

Late Hīnayāna Buddhism and the Transition to Mahāyāna: A Study of the Early Buddhist *Samgha* and the Buddha Figures at Kanheri

SURAJ A. PANDIT

THE Kanheri caves, the more than one hundred caves situated in the vicinity of Mumbai, are one of the major monastic cave sites in western India. The site—with its architectural grace, epigraphical glory, and sculptural masterpieces—tells the history of the Buddhism as existed there for more than a millennium.

The history of Kanheri begins in the first century B.C.E. and is divided into three different phases based on the dynastic control there, as drawn from the epigraphical data from the site:

Phase I: First century B.C.E. to fourth century C.E.

Phase II: Fifth century to sixth century.

Phase III: Seventh century to ninth century.

During Phase One, the area was under the control of the Śātavāhana dynasty. Phase Two can be labeled the Traikutaka-Maurya period.¹ During Phase

¹ Owing to the discovery of a copperplate mentioning the Traikutaka rule, this phase can be labeled as the Traikutaka period; however, there is some debate about the era in which the copperplate was produced. This is the period (i.e., the late fifth century C.E. [after the decline of the Vakatakas in Vidarbha] and early sixth century C.E.) allotted to the Konkan Mauryas by some scholars. In light of this, the author has chosen to label this phase as the Traikutaka-Maurya to avoid any controversy.

Three, this region was mainly under the rule of the Rāṣṭrakuṭas and later the Śilāhāras.

Kanheri is surrounded by various ancient sites like Sopara, Kalyan, Thane, and Bassein. Chaul is also not far from Kanheri, on whose periphery we can see cave sites such as Magathane, Jivadhan, Lonad, Ambivali, and Kondivate (Mahakali). Only a few of these places are mentioned in the epigraphical sources from Kanheri. During the Śātavāhana period, Sopara and Kalyan were the two main commercial centers,² though the decline of the former as a port had already started due to the silting of its waters, which in turn left Kalyan as the alternative port. These two centers were linked by a trade route, which proceeded to Junnar, Nasik, and then on to Paithan.³ There was another route from Sopara towards the fertile lands of the Ganga–yamuna and the north-west region, via Bharuch.

At one time, Kanheri was on an island adjacent to the Sopara region, known as Salsette (Sashti) Island, and was isolated from the mainland by the Bassein River. Kanheri was neither on an ancient trade route like the caves at Bhaja, Karle, Karad, nor was it in the vicinity of any particular trade center like the caves at Junnar.

The main *caitya* (*stūpa*), i.e., Cave 3 at Kanheri, is located near the entrance of the site and is one of the most important caves in the whole complex. Architecturally, this cave represents a continuation of the tradition found at Karle and dates from the middle of the second century C.E. This date can be ascertained from an inscription by the donors, the two brothers Gajasena and Gajamitra, who donated the cave to the spiritual teachers of the Bhadrāyānīya school. The inscription is one of the most important inscriptions that refer to a later Śātavāhana king, Yajñaśrī Sātakarṇi.⁴ Additionally, on a pillar in the courtyard outside this cave, there are two unique examples of Buddha figures in the Mathurā style from the Kuṣāṇa dynasty, which are thought to be the earliest depictions in southern India of the Buddha in anthropomorphic form.

The study of the rise of Mahāyāna as reflected in the art and architecture of western Indian Buddhist caves has been undertaken by various art historians. Nagaraju (1981) and later Dhavalikar (1984) have pointed out several

² References to Sopara are found in the inscriptions in Caves 3, 7, and 86; Kalyan is referred to in the inscriptions in Caves 32, 72, 74, 75, and 98 at Kanheri.

³ Nasik was an early capital of the Śātavāhanas before Paithan. Reference to Paithan can be seen in an inscription in Cave 3 that dates from the second century C.E.

