as the composer of the prose introduction), even in denying hierarchy, however, plainly acknowledges its existence, taking what are obviously the diametrically opposed poles of his scale—the highest, the brāhmaṇa, and the lowest, the outcaste—to deny the inherent validity of these assignments. We should notice precisely what the key verse actually says: "Not by birth does one become an outcaste, not by birth does one become a brāhmaṇa." There is in fact no denial here of the validity of these extreme, polar categories—only a denial of the fact that one is positioned in either status merely by birth. Here we must not forget the basic doctrinal lynch-pin of Buddhist thought, namely that everything about one's status is a result of nothing other than one's karma, that is, one's actions.[34] In this light, the *Suttanipāta*'s claim appears not at all revolutionary or egalitarian as a social philosophy. Rather, in the process of asserting the centrality of actions, it actually affirms the strict social hierarchy it might, at first blush, seem to deny.

There are, however, a number of examples in Buddhist literature of depictions which *do* actually seem to deny, at least implicitly, the inherently low

31 *na jaccā vasalo hoti na jaccā hoti brāhmaṇo | kammanā vasalo hoti kammanā hoti brāhmaṇo*. Trans. Norman 1992: 16, slightly modified. That this does not come from the very oldest portion of the *Suttanipāta* does not seem to me crucial in the present context.

32 See Jamison 2009.

33 *jānāsi pana tvaṁ, brāhmaṇa, vasalaṁ vā vasalakaraṇe vā dhamme*. Cp. Norman 1992: 14.

34 Eltschinger 2012 discusses the differences in doctrinal positions a propos this point between, chiefly, the Vaibhāṣikas and Vasubandhu; for more, see Eltschinger's very detailed discussion.

status of the *caṇḍāla*.[35] In the first place, and commonly cited in scholarly literature, it should be noticed that several Pāli Jātakas depict the bodhisatta—the Buddha-to-be in a former life—as a *caṇḍāla*,[36] and such passages have been understood, at least by some modern scholars, to deny the idea that even status as an outcaste has some definitive impact on one's spiritual potential. However, it is essential to recognize that this refers not to the status of the bodhisatta in his final life, but in one of his (technically speaking, infinite) former lives. There are other examples of the same formulation.[37] Since all

35 In the survey presented here, I do not offer any hypothesis about possible chronological, geographical or sectarian patterns of attitudes expressed toward *caṇḍāla*s. However, it must be remarked that Shimoda 1991 put forward the suggestion that there was a shift over time in the attitude toward *caṇḍāla*s of the *dharmabhāṇaka*s who preached the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*, the earlier period being one of acceptance which later gave way to intolerance. If this hypothesis were correct it would necessitate a close reexamination of all our other materials concerning this question, since it would imply that we can offer suppositions concerning chronology, or at least relative chronologies, on this basis. However, I cannot agree with Shimoda's hypothesis which is, I believe, based on a rather strong over-reading of his materials. As far as I can tell, he based his argument concerning the early tolerance of *caṇḍāla*s on one passage in one of the Chinese translations of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*, in which it is stated that in times of internal disorder in a land the dharma-preacher may take recourse to the protection offered by *caṇḍāla*s and those carrying weapons, and may travel in dangerous areas in their company. Other—according to Shimoda later—versions of the same text contradict this "liberal view." I will not enter into a detailed critique of Shimoda's theory here, but it may suffice for the present to note that there are numerous exceptional rules in various Buddhist texts allowing otherwise impermissible activities in times of strife and hardship (*āpaddharma*), and I cannot see that the passage so emphasized by Shimoda should be treated any differently. On the general principle in Buddhist contexts, see Schopen 2018.

36 For instance, in *Jātaka* 309, "Chavaka," the bodhisatta was a *chavaka* = *śvapaka* (see Alsdorf 1974), literally a dog-cooker (but also see Norman 1958: 47 with n7, who discusses Sopāka < *śvapāka*, or perhaps **śavapāka*?), or Cittasambhūta (*Jātaka* 498). See Law 1937: 25 for further examples. Problems in interpreting the relevance of these stories aside, the utility of the *Jātaka* prose as sources of Indian Buddhism seem to me potentially problematic, since they belong to a Sri Lankan milieu, and in the absence of parallels I refrain from citing Pāli *Jātaka* prose evidence here.

37 The *Bhadrakalpika-sūtra* offers a list of (according to the count of Skilling and Saerji 2014–2018, upon whose work the following is based) 994 buddhas, for almost all of whom there is an identification of the social position or occupation of the individual when he or she first made the aspiration to awakening. Again, this does not, however, refer to the last life, and there is therefore no contradiction with the stipulation discussed above that buddhas (i.e., bodhisattvas in their last life) are born as either kṣatriyas or brāhmaṇas. Speaking of the initial moment of aspiration, there is a wide range of social statuses given, ranging from gods, kings and court priests down to the lowest social strata, including not only one mention of *caṇḍāla* (#350), but also other occupations which form part of the standard lists of those of low status: cartwright (*rathakāra*; #16, and 16 others), leather-worker (*car-*

beings cycle through saṁsāra, being born as high and low (and as animals and gods and hell-beings), from a doctrinal point of view, one's erstwhile identity is irrelevant for one's present spiritual potential. Such references to former lives of the Buddha, therefore, do not demonstrate anything. So much is clear. Be that as it may, this is not the only type of evidence available, and there does exist evidence of attitudes toward *caṇḍāla*s which do seem non-discriminatory.

While, as we saw above, there are a number of examples of claims made for the high status of the family of the Buddha—the Pāli term is usually *ucca*, in contrast to *nīca*, low—in the *Majjhimanikāya* the Buddha is made to proclaim:[38] "I do not say that one is better because one is from an high status family (*uccākula*), nor do I say that one is worse because one is from an high status family." The reason, as the sequel explains, is that one from a high-status family, or wealthy, may nevertheless commit evil deeds.[39] This approach seems to

makāra, #20, and 4 others), *śūdra* (#433), bamboo-worker (*veṇukāra*, #926), and umpteen others of clearly low status. Perhaps needless to say, almost all the figures given in this list are otherwise entirely unknown and therefore have no hagiographical traditions associated with them.

Note that the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* (Habata 2013: 357, § 526; T. 374 [XII] 423b7–9 = T. 375 [XII] 664b24–26 = T. 376 [XII] 895b24–26) also speaks of a *caṇḍāla* who will quickly become a buddha, but this once again refers to his status when he first makes the aspiration to awakening, not his status at birth in the life in which he finally attains buddhahood, and it is explicitly spoken of as a prophecy or prediction. Matsunaga 1991: 287 misrepresents this key fact.

38 MN ii.179,13–15: *nāhaṁ brāhmaṇa uccākulīnatā seyyaṁ so ti vadāmi | na panāhaṁ brāhmaṇa uccākulīnatā pāpiyaṁ so ti vadāmi*. This is stated in the context of a passage in the immediately preceding sutta: MN ii.167,9–11: *samaṇo khalu bho gotamo uccākulā pabbajito ādīnakhattiyakulā | samaṇo khalu bho gotamo aḍḍhakūlā pabbajito mahaddhanā mahābhogā*, "Sirs, the recluse Gotama went forth from an aristocratic family, from one of the original noble families (*khattiyakula*). Sirs, the recluse Gotama went forth from a rich family, from a family of great wealth and possessions." Trans. Ñāṇamoli 1995: 777.

39 See in this regard also SN i.168,9–12 (VII.I.9.9): *mā jātiṁ puccha caraṇañ ca puccha kaṭṭhā have jāyati jātavedo | nīcākulīno pi muni dhitimā ājānīyo hoti hirīnisedho*. Trans. Bodhi 2000: 262: "Ask not of birth but ask of conduct: Fire is indeed produced from any wood. A resolute sage, though from low family, Is a thoroughbred restrained by a sense of shame." Bodhi 2000: 447n448 translates the commentary: "It is not the case that only fire produced from a pure type of wood, such as sal-tree logs, can perform the work of fire, but not fire produced from the wood of a dog's trough, etc. Rather, by reason of its flame, etc., fire produced from any kind of wood can do the work of fire. So you should not think that only one born of a brahmin family is worthy of offerings, but not one born in a caṇḍāla family, etc. Whether from a low family or a high family, an arahant sage is a thoroughbred—resolute, restrained by a sense of shame."

conform to some narrative portrayals found in various texts. An example is the trope which lauds the humility of the *caṇḍāla*. In the *Aṅguttaranikāya*, we find the following:[40]

> As an example, a young *caṇḍāla* boy or girl, with a container in hand and clad in rags, entering a town or village, enters having produced a humble/low mental attitude. In just this way, Venerable Sir, I live with a mentality the same as that of a young *caṇḍāla* boy or girl, expansive, lofty, measureless, free from hatred, harmless.

This is closely paralleled in the *Madhyamāgama*:[41]

> World-honored One, take as an example a *caṇḍāla* boy who, having had both hands cut off, with his mind supremely low, wanders going from village to village, from town to town, and wherever he goes he commits no offence. World-honored One, I too am like this: my mind is like that *caṇḍāla* boy with hands cut off. Without bonds, without hatred, without wrath, without quarrels, extremely vast, incredibly lofty, [characterized by its propensity for] immeasurable good practices, it wanders pervading the entire world.

Similarly, in the *Ekottarikāgama* we read that "Again, it is like a female *caṇḍāla*, who clutches her tattered clothing and while begging for food among people yet feels no prohibitions. I too am like this. World-honored One, I too wander far and wide with no notion of entering into conflict with others."[42] A similar mention of the *caṇḍāla* as the epitome of humility is found in the *Adhyāśayasaṁcodana*, which states, amidst a list of qualities of the bodhisattva, "If we do not dwell with humble minds, with minds like those of *caṇḍāla*s, we would have

40 AN iv.376,11–16: *seyyathāpi bhante caṇḍālakumārako vā caṇḍālakumārikā vā kaḷopihattho nantakavāsī gāmaṁ vā nigamaṁ vā pavisanto nīcacittaṁ yeva upaṭṭhapetvā pavisati | evam evaṁ kho ahaṁ bhante caṇḍālakumārakacaṇḍālakumārikāsamena cetasā viharāmi vipulena mahaggatena appamāṇena averena avyāpajjena*. The precise meaning of *kaḷopi* is not sure, but also not germane to the subject at hand.

41 MA 24, T. 26 (1) 453a11–15: 世尊, 猶旃陀羅子, 而截兩手, 其意至下, 從村至村從邑至邑, 所遊行處, 無所侵犯。 世尊, 我亦如是。 心如截手旃陀羅子。 無結、無怨、無恚、無諍, 極廣、甚大、無量善修, 遍滿一切世間成就遊.

42 T. 125 (11) 713a24–26: 亦如旃陀羅女著弊壞衣， 在人間乞食, 亦無禁忌。 我亦如是。 世尊, 亦無想念當興諍訟, 而遠遊也. The term *jinji* 禁忌 may include some notion of taboo, including over food.

lied to the Tathāgata."[43] The Mahāyāna scripture *Ratnameghasūtra* contains several passages along the same lines. Bodhisattvas, this sūtra maintains, are noble (*ājāneya*) because they possess ten qualities, one of which is that they "live in the world with a most base mind, like young *caṇḍāla*s. And they become free of pride, arrogance and conceit, because they constantly have in mind the idea of alms."[44] Again, the pride (*māna*) of a bodhisattva with ten qualities is

43 Quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bendall 1897–1902: 98.16–17; MS Cambridge Add. 1478 54b1–2): *saced vayaṁ bhagavan nīcacittāś caṇḍālasadṛśacittā na viharema visaṁvādito asmābhis tathāgato bhavet*. All other versions (the Tibetan of the sūtra and 2 Chinese translations, and the Tibetan and Chinese of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*) add "and dogs" to *caṇḍāla*s; we might emend to **nīcacittāś śvacaṇḍalā*°. It is easy to see how *śva* could have dropped out graphically.

44 Quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (MS Cambridge Add. 1478 74a6–7; cf. Bendall 1897–1902: 150.12–13): *caṇḍālakumāropamāś ca loke viharanti nīcanīcena manasā | mānamadadarpyavigatāś ca bhavanti paiṇḍilyasaṁjñāyāḥ satatasamitaṁ pratyupasthitatvād iti*. The last clause is not particularly easy to understand, and my translation is somewhat speculative. D 3940, *dbu ma, khi* 85a1–2: *gzhan yang dman pa'i yid kyis gdol bu lta bur 'jig rten na spyod pa yin | rtag tu rgyun mi 'chad par bsod snyoms slong ba'i 'du shes nye bar gzhag pas dman zhing dman pa'i yid kyis nga rgyal dang rgyags pa dang dregs pa dang bral ba rnams yin no zhes gsungs so*. Thanks to the generosity of Vinītā Tseng, I can refer to the Sanskrit manuscript of the *Ratnamegha* she is now editing, which reads in her transcription as follows (36b7–37a1): *caṇḍālakumārakopamāś ca bhavanti | anuvicaranti nīcanīcena cittena | mānamadadarppapaḍṛṣṭivigatāś ca bhavanti paiṇḍilyasaṁjñāyāḥ satatasamitaṁ pratyupasthitatvāt*. I do not enter here into the details of the establishment of the text and the relation between the manuscript and its citation in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, which will be addressed by Tseng in her edition. Kanjur version D 231, *mdo sde, wa* 58a5–6: *dma' ba dma' ba'i yid kyis gdol bu ltar 'jig rten na spyod pa rnams yin | rtag tu rgyun mi chad par bsod snyoms blang bar 'du shes nye bar gzhag pas nga rgyal dang | rgyags pa dang | dregs pa dang bral ba rnams yin*. Cp. the trans. Dharmachakra Translation Committee 2019: 1.321. Chinese versions split what seems in Sanskrit and Tibetan to be one item into two (5 & 6): T. 659 (XVI) 257a10–12: 行於世間如旃陀羅卑下之子, 以下卑心, 遠離自高傲慢狂醉故…恒乞食活次第平等故; T. 489 (XIV) 726c15–17: 能於世間自卑其身, 如旃陀羅謙下其意…遠離憍慢, 常於他人起智者想; T. 660 (XVI) 305c6–9: 隨順諸法平等, 理趣通達, 實相遊止, 世間心常下劣, 如旃荼羅…於一切時常能起於乞匄之想, 遠離我慢憍醉放逸.

Perhaps conceptually related to this is a passage in a text we will encounter again below, the *Ratnarāśi*, which advises the alms-begging monk (*piṇḍacārika*) regarding the attitude to take while begging as follows: "In absolutely no way should he have any ideas about taste with regard to good foods. He should train himself, thinking thus: In this way I should be like a young *caṇḍāla* and purify my body and mind, but I should not purify my body with food. Why? No matter how good the food that is eaten, it all ultimately flows out as pus. Ultimately it is disagreeable. Ultimately it is evil-smelling. Therefore, I should not desire good food.'" Silk 1994: §VI.2: *des kha zas bzang po rnams la ro bro ba'i 'du shes thams cad kyi thams cad du bskyed par mi bya'o || des 'di ltar bdag gis gdol pa lta bu dang | lus dang sems gtsang mar bya'i kha zas kyis lus gtsang mar ni mi bya'o || de ci'i phyir zhe na*

destroyed, one of which is "I go for alms with a most base mind, like a young *caṇḍāla*."[45] Now, it may be granted that such references are ambiguous: they seem to be referring to *caṇḍāla*s in some positive way, but gain their power from the expectation that *caṇḍāla*s are humble for a good reason, that they deserve to be humble (we might recall the witticism that "He is a humble man with much to be humble about!"). Therefore, one could certainly justifiably argue that such usages actually do not present any positive view of the *caṇḍāla*.

However, various texts do contain passages in which the spiritual potential of *caṇḍāla*s themselves appears to be explicitly accepted. The **Vidyutprāptasūtra* speaks of a *caṇḍāla* butcher named Fearsome (可畏)[46] who, despite being in a rage to butcher a cow, hears the preaching of a Tathāgata, and immediately becomes awakened, his blood-lust gone. He tells the Tathāgata he would like to renounce the world, and the Buddha makes him a śramaṇa with the *ehi bhikṣu* ("Come, monk!") formula, thereby conferring the *upasampadā* ordination precepts upon him.[47] The Buddha then preaches to him about the bodhisattva practices, and the former butcher, upon hearing this, attains the advanced spiritual fruit of the *anutpattikadharmakṣānti*, the profound understanding that nothing exists inherently, and subsequently the former butcher gains rebirth in the heaven of Maitreya, Tuṣita.[48] In contrast, then, to the *Jātaka* stories

| *zas bzang po ji snyed cig zos kyang de thams cad ni tha mar rnag tu zag go* | *tha mar mi 'thun no* || *tha mar dri nga ba'o* || *de lta bas na bdag gis bzang po 'dod par mi bya'o snyam du bslab par bya'o*. The corresponding Sanskrit is quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (MS 66a4–6 = Bendall 1897–1902: 129.16–130.3): *tena sarvveṇa sarvvaṁ rasasaṁjñā notpādayitavyā* | *caṇḍālakumārasadṛśena mayā bhavitavyaṁ cittakāyacaukṣeṇa* | *na bhojanacaukṣeṇa* | *tat kasmād dhetoḥ* | *kiyata praṇītam api bhojanaṁ bhuktaṁ sarvvan tatpūtiniṣyandaparyavasānaṁ durgandhaparyavasānaṁ pratikūlaparyavasānaṁ tasmān mayā na praṇītabhojanākāṁkṣiṇā bhavitavyaṁ*.

45 Quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bendall 1897–1902: 150.18): *nīcanīcena cittena caṇḍālakumārasadṛśena piṇḍāya carāmīti nihatamāno bhavati*. The version in the sūtra manuscript (quoted after the draft ed. of Dr. Tseng) reads only trivially differently (61a1): *nīcanīcena cittena caṇḍālakumārakasadṛśena piṇḍāya carāmīti nihatamāno bhavati*. Kanjur text at D 231, *mdo sde, wa* 95a2: *gdol bu dang 'dra bar dman pa dman pa'i sems kyis bsod snyoms kyi phyir 'gro'o zhes nga rgyal bcom pa yin*. Cp. Dharmachakra Translation Committee 2019: 1.537.

46 Matsunaga 1991: 282 speculates that given the similarity of *caṇḍāla* and *caṇḍa*, the latter may have been the name meant here. It is true that the semantic domains of *caṇḍa*—violent, fierce, angry—may overlap with those of *wèi* 畏—to fear, awe-inducing, but also dreadful—but I am not quite sure about the suggestion.

47 At least this is how I understand the text (T. 310 [20] [XI 485b29–c1): 善來比丘, 即成沙門, 得具足戒. The wording is a bit peculiar.

48 T. 310 (20) (XI) 485b3–c5, esp. b26–c1. Cp. the trans. in Chang 1983: 160. Since the Tibetan translation is a rendering of the Chinese, I refer only to the former here.

referred to above, here the spiritual attainment takes place in the very life in which the individual was born as a *caṇḍāla*. Another example is found in a well-known episode in the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna*.[49] This text is often cited for its presentation of the nested *jātaka* story of king Triśaṅku, the *caṇḍāla* king of the Mātaṅgas,[50] and the way in which this episode is deployed by the Buddha in his argument to king Prasenajit against caste. The frame story has Ānanda encounter the Mātaṅga girl Prakṛti (her very name suggests some fundamental naturalness), who falls in love with him. Through the Buddha's intervention, she asks him to ordain her. There follows a small comment which is likely to be a later interpolation, of which only the final words, mentioning ordination, are old, in which the Buddha states that "having entirely purified, by means of a *dhāraṇī* [called the *Dhāraṇī*] *which Purifies One From* [*Rebirth in*] *All of the Unfortunate States*, all of the sins which the Mātaṅga girl Prakṛti had acquired in her previous lives[, sins which fated her to] unfortunate rebirths, and liberating her from the Mātaṅga *jāti* (caste), he spoke to that Mātaṅga girl Prakṛti who had become by nature (a pun on *prakṛti*) purified of defilements, saying: 'Come, nun! Practice the celibate life!'"[51] Under the Buddha's tutelage she then

49 See Ujike 1984; Isobe 2005; Miyasaka 1993. The textual history of the related works is complex, on which see also briefly Aoyama 1982. See also Karashima and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2015: 257–259, with n. 148, a reference I owe to one of the reviewers of this paper.

50 We should recall that in the *Suttanipāta* 1.7 (Vasalasutta), verse 137, it is stated that Sopāka (see above n. 36 for the possible etymology) is a *caṇḍāla* named Mātaṅga: *caṇḍālaputto sopāko mātaṅgo iti vissuto*. For a translation of the commentary, see Bodhi 2017: 555–562. On Mātaṅgas, see the perhaps not so very informative Maetani 1994. I have unfortunately no access to Miyasaka 1976.

51 Mukhopadhyaya 1954: 7.21–8.2: *pravrajayatu māṁ sugata pravrajayatu māṁ bhagavān | atha bhagavān yat tasyāḥ prakṛter mātaṅgadārikāyāḥ pūrvasañcitāpāyadurgatigamanībhūtaṁ tat sarvaṁ pāpaṁ sarvadurgatipariśodhanyā dhāraṇyā niravaśeṣeṇa pariśodhya mātaṅgajāter vimocayitvā śuddhaprakṛtinirmalībhūtaṁ tāṁ prakṛtiṁ mātaṅgadārikām idam avocat | ehi tvaṁ bhikṣuṇī cara brahmacaryam*. Mukhopadhyaya removed from the text the portion after *atha bhagavān* until *idam avocat*, which he gives on p. 8n1, explaining p. 219 that "These lines are omitted in translations. Such an idea is against the spirit of Buddhism. Hence we consider it an interpolation." The lines are included in the text in Cowell and Neil 1886: 616.12–15. See also Hiraoka 2007a: 11.311n90. I agree that the lines are an interpolation, but not with the reasoning of Mukhopadhyaya. In fact, the textual history of this material is very complex, and we await a full philological treatment (although excellent work was done by Hiraoka 2007a). See however Hiraoka 1991: 30, 37, who accepts what I consider to be the interpolation and suggests that because the Buddha purified Prakṛti with a *dhāraṇī* and thus freed her from her caste, "Therefore, the compiler(s) of the *Divy*[*āvadāna*] did not consider her to be from the mātaṅga caste at the time of her ordination." Referring also to several other stories in the same collection, Hiraoka concludes, "These stories reveal that … at least some (Mūlasarvāstivādin?) groups did not approve of

attains great spiritual results, but the brāhmaṇa householders of Śrāvastī, hearing that the Buddha has ordained a *caṇḍāla*, are not at all happy.[52] They wonder whether a *caṇḍāla* girl will be able to correctly carry out the practice of monks, or of nuns, male lay followers or female lay followers.[53] How, they further wonder, could it be that a *caṇḍāla* girl would enter into the houses of brāhmaṇas, kṣatriyas, householders, or great families for alms?

A similar (and perhaps in origin related) story occurs in a number of texts in slightly variant forms. It is known even to the massive compendium called **Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* (*Da zhidu lun* 大智度論), which refers to the story very laconically, stating only that the low status character becomes a great Arhat.[54] The fullest version is that in the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*,[55] a portion

men of humble birth being ordained and joining the saṁgha. I surmise, therefore, that the *Divy*. provides evidence of some type of discrimination against those of low social status." I suspect that we have perhaps to do with various stages of editing, and the conflicts between the extant Sanskrit and the other parallel versions provide some evidence of this process.

According to Hirakawa 2000: 170, this is the first instance of a bhikṣuṇī ordained with this formula. Notice however that, as pointed out by Isobe 2005: 25, in the version of the story in the early Chinese translation *Binaiye* 鼻奈耶 (T. 1464 [XXIV] 864c1), the Buddha allows her ordination (世尊許旃荼羅女爲道), but it is actually Mahāprajāpatī who performs that ordination.

It is a pity that A. Rotman, who translated much of the *Divyāvadāna*, chose not to attempt this section; along with other unfortunate omissions, the result is that we still lack any published full rendering of the compilation in English.

52 Mukhopadhyaya 1954: 10.10–11: *aśrauṣuḥ śrāvasteyakā brāhmaṇagṛhapatayo bhagavatā kila caṇḍāladārikā pravrājiteti*. Then further 10.11–14: *śrutvā ca punar avadhyāyanti | kathaṁ hi nāma caṇḍāladārikā bhikṣūṇāṁ samyakcaryāṁ cariṣyati | bhikṣuṇīnām upāsakānām upāsikānāṁ samyakcaryāṁ cariṣyati | kathaṁ hi nāma caṇḍāladārikā brāhmaṇakṣatriyagṛhapatimahāśālakuleṣu pravekṣyati*. The king then repeats these questions.

53 I do not understand the gender inclusivity here, which is perhaps no more than an artifact of the standard phrase, inappropriately copied here.

54 T. 1509 (XXV) 248a9–10: 如客除糞人名尼陀。 佛化度之得大阿羅漢, trans. Lamotte 1944–1980: III.1634, with, as always, valuable notes. See also T. 1509 (XXV) 310a18–20: 如尼他阿波陀那中: 舍婆提國除糞人, 而佛以手摩頭, 教令出家, 猶不輕之, trans. Lamotte 1944–1980: V.2318–2319.

55 T. 201 (IV) 293c3–297c10, trans. Huber 1908: 192–210. The title might also have been understood more fully as *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā Dṛṣṭāntapaṅkti*, for which Loukota Sanclemente suggests "Garland of Examples Adorned by Poetic Fancy"; see 2019: 64 for his discussion of the title. Nota bene: the same story being found in many sources, including in Pāli, casts significant doubt on the suggestion of Loukota Sanclemente 2019: 141n174 that the story of Nītha is an "original invention of Kumāralāta." Likewise I do not understand his mention (p. 177) of "Kumāralāta's vehement defense of the *caṇḍāla*," which I at any rate cannot detect.

of which has recently been reexamined by Loukota Sanclemente,[56] who calls it (p. 131) "one of the longest and most elaborate stories in the collection." Here the main character Nītha is a cleaner of filth (糞穢人).[57] The Tathāgata is praised (295a20–21, Huber 1908: 200) as one who examines hearts, not paying attention to caste, and somewhat later the Buddha himself proclaims (295c6–7, Huber 202) that he does not observe caste or high or low status, but only one's previous deeds. Proclaiming that he preaches equally to all, he then says (295c24–25, Huber 203) that like pure water (see above n. 9) his teaching is available equally to brāhmaṇas, kṣatriyas, vaiśyas and śūdras. Nītha too is ordained and becomes an Arhat (296b8, Huber 206). This is where the text gets interesting (296b8–15) for, as we just saw above in the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna*, there is strong opposition. The brāhmaṇa elders of the town, hearing about the ordination, fear that one of mean status, coming to beg, will sully their homes.[58] They complain to king Prasenajit, who promises them that he will request the Buddha not to grant ordination to the low caste person. However, when the king arrives and encounters a monk, he does not recognize that this is the very same Nītha who so concerns the townsmen and him (296b25). The story continues in some detail, and the king eventually acknowledges (296c26) that all castes can equally attain spiritual fruits, and here too (296c29–297a2) we find an expression we have encountered above, namely that caste applies in matters of marriage (婚娶) but not in the Buddha's teaching,[59] and persons are like different woods that burn in the same way (see n. 39, above). The same basic story is recounted briefly also in Pāli, in the commentary to the *Theragāthā*,[60] where the main character Sunīta (obviously related to Sanskrit Nītha) gathers spoiled and wilted flowers from shrines, the Buddha ordains him with the *ehi*

56 Loukota Sanclemente 2019: 131–138.

57 The name is attested in Schøyen Brāhmī MS 2382.318 A, recto 2, edited in Loukota Sanclemente 2019: 352, and discussed p. 354.

58 This portion is preserved in Schøyen Brāhmī MS 2379.5, recto 2–3, edited in Loukota Sanclemente 2019: 357–358, where we find /// .. *saṁv*[*ṛ*]*taḥ pravrajitaṁ ca nītham ājñāya śrāvastakā brāhmaṇagṛhapataya kṣ*(*o*)*bdh*(*u*).. .. /// (r 3) /// (*visar*)*j*(*a*)*yati viṭvālitany asmākaṁ gṛhāṇi dūṣitāni ca śayanāsanāni yatra śramaṇāḥ* ///. The Chinese text of T. 201 (IV) 296b8–c23 is translated pp. 360–363.

59 See the passage cited above from the *Kuṇālāvadāna*. Here 296c29–297a2: 若婚娶時, 取四種姓。 此四種姓皆可得淨。 若娶取婦嫁女, 應擇種姓。 此佛法中, 唯觀宿世善惡因緣, 不擇種姓。

60 Th-a ii.262–265, trans. Rhys Davids 1913: 271–274, on *Theragāthā* 620–631. In *Theragāthā* 620, Sunīta says "I was born in a low family, poor, having little food; my work was lowly—I was a disposer of (withered) flowers," *nīce kulamhi jāto 'haṁ daḷiddo appabhojano | hīnaṁ kammaṁ mamaṁ āsi ahosiṁ pupphachaḍḍako*. Trans. Norman 1969: 62.

bhikkhu formula (ii.263,1; 28), and Sunīta gains great spiritual fruits. Finally, we should note the version of the same story found in the *Chuyao jing* 出曜經, a commentary on the *Dharmapada*,[61] in which the central character is explicitly a *caṇḍāla*. The Buddha ordains him (710a22) and he quickly attains spiritual fruits, up to arhatship. Once again, Prasenajit hears that a *caṇḍāla* has been ordained, and worries. He thinks (710a29–b4) that the Buddha himself comes from the Śākya clan, and the monks from all four castes, but now that someone from the *caṇḍāla* caste (旃陀羅種) has been ordained, how are we to bow to him? However, upon visiting the Buddha he encounters the very monk who concerned him, learns that he has attained supernatural powers, and in the end is satisfied.

These are not the only stories of the ordination and spiritual attainment of a *caṇḍāla*. In the *Karmaśataka*, we read that Kātyāyana ordained a *caṇḍāla*, instructed him, and this *caṇḍāla* attained arhatship.[62] In a story of the past explaining the present situation, it is narrated that in a previous life this same individual was a *caṇḍāla* who became a monk, but being quarrelesome became angry at a group of many monks and called them "*caṇḍāla*," which however he quickly repented. However, as a karmic result of his calling that group of monks "*caṇḍāla*," he was reborn 500 times as a *caṇḍāla*.[63] Another example comes from a story in the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā* of a *caṇḍāla* executioner. A crisis occurs because the *caṇḍāla* refuses further to act as an executioner. Ultimately, after killing almost everyone in his quest for obedience, the king says:[64]

> People of the world examine one's caste, they do not examine whether internally one upholds the rules of restraint.

61 T. 212 (IV) 709c28–710b28; Miyasaka 1992: 94–96. Note however that the Indian bona fides of the *Chuyao jing* as a collection are questionable; Hiraoka 2007b suggests that despite a preponderance of Sarvāstivāda materials, the collection as a whole also contains matter from other sectarian sources, suggesting it as a Chinese compilation (I do not know whether there exist any Indian compositions with material from different lineages mixed together). This does not, however, imply that the stories it contains are not themselves Indian, only that the arrangement of diverse materials took place elsewhere. I thus feel confident citing it here as Indian evidence.

62 Story v.5, summary in Feer 1910: 300, trans. Lozang and Fischer 2020: 5.83–95. The text is in D 340, *mdo sde, ha*, 214b5 ff.

63 D 340, *mdo sde, ha*, 216a7, 216b3–4.

64 T. 201 (IV) 299a6–12: 世人觀種族不觀內禁戒 / 護戒爲種族設不護戒者 / 種族當滅壞我是旃陀羅 / 彼是淨戒者彼生旃陀羅 / 作業實清淨我雖生王種 / 實是旃陀羅我無悲愍心 / 極惡殺賢人我實旃陀羅. Trans. earlier by Huber 1908: 219.

[But actually] keeping the rules of restraint constitutes one's caste. One who does not keep the rules of restraint
Destroys his caste. It is I who am a *caṇḍāla*.
Those persons purely upheld the rules of restraint, [though] they were born as *caṇḍāla*s.
Their actions were truly pure. Though I was born in the royal caste,
I am truly a *caṇḍāla*. I lack a compassionate heart,
Extremely evil, I killed noble men—I truly am a *caṇḍāla*.

In the same text, elsewhere we find the expression that a *caṇḍāla* was a learned *upāsaka* and had obtained the *darśanamārga*, the third of five landmarks toward spiritual perfection.[65] Clearly, then, here in the narrative tradition, even if it is limited and mono-typical, we find examples which portray *caṇḍāla*s as capable of spiritual attainment. The evidence of such passages must be acknowledged, and given full weight. They suggest the existence of an attitude of openness and lack of discrimination against even the lowest of the low. This cannot be denied.

At the same time, despite the evident importance of such passages, almost everywhere *else* in Indian Buddhist literature, no matter where we look, we encounter, on the contrary, considerable evidence of the nearly uniform fashion in which these texts display an intense antipathy toward *caṇḍāla*s. Some of these instances are quite explicit and perhaps self-conscious, while others seem rather to demonstrate a tacit and even subconscious attitude.

5 The Bad State of the *caṇḍāla*

It is clear that for those who composed almost all varieties of Indian Buddhist texts, the examples cited above aside, it is very bad indeed to be a *caṇḍāla*. The Pāli Vinaya speaks of two kinds of birth, inferior and superior, in the following terms:[66] "There are two kinds of birth: inferior birth and superior birth. Infe-

65 T. 201 (IV) 298b18: 彼旃陀羅是學優婆塞得見諦道. See Huber 1908: 217.

66 Vin. iv.6,9–12: *jāti nāma dve jātiyo: hīnā ca jāti ukkaṭṭhā ca jāti | hīnā nāma jāti: caṇḍāla-jāti veṇajāti nesādajāti rathakārajāti pukkusajāti | esā hīnā nāma jāti. ukkaṭṭhā nāma jāti | khattiyajāti brāhmaṇajāti | esā ukkaṭṭhā nāma jāti.* This first sort of listing is found right up through the tantric literature. For instance, see the *Da faju tuoluoni jing* 大法炬陀羅尼經 (T. 1340 [XXI] 666a22–24), in which the list includes *caṇḍāla*s, evil magicians (惡呪師家), butchers, bamboo workers, trappers and birders.

rior birth is birth as an outcaste (*caṇḍāla*), birth as a bamboo-worker (*veṇa*), birth as a hunter (*nesāda*), birth as a cartwright (*rathakāra*), birth as a scavenger (*pukkusa*). This is inferior birth. Superior birth is birth as a khattiya, birth as a brāhmaṇa. This is superior birth." In case there were any lingering doubts about how these were imagined, such doubts would be removed by a passage in the *Majjhimanikāya* in which we find a description of what happens after the very negative rebirth in the unfortunate realms (*vinipāta* = *duggati*) of a fool who does not practice the Teaching:[67]

67 MN iii.169,25–170,6: *sa kho so bhikkhave bālo sace kadāci karahaci dīghassa addhuno accayena manussattaṁ āgacchati | yāni tāni nīcakulāni caṇḍālakulaṁ vā nesādakulaṁ vā veṇakulaṁ vā rathakārakulaṁ vā pukkusakulaṁ vā | tathārūpe kule paccājāyati dalidde appannapānabhojane kasiravuttike | yattha kasirena ghāsacchādo labbhati | so ca hoti dubbaṇṇo duddasiko okoṭimako bahvābādho kāṇo vā kuṇī vā khujjo vā pakkhahato vā na lābhī annassa pānassa vatthassa yānassa mālāgandhavilepanassa seyyāvasathapadīpeyyassa | so kāyena duccaritaṁ carati vācāya duccaritaṁ carati manasā duccaritaṁ carati | so kāyena duccaritaṁ caritvā vācāya duccaritaṁ caritvā manasā duccaritaṁ caritvā kāyassa bhedā paraṁ maraṇā apāyaṁ duggatiṁ vinipātaṁ nirayaṁ upapajjati*. Trans. Ñāṇamoli 1995: 1021. (See also T. 26 [199] [1] 761c13–22.) Almost precisely the same passage is found for instance in SN i.93,28–94,13; AN ii.85,15–15, iii.385,7–18. This last passage is presented as part of the Buddha's response to Pūraṇa Kassapa, who claimed (AN iii.383,22–25): *kaṇhābhijāti paññattā orabbhikā sūkarikā sākuṇikā māgavikā luddā macchaghātakā corā coraghātakā bandhanāgārikā ye vā panaññepi keci kurūrakammantā*, namely that the "black class" of beings includes various butchers, hunters, and other killers. The Buddha here thus seems to reject the idea that one's livelihood places one into a certain category. Jha 1974a: 78 seems to have misunderstood the passage. Note that in contrast similar listings of low births are indeed not uncommon, and precisely the same terminology of "black class" is found for instance in the *Yogācārabhūmi* (Bhattacharya 1957: 195.12–16): *abhijātiprabhedataḥ kāmadhātau manuṣyeṣu kṛṣṇābhijātikaṁ janma | yathāpīhaikatyaś caṇḍālakuleṣu vā pukkasakuleṣu vā rathakārakuleṣu vā veṇukārakuleṣu vā iti yāni vā punar anyāni nīcāni adhamāni kṛcchrāṇi kṛcchravṛttīni parīttāni parīttānnapānabhojanāni ity evaṁrūpeṣu kuleṣv abhijāto bhavati | ta eva manuṣyadurbhagā ity ucyante* = T. 1579 (XXX)320b28–c3: 勝生差別者, 謂欲界人中有三勝生。一, 黑勝生生, 謂如有一生旃荼羅家、 若卜羯娑家、 若造車家、 若竹作家、 若生所餘下賤、 貧窮、乏少財物、飲食等家。如是名為人中薄福德者.

We find the same idea in the *Pañcaviṁśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, directed against those who reject the profound Perfection of Wisdom (Kimura 1986: 151.19–25): *te bahuduḥkhavedanīyaṁ karma kṣepayitvā kadācit karhicit mānuṣyakam ātmabhāvaṁ pratilapsyante | te yatra yatropapatsyante tatra tatra jātyandhā bhaviṣyanti | jātyandhakuleṣūpapatsyante | caṇḍālakuleṣu vā puṣkasakuleṣu vā śākunikuleṣu vā sukarikuleṣu vā aurabhikakuleṣu vā nīceṣu vā kutsiteṣu vā kuleṣu vā nīcavṛttisu vā upapatsyante | te teṣūpapannā andhā vā bhaviṣyanti kāṇā vā ajihvā vā ahastā vā apādā vā akarṇakā vā anāsikā vā*. See the (somewhat abbreviated) trans. in Conze 1975: 289. Almost the same at Kimura 1992: 30.19–25; trans. Conze 1975: 454.

> If sometime or other at the end of a long period, that fool comes back to the human state, it is into a low family (*nīcakula*) that he is reborn—into a family of outcasts (*caṇḍāla*) or hunters (*nesāda*) or bamboo-workers (*veṇa*) or cartwrights (*rathakāra*) or scavengers (*pukkusa*)—one that is poor with little to eat and drink, surviving with difficulty, where he scarcely finds food and clothing; and he is ugly, unsightly, and misshapen, sickly, blind, cripple-handed, lame, or paralyzed; he gets no food, drink, clothes, vehicles, garlands, scents and unguents, bed, lodging, and light; he misconducts himself in body, speech, and mind, and having done that, on the dissolution of the body, after death, he reappears in a state of deprivation, in an unhappy destination, in perdition, even in hell.

This kind of list of the "low"—typically including at least *caṇḍāla*s, bamboo-workers, cartwrights, and *pukkasa*—is frequently met with, and plainly refers to a grouping of those who stand outside the norms of acceptable society.[68] It appears for instance in slightly flexible stock description of unfavorable rebirths that might be the result of evil actions, placed together with various bodily infirmities—we would call them, politically correctly, handicaps or disabilities—among which being born ugly is a common member of the list.[69] Evil deeds lead to this result, and some authors use this opportunity to insert

68 Their use as terms of aspersion is evident in verses of the *Kuśa Jātaka* found both in Pāli and in the *Mahāvastu*, which, although slightly differently cast, make the same point. In Pāli (verses 57–58, Jāt. v.306,14–22) we find the character Pabhāvatī's mother accusing her: *veṇī tvam asi caṇḍālī adū si kulagandhinī | kathaṁ maddakule jātā dāsaṁ kayirāsi kāmukan ti*, "You are a bamboo-worker, *caṇḍālī*, a destroyer of this family! Born into Madda's household, how could you make a slave your lover?" She replies: *n 'amhi veṇī na caṇḍālī na c 'amhi kulagandhinī | okkākaputto bhaddan te tvaṁ nu dāso ti maññasī ti*, "I am no bamboo-worker, no *caṇḍālī*, no destroyer of this family! If you please, he is the son of [king] Okkāka [= Kusa], whom you think a slave!" In the *Mahāvastu* parallel we find the grammar altered, and the subject Kuśa, not the maiden: *ko nu veṇo va pāṇo vā atha vā puna pukkaso | kasya rājakule jāṭo kasya kurvaṁ adhomukhaṁ*, "Is he a bamboo-worker, a *pāṇa* [?], or a *pukkasa*? Is he of royal birth? Whom does he serve?" [I here follow Marciniak 2019: 29n4]. Then the character Sudarśanā answers saying: *na eṣa veṇo na caṇḍālo atha vā puna pukkaso | putro ikṣvākurājasya taṁ tvaṁ dāso ti manyasi*, "He is no bamboo-worker, no *caṇḍāla*, nor a *pukkasa*. He is a son of the Ikṣvāku king, the one whom you think to be a slave." For the text see now Marciniak 2019: 29.4–8. (Note that translations including Jones 1949–1956: III.20 misunderstand *veṇa* as "musician.") Given the reply, it is hard to understand both *pāṇa* and the absence of *dāsa*; see in addition to Marciniak's notes the considerations of Chopra 1966: 134 (and see p. 181).

69 The topic of physical (what we would now call) handicaps or disabilities in Indian Buddhism is seriously understudied. See for a start Kusama 1989.

their quite specific dislikes.[70] As one example, for the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*,[71] "[A meat eater is] born again and again among the *caṇḍāla*s, *pukkasa*s and *ḍomba*s as evil-smelling, offensive, and insane." In listings of dangers and threats, for instance to travelers, we find the same general idea. In Perfection of Wisdom scriptures, a person, having walked through a forest, upon seeing a town is no longer afraid: "He may take a deep breath and there is no longer any danger of robbers, of *caṇḍāla*s, of fierce beasts, of hunger or of thirst."[72] The *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* presents much the same idea of the dangers lurking in a wilderness:[73]

---

70 As one example of a rather generic but quite clear cause and effect relation, see the passage from the *Śāriputra Repentence Sūtra*, *Shelifu huiguo jing* 舍利弗悔過經: "If there are good men and good women who do not desire to enter into the states of hell-dwellers, animals, or hungry ghosts, they should repent all of their transgressions and should not conceal them. After they have undertaken the precepts, they should not do evil again. If they do not desire to be reborn in borderlands without a buddha, without the teaching, without a community of monks, without righteousness, in a place [defined by distinctions between] good and evil, they should repent all of their transgressions and should not conceal them. If they do not wish to be stupid, deaf, blind, or mute, if they do not wish to be born as butchers, fishermen, jailors, or reborn into poor families, they should repent of all their sins and should not conceal them." T. 1492 (XXIV) 1090b18–24: 若有善男子善女人, 意不欲入泥犁、 禽獸、 薜荔中者, 諸所作過, 皆當悔之, 不當覆藏, 受戒以後, 不當復作惡。 不欲生邊地無佛處、 無經處、 無比丘僧處、 無義理處、 善惡處者, 皆當悔過, 不當覆藏。 意不欲愚癡、 聾、 盲瘖瘂、 不欲生屠生、 漁獵、 獄吏更生貧家, 皆當悔過不當覆藏. In the otherwise apparently unknown *Pravrajyāntarāyasūtra* quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bendall 1897–1902: 69.5–7; Cambridge Add. 1478 40a3), a householder who acts wrongly (in ways which the passage enumerates) will suffer in various unsavory rebirths: "He will be born blind, stupid, dumb, a *caṇḍāla*, never happy. And he will be often slandered, will be impotent, queer, an eternal slave, and he will be a woman, a dog, a pig, a donkey, a camel, and a poisonous snake in birth after birth," *jātyandhaś ca jaḍaś cājihvakaś ca caṇḍālaś ca na jātu sukhito bhavaty abhyākhyānabahulaś ca ṣaṇḍakaś ca paṇḍakaś ca nityadāsaś ca | strī ca bhavati śvā ca śūkaraś ca gardabhaś coṣṭraś cāśīviṣaś ca bhavati tatra tatra jātau.* (On the sexual vocabulary see the detailed study of Cabezón 2017, esp. 373–451.)

71 Nanjio 1923: 257.16–258.1, 8.14 (quoted also in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, Bendall 1897–1902: 132.18–133.1): *durgandhikutsanīyaś ca unmattaś cāpi jāyate | caṇḍālapukkasakule ḍombeṣu ca punaḥ punaḥ*.

72 Kimura 1990: 17.13–15: *sa āśvāsaprāpto bhavet | na cāsya bhūyo bhavati caurabhayaṁ vā caṇḍālabhayaṁ vā caṇḍamṛgabhayaṁ vā bubhukṣābhayaṁ vā pipāsābhayaṁ vā*; cp. Conze 1975: 322. A similar listing of dangers is found at Kimura 1990: 51.15–16: *yena caurabhayaṁ caṇḍālabhayaṁ lubdhakabhayaṁ caṇḍamṛgabhayam āśīviṣabhayaṁ kāntārāṭavībhayaṁ durgabhayaṁ*; Conze 1975: 342: danger from robbers, outcastes, desperadoes, fierce beasts, vipers, wild jungles, and treacherous roads. Similar passages could be easily multiplied.

73 Quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, Bendall 1897–1902: 198.1–6: *punar aparaṁ gṛhapate pravrajitena bodhisatvenāraṇye prativasataivam upaparīkṣitavyaṁ | kimartham aham*

> Moreover, O Eminent Householder, the renunciant bodhisattva who lives in the wilderness should reflect as follows: "For what reason do I live in the wilderness? Wilderness-dwelling alone does not make one a śramaṇa. There are many living here who are not tamed, not disciplined, not restrained, not intent, such as deer, monkeys, flocks of birds, thieves and *caṇḍāla*s. And they do not possess the qualities of a śramaṇa. So for what reason do I live in the wilderness? Namely, it is so that I might fulfill the aim of the śramaṇa."

It is in fact quite common that birth as a *caṇḍāla* is characterized as low, and *caṇḍāla*s are considered fearful, together with wild beasts and robbers.[74] The location of such beings signals danger. In a stock expression, found widely in the Vinaya and śāstric literature, for instance in the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, there are five places a monk should not go. Although the first item is not entirely clear—it might refer to a musician or a butcher—the remaining four places prohibited to monks are a brothel, a bar, a royal palace, and a *caṇḍāla*'s hut.[75] Leaving aside the many interesting questions raised by this list, it is clear that the *caṇḍāla*

---

araṇye prativasāmi | na kevalam araṇyavāsena śramaṇo bhavati | bahavo 'py atrādāntāvinītāyuktānabhiyuktāḥ prativasanti | tad yathā | mṛgavānarapakṣisaṁghacauracaṇḍālāḥ prativasanti | na ca te śramaṇaguṇasamanvāgatā bhavanti | api tu khalu punar ahaṁ yasyārthāyāraṇye prativasāmi sa mayārthaḥ paripūrayitavyo yad uta śrāmaṇyārthaḥ. The trans. is mine, but based on that of Nattier 2003: 291, § 25A, who did not translate the Sanskrit.

74 In a passage from the Perfection of Wisdom, a bodhisattva who trains correctly is freed from nasty rebirths, listed as (Conze 1962: 41.17–21; trans. Conze 1975: 454) *naraka, tiryagyoni, yamaloka, pratyantima janapada, pukkasa-caṇḍālakula*, nor is one one-eyed, humpbacked, lame, crippled (?), deaf, sunken in mud (?), or handicapped, *kāṇa, kubja, laṁga, ūnāṅga, badhira, paṅkapatita, vikalendriya*. Jens-Uwe Hartmann kindly drew my attention to the passage in a Schøyen manuscript (the name of the text is unknown) at Harrison, Harmann and Matsuda 2016: 290–291 which has *caṇḍāla, pukkasa, veṇukāra ... andha, kāṇa, kubja, kalla, laṁga, badhira, pakṣahata*.

75 Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group of Taishō University 1998: 66, (1)-c-11l-4-a-(1)-iv; D.17a3–5; T. 1579 (xxx) 402c15–20 (cp. 368a28–b3): *kathaṁ ca gocarasaṁpanno bhavati | pañca bhikṣor agocarāḥ | katame pañca | tadyathā ghoṣo veśyaṁ pānāgāro rājakulaṁ caṇḍālakaṭhinam eva pañcamam iti | ya etāṁs tathāgatapratikṣiptān agocarān varjayitvānyatra gocare caraty anavadye tatra kālenaivaṁ gocarasaṁpanno bhavati*. see Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group of Taishō University 2007: 337–368, and (1)-c-11l-8-a-(3)-i; D.48a2; T. 1579 (xxx) 415b25–27. Basically the same listing is also found, to name only a few sources among many, briefly in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya (T. 1442 [xxiii] 689c2–4; 733a20–21; 790a15–17; T. 1451 [xxiv] 381a12–14), Sarvāstivāda Vinaya (T. 1435 [xxiii] 359b17–25) and *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* (Tatia 1976: 71.15–17; Bayer 2010: 258): *gocarasaṁpannaḥ pañcāgocaraparivarjanāt | pañca bhikṣor agocarāḥ | ghoṣo veśaḥ pānāgāraṁ rājakulam caṇḍālakaṭhinam eva pañcamam*. In Tibetan, D 4053, *sems tsam, shi* 205a7–b1, the word *ghoṣa* is

represents a danger to the serious practitioner. The same holds for the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, in which it is stated that a bodhisattva should avoid a great many undesirables, including the *caṇḍāla*:[76]

---

rendered *gsod pa'i sa*, killing place. There are other instances of the stock expression with slightly different wordings.

The first term, *ghoṣa*, is difficult. When the list above is repeated at T. 1579 (XXX) 368a28–b1, *ghoṣa* is defined as follows (T. 1579 [XXX] 368b1–3): 唱令家者, 謂: 屠羊等。由遍宣告, 此屠羊等, 成極重罪。 多造惡業, 殺害羊等故, in Tibetan (D 4035, *sems tsam, dzi* 215b7–216a1): *sha 'tsong gi gnas ni gsod pa'i gnas yin par blta bar bya ste | der 'bod cing shan pa byed pa la sogs pas shin tu kha na ma tho ba sdig pa'i las lug la sogs pa gsod par byed pa'o*. Here butcher or some other kind of killer is the operative understanding. (See also the *Yugaron ki* 瑜伽論記 by the early 8th c. Korean Tullyun 遁倫 [T. 1828 (XLII) 418c4–19].) The word is also glossed in Huilin's 慧琳 *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 (T. 2128 [LIV] 622c11–12): 唱令家: 上 [鳽-廾+幺] 讓反。 謂作音樂人、 戲作人也。 又云尋香人也。是等家無産業唯乞自活。若見有飲食處, 即徃至彼爲設倡伎求財食也. This glossary, which in this case seems to transmit a meaning also found in Indian sources, suggests the meaning of "musician." The word is discussed by Bayer 2010: 409n386, without reference to either of these sources, but with notice of both possible meanings (as well as several other ideas). Other of Bayer's notes here briefly discuss the other four terms as well. I am not totally convinced by the suggestion of Ujike 1985: 3 that the five places should be connected to the *pañcaśīla*.

Peter Szántó draws my attention to Turner 1966: §4528, which identifies Prakrit *ghōsa* (semantically similar to Sanskrit *goṣṭha*) in the sense of "cowherd's station," a meaning found also for Sanksrit *ghoṣa* and Pāli *ghosa*, Szántó then suggesting that this was a place where animals were killed.

76 *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* XIII §8–9, verses 1–12, cited following the Gilgit/Nepalese recension edited by Karashima 2003 (see also Silk 2001: 93 for the citation in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*).

yo bodhisatva iccheyā paścātkāle subhairave |
idaṁ sūtraṁ prakāśetu anolīno viśāradaḥ || 1
ācāragocaraṁ rakṣed asaṁsṛṣṭa śucir bhavet |
varjeyā saṁstavaṁ nityaṁ rājaputreṣu rājabhiḥ || 2 ||
ye cāpi rājapuruṣāḥ kuryāt tehi na saṁstavam |
cāṇḍālamauṣṭikaiś cāpi tīrthikaiś cāpi sarvaśaḥ || 3 ||
adhimānī na seveta vinaye cāgame sthitān |
arhantasaṁmatān bhikṣūn duḥśīlāṁś ca vivarjayet || 4 ||
bhikṣuṇī varjayen nityaṁ hāsyasaṁlāpagocarān |
upāsakāṁś ca varjeyā prākaṭān anavasthitān || 5 ||
yā nirvṛtiṁ gaveṣanti dṛṣṭe dharme upāsikāḥ |
varjaye saṁstavaṁ tābhi ācāro ayam ucyate || 6 ||
yaś cainam upasaṁkramya dharmaṁ pṛcche 'grabodhaye |
tasya bhāṣet sadā vīro anolīno aniśritaḥ || 7 ||
strī paṇḍakāś ca ye satvāḥ saṁstavaṁ tair vivarjayet |
kuleṣu cāpi vadhukāḥ kumāryāś ca vivarjayet || 8 ||
na tān saṁmodaye jātu kauśalyaṁ h' āsa pṛcchitum |
saṁstavaṁ ca vivarjeya saukarorabhrikehi ca || 9 ||

> A bodhisattva who, bold, uncowering, would wish to preach this sūtra in an extremely fearful future time should keep to proper practices and should be undefiled and pure. He should constantly avoid familiarity with princes and kings, and should not be familiar with royal servants either, nor with *caṇḍāla*s, wrestlers (?), non-Buddhist sectaries, anywhere at all. He should not serve those who are arrogant about their fidelity to the Monastic Rule and the Teachings, and should stay away from monks who, while considered to be Saints, are [actually] ill-behaved. He should constantly avoid nuns given to laughter and chit-chat, and should avoid vulgar, fickle female lay-followers. He should avoid familiarity with those female lay-followers who seek liberation in the here and now—this is called [proper] practice. But he, being brave, uncowering, truly free, should always preach to a man who would approach him and ask about the Teaching for the sake of the highest Awakening. He should shun familiarity with women and hermaphrodites, and should shun young women and maidens in families. He should never converse with them to ask after their well-being, and should avoid familiarity with pig and sheep butchers. He should shun familiarity as well with those who take life in various forms in order to make a living, who sell meat at a slaughterhouse. He should avoid familiarity with pimps, and with dancers, fighers and wrestlers,[77] and such like. He should not serve madams and others in the pleasure business, he should thoroughly avoid any sort of communication with them at all.

This type of expression is found in other genres of literature as well. The *dhāraṇī* sūtra *Dabao guangbo louge shanzhu mimi tuoluoni jing* 大寶廣博樓閣善住祕密陀羅尼經, for instance, states that those who uphold the *dhāraṇī* will be free of poverty, and not harmed by dangers such as poisons, weapons, fire or water and the like. Wild animals will not attack them, and there will be no thieves

---

ye cāpi vividhāṁ prāṇīṁ hiṁseyur bhogakāraṇāt |
māṁsaṁ sūnāya vikrenti saṁstavaṁ tair vivarjayet || 10 ||
strīpoṣakāś ca ye satvā varjayet tehi saṁstavaṁ |
naṭai jhallakamalleṣu ye cānye tādṛśā bhavet || 11 ||
vāramukhyā na seveta ye cānye bhogavṛttayaḥ |
pratisaṁmodanāṁ tehi sarvaśaḥ parivarjayet || 12

77 This list is stock: see MBh 2.4.7ab: *tatra mallā naṭā jhallāḥ sūtā vaitālikās tathā*, and *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* (Ed. and trans. Olivelle 2005) 12.45ab: *jhallā mallā naṭāś caiva puruṣāś ca kuvṛttayaḥ*, "Jhallas, Mallas, Naṭas, men who live by vile occupations …." The terms occur together also in 10.22.

or robbers or *caṇḍāla*s.[78] The text goes on that they will be free of dangers while traveling, from a variety of diseases, and so on.[79] A clearly tantric text, the

78 The text adds: or *nanmo* 喃摩; I do not know the meaning of this evident transcription.

79 T. 1005a (XIX) 622c5–7: 離於貧窮, 不受世間毒藥、刀杖、水火等難。諸惡獸怖不能爲害。 無諸賊怖, 無劫盜怖, 無旃陀羅怖, 無喃摩怖. This was referred to by Matsunaga 1991: 271. A type of restriction similar to that in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* is found with regard to mantra practitioners, for instance, in the *Pinaiye jing* 毘奈耶經 (the Indian origins of which are not clear to me, hence I cite it here in a note), in which we read that "One who recites the mantras should not approach a place of thieves, prostitutes, widows, *caṇḍāla*s, dangerous beasts, or poisonous snakes, nor the houses of leather workers, pork and mutton butchers, and places where camels, donkeys, boars, dogs, chickens, or hawks are raised to be hunted, nor charnel grounds, nor the homes of physicians or non-Buddhist sectaries—the mantra reciter should absolutely not dwell in such places," T. 898 (XVIII) 773b28–c2: 若有賊難、婬女、寡婦、旃陀羅、惡獸、毒蛇之處, 及作皮靴家、屠兒魁膾家、養駝、驢、猪、狗、雞、鷹遊獵之家, 亦不近塚間, 醫師、外道家, 如是等處, 誦持呪者, 悉不應住.

Although I do not systematically consider tantric literature here, it is worthwhile noting that tropes similar to those in other Buddhist literature abound. Matsunaga 1991 cites a great number of passages in which, for instance, it is prohibited to eat together with *caṇḍāla*s, in which seeing a *caṇḍāla* in a dream is inauspicious, and so on, but others which are, or superficially seem, much more positive and accepting. In general, since the more antinomian tantric rhetoric can introduce complications, for the present I leave consideration of these materials aside, in the hope that a specialist will undertake a good survey. Matsunaga 1991 is no doubt a start, but not more than that. In this regard, see also Aktor 2016; Shizuka 2001, the latter concerning a passage treated by Szántó 2012: 336–338.

Potential complications aside, it is possible that we should best understand much of this literature (also) in a context which shows it ultimately to align with our other materials. In this light, I cite a single example in which it is abundantly clear, once again, that the *caṇḍāla* is emblematic of the lowest of the low, a short series of verses from the *Guhyasamājatantra* (Matsunaga 1978: 15.9–20, vss. V.2–7):

> *Caṇḍāla*s, bamboo workers and the like, those who have their minds set on killing, succeed here in the highest vehicle, the unexcelled Mahāyāna. 2
>
> And those too who commit terrible sins, beginning with the [five] sins of immediate retribution, succeed here in the Buddha vehicle, the ocean of the Mahāyāna. 3
>
> Those most intent on blaming their teachers will never succeed in their practice. But those beings who take life, who delight in telling lies, 4
>
> And those who delight in the possessions of others, and always delight in lust, who consume piss and shit, they indeed are fit for [this] practice. 5
>
> And the practitioner who would sexually enjoy mother, sister or daughter would fully attain complete perfection, the ultimate reality of the Mahāyāna. 6
>
> Desiring the mother of the lord, the Buddha, he is not attached to [her]; that wise one, free from conceptual thought, succeeds [in attaining] buddhahood. 7
>
> *caṇḍālaveṇukārādya māraṇārthārthacintakāḥ |*
> *sidhyanti agrayāne 'smin mahāyāne hy anuttare || 2*
> *ānantaryaprabhṛtayo mahāpāpakṛto 'pi ca |*
> *sidhyante buddhayāne 'smin mahāyānamahodadhau || 3*

Jingang kongbu jihui fangguang guiyi guan zizai pusa sanshi zuisheng xinming wang jing 金剛恐怖集會方廣儀軌觀自在菩薩三世最勝心明王經, emphasizes the inauspiciousness of the *caṇḍāla* as follows:[80] "If one does not obtain the *siddhi*, he will dream of *caṇḍāla*s, piśācīs or [other] evilly shaped creatures, or he will see persons wearing soiled and ruined clothing, or he sees the mantra, but it is missing some of the words, or he sees crippled persons." The point here should be clear, namely that *caṇḍāla*s are an expected part of the negative and indeed dangerous landscape, both physical and metaphorical, and strictly to be avoided and indeed feared.

This assumption of the extreme baseness of the *caṇḍāla* is emphasized by his use as a register of the supreme achievements of the bodhisattva. The *Ratnameghasūtra* says that, "Just as [bodhisattvas] teach kings and high ministers, they also teach *caṇḍāla*s and young *caṇḍāla*s, to say nothing of [teaching] others [such as] townsmen and provincials. But through this offering of the Teaching they do not become arrogant; in just this way, good man, the bodhisattva becomes complete in his offering of the Teaching."[81] Similarly, "How is the bodhisattva's unrivaled non-discriminative tolerance (*kṣānti*) complete? Although some are tolerant toward father, mother, master, wife, son, daughter, relatives, and kinsmen, but impatient with others, the bodhisattva is patient even as far as toward young *caṇḍāla*s. In just this way, the bodhisattva's unrivaled non-discriminative tolerance becomes complete."[82] In a

---

ācāryanindanaparā naiva sidhyanti sādhane |
prāṇātipātinaḥ sattvā mṛṣāvādaratāś ca ye || 4
ye paradravyābhiratā nityam kāmaratāś ca ye |
viṇmūtrāhārakṛtyā ye bhavyās te khalu sādhane || 5
mātṛbhaginīputrīś ca kāmayed yas tu sādakaḥ |
sa siddhiṁ vipulāṁ gacchen mahāyānāgradharmatām || 6
mātaraṁ buddhasya vibhoḥ kāmayan na ca lipyate |
sidhyate tasya buddhatvaṁ nirvikalpasya dhīmataḥ || 7

80 T. 1033 (XX) 14b27–29: 若失成就。夢旃陀羅、毘舍遮鬼、惡形狀者, 或見人身著垢弊衣, 或見眞言文句闕少。或見不具足人.

81 Thanks to the generosity of Vinītā Tseng, I can cite the Sanskrit here (7b6): *yathaiva rājño rājamātrasya vā saṁprakāśayati | yathaiva caṇḍālasya vā caṇḍālakumārasya vā saṁprakāśayati | kaḥ punar vādas tadanyeṣāṁ naigamajānapadānāṁ na ca tena dharmadānenonnato bhavaty evaṁ hi kulaputra bodhisatvo dharmadānasaṁpanno bhavati.* D 231, *mdo sde, wa* 11b7–12a2: *ji ltar rgyal po'am blon po chen po la yang dag par ston pa de ltar gdol pa'am | gdol bu la yang yang dag par ston na | de ma yin pa grong pa dang | yul gyi mi gzhan dag la lta ci smos | chos kyi sbyin pa des khengs par yang mi 'gyur te | rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sems dpa' chos kyi sbyin pa phun sum tshogs pa yin no.*

82 The sūtra manuscript reads (11a7–b1): *kathaṁ ca bodhisatvo nānākṣāntisaṁpanno bhavati | iha bodhisatvo na mātāpitṛgurubhāryāputraduhitṛjñātisālohitānāṁ kṣamate | anyeṣāṁ na kṣamate | kin tarhi bodhisatvo antaśaś caṇḍālakumārakasyāpi kṣamate | evaṁ*

final example from the same text, we read, "How does a bodhisattva treat all beings equally? Good man, take fire as an example: it treats all beings equally. As it provides service to a king, just so it does the same to a *caṇḍāla*. In this manner a bodhisattva too treats all beings equally, and he provides service to a king just as he does to a *caṇḍāla*. In just this way, the bodhisattva treats all beings equally."[83] Such examples demonstrate that the *caṇḍāla* serves as a pole, at the very most negative extreme, and the fact that the bodhisattva is equally open to him is a mark of his transcendence. In other words, the category of *caṇḍāla* is deployed in such instances to emphasize the extreme (we might say superhuman) abilities of the bodhisattva, thereby emphasizing the—once again, extreme—baseness of the *caṇḍāla*.

---

hi bodhisatvo nānātvakṣāntipratipanno bhavati. Dr. Tseng edits this as follows: *kathaṁ ca bodhisatvo 'nānātvakṣāntisaṁpanno bhavati? iha bodhisatvo na mātāpitṛgurubhāryāputraduhitṛjñātisālohitānāṁ kṣamate 'nyeṣāṁ na kṣamate. kiṁ tarhi? bodhisatvo 'ntaśaś, caṇḍālakumārakasyāpi kṣamate. evaṁ hi bodhisatvo 'nānātvakṣāntisaṁpanno bhavati*. The *na* after *iha bodhisatvo* is, I believe, to be deleted, though I note that Dr. Tseng disagrees, pointing to the Tibetan translation, which in other respects has guided my translation: D 231, *mdo sde, wa* 17b4–5: *ji ltar na byang chub sems dpa' tha dad pa med pa'i bzod pa phun sum tshogs pa yin zhe na | 'di la byang chub sems dpa' pha dang | ma dang bla ma dang bu dang bu mo dang chung ma dang nye du 'am snag gi gnyen mtshams la bzod la | gzhan la mi bzod pa ma yin gyi | byang chub sems dpa' ni tha na gdol pa gzhon nu yan chad la yang bzod de | de ltar na byang chub sems dpa' tha dad pa med pa'i bzod pa phun sum tshogs pa yin no*. Cp. Dharmachakra Translation Committee 2019: 1.96. T. 658 (XVI) 214a4–8 words things slightly differently, but with the same gist: 云何名菩薩修處處忍。 有人於父母、 師長、 夫妻、 男女、 大小、 內外, 如是中生忍, 餘則不忍。 菩薩忍者, 則不如是。 如父母邊生忍, 旃陀羅邊生忍亦爾。 是名菩薩修處處忍. Dr. Tseng understands that "Here a bodhisatva does not patiently accept his mother, father, preceptor, wife, son(s), daughter(s), relatives and kinsmen, to the exclusion of the others."

83 Dr. Tseng kindly again shared her transcript (26b7–27a1): *kathaṁ ca bodhisatvaḥ sarvasatvasādhāraṇo bhavati | tadyathāpi nāma kulaputra tejaḥ sarvasatvasādhāraṇam yathaiva rājña upakāreṇa pratyupasthitaṁ bhavati | yathaiva* [> *tathaiva*] *caṇḍālakumārasyāpi | evam eva bodhisatvaḥ sarvasatvaḥ sādhāraṇo bhavati | yathaiva rājña upakāreṇa pratyupasthito bhavati | tathaiva caṇḍālakumārasyāpi | evaṁ hi bodhisatvaḥ sarvasatvasādhāraṇo bhavati*. D 231, *mdo sde, wa* 41b2–4: *ji ltar na byang chub sems dpa' sems can thams cad kyi thun mong du gyur pa yin zhe na | rigs kyi bu 'di lta ste | dper na me ni sems can thams cad kyi thun mong du gyur pa ste | ji ltar na rgyal po la phan par nye bar gnas pa ltar gdol bu la yang de bzhin no || de bzhin du byang chub sems dpa' yang sems can thams cad kyi thun mong du gyur pa yin te | ji ltar rgyal po la phan par nye bar gnas pa ltar gdol bu la yang de bzhin te | de ltar na byang chub sems dpa' sems can thams cad kyi thun mong du gyur pa yin no*. Cp. Dharmachakra Translation Committee 2019: 1.222. T. 659 (XVI) 255b27–c2: 云何菩薩一切衆生平等。善男子, 譬如火性於諸衆生悉皆平等, 如於國王及旃陀羅平等無二。菩薩亦爾。於諸衆生悉皆平等, 如於國王悉作利益, 於屠殺者亦作利益。是名菩薩於諸衆生皆悉平等. Also T. 489 (XIV) 719b28–c4.

As a further example of the disdain in which *caṇḍāla*s were held, and in a further contrast to some of the more open statements cited earlier, for the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*, some persons might claim that "'*Caṇḍāla*s, persons without any sexual organs, persons with two sexual organs, persons with indeterminate sexual organs, or persons whose organs are incomplete, are all permitted to take the tonsure and follow the Buddhist path'—This I [= the Buddha] call an exposition of Māra."[84] Here, alongside those who are physically debarred from ordination for having aberrant sexual organs—a restriction found also in the almost certainly much older monastic codes—we find a restriction on the very admission to the monastic community precisely of the *caṇḍāla*, and furthermore the assertion that to even *suggest* that *caṇḍāla*s should be ordained is to do the work, literally, of the devil. This sūtra prohibition, moreover, is not unique.

6 Exclusion from Ordination

While the examples offered above amply demonstrate the types of negative attitudes held toward *caṇḍāla*s, there is in addition evidence for the official (that is, normative) institutional rejection of those belonging to this and related categories, namely the explicit prohibition against ordination of *caṇḍāla*s, at least in Mūlasarvāstivāda sources. The *Vinayasūtra* of Guṇaprabha has the following: "Cartwrights, *caṇḍāla*s, *pukkasa*s and their ilk may not be initiated."[85]

84 T 374 (XII) 406a19–21: 旃陀羅子、無根、二根及不定根身根不具, 如是等輩如來悉聽出家爲道。是名魔説 = Derge *mdo sde, nya* 113 b3–4: *gdol bu dang | dbang po med pa dang | mtshan gnyis pa dang | mtshan ma nges pa dang | dbang po ma tshang ba la sogs pa thams cad de bzhin gshegs pas rab tu byung bar gnang ngo zhes smra na de ni bdud kyis bstan pa yin no*. Note that this Tibetan translation is based on the Chinese. The version from Sanskrit reads (Habata 2013: 266, §364): *gdol pa'i bu dang | ma ning dang | mtshan gnyis pa dang | yan lag nyams pa thams cad rab tu 'byung bar bcom ldan 'das kyis gnang ngo || … zhes zer ba de lta bu ni bdud kyis smras pa'i mdo sde dang 'dul ba yin par rig par bya ste*. See also Cabezón 2017: 380–385. There are a number of interesting references to *caṇḍāla*s in this sūtra, but since (perhaps out of an overabundance of caution) I am not quite sure of the Indian authenticity of the relevant passages, I refrain for the moment from bringing them into the discussion. However, it is quite possible that they are in fact genuinely Indian, and should in future be taken into account.

85 *Ritsukyō* 'Shukkeji' Kenkyūkai 2010: 14, with trans. p. 24 (numbering the sūtra 4*; Sankrityayana 1981 # 149; cp. Bapat and Gokhale 1982: 25.20–23, with the commentary, taking it as sūtra 1.151): *na rathakāra-caṇḍāla-pukkasa-tadvidhān pravrājayet* (D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 4b7: *lham mkhan dang gdol ba dang g.yung po dang de lta bu rab tu dbyung bar mi bya'o*). The autocommentary reads: *rathakāraś carmmakāraḥ | tadvidhān ity abhokṣyān |*

That is, such persons are barred from *pravrajyā*, the first phase of the two-fold ordination process, the initiation. The auto-commentary expands, saying: "Cartwrights [etc. as a category includes] leather-workers. 'Their ilk' refers to persons from whom [monks] may not receive food. That cartwrights and so on are unworthy of ordination (*upasaṁpādana*) [or the states of?] *śrāmaṇera*s or *śikṣamāṇa*s is indicated by their being prohibited from initiation. Therefore, for those [types of persons] as well this [stipulation] is a proof of the impossibility [of ordination]." Quite interestingly, the vital indication concerns food. This requires, obviously, further serious study. This *Vinayasūtra* passage is based on a portion of the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, in which we find the following prohibition on the initiation of *caṇḍāla*s:[86]

śrāmaṇeratvaśikṣamāṇatopasaṁpādana-m-anarhatvaṁ rathakārādīnāṁ apravrājane nimittam | tasmād āsāṁ api etad akaraṇīyatvasya pratipādanam. Here one might be tempted to think that *lham mkhan = carmakāra*, as in Mhvy § 3795, but the closely following entry § 3797 has *rathakāra = shing rta mkhan nam lham mkhan*. See also D 4119, *'dul ba, zhu* 24b6–25a1: *shing rta byed pa dang | lham mkhan dang | gdol pa dang | g.yung po dang | de lta bu rab tu dbyung bar mi bya'o zhes bya ba la | shing rta byed pa ni lham mkhan no || de lta bu zhes bya ba ni zan bza' bar mi bya ba ste | dge tshul nyid dang slob pa nyid kyis bsnyen par rdzogs par 'os pa ma yin pa nyid shing rta mkhan la sogs pa rnams la rab tu dbyung ba ma yin pa nyid kyi rgyu mtsan no || de bas na 'di rnams la yang mi bya ba nyid du ston pa'o*.

Note that sūtra 6* reads *na jātikāyaduṣṭaṁ pravrajitam upasthāpayet*, followed by the commentary which begins *rathakārādikam abhojyaṁ jātiduṣṭam*. It continues a bit later *tathā ca bhikṣuṇā parṣaddūṣakāparṣad na upasthāpayitavyā upasthāpayati sātisāro bhavatīty uktvā kiyatā parṣaddūṣakāparṣad vaktavyā | jātito varṇṇasaṁsthānena ca | kathaṁ jātitaḥ | rathakāracaṇḍālapukkasakulāt | kathaṁ varṇṇasasthānataḥ | haridrakeśā ityādy atroktam*. This should be considered together with sūtra 4*, and the Vinaya passage quoted below. This all clearly requires more unpacking than is possible here, both concerning the exact meaning of the texts and the sources upon which they rely. For the purposes of the present study, however, it is clear that initiation, much less ordination, is prohibited to *caṇḍāla*s and others belonging to the same general class of persons. I am grateful to Shayne Clarke for his kind advice with regard to these passages.

86 T. 1451 (XXIV) 328b4–11: 是故, 苾芻不應與彼毀法衆人, 而爲出家。若有作者, 得越法罪。如佛所説。如是等類不與出家。苾芻不知何謂毀法衆人。佛言。有二種鄙惡, 毀辱法衆。云何爲二。一, 謂種族。二, 謂形相。言種族者, 謂家門族胄下賤卑微、貧寒庸品、客作自活、飲食不充。或旃荼羅、卜羯娑、木作、竹作、浣衣、酤酒、獵師等類。是名種族鄙惡. D 6, *'dul ba, da* 38a2–5: *de lta bas na dge slong gis 'khor sun par byed pa'i 'khor nye bar gzhag par mi bya'o || dge slong gis 'khor sun par byed pa'i 'khor nye bar gzhag na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro || bcom ldan 'das kyis dge slong gis 'khor sun par byed pa'i 'khor nye bar gzhag par mi bya'o zhes bka' stsal pa dang | dge slong rnams kyis 'khor sun par byed pa ji lta bu ma shes nas | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | dge slong dag 'khor gyis 'khor sun par byed pa ni rgyu gnyis kyis te | gang dag gis shes na rigs dang | mtshan mas so || de la rigs kyis ni rigs gang yang rung bas te | ma rabs | dman pa | phongs pa | dkos thag pa | bkren pa | bza' ba dang | btung ba chen po mi bdog*

> "Therefore [following on a story not quoted here], a monk should not grant initiation to those persons who damage the monastic community (*parṣaddūṣaka*). If he does, he becomes guilty of a transgression." The Buddha said: "Such [above mentioned] types of persons may not be granted initiation." The monks did not know what was meant by "persons who damage the monastic community." The Buddha said: "There are two types of persons who are detestable, and damage the monastic community. What are the two? 1. [Those of certain] castes. 2. [Those of certain] physical appearance.[87] As for [those of certain] castes, this means that their family lineage is low class and mean, impoverished and common, laborers, without enough to eat or drink. Some are *caṇḍāla*s, *pukkasa*s, carpenters, bamboo-workers, washer-men, liquor sellers, birders and the like. These are what are called persons who are detestable."

Did Buddhists actually demonstrate such attitudes in their lived practice? Above we noticed the Kaśmīri scholar Bhaṭṭa Jayanta speaking of Buddhists eating together with monks from all four castes, and understood this as possible evidence for non-discriminative practices, or perceptions of such among those who disapproved of such behaviors. Referring now not to caste but to outcastes, in the same author's *Nyāyamañjarī* we find him arguing that Buddhists actually do accept the validity of the Vedic tradition with regard to (some) matters of caste (here *jāti*, birth or class):[88] "Even these wretched Buddhists and their ilk, strictly restrained by the Veda's authority, avoid physical contact with *caṇḍāla*s and other persons [of low birth]. For if they really had thrown off the pride of belief in caste, what problem would there be for them in being touched by *caṇḍāla*s and such like?" In other words, put together with the earlier cited

---

pa de lta bu'i rigs dag las so sor skyes par gyur pa de dag dge slong rnams rab tu 'byin par byed na de lta bu ni rigs kyis yin no. I translate the Chinese here. Something a bit different appears to be going on with the Tibetan, which should be considered also in the context of the *Vinayasūtra* materials, quoted in the previous note.

87 Discussion of this is extremely interesting, but unfortunately cannot be dealt with here. See n. 85 and the *Vinayasūtra* materials there, and sūtras 5* and 6*. This material would richly reward careful attention.

88 *ete bauddhādayo 'pi durātmāno vedaprāmāṇyaniyamitā eva caṇḍālādisparśaṁ pariharanti | niraste hi jātivādāvalepe kaś caṇḍālādisparśe doṣaḥ*, trans. Sanderson (slightly modified), unpublished revised Gonda lecture n. 359; text ed. Kataoka 5.2.2.2. The trans. of Kataoka and Freschi 2012: 38 is slightly different: "[T]hese wicked Buddhists, etc., are disciplined [in their behaviour because of assuming] the validity of the Veda: they avoid the contact of a *caṇḍāla*, and of other [untouchables]. [This is an evidence of the fact that they also respect the Veda] because once one has refuted the pride in casteism, what is wrong in touching a caṇḍāla, etc.?"

passage, Jayanta suggests that even though Kaśmīri Buddhists accepted caste equality in terms of the four castes, eating together with them promiscuously, their (more fundamental?) adherence to generalized norms of Indian society is demonstrated by their maintenance of taboos against *caṇḍāla*s. Once again, of course, we must remember that this passage represents a polemical position, and is not journalistic reporting. That said, we must at least consider the possibility that if the evidence Jayanta's readers would have seen around them would not have corresponded to the picture he painted, his argument would have held little sway.

7 Grammaticalization of *-caṇḍāla*

A final but extremely important category in Buddhist texts is the use of *caṇḍāla* as a sort of grammatical affix, attached to terms which an author wishes to despise.[89] Although (as far as I know) we lack evidence from lexicons citing it as the inverse of *-ratna* as a grammaticalized affix, a well-attested usage which indicates that something is considered the *best* in its class,[90] in fact we have a pair of linked passages in the *Aṅguttaranikāya* which show precisely this opposition:[91]

> Bhikkhus, possessing five qualities, a lay follower is a *caṇḍāla* of a lay follower, a stain of a lay follower (*upāsakamala*), a despised upāsaka (*upāsakapatikiṭṭha*).[92] What five? (1) He is devoid of faith (*assaddha*); (2) he is immoral (*dussīla*); (3) he is superstitious and believes in auspicious

89 This may be what Yamazaki 2005: 194 had in mind when he stated "the term 'caṇḍāla' itself was often used as a term of derision."

90 Salvini 2016: 221 quotes as an example *Amarakośa* 3.3.607: *ratnaṁ svajātiśreṣṭhe 'pi*.

91 AN iii.206,5–22 (175): *pañcahi bhikkhave dhammehi samannāgato upāsako upāsakacaṇḍālo ca hoti upāsakamalañ ca upāsakapatikuṭṭho ca | katamehi pañcahi | assaddho hoti dussīlo hoti kotūhalamaṅgaliko hoti maṅgalaṁ pacceti no kammaṁ ito ca bahiddhā dakkhiṇeyyaṁ gavesati tattha ca pubbakāraṁ karoti | imehi kho bhikkhave pañcahi dhammehi | samannāgato upāsako upāsakacaṇḍālo ca hoti upāsakamalañ ca upāsakapatikuṭṭho ca | pañcahi bhikkhave dhammehi samannāgato upāsako upāsakaratanañ ca hoti upāsakapadumañ ca upāsakapuṇḍarīkañ ca | katamehi pañcahi | saddho hoti sīlavā hoti akotūhalamaṅgaliko hoti kammaṁ pacceti no maṅgalaṁ na ito bahiddhā dakkhiṇeyyaṁ gavesati idha ca pubbakāraṁ karoti | imehi kho bhikkhave pañcahi dhammehi samannāgato upāsako upāsakaratanañ ca hoti upāsakapadumañ ca upāsakapuṇḍarīkañ cā ti*. Trans. Bodhi 2012: 788–789, slightly modified. In the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* 1.235, an upāsaka who is not faithful, moral and is superstitious is called a *caṇḍāla* upāsaka, etc.

92 See Edgerton 1953, s.v. pratikṛṣṭa and pratikruṣṭa.

> signs (*kotūhalamaṅgalika*), not in kamma; (4) he seeks outside here [*the Buddhist community*] for a person worthy of offerings; and (5) he first does [meritorious] deeds there. Possessing these five qualities, a lay follower is a caṇḍāla of a lay follower, a stain of a lay follower, the last among lay followers.
>
> Bhikkhus, possessing five qualities, a lay follower is a gem (*ratana*) of a lay follower, a red lotus of a lay follower, a white lotus of a lay follower. What five? (1) He is endowed with faith; (2) he is virtuous; (3) he is not superstitious and believes in kamma, not in auspicious signs; (4) he does not seek outside here for a person worthy of offerings; and he first does [meritorious] deeds here. Possessing these five qualities, a lay follower is a gem of a lay follower, a red lotus of a lay follower, a white lotus of a lay follower.

Here the author characterizes those who are ultimately anti-Buddhist—denying their faith, their morality, karma and the saṁgha itself—by labeling them with the polar opposite of *-ratana*, in other words, with what is evidently the very worst epithet he could conjure up, "*caṇḍāla*."

The same *Aṅguttaranikāya* uses the term further in reference to objectionable brāhmaṇas:[93] "And how, Doṇa, is a brāhmaṇa a *caṇḍāla* of a brāhmaṇa?"

93 AN iii.228.24 (192): *kathañ ca doṇa brāhmaṇo brāhmaṇacaṇḍālo hoti*. Trans. Bodhi 2012: 805. Peter Bisschop kindly brings to my attention the appearance of the term *brāhmaṇacaṇḍāla* in Brāhmaṇical sources. *Mahābhārata* 12.77.8 has the following: *āhvāyakā devalakā nakṣatragrāmayājakāḥ ete brāhmaṇacaṇḍālā mahāpathikapañcamāḥ*, translated by Sanderson 2009a: 277n658: "All the following are brahmin untouchables: couriers, temple-priests, those who perform worship to the asterisms, those who perform worship on behalf of a whole village, and, fifth, those who undertake long journeys." Sanderson 2009a: 276–277 locates this by saying: "[F]unctioning as a priest in a temple, and therefore living off the endowment of the deity in return for one's work, carried a loss of status with which the older tradition was unwilling to be associated. According to brahmanical sources any brahmin who persists in such work for three years is considered to have lost his brahmin status and is then known as a Devalaka. He is described as an *upabrāhmaṇaḥ* 'a sub-brahmin' or, even more disparagingly, as a *brāhmaṇacaṇḍālaḥ* 'a brahmin untouchable.'" Shulman 1984: 16 observes the tension for brāhmaṇas whenever they must, for economic reasons, work in subservient roles, remarking on "the vehemence with which the classical sources inveigh against the Brahmin who seeks his livelihood as a *purohita* or as the servant of a god (*devalaka*, 'godling,' in the scornful language of the texts). We are even told that the Brahmin who performs worship for others for a fee is, in effect, a *Caṇḍāla*," referring precisely to *Mahābhārata* 12.77.8. In the context of the priority of marrying a woman of proper caste, in *Mānava-Dharmaśāstra* 9.87 (ed. and trans. Olivelle 2005: 762, 194) we find: *yas tu tat kārayen mohāt sajātyā sthitayānyayā | yathā brāhmaṇacaṇḍālaḥ pūrvadṛṣṭas tathaiva saḥ*, "If he foolishly gets another wife to carry these out while

The answer includes a lengthy discussion of the brāhmaṇa's practices, including: "He then seeks a teacher's fee for his teacher both in accordance with the Dhamma and contrary to the Dhamma—by agriculture, by trade, by raising cattle, by archery, by service to the king, by a particular craft, and not only by wandering for alms without scorning the alms bowl."[94] There follows an account of his sexual promiscuity (he has sex with any kind of woman, including a variety of low caste persons), but then the text returns to its theme:[95] "He earns his living by all kinds of work. Brāhmaṇas say to him: 'Why, sir, while claiming to be a brāhmaṇa, do you earn your living by all kinds of work?' He answers them: 'Just as fire burns pure things and impure things yet is not thereby defiled, so too, sirs, if a brāhmaṇa earns his living by all kinds of work, he is not thereby defiled.' Since he earns his living by all kinds of work, this brāhmaṇa is called a *caṇḍāla* of a brāhmaṇa. It is in this way that a brāhmaṇa is a *caṇḍāla* of a brāhmaṇa."

We find the same grammaticalized usage in Mahāyāna scriptures, in which for instance the Perfection of Wisdom literature disparages those who believe and act wrongly as "bodhisattva-*caṇḍāla*s." As an example, one passage discusses one who dwells in the forest without the proper attitude, giving confused advice to other bodhisattvas. The bad bodhisattva is then characterized in the following terms, with imagery we will encounter again below:[96]

---

a wife of equal class is available, he becomes exactly like a Brahmin-Cāṇḍāla described by the ancients." [Note that the spelling in Olivelle's trans. does not agree with his own edition!]. It is quite possible that the Buddhists who used the term were aware of such sources, or even precisely these passages.

94 *ācariyassa ācariyadhanaṁ pariyesati dhammena pi adhammena pi kasiyā pi vaṇijjāya pi gorakkhena pi issatthena pi rājaporisena pi sippaññatarena pi kevalam pi* [Bodhi 2012: 1743n1190 reads *na kevalaṁ*] *bhikkhācariyāya kapālaṁ anatimaññamāno*. Trans. Bodhi 2012: 805, but perhaps rather with Hare 1934: 167: "or despising not the beggar's bowl, just by going about for alms."

95 AN iii.229,16–24: *so sabbakammehi jīvikaṁ kappeti | tam enaṁ brāhmaṇā evam āhaṁsu kasmā bhavaṁ brāhmaṇo paṭijānamāno sabbakammehi jīvikaṁ kappetī ti | so evam āha seyyathā pi bho aggi sucim pi ḍahati asucim pi ḍahati na ca tena aggi upalippati | evam evaṁ kho bho sabbakammehi ce pi brāhmaṇo jīvikaṁ kappeti na ca tena brāhmaṇo upalippati | sabbakammehi jīvikaṁ kappetī ti kho doṇa tasmā brāhmaṇo brāhmaṇacaṇḍālo ti vuccati | evaṁ kho doṇa brāhmaṇo brāhmaṇacaṇḍālo hoti*. Trans. Bodhi 2012: 805–806.

The Chinese translation T. 26 (158) (I) 680b22–681c23, esp. 681b23 ff. makes it clear that both work and marriages are not in conformity to the dharma.

96 *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (Wogihara 1932–1935: 782.28–783.5) = T. 223 (VIII) 353b26–c1 = T. 224 (VIII) 461c2–8 = T. 225 (VIII) 499a25–29 = T. 226 (VIII) 534c3–8 = T. 227 (VIII) 571b3–7 = T. 228 (VIII) 653c3–8). I translate the Sanskrit: *ayaṁ subhūte bodhisattvacaṇḍālo veditavyo bodhisattvadūṣī veditavyo bodhisattvapratirūpako veditavyo bodhisattvaprativarṇiko veditavyo bodhisattvakāraṇḍavako veditavyaś cauraḥ śramaṇaveṣaṇacauro bodhisattvayāni-

> Subhūti, you should know this one as a *caṇḍāla* of a bodhisattva. You should know him as a defiler of a bodhisattva (*bodhisattvadūṣin*). You should know him as an imitation bodhisattva (*bodhisattvapratirūpaka*). You should know him as a counterfeit bodhisattva (*bodhisattvaprativarṇika*). You should know him as a chaff bodhisattva (*bodhisattvakāraṇḍavaka*). He is a thief wearing the clothing of a śramaṇa. He is a thief of people belonging to the vehicle of the bodhisattvas. He is a thief of the world along with its gods. Such people as these should not be served (*na sevitavya*), should not be worshipped (*na bhaktavya*) and should not be honored (*na paryupāsitavya*).

The commentary of Haribhadra on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* informs us that "he is a *caṇḍāla* of a bodhisattva since he is untouchable (*aspṛśya*) by other bodhisattvas."[97] A similar passage is also found in the *Pañcaviṁśatisāhasrikā*.[98] A bodhisattva who defends his own corrupt version of the Mahāyāna is compared as follows: "He will revile other good men belonging to the vehicle of the bodhisattvas, he despises them, yells aggressively at them, abuses them. This one, Subhūti, should be known as a *caṇḍāla* of a bodhisattva, a defiler of a bodhisattva, a counterfeit bodhisattva, a thief of the world with its gods, men and Asuras, a thief in the guise of a śramaṇa, a thief of good men belonging to the vehicle of the bodhisattvas." Such expressions are apparently formulaic.

---

kānāṁ pudgalānāṁ cauraḥ sadevakasya lokasya tajjātītaḥ khalu punaḥ subhūte pudgalo na sevitavyo na bhaktavyo na paryupāsitavyaḥ.

97 Wogihara 1932–1935: 783.14: *anyair bodhisattvair aspṛśyatvād bodhisattvacaṇḍālaḥ.* According to Yamazaki 2005: 197, the term *aspṛśya* "only came into use in the later *Dharmaśāstras*." This is further specified by Jha 1975: 24, who states "Viṣṇu is the first lawgiver to use *aspṛśya*," referring to V.104 and XLIV.9. This would date the usage as late as the seventh century. Haribhadra belongs to a time approximately a century or so later (Harter 2019: 204). See also Kashyap 2005, esp. p. 53. Note as well a passage in the *Hevajratantra* that points to a similar sense, this also chronologically consistent since this text has been dated by Szántó 2015: 334 to around 900 CE: "Men of all castes may touch as readily as his own body [those difficult to touch, *duḥspṛśa*—JAS], *ḍombas*, *caṇḍālas*, *carmāras*, *haḍḍikas* and the rest, brahmans and kṣatriyas, vaiśyas, and śūdras" (trans. Snellgrove 1959: I.98). The text reads (Snellgrove 1959: II.58.21–22, vs. II.iii.45): *ḍombacaṇḍālacarmārahaḍḍikādyān tu duḥspṛśān | brahmakṣatriyavaiśyaśūdrādyān ātmadeham iva spṛśet*. Note here the key terms *duḥspṛśān* and *spṛśet*.

98 Kimura 1992: 9.24–30: *ayaṁ bodhisattvas tadanyān bodhisattvayānikān kulaputrān paṁsayiṣyaty avamaṁsyate ullāpayiṣyati kutsayiṣyati | ayaṁ subhūte bodhisattvacaṇḍālo veditavyaḥ | bodhisattvadūṣī veditavyaḥ | bodhisattvaprativarṇiko veditavyaḥ | cauraḥ sadevamānuṣāsurasya lokasya | cauraḥ śramaṇaveṣeṇa | cauro bodhisattvayānikānāṁ kulaputrāṇāṁ*. Cp. Conze 1975: 438–439.

In the *Ākāśagarbhasūtra*, we find another such grammaticalized use of *caṇḍāla*, as follows:[99]

> In the future, good man, kṣatriyas will have *caṇḍāla*s of royal priests, *caṇḍāla*s of ministers, and *caṇḍāla*s of soldiers—very rich and powerful fools who fancy themselves scholars. Seeming to engage in many sorts of meritorious deeds of charity, arrogant and haughty of their generosity, through their arrogance, pride and insolence, they will divide the kṣatriyas [from each other?] and the kṣatriyas from the renunciants.[100] Relying on the kṣatriyas, those [*caṇḍāla*s–Tib.] will punish the renunciants, stealing their possessions in [the guise of] punishment. Because of that calamity, those monks are forced to surrender to them their personal belongings, the belongings of the local saṁgha, the belongings of the universal saṁgha or belongings of the stūpa which were taken by the renunciants. What is more, those *caṇḍāla*s will offer them to the kṣatriyas.[101] Both of these actions constitute root transgressions.

Similarly, the *Sūryagarbhasūtra* states that:[102]

---

99 Bendall 1897–1902: 63.10–16: *punar aparaṁ kulaputra bhaviṣyanty anāgate 'dhvani kṣatriyāṇāṁ purohitacaṇḍālāmātyacaṇḍālā bhaṭacaṇḍālā mūrkhāḥ paṇḍitamānino mahādhanā mahābhogāḥ | bahuvidheṣu dānamayapuṇyakriyāvastuṣu saṁdṛśyante te tyāgamadamattā mānamadadarpeṇa kṣatriyaṁ vibhedayanti | śramaṇān kṣatriyaiḥ | te kṣatriyān niśritya śramaṇān daṇḍāpayanti | arthaṁ daṇḍena muṣanti | tenopadraveṇa te bhikṣavaḥ paudgalikaṁ vā sāṁghikaṁ vā cāturdiśasāṁghikaṁ vā staupikaṁ vā śramaṇair apahṛtya teṣāṁ prāhṛtaṁ pradāpyante | te punaś caṇḍālāḥ kṣatriyasyopanāmayiṣyanti | te ubhayato 'pi mūlāpattim āpadyante*. D 3940, *dbu ma, khi* 41a5–b1. The sūtra itself is found at T. 405 (XIII) 653c10–20; D 260, *mdo sde, za* 277a7–b3 (the trans. in Sakya Pandita Translation Group 2019: 1.75 is problematic in details).

100 T. 405 (XIII) 653c16: 瞋嫌憎嫉餘善比丘共相鬪諍, "They will hate other monks who are good [unlike themselves], and dispute with them." The Sanskrit may be corrupt here, but the Kanjur text is also difficult to understand.

101 T. 405 (XIII) 653c16–18: 恃王臣力。 取善比丘物以奉大臣。 大臣得已傳以上王。 佛法僧物亦復如是, "Making use of the authority of the royal ministers, they will take the possessions of the good monks and give them to the ministers. The ministers in their turn will give them to the king. The goods of the Buddha, Dharma and monastic community will also be treated like this."

102 D 257, *mdo sde, za*, 104b3–7: *mi gdol pa gnas na gnas par byed pa ni sla'i | dge slong gdol pa yongs su 'dzin pa dang bcas pa | rgyud tshig pa | don la mi lta ba | 'jig rten pha rol btang ba | snying rje'i bsam pa med pa | phyi sa khung chen po dang 'dra ba | bdud kyi lam du zhugs pa | lha dang mi rnams la gnod pa byed pa | dus gsum thams cad kyi drang srong thub pa rnams la slu bar byed pa | dkon mchog gsum gyi gdung chos kyi mar me med par byed pa | chos kyi rgya mtsho skems par byed pa | chos smra ba'i dbyen byed pa | sbyin pa po dang sbyin bdag rnams la 'drid par byed pa | dge slong chos kyis gnas pa rnams la tho 'tsham par byed pa |*

> to be a dweller in the dwelling place of *caṇḍāla*s is easier than living with one in suite with a *caṇḍāla* of a monk, who has an angry character, who does not see the significance [of the Teaching], who has rejected the other world, who is without compassionate intention, who resembles a giant pit of excrement, who has entered the path of Māra, who does injury to gods and men, who deceives all the sages of the three times, who extinguishes the dharma lamp of the descendants of the three jewels, who dries up the ocean of the Teaching, who causes dissension among the preachers of the Teaching, who cheats donors and benefactors, who mocks monks who live according to the Teaching, who interrupts the income of a saṁgha which is in agreement. That evil monk through the condition of his attachment turns the king away from the path to heaven. He turns away kṣatriyas, brāhmaṇas, vaiśyas, śūdras, men, women, boys and girls. He sends them to the three paths of the evil destinies.

The company that the expressions "*caṇḍāla* of a monk" and "*caṇḍāla* of a bodhisattva" is made to keep in these passages demonstrates very well its semantic sphere: the authors here are practically spitting with vitriol as they array the most horrible epithets they can think of. A yet again quite similar passage from the *Ratnarāśisūtra*—perhaps the most extreme we will encounter here—occurs in a chapter devoted, with incredible venom, to bad monks:[103]

---

dge 'dun 'thun par byed pa'i rgyun gcod par byed pa ni de lta ma yin no || sdig pa can gyi dge slong de ni yongs su 'dzin pa'i rkyen gyis mtho ris kyi lam las rgyal po ldog par byed pa yin no || rgyal rigs dang | bram ze dang | rje'u rigs dang | dmangs rigs dang | skyes pa dang | bud med dang | khye'u dang | bu mo ldog par byed pa yin no || ngan song gi lam gsum la rab tu gzhog par byed pa yin no. Cp. T. 397 (XIII) 238a9–12.

103 I cite the Tibetan text from my dissertation, Silk 1994, § III.1–5. My translation here does not engage with the philological problems of the passage, which will be dealt with in my forthcoming revision of my edition.

III.1: [a)] || *'od srung de la dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu gang zhe na* | [b)] *'od srung 'di lta ste dper na gdol pa ni rtag tu dur khrod spyod yul pa yin te* | [c)] *shi ba la re ba dang | byams pa med pa'i mig gis 'gro ba la lta ba dang | shi ba la dga' ba yin no* || [d)] *'od srung de bzhin du dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu yang rtag tu mdza' bshes kyi khyim dang | slong ba ster ba'i khyim la gdu ba yin te* | [e)] *de nas rnyed pa dang | bkur stis nye bar 'tsho zhing khyim pa de dag chos sam | 'dul ba yang dag par 'dzin du mi 'jug pa dang | de rnyed pa'i ched du 'dris par byed kyi don gyi ched du ma yin pa dang | mdza' ba'i sems med cing rtag tu rnyed pa la re ba yin te* | [f)] *'od srung 'di ni dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu zhes bya'o* ||

III.2: [a)] *'od srung 'di lta ste dper na | gdol pa ni tshong dpon dang | khyim bdag dang | blon po dang | khams kyi rgyal po dag dang | bram ze dang | rgyal rigs dang | grong rdal gyi mi dang | yul gyi mi rnams kyis rtag tu yongs su spang bar bya ba'i 'os yin te* | [b)] *gdol par rig nas thag ring po bas kyang ring por yongs su spong ngo* || [c)] *'od srung de bzhin du dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu yang dge slong dang | dge slong ma dang | dge bsnyen dang | dge bsnyen ma*

What is the *caṇḍāla* of a śramaṇa? The *caṇḍāla* is one who always frequents charnel grounds. He hopes [to find] a corpse, looks at living beings with eyes devoid of friendliness, and takes delight in [encountering] a corpse. In a similar way, the *caṇḍāla* of a śramaṇa also is one who is always eager to find the house of a friend and the house of one who gives alms. Then, subsisting on the profit and honor [he obtains], he does not incite those householders to undertake the Teaching and the Discipline, but he becomes familiar with them for the sake of profit and not for the sake of [acquiring] the goal; he is without a loving heart and he always hopes for profit.

The *caṇḍāla* deserves to be forever spurned by guild-chiefs, householders, ministers, vassal princes, brāhmaṇas, kṣatriyas, townsmen and country-folk. Recognizing the *caṇḍāla*, even those far away spurn him at a distance. In a similar way, the *caṇḍāla* of a śramaṇa too deserves to be spurned by monks, nuns, upāsakas and upāsikās who uphold the precepts and are virtuous.

High class people do not touch and do not use a *caṇḍāla*'s flag or garments, everything used by him. Similarly, because the *caṇḍāla* of a śramaṇa's bowl, robes, and everything used by him is sought for through improper livelihood, sought for through injuring body and mind, those who uphold the precepts and are virtuous do not touch and do not use them.

---

tshul khrims dang ldan pa | yon tan dang ldan pa rnams kyis yongs su spang bar bya ba'i 'os yin te | [d] *dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu sdig pa'i chos kun tu spyod cing tshul khrims 'chal par rig nas | thag ring po bas kyang ring por yongs su spong ngo ‖*

III.3: [a] *'od srung 'di lta ste dper na | gdol pa'i kha phyis sam | gos sam | yongs su spyad pa de thams cad la ni skye bo ya rabs rnams mi reg cing yongs su mi spyod do ||* [b] *'od srung de bzhin du dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu'i lhung bzed dam | chos gos sam | yongs su spyad pa de thams cad ni mi mthun pa'i 'tsho bas yongs su btsal ba |* [c] *lus dang sems rmas pas yongs su btsal ba yin pas tshul khrims dang ldan pa | yon tan dang ldan pa dag de la mi reg cing mi spyod do ‖*

III.4: [a] *'od srung 'di lta ste dper na | gdol pa ni kha phyis thogs te | zhum zhum por byas nas gzhan gyi khyim du 'gro'o ||* [b] *'od srung de bzhin du dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu yang zhum zhum por byas nas | de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten la phyag 'tshal lo ||* [c] *zhum zhum por byas nas 'khor gyi nang du 'gro'o ||* [d] *zhum zhum por byas nas gtsug lag khang dang | gnas khang dang | gzhan gyi khyim du 'gro'o ||* [e] *zhum zhum por byas nas 'gro ba dang | 'dug pa dang | nyal bar byed do ||* [f] *'od srung de ltar na zhum zhum por byas pa sdig pa 'chab pa de'i spyod lam gang yin pa de dag thams cad ni rung ba ma yin pa las yongs su brtags pa'o ‖*

III.5: [a] *'od srung 'di lta ste dper na | gdol pa'i sems ni bde 'gro'i skye ba la mi gnas so ||* [b] *de ci'i phyir zhe na | 'di ltar de rang gi las kyi nyes pa'i phyir ro ||* [c] *'od srung de bzhin du dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu'i sems kyang bde 'gror 'gro bar bya ba'i phyir mi gnas shing | de'i 'jig rten pha rol rnam par zhigs la |* [d] *de ngan 'gro gsum du gnas par sgrib pa med de |* [e] *'od srung 'di ni dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu zhes bya'o ‖*

> The mind of the *caṇḍāla* is not set on birth in a good destiny. Why? It is through the fault of his very own actions. Similarly, the mind of the *caṇḍāla* of a śramaṇa too is not set on doing the actions necessary to go to a good destiny, and so that other world is lost, and there is no obstacle to his dwelling in the three bad destinies.

In a very similar manner, the *Buddhapiṭakaduḥśīlanigraha*, a text which has much in common with the *Ratnarāśi* in terms of its concern with corruption, contains the following in its own quite expansive discussion of the precept-breaking monk:[104]

> Śāriputra, when those who are honorable, precept-keeping monks see precept-breaking monks in my community, they will avoid them at a

104 D 220: *mdo sde, dza* 24a3–b3; P 886: *mdo, tshu* 24a8–b7; sTog 36 *mdo, kha* 353a3–b4: *shā ri'i bu nga'i bstan pa 'di la tshul khrims dang ldan par bkur ba'i dge slong gang yin pa de dag gis | tshul khrims 'chal ba'i dge slong rnams mthong na | rgyang ring po kho nar yongs su spong bar 'gyur ro || de ci'i phyir zhe na | shā ri'i bu 'di ltar tshul khrims 'chal ba'i dge slong rnams kyi lhung bzed dam | chos gos gang yin pa de dag dang | tshul khrims dang ldan pa'i dge slong rnams kyir 'dres na | dug dang 'dres pa lta bur rig par bya'o || shā ri'i bu nga ni sbrul gyi ros gang ba 'am | khyi ros gang ba 'am | mi ros gang ba'i sa la spyod lam bzhi po rnams las spyod lam gang yang rung bas gnas par ni spro yi | shā ri'i bu nga ni tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong spyod* [P *sbyong* for *slong spyod*] *pa nyams pa | 'tsho ba nyams pa | lta ba nyams pa rnams dang | mtshan gcig gam | nyin gcig gam | skad cig gam | tha na se gol gtogs pa tsam yang lhan cig tu gnas par mi spro'o || de ci'i phyir zhe na | shā ri'i bu 'di ltar de lta bu'i dge sbyong* [P *slong*] *rnams ni dge sbyong* [P *slong*] *tha shal zhes bya'o || dge sbyong bkren ba zhes bya'o || dge sbyong phal pa zhes bya'o || dge sbyong sbun pa zhes bya'o || dge sbyong rul pa zhes bya'o || dge sbyong dri can zhes bya'o || dge sbyong gi snyigs ma zhes bya'o || dge sbyong gi dri ma zhes bya'o || dge sbyong gdol pa zhes bya'o || dge sbyong nyams pa zhes bya'o || dge sbyong sdig can zhes bya'o || dge sbyong sre da zhes bya'o || 'phags pa'i lam las phyi rol pa zhes bya'o || dge sbyong chu skyar zhes bya'o || dge sbyong sun 'byin pa zhes bya ste | de dag nga'i bstan pa 'di la rab tu byung nas* [? read *na*?] *| bsod nams ma yin pa'i phung po mang du 'thob par gyur ro || shā ri'i bu de dag ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan pa la 'thab khrol ba yin no || shā ri'i bu de dag ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan pa la chom rkun chos sun 'byin pa yin no || shā ri'i bu skyes bu dam pa ma yin pa de dag ni tshul 'chos pa 'tsho ba lhur len ba | 'jig rten gyi zang zing gis bkol ba | zas dang bgo ba lhur len pa yin no*. T. 653 (XV) 788c1–12: 持戒比丘見此破戒, 即時遠離。何以故。若破戒比丘手所觸物及所受物於持戒者, 則爲毒惡。舍利弗, 正使三屍臭穢滿地。我能於中行四威儀, 不能與此破戒比丘須臾共住。何以故。舍利弗, 是爲沙門中卑陋下賤, 爲沙門中朽壞弊惡, 爲沙門中粗糠, 爲沙門中垢, 爲沙門中濁, 爲沙門中污, 爲沙門中曲, 爲沙門中麁, 爲沙門中失聖道者。 如是人等於我法中出家求道, 而得重罪。 舍利弗, 如是之人於我法中爲是逆賊, 爲是法賊, 爲是欺誑詐僞之人。但求活命貪重衣食。是則名爲世樂奴僕.

There are many other examples, including in texts which may have been composed outside of India; for instance, an example of bad bodhisattvas compared to *caṇḍāla*s is found in the **Upāsakaśīla-sūtra*, 優婆塞戒經 (T. 1488 [XXIV] 1046a24–26).

> great distance. Why? Because, Śāriputra, you should know that mixing those bowls and robes of precept-breaking monks with those of precept-keeping monks is like mixing with poison. Śāriputra, I am willing to dwell in any of the four modes of deportment at a place full of the corpses of snakes, or full of the corpses of dogs, or full of the corpses of humans, but Śāriputra, I am not willing to dwell together with precept-breaking monks of defiled conduct, of defiled livelihood, of defiled view, for even one night, one day, one moment or even one finger snap's instant. Why? Because, Śāriputra, such monks as that I call "vile monks," "sordid śramaṇas," "vulgar śramaṇas," "refuse śramaṇas," "rotten śramaṇas," "stinking śramaṇas," "weed śramaṇas," "defiled śramaṇas," "*caṇḍāla* śramaṇas," "impaired śramaṇas," "evil śramaṇas," "chaff śramaṇas," "outsiders to the Noble Path," "crane śramaṇas,"[105] "corrupting śramaṇas," and if they renounce the world in my instruction they will acquire a great mass of sin (**apuṇya*). Śāriputra, they are disputants in the instruction of the Tathāgata. Śāriputra, they are thieves in the instruction of the Tathāgata, they are corrupters of the teaching. Śāriputra, those dishonorable men are deceitful, are most interested in their own livelihood, are enslaved by worldly material possessions, are most concerned with food and clothing.

Such passages and uses of *caṇḍāla* as a grammaticalized suffix could be multiplied in the literature.[106] It is hardly possible to read such passages without viscerally appreciating that for their authors, the term *caṇḍāla*—the most prominent and frequently encountered term common to these passages—is among the harshest, most extreme epithets that they were capable of disgorging. The word, it is probably not wrong to say, is an extremely strong obscenity,[107] a clear and unambiguous example of which we saw above in the context

105 Shayne Clarke convincingly suggests a connection with the "heron ascetic" (*baka*) mentioned by Bloomfield 1924: 211–212.

106 There is no need to offer a catalogue, but for instance see *Buddhapiṭakaduḥśīlanigraha* T. 653 (xv) 787b16–21, which speaks of the *śramaṇa-caṇḍāla* (沙門旃陀羅).

107 Despite their suggestive titles, neither Masson-Moussaieff 1971 nor Dwivedi 1981 deal with the topic, being devoted rather to sexual references in Sanskrit poetics. Perhaps the closest we can get at present to an examination of insulting words in Sanskrit is Hopkins 1925. To my regret, my ignorance of Russsian leaves Vigasin 2016 largely inaccessible to me (but from what I gather from its machine translation, it seems interesting). More narrowly focusing on Buddhist monastic regulations, one might think of the rules against insulting speech (Pāli *omasavāda*, Skt. *ūnamanuṣyavāda*), the best treatment of which so far is probably that of Hirakawa 1994: 66–82.

of the *Kuśa Jātaka*.[108] To clarify: the direct targets of the righteous indignation of the authors cited above are monks who do not properly uphold the discipline expected of them, the precept-breaking monks, who are among other things thieves of the donations offered by the pious. The anger of the authors, and their disgust, is directed at those who, they feel, threaten the integrity of the Buddhist monastic community (and its ability to receive support from the surrounding community). But how are we to understand the vocabulary through which these authors express this anger and disgust? For while we may well judge monastic discontent with bad monks to be fully justified, a pertinent question for us is how to make sense of the transfer of this negative feeling to another group: what lies behind the generalized deployment of reference to a despised social class to express disgust?

8 Rhetoric and Prejudice

To focus our question in a Buddhist frame: how can we account for the fact that Buddhist authors, so obviously concerned with overcoming the multitude of defilements which characterize the human condition, and ultimately with transcendence to a state of perfection beyond prejudice and whim, would nevertheless deploy language indicative of base and unreflective hatred? In other words, if we accept that the diversity of the evidence gathered here cannot be explained by appealing to different lineages and different authors, some of whom were tolerant and some of whom were not—and this would be hard to maintain, in any event, since all the materials equally were enshrined in the canonical literatures of the tradition—how can we make sense of the apparent conflict between, on the one hand, a rhetoric of non-discrimination, and even equality and openness toward all, and, on the other hand, expressions of extreme prejudice and vitriol referencing those belonging to the most vulnerable stratum of society? And this latter question does not disappear even when we recognize that "really" the vitriol is directed against a deserving target, the monks who threaten the integrity of the community. The question, then, is not the direct target, but the indirect reference, the object of the expression used to express disdain.

The ways this vocabulary functions rhetorically and psychologically—its logic, so to speak—are, I think, comparatively easy to understand, and the key lies in the basic human condition. Certainly without wanting to equate the two,

108 See above n. 68.

it is worth reflecting on the parallelism between this Buddhist rhetoric toward outcastes and the pervasive anti-Jewish rhetoric encountered for centuries in European writing, and beyond. As David Nirenberg (2013: 260) has so clearly shown, the nature of anti-Jewish rhetoric is that it consists in, as he says in speaking of Martin Luther, a "strategic appropriation of the most powerful language of opprobrium available," and that moreover its target is not real, actual Jews anywhere or anytime, but rather the created figurative, imaginary Jew.[109] I would suggest that very much the same thing might be said of the *caṇḍāla* in Indian Buddhist rhetoric: at least at the extreme, and surely in the grammaticalized usages illustrated above, the *caṇḍāla* is not a real individual, nor even a real class of persons, but a fictional and imaginary embodiment of the ultimate negative, the very nth degree of the objectionable and the despicable.[110] As long as such vitriol is directed toward the purely imaginary—and we might think here also of the deployment of the term *hīnayāna* in some Mahāyāna polemics—there is perhaps little harm done. Just as no person self-identifies as a hypocrite, so long as no individual or group could be understood as the referent of a slander, its danger is limited. The Indian Buddhist imagery of the *caṇḍāla*, and its deployment, however, arise from the social environment of a very real group of individuals, and the effect of this rhetoric on the treatment of real persons in the real world cannot help but have been corrosive, to say the least. We may not know exactly how this worked itself out in ancient India, but we know well that far on the other side of the Buddhist world, and even into the modern day, the term *sendara*, the Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese characters used to transcribe *caṇḍāla*, continues to function in Japan as a label with profoundly negative social consequences, applied to the outcastes, the *hinin*, the non-humans, or *eta*, those filled with filth, terms nowadays replaced by *buraku*, but still indicative of a highly discriminated-against class.[111]

Fundamental Buddhist karma doctrine holds that one's present circumstances are merely the result of one's past actions, and there is nothing whatsoever inherent in one's status. This is indeed precisely one of the bases of the

109 This is naturally only reinforced when we recall the anti-semitic imagery rife in England during the period (roughly 13th–mid-17th c.) when there were no Jews there, or the same in Japan, where even in the present there are no more than a handful of actual Jews, and historically none at all, yet anti-semitic tracts populate the shelves of bookshops.

110 In order to highlight the ease with which one may use terms unaware of their origins or nature, it may not be out of place to relate my own experience with "gyp" as a verb meaning "to cheat." It was only well into middle age that I realized that this was derived from prejudicial attitudes toward gypsies, Roma. It is little solace that I am not alone in this: see Challa 2013, Sonneman 1999.

111 See above n. 3.

rejection of caste as a meaningful category for the epistemologists, as so ably demonstrated by Eltschinger. Does it make sense, then, to assume that the same individuals (the authors of our texts, almost certainly Buddhist monks) could both sincerely believe in the meaninglessness of any specific and contingent form of birth, and yet use vocabulary which is so blatantly discriminatory and offensive? How can we reconcile doctrine with actions—in this case, at the very least, linguistic usages—which apparently contradict it?

Here research from psychologists interested in prejudice may help us. On the one hand, we learn that "[F]or those who pursue egalitarian objectives consistently, relatively automatic forms of bias control may emerge and operate in ways that are not especially taxing to the self-regulatory system."[112] Put into English, this means that one can train oneself to be less prejudicial. Nevertheless, other research suggests that "mere knowledge of a proposition endorsed by other people can contribute to the activation of corresponding associations in memory even when a person does not believe in the validity of that proposition. For example, mere knowledge of a cultural stereotype may lead to automatic negative reactions toward the members of a disadvantaged minority group even when the stereotype is considered inaccurate."[113] If one lives, then, in a society in which certain attitudes are pervasive, one's own convictions may not be able to override one's conditioning. While we do not know nearly enough about the sources of our Indian Buddhist texts, making the assumption that Buddhist literature tells us something of Buddhist culture—that the literature reveals a way of thinking, even if it does not reveal anything concrete about action in the world—we might conclude that at least some Indian Buddhists made sincere and extensive efforts to overcome their pre-judgements, their prejudices, in this case with regard to *caṇḍāla*s as outsiders and as Other, but it does not follow that all tried to do so, nor that all those who tried were necessarily able to do so consistently. Moreover, the very same collection of evidence also suggests that there were more than a few institutionally embedded Buddhists, monastic authors of texts preserved and treasured by the tradition, who either out of personal conviction or because they were unable to overcome their cultural conditioning, and perhaps even acting subconsciously, expressed themselves in a manner manifestly prejudicial toward specific groups of persons, those whom we refer to generically as outcastes.[114] In many cases, their

112 Bodenhausen et al., 2009: 128.

113 Gawronski & Bodenhausen 2006: 695.

114 My colleague Gregory Forgues offers an intriguing suggestion, which requires more detailed consideration than I am able to offer at this moment. (I have slightly reformulated what Forgues wrote to me and added some references; the "I" below is JAS): What if bauddhas were designated as *caṇḍāla*s in brahmanical communities and, as a con-

very language demonstrates a depth of negative feeling that it is hard to reconcile with the highest aspirations of Buddhist spiritual cultivation. The hypotheses of psychologists suggest that the solution to this paradox may lie precisely in a recognition that these authors were human beings, even if some aspired to be spiritual virtuosi. But a further conclusion is that there remained something in the intellectual processes of some of these authors which did not permit them to notice any contradiction between eloquent advocacy of, for instance, the bodhisattva path toward self-perfection and the salvation of all beings and use of vile, noxious and hateful rhetoric referencing a sub-category of that same group of beings.

Were some Indian Buddhists, then, at least tolerant of *caṇḍāla*s, even if they did not accept them as equals? At least for some scholars, "a minimal definition of tolerance requires that three events should occur: that someone should take offence at something, that he should be in a position to suppress it, and he should choose to forbear from using this power. People who do not take offence at anything, therefore, can be tolerant no more than they can be intol-

---

sequence, ended up stressing the Otherness of *caṇḍāla*s in their own texts to preserve their identity as followers of the Buddha? One can imagine that, if Buddhist communities were associated with *caṇḍāla*s by some non-Buddhists, bauddhas might have intentionally drawn a line between themselves and those social groups that were associated with things they could not identify with (such as a livelihood based on some kind of violence). Sanderson 2015: 163 (clearly directly inspired by Kane 1968–1977: II.1: 168–169 ≈ IV. 114–115) cites two verses which, among other things, put Buddhists into the category of a type of untouchable. The first Sanderson attributes to Aparāditya's *Yājñavalkyasmṛtiṭīkā* (the text is also called *Aparārka-Yajñavalkyadharmaśāstranibandha*, and some refer to the author as Aparārka; see Kane 1968–1977: I.2: 713–723), but this figure belongs to the 12th c. (see also Sanderson's note 2015: 163–164n19). Sanderson cites Aparāditya's quotation of a *Ṣaṭtriṁśanmata* (which I cannot further identify) as follows: "If he comes into physical contact with Buddhists, Pāśupatas, materialists, deniers [of life after death, the validity of the Veda, and the like], or brahmins engaged in improper employment, he should bathe fully clothed." He further gives another citation of the same author: "If he sees Jainas, Pāśupatas, Buddhists, Kāla[mukha]s, [Śākta] Kaulas, or peripatetic [mendicants] he should glance at the sun. If he has come into contact with any of them he should bathe fully clothed." From such references, it seems that brahmanical communities may have associated with *caṇḍāla*s all those who did not fit into their religious/social worldview. Beyond the purely linguistic prejudiced-based usage of the expression *caṇḍāla*, it would be interesting to research whether bauddhas might have used this term in a way that reflects social considerations resulting from the solidification of the caste system. One consideration in any further discussion is the date of the texts noticed by Kane and subsequently by Sanderson; the sources we have at present are rather late (12th c.), and therefore unlikely to have been significant in terms of Indian Buddhist history; however, if Aparāditya really is citing significantly older sources, these would require careful consideration. (Note that Hazra 1940: 201 cites precisely the same sources; evidently both he and Sanderson based themselves on Kane, though neither acknowledges it.)

erant."[115] Ideally, then, keeping in mind one category of passages introduced above, we may conclude that the attitude toward *caṇḍāla*s advocated by *some* Indian Buddhist writers is one of neither tolerance nor intolerance, but simply non-offense. Further, it might be possible, with charity, to conclude that for other authors, what comes through is both their utter disdain for *caṇḍāla*s, and their sense that they are powerless to do anything about it, at least if we interpret the vehemence, if not the violence, of their words as an expression of their frustration at their powerlessness.

"A just society," it has been said, "is one in which persons value the well-being of their fellow citizens."[116] A prerequisite for this, of course, is a recognition that others are indeed one's fellows. This, it seems to me, may be an awareness missing in much of the rhetoric we encounter in regard to *caṇḍāla*s in Indian Buddhist literature. And it is precisely this disconnection between different aspects of Buddhist thinking that is, I believe, well deserving of our attention.

Reference Note

References to Pāli follow the abbreviations of the *Critical Pāli Dictionary*.

Tibetan canonical sources are cited from the Derge Kanjur and Tanjur, indicated with D, unless otherwise noted.

When no translator is noted, the English renderings are my own.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the Horizon 2020 program (Advanced Grant agreement No. 741884). Some of the research for this study was carried out several years ago under the auspices of a VICI grant from the NWO (Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek, Project number 277-63-001, 2010–2015) for the project "Buddhism and Social Justice," which I directed at Leiden University. I remain grateful for the generous support. I thank Peter Szántó, Vincent Eltschinger, Rafal Felbur, Gregory Forgues, Shayne Clarke, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Peter Bisschop, Harunaga Isaacson, and two reviewers for the journal, for very kind and helpful comments on various drafts. I further thank Ven. Vinītā Tseng for her generosity in sharing with me passages from her edition of the *Ratnameghasūtra*, now in preparation, as well as several corrections.

115 Vernon and LaSelva 1984: 4.

116 Kelly 2003: 267.

References

Aktor, Mikael. 2002. "Rules of untouchability in ancient and medieval law books: Householders, competence and inauspiciousness." *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 6.3: 243–274.

Aktor, Mikael. 2008. *Ritualisation and Segregation: The untouchability complex in Indian Dharma literature with special reference to* Parāśrasmr̥ti *and* Parmāśramādhavīya. Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum et fontes iuris Asiae Meridianae et Centralis 9 (Torino: Comitato Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum et fontes iuris Asiae Meridianae et Centralis).

Aktor, Mikael. 2010. "Untouchability." In K.A. Jacobsen, et al., eds., *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism: Sacred Texts, Ritual Traditions, Arts, Concepts*. Vol. II. (Leiden: Brill): 876–881.

Aktor, Mikael. 2016. "The Cāṇḍālī as Śakti: Untouchable Women in Some Tantric Texts." In Bjarne Wernicke Olesen, ed., *Goddess Traditions in Tantric Hinduism: History, Practice and Doctrine*. (London: Routledge): 96–108.

Alsdorf, Ludwig. 1974. "The Impious Brahman and the Pious Caṇḍāla." In Lance Cousins et al. eds., *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel): 9–13.

Aoyama Tōru 青山亨 1982. "Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna no kenkyū" Śārdūlakarṇāvadānaの研究. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 30.2: 152–153.

Bapat, P.V, and V.V. Gokhale. 1982. *Vinaya-sūtra*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 22 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).

Barua, P.L. 1959. "The Doctrine of Caste in Early Buddhism." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan* 4: 134–156.

Bayer, Achim. 2010. *The Theory of* Karman *in the* Abhidharmasamuccaya. Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph 26 (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies).

Bendall, Cecil. 1897–1902. *Çikshāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching Compiled by Çāntideva, Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 1 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag, 1970).

Bhattacharya, Vidhushekhara. 1957. *The Yogācārabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga: The Sanksrit Text Compared with the Tibetan Version* (Calcutta: The University of Calcutta).

Bloomfield, Maurice. 1924. "On False Ascetics and Nuns in Hindu Fiction." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 44.3: 202–242.

Bodenhausen, Galen V., Andrew R. Todd, and Jennifer A. Richeson. 2009. "Controlling Prejudice and Stereotyping: Antecedents, Mechanisms, and Contexts." In T. Nelson, ed., *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination* (New York: Psychology Press): 111–135.

Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Saṁyutta Nikāya* (Boston: Wisdom Publications).

Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2012. *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Aṅguttara Nikāya* (Boston: Wisdom Publications).

Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2017. *The Suttanipāta: An Ancient Collection of the Buddha's Discourses, together with its commentaries* (Boston: Wisdom Publications).

Bodiford, William. 1996. "Zen and the Art of Religious Prejudice: Efforts to Reform a Tradition of Social Discrimination." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23.1/2: 1–27.

Bronkhorst, Johannes. Forthcoming. "India's Past Reconsidered." To appear in Paul W. Kroll and Jonathan A. Silk, eds., *"At the Shores of the Sky": Asian Studies for Albert Hoffstädt* (Leiden: Brill).

Cabezón, José Ignacio. 2017. *Sexuality in Classical South Asian Buddhism* (Boston: Wisdom Publications).

Challa, Janaki. 2013. "Why Being 'Gypped' Hurts The Roma More Than It Hurts You." Found at https://text.npr.org/s.php?sId=242429836, dated December 30, 2013.

Chalmers, Robert. 1894. "The Madhura Sutta concerning Caste." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1894: 341–366.

Chang, Garma C.C., et al. 1983. *A Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras: Selections from the Mahāratnakūṭa Sūtra* (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press).

Choong, Mun-keat. 2009. "A comparison of the Pāli and Chinese versions of the *Brāhmaṇṇa Saṁyutta*, a collection of early Buddhist discourses on the priestly *Brāhmaṇas*." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Series 3, 19.3: 371–382.

Chopra, Tilak Raj. 1966. *The Kuśa-Jātaka: A Critical and Comparative Study*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 13 (Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter & Co).

Conze, Edward. 1962. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā: Chapters 55 to 70, Corresponding to the 5th Abhisamaya*. Serie orientale Roma 26 (Rome: Instituto Italian per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).

Conze, Edward. 1975. *The Larger Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, with the divisions of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Cowell, E[dward] B[yles] and R[obert] A[lexander] Neil. 1886. *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge; Reprint: Amsterdam: Oriental Press / Philo Press, 1970).

Davidson, Ronald M. 2017. "Magicians, Sorcerers and Witches: Considering Pretantric, Non-sectarian Sources of Tantric Practices." *Religions* (Special Issue on Society for Tantric Studies) 8(9), 188: 1–33.

Dezső, Csaba. 2005. *Much Ado About Religion by Bhaṭṭa Jayanta*. Clay Sanskrit Library. (New York: New York University Press).

Dharmachakra Translation Committee. 2019. *The Jewel Cloud*. v. 1.30.1. Published online by 84000: Translating the Words of the Buddha.

Dwivedi, R.C. 1981. "Concept of Obscenity (*aślīlatā*) in Sanskrit Poetics." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 62.1/4: 67–76.

Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Ellis, Gabriel. 2019. "Early Buddhism and Caste." *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 72.1: 55–71.

Eltschinger, Vincent. 2012. *Caste and Buddhist Philosophy: Continuity of Some Buddhist Arguments against the Realist Interpretation of Social Denominations*. Trans. Raynald Prévèreau (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).

Eltschinger, Vincent. 2017. "The *Yogācārabhūmi* against Allodoxies (*paravāda*): 3. The Caste-Classes," in Christophe Vielle, Christian Cannuyer and Dylan Esler, eds., *Dieux, génies, anges et démons dans les cultures orientales & Florilegium Indiae Orientalis Jean-Marie Verpoorten in honorem*. Acta Orientalia Belgica 30. Brussels: Société Royale Belge d'Études Orientales: 203–240.

Feer, Henri-Léon. 1901. "Le Karma-Çataka." *Journal Asiatique* (January–February 1901) 53–100; (March–April 1901): 257–315; (May–June 1901): 410–486.

Fick, Richard. 1920. *The Social Organisation of North-East India in Buddha's Time*. Trans. Shishirkumar Maitra (Calcutta. Reprint: Delhi: Indological Book House, 1972).

Fukita, Takamichi. 2003. *The Mahāvadānasūtra: A New Edition Based on Manuscripts Discovered in Northern Turkestan*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Fujita Kōtatsu 藤田宏達. 1953. "Genshi Bukkyō ni okeru shishō byōdōron" 原始仏教における四姓平等論. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 2.1: 55–61.

Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G.V. 2006. "Associative and propositional processes in evaluation: An integrative review of implicit and explicit attitude change." *Psychological Bulletin* 132: 692–731.

Goodman, Charles. 2016. The Training Anthology *of Śāntideva: A Translation of the* Śikṣā-samuccaya (New York: Oxford University Press).

Habata, Hiromi. 2013. *A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Translation of the* Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra. Contributions to Tibetan Studies 10 (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag).

Hanumanthan, K[rishnaswamy] R[anaganathan]. 1979. *Untouchability: a historical study upto 1500 A.D.: with special reference to Tamil Nadu* (Madurai: Koodal Publishers).

Hare, Edward M[iles]. 1934. *The Book of the Gradual Sayings* III (Reprint London: Pali Text Society, 1973).

Harrison, Paul, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Kazunobu Matsuda. 2016. "The Final Folio of a Version of the Larger Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra and Fragments of a Text Possibly Related to the Tathāgatabimbaparivarta." In Jens Braarvig, ed., Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection: *Buddhist Manuscripts IV* (Oslo: Hermes): 283–293.

Harter, Pierre-Julien. 2019. "Haribhadra." In Jonathan A. Silk, ed. *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism. II: Lives* (Leiden: Brill): 204–208.

Hayashi Hisayoshi 林久良. 1997. *Bukkyō ni miru sabetsu no genryū: Sendara: Etori hōshi no gogen* 仏教にみる差別の根源: 旃陀羅—餌取法師の語源 (Tokyo: Akashi shoten 明石書店).

Hazra, Rajendra Chandra. 1940. *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*. Dhaka: The University of Dacca (University of Dacca Bulletin 20).

Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1994. *Nihyakugojūkai no Kenkyū* 二百五十戒の研究 *III*. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 16 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 2000. *Ritsuzō no Kenkyū* 律蔵の研究 *II*. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 10 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 1991. "Diviya-avadāna ni mirareru shakaiteki chii to shukke no mondai" ディヴィヤ・アヴァダーナに見られる社会的地位と出家の問題. *Nanto Bukkyō* 南都仏教 65: 19–37.

Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡 2002. *Setsuwa no kōkogaku: Indo Bukkyō setsuwa ni himerareta shisō* 説話の考古学: インド仏教説話に秘められた思想 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版).

Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 2007a. *Budda no nazo toku sanze no monogatari: Diviya Avadāna zen'yaku* ブッダが謎解く三世の物語『ディヴィヤ・アヴァダーナ』全訳 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan).

Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 2007b. "*Shutsuyōkyō* no seiritsu ni kansuru mondai" 出曜経の成立に関する問題. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 55.2: 181–187 (848–842).

Hokazono Kōichi 外園幸一. 1994. *Raritavisutara no Kenkyū* (*Jōkan*) ラリタヴィスタラの研究 (上巻) (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社).

Hopkins, E. Washburn. 1925. "Words of Defamation in Sanskrit Legal Language." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 45: 39–50.

Horner, Isaline Blew. 1938–1966. *The Book of the Discipline* (*Vinaya Piṭaka*) (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1982–1986). 6 volumes.

Huber, Édouard. 1908. *Sûtrâlaṃkâra. Traduit en Français sur la version chinoise de Kumârajîva* (Paris: Ernest Leroux).

Isobe Yumi 磯邊友美. 2005. "Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna ni miru chandāra no shukke" Śārdūlakarṇāvadānaに見るチャンダーラの出家. *Ryūkoku daigaku daigakuin bungaku kenkyūka kiyō* 龍谷大学大学院文学研究科紀要 27: 17–31.

Jamison, Stephanie W. 2009. "Sociolinguistic Remarks on the Indo-Iranian *-ka-Suffix: A Marker of Colloquial Register." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52.2–3: 311–329.

Jansen, Berthe. 2014. "Selection at the Gate: Access to the Monkhood and Social Mobility in Traditional Tibet." In Tsuguhito Takeuchi et al., eds., *Current Issues and Progress in Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Third International Seminar of Young Tibetologists, Kobe 2012* (= *Journal of Research Institute* 51), Kobe: Kobe City University of Foreign Studies: 137–164.

Jha, Vivekanand. 1974a. "From Tribe to Untouchable: The Case of Niṣādas." In R.S. Shar-

ma, ed., *Indian Society: Historical Probings in Memory of D.D. Kosambi* (New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House): 67–84.

Jha, Vivekanand. 1974b. "Status of the Rathakāra in Early Indian History." *Journal of Indian History* 52.1: 39–47.

Jha, V.N. 1975. "Stages in the History of Untouchability." *Indian Historial Review* 2.1: 14–31.

Jha, Vivekanand. 1978. "Position and Status of Bamboo-workers and Basket-makers in Ancient and Early Medieval Times." *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress* 39.1: 230–240.

Jha, Vivekanand. 1979. "Leather Workers in Ancient and Early Medieval India." *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress* 40: 99–108.

Jha, V.N. 1986. "Caṇḍāla and the Origin of Untouchability." *Indian Historial Review* 13.1–2: 1–36.

Jha, Vivekanand. 1997. "Caste, Untouchability and Social Justice: Early North Indian Perspective." *Social Scientist* 25.11/12: 19–30.

Jones, J[ohn] J[ames]. 1949–1956. *The Mahåvastu* (Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1973–1978).

de Jong, Jan W. 1988. "Buddhism and the Equality of the Four Castes." *Hommages et Opera* 12: 423–431.

Kane, P[andurang] V[aman]. 1968–1977. *History of Dharmaśāstra* (*Ancient and Medieval Religious and Civil Law in India*). Second Edition. Government Oriental Series B 6 (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute).

Karashima, Seishi. 2003. "A Trilingual Edition of the Lotus Sutra: New editions of the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese versions." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 6: 85–182.

Karashima, Seishi, and Margarita I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya. 2015. *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia. The St. Petersburg Sanskrit Fragments 1*. Tokyo: The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences and The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

Kashyap, Shashi. 2005. "Cāṇḍāla (the only untouchable by birth in *Dharma-śāstra*)." *Bhāratīya Vidyā* 65: 49–64.

Kataoka, Kei. No Date. Edition of *Nyāyamañjarī Āgamaprāmāṇyam*. http://www2.lit.kyushu-u.ac.jp/~kkataoka/Kataoka/NMaprR.pdf

Kataoka, Kei, and Elisa Freschi. 2012. "Jayanta on the validity of sacred texts (other than the Veda)." *Minami Ajia Kotengaku* 南アジア古典学 / *South Asian Classical Studies* 7: 1–55.

Kelly, Erin I. 2003. Review of Hans Oberdiek, *Tolerance: Between Forbearance and Acceptance*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001. *The Philosophical Review* 112/2: 266–269.

Kimura, Takayasu. 1986. *Pañcaviṁśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā II–III* (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin Publishing).

Kimura, Takayasu. 1990. *Pañcaviṁśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā IV* (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin Publishing).

Kimura, Takayasu. 1992. *Pañcaviṁśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā V* (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin Publishing).

Krishan, Y. 1986. "Buddhism and the Caste System." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 9.1: 71–83.

Kudo, Noriyuki. 2004. *The* Karmavibhaṅga: *Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 7 (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University).

Kuijper, F.B.J. 1991. *Aryans in the Rigveda*. Leiden Studies in Indo-European 1 (Amsterdam: Rodopi).

Kusama Hōshō 草間法照. 1989. "Indo Bukkyō ni okeru byōdō to sabestu: sono shintai shōgaishakan o megutte" インド仏教における平等と差別: その身体障害者観をめぐって. In Fujita Kōtatsu hakase kanreki kinen ronshū kankōkai 藤田宏達博士還暦記念論集刊行会, eds., *Indo testugaku to Bukkyō: Fujita Kōtatsu hakase kanreki kinen ronshū* インド哲学と仏教: 藤田宏達博士還暦記念論集 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店): 275–295.

Lamotte, Étienne Paul Marie. 1944–1980. *Le Traité de la grande Vertu de Sagesse*. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 25, 26, 2, 12, 24 (Louvain: Université de Louvain; reprint, 1970–1981).

Lamotte, Étienne Paul Marie. 1976. *The Teaching of Vimalakīrti* (*Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*). Trans. Sara Boin (London: The Pali Text Society).

Law, Bimala Churn. 1937. *Concepts of Buddhism* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris / Kern Institute, Leiden).

Lefmann, Salomon. 1902–1908. *Lalita Vistara: Leben und Lehre des Çākya-Buddha* (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses; reprint: Tokyo: Meicho-Fukyūkai, 1977).

Lévi, Sylvain. 1932. *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* (*La Grande Classification des Actes*) *et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa* (*Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga*). (Paris: Librarier Ernest Leroux).

Levman, Bryan Geoffrey. 2013. "Cultural Remnants of the Indigenous Peoples in the Buddhist Scriptures." *Buddhist Studies Review* 30.2: 145–180.

Loukota Sanclemente, Diego. 2019. The Goods that Cannot Be Stolen: Mercantile Faith in Kumāralāta's *Garland of Examples Adorned by Poetic Fancy*. PhD thesis, UCLA.

Lozang Jamspal and Kaia Tara Fischer. 2020. *The Hundred Deeds* (*Karmaśataka*). Version v 1.1.3. Online publication by 84000: Translating the Words of the Buddha.

Maetani Eshō (Akira) 前谷恵紹(彰). 1994. "Mātaṅga no shuzokuteki kigen o megutte" Mātaṅga の種族的起源をめぐって. *Mikkyō Bunka* 密教文化 184: 156–131.

Maetani Eshō (Akira) 前谷恵紹(彰). 1995. "Chandārī, Mātangī ni tsuite no kaishaku:

arataru shiten yori" チャンダーリー・マータンギーについての解釈: 新たなる視点より. *Kōyasan daigaku ronsō* 高野山大学論叢 30: 1–30.

Marciniak, Katarzyna. 2019. *The* Mahāvastu: *A New Edition*. Vol. III. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XIV,1 (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology Soka University).

Masson-Moussaieff, J. 1971. "Obscenity in Sanskrit Literature." *Mahfil* 7.3/4: 197–207.

Matsunaga, Yūkei 松長有慶. 1978. *The Guhyasamāja Tantra* (Tokyo: Toho Shuppan).

Matsunaga Yūkei 松長有慶. 1991. "Indo Mikkyō ni okeru sendarakan" インド密教における旃陀羅観. *Kōyasan daigaku mikkyō bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 高野山大学密教文化研究所紀要 4: 1–20. Reprinted in *Matsunaga Yūkei chosakushū II: Indo Mikkyō no kōzō* 松長有慶著作集　第二巻　インド密教の構造 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館, 1998): 269–295.

Matsunami Seitatsu 松涛誠達. 1992. "Shukkeshugyōsha to chandāra" 出家修行者とチャンダーラ. *Bukkyōgaku* 仏教学 32: 1–22.

Miyasaka Yūshō 宮坂宥勝. 1976. "Mātaṅga to Bukkyō" MĀTAṄGAと仏教. In Okuda Jiō sensei kiju kinen ronbunshū kankōkai 奥田慈応先生喜寿記念論文集刊行会, eds., *Bukkyō shisō ronshū: Okuda Jiō sensei kiju kinen* 仏教思想論集: 奥田慈応先生喜寿記念 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店): 1001–1016. [Not seen]

Miyasaka Yūshō 宮坂宥勝. 1991. "Sendara: Bukkyō ni misutereareta mono" 旃陀羅—仏教に見捨てられたもの. *Bukkyō* 仏教 / *Kikan Bukkyō* 季刊仏教 15: 62–70. Reprinted in Miyasaka 1995b: 67–79. I cite the latter.

Miyasaka Yūshō 宮坂宥勝. 1992. "Sendara no shiteki kōsatsu 1" 旃陀羅の史的考察 (一). *Chisan Gakuhō* 智山学報 55: 37–57. Reprinted in Miyasaka 1995b: 80–103. I cite the latter.

Miyasaka Yūshō 宮坂宥勝. 1993. "Sendara no shiteki kōsatsu 2" 旃陀羅の史的考察 (二). *Chisan Gakuhō* 智山学報 56: 71–87. Reprinted in Miyasaka 1995b: 104–122. I cite the latter.

Miyasaka Yūshō 宮坂宥勝. 1994. "Sendara no shiteki kōsatsu 3" 旃陀羅の史的考察 (三). *Chisan Gakuhō* 智山学報 57: 53–79. Reprinted in Miyasaka 1995b: 123–153. I cite the latter.

Miyasaka Yūshō 宮坂宥勝. 1995a. "Kodai Indo ni okeru chyandāra" 古代インドにおけるチャンダーラ. *Chisan Gakuhō* 智山学報 58: 19–36.

Miyasaka Yūshō 宮坂宥勝. 1995b. *Indogaku Mikkyōgaku Ronkō* インド学密教学論考 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館).

Mukhopadhyaya, Sujitkumar. 1954. *The Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna* (Santiniketan: Viśvabharati).

Mukhopadhyaya, Sujitkumar. 1963. *The Aśokāvadāna* (New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi).

Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu, edited and revised by Bhikkhu Bodhi. 1995. *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya* (Boston: Wisdom Publications).

Nanjio, Bunyiu. 1923. *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. Bibliotheca Otaniensis 1 (Reprint: Kyoto: Otani University Press, 1956).

Nattier, Jan. 2003. *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to The Inquiry of Ugra* (Ugraparipṛcchā) (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).

Nirenberg, David. 2013. *Anti-Judaism: The Western Tradition* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company).

Norman, K[enneth] R[oy]. 1958. "Samprasāraṇa in Middle Indo-Aryan." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 90.1–2: 44–50.

Norman, K[enneth] R[oy]. 1969. *The Elders' Verses I: Theragāthā*. Pali Text Society Translation Series 38 (London: Pali Text Society. Reprint 1990).

Norman, K[enneth] R[oy]. 1992. *The Group of Discourses* (*Sutta-Nipāta*). *Volume II: Revised Translation with Introduction and Notes*. Pali Text Society Translation Series 45 (Oxford: The Pali Text Society).

Olivelle, Patrick. 1998. *The Early Upaniṣads: Annotated Text and Translation* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Olivelle, Patrick. 2005. *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Ōta Shinkai 太田心海. 2000. "Sendara to Bukkyō" 旃陀羅と仏教. In Yamada Meiji 山田明爾, ed., *Yamada Meiji Kyōju Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshū: Sekai Bunka to Bukkyō* 山田明爾教授還暦記念論文集: 世界文化と仏教 (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō 永田文昌堂): 3–26.

Parasher, Aloka. 1979. "The Designation Mleccha for Foreigners in Early India." *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress* 40: 109–120.

Parasher-Sen, Aloka. 2006. "Naming and Social Exclusion: The Outcaste and the Outsider." In Patrick Olivelle, ed., *Between the Empires: Society in India 300 bce to 400 ce* (New York: Oxford University Press): 415–455.

Ratchaneekorn Ratchatakorntrakoon and Suchitra Chongstitvatana. 2018. "The Concept of Justice in Buddhism: A Case Study of Caṇḍāla in Jātakaṭṭhakathā." *International Journal of Engineering & Technology* 7 (4.38): 970–974.

Rhys Davids, [Caroline Augusta Foley]. 1913. *Psalms of the Early Buddhists. II. Psalms of the Bretheren* (Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1980).

Ritsukyō 'Shukkeji' Kenkyūkai『律経』「出家事」研究会, ed. 2010. "*Ritsukyō* 'Shukkeji' no kenkyū (6)"『律経』「出家事」の研究 (6). *Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo nenpō* 綜合佛教研究所年報 32: 1–37 (48–84). (I have access only to an offprint and cite its pagination.)

Sakya Pandita Translation Group. 2019. *The Ākāśagarbha Sūtra*. v 2.18. Published online by 84000: Translating the Words of the Buddha.

Salvini, Mattia. 2016. "*Ratna*: A Buddhist World of Precious Things." In Fabrizio M. Ferrari and Thomas W.O. Dähnhardt, eds., *Soulless Matter, Seats of Energy: Metals, Gems and Minerals in South Asian Traditions* (Sheffield: Equinox).

Samuels, Jeffrey. 2007. "Buddhism and Caste in India and Sri Lanka." *Religion Compass* 1.1: 120–130.

Sanderson, Alexis. 2009a. "The Śaiva Age." In Shingo Einoo, ed., *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Institute of Oriental Culture Special Series 23 (Tokyo: University of Tokyo): 41–349.

Sanderson, Alexis. 2009b. "Tantric Śaivism and Caste." Handout for lecture at Institut für Südasien-, Tibet- und Buddhismuskunde Universität Wien 7 June, 2009. 12pp.

Sanderson, Alexis. 2015. "Tolerance, Exclusivity, Inclusivity, and Persecution in Indian Religion During the Early Mediaeval Period." In John Makinson, ed., *Honoris Causa: Essays in Honour of Aveek Sarkar*. London: Allen Lane, 2015: 155–224.

Sankrityayana, Rahula. 1981. *Vinayasūtra of Bhadanta Gunaprabha*. Singhi Jain Śāstra Śiksāpītha [*sic*] Singhi Jain Series 74 (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan).

Schopen, Gregory. 2018. "On Monks and Emergencies: The Brahmanical Principle of *Āpad* in a Buddhist Monastic Code." In Lutz Edzard, Jens W. Borgland and Ute Hüsken, eds., *Reading Slowly: A Festschrift for Jens E. Braarvig* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag): 375–391.

Schuessler, Axel. 2009. *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese. A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).

Shimoda Masahiro 下田正弘. 1991. "*Genshi Nehangyō* no sonzai: *Daijō Nehangyō* no seiritsushiteki kenkyū: sono ichi" 『原始涅槃經』の存在・『大乘涅槃經』の成立史的研究その１ *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 東洋文化研究所紀要 103: 1–126.

Shizuka Haruki 静春樹. 2001. "Baramon to inu to chandāra: Han-kāsuto no kyōshoku girei toshite no jurin" バラモンと犬とチャンダーラ: 反カーストの共食儀礼としての聚輪. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 50.1: 309–307.

Shulman, David. 1984. "The Enemy Within: Idealism and Dissent in South Indian Hinduism." In S.N. Eisenstadt, Reuven Kahane, and David Shulman, eds., *Orthodoxy, Hetrodoxy and Dissent in India*. Religion and Society 23 (Berlin: Mouton): 11–55.

Silk, Jonathan A. 1994. The Origins and Early History of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism with a Study of the *Ratnarāśi* Sūtra and Related Materials. Dissertation, The University of Michigan.

Silk, Jonathan A. 2001. "The Place of the Lotus Sūtra in Indian Buddhism." *Journal of Oriental Philosophy* 11: 89–107.

Silk, Jonathan A. 2008. "Incestuous Ancestries: On the Family Origins of Gautama Siddhārtha, Interpretations of Genesis 20.12, and the Status of Scripture in Buddhism." *History of Religions* 47/4: 253–281.

Skilling, Peter, and Saerji. 2014. "How the Buddhas of the Fortunate Aeon First Aspired to Awakening: The *pūrva-praṇidhāna*s of Buddhas 1–250." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 17: 245–291.

Skilling, Peter, and Saerji. 2016. "How the Buddhas of the Fortunate Aeon First Aspired to Awakening: The *pūrva-praṇidhāna*s of Buddhas 251–500." *Annual Report of the*

International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University 19: 149–192.

Skilling, Peter, and Saerji. 2017. "How the Buddhas of the Fortunate Aeon First Aspired to Awakening: The *pūrva-praṇidhāna*s of Buddhas 501–750." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 20: 167–204.

Skilling, Peter, and Saerji. 2018. "How the Buddhas of the Fortunate Aeon First Aspired to Awakening: The *pūrva-praṇidhāna*s of Buddhas 751–994." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 21: 209–244.

Snellgrove, David L. 1959. *The Hevajra Tantra: A Critical Study*. London Oriental Series 6 (London: Oxford University Press).

Sonneman, Toby F. 1999. "Dark Mysterious Wanderers: The Migrating Metaphor of the Gypsy." *Journal of Popular Culture* 32.4: 119–139.

Speyer, Jacob Samuel. 1906–1909. *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 3. Indo-Iranian Reprints 3 (St. Petersburg; Reprint: The Hauge: Mouton, 1958).

Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group of Taishō University (Taishō Daigaku Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 大正大学声聞地研究会). 1998. *Yugaron Shōmonji: Dai-ichi Yugasho: Sansukuritto-go Tekisuto to Wayaku* 瑜伽論声聞地第一瑜伽処: サンスクリット語テキストと和訳 / *Śrāvakabhūmi: Revised Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation: The First Chapter*. Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Kenkyū Sōsho 大正大学総合仏教研究所研究叢書 4 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 三喜房佛書林).

Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group of Taishō University (Taishō Daigaku Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 大正大学声聞地研究会). 2007. *Yugaron Shōmonji: Dai-ni Yugasho: Sansukuritto-go Tekisuto to Wayaku* 瑜伽論声聞地第一瑜伽処: サンスクリット語テキストと和訳 / *Śrāvakabhūmi: Revised Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation: The Second Chapter*. Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Kenkyū Sōsho 大正大学総合仏教研究所研究叢書 18 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 三喜房佛書林).

Szántō, Péter-Dániel. 2012. Selected Chapters from the *Catuṣpīṭhatantra*: (1/2) Introductory study with the annotated translation of selected chapters. PhD thesis, Oxford University.

Szántō, Péter-Dániel. 2015. "Hevajratantra." In Jonathan A. Silk, ed. *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism. 1: Literature and Languages* (Leiden: Brill): 334–340.

Tatia, Nathmal. 1976. *Abhidharmasamuccaya-Bhāṣyam*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 17 (Patna: Kasahi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).

Thieme, Paul. 1994. "On M. Mayrhofer's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 57.2: 321–328.

Turner, R[alph] L[illy]. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages* (London: Oxford University Press).

Ujike Kakushō 氏家覚勝.1984. "Hakushiki sendara" 博識旃陀羅. *Bukkyōgaku kaihō* 仏教学会報 10: 1–6.

Ujike Kakushō 氏家覚勝. 1985. "Bukkyō kyōten ni okeru sendara no yōrei (oboegaki)" 仏教経典における旃陀羅の用例(覚え書). *Kōyasan daigaku ronsō* 高野山大学論叢 20: 103–146.

Vernon, Richard and Samuel V. LaSelva. 1984. "Justifying Tolerance." *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique* 17/1: pp. 3–23.

Vigasin, Alexey A. 2016. "Verbal Abuse and Obscenity in Ancient India", *Vestnik drevnei istorii* 76/1: 108–117. In Russian: Вигасин А. А. Поношение и срамословие в Древней Индии // *Вестник древней истории*.

Vollmer, Klaus. 1994. "Die Begriffswelt des Marginalen im mittelalterlichen Japan: Zum Problem der Klassifizierung gesellschaftlicher Randgruppen und ihrer Bezeichnungen." *Oriens Extremus* 37.1: 5–44.

Yamazaki, Genichi. 2005. *The Structure of Ancient Indian Society: Theory and Reality of the Varṇa System*. Toyo Bunko Research Library 6 (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko).

Yinshun 印順. 1954. *Yi fofa yanjiu fofa* 以佛法研究佛法. Xinzhu, Taiwan: Zhengwen chubanshe 正聞出版社. Accessed through CBETA Y16n0016, without indication of the edition used; the page numbers cited thus refer to those in the CBETA data.