

仙石山仏教学論集
第13号（令和4年）

Sengokuyama Journal
of Buddhist Studies
Vol. XIII, 2022

Some More Equal than Others: Restriction and Exclusion in Early and Middle Indic Buddhism

Corin Golding

Some More Equal than Others: Restriction and Exclusion in Early and Middle Indic Buddhism

Corin Golding

Abstract

Buddhism, from the early tradition to the later Mahāyāna (and beyond), contains a wide-ranging taxonomy of restriction, exclusion and, from a modern perspective, perhaps, discrimination. Many examples exist, from prohibitions on certain categories of person (and non-person) entering the monastic order or listening to the Buddha's teachings, to more comprehensive statements against those who are denied the capacity to achieve Buddhahood. Arguably, this exclusion gained its fullest articulation in later Buddhism in the form of the *icchāntika*. In this paper, I trace some of the possible antecedents to the *icchāntika* found in two key passages from the Pali tradition, before presenting sections from a Mahāyāna treatise in which we are introduced to the category of *agotrastha*, 'one lacking in the lineage (for attaining Nirvāṇa)', who has much in common with the *icchāntika*; ultimately, at least in one key text, the two appear to be conflated.

Introduction*

One of the most culturally influential teachings of Buddhism, in its contemporary incarnations in the West as well as historically in most sects

* I am delighted for the opportunity to acknowledge the tremendous support and assistance of all the faculty and related staff at the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies, Tokyo, many of whom have provided invaluable feedback on this paper in particular, and contributed greatly to my studies more broadly. Most of all, I owe an inexpressible debt of gratitude to Prof. Florin Deleanu and Prof. Habata Hiromi, both of whom have conferred on me untold generosity and patience, sharing their own translations of many difficult passages

throughout East Asia, is that all beings can become a Buddha; or, in the canonical formulation(s), variations of the following: Skt. *sarvasattvās tathāgatagarbhāḥ*; Tib: *sems can thams cad la de bzhin gshegs pa'i snying po yod*; Chin. 一切眾生悉有佛性 (often translated along the lines of ‘all beings have Buddha Nature’).¹ However, contrary to popular imagination, early Buddhism contains many instances of beings, human and non-human, who are excluded in some capacity from the *Buddha dharma*, from prohibitions on certain individuals entering the monastic community (Saṃgha), to others who are denied the capacity to achieve Buddhahood, in some circumstances for a provisional time-frame, in extreme cases, for eternity.

Perhaps the earliest, and best known, instance of exclusion relates to the well-known story of the Buddha’s maternal aunt, Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī, whose ordination was refused by the Buddha until Ānanda interceded on her behalf.² It would be several centuries after that episode before the appearance

discussed in this paper, and regularly enlightening me with their extensive exegetical insights. If there is any scrap of merit contained herein, it is entirely owing, and owed, to them. Needless (yet absolutely necessary) to say, any and all errors and shortcomings that doubtless remain are my own.

¹ See especially Habata 2015; Kanō 2020.

² See e.g., Jonathan S Walters (1994). There are several other examples beyond those I summarise in this paper, which either are too vast a subject for the scope of this survey, or do not bear immediately apparent affinities with the *icchāntika*. Two obvious omissions, in addition to that of Mahāprajāpatī, worthy of passing mention concern the *cāṇḍāla* (e.g., Jonathan Silk, 2020) and Dharmākara, the Bodhisattva who would become Amitābha, the Buddha of Pure Land Buddhism. In the *Sukhāvāṭīvyūha*, Dharmakāra’s 18th vow famously adds a qualification to his commitment to save all beings, namely that this would not extend to those who commit the five sins of immediate retribution or those who slander the dharma. This is not without at least indirect relevance to the figure of the *icchāntika*; however, Silk (2007, 274, n.78) questions ‘how important it may have been in India itself’ and my interest here is discourses of exclusion in Indic Buddhism. Finally, one further example (though by no means the last) that will be of interest to a wider study are the several sub-categories of slave and how these speak to the

of the *icchantika*, perhaps the most notorious villain in the South and East Asian Buddhist worlds who, at least in some characterisations, is wholly denied the capacity to attain ultimate Nirvāṇa (*parinirvāṇa*).³ However, clearly the *icchantika* did not appear in a vacuum, and there are some striking continuities with some categories from the early tradition that suggest they are very much part of a wider discourse of exclusion, inflected, at least, perhaps in part determined, by these categories. To be sure, none of these earlier classes constitute as thoroughgoing an exclusion as would be articulated in some characterizations of the *icchantika*, though the *agotrastha*, elaborated primarily within the later Yogācāra school, very much appears to be of the same genus. In brief, Buddhism from the outset has not been the catholic church that is often popularly assumed.

While the restrictions placed on certain categories in the early sources may not be as radical as the *icchantika*, several of them anticipate the latter in interesting ways, while others often appear together with them in later lists of beings considered to exemplify the most degraded behaviour and vilest impulses. That is to say, despite often being presented in the literature as exceptional in the Buddhist world, we can see that the *icchantika* emerged in a milieu already punctuated by often finely calibrated (and from a modern point of view, perhaps discriminatory, even arbitrary) systems of exclusion. Furthermore, I would like to suggest, hesitantly, that in some passages the *icchantika* comes to function as something of a catch-all for many of the early categories, representing metonymically a litany of vices and sins that coalesce and cohere in them.

question of who can or cannot become ordained as monks or nuns (see e.g., Gregory Schopen, 2010).

³ However, to be clear, I will not be discussing the *icchantika* in any depth in this paper; that vexed topic is the subject of several forthcoming articles.

In the first part of this paper, I introduce a representative passage from the para-canonical *Milindapañha* (*The Questions of King Milinda*; Mil⁴), in which we find a list of beings that are defined as being ‘unable to gain complete insight into the nature of things’ even if they were to practise correctly the Buddha’s teaching. I then note a similar list found in the *Mahāvagga* of the *Vinaya* cataloguing those who may not be granted permission to ordain as a monk, or, if already ordained, are to be expelled. A discussion of several of these categories is followed by a limited number of representative sequences depicting the *icchantika*, primarily from the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*.

In part two I turn to a section of a Yogācāra text, the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, to present passages which introduce, define, and elaborate, among others, the category of the *agotrastha*, ‘one lacking in the lineage (for attaining Nirvāṇa)’. As will be seen, unlike the provisional forms of restriction found in part one, the *agotrastha* bears striking affinities with the *icchantika*, and though conceived as part of the Yogācāra classificatory system while the *icchantika* emerged in a less clearly defined context, these two figures have much in common, both in terms of the characteristics on the basis of which they are defined as bereft of any potential for awakening, and in the extent to which their condemnation is unequivocal. Finally, the logic by which they each find their ultimate rehabilitation also bears the imprint of the other, until

⁴ According to Oskar von Hinüber (1996b, 85), Mil, which takes the form of a dialogue between the Indo-Greek king Menander (Menandros; Milinda) and the Buddhist monk Nāgasena, can be analysed into five separate layers united ‘only by the persons of the interlocutors’, and that developed over several centuries, the first layer from roughly 100 BCE to 200 CE. The passage in question is found in the second layer, meaning it likely postdates 200 CE. Consequently, this list of restricted categories may well be later than the earliest references to the *icchantika* found in e.g., *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*. However, it is not my intention to claim a direct influence on the *icchantika* of any of these specific cases; rather, I only hope to demonstrate an extensive and pervasive discourse of exclusion in the context of which the *icchantika* emerged.

at last they appear to be conflated, at least in one well-known passage in the *Lankāvatārasūtra*.

1. Antecedents to the *icchāntika* in early Buddhism

In looking for enumerations of classes or categories of exclusion in the Buddhist canon, perhaps the obvious place to start is the *Vinaya*. I B Horner (1951, xiv) in the introduction to her translation of the *Mahāvagga* (MV) comments on the gradual regulation of the Saṃgha and its members, noting ‘the first steps of all – admission and ordination into the Order – were experimented with until various types of applicants regarded as not eligible for entry could be excluded by rules, based either on experience or on forethought’. Vin I 91.7-18, for example, lists 32 types of physical impairment and diseases, the bearer of which may not be ordained, including having various limbs cut off (e.g., hands [*hatthacchinna*], feet [*pādacchinna*]), being a dwarf (*vāmana*), suffering from elephantiasis (*sīpadi*), or being blind and/or dumb and/or deaf (*andha*, *mūga*, *badhira*). No doubt there were important social and medical reasons for some of these prohibitions (though perhaps it is not always clear to a modern reader why some of these conditions should disbar one from the community), and we shall see echoes of these restrictions on physical impairment when we turn to the ŚrBh in part 2, below; others were perhaps intended to maintain the credibility of the Saṃgha in the eyes of the laity, upon whom the monks and nuns depended for subsistence.

In this paper, I would like to look more closely at another list of excluded categories from the MV, alongside a later passage from Mil. These two contain striking similarities in their contents, though they are by no means identical. Indeed, one important point of difference concerns not the categories they include so much as the extent of the restrictions being imposed. In the case of the MV, the list enumerates individuals who are precluded from being ordained, or from remaining, as a monk, while in Mil,

the scope has been expanded to describe those beings (human and non-human) who, ‘even if they were to correctly follow the path, would not gain complete insight into the nature of things’.⁵ That is, from one perspective it may be helpful to think of the development of the process of restriction and exclusion to follow along a historical continuum, from social and concrete categories at the time of the Buddha, to theoretical and soteriological discourses in the centuries that followed.⁶ For the sake of clarity, it will be helpful to present the later Mil passage first, and then notice the common categories found in the earlier sequence from the *Vinaya*.

In the section in question, the King Menander asks the Venerable Nāgasena: Do all those who correctly follow the path gain complete insight into the nature of things? The answer is a resounding ‘No’, and Nāgasena goes on to enumerate, without much further elaboration, 16 classes of being that will not attain insight.

Bhante Nāgasena, ye te sammā paṭipajjanti tesam sabbesaṃ yeva dhammābhisamayo hoti, udāhu kassaci na hotīti. – Kassaci mahārāja hoti, kassaci na hotīti. – Kassa bhante hoti, kassa na hotīti. – Tiracchānagatassa mahārāja supaṭipannassāpi dhammābhisamayo na hoti, pettivisayūpapannassa micchādīṭṭhikassa kuhakassa mātughātakassa pitughātakassa arahantaghātakassa sanghabhedakassa lohituppādakassa theyyasaṃvāsakassa titthiyapakkantakassa bhikkunīdūsakassa terasannaṃ garukāpattīnaṃ

⁵ *supaṭipannassāpi dhammābhisamayo na hoti* (Mil. 310.18).

⁶ This process may also nuance our understanding of the *icchantika*’s passage from historical reality to theoretical abstraction. The complex question of the historical identity of the *icchantika* will be addressed more fully in a future paper. See brief outline in section on the *icchantika* below, and, especially, Fujii (1999); Mochizuki (1988); Shimoda (1997) for extensive discussions of the topic.

aññataraṃ āpajjitvā avuṭṭhitassa paṇḍakassa ubhatobyaññanakassa supaṭipannassāpi dhammābhisamayo na hoti, yo pi manussadaharako ūnakasattavassiko tassa supaṭipannassāpi⁷ dhammābhisamayo na hoti.
Mil 310.5-18

‘Venerable Nāgasena, do all those who correctly follow the path gain complete insight into the nature of things, or do some not [gain such insight]?’

‘Some do, Great King, others do not.’

‘Who does, Venerable One, and who does not?’

‘An animal,⁸ Great King, even if it were to correctly follow the path, would not gain complete insight into the nature of things; [nor] one born in the realm of the departed;⁹ [nor] one holding false views; [nor] one who is a fraud; [nor] one who has committed matricide, parricide, or killed an Arhat; [nor] one who has created a schism in the Saṃgha; [nor] one who has spilt the blood [of a Buddha]; [nor] one who falsely purports to be a monk¹⁰; [nor] one who has converted to the heretics¹¹; [nor] one who corrupts a nun; [nor] one who has committed one of the 13 serious offences¹² [but] has not been absolved; [nor] a eunuch; nor

⁷ PTS edition appears to contain a typographical error (*supaṭipannassāpi*), corrected here.

⁸ Occurrence of *tiracchānagata* here with *pettivisaya* indicates two of the three ‘evil destinations’ (*durgati*); in MV to follow we only see *tiracchānagata*.

⁹ PTSD s.v. *pettivisaya* ‘der. fr. pitar, but influenced by peta’; *peta*: including ‘the departed spirit [; ...] represents the Vedic pitarah (manes) [; ...] ghosts’.

¹⁰ ‘one who has furtively attached himself to the Order’, Rhys Davids (1963, 177); ‘one living in communion as though by theft’, Horner (1964, 144).

¹¹ *theyyasamvāsakassa* and *tīthiyapakkantakassa* appear to be understood as a collective term. See note 18 on MV below.

¹² *garuka-āpatti*; according to Rhys Davids, ‘equivalent to the Saṃghādisesa offences’ (1894, 177). However, for more see below on *pārājika*.

would one who has the characteristics of both genders,¹³ even if they were to correctly follow the path, gain complete insight into the nature of things; nor would a human child under the age of seven years¹⁴, even if they were to correctly follow the path, gain complete insight into the nature of things.’

As may be immediately apparent, the Mil catalogue appears both unsystematic and inexhaustive, mixing smaller lists and individual items with no apparent logic and seemingly addressing both the laity and the monastic community. In addition to noting the range of class of being who is included in the list, from animals to children to the departed, there are also several categories that anticipate some of the charges levelled against the *icchāntika* and thus perhaps highlight a degree of continuity connecting the latter to the early tradition. For example, in several places in the key texts that seek to establish the manifold sins and failings of the *icchāntika* (primarily, for my purposes here, *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* [MPM], *Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra* [RGV] and the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* [LAS]), the *icchāntika* is accused of holding false views,

¹³ *ubhatobyañjanaka*, ‘hermaphrodite’ in both Rhys Davids (1963, 177) and Horner (1964, 144). The extent to which the terms overlap, much less equate, is a complex question and deserves a separate study.

¹⁴ Just before the passages from the MV summarized below, we find two other age restrictions, considerably older than the seven years in Mil, defining the age at which an individual can be fully ordained (*upasampajjati/upasampadā*), or be accepted as a novice (*pabbajati/pabbajā*):

Vin I 78.30-32: *na bhikkhave jānaṃ ūnavīsativasso puggalo upasampādetabbo. yo upasampādeyya, yathādhammo kāretabbo ’ti*. O monks, an individual younger than 20 is not to be ordained. Whoever ordains (such an individual) is to be treated according to the law.

Vin I 79.5-6: *na bhikkhave ūnapannarasavasso dārako pabbājetabbo. yo pabbājeyya, āpatti dukkaṭassa ’ti*. O monks, a boy younger than 15 is not to be admitted as a monk. Whoever admits [such a boy commits] an offence of wrong doing. (Unless, that is, he can scare crows [*kākuṭṭepaka*], Vin I 79.19-20).

while the accusation of rejecting and slandering the teachings, perhaps a close cousin of the heretic, is absolutely central to the figure of the *icchāntika* as they are conceived throughout the MPM and RGV.¹⁵ Similarly, making false claims concerning their attainments is one of the fundamental definitions of the *icchāntika* proposed by Karashima (2007, 74). I will return, briefly, to these and other affinities with the *icchāntika* below. First, however, a comparison with the list from the MV will help focus more keenly attention on the several classes that I would like to highlight.

The passage in question comprises 10 verses in the MV identifying 20 types of person who, ‘if they have not been ordained as a monk, they are not to be ordained, [or] if they have been ordained as a monk they are to be expelled’.¹⁶ The types are presented in the following order:

paṇḍaka-; *theyyasaṃvāsaka-*; *tiṭṭhiyapakkantaka-*¹⁷; *tiracchānagata-*;
mātughātaka-; *pitughātaka-*; *arahantaḡhātaka-*; *bhikkhunīdūsaka-*;
saṃghabhedaka-; *lohituppādaka-*; *ubhatovyañjanaka-*;
anupajjhāyaka- (one who has no preceptor); *saṃghena upajjhāyena-*
 (one who has the Saṃgha as preceptor); *gaṇena upajjhāyena-* (one who
 has a group as preceptor); one who has any of the first 11 of these

¹⁵ In the RGV, for example, the *icchāntika* are defined alongside, and therefore associated with but distinct from, the heretics, as two of four forms of obstruction (*āvaraṇa*). See below.

¹⁶ *anupasampanno na upasampādetabbo, upasampanno nāsetabbo* (Vin 1 *passim*).

¹⁷ *theyyasaṃvāsaka* and *tiṭṭhiyapakkantaka* appear to be taken as a single unit as they are both given in the same verse and the restriction against them is given at the same place. Vin I 62: *theyyasaṃvāsako bhikkhave anupasampanno na upasampādetabbo, upasampanno nāsetabbo. tiṭṭhiyapakkantako bhikkhave anupasampanno na upasampādetabbo, upasampanno nāsetabbo* ‘ti. Further, if they are counted separately, the section would contain 21 categories, while it clearly states there are 20 (*naupasampādetabbakavīsativāraṃ niṭṭhitam*). See also PTSD s.v. *theyya-*, ‘-saṃvāsaka [...] (always foll. by *tiṭṭhiyapakkantaka*)’.

classes (i.e., from *paṇḍaka-* to *ubhatovyañjanaka-*) as a preceptor; *apattaka-* (one who has no bowl); *acīvaraka-* (one who has no robe); *apattacīvaraka-* (one who has no bowl or robe); *yācitakena pattena-* (one ordained by being lent a bowl); *yācitakena cīvarena-* (one ordained by being lent a robe); *yācitakena pattacīvarena-* (one ordained by being lent a bowl and a robe) (Vin I 85-91 *passim*).

This passage also seems somewhat lacking in consistency, and in fact has the impression of combining two distinct lists, the first ending with the prohibition on those having as a preceptor any of the first 11 classes, and the second beginning with those who have no bowl. The main point to notice here is that in this *Vinaya* list, the first 11 categories are all found in the Mil passage.

Perhaps the most immediately obvious group contained in both passages are the five sins of immediate retribution (Pali. e.g., *pañcānantariyakamma*; Skt. e.g., *pañcānantaryāṇi* [*karmāṇi*]): one who has committed matricide, parricide, killed an Arhat, created a schism in the Saṅgha or spilt the blood of a Buddha (usually, in various Sanskrit formulations, ‘with evil intent’).¹⁸ The *pañcānantaryāṇi* are found in several commentarial sources, including the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (AKBh), where they are presented in the following way:

*pañcānantaryāṇi karmāvaraṇam tadyathā mātrvadhaḥ
pitṛvadho ’rhadvadhaḥ saṅghabhedaḥ tathāgataśarīre
duṣṭacittarudhirotpādanam.*

¹⁸ In the MV, we notice having sex with a nun occurs between the three kinds of murder (mother, father, Arhat), on the one hand, and schism and spilling a Buddha’s blood, on the other. Perhaps, then, the five-fold classification was not yet known to the MV. According to the CPD s.v. *ānantariya-kamma*, the term with *pañca* appears in Mil and later commentaries.

AKBh 259.8-9¹⁹

The karmic obstacle is the five [sins of] immediate [retribution], namely: killing one's mother, father, or an Arhat, causing a schism in the monastic community, and spilling the blood of the Tathāgata with evil intent.

La Vallée Poussin (1971) notes that this is the same sequence as that found in the *Vibhāṅga*, while in the *Mahāvīyutpatti*, the murder of the Arhat precedes that of the father; in the *Dharmasaṃgraha*, *saṃghabhedadh* comes last (IV.201, n.3).²⁰ We will notice later that in the ŚrBh the sequence follows that of the AKBh, while in RGV harming the Buddha comes first, schism comes last.

As for the precise meaning of *ānantarya* in this regard, it is generally glossed as a sin entailing immediate rebirth in one of the hells, often (but not always) Avīci (e.g., Silk 2007, 254). However, as often with such terms, and which we shall see also in the case of the *pārājika* below, the tradition recognizes both etymological explanations and practical definitions. For example, the AKBh provides the following gloss a little further on from the above explanation:

ānantaryāñīti ko 'rthaḥ
nāntarāyituṃ śakyāni vipākam prati janmāntaraphalena
karmāntareṇety ānantaryāñi. na tiraskartum ity arthaḥ. na vā
tatkāriṇaḥ pudgalasyetaś cyutasyāntaram asti narakopapattigamaṇam

¹⁹ All references to Pradhan (ed.) 1967.

²⁰ 'C'est l'ordre de *Vibhāṅga*, p. 378: dans *Mvy*, 122, le meurtre de l'Arhat précède le parricide; dans *Dharmasaṃgraha*, 60, la blessure du Tathāgata précède le schisme.' See also Silk (2007, 254 ff) on the sequence in several other sources, as well as variations in and developments of the members of the list.

*praīṭy anantarāḥ. tadbhāva ānantaryam yasya dharmasya yogāt
so 'nantaro bhavati śrāmaṇyavat.*

AKBh 259.21-24

What is the meaning of *ānantaryāṇi*?

Ānantaryāṇi means, concerning their fruition, [the five sins of immediate retribution] cannot be crossed (i.e., skipped over) by other karmic results from another life. This means, [the five sins cannot] be crossed (or, passed) over. Or again, it is called ‘without interval’ because the person who commits [one of the five sins], after they fall from this world (i.e., die) [they enter the state of] going to an existence in hell without interval. That state (*bhāva*) [is called] ‘without interval’ (*ānantarya*), [because it is a state] whose [defining] factor (*dharma*) is connected with [the condition of] ‘non-interval’ (*anantara*), [linguistically speaking] just as ‘the state of being a recluse’ [is named so on account of being connected to ‘*śrāmaṇa*’].

Thus, ‘immediate’ refers both to the fact that, even if an individual has amassed a wealth of positive karma from any previous life (or lives), no good result can come to fruition before the consequences of these sins; and, secondly, they are destined to fall into one of the hells in their (immediately) subsequent birth.

The manner of exclusion in the case of those who commit the *pañcānantaryāṇi karmāṇi* is complex. Widely considered the gravest of all transgressions in the Buddhist world, the sinner is thus excluded both socially, from the community, and soteriologically, from being able to gain clear insight into the nature of reality, though they may practice well the path. However, paradoxically, perhaps, the very gravity of their transgression(s) may actually be their saving grace, as it were. Compelled to expiate their sin(s) in their very next birth, they will, albeit after vast amounts of time, eventually pay off the karmic debt, and, in principle, once again be eligible

to join the Saṃgha and hope for a clear understanding of the nature of things. As Silk (2007, 282) ends his discussion: ‘... every act, no matter how criminal, evaporates as its results become manifest. ... Nothing lasts forever, and even the worst evil will, inevitably, make room for the very highest good, in the end’.²¹

There is a great deal more than can be said, but the point to note here is that the category often appears with the *icchantika* in the MPM along with a third group of sinners, those who commit the four *pārājika*. The *pārājika* are admittedly only hinted at in the Mil passage, and do not occur at all in the MV list.²² Indeed, as the four most serious transgressions a monk can commit (there are eight *pārājikas* in the case of the Bhikkunī Pāṭimokha), their absence in the list of reasons for which a member of the Saṃgha must be ‘expelled’ (*nāsetabbo*) is conspicuous.

The main source for discussion and definition of the *pārājika* is the *Suttavibhaṅga*. Briefly, the four comprise a member of the monastic community breaking the prohibitions on: sex (Vin III 23.33-36), stealing (Vin III 47.16-20), killing (Vin III 73.10-16), and making false claims about one’s spiritual achievements (Vin III 90.32-91.2). The earlier debate among scholars regarding the etymology of *pārājika* being derived either from a. *parā-* + √*ji*, ‘defeat’ or b. *parā-* + √*aj*, ‘expel’ (see Horner 1949, xxvi; Clarke

²¹ That may be so, in the case of those who commit the five sins, though in several places this contrasts with the *icchantika*, most notably in the MPM and RGV. For example, in the passage from the RGV presented below we are told that only if they accept the teachings can they hope for liberation (*vimukti*).

²² While reference in Mil is made to the 13 *samghādisesa* offences, no explicit mention is made of the *pārājika*. However, despite the number 13 clearly suggesting only the second category (i.e., *samghādisesa*), the term *garuka-āpatti* more properly refers to both *samghādisesa* and *pārājika* (see von Hinüber 1997, 91 n.15). That said, the four *pārājika* offences – sex, stealing, killing, making false claims about spiritual achievements – only apply to the monastic community, and thus there is apparently no such exclusion stipulated for the laity who may have committed e.g., murder.

2009a, 22-3) is significant for a survey of categories of exclusion, and seems to have been settled by von Hinüber, who endorses Burnouf's interpretation as deriving from *parā* + *√aj* (1988, 3, n.2; see also Clarke 2009b, n.2).²³ However, both von Hinüber and Clarke also note that the etymology, deriving as it does from the Vedic period²⁴ (Horner [ibid.] states *√aj* is not known in Pali), may have little connection to how the term was understood by Buddhists, and the meaning had been lost by the time of the passages in question. Thus, we appear to have three possible interpretations: etymology proper,²⁵ usage,²⁶ and, folk etymology.²⁷ Regardless of which of these directs our analysis, the significance of the term as harnessed by passages in especially the MPM, in which those who commit the *pārājika* inflect and reflect the *icchantika*, seems to carry clear overtones of exclusion.

Another category in both lists worthy of brief mention, though of only oblique relevance to the *icchantika*, is the *paṇḍaka*. The precise meaning of this term, which is often translated as eunuch though the

²³ Note, however, that Tib. seems to have understood it as defeat, e.g., Mvp. 8358: *phas pham par 'gyur ba'i chos bzhi*; see also examples from MPM below.

²⁴ Whitney 1963, *√aj* s.v.

²⁵ Etymologically, as we have seen, it appears to be traceable to a root meaning 'expel', and thus provides another category of exclusion, in this case, directed at those have been ordained. See, however, Clarke 2009a for a discussion of the *śikṣādattaka* ('penitent monk'), found in all *Vinayas* except Theravādin.

²⁶ The usage as understood by the tradition can be found, following von Hinüber (1995, 9 n.9), in the *Parivāra*, at 148.15:

pārājikan ti yaṃ vuttaṃ taṃ suṇohi yathātathaṃ. cuto 'paraddho bhattḥo ca saddhammehi niraṃkato, saṃvāso ca tahiṃ n'; atthi: ten'; etaṃ iti vuccati.

Vin V 148.14-16

Listen well to that which is called *pārājika*:

Disappeared, transgressed, and fallen down, repudiated by the correct rules,
For such a one there is no residing together: therefore, it is called [*pārājika*].

²⁷ As for the folk etymology, again von Hinüber directs us to *Samantapāsādikā* 259.17, where we read:

pārājiko ti parājito parājayaṃ āpanno

pārājika means one who is defeated, who has met with defeat.

etymology is much more uncertain than that word suggests, is complex, and Leonard Zwilling (1992, 206) refers to ‘the utter inadequacy’ of the English. Zwilling (ibid., 204) tells us *paṇḍaka* is the ‘primary term employed in the [Buddhist] literature [for homosexuality]’ and suggests the derivation *apa + aṇḍa + ka*, ‘without testicles’. Summarising instances in e.g., Asaṅga’s *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and Yaśomitra’s commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa*, along with the entries in the *Mahāvīyūtpatti* (8768-8773), Zwilling finds that *paṇḍaka* is used as a ‘general rubric’ for ‘dealing with a variety of sexual dysfunctions and variations’, all of which ‘share the common quality of being “*napuṃsaka*,” “lacking maleness”’ (Zwilling notes there are also female *paṇḍakas*) (ibid., 205).

Inclusion of the *paṇḍaka* in these two passages also connects to a sequence in the ŚrBh (see part 2), in which clear reference is made to the prerequisite that an individual has definitively male or female genitalia to be able to aspire to *ātmasampat*.²⁸ The fact that only anatomically normative individuals can qualify for awakening seems to find its corollary in the AKBh, where the *paṇḍaka* is denied the potential to commit the *pañcānantaryāni*. That is, in an apparent inversion of the exclusory process, only those worthy of ultimate Nirvāṇa are also capable of extreme transgression. The section in question reads as follows:

triṣu dvīpeṣv ānantarya
nottarakurau nānyāsu gatiṣu. kuta evānyatra dhātau teṣvapi
stripuruṣāṅām eva.
*śaṅdhādīnām*²⁹ *tu neṣyate.*
kīṃ kāraṇaṃ tad evāsaṃvarābhāve kāraṇaṃ uddiṣṭam
 AKBh 260.1-5

²⁸ See note 57 for a brief discussion of this term.

²⁹ According to Monier-Williams, mistaken form of *śaṅḍha* (s.v.). Yaśomitra reads *śaṅḍha* (e.g., Wogihara 1936, 426.12).

The [five sins of] immediate retribution [take place] in the three continents.

[They do not take place] in Uttarakuru or in other destinations. Among those in any of the states, [they take place] only among men and women.

It is not held that those such as eunuchs³⁰ [can commit the five sins].

The reason is said to be their lack of unrestraint.

Zwilling explains this ‘paradox’ in the following way: ‘On the one hand, *paṇḍakas* are incapable of religious discipline because ... they possess the defiling passions of both sexes.’ At the same time, they lack the necessary ‘unrestraint one must have the capacity to check if one is going to successfully lead the religious life’. That is, for example, the *paṇḍaka* does not have close ties to their parents, so cannot commit the sins of matricide or parricide.³¹

Finally, several other classes that find resonances in the *icchāntika* include *theyyasaṁvāsaka* and *titthiyapakkantaka*, and *kuhaka*. The latter term may have a general sense of ‘fraud’, ‘deceit’, though it can also refer to ‘hypocrisy, specifically display of behaviour designed to stimulate laymen

³⁰ In general, *śaṇḍha* appears to be a synonym of, or at least closely related to, *paṇḍaka*. Janet Gyatso (2003, 94) writes: ‘The early monastic sources provide several subtypes within the group of people excluded from male ordination on sexual grounds. These usually include the hermaphrodite (*ubhatovyañjanaka*), a class of people called *paṇḍaka*, and sometimes a class of people called *śaṇḍha*. Neither of the latter terms seem ever to be precisely defined; but as the Vinaya tradition develops, *paṇḍaka* becomes the term of choice that most often stands for the excluded third sex category as a whole.’

³¹ As an aside, the status of the *paṇḍaka* may be instructive for a wider sociological study of the *icchāntika*, in so far as the category appears to have begun as a social reality that confounded existing classificatory systems, then through long and troubled reflection it developed a theoretical formulation whose complexity reflected its initial status as someone who defied orthodoxy. A further point that is suggestive is that the *icchāntika* appears alongside the category of *napuṃsaka* in the list of Mahāmati’s 108 questions at LAS 27.6.

to give gifts'.³² Thus, if indeed it may denote specifically a monk defrauding the laity, collectively these three appear to refer to monks who generally deceive, lie and even convert to other schools. We shall see passages from the RGV that distinguish the *icchāntika* from the heretic (*tīrthya*; *tīrthika*); nonetheless, they are grouped together, firstly, to comprise a group of four obstructions, and secondly, as those who are contrasted with those 'firmly established in the Mahāyāna'. Further, elsewhere the *icchāntika* is routinely described as rejecting or slandering the teachings (in particular, of the *Vaitulya*), which, if not coterminous with *titthiyapakkantaka*, perhaps can be understood as an elaboration of the class.

Ichchantika

As noted in the introduction, this is not a paper on the *icchāntika*, *per se*. However, in order to demonstrate how the foregoing instances of restriction and exclusion, as well as those to come in part 2, are suggestive of some of the resonances accrued to 'a being condemned forever to spiritual darkness' (Liu 1984, 59), it is necessary briefly to sketch their rough contours here, and to offer a few representative passages. In this section I will provide a limited number of references from the MPM and RGV, while in the next I will present a specific instance from the LAS in response to the translations from the ŚrBh.

One of the most puzzling features of the *icchāntika* is that, in the earliest references we have, they appear fully formed, with no introduction, definition or explanation. They are elaborated, at least as far as can be ascertained based on the available witnesses of the MPM, not by reference to their name but to their characteristics, which include a wide range of negative attributes, many of which, I propose, appear to draw on categories

³² BHSD s.v. *kuhaka*.

that are at least suggestive of the early lists introduced above. This statement is of course speculative, but in the case of the *icchāntika*, a certain degree of hypothesising is unavoidable.³³

There is broad (though by no means univocal) consensus in the Western and Japanese scholarship that the word *icchāntika* derives from Sanskrit \sqrt{ic} ,³⁴ and thus has as its root a meaning related to ‘wish’, ‘desire’.³⁵ However, regardless of how the original meaning of *icchāntika* is to be understood semantically, its philosophical range clearly expanded during the course of the development of the relevant literature. As far as I know, there is only one passage that explicitly defines the *icchāntika* in terms of the verb

³³ The difficulty of pinning down the precise identity, historical or philosophical, of the *icchāntika* is perhaps captured most pleasingly by Mochizuki Ryōkō, who described the task as being ‘like trying to scratch your foot through your shoe’ 「隔靴搔痒の感」 (1988, 97).

³⁴ There is slightly less agreement, however, on the precise meaning and grammatical form of that root.

It is generally, though not universally, accepted to be the present active participle, strong stem, *icchant* with suffix *-ka*. Edgerton: ‘somehow based on pres. pple. of *icchatī*’. Karashima: ‘This explication is not without difficulties, as we may expect **icchāntaka* instead of *icchāntika*, to have derived from *icchant-* plus *-ka*’ (2007, 77, n. 52). Karashima suggests an alternative, *icchā-anta-ika*: **icchāntika* > *icchāntika*, ‘someone who claims, maintains’, and explains the *-anta-* as ‘pleonastic’ (ibid., n.53). Habata (forthcoming) agrees with Karashima’s grammatical analysis, though her interpretation of the individual morphemes differs, suggesting ‘*icchā* and *anta* suffixed with *-ika*, in which the long vowel *-ā* (**icchāntika*) is shortened because of the principle of two moras in the Middle Indic’.

³⁵ e.g., Habata (forthcoming); Shimoda (1997, 358-9); Suzuki (1930, 219 n.1); Tagami (2000). Exceptions include Unrai Wogiwara, who suggested a derivation from “‘*īthamtvika* or *aīthamtvika*, meaning “being worldly” or “belonging to this world.”’ (1927, 23); and Karashima (2007), for whom the term denotes, at least in its use in the MPM, ‘an opinionated one’ (ibid., 72), ‘a monk who, claiming (or fancies; *icchānti*) himself to be an Arhat, rejects the teaching of the Vaipulya’ (ibid., 76), or again, ‘one who claims (to be an authority)’ (ibid., 77).

Several other scholars prefer to discuss the *icchāntika* based on descriptive passages in the sources, without extensive reference to etymology: e.g., Hodge (2006); Jones (2020); Liu (1984); Silk (2007); Takasaki (1966).

icchati in the RGV,³⁶ while in the LAS we also find a definition based on the sense of desire, but in the negative, indicating that they have ‘no desire for liberation’.³⁷ However, this is not that text’s primary designation for the *icchantika*; that is the term *sarvakuśalamūlotsarga* (‘one who has abandoned all roots [of merit]’). Thus, the question arises, how did we get from an etymology likely (though not definitively) indicating desire, greed, to association with the four *pārājika* and the five *ānantaryāṇi*, as well as slandering or rejecting the teachings, abandoning all good roots (of merit), and grouped along with e.g., those holding false views, among several other characterisations.

The question of how to understand the passage from an epithet denoting desire to the accrual to the *icchantika* of a litany of established charges of base conduct and nature may be fruitfully addressed in parallel with an important theme developed primarily in the Japanese secondary literature, namely, the relation between monastic history (教団的), i.e., institutional or social history, and the history of ideas (思想的), along with the attendant conceptual binary of concrete-hypothetical (具体-假定). Following the work of, primarily, Mochizuki Ryōkō and Shimoda Masahiro, and at the risk of simplifying these wide-ranging and extensive studies, there is a persuasive argument that the *icchantika* began as a concrete, historical

³⁶ RGV 28.14-15: *tadubhayānabhilāṣiṇaḥ punar mahāyānasamprasthitāḥ paramatīkṣhendriyāḥ sattvā ye nāpi saṃsāram icchanti yathecchantikā ...*

Further, those sentient beings who desire neither [existence nor freedom from it] are ones who are firmly established in the Mahāyāna and are of superior faculties. They do not desire Saṃsāra like the *icchantika* ...

³⁷ LAS 65.17-66.2: *tatreccchantikānām punar mahāmate anicchantikatā mokṣam kena pravartate yaduta sarvakuśalamūlotsargataś ca satvānādikālapraṇidhānataś ca |*

Again, Mahāmati, how is it that no desire for liberation arises in the *icchantika*? [Either because] they have abandoned all [their] good roots or [because of taking] vows [to follow the Bodhisattva path] since beginningless time [for the sake of all] sentient beings.

reality, but over time and as a result of the demands of philosophical innovation, the concept developed into a hypothetical tenet of doctrine.

Mochizuki (1988, 107) traces possible antecedents to the *icchantika* in earlier texts, including the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* and, noting affinities with the two classes of monk who are identified therein as committing the four and five serious offences, argues that the *icchantika* were a specific historical class of Buddhist monk who were perceived as ‘pseudo-Mahayanists’ (似非大乘) whom he defines as ‘attached to desire for profit’ (利養に貪著) (Mochizuki 1988, 107). Shimoda, meanwhile, most explicitly states the relation between social history and the history of ideas:

There is a need to remain clearly aware that making a distinction between religious organisation [social history] and thought [history of ideas] is merely an expedient. [...] In the MPM, the *icchantika* never take a sectarian form clearly distinguished from their ideology; [similarly, the MPM] does not express its thought unrelated to a sectarian figure. The image of [the *icchantika*] emerges at the intersection of the two.³⁸

(Shimoda, 1997, 356-7)

This emphasis on the relation between social history and doctrine is both analytically necessary while also providing a framework that enables us at least to begin to organize some of the almost overwhelmingly unsystematic characterisations of the *icchantika* that we confront in the various versions of the MPM, in particular. Finally, Fujii Kyōkō (1991, 538) finds a process

³⁸ 教団。思想という分類は、単に便宜的なものであることをはっきり自覚しておく必要がある。[...] 涅槃経の中では、一闍提はけっしてその思想から切り離して明らかになるような教団的姿を持っているものではないし、教団的姿と関連のない思想を表明したものでもない。その両者の交錯点に浮かび上がる映像なのである。

of ‘dilution’ (稀薄化) by which the *icchāntika* develops from a historical reality to a generalised class of ‘evil beings’ (悪なる存在). I suggest it is precisely in this process of dilution that the *icchāntika* gathers many of the resonances of the earlier expressions of exclusion.

Ahead of presenting some brief examples from the MPM, it is impractical here to go too deeply into the thorny issue of its historical development; it will suffice to notice simply that, with all due caveats, the text(s) as we know it (them) clearly contain(s) multiple layers and developed in several stages, likely in various geographical locations, and the vast majority of references to the *icchāntika* in the portion common to both Chinese versions (Dharmakṣema [ChinD] and Faxian [ChinF]) and the Tibetan translation (Tib.) occur in the context of the elaboration of **buddhadhātu*.³⁹ However, the topic continues to be discussed at length in the (extensive) portion unique to Dharmakṣema (henceforth D-unique⁴⁰), as well. As a – perhaps foolish – attempt at both brevity and comprehensiveness, therefore, I summarise two examples that occur in all three main witnesses, and then present three others from D-unique. Finally, I return to a passage from all three versions to note a further possible affinity with several of the earlier categories.

In a sequence in which the Buddha is explaining his appearances in the world taking various forms that appear to defy the expectations of living beings regarding the nature of the Buddha, he states (with slight variations among the three witnesses⁴¹) that he has taken the forms of one who commits the

³⁹ Or, among other related terms, *tathāgatagarbha*; Chin. *foxing* 佛性, *rulaixing* 如來性; Tib. *sangs rgyas kyi khams, de bzhin gshegs pa'i khams*. (See e.g., Habata 2015, *passim*; Radich 2015, 23-25.)

⁴⁰ i.e., the material that is not found in ChinF or the Tibetan, and for which we have no corresponding Sanskrit fragments.

⁴¹ ChinD. 389b12-19; ChinF. 871b25-29; Tib. MPM § 205-207.

four grave offences⁴², an *icchantika*⁴³, a schismatic⁴⁴, one who commits the five sins of immediate retribution⁴⁵, and one who rejects the true teachings.⁴⁶ In a later passage, the Buddha is describing his imperishability, explaining the futility of the efforts of various categories to cause him harm. These include a similar grouping:⁴⁷ those who would spill the blood of a Buddha with evil intent⁴⁸, commit the five sins of immediate retribution, the *icchantika*, and schismatics.

Already, it should be easy to recognize at least affinities with several of the categories in the Mil and MV presented earlier, and to discern a rather mechanical use of these classes. It is noteworthy that very often it is not specified which *pārājika* or *ānantaryāṇi* offence is being referred to, and these terms, not unlike *icchantika*, gradually seem to be depleted of their original critical focus.

Two passages from D-unique by turns distinguish the *icchantika* from, and conflate them with, the four serious offences of a monk (**pārājika*), the five sins of immediate retribution (**pañcānantaryāṇi*) and those who deny or slander the **Vaitulya*.

ChinD 374 448b7-9

善男子！惡有二種。一者阿修羅、二者人中。人中有三種惡：一者一闍提、二者誹謗方等經典、三者犯四重禁。

⁴² ChinD. 犯四重罪; ChinF. 犯四重法; Tib. *pham pa byung ba*.

⁴³ ChinD., ChinF. 一闍提; Tib. *'dod chen pa*.

⁴⁴ ChinD. 破[和合]僧 ChinF. 破僧; Tib. *dge 'dun gyi dbyen byed pa*.

⁴⁵ ChinD. none; ChinF. 作無間業; Tib. *mtshams med pa lnga'i las*.

⁴⁶ ChinD., ChinF. none; Tib. *dam pa'i chos spong ba* (**[saddharma]pratikṣepa*). *vaitulyam na prati-ṅkṣip* attested in MPM SF 16.2, 16.3 and 16.5; *dharmapratigha* in the RGV; *bodhisattvapiṭakanikṣepa* in the LAS.

⁴⁷ ChinD. 416c9-11; ChinF. 890c11-12; MPM § 457.

⁴⁸ ChinD. 惡心出佛身血; ChinF. 現傷佛身; Tib. *ngan sems kyis khrag phyung ba*.

O good son! Evil is of two kinds. One [appears in] the Asura [realm], the other [appears in the] human [realm]. In the human [realm], there are three kinds of evil [person]: one, the *icchantika*; two, those who deny the teachings of the **Vaitulya*; and three, those who commit the four serious prohibitions (**pārājika*).

ChinD 374 487c23-24

一闍提人犯四重禁、作五逆罪、謗方等經。

The *icchantika* commits the four serious offences, the five sins of immediate retribution, and slanders the teachings of the **Vaitulya*.⁴⁹

In a further passage from D-unique, we notice three further categories reminiscent of the Mil and MV passages: evil destinies, 惡道 (**durgati*), where Mil includes *tiracchānagata* and *pettivisaya* (MV only includes *tiracchānagata*); eunuch (**paṇḍaka*; 受黃門身); and, hermaphrodite (**ubhatovyañjanaka*; 無根二根), along with, again, the four serious offences of a monk and the five sins of immediate retribution.

ChinD 374 431a6-9

善男子！我從是來未曾有惡煩惱業緣墮於惡道、誹謗正法、作一闍提、受黃門身、無根二根、反逆父母、殺阿羅漢、破塔壞⁵⁰僧、出佛身血、犯四重禁。

O good son! Since then, I have never, having evil defilements and karmic conditions, fallen into evil destinies, slandered the True Teaching, become an *icchantika*, [I have never] taken the body of a eunuch [or] a hermaphrodite, rebelled against my parents, killed an

⁴⁹ Again, it is noteworthy that no specific offence among the four and five transgressions is referenced.

⁵⁰ In the earlier example, ChinD. used 破僧; here 破 is replaced by 壞.

Arhat, destroyed a stupa, split the Saṃgha, shed the Buddha's blood,
[or] committed the four serious prohibitions.

Finally, a passage from all three witnesses that, despite the complexities in its precise meaning, is suggestive of several of the earlier categories that encompass notions of deceitful or false monks:

MPM §483 5-8

*'dod chen pa long ba gcig bu dgra bcom pa yin par 'dod pa ni lam
mi bzad pa chen por 'gro 'dod do //*

*byams pa dang ldan pa 'i dgra bcom pa yin par 'dod la shin tu rgyas
pa sun dbyung bar 'dod de /⁵¹*

The *icchantika* who is blind, alone, and desires to be an Arhat, greatly desires the frightful path. He desires to be a compassionate Arhat, and desires to renounce the **Vaitulya*.

The key phrase here is *dgra bcom pa yin par 'dod pa*, rendered by Karashima as ‘claims to be an Arhat’ (2007, 74) and which forms one of the key pieces of evidence in his argument that the *icchantika* is to be understood, according to the MPM, as ‘a monk who, claiming ... himself to be an Arhat, rejects the teaching of the Vaipulya – namely, the [MPM] itself’ (ibid., 76).⁵²

⁵¹ Karashima (2007, 74) translated this passage from the Peking edition before Habata’s critical edition of the MPM was published; therefore, he could not have known that *mi zad pa*, endless, is to be emended to *mi bzad pa*, frightful, terrible (**ghora*). The Skt. can be reconstructed with some confidence on the basis that in SF 20.6 we read (*na bibh*)y(a)ti *gacchaṃti goraṃ mānavaśaṃ* (with *gora* as unspirated form of *ghora* [Habata 2019, 156]), which corresponds to the Tibetan *byis pa rnams ni lam chen 'jigs pa med // nga rgyal dbang gis mi bzad 'gro bar 'gyur //* (MPM § 481.13-14).

⁵² This interpretation of the *icchantika* as ‘a monk who (falsely) claims to be an Arhat’, supported by Karashima’s extensive analysis of uses of *icchanti* in the Pali and Sanskrit sources, may be quite persuasive. However, as suggestive as it is for

We have already seen that the *icchāntika* is routinely accused of rejecting the teachings, variously conceived; the additional suggestion that they make (false) claims regarding their status as an Arhat, in addition to the classes *kuhaka* and *theyyasamvāsaka*, also brings to mind the fourth *pārājika*, making false claims about one's spiritual achievements.

Before rounding off this section, two further passages worth attention can be found in the RGV, and similarly link the *icchāntika* to, first, the heretic (*tīrthya*), and second, the *pañcānantaryāṇi*. Early in the RGV, the *icchāntika* is defined as *dharmapratigha*, one who rejects the dharma, and comprises the first of a group of four types of obstruction to awakening:

my purposes here, i.e., connecting depictions of the *icchāntika* to earlier categories of exclusion, including e.g., *kuhaka*, 'fraud', there should be some hesitation in wholly accepting the understanding based on *dgra bcom pa yin par 'dod pa*. Firstly, the use of a verb to indicate reported speech, as in Karashima's understanding of *'dod pa* here, ought to require a speech marker, for example *zhes*. Secondly, as demonstrated by Habata (forthcoming), we find an earlier statement, in MPM § 179, that appears to carry precisely the meaning Karashima suggests, namely, a monk who claims to be an Arhat, except here we see the use of *zhes* as well as a different verb for 'claim': *bdag ni dgra bcom pa yin no zhes khas 'che ba*. The form of the verb *yin* also seems less problematic than *yin pa(r)* in the verse in question. Furthermore, elsewhere in the same text we find the Tib. verb *'dod pa* translating Skt. *arthin* (SF 21.2; MPM § 495.6): Skt. *kr̥ṣyarthisatva*, Tib. *zhing las byed 'dod pa'i sems can*. It may therefore be doubtful whether there is a clear semantic or etymological relation between *'dod pa* and *icchānti* based on these examples. Finally, it remains unclear why Karashima rejects the translations of Mochizuki (阿羅漢たること願う) and Shimoda (阿羅漢であろうと思つて) of this passage as 'grammatically not possible' (ibid. 75), as well as precisely what Skt. may be expected based on his understanding of the Tibetan.

Both Chinese translations appear to similarly struggle to understand this passage, suggesting the Sanskrit may already have been corrupt: ChinD. 374 419a4-7: 一闍提者名爲無目、是故不見阿羅漢道。如阿羅漢不行生死險惡之道。以無目故誹謗方等、不欲修習。如阿羅漢勤修慈心、一闍提輩不修方等亦復如是。ChinF. 376 892c9-1: 有似阿羅漢一闍提而行惡業。似一闍提阿羅漢而行慈心。有似阿羅漢一闍提者。是諸衆生誹謗方等。似一闍提阿羅漢者。

caturdhāvaraṇaṃ dharmapratigho 'py ātma darśanam |
samsāraduḥkhabhīrutvaṃ sattvārthaṃ nirapekṣatā ||
icchantikānāṃ tūrthyānāṃ śrāvakānāṃ svayambhuvām |
adhimuktyādayo dharmāś catvāraḥ śuddhihetavaḥ ||
 27.13-16⁵³

The obstructions are four-fold: [1] opposition to the teaching; [2] [holding to] the view of the self;

[3] Fear of suffering in Samsāra; and, [4] having no care for the welfare of beings.

[Namely:] [1] the *icchantika*; [2] heretics, [3] Śrāvakas and [4] Pratyekabuddhas.

The causes of purification are the four factors starting with earnest application leading to conviction [in the Mahāyāna].

That faith in the teaching (*adhimukti*) is the remedy prescribed to the *icchantika* is important, and this emphasis is re-enforced in the final section of the RGV, underlining its central place in *tathāgatagarbha* discourse. Here, again, even those who commit the *pañcānantaryāṇi* are afforded the possibility of redemption, while the *icchantika* are firmly denied it, though only as long as, and to the extent that, they continue to reject the dharma.

yo 'bhīkṣaṇaṃ pratisevya pāpasuhr̥daḥ syād buddhaduṣṭāśayo
mātāpitrarihad vadhācaraṇakṛt saṃghāgrabhetā naraḥ |
syāt tasyāpi tato vimuktir aciraṃ dharmārthanidhyānato dharme
yasya tu mānaṣaṃ pratihataṃ tasmai vimuktiḥ kutaḥ ||
 119.1-4

⁵³ All references to Johnston (ed.) 1950.

The one, who again and again serves evil friends, has evil intent towards the Buddha, commits the acts of killing their mother, father or an Arhat, and creates schism in the best of the communities of monks,

Even that person could quickly be liberated from those [transgressions] through [gaining] insight into the meaning of the Dharma; however, how can there be liberation for one whose mind rejects the Dharma?⁵⁴

In brief, then, we have seen several of the early categories of restriction and exclusion accrue to the *icchāntika*, who is at times equated with, and at others distinguished from, these classes. The impression, I suggest, is that, regardless of whether they are identified as e.g., one who commits the *pañcānantaryāni* or as one who exceeds even their baseness, the figure of the *icchāntika* is, to some extent, defined and determined by the reflections of many other, lesser, forms of exclusion.

2. Exclusion in the *Yogācāra*:

The *agotrastha*

If the examples of exclusion in the earlier passages were provisional, while suggestions of affinities with the *icchāntika* were largely speculative, those in this section elaborate a much more thoroughgoing category of person denied the potential for ultimate Nirvāṇa with altogether much clearer correspondences with the *icchāntika*. The main focus will be on the *Śrāvakahūmi* (ŚrBh), a Yogācāra text, specifically the first section, the *Gotrabhūmi*. First, I will present important passages that describe those who

⁵⁴ In Chin. (1611 847c27 斷諸善根) we find that the list of transgressions and traits that can be redeemed by devotion to the doctrine includes those who have cut off all their good roots, which we do not see in the Sanskrit or Tibetan. The term ‘cutting off all good roots’ is routinely used in the MPM to refer to the *icchāntika*, which would be well known to the author(s)/compiler(s) of the RGV.

have the capacity for ultimate Nirvāṇa though may be precluded from attaining it in a current incarnation, before introducing the *agotrastha*, highlighting those characteristics that bear comparison with the *icchantika*. Finally, I will also briefly refer to the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, which presents a slightly different classification of the *agotra*, and also most explicitly, if still rather puzzlingly, identifies this class with the *icchantika*. Before turning to the texts, however, it will be helpful to try and get a grasp on this rather opaque term *gotra*, whose range of meanings are many. The topic has been the subject of several thorough and intricate studies; it will only be possible here for me to pick up on the primary meanings as far as they prepare us for an understanding of the term as used in the ŚrBh and LAS.

Gotra discourse

David Seyfort Ruegg (1976, 341-2), in one of several seminal studies on the subject, identifies two primary groups of meaning of *gotra*, a ‘soteriological or gnoseological category or class’, or ‘the spiritual factor or capacity that determines classification in such a category or class’. Within these two groups, the main cluster of meanings centres around relations to ‘the concept of a lineage, clan, or family, or of a genus and its meanings are then associated with a socio-biological metaphor (*gotra* = *kula*, *vaṃśa* “family”, etc.) and a biological or botanical metaphor (*gotra* = *bīja*, “seed, germ”)’. To these two primary meanings of *gotra*, Ruegg also surveys additional scriptural and commentarial references to add a third metaphorical usage, connected with ‘mineral’, namely ‘mine’ or ‘matrix’. Finally, he notes “class, category” could be derived from any one of these three meanings’ (ibid. 354).

Takasaki Jikido (1966, 22) offers a similarly wide-ranging catalogue of possible meanings, chief among them in Buddhist usages being 1. *dhātu*, *hetu*; and 2. *bīja*, and offers for English translations: element, cause, source, origin, basis, ground, essence, or nature. Takasaki also notes as a third group

of meanings those mentioned by Ruegg, namely: lineage, clan, family, and ‘analogically’ ‘germ, mine or matrix’. Thus, to summarise and synthesise Ruegg and Takasaki, we find the following clusters of primary meanings (and these are not exhaustive): i. family, clan, lineage; ii. germ; seed; iii. mine, matrix; and iv. class, category.

The ŚrBh offers three synonyms for *gotra* that help to clarify our understanding of its meaning in that text, and also to distinguish its use from that of the LAS: seed (**bīja*), element (**dhātu*), and nature (**prakṛti*; **svabhāva*). The ŚrBh also broadly categorises beings into two divisions: *parinirvāṇadharmaka*, those with the factor or nature of one who will attain Nirvāṇa; and *aparinirvāṇadharmaka*, those who do not possess this fundamental factor, the latter equated with the *agotra*. In slight contrast, in the LAS, as we will see below, *gotra* is most clearly used to refer to one of five lineages of spiritual attainment (*pañcābhisamayagotrāṇi*) and the fruits of that lineage.

Certainly, by the time of the LAS, the *icchāntika* appears to have been wholly conflated with *agotrastha*. Commenting on the use of the latter two terms in the LAS, Ruegg (1976, 341) notes that ‘...since they [*agotras*] ... achieve neither *bodhi* nor *nirvāṇa*, they represent the same type as the *icchāntikas* to the extent that the latter also are considered to lack this capacity’. The question of how the *agotra* might have come to denote the *icchāntika* is puzzling from the perspective of scholastics. The *gotra* system, though not uniformly analysed in the manner I have presented it above, is very much a part of the classificatory apparatus of the Yogācāra, while the *icchāntika* appears to have emerged alongside *tathāgatagarbha* theory as more of a popular denomination; having more public currency, the *icchāntika* is perhaps more historically grounded and, therefore, arguably more of a pejorative than the *agotra*, and remains unsystematised throughout the *tathāgatagarbha* literature. On the other hand, when we look more closely at the traits ascribed to the *agotra* presented below, as well as at the

prognoses regarding their chances of liberation (which are often, though not exclusively, nil), we see striking affinities with the *icchantika*. Thus, although Yogācāra and the *tathāgatagarbha* corpus of texts are very much distinct strains in Indic Buddhism,⁵⁵ at least until we come to the LAS, it is tempting to wonder whether there was not some degree of cross-fertilization, or at least mutual awareness, between the two communities that finally came to full expression in the latter text.

Gotrabhūmi⁵⁶

The *Gotrabhūmi* comprises the first portion (*yogasthāna*) of the ŚrBh. In the first sequence below, we are told that possessing the factor of ultimate Nirvāṇa (**parinirvāṇadharmaka*) is not in itself a guarantee of that attainment, at least in a given specific life; there are several obstacles that may preclude one from ‘propitious conditions’ (**ātmampat*⁵⁷). The second section explains various physical and circumstantial obstacles to attaining ultimate Nirvāṇa, several of which may seem, to a modern reader, either arbitrary or outright discriminatory, and also bring to mind some of the categories already discussed in part 1. The final section establishes the existence of the *agotrastha*, perhaps the most systematically classified reference to individuals excluded from the ultimate goal in Buddhism. There

⁵⁵ Indeed, one of the defining characteristics of the Yogācāra is their rejection of the *tathāgatagarbha* theory that all beings have inherent Buddha Nature. See e.g., Ruegg (1976).

⁵⁶ References follow Taishō Group (TG) edition. Some of the portions of ŚrBh relevant to this discussion are not available in the Sanskrit, so for those passages I translate the Tibetan in the body of the text, and present the Chinese in the footnotes, only noting significant variants or points of interest; for the sections where we have the Sanskrit, I present that alone, similarly only referring to the Tibetan and Chinese where necessary.

⁵⁷ See Deleanu (2006, 38 n.23) on possible translations of *sāmpad*. In ŚrBh there are a ‘series of factors (five each) ensuring that oneself and the environment in which one lives are fit for the practice of the Buddhist path’. See also Kragh (2013, 110) on *ātmampat* as ‘a human rebirth in a place and condition that is opportune for practicing the Dharma’.

are several ‘marks’ (*līṅga*) of an *agotrastha*; I draw attention only to those here that, again, echo features of the *icchantika*.

1. Four reasons why *parinirvānadharmaka* may not attain ultimate Nirvāṇa

(I)-A-I, D.1b5

*de la rigs gang zhe na / smras pa / rigs la gnas pa'i gang zag gi sa
bon gyi chos gang yin pa ste / gang yod cing med pa ma yin la rigs la
gnas pa'i gang zag rnam kyī rkyen yang rnyed na mya ngan las 'das
pa 'thob pa dang reg par nus shing mthu yod par 'gyur ba'o //*

...

*sa bon dang khams dang rang bzhin zhes bya ba ni ming gi rnam
grangs dag yin no //*

In this case, what is *gotra*? Answer: [it is] the quality (*dharma*) of the seed (*bīja*) of the person established in a lineage. [For someone who certainly] has it and [for whom] it is not non-existent,⁵⁸ when the conditions are realised for the persons dwelling in a lineage, they can attain and touch Nirvāṇa and bring it into effect.

...

Seed (**bīja*), element (**dhātu*), or nature (**prakṛti* / **svabhāva*) are the synonyms [of *gotra*].⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Deleau (n.d.): ‘Since it actually exists’; ‘literally, “given the fact that it exists and is not inexistent”’. TG (3): ‘それを確かに有していれば、...’.

⁵⁹ Chin. 1579 395c19-22; 23-4
云何種姓？謂：住種姓補特伽羅有種子法。由現有故，安住種姓補特伽羅若遇勝緣，便有堪任，便有勢力，於其涅槃能得能證。

...
或名種子，或名為界，或名為性 是名差別。

(I)-A-II-3, D.2b.4

smras pa / gal te rigs la gnas pa'i gang zag rnams yongs su mya ngan las 'da' ba'i chos can yin la / rigs la gnas pa ma yin pa rnams ni yongs su mya ngan las 'da' ba'i chos can ma yin par lta na / 'o na ci'i phyir yongs su mya ngan las 'da' ba'i chos can rnams sngon gyi mtha' nas yun ring por 'khor bar gyur cing / yongs su mya ngan las ma 'das she na / smras pa / rgyu bzhis yongs su mya ngan las ma 'das te / bzhi gang zhe na / mi khom par skyes pa dang / bag med pa'i nyes pa dang / log par zhugs pa dang / sgrib pa'i nyes pas so //

It is said: If we see that there are those established in the *gotra* who have the factor of ultimate Nirvāṇa (**parinirvāṇadharmaka*) and those with no *gotra* who do not have the factor of ultimate Nirvāṇa (**aparinirvāṇadharmaka*),⁶⁰ in that case why have those who have the factor of ultimate Nirvāṇa been wandering in *Samsāra* since the beginning of time, why do they not [attain] ultimate Nirvāṇa (**parinirvāṇa*)?

It is said: there are four reasons for not [attaining] ultimate Nirvāṇa. What are the four [reasons]? [There are people who are] born with no opportunity [to practise] (**akṣanyopapanna*)⁶¹; [who are] guilty of negligence (**pramatta*; **pramāda*); [who hold to] wrong views (**mithyāpratipanna*); and [those with] the fault of obstructions (*sgrib pa*; 障, **āvaraṇa*; **āvṛta*).

⁶⁰ Here we see clearly spelled out, in the Tibetan, the identification of the *agotrastha* and *aparinirvāṇadharmaka*: *rigs la gnas pa ma yin pa rnams ni yongs su mya ngan las 'da' ba'i chos can ma yin par lta na*.

Chinese does not have the negated formulation corresponding to the Tibetan above. In fact, the Chinese syntax is a little hard to understand, as it appears to repeat the existence of individuals who are established in the *gotra* and have the factor of Nirvāṇa: 若住種姓補特伽羅有涅槃法，此住種姓有涅槃法補特伽羅。

⁶¹ *Skt. *akṣana*: lack of opportunity, favourable occasion. Tib. *mi khom pa*; Chin. 無。

The first three of these reasons perhaps speak for themselves, at least for the purposes of this paper (though it is worth noting, in passing, that the third reason, **mithyāpratipanna*, again reminds us of the list in Mil); however, the last, ‘the fault of obstructions’, warrants a little further scrutiny.

(I)-A-II-3-d, D.3a4

*sgrib pa gang zhe na / smras pa / 'di ltar dbus kyi mi rnams*⁶² *su skyes pa'i bar du rgyas par snga ma bzhin du gyur cing sangs rgyas 'jig rten du byung ba dang / dam pa'i chos ston pa'i dge ba'i bshes gnyen dag rnyed par gyur kyang / de glen pa dang / dig pa dang / lkugs pa dang / lag pas brda byed par gyur zhing legs par gsungs pa dang / nyes par bshad pa'i chos rnams kyi don kun shes par mi nus pa dang / mtshams med pa'i las rnams byed par 'gyur ba dang / nyon mongs pa yun ring ba yin te / de ni sgrib pa zhes bya'o //*

What are the obstructions (**āvṛta*)? It is said: even if one is born in the Central Kingdom (i.e., central north India), as previously [explained] at length, and the Buddha has appeared in the world, [even if] they encounter spiritual friends (**kalyāṇamitra*) who preach the True Dharma, they are either slow-witted, or stammer,⁶³ or deaf-mute and speaking by hand, or cannot understand the meaning of any doctrine [whether] well-spoken or badly spoken, or has committed [one of the

⁶² Literally: ‘central people’, perhaps translating *madhyajanapada* more literally than the alternative *yul dbus* for *madhyadeśa* as found in D.3b5 below. Chin. 1579 396a.25 reads: 如有一雖生中國. Hirakawa (1997, 72): e.g., *madhyadeśa*, *madhya-janapada*. See e.g., Cheng (2018) for a discussion of the confusion that has surrounded *zhongguo* 中國, potentially referring as it can to both central north India (Madhyadeśa) and to China. For the specific boundaries of Madhyadeśa, see Law (1933-34, 8-9).

⁶³ Tib. *dig pa*; ‘intoxicated’ may also be possible, though ‘stammer’ seems more likely in the context, as the list enumerates perceived physical impairments. Chin. does not seem to have a corresponding term.

five] sins of immediate retribution (**ānantariyakarman*), or has accumulated defilements (**kleśa*) over a long period. These are called the obstructions.

(continued)

*rgyu gang dag gis yongs su mya ngan las 'da' ba'i chos can rnams
yongs su mya ngan las ma 'das pa'i rgyu ni bzhi po de dag yin no // de
dag kyang gang gi tshe sangs rgyas 'byung ba dang dam pa'i chos nyan
pa dang rjes su mthun pa'i gdams ngag rjes su bstan pa rnyed cing rgyu
de dag kyang med par gyur pa, de'i tshe na dge ba'i rtsa ba dag yongs
su smin cing rim gyis yongs su mya ngan las 'da' bar yang 'gyur ro //*

*yongs su mya ngan las mi 'da' ba'i chos can rnams ni nges pa'i
tshogs la gnas pa yin pas / de dag ni rkyen rnyed kyang rung ma rnyed
kyang rung ste / rnam pa thams cad kyi thams cad du yongs su mya
ngan las 'da' ba'i skal ba med pa kho na yin no //*

These are the four reasons why those who have the factor of ultimate Nirvāṇa do not attain ultimate Nirvāṇa. But if they meet by chance the Buddhas appearing in the world and hear the True Dharma, and realize and follow⁶⁴ [it], receiving instruction and precepts in harmony with (**ānulomika*) [the scriptures], [if] at that time these four causes are not present, then their wholesome roots will ripen and they will gradually attain ultimate Nirvāṇa.

Those who do not have the factor of ultimate Nirvāṇa (*aparinirvāṇadharmaka*) [in contrast], because they abide in the class which is fixed [**niyata*; Tib. *nges pa*; Chin. 決定], regardless of

⁶⁴ lit. 'hear': **śru*; Tib. *nyan pa*; Chin. 聽聞.

whether or not they encounter [favourable] conditions, in no way can they possibly⁶⁵ [attain] ultimate Nirvāṇa.⁶⁶

2. Circumstantial and physical obstacles

In the following section, we notice several impediments which appear to be beyond the control of the individual, and the reason that (lack of) such characteristics should preclude ultimate Nirvāṇa is not always clear. Nonetheless, the restrictions become undeniably closely drawn: one must be born a human (contrary to some strands of later Buddhism); one must be fortunate enough to take a birth in the ‘noble lands’ of India (and at that, a specific part of north India, often associated with the region of Magadha); one must have all one’s senses and limbs, even secondary body parts such as fingers (reminiscent of the list of deformities precluding one from ordination in the *Vinaya* noted earlier); and, one must apparently be of unambiguous gender, also reminding us of the exclusion of the *paṇḍaka* and *ubhatovyañjanaka* in the Mil and MV cited earlier.

(I)-A-II-4-b-(1); D.3b5; 1579 396b15

(*de la bdag gi 'byor pa gang zhe na | mir gyur pa dang | yul dbus*⁶⁷
su skyes pa dang) *indriyair avikalatā, āyatanagataḥ prasādaḥ,*
aparivṛttakarmāntatā.

⁶⁵ Tib. reads literally, ‘absolutely (*rnam pa thams cad kyi thams cad du*, **sarveṇa sarvaṃ*) lack the good fortune / condition / allotment (*skal ba med pa*; **bhāga*) [to attain] ...’; Chin. more simply: ‘in every way are absolutely incapable of attaining...’.

⁶⁶ 如是名為四種因緣，由此因緣故，雖有般涅槃法而不般涅槃。彼若值遇諸佛出世，聽聞正法，獲得隨順教授、教誡，無彼因緣爾時，方能善根成熟，漸次乃至得般涅槃。無涅槃法補特伽羅住決定聚，彼若遇緣，若不遇緣，遍一切種畢竟不能得般涅槃。

⁶⁷ See note 62 above on *madhya-deśa*, where Tib. reads *ltar dbus*.

What is [necessary for] perfecting oneself (*ātmasampat*)⁶⁸? It is [being born with] the quality of being a human ('humanness'), being born in the Central Kingdom,⁶⁹ with unimpaired senses, having pure faith in the teaching,⁷⁰ and having no karmic hindrances.

(I)-A-II-4-b-(1)-i; D.3b5; 1579 396b17

*tatra manuṣyatvaṃ katamat. yathāpīhaikatyo manuṣyāṇāṃ
sabhāgatāyāṃ pratyājāto bhavati puruṣas ca puruṣendriyeṇa
samanvāgataḥ strīś ca idam ucyate manuṣyatvam.*

In this case, what is humanness? If someone is reborn among the class of humans, and that person is endowed with male or female faculties,⁷¹ this is what is called humanness.

(I)-A-II-4-b-(1)-ii; D.3b5; 1579 396b19

*āryāyatane pratyājātīḥ katamā. yathāpīhaikatyo madhyeṣu
janapadeṣu pratyājāto bhavati, pūrvavad yāvad yatra gatiḥ
satpuruṣāṇāṃ iyaṃ ucyate āryāyatane pratyājātīḥ.*

What is rebirth in the noble realm? If a person is reborn in the middle country (India), previously extensively [explained], there [taking] form⁷² among good men, this is called rebirth in the noble realm.

⁶⁸ Tib. *bdag gi 'byor pa* > Skt. *ātmasampat*; Chin. 自圓滿 (1579 396b15). See note 57.

⁶⁹ Chin. 聖處 (1579 396b16).

⁷⁰ *āyatana*, support can refer to the six senses, but has several other uses in Buddhist contexts (Edgerton, s.v.), *inter alia* department, field; a worthy object; *dharma*. The latter meaning, in the sense of teaching, is clear in the definition to follow (see below). Chin. 勝處 'place/base of overcoming'.

⁷¹ *indriya*, faculty, clearly here implies sex organs. See PTSD (s.v.). Chin. 男根 ... 女身 (1579 396b18).

⁷² *gati*, destiny, realm or state of rebirth. Chin. 往遊涉 (1579 396b20-21).

(I)-A-II-4-b-(1)-iii; D.3b6; 1579 396b21

*indriyair avikalatā katamā. yathāpīhaikatyo 'jaḍo*⁷³ *bhavati aneḍaka iti*⁷⁴ *vistaraha aṅgapratyaṅgāvikalō vā yadrūpeṅāṅgapratyaṅgāvaikalyena śrotrāvaikalyādikena bhavyaḥ kuśalapakṣasamudāgamāya. idam ucyate indriyā[']vaikalyam*

Who are they of unimpeded senses? If someone is not unintelligent or stupid, as described [above], or whose primary and secondary body parts are unimpaired, who by way of their primary and secondary body parts being unimpaired, their hearing etc., being unimpaired, is capable of attaining the virtuous qualities, this is called being of unimpeded senses.

(I)-A-II-4-b-(1)-iv; D.3b7; 1579 396b25

āyatanagataḥ prasādaḥ katamaḥ. yathāpīhaikatyaena tathāgatapravedite dharmavinaye śraddhā pratilabdhā bhavati cetasaḥ prasādaḥ. ayam ucyate āyatanagataḥ prasādaḥ. tatrāyatanam tathāgatapravedito dharmavinayaḥ sarveṣāṃ laukikalokottarāṅām śukladharmāṅām utpattaye. yā punar atra śraddhā tena pūrvaṅgamenādhipatyena sa āyatanagataḥ prasādaḥ. sarvkleśamalakaluṣyāpanayanat.

What is pure faith in the teaching? If someone obtains faith in the Dharma (i.e., *sūtras*) and Vinaya taught by the Tathāgatha; that is the pure faith of the heart. This is called pure faith in the teaching. In this case, the teaching is the Dharma and Vinaya preached by the Tathāgata, for the purpose of producing all bright teachings of the mundane and supramundane worlds. Further, that faith [developed] by previous

⁷³ Shukla reads *ajāto*; emended according to SSG.

⁷⁴ Tib. includes in the list *dig pa*, 'intoxicated' or 'a stammerer'. See note 63 above.

power is pure faith in the teaching, because it removes the impurities and filth of all defilements.

(I)-A-II-4-b-(1)-v; D.4a2; 1579 396c2

*aparivṛttakarmāntatā*⁷⁵ *katamā. yena pañcānām ānantaryāṇāṃ karmaṇāṃ, tadyathā māṭṛvadhāt piṭṛvadhād arhadvadhāt saṃghabhedāt tathāgatasyāntike duṣṭacittarudhirotpādād anyatamānyatamād ānantaryaṃ karma dṛṣṭa eva dharme*⁷⁶ *na kṛtaṃ bhavati nādhyācaritam iyam ucyate 'parivṛttakarmāntateti imāni pañcānantaryāṇi karmāni kṛtopacitāni dṛṣṭa eva dharme parivartyābhavyo bhavati parinirvāṇāyāryamārgasyotpattaye. tasmād etāni parivṛttakarmāntatety ucyate.*

What does it mean, ‘not obstructed by karma’? Where there is [the state of] not having committed the five acts of immediate retribution, namely: killing one’s mother, father, or an Arhat, causing a schism in the monastic community, and spilling the blood of the Tathāgata with evil intent; [if] any of these are not enacted (*na kṛtaṃ bhavati*), do not manifest ([*bhavati*] *nādhyācaritam*) an immediate karm[ic effect] in this very life, this is called ‘not obstructed by karma’. Having committed these five sins of immediate retribution which [then]

⁷⁵ Where Skt. and Tib. use negated forms (*aparivṛttakarmāntatā*; *las kyi mtha' ma log pa* [D4a2.4]) when introducing the category, Chin. reads ‘separated from’ the karmic obstructions (1579 396c2: 云何名為離諸業障?). However, in the concluding statements of this section, Skt. and Tib. both switch to the positive formulation to define the five sins of immediate retribution: *parivṛttakarmāntatā*; *las kyi mtha' log pa*, while Chin. retains 離諸業障.

⁷⁶ Lit. ‘in the factors which are indeed manifest’, i.e., in this very life; the meaning, therefore, appears to be that committing these sins results in the incapacity to work off the negative karma in this life, and the individual must go directly to hell; however, this is not a permanent state of affairs, and in due course (albeit, likely a very long course), they may be able to gain the fruits of the path in a later birth. See Silk (2007).

accumulate,⁷⁷ one becomes incapable of accomplishing the noble path [that leads to] ultimate Nirvāṇa in this very life.⁷⁸ Therefore, these [five sins] are called ‘obstructed by karma’.

3. The various kinds of *agotrastha*⁷⁹ (*aparinirvānadharmaka*)

Several categories of *agotrastha* delineated below bear remarkable similarities to the *icchantika*, chiefly: latent craving; lack of shame; lack of faith and rejecting the teaching of the true doctrine; and, desiring phenomenal existence. It is consequently hard to believe the two categories,

⁷⁷ *upacita*: see e.g., Edgerton. ‘technically applied to *karman*, piled up’ (s.v.); PTSD: e.g., ‘accumulated, produced (usually of *puñña* and *kamma karma*)’ (s.v.). Tib. *bsags*; Chin. 增長.

The meaning is unclear. The previous sentence reads *anyatamānyatam(a)*, indicating any single one of the sins has the result of immediate retribution, so it is unlikely that the intention here is to emphasise the accumulation of multiple sins in one life.

⁷⁸ Is there a hint in this instance of ‘in this life only’? Tib. *tse 'di nyid la*; Chin. 現法中.

Alexander von Rospatt (2013, 865-66) comments: ‘The ŚrBh specifies that it is “in this very life” (*dr̥ṣṭa eva dharme*) that those who have committed one of these five sins is unable to accomplish the path.’ Comparing this to a corresponding passage in the *Bhāvanāmayī Bhūmi*, von Rospatt states: ‘this limitation [i.e., that it is only for this life that one is debarred from the path] is missing entirely ... in the BhāvBh [which] instructs the practitioner ... to consider ... that the five sins “with immediate retribution do not allow for a bridge” that would connect to monastic renunciation (*pravrajyā*) and the subsequent fruits of practice. By not spelling out clearly that the commitment of an *ānantarya* sin disqualifies *for this life alone* [emphasis added], the BhāvBh hints that the adverse consequences of such a crime last into the distant future, and thereby ensures that they are viewed with due terror. If a deliberate choice, this was to improve upon the formulation of the ŚrBh, which, while technically correct, may have been perceived to be lacking in emotive impact.’

⁷⁹ *agotrastha*: lit., ‘one established in no lineage’.

which emerged apparently independently in Yogacāra and *tathagatagarbha* literature, respectively, remained unknown to each other.⁸⁰

(I)-A-III; D.7a6; 1579 397c27

kāni punar aparinirvāṇadharmakaliṅgāni yaiḥ samanvāgato 'parinirvāṇadharmakaḥ pudgalaḥ "aparinirvāṇadharmako 'yam" iti vijnyeyah. āha bahūny aparinirvāṇadharmakaliṅgāni pradeśamātram tu nirdeksyāmi.

What furthermore are the marks of one who lacks the factor of ultimate Nirvāṇa (*aparinirvāṇadharmaka*) by which the person who lacks the factor of ultimate Nirvāṇa is endowed so that “this *aparinirvāṇadharmaka*” can be known? It is said: there are many marks of one who lacks the factor of ultimate Nirvāṇa, but I will name just a few.

(I)-A-III-a; D.7a7; 1579 398a1

ihāparinirvāṇadharmakasya pudgalasyādita evālayatṛṣṇā sarveṇa sarvaṃ sarvathā ca sarvabuddhair āśrayasaṃniviṣṭā aprahāṇadharminī bhavaty anutpīḍyā dūrāgatā pragāḍhasaṃniviṣṭā / idaṃ prathamam agotrasthasya pudgalasya liṅgam //

In the case of a person who lacks the factor of ultimate Nirvāṇa, from the very beginning they [are characterised by] latent craving and are attached to the basis [of existence which] has [such a] nature [that

⁸⁰ I present four of the six types below to pick up only on the most striking affinities; however, that is not to say there are not also opportunities for comparison in the other two. For example, the following depiction of the fifth type of *agotrastha* certainly suggests the various types of fraud, lying, and putative false claims discussed at various points earlier in this paper:

(I)-A-III-e; D.8a1; 1579 39b1: *aśramaṇaḥ śramaṇapratijñāḥ, abrahmacāri brahmacāripratiññāḥ*; ‘not being a Śramaṇa, claims to be one; not being a Brahmacārin, claims to be one’.

it can]not be eliminated [even] by all the Buddhas whatever [they may do], cannot be squeezed out, originates from long ago [being] firmly bound [to the basis of existence]. This is the first mark of the person who is *agotrastha*.

(I)-A-III-c; D.7b5; 1579 398a17

punar aparam agotrasthaḥ pudgalaḥ. ādita evādhimātreṇāhrīkyānapatrāpyeṇa samanvāgato bhavati yenāyam aghṛṇacittaś cāsaṃkucitacittaś ca prahr̥ṣṭacittaś ca sarvaṃ pāpam adhyācarati. na ca kadācit tan nidānaṃ vipratīṣārī bhavati. [gzhi des tshe 'di'i zang zing dang bcas pa'i bdag nyid nyams pa kho na tsam du mthong bar zad de /] idaṃ tṛtīyam agotrasthaṃ liṅgam.

Again, there is [another kind of] person who is *agotrastha*: From the very beginning, [the *agotrastha*] is endowed with excessive shamelessness and a lack of conscience, because of which their mind lacks aversion and fear and with delighted mind they commit all manner of sins. Therefore, they never become repentant. [For this reason, [the *agotrastha*] ends up experiencing only decline of the self which pursues (lit. endowed with) [nothing more than] worldly wealth (prosperity)] in this very life (lit. of this time)]. This is the third mark of the *agotrastha*.

(I)-A-III-d; D.7b6; 1579 398a23

punar aparam agotrasthaḥ pudgalaḥ. sarvākāraparipūrṇe sphuṭe yukte citre gamake duḥkhaṃ vārabhya samudayaṃ vā nirodhaṃ vā mārgaṃ vā saddharme deśyamāne na labhate cetasa āvarjanamātrakaṃ adhimuktimātrakaṃ ca [spu zing zhes byed pa'am / mchi ma bkrug⁸¹ ces byed pa thob par gyur pa lta ci smos te]

⁸¹ I read as *dkrug*. See D.8a1.2; Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group (SSG), (26 n.10).

*atītānāgatapratyutpannam adhvānam upādāya. idaṃ caturtham
agotrasthaṃ liṅgam*

Again, there is [another kind of] person who is *agotrastha*: Upon being taught the true doctrine, which is in all respects perfect, plain, in conformity with reason, clear, easy to understand whether with regard to suffering, or [its] origination, or cessation, or the way [to cease it], [the *agotrastha*] does not gain even a measure of being convinced in their mind⁸², [let alone, making the hairs stand on end, or being moved to tears] whether in the past, the present or the future. This is the fourth mark of the *agotrastha*.

(I)-A-III-f; D.8a7; 1579 398b18

*punar aparam agotrasthaḥ pudgalaḥ. yat kiṃcit kuśalam karma
karoti kāyena vācā manasā vā, tat sarvaṃ bhavābhiprāyo vā viśiṣṭam
āyatipunarbhavam abhiprāthayamānaḥ, bhogābhiprāyo vā viśiṣṭam
bhogam abhiprāthayamāno karoti / idaṃ ṣaṣṭham agotrasthasya
pudgalasya liṅgam //*

Again, there is [another kind of] person who is *agotrastha*: That person does some measure of good things, whether by body, speech or mind, but [he/she] does all [of this] with the aim of [happiness in this] existence, or with the intention of an excellent rebirth in the future, or with the aim of enjoyment,⁸³ with the intention of [obtaining] excellent enjoyment. This is the sixth mark of the person who is *agotrastha*.

⁸² *adhimukti-mātraka*, Tib. *mos pa tsam*, Chin. 微小信解: ‘earnest application leading to conviction’, an important term in the Mahāyāna, and a quality regularly identified as lacking in the *icchantika*.

⁸³ *bhoga* of course has several meanings, including both sensual pleasure(s) (chiefly, perhaps, culinary as well as sexual) and wealth. I am tempted to foreground the former here, to highlight the overlap with the *icchantika*, without excluding the latter. Chin. reads 財寶 ‘wealth’, 1579 398b21.

The *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*

It only remains to note a slightly different usage of *gotra* in the LAS compared with the *Gotrabhūmi* passages. In so doing, we also have the chance to observe the moment where the *agotrastha* is conflated most clearly with the *icchantika*.

*punar aparame mahāmate pañcābhisamayagotrāni katamāni pañca
yaduta śrāvakayānābhisamayagotraṃ
pratyekabuddhayānābhisamayagotraṃ
tathāgatayānābhisamayagotraṃ aniyataikataragotraṃ agotraṃ ca
pañcamam |*
63.2-5⁸⁴

Further, Mahāmati, [regarding] the five lineages of spiritual attainment, what are the five? [They are those of: 1.] the Disciples' vehicle; [2.] the Solitary Buddhas' vehicle; [3.] the Tathāgatas' vehicle; [4.] the uncertain vehicle; and, [5.] those of no spiritual lineage.⁸⁵

After elaborating at some length how to recognise each of the first four categories, as well as describing various sub-divisions within them, and after some intervening verses, the Buddha turns to the *icchantika*.

*tarecchantikānāṃ punar mahāmate anicchantikatā mokṣaṃ kena
pravartate yaduta sarvakuśalamūlotsargataś ca
sattvānādikālaprañidhānataś ca |*
65.17-66.2)

Again, Mahāmati, how is it that no desire for liberation arises in the *icchantika*? [Either because] they have abandoned all [their] good roots

⁸⁴ All references to Nanjio (ed.) 1923.

⁸⁵ 1. 聲聞乘種性 2. 緣覺乘種性 3. 如來乘種性 4. 不定種性 5. 無種性 T16.597a29-b2.

or [because of taking] vows [to follow the Bodhisattva path] since beginningless time [for the sake of all] sentient beings.

We should note carefully here that the language in the initial list above refers to the *agotra*, with the Chinese also using 無(種)性.⁸⁶ Suddenly, however, and with no apparent explanation for the slippage, the term becomes *icchantika* in the Sanskrit, and accordingly 一闍提 in Śikṣānanda⁸⁷. Bodhiruci does, at least, appear alert to the inconsistency, and attempts to transition between the terms by drawing attention to the shift, defining the *agotra* as *icchantika*, and then the *icchantika* as *aparinirvāṇagotraka*.⁸⁸

Conclusion

We have, then, encountered several classes of human and non-human beings who are excluded to a lesser or greater extent from the Buddhist world, either socially or cosmologically. In some cases, we noticed early traces in the Pali tradition that may foreshadow the *icchantika*, including the examples of those who hold false views, frauds, heretics, and those who commit the four serious offences of a monastic (*pārājika*), and the five sins of immediate retribution (*pañcānantaryāṇi*). The second example we saw, the *agotrastha*, those denied the capacity or lineage necessary for ultimate Nirvāṇa, also exhibits several psychological and behavioural tendencies that apparently echo the *icchantika* to such an extent that at some stage, the two seem to have merged.

My purpose here has been to provide an admittedly rather unsystematic survey of some of the main classes and behaviours that bear

⁸⁶ Bodhiruci 無性 671 526c11; Śikṣānanda 無種性, 672 597b2.

⁸⁷ 672 597c9.

⁸⁸ 大慧。何者無性乘。謂一闍提。一闍提者無涅槃性。 671 527a29-b1 As noted above, the *aparinirvāṇagotraka* is explicitly identified with the *agotrastha* in the *Gotrabhūmi*.

affinities with the *icchāntika* and that may speculatively be considered to have inflected the understanding of the latter over the course of time. Notwithstanding the fact that the passages discussed were drawn from disparate schools within the Indic Buddhist fold, there are some striking continuities regarding the language and conceptual frameworks with and within which these various forms of exclusion are elaborated. Viewed in the light of these categories, then, the *icchāntika* may be understood less as a doctrinal aberration or a historical exception; rather, they have a long line of institutionally sanctioned antecedents.

Bibliography

Original sources and abbreviations

- AKBh: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. (Pradhan ed.)
 AKVy: *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā by Yaśomitra*. (Wogihara ed.)
 BHSD: Buddhist-Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary, vol. II. (Edgerton ed.)
 Chin.: Chinese language/translation
 ChinD: 大般涅槃經 *Dabanniepan jing* (Taishō Vol. 12 No. 374)
 ChinF: 大般泥洹經 *Dabannihuan jing* (Taishō Vol. 12 No. 376)
 LAS: *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. (Nanjio ed.)
 Mil: *Milindapañha* (Trenckner ed.)
 MPM: *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*.
 MV: *Mahāvagga* (Vin I)
 PTS: Pali Text Society
 RGV: *Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra*. (Johnston ed.)
 SF: Sanskrit Fragments of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*. (Habata ed. 2007; 2019.)

Skt.: Sanskrit language/original

ŚrBh: *Śrāvakabhūmi*

T: Chinese Canon, Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新脩大藏經

TG: Taishō Group. (*Śrāvakabhūmi* Study Group of Taishō University, ed. and trans.)

Tib.: Tibetan language/translation

Vin: *Vinayapitaka*. (Oldenberg ed.)

References

- Blum, Mark (trans). 2013. *The Nirvāṇa Sutra* (Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra). *Volume I*. BDK English Tripiṭaka Series. Berkeley: Bukkyo Dendo Kyokai America, Inc.
- Böhtlingk, Otto und Rudolph Roth. 1875. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg.
- Cheng, Anne. 2018. “Central India is What is Called the Middle Kingdom.” in Sharma (ed.). *Records, Recoveries, Remnants and Inter-Asian Interconnections: Decoding Cultural Heritage* (pp. 141-159). Singapore: ISEAS Publishing.
- Clarke, Shayne. 2009a. Monks Who Have Sex: “*Pārājika*” Penance in Indian Buddhist Monasticisms. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 37(1), 1-43.
- 2009b. When and Where is a Monk No Longer a Monk? On Communion and Communities in Indian Buddhist Monastic Law Codes. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 52, 115–141.
- Deleanu, Florin. 2006. *The Chapter on the Mundane Path (Laukikamārga) in the Śrāvakabhūmi: A Trilingual Edition (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese), Annotated Translation, and Introductory Study*. Volume I, II. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. New Haven.

- Fujii, Kyōkō 藤井教公. 1991. *Issendai ni tsuite*. 一闡提について. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, 39(2) 「印度學佛教學研究第三十九卷第二號」 平成三年三月 537-541.
- 1999. Transition of the Concept of *Ichchantika* in East Asian Buddhism. *Proceedings of the XIIth IABS Conference Lausanne*, 75-82.
- Gyatso, Janet. 2003. One Plus One Makes Three: Buddhist Gender, Monasticism, and the Law of the Non-excluded Middle. *History of Religions*, 43(2), 89-115.
- Habata, Hiromi. 2007. *Die zentralasiatischen Sanskrit-Fragmente des Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra. Kritische Ausgabe des Sanskrittextes und seiner tibetischen Übertragung im Vergleich mit den chinesischen Übersetzungen*. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag (Indica et Tibetica 51).
- 2013. *A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Translation of the Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*. Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert.
- 2015. *Buddhadhātu, tathāgatadhātu and tathāgatagarbha in the Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*. *Hōrin: Comparative Studies in Japanese Culture*, 18, 176-196.
- 2019. *Aufbau und Umstrukturierung des Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra. Untersuchungen zum Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra unter Berücksichtigung der Sanskrit-Fragmente*. (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 25). Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Forthcoming. The Conflict with the Opponent Traced in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra: Sautrāntika and Ichchantika*.
- von Hinüber, Oskar. 1988. *Die Sprachgeschichte des Pāli im Spiegel der südostasiatischen Handschriftenüberlieferung*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

- 1995. Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya: A Survey of Theory and Practice. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 18(1), 7–45.
- 1996a. Buddhist Law According to the Theravada Vinaya (II): Some Additions and Corrections. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 20(2), 87-92.
- 1996b. *A Handbook of Pali Literature*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Hirakawa, Akira. 1997. *A Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary*. 佛教漢和大辭典. The Reiyukai.
- Hodge, Stephen. 2010/12. The Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra: The Text and its Transmission. <https://www.buddhismuskunde.uni-hamburg.de/pdf/5-personen/hodge/the-textual-transmission-of-the-mpns.pdf>. Retrieved 25 February, 2022.
- Horner, I.B. 1949. *The Book of the Discipline. Vol. I (Suttavibhaṅga)*. Pali Text Society.
- 1951. *The Book of the Discipline. Vol. IV (Mahāvagga)*. Pali Text Society.
- 1964. *Milinda's Questions. Vol. II*. Pali Text Society.
- Johnston, E.H. 1950. *Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra*. Patna: Bihar Research Society.
- Jones, Christopher V. 2021. *The Buddhist Self: On Tathāgatagarbha and Ātman*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Kanō, Kazuo. 2020. A Syntactic Analysis of the Term *Tathāgatagarbha* in Sanskrit Fragments and Multiple Meanings of *Garbha* in the *Mahāparinirvāṇamahāsūtra*. *Acta Asiatica*, 118, 17-40.
- Karashima, Seishi. 2007. Who Were the *Ichchantikas*? *ARIRIAB*, 67-80.
- Kragh, Ulrich Timme. 2013. The *Yogācārabhūmi* and its Adaptation. Introductory Essay with a Summary of the Basic Section. in Kragh, U. (ed.), *The Foundation for Yoga Practitioners: The Buddhist*

- Yogācārabhūmi Treatise and Its Adaptation in India, East Asia, and Tibet* (pp. 22-286). Harvard University Press.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. [1923-1931] 1971. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu. Traduction et annotation*. 6 vols. Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises.
- Law, B. C. 1933. Geographical Data from Sanskrit Buddhist Literature. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 15(1/2), 1–38.
- Liu, Ming Wood. 1984. The Problem of the *Icchantika* in the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*. *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 7(1).
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen*. C. Winter.
- Mochizuki, Ryōkō 望月良晃. 1988. *Daijō Nehangyō no kenkyū*. 大乘涅槃經の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Mochizuki, Shinkyo and Zenryu, Tsukamoto. 1954 (1932). *Bukkyō Daijiten* (Great dictionary of Buddhism). 10 vols. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankyō Kyōkai.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1872. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nanjio, Bunyiu. 1923 (1956). *The Lankāvatāra Sūtra*. Bibliotheca Otaniensis Vol. 1. Kyoto: Otani University Press.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1879 (1997). *Vinaya-Pitaka, Vol. I: Mahavagga*. Pali Text Society.
- 1881 (1993). *Vinaya-Pitaka, Vol. III: The Suttavibhaṅga*. Pali Text Society.
- 1883 (1982). *Vinaya-Pitaka, Vol. V: The Parivāra*. Pali Text Society.
- Pradhan, Prahlad. 1967. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

- Radich, Michael. 2015. *The Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra and the Emergence of Tathāgatagarbha Doctrine*. Hamburg: Hamburg University Press.
- Rhys Davids, T.W. 1963 (1890). *The Questions of King Milinda*. Part II. New York: Dover Publications.
- 1894. *The Questions of King Milinda*. Part II. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- von Rospatt, Alexander. 2013. Remarks on the *Bhāvanāmayī Bhūmiḥ* and its Treatment of Practice. in Kragh, U. (ed.), *The Foundation for Yoga Practitioners: The Buddhist Yogācārabhūmi Treatise and Its Adaptation in India, East Asia, and Tibet* (pp. 852-871). Harvard University Press.
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1976. The Meanings of the Term ‘Gotra’ and the Textual History of the ‘Ratnagotravibhāga’. *Bulletin of the School of Asian and African Studies*, 39(2), 341-363.
- Schopen, Gregory. 2010. On Some Who Are Not Allowed to Become Buddhist Monks or Nuns: An Old List of Types of Slaves or Unfree Laborers. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 130(2), 225-234.
- Shimoda, Masahiro 下田正弘. 1997. *Nehangyō no kenkyū: Daijō kyōten no kenkyū hōhō shiron*. 涅槃經の研究—大乘經典の研究 方法試論. Shunjūsha.
- 2015. *Mahāparinirvāṇamahāsūtra*. In Silk, Jonathan (ed.), *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism. Vol. I: Literature and Languages* (pp. 158-170). Leiden: Brill.
- Shōmon ji Kenkyū-kai 声聞地研究会 [Śrāvakahūmi Study Group of Taishō University] ed. and trans. 1998. *Yuga ron Shomon ji Dai’ichi yugasho: Sansukurittogo to wayaku* 瑜伽論声聞地第一 瑜伽処—サンسكريット語テキストと和訳— (Śrāvakahūmi: Revised Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation, The First Chapter). Tokyo: Sanki-bō bussho-rin.

- Shukla, Karunesh. 1973. *Śrāvakahūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Silk, Jonathan. 2007. Good and Evil in Indian Buddhism: The Five Sins of Immediate Retribution. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, (35)3, 53-286.
- 2020. Indian Buddhist Attitudes toward Outcastes: Rhetoric around *caṇḍālas*. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, (63), 128-187.
- Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro. 1930. *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra: One of the most important texts of Mahayana Buddhism, in which almost all its principal tenets are presented, including the teaching of Zen*. Munshiram Manoharlal.
- 1932. *The Lankavatara Sutra: A Mahayana Text. Translated for the First Time from the Original Sanskrit*. London: George Routledge and Sons.
- Tagami, Taishu. 2000. 田上, 太秀. Issendai to ha Nanimono ka 一闡提とは何者か. *Journal of Buddhist studies*, 31, 167-185.
- Takasaki, Jikido. 1966. *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra): Being a Treatise on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory of Mahāyāna Buddhism*. Serie Orientale Roma Vol. XXXIII.
- 2000. The Tathāgatagarbha Theory Reconsidered: Reflections on Some Recent Issues in Japanese Buddhist Studies. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, 27(1/2), 73-83.
- Trenckner, V. 1962 (1880). *The Milindapañho: Being Dialogues Between King Milinda and the Buddhist Sage Nāgasena*. London: Luzac & Company (Pali Text Society).
- Walters, Jonathan S. 1994. A Voice from the Silence: The Buddha's Mother's Story. *History of Religions*, 33(4), 358-379.
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1963 (1997). *The Roots, Verb-Forms and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language. A Supplement to His Sanskrit Grammar*. Motilal Banarsidass.

- Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲来. 1927. *Bonkantaiyaku Bukkyōjiten* 梵漢對譯佛教辭典: Honyakumeigitaishū 翻譯名義大集 [Mahāvvyutpatti]. Tōkyō: Heigoshuppansha.
- 1936. *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā by Yaśomitra*: Tokyo: The Publishing Association of Abhidharmakośavyākhyā.
- Zwilling, Leonard. 1992. Homosexuality as Seen in Indian Buddhist Texts. In Cabezón, J. (ed.), *Buddhism, Sexuality, and Gender* (pp. 203-14). State University of New York Press.

Keywords: Buddhism; exclusion; *agotra*; *icchāntika*

*Postgraduate Student,
International College
for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies*

要 旨

一部の者は他の者より更に平等 —初期・中期インド仏教に於ける差別と排他—

コリン・ゴールディング (Corin Golding)

仏教経典には、その成立当初から、差別や排他事例が見られる。パーリ語聖典や大乘仏教の文献には、ある種の人間（と人間でないもの）が僧伽に入ることや仏陀の教えを聞くことを禁止するものから、ある人々が成仏する能力を否定するという、より包括的な禁止の記述に至るまで、さまざまな例が見られる。このような除外は、おそらく後世仏教において、一闍提という形で最も明確に表現されるようになった。本論文では、パーリ語の仏典の中の2つの重要な箇所から、一闍提の前身と思われるものを探し出す。次に一闍提と共通点の多い *agotrastha* 「(涅槃を得る) 素質 (または血統) に欠ける者」というカテゴリーを取り上げる。大乘仏教の論書の中の *agotrastha* に関するいくつかの箇所の英訳を提示し、少なくともあるテキストでは、*agotrastha* と一闍提が混同されている可能性があることを指摘する。