⁴ The reading of the line in the inscription is as follows: “. . . Ceti (ya. . .) ācāriyānam nika (yasa . . . Bhādāya) nīyānam.” This reading is from Gokhale 1991, p. 51.

changes in the cave architecture of this period. The latter has labeled this architectural phase as “late Hīnayāna,” although it is difficult to relate it to a particular school or ideological revolution. The culture of the Deccan region is a synthesis of southern and northern Indian cultural streams, and this has added to the confusion as to where Mahāyāna originated. Traditionally, it is believed that the Mahāsāṅghikas promoted Mahāyāna concepts. However, the term Mahāsāṅghika was used in the inscriptions in western Indian Buddhist caves to denote a particular group of schools, and thus there are no inscriptions that give us clues to the existence or location of an individual Mahāsāṅghika school. It is believed that there were two schools, each with its own system of logic, that brought drastic changes to Buddhist thought—the Sarvāstivādin and the Ekavyāvahārika.⁵ There are no specific references to these two schools in any of the inscriptions in western Indian Buddhist caves in the early years of the Common Era, and therefore we are unable to understand the exact process of transition from Sthaviravādin to Mahāyāna. However, Kanheri, being one of the major cave complexes in India, preserves some data that can shed light on this issue.

In this paper, I will focus on the above-mentioned inscription that refers to Yajñaśrī Sātakarṇi. I will also cover the Bhadravānīya, a Sthaviravāda school, and the two Buddha figures found in Cave 3, which are from the same period as the inscription, and their appearance in southern India is striking. Here, therefore, an attempt will be made to clarify the transition from early Buddhism to “late Hīnayāna” Buddhism at Kanheri.

During the lifetime of the Buddha, attempts were made to divide the *saṃgha* by monks like Devadatta.⁶ With the death of the Buddha, the *saṃgha* lost not only its spiritual teacher but also an able leader (*saṃgha-pramukha*). This unstable time compelled the monks to begin to make changes in the rules and regulations for the *saṃgha* resulting in the convening of the First Council. There, the *tripitakas* were compiled under the supervision of elder monks.

The Second Council, held at Vaiśālī one hundred years after the death of the Buddha, was important in the course of the development of Buddhism and the Buddhist schools. Here, the first split of the *saṃgha* into the orthodox Sthaviravāda school and the liberal Mahāsāṅghika school occurred. The

⁵ *Encyclopedia Indica*, vol. 27, pp. 554–6.

⁶ See “Culla-vagga” and “Samghabheda-khandhaka” of the *Vinayapitaka*.

Council, which was formed to settle a dispute over the ten precepts in the *Vinaya*, took place between the 500 monks at Vaiśālī—liberal monks known as the Vajjiputtakas—and the monk who led the event, Yaśa.⁷ Immediately after the Council, the monks of the Mahāsāṅghika also compiled their own *tripiṭaka* by making a few changes to the original literature.⁸ Later, these groups divided into various sub-groups. The ten controversial points were as follows:⁹

1. Siṅgiloṇa-kappa: The practice of carrying salt in a horn for use when needed, which, according to one view, contravened the rule against the storing of articles of food.
2. Dvaṅgula-kappa: The practice of taking food after midday. (Literally, when the shadow is two digits wide.)
3. Gāmantara-kappa: The practice of going to a neighboring village and taking a second meal there the same day, thereby committing the offence of overeating.
4. Āvāsa-kappa: The observance of *uposatha* in different places within the same parish.
5. Anumati-kappa: Doing an act and obtaining permission for it afterwards.
6. Āciṅṇa-kappa: Considering a teacher's word more authentic than the *Vinaya*.
7. Amathita-kappa: The drinking of milk after meals.
8. Jalogi-pāṭum: The drinking of fermented palm-juice that has not yet turned to alcohol.
9. Adasakam-nisidanam: The use of an unhemmed sheet to sit on.
10. Jātarūpa-rajatam: The acceptance of gold and silver.

Others, such as Dutt, also attribute this first rift in the *saṅgha* to Mahādeva's "five articles of faith," which devalued the level of enlightenment attained by arhats.¹⁰

⁷ A detailed account of the Vajjiputtakas of Vaiśālī, their opposition to the precepts, and their arguments following the Second Council also appear in the "Culla-vagga" in the "Sattasatika-khandhaka" of the *Vinayapitaka* (Kaushalyayana 1994, pp. 548–58).

⁸ *Dīpavaṃsa* (Sinh 1996a, p. 71).

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 66–67, and also Dutt 1980, p. 125. Also see the "Culla-vagga" in the "Sattasatika-khandhaka" of the *Vinayapitaka*.

¹⁰ Dutt 1980, p. 126.

According to the *Mahāvamsa*, following the Second Council, the Sthaviravāda school split into the Vātsīputrīya and Mahīśāsaka schools while the Mahāsāṅghika school split into the Ekavyāvahārika and Kaukūlika schools. Until the Mauryan dynasty, a further sub-division can be seen. The Vātsīputrīya school divided into Dharmottara, Bhadrāyānīya, Channagirika, and Sāṃmitīya schools. The Mahīśāsaka school divided into the Dharmaguptaka and Sarvāstivādin schools. The Sarvāstivādin school further divided into the Kāśyapīya, Sankatīya, and Sautrāntika schools. The Kaukūlika school also later divided into the Prajñāptivādin, Bahuśrutīya, and Caitika schools. According to the *Mahāvamsa*, after the third century B.C.E., six more schools appeared in India: the Haimavata, Rājagirīya, Siddhāthika, Purvaśaila, Aparāśaila, and Vajirīya schools.¹¹

As stated above, the schools that were offshoots of the Mahāsāṅghika school are not mentioned individually in the Śātavāhana inscriptions from Nasik and Karle.

We now move to the division of the Mahāsāṅghika school as given by the northern Indian tradition. As we saw from the information in the *Mahāvamsa*, the Mahāsāṅghikas divided into the Kaukūlika and Ekavyāvahārika schools. The Kashmiri tradition gives us a different division, with the Mahāsāṅghika school dividing into the Lokottaravādin, Aparāśaila, Purvaśaila, and Uttarāśaila schools.¹² After comparing the *Mahāvamsa* and the northern Indian account, Dutt makes the following classification:¹³

A comparison of the different lists of schools shows that their groupings are largely consistent. The Mahāsāṅghika branches may be classified into two groups: The earlier (or the first) group comprised the original Mahāsāṅghika, Ekavyāvahārika, and Caitika—or Lokottaravādin—schools. According to Tāranātha [a priest-scholar born in Tibet in the sixteenth century], the Ekavyāvahārikas and the Mahāsāṅghikas were almost identical. The chief center of their group was at Pātaliputra. The later (or the second) group came into existence long after the Mahāsāṅghikas—they became widely known as the Śaila—or Andhaka—schools¹⁴

¹¹ See the *Mahāvamsa* (Sinh 1996b), vols. 11 and 12.

¹² Dutt 1987, pp. 48–49.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 48–56.

¹⁴ According to the *Kathāvatthu*, the Vetulyakas and the Hetuvādins should be added to the Andhakas.

and made their chief center at Amarāvati and Nāgarjunikonda. The Bahusrutiya and Prajñaptivādin schools may be placed in this group, as they agreed more with the doctrines of the Śāila rather than the Mahāsāṅghika schools.

In addition to these two groups, Dutt also notes three others:¹⁵

The third group is formed by the earlier Mahīśāsakas, the Sarvāstivādins, and the later-period Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas, Kāśyapīyas, Saṃkrāntivādas or Uttarāpathakas or Tāmraśatiyas. The fourth group comprised the Vātsīputrīyas, along with the Dharmottara, Bhadrāyāniya, Channagirika, Sāṃmitīya, and Kaurukullaka schools. In this group, practically all the schools merged into one school, namely, the Vātsīputrīya school, otherwise known as the Sāṃmitīya school. The fifth and last group, but the earliest in origin, was the Sthaviravāda, which, as Vinitadeva says, formed a group with the Ceylonese sects, namely, the Jetavanīyas, Abhayagirivāsins, and Mahāvihāravāsins.¹⁶

In addition to the controversy over the *Vinaya*, there are other factors that may have contributed to the split of the *saṃgha*. After the death of the Buddha, his followers gathered around noted elder monks. The Buddha in fact had encouraged this.¹⁷ These elders were known for their attainment in certain aspects of the Dharma. For example, Śāriputra was known for his high attainment of wisdom, and Mahāmaudgalyāyana was known as the foremost possessor of miraculous powers.¹⁸ In time, the followers of these elder monks formed their own groups. Interestingly, these groups are mentioned in the epigraphical data from the western Indian caves. According to Gokhale,¹⁹ an inscription in Cave 3 at Nasik records information about the followers of Mahāmaudgalyāyana and refers to the cave as the “Cave-monastery of the Possessor of Miraculous Powers.” The copperplate found at Kanheri refers to the name of Śāriputra, and the site reveals the presence of a succession of teachers there in the form of memorial *stūpas*. Gokhale has also pointed out

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 48–56.

¹⁷ In the *Vinayapīṭaka*, the Buddha established rules regarding the number of students under *ācāryas*. See Kaushalyayana 1994, pp. 110 ff.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 112.

¹⁹ Gokhale 2004, pp. 298–310.

that Cave 3 at Nasik comprises twenty cells, which suggests that the site had a bhikkhu *saṃgha* capable of performing all the official acts specified by the *Vinaya*.²⁰

Gokhale has attributed the cave sites in Nasik and Kanheri to the Bhadrāyānīya school, as epigraphical data from the sites seem to suggest the existence of the school in that area. In the case of Kanheri, however, there is a gap of at least three centuries between the inscriptions that refer to Śāriputra and the inscriptions that refer to the Bhadrāyānīya school. And in the case of Nasik, the presence of a sizable *saṃgha*, which Gokhale notes, is not restricted to only the Bhadrāyānīya school. The word “mahiddhika” is significant here,²¹ as it appears in the same inscription from Nasik where the term Bhadrāyānīya is found. As we saw in the split between the Sthaviravādins and the Mahāsāṅghikas, one of the major points of controversy was considering one’s teacher’s words more authentic than the *Vinaya*. It is quite possible that this was due to the influence of the Mahāsāṅghikas in the Deccan region. As we know from the Karle inscription by King Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi (grandfather of Yajñaśrī Sātakarṇi), royal patronage was given to the Mahāsāṅghikas during his reign. One of the Nasik cave inscriptions records the donation by a lay follower of a cave for memorial *stūpas* (*caityas*),²² which suggests that the Mahāsāṅghikas were popular in that region.

The lineage of teachers must have become important under the Mahāsāṅghikas. In a later period (c. the second century C.E.), we can see monolithic memorial *stūpas* of teachers in the *stūpa* gallery at Bhājā. After the rise of Karle, Bhājā, which is not far from Karle, was a prominent Mahāsāṅghika center in the first century C.E. The same tradition existed at Kanheri. There, Cave 4, which can be stylistically and paleographically dated to the second century C.E., contains a *stūpa* donated by the lay follower Śivapālitanikā to the *ācārya* Dhammapāla.

Socio-political forces hindered the division of the *saṃgha* during the Mauryan period. The Aśokan edicts on the pillars at Sārnāth, Kausambi, and

²⁰ Ibid., also see the *Vinayapitaka*, Mahā-vagga, Campeyya-khandhaka (Kaushalyayana 1994, pp. 303–5).

²¹ This word occurs in an inscription at Nasik by the Śātavāhana king, Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumavi. The cave is known as *devi lena*. Another inscription in the same cave records the donation of the village Sudarśana to the Bhadrāyānīya *saṃgha*. Mirashi (1979, pp. 44–46) translates this word as “precious.”

²² Luders’ list no. 1130.

Sānchi prohibit causing division in the *samgha*. The translation of the minor pillar edict at Sānchi is as follows:

Whoever causes the sangha to divide, whether monk or nun, shall be compelled to wear white garments and to live in a non-residence (*anivāsi* i.e., where there is no residence). It is my desire that the sangha be united and endure for ages.²³

The unity of the *samgha* during the Mauryan period might also have been due to the popularity of Buddhism itself. The rise in the popularity of Buddhism among the masses created a necessity to maintain the image of the *samgha*. Another important development in Buddhism during this period was its transition towards a new phase, i.e., the early Mahāyāna of Nāgārjuna. Early Buddhist philosophy had taken in new liberal elements during its process of sectarian development—the whole philosophical foundation was on the eve of a new interpretation.

We have seen in the inscriptions from Nasik and Karle how the Śātavāhana king, Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi, gave patronage to the Mahāsāṅghikas. However, not a single inscription of this king refers to a specific Mahāsāṅghika school. Reference to the Bhadrāyānīya school can be seen in the Nasik inscription by King Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumavi. The lack of references to this school suggests that it was not so popular in western India after the Śātavāhana dynasty.

The Bhadrāyānīya school is also referred to in the inscriptions in Caves 3 and 50 at Kanheri.²⁴ The Bhadrāyānīya school appears as a sub-sect of the Vātsīputriyas, which was under the Sthaviravāda tradition. A northern Indian text of Bhāviveka mentions the sect by name.²⁵ The *ācārya* Bhadrāyana was said to be its founder, and the sect was named after him.²⁶ It is said in the *Dīpavaṃsa* that this school arose during the two centuries after the Buddha's death.²⁷ According to the *Mahāvāṃsa* and the *Dīpavaṃsa*, the Bhadrāyānīya school originated around the same time as the Andhaka school, and both

²³ Srinivasa and Aiyangar 1951, pp. 120–25.

²⁴ The donor of Cave 50 was an inhabitant of Kalyān, and by comparing his inscription with one in Cave 98, we can see that the donor was the *bhojiki* (wife of a provincial governor) of Konkan.

²⁵ Shastri 1965.

²⁶ Nagaraju 1981, pp. 33–34.

²⁷ Mirashi 1979, p. 122.

existed during the Mauryan period.²⁸ Although there is little information about this school, we can infer that it was popular in the Deccan region in the early centuries of the Common Era and that it received considerable royal patronage under the Śātavāhanas. However, there is no reference to this school in Fa-hien's or Huen-tsiang's accounts.

Cave 3 at Kanheri, which is the main *caitya* at the site, was under Bhadrāyānīya influence. Here, we can see the ways in which the Buddha was revered in symbolic form. On the tops of the pillars in the main hall, the Buddha is depicted in the form of footprints, a *stūpa*, and a seat. The cave itself contains a large *stūpa*, as it is a *caitya* cave.

This cave also contains one of the earliest images in western India of the Buddha in the Mathurā style of the Kuṣāṇa dynasty.²⁹ These two images are on a pillar in the outside courtyard. One other figure once stood on a pillar in the main hall of the *caitya*, as there are two broken attendant figures there similar to those in the courtyard. Owing to the weathering of the rock, the figure inside no longer exists. The figures in the courtyard are placed on the column of the pillar, which is divided into two horizontal parts by an abacus-like base of the upper figure. The lower figure is in a standing posture (*sthānaka*), while the upper one is in a seated posture (*āsana*). The fact that a similar placement of pillars was found in the courtyard of the *caitya* cave at Karle suggests that this was an important feature in *caitya* architecture.

The pillar at Karle is reminiscent of the great pillars of Aśoka. Why were so many pillars erected, and what was their symbolism?

Numerous panels from various sites depict the worship of the Buddha in the symbolic form of a pillar. Many of these panels offer interesting evidence of the use of "Dharma wheels" (*dharmacakra*) for the crown of the pillar. The Aśokan and Karle pillars also belong to this same tradition. In the *caitya* cave at Karle, one of the pillars is a small replica of a pillar on which a wheel is depicted. This wheel has a depiction of the Three Jewels on it, which represents the Dharma wheel.

The pillars in the courtyard at Kanheri are inferior copies of the Karle pillars. Here, the pillars have capitals depicting lions and dwarves. Although nothing remains on the tops of these pillars, we can speculate that Dharma wheels—possibly made of wood—were placed on the capitals. All these elements suggest the significant position of the pillars in the plan of the *caitya* cave at Kanheri.

²⁸ Davids 1978.

²⁹ Leese 1970, pp. 83–93.

Artists must have traveled to Kanheri through the Kṣatrapa territory, as the art in the caves reveals an affinity for Shaka art. The region also had contacts with Mathurā, as the Buddha figures are in the Mathurā-Kuṣāṇa style. A depiction of Bactrian camels can be seen on the capital of the first pillar in the main hall, as well as on the railing at the entrance to the cave—thus connecting this region to the Silk Road in the northwest. Kanheri was accessible only through Mathurā, which was a major political and economic center in India. At that time, the Mathurā region was under the influence of various Mahāsāṅghika schools. The Mahāsāṅghikas, with the royal patronage of the Śātavāhanas, had already been successful in establishing their school in northern Konkan (Aparānta).³⁰ It is believed that the Mahāsāṅghikas were responsible for introducing idol worship into Buddhism.

In this period, Buddhism became a religion of the common people. Religions often become ritualistic when this happens, as it is difficult to convey more profound philosophical teachings to all classes of society. Buddhism divided into a religion of intellectuals—which was more focused on the Buddha's teachings and their philosophical interpretation—and a religion of the masses, which was more ritualistic. The focus on ritual might have introduced the “devotional” (*bhakti*) element into Buddhism, thus leading to the rise of image worship.

It cannot be just a coincidence that the two Buddha figures at Kanheri were found in the same cave as the inscription that refers to the Bhadrāyānīyas. This Sthaviravāda school might have accepted the practice of idol worship, which is thought to have been spread by the more liberal Mahāsāṅghika school. Indeed, it is quite likely that the Sthaviravāda and Mahāsāṅghika schools influenced each other. Another important thing we know about the inscription is that it is the last known inscription referring to the Bhadrāyānīyas. As this school started accepting liberal ideas—likely due to the demands of the masses—it might have merged with another school, most likely the Mahāsāṅghikas.

An important feature of the *saṃgha* at Kanheri in the second and third centuries C.E. was its preservation of the lineage of teachers in the form of memorial *stūpas*. There are other inscriptions referring to donations of caves, cisterns, etc. by nuns to the *saṃgha*, and they specifically state the names of their teachers in these inscriptions.³¹ As noted in Part One of this paper,

³⁰ See the inscriptions of Gautamiputra Śātakarṇi from Nasik and Karle.

³¹ See the inscriptions in Caves 22, 54, and 65 (Gokhale 1991).

considering one's teacher's words more authentic than the *Vinaya* (*ācinṇakappa*) and the acceptance of gold and silver (*jātarūpa-rajatam*) were two main points of controversy between the Sthaviravādins and the Mahāsāṅghikas. At the Second Council, the elder Yaśa and 500 liberal monks known to us as the Vajjiputtakas debated these points. In a later period, the orthodox Sthaviravāda (*visuddha theravāda*) split into a branch called the Vātsīputrīyas (Vajjiputtiyas). The Bhadrāyānīya school is one of the sub-schools of the Vajjiputtiyas. Is it a coincidence that the second split in the *samgha* was due to the Vajjiputtiyas, whose name is similar to the Vajjiputtakas, or did the name Vajjiputtiya have some other significance of which we are unaware?

The Dharmottara is another school that belongs to the Vajjiputtiya group. There are two pillars at Karle donated by Bhayanta Dharmottara of Sopara. Were the Vajjiputtiyas prominent here in this region, which was surrounded by the Mahāsāṅghikas? All three sites—Karle, Nasik, and Kanheri—that mention the Vajjiputtiya schools in their epigraphs also mention the Mahāsāṅghikas. Is this just a coincidence or was there some relationship between these two schools?

Is there any information about the rise and development of the Mahāsāṅghikas at the site of Kanheri? The Mahāsāṅghikas were popular among both royal families and commoners, and their presence in the region might have influenced the Bhadrāyānīyas. It is believed that the Mahāsāṅghikas were responsible for the rise of the Mahāyāna, as they were more liberal. It is quite possible that the Bhadrāyānīyas might have accepted the practice of idol worship on a practical—not philosophical—level. The inscription at Kanheri about the Bhadrāyānīyas is the last epigraphical evidence of this school. Except for in historical texts like the *Dīpavaṃsa* and the *Mahāvāṃsa*, there is no reference to this school in other literature. It is possible that they merged with the Mahāsāṅghika schools that became prominent here in later years. In the following period, the Mūlasarvāstivāda school became popular at the site.³² This school brought about revolutionary changes in Buddhism; however, these changes were made possible by the Bhadrāyānīyas.

³² Although there is no epigraphical evidence referring to this school, there are numerous data that hint to its popularity in the region.

Buddhist Schools Referred to in the Inscriptions of the Western Indian Caves

The Mahāsāṅghika School

Karle inscription of Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi (first century C.E.). Luders, 1105.

Nasik inscription of Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumavi (second century C.E.). Luders, 1106.

The Aparasāila School

Kanheri inscription, Cave 65 (third century C.E.). Luders, 1020.

Ajanta inscription, Cave 22 (fifth century C.E.).

The Caitika School

Nasik inscription, Cave 8. Luders, 1130.

Junnar inscription.³³ Luders, 1171.

Ajanta inscription, Cave 10 (fifth century C.E.).

The Kāśyapīya School

Karle inscription of Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumavi³⁴ (second century C.E.). Luders, 1106.

The Dharmottara School

Two inscriptions in the Karle cave (main *caitya*) refer to this school³⁵ (first century C.E.). Luders, 1094–95.

Junnar inscription, Cave 33. Luders, 1152.

The Bhadrāyānīya School

Nasik inscription of Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumavi (year 10) (second century C.E.). Luders, 1123.

³³ This inscription refers to the name of “Bhadanta Chetiyasa” and not directly to the Caitika school.

³⁴ This school is referred to as the Suvarśas, which is identified as the Kāśyapīyas by Mirashi (1979, pp. 54–55) and Dutt (1987, p. 54). This inscription also refers to a donation made to the Mahāsāṅghikas.

³⁵ These inscriptions refer to the donation of two pillars by “Bhayata Dhamutariya” from Soparaka.

- Nasik inscription of Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumavi (years 19 and 22) (second century C.E.). Luders, 1124.
 Kanheri inscription, Cave 3 (second century C.E.). Luders, 987.
 Kanheri inscription, Cave 50 (second century C.E.). Luders, 1018.

REFERENCES

- Davids, T. W. Rhys. 1978. *The Sects of the Buddhists*. 1891. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Dhavalikar, M. K. 1984. *Late Hinayana Caves in Maharashtra*. Pune: Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute.
- Dutt, N. 1980. *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and the Buddhist Schools*. Delhi: Rajesh Publications.
- . 1987. *Buddhist Sects in India*. Varanasi: Indological Book House.
- Gokhale, S. 1991. *Kanheri Inscriptions*. Pune: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.
- . 2004. "Some New aspects of Bhadrayaniya Sect from western Indian Cave Inscriptions." In *Buddhism in Global Perspective*. Edited by K. Sankarnarayan, Motohiro Yoritomi and Shubhada Joshi. Mumbai: Somaiya Publication.
- Kaushalyayana, A. 1994. *Vinayapīṭaka*. Varanasi: Bauddha Akar Granthamala, Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapitha.
- Leese, M. 1970. "The Earliest Buddha Icon in Kanheri Cave 3." *Artibus Asiae* 41, pp. 83–93.
- Lüders, H. 1984. "A List of Brahmi Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to about A.D. 400 with the Exception of Those of Asoka." 1912. Reprint, Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India.
- Mirashi, V. V. 1979. *Satavahana Ani Pashchim Kshatrapa Yancha Itihas Ani Koriva Lekha (Marathi)*. Mumbai: Maharashtra Rajya Sahitya Sanskriti Mandal.
- Srinivasa, Murti, G. and A. N. Krishna Aiyangar. 1951. *Edicts of Asoka (Priyadarṣin)*. Madras: Adyar Library.
- Nagaraju, S. 1981. *Buddhist Architecture of Western India*. Delhi: Agama Kala Prakashan.
- Shastri, A. M. 1965. *An Outline of Early Buddhism*. Varanasi: Indological Book House.
- Sinh, P., ed. 1996a. *Dīpavaṃsa*. Varanasi: Bauddha Akar Granthamala, Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapitha.
- , ed. 1996b. *Mahāvamsa*. Varanasi: Bauddha Akar Granthamala, Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapitha.