Ideology, Interface and Interdependence: Some Reflections on Lay-Monastic Dynamics in Early Indian Buddhism

Dr. Amrita Singh
Associate Professor, Dept. of History, Shyama Prasad Mukherji College, Delhi University

Abstract

Perceptions of the past that emanate from Buddhist religious concerns cannot be understood in isolation. They have to be woven in relation to contemporary political affairs, its own community and beyond and also with networks of economic activities and exchanges. The paper proposes to represent an interactive connection of the Buddhist sangha with the world which initially comes about by delineating itself for spiritual fulfillment from the mundane or the worldly. The role, responsibilities and challenges of the laity are put forth to reflect on the two sides of the spectrum of the twofold Buddhist Community. These two sides often converge in the stories of Buddha's former birth — the Jatakas — primarily to uphold the Buddhist teachings and ideals. Through the lengthy narratives of the Jataka stories lay-monastic dynamics is being attempted to discern an understanding of the modalities of everyday lives and working of the sangha with its social base. Gihi-sangha relations are viewed through everyday understandings rather than idealized parameters.

Keywords: Laity, Piety, Renunciation, Monasticism, Interface, Interdependence, Sociability, Convergence

Introduction

Buddhism has often been heralded as a world denying religion marked by renunciation, monasticism and solitude. It can be assumed that solitude or detachment from worldly affairs probably facilitated religious focus and sincere devotion[1]. But it really may not be the case when the said solitude depended on the society outside for sustenance indicating the interdependence from the time of Buddha itself. The worldliness/unworldliness of Buddhism gets further enmeshed with the demarcations within the components of the followers i.e., lay-monastic distinctions.

The Buddhist Community has been recognised as fourfold (*catuparrisamajjhe*), namely *Bhikkhu*, *Bhikkhunī, Upāsaka* and *Upāsika*. The last two categories are combinedly referred to as *laity* which too has played a significant and enduring role in the spread, development and continuation of Buddhism from the beginning until present times. The laity remains a key component of not just religious participation but also patronage and transmission of Buddhist ideas. The laity indulged in

learning from the Buddha's teachings, honoring the Buddha and supporting the monastic community. Then, it may be significant for us to inquire whether the categorization of the community is as straightforward as it seems? What are the areas in between the laity and monastics that often get enmeshed, if at all they do?

Who joined the sangha? Who gave support to them? How did the sangha sustain itself over time? Did the support remain in terms of material requisites alone? How do we gauge ephemeral ways of support? Is the predominance of monasticism recognised and maintained? Were the boundaries between laity and monastics clear or opaque? The answers to these are not straightforward. The Vinaya Pitaka no doubt lays down rules for initiation, expulsion, support etc. and also gives valuable information on the background to the making of rules. But what exactly happens when everyday life of a Buddhist order interfaces with its community outside? The *Jātaka* stories largely meant for propagation of Buddhist teachings offer a wide range of possibilities to reflect on everyday working of the sangha in relation to the laity. The laity seems to be present in the lives and times of the sangha. The paper interrogates whether the laity plays a prescribed supportive role or an active one? It also explores the Buddhist response to everyday needs of the laity and then goes to unravel the layers in understanding monastic-lay dynamics from a variety of situations that occur from numerous *Jātaka* stories.

Surveying Writings on the Buddhist Community

One of the earliest scholars to write on Indian religions Max Weber considered Buddhism as an 'other worldly religion.'[2] Subsequently western writers and travelers who engaged themselves with the study of Buddhism were moved and amazed by Buddha's renunciation and enlightenment. This is largely because of some early writers, resulted in a skewed portrait of Buddhism as a world-denying religion.[3] Gombridge (2018) suggests that Weber's writings on Buddhism primarily were vitiated by lack of adequate available factual information but his analysis of religion in its social aspects were well devised and provided a useful analytical base for future academic work[4]. But recent scholarship on Indian monasticism did not solely rest on the contrast that they made with their own tradition but also on the readings of the canonical texts, particularly in the Theravada traditions which served and shaped understandings and the future course of academic engagements in their own way.[5]. Similarly, distinctions between the two components of the Buddhist community were initially made neatly or pasted upon by already existing ideas and preconceived notions. An early work on Buddhism by Hodgson (1828) divided the followers of the Buddha into regular or secular (a distinction that he made roughly equivalent to the grihastha ashrama and the Vairagi ashrama of the Hindoos)[6]. Even earlier scholars[7] reflected on the category of the monastics and iterated on the idea of renunciation like the aforementioned. Some of them were in non-English languages while others wrote on aspects of other regions.

Akin to this line of thought was Spence (1850) who wrote on Buddhism in the context of eastern monachism,[8] Oldenberg (1896) who apprised on the lives of the monastics and their placement in ancient Indian religious life[9] and Horner (1930) who in the title of her work itself distinguishes between the monastics and laity, though she endeavored to represent a rather comprehensive portrayal of the category of women in Buddhism that she examined.[10]Sukumar Dutt (1924,1984) takes on the line of prevailing scholarship on monasticism in the west who equated Buddhist monasticism with the Benedictine's classification of monks[11]. He digs out evidences from Sutta *Nipāta* and Dhammapada to highlight asocial aspects of early Buddhism.[12]

Academic discourses even more lately, have dealt with these views with not a noticeable departure from earlier views. Spiro (1970) looks at the category of the early monk as isolated from the world. Further, he looks at it as a pan- Buddhist ideal rather than just focusing on early period.[13] Gombridge (1975) to some extent nuances the whole argument but reaffirms that "the first Buddhists were asocial, rather anti-social."[14] Bailey and Mabbet (2003) in their comprehensive account on the social base of Buddhism partly support this stance of Gombridge.[15]More recent scholarship on Buddhism like those of S Collins (1992)[16] and R Salomon (2000)[17] have attempted to stress on the subtleties of distinction between the ascetic and monastic traditions that many failed to put forth, although in refutation to each other. Brekke (1997, 2002)[18] too reflects on the overlapping between the two categories in the early phases of the development of Buddhism. Further, he elaborates on the intrinsic and extrinsic factors for gaining followership of the Buddhist faith.[19] Schopen (1997) reiterates on the monk-laity distinction but changes the source base and contours of monk/laity (bhikkhu/*upāsaka* or *bhikkhunī*/*upāsika*) distinctions dramatically. Graphically collating literary evidences for the earliest written records and the tyrannies of conflicting claims, he draws attention to the value of inscriptional data on grounds that it predates the actual written evidence and throws light on the activities of a large number of practicing Buddhists.[20]Hinuber (2006) on the other hand tried to highlight on the daily lives of the monastics to add newness to the relations of the sangha with the outside world.[21]

Lately, scholars have focused their attention on the various forms of monasticism, greater permeability of the order and maintenance of family ties in various Buddhist traditions over time. Ohnuma (2012) has highlighted the bonds that continue to survive and thrive in certain cases that she mines from various texts of Buddhist canonical literature.[22] Clarke (2014) has challenged upheld assumptions of monastic practices. He posits that there is no severing of family ties in Buddhist traditions. To authenticate his argument, he collates data from various recessions of the Vinaya Pitaka to emphasize on practices, like maintaining relations with not only respective kin members and friends but also former wives. This is markedly distinct from the ideal monasticism that is perceived not only by scholars and practitioners but also the world at large.[23] These works not only challenge the notions of renunciation but also the role and space of the laity in relation to it. Chakravarti (1983) in her monograph, traces the social dynamics at work in the development of Buddhism in India. Her work

culls out valuable data from Buddhist literary sources to highlight the role of and places the various social groups in the context of Buddhism in early India. In the specific context of the laity, Chakravarti points towards a significant role of the Gahapatis who were wealthy landowners and also peasants. The category of Gahapati in her view represented the “backbone” of the lay following of the Buddha.[24] Kumkum Roy in a whole range of writings[25] has brought about various nuanced ways of understanding dimensions of the sangha and their relations with the world, primarily the laity. Through the use of *Jātakas* she has reflected on the diverse themes like that of the intricacies of the household, matters of friendship and aspects of social stratification to analyse them within the framework of gender relations.

Community, Components and the Context

Isolation and engagement though appear incongruous may be perceived as in usualness to each other. Since the *Jātakas* do not in the strict sense deal with monastic teachings and were meant to cater to the larger community it could be a value adding enterprise to investigate as to how the stories reflect on the laity and its relations with the sangha, which were interlinked to each other beyond simple alms giving and making merit. We should also keep in mind that many ancient Indian texts including the *Jatakas* contain within them several strands as they reflect multiple ideas, sometimes contradictory ones, which may challenge each other within a single text.

In ancient India the Buddhist Sangha probably received considerable support from the 'householder’(gihi) who would not have regarded themselves as formally Buddhist *upāsaka* or *upāsika*[26]. From the renunciation elements of the Buddhist practice are derived values of simplicity, equanimity and non- violence. These values are not confined to the monastics only. For the laity, the practice of good conduct takes the form of commitment to the five precepts usually recited in conjunction with the three refuges: (1) to refrain from harming living creatures, (2) to refrain from taking what is not given, (3) to refrain from sexual misconduct, (4) to refrain from false speech, (5) to refrain from intoxicants that cause heedlessness. In addition to these, the lay disciple may on special occasions (traditionally the full moon 'observance' days) or for longer periods take the eight precepts, replacing the third precept (refraining from sexual misconduct) with complete sexual abstinence and adding (6) refraining from eating after midday (7) refraining from attending entertainments and using perfumes, etc., and (8) refraining from using luxurious beds. In taking the eight precepts the lay follower takes on the discipline that approximates to monastics.[27]

There is also an overwhelming impression that the *Pāli* canon caters to its monastic practitioners rather than its lay followers. Though scattered yet are significant strands within the *Tipiţaka* that display its valuable engagement with its laity, its working and welfare. Several suttas significantly engage with the laity. An attempt has been made to highlight some of them with the use of the following table. [28]

S. No.	Sutta	Source	Reflects on
1.	*Sigālovāda Sutta*	*Digha Nikāya (31)*	Ethical, social, and economic issues including on how to preserve friendliness and harmony among all.
2.	*Parabhava Sutta*	*Suttanipāta (1.6)*	Avoid adversities that may lead to poverty
3.	*Vyagghapajja Sutta*	*Aṅguttara Nikāya (8.14)*	The markers of welfare for the laity.
4.	*Dhammika Sutta*	*Suttanipāta (2.14)*	Lays down moral duties for a layperson.
5.	*Maṅgala Sutta*	*Suttanipāta (2.4), Khuddakapātha (5)*	Buddhist ethics for the individual and society in the form of 38 blessings.

The aim of the paper is not to demarcate the two components of the Buddhist community or just to highlight the laity. Rather, it proposes to suggest that if the Vinaya Piṭaka through its rules of conduct diverges the two, the *Jātakas* provide a point of convergence of the two components, with morals as the point of meet. *Jātaka* stories meant for dissemination and spread of Buddhist teachings yield ample evidence of the laity in a gamut of affairs and activities that are entailed in them. The laity was not just the chief audience of the *Jātaka* stories but also its carrier for facilitating transmission and agents for garnering more support. To further an understanding of issues related to Buddhist monasticism and its lay participants and patrons the stories provide a useful window. The composers of the *Jātaka* stories knit together locales of cities, villages, palaces, hermitages, forests and groves like Jetavana etc., as interacting and interdependent entities within the realm of Buddhism as a whole. Hence, movement and participation of a divergent set of people is largely visible in contrast to other canonical texts, which enables us to probe into sociability of a supposedly ‘asocial’ religion. Also, the

laity is abundantly represented and is by no means homogeneous in the *Jātakas* and raises an expressive imagery of complex issues of the times concerned.[29]

Laity and Piety: Idealizing the Social World of Buddhism

The *saṅgha* is defined according to the rules of the vinaya, stipulating that those who renounce lay life and become monks by receiving the full set of precepts receive the laity's veneration and offerings. The presence of the laity is rather remarkable, if not placing it either in the forefront or at a distance. They are a visible, tangible, part of the life of the *saṅgha* as supporters, donors, sympathisers, merchants, caravan leaders and so forth. A difference between the two had to be made and maintained. Precedence of monasticism over lay life is often understood and maintained. But do the demarcations between the two hinder the growth of intimacy, trust and understanding upon which a truly complementary partnership depends? Were these boundaries always static or adhered to? Were the Lay-monastic relations always pleasant, as prescribed? In other words, was the give and take always smooth? How were interjections in their interdependence resolved? Complexities of the community are vital to address the dynamics of the web of social relations and of the moral economy that develops with support for merit making.

To begin with it would to appropriate to highlight that the *Khadiraṅgāra-Jātaka*[30] which opens with a detailed lavish display on the part of the great treasurer *Anātha Piṇḍika's* generosity to the Buddha and his order. The story informs us that the great treasurer visited the Jetavana more than three times in a day and carried with him different sets of offerings. For his early morning visit he took rice gruel (*yāgum*). After breakfast he offered ghee, butter, honey and molasses (*sappinavanitmadhupphanitadeni*). In the evening (*sāyaṇhasamaye*) he gifted perfume, garlands and clothes (*gandhamālāvathhahatto*). His gifts of generosity do not end with this. His house which was of seven levels was frequented by the Buddha himself and other members of his sangha. The stock of rice in his house could feed five hundred monks at a single time. The *Jātaka* story also tells us about a certain fairy (*ekā michēdiṭṭhikā* devata) who was a heretic and lived in the fourth level of his household (catuthe *dvārakoṭṭhake* vasati). She not just got bothered with regular transit of the Buddha and his monks but also wondered as to why the treasurer bestowed such a large quantum of material wealth and valuable time on the faith of the Buddha. She expresses her concerns to a particular attendee of the merchant by saying "Heedless of his own future, he is drawing upon his own resources, only to enrich the ascetic Gotama. He engages in no traffic; he undertakes no business."[31] Then over a period of time the wealth of the merchant diminishes. Then too, his commitment towards the faith does not deter nor does his generosity. Even though he thought that his gifts were no longer palatable, the Buddha skillfully drawing attention to the worthiness of people who offer with good heart. Thereafter, the fairy in her efforts to dissuade the merchant from his acts of generous alms-giving asks him to pay greater attention towards his livelihood matters. Instead, he posits his

commitment and steadfastness to the faith. A series of such attempts take place and the fairy realises her folly and seeks pardon for which *Anātha Piṇḍika* takes her to the presence of the Buddha. The treasurer asks the Buddha, that he did not get deterred from his acts of alms giving despite forces that contrived to dissuade him, hence wasn't this commendable? The Buddha replied stating that he was a convert and an elect disciple of the faith whose faith is established. But in older days when Pacceka Buddha was on rounds and the faith was not yet established even then the wise did not hesitate to give alms in spite of deep pits of fire set on the way by *Mārā* (lord of the realm of lust).

The story, though set in the household of *Anātha Piṇḍika,* becomes exemplary for all lay-followers alike. The story also raises concern for one's vocation due to indulgence of the laity in acts of generosity towards the sangha which must have been a concern for many lay-families are suggested from the story. This goes on to show that not just abdication of the household, but excessive gifting was a matter of stress to the laity irrespective of their economic status. The significance for alms-giving in times when the upcoming faith met resistance and competition at several fronts is iterated. Therefore, the significance of support from laity seemed important at the establishing phase of Buddhism and is considered as a virtuous act. Hence, relevance along with antecedence of alms giving is placed by the narrative of the above instantiated *Jātaka.* Within the rhetoric of the ideal levels of complexities can be discerned, and that is what one is aiming to address.

On a similar note, is the *Visayha Jātaka*[32] which informs us about a rich merchant, who in spite of being reduced to beggary, continues to exercise charity. The story of the present reads virtually the same as the above explained *Jātaka* with *Anātha Piṇḍika* being the protagonist, representing a wealthy section of the Buddhist laity. In the story of the past the Bodhisatta is a great merchant, named Visayha who gave alms generously and also had alms-halls constructed at four quarters, welcoming monastics from all directions. His acts of excessive charity created a ground for jealousy for Sakka (the king of heaven) who feared being replaced by *Visayha* as his ways were the same on account of which the Sakka was bestowed the lordship of the heavenly abode. The Sakka therefore plots to reduce the merchant to a state of penury. Visayha and his wife are astonished with an absolute eclipse of their bountiful wealth yet they continued with their acts of charity as per their new economic status. Sakka tests the Bodhisatta for seven days until the latter's physical condition deteriorates. Sakka then appears in midair to prevent the Bodhisatta from giving alms by asking him to show self-restraint. But he is unmoved and continue his acts of giving. Finally, the lord of heaven realises and restores the merchant to his former material wealth to facilitate his dispenses. Through tracing the tradition of alms giving or engaging in charity from days when Buddha himself was a householder.[33]It makes such acts imperative for both individuals (seeking Buddhahood) and the faith at large (to facilitate support of the sangha from outside). In terms of the general moral, generosity towards the faith by the laity, irrespective of the value of wealth is certainly (re)emphasized through vicissitudes of vicious ploys at the hands of Sakka.

Sasa Jātaka[34] narrates a story which highlights the gifts of all the Buddhist requisites. A certain landowner of Savatthi provided all requisites to the Buddha and his order. He offered his services to the order for seven consecutive days and on the seventh and the last day offered all other requisites to them all. The master on returning thanked and commended the lay-man for his charity and acquainted him and all that this was the tradition which has been prevalent from earlier times, which he elaborates with the story of the past. The story sets the image of sustenance of the *saṅgha* through the laity. It also makes a strong reference point to the lay-followers to gift the requisites to the sangha. Laity appears as a source of gains and honour in reciprocation of means of merit making.

Apart from gifting, the Buddha also laid great value on observing fast days i.e., *uposatha* by the laity. *Sādhīna Jātaka*[35] is set in the Jetavana, when the Buddha talks about an *upāsaka* who was particular on keeping fasts on the assigned days. Addressing to an audience of laity, he substantiates "lay-fellows, wise men of old days, by virtue of keeping fast-day vows, went in the body of heaven, and there dwelt for a long time"[36]. On a similar note, is *Campeyya Jātaka*[37] where the Buddha extols an *Upāsaka* to have kept up his vows for keeping fast on specified days. *Kiṁchanda-Jātaka*[38] instantiates of both *Upāsakas* and *Upāsikas* keeping fasts when the Buddha himself queries them for doing so. In *Saṁkhapāla Jātaka*[39] the Buddha asks the laity (*upāsake*) present at Jetavana on having observed fast on the said days and thereafter elaborate a related old-world tale. *Bhūridatta Jātaka*[40] is yet another example of lay practices like keeping fast days (*uposatha*) being followed with earnestness, is addressed by the Buddha at Jetavana to the community, which is also marked by the presence of laity. The laity is often reminded of their roles, duties and practices through the *Jātakas* failing to upkeep them leads to being doomed which are displayed through complex and multilayered narratives in the respective stories of the past. Also, the significance and ancestry of these practices are placed in times when Buddhism was not an established faith. It makes them enablers towards a path to fruition or Buddhahood. At another level, deriving from old traditions could make for greater reception by the common folks, where the stories circulated.

The *Jātakas* often abhor the image of an idle-laity, not doing its meritorious duties or engaged in right ways of livelihood. Just as false ways are detested for ascetics in the stories, so is the non-performing laity disliked. For instance, parts of verses in *Somanassa Jātaka*[41] and *Rathalaṭṭhi Jātaka*[42] reads: -

"The idle, sensuous layman I detest, the false ascetic is a rogue confest; A bad king will a case unheard decide, Wrath in a sage can ne'er be justified."[43]

The moral underpinnings of the *Jātakas* set standards for all, in its community and the laity is equal in dispensing on grounds of the normativism juxtaposed. This kind of an ideal picture though was prescribed by the Buddhist teachings, but may not really have been the case in all circumstances and across time. Hence, it would be intriguing to probe and present diversities in lay-monastic relations from the story.

Tipallattha-Miga-*Jātaka*[44] narrates a rather long description of Rahula, son of the Buddha who had newly joined the sangha and at that time was present at the *Aggāḷava* vihara at the city of *Āḷavī* where the Buddha himself was stationed. The story tells us that many people including female-lay followers and even bhikkhunis assembled to hear the sermons of the Buddha during day time. But during the evening the women did not stay to listen to the master. Lay-men and the bhikkhus would stay on to hear the master in the evenings. At one instance the laymen stayed back at the service hall. Due to lack of abundant chambers for the bhikkhus some of them slept over with the present laymen. By this act a *pāccittiya* offence (requiring confession and absolution) was committed. Rahula was so struck by the violation that he did not bother any of the elderly members present in the monastery at that time. Such was his commitment to the disciplinary norms of the order that he took rest at night near the closet, probably meant for defecation. Once this was reported to the elders, they took note and got a chamber for Rahula. A well-defined segregation of the monastic monks with the laity by strict following of the Vinaya rules is clearly highlighted through the *Jātaka* story. The Importance of following the rules too, is signified by the character of Rahula, who despite his background and pedigree could not have been callous about following the rules of discipline. He earnestly follows them, even if it brings him some difficulty. As the *Jātakas* were primarily meant for the laity, the message of practicing the faith through rules was well conveyed as well. The story above also brings into focus the issue of dwellings and lodging. With the establishment of the monastic order, dwellings to stay became a need. Non availability of enough chambers for novices points out to temporary/non-permanent structures in the initial phases of the spread of Buddhism. Another story that highlights on dwellings is in the Tirriya *Jātaka*[45] which gives evidence of construction of a monastery at Vesali by the reputed lay-follower of Buddha and his faith, *Anātha Piṇḍika*. As he sent the knowledge of it reaching finality, some bhikkhus hastily went and preoccupied the chambers for lodging without keeping in mind the rules of seniority. Such was the act of some that even the Venerable *Sāriputta* was left with no chamber to rest at night. He passed a night near the Buddha's chamber under a tree. The Buddha takes cognizance of it and makes the matter of seniority in the monastic order clear to all present by saying "In the religion that I teach, the standard by which precedence in the matter of lodging and the like is to be settled, is not noble birth, or having been a brahmin, or having been wealthy before entry into the sangha; the standard is not familiarity with rules of the order, with the suttas, or with the metaphysical books; nor is it the attachment of any of the four stages of mystic ecstasy, or walking in any of the four paths of salvation. Brethren, in my religion it is seniority which claims respect of word and deed, salutation and all due service; it is seniors who should enjoy the best water and the best rice"[46]. The stories exemplified above highlight growth of followership in the monastic organization and significant role of patronage by the wealthy laity to meet up with the growing requirements. Precedence of monastic order vis-a-vis the laity and seniority within the monastic order is well put forward.

Bhikkhā-Parampara-*Jātaka*[47] intimates us of a laity's ineptitude to measure the ephemeral aspect of Dhamma, one of the three jewels of Buddhism. He expressed his dilemma to be unable to offer

anything in tangible, material terms to the third jewel of the faith (dhamma) just as he did to the other two i.e., the Buddha and the sangha. The Buddha directs him to pay respect and honour *Ānanda*, referred to as the custodian of law in the tradition. The lay-man invites upon the elder *Ānanda* to do his duties as a laity. But the venerable Ananda on being able to measure the honour in the name of the dhamma of the faith gave the gifts to the respected *Sāriputta*, who in return handed all the materials to the Buddha, who he expresses could be the only beneficiary, as he was 'the' only lord of the law. The Buddha thus, gracefully accepts the benevolence of the laity. The story at one level displays incongruity on the part of the laity to discern and scale the in-depth understanding of the three jewels of Buddhism. At another level, it is skillfully and humbly set and restates the gradation among monastics. On a moral ground it is iterated that gifts were to be bestowed to the right beneficiary.

Mahāsāra Jātaka[48] is set in the household of the king of Kosala, a lay follower of the Buddha. The wives of the king of Kosala were aware of their contemporaneity with the Buddha and felt fortunate for the same. They lament on not being able to hear the teachings of the Buddha in person. Expressing their desire to be versed in the preaching of the Buddhist faith to the king, they rejoice on his consent. On marking a presence to the Buddha, the king observes a lay-man, *Chattapāni*, who was well versed and had entered the third path. Out of reverence for the Buddha, *Chattapāni* neither greeted the king nor stood up to mark respect. The Buddha observes the king's displeasure on his behaviour and is appraised of his merits in Buddhist teachings. At the end of the teaching the king leaves the presence of the Buddha ceremoniously. At another instance, when the King comes across *Chattapāni* he asks him to teach his wives the precepts of the Buddha's faith. *Chattapāni*, on account of being a lay-man refuses the offer of the king out rightly. He thus said "It is not me sir, that a layman should expound or teach the truth at the king's harem; that is the prerogative of the brethren."[49] The king well understood the meaning of his refusal and instead asked his wives for the choice among the elders to be their instructor. They unanimously chose *Ānanda* for the same. The story draws out the context of precedence of the monastics over laity at several levels. Firstly, the well versed *Chattapāni*, omitting the act of respect to the king, marks his respect to the Buddha above the ruler of the realm (who was a laity too). Secondly, *Chattapāni*'s clear stance on the prerogative of the monastics in matters of teaching and preaching the verses of the faith steadfast the observance of rules for the laity. Choice of Ananda marks precedence of seniority in the monastic order, especially in the context of the king's household.

The aforementioned stories surely set a standard for the laity in terms of alms giving, generosity, looking into specific needs of the sangha, observance, maintenance of decorum and so on. The stories circulate among common people to raise the understanding of precepts yet become examples to be followed by many.

Give and Take: Bridging or Breaching Boundaries?

Monastics concentrated on their paths towards the highest goals while the laity contributed towards the monastic set up from outside. Help and support from the laity also had its own dynamics. Was help and support always readily available? Did the laity too waiver from its task of support to Buddhism? Is there evidence to highlight differences between prominent lay-persons and those that monks encountered on a daily basis? Let us examine some of these queries through the available stories.

Ghatāsana Jātaka[50] tells us that the Buddha, while stationed at Jetavana had asked a monk to train himself well in some specified verses. For the purpose directed by the Buddha, the monk took refuge at a hut near the forest but went to the nearby village for alms. Due to heavy rains his temporary abode was destroyed, which caused failure in his efforts towards perfection of the assigned task. The monk asked his lay-friends in the village to repair his hut. Though they proposed to offer support, but due to unexplainable circumstances they failed to repair the hermitage. The instance clearly points out that support from the laity is understood and seems apparent, but the extent, the circumstances and everyday nuances had their own roles to play. Suvannahamsa *Jātaka*[51] showcases that everyday experiences of the laity for their support to the sangha were not always pleasant. A lay-follower at the city of *Sāvatthi* offered to donate the *bhikkhunī saṅgha* with generous supply of garlic which he did as well. But once a greedy bhikkhuni, named Nanda, along with her group, took more than individual share. The caretaker of the fields of the lay follower remarked on their greediness and reported the matter to his master who in turn went to seek the presence of the Buddha to narrate the episode. The Avaricious nature of members of the monastic order could irk the laity to stop further supplies. Hence, the Buddha narrates the story of the past to tarnish greediness of his disciples. On a similar note, is also *Kuṭidūsaka Jātaka*[52] which gives evidence of inappropriate behaviour of a novice. The story deals largely with the problem of a young disobedient novice who troubles the elder *Mahā* Kassapa. The disobedient and evil-minded novice on a particular round for alms with the elder recognised the house of his retainers and on another day went to the same household alone to fetch a meal of his choice, on account of the elder's illness. Often generosity of the laity could become a ready source for exploitation at the hands of certain members of the order. Brahmadatta *Jātaka*[53] instantiates an account of a greedy monastic who asked for alms importunately and irked the laity. His ways of seeking alms annoyed the Buddha, who confronted and reprimanded him on his ways. He then unfolded a story of the olden days whereby wise men, when asked by the king on their choice for gift, kept in mind the sensitivity of the doner. Even though all that the wise man desired was a pair of single soled shoes[54], did so, but in private. The story certainly adds to the variance in evidence on the issue of alms. Not on materiality (in terms of value, quantity etc.) per say but on ways of seeking. On the issue of shoes there is yet another story of *Saṅkha Jātaka*.[55] A certain lay-man gave an invitation to the Buddha and the monks in the specific order for a feast. He made elaborate arrangements, of raising a pavilion which was splendidly equipped. For seven days he offered a

delightful feast to the Buddha and his five hundred monks that accompanied him. On the seventh day, he gifted all, with requisites (*sabbaparikkhāradānaṁ*). To these, he added special gifts of valuable shoes (*upahanasamghāto*) for the Buddha and his Chief disciples, *Sāriputta* and *Mahā Moggallāna* and all five hundred monks. The Buddha thanked him for his benevolence but refused to accept shoes as gifts. To justify his denial, he narrated an old-world story with devastating karmic repercussions. To substantiate the monastic rules on the prescribed requisites, the Buddha tells the story of the past. Through the device of stories that were transmitted widely, the Buddha sets the rules of discipline to be maintained by both the monastics and the laity in a more accepting way. The lucidity of the story and the baggage of reverberation, may have come in handy, as prescribed rules must have been incomprehensible to many in the community at large.

Greed on the part of the monks/nuns was condemned in the stories in the word of the Buddha himself. Not just were the ways of seeking important, the ways in which the laity offered the requisites was an equal matter of concern. Kesava *Jātaka*[56] opens with the depiction of the household (gehe) of the laity *Anātha Piṇḍika*, where the standard number of the narrative, five hundred monks (pañ*cannaṁ bhikkhusatāni*) could feast at a time. The king of Kosala (*kosalarājā*), also a follower of the faith of Buddha observes the splendid and generous act of alms giving by the chief treasurer (*Mahāseṭṭhi*). The king, too, decides to feed the monks with both quantity and variety. The king ordered for the construction of an assembly for alms. Great amount and variety of food was made available. But the monks did approve of the way in which the attendants of the kings' court dispensed the food, especially lacking kindness (dayakanan abhava). Result being that the monks took the food from the palace and went back to the houses of their respective retainers, with whom they exchanged the royal food for their meals. The king, on noticing absence of monks from the alms assembly and gaining knowledge of the matter, seeks the presence of the Buddha. The Buddha then explained to the king that food which is gently given with love tastes the best. Also, those eating places are sought for, where friendly ties are accorded. Dasa- *Brāhmaṇa Jātaka*[57] intimates us about an observation on the part of monks and their discussion on inequity observed by the king of Kosala (*kosalarājā*) in distribution of requisites as gifts. Particularly between the Buddha along with his chief disciples (*jeṭṭhakaṁ*) and the common monks (*bhikkhusatāni*) who accompanied them. Hence the monks therefore expressed that "in giving the incomparable gift, gave it in the case of much merit."[58] Gifting in discrimination is co-opted with an old reference point (story of the past), by the Buddha to elucidate and sanctify the context. Excessive gifting is also highlighted in Sivi *Jātaka*[59] where a lavish robe is presented to the Buddha by the king of Kosala (the omnipresent royal laity) in the story of the present and pulling out of one's eyes for the sake of others in the story of the past. Such stories are markers of raising standards for following Buddhist principles and virtues. Hence, a complex range of evidence gets displayed through careful reading of the stories. Overtly expressive and emotive strategies are crafted to reflect on basic Buddhist undercurrents.

Through a few stories exemplified above a moral order of both give and take is harnessed by the Buddha to maintain a relation of equilibrium for support, sustenance and seeking merit. Equilibrium of interdependence through the ideology/faith of Buddhism with its principles of compassion (karuna), generosity (dana) and friendliness (metta) are maintained. Rightful and meaningful behavioural conduct for the community at large is justly dispensed by the presence of the Buddha himself in the stories.

Buddha not only specified on conduct of the members of the order to be maintained towards alms seeking but appropriate conduct and appearance on venturing out of the premises of the order. For instance, *Cammasāṭaka Jātaka*[60]tells us about a monk, who wore leather (camman) made inner and outer robes (*nivāsanañ* ca parupanañ ca). As he went on his round for alms, he was attacked by a ram, a horned animal (elako). He did not foresee this as any danger, but thought it to be a kind of respect by the animal (elako) to him. Such was his pride and lack of apt judgement that he met a fatal end. Wearing of right robes, on alms round was an essential part of the code of conduct of the order. Ambacora *Jātaka*[61] informs us about a perfidious monk, who watched over the fruits of a mango tree in an orchard (ambavanam). In order to keep vigilance, he even built a small hut near the Jetavana (paccente ambavane *pannasālaṁ* karetva), the monastery of which he was a member. One day while he was on his rounds for alms (bhikkacharam), a band of thieves (*ambacorakā*) plucked off the mangoes, ate them and fled. Accidently, at the same time four daughters of a merchant (catasso *seṭṭhidhitaro*) after bathing in river, *Acaravatī*, moved into the orchard (*ambavanaṁ* parisimsu). The monk on seeing the mangoes that he dearly cherished vanished, accused the four girls of theft. He subsequently let them off but only after taking a verbal oath from each. Thus, he put them to shame. This not only highlights avaricious behavior on the part of a certain monk who desired the mango fruit even though he had to live on alms as per the vocation he had sought and got initiated into. His act of making four young girls take oath for their claim of being innocent certainly did not go down well with the lay-followers who supported the Buddhist sangha. Such stories reflect diversities not just in lay-monastic interrelations but also throw valuable light on the variance of evidence to the much-romanticized renunciation that Buddhism has often been perceived with.

Pīṭha Jātaka[62] is yet another account where ready availability of alms at the laity's household does not seem an easy possibility. The story narrates an account of a certain monk who queries Buddha on who would look after his sustenance as he was new to the city of Savatthi. To which the Buddha replied the chief treasurer (*mahāseṭṭhi*) *Anātha Piṇḍika* and the revered lay-sister (*mahāupasikā*) *Vishākhā*. The monk arrived at the entrance of house (*ghardvaraṁ*) of the wealthy treasurer at early hours of the morning. Hence nobody attended to him. The same gets repeated at the lay-sister *Vishākhā*'s residence. Result being he did not get even gruel of rice for his intake. He returned to the Jetavana and went about reviling the two prominent households who were staunch Buddhist supporters. The Buddha narrates an old-world story to assuage his anger about an ascetic, who did not lose his temper on not receiving alms. The story clearly addresses that expecting ready availability of

requisites, at unseasoned time was not advisable to the members of the order. *Anātha Piṇḍika* (*mahāseṭṭhi*) and *Vishākhā* (*Mahāupasikā*) have certainly used as a narrative ploy to convey to the members of the order that even the wealthy and ardent supporters of the faith, may be unable to support if deliberated at an inappropriate hour. Alms giving and receiving does not appear as a smooth exchange with perennial consistencies. Hence the story provides a window to glean subtleties in the relations of the sangha and the laity which certainly adds to the dynamics of their interfaces and interdependence.

Babbu *Jātaka*[63] also narrates an account of a lay-woman who was a stream earner (*sotāpannā*) whose daughter *kāṇā* was married off to a man of the same caste in the nearby village (aññataresmin *gāmake samānajātiyassa* purisassa *adāsi*). She had come to her parental house for a few days to see her mother. On hearing that a messenger (*dūtam*) sent by her husband wishing to have her back she asks leave from her mother. But since she could not send her off empty handed the mother began to make cakes (puvam paci) for her. Just as one was prepared a monk (eko *piṇḍacāriko* Bhikkhu) arrived at the doorstep for alms. Being a true believer of the faith and realising her duty to give alms she gave the cake (puvam). Just as she prepared the second one (puvam), another monk arrived for alms and the same occured in a chain. This deferred the departure of her daughter which annoyed her husband who at once took another woman in marriage (aññam pajapatim *ānesi*). The stories exemplified above display that it was not always fruitful for the laity to be overly generous to the monastics. Though in prescriptive terms gifting aids in merit making, in everyday life matters it could be tedious and often displeasing. At some instance in the latter story, they may cause irretrievable harm to the laity. What is suggestive through a few stories instantiated above is that a fine line was the key to preserve a symbiotic relation between the sangha and the laity. The fine line was to prevent abuse of the means of dependence on laity. Equally essential was to sustain linkages of the sangha with the laity. The monks were to regulate their lives in a way that they could maintain pleasantness in conduct and gave no room for complaint. On the contrary to the above story is *Avāriya Jātaka*[64] where a ferryman caused trouble to a monk. The story apprises about a ferryman (ekam *titthanāvikam*), who was ignorant (*bālo* ahosi) in the essence of the three jewels of Buddha (*Buddhādīnaṁ ratanānaṁ*). Resultantly was harsh and hasty in his dealings. A said monk from a village (Janapado bhikkhu), willing to cross over river *Acaravatī* to mark presence to the Buddha at Jetavana requested him to be sailed through. At first the ferryman refused but on further insistence agreed grudgingly. Such was the way in which he steered the boat that it drenched the monk's robes(civaram) which prevented him from seeking the Buddha's presence on the said day. Everyday lives and constructions mark a stark shift from the all benevolent, generous imagery of the laity in the Buddhist tradition. *Jātaka* stories certainly seem to provide insights into them.

Bharu *Jātaka*[65] acquaints us with the king of Kosala, who was a lay devotee himself and bestowed the sangha with lavish offerings. This created enough worry and resentment among other prevalent faiths as they did not receive the same gains (*annatithiyā* pane *paribbājaka* na *sakkatā* honti). They

desired an enclosure just like the Jetavana. To be able to construct one of its kinds for themselves, they bribed the king who granted them the permission. As the Buddhist monastics and the Buddha gained knowledge of the matter, they took to resolve the matter by stopping the construction of the structure at once. The monks including elders at the order went to seek the presence of the king and stood at the palace doors. But the king did not grant them a meeting. Then to set the matter straight, the Buddha dressed in his robe and carrying his bowl, followed by five hundred brothers went to meet the king in whom he had no choice but to subdue to the blessed one. The moral is set that by making virtuous people at loggerheads with each other, kings get dispossessed of their kingdom. In other words, meant that belief and support to Buddhism alone could make their rule sturdy and be embraced with longevity. The rhetoric of the Samaññaphala sutta often resonates in various ways in the stories (as has been highlighted above). Laity that marked means of sustenance, habitation and patronage to the sangha often did not fall prey to demands and pressures of other intellectual trends. The placement of the king of Kosala was nothing but a narrative devise to highlight the issue and its gravity clarifying that royalty was no exception. Continuance of interdependence was just not followed by sheer prescribed rules, but had to balanced and counterbalanced by both the monastics and the laity for maintenance and furthering the aim of the religion, especially its spread and continuity.

Chavaka *Jātaka*[66] informs us that the Buddha on gaining knowledge of a certain set of monks numbering six (chabbagiye) taught the law or Buddhist Dhamma to pupil seated on a lower seat than them (nice *āsane nisīditvā* ucce *āsane* nisinnassa dhammam *desethō*). The matter infuriated the Buddha as it was clear transgression of the monastic rules.[67] He summoned them at once and reiterated his stand for respect for his law (dhamma) enforced through rules (vinaya). He then narrated the story of the past where other prevailing ideologies referred to as heretical sects often showed such disrespect towards teachers and pupils on matter of seating which were interrupted by the Bodhisatta who not only showed wisdom but also informed on karmic repercussions for such acts. Respect towards Buddhist monastic teachers enforced through disciplinary rules in the story of the present (Paccuppanavattu) and harped on through karmic repercussions in the story of the past (*Atītavatthu*) clearly lays precedence to monastics within the Buddhist community as they were entrusted with the prerogative to preach the teachings of Buddhism.

It has been pointed pot by scholars[68] that many a time lay followership was not exclusive to a single faith and there are instances of overlap in people faith. In their opinion in all possibility, certain lay followers were not exclusive adherents to the faith of the Buddha alone. Neru *Jātaka*[69] provides insight into a frontier village (*paccantagāmam*) that honoured and supported šramanas alike. A novice, on gaining ground in meditation (Satthu santike *Kammaṭṭhānnam* gahetva), moves to a frontier village (ekam *paccantagāmaṁ agamāsi*), where the inhabitants provided him with requisites. They provided him with food, built a hut for him near the forest (araññe *paṇṇasālam karitvā*) and paid respect to him but over a period of time, as other holy men came by (eke sassatavada *āgamimsu*) he realised that they did the same for several others who either believed in permanence of matter, those

who deny immortality and also those who roamed about in a naked state. Lack of exclusive adherence to the Buddha's faith and failing to realise worthy/unworthy (*guṇāguṇaṁ*) created distress in him and he deported back to Jetavana, after the culmination of the rainy season and *pavāraṇā*[70]. He expresses his displeasure to the Buddha on viewing lack of knowledge among the villagers on allegiance to either of quality or without (*guṇāguṇam*). Such references are to be mentioned not for the rarity but to enhance the variable of laity, and kinds of support that they grant. The *Jātakas* thus offer a vivid imagery of the laity and the monastics through their multilayered and dually timed structure. Through the diversity that the *Jātakas* array, complexities of societal structures, their linkages and dimensions, can be discerned from within and outside of the sangha through interplay of the components of the Buddhist community.

Conclusion

The paper has attempted to get an understanding of the Buddhist community with its various components in general and the laity in particular to address issues of everyday working of the religion and its various structures. The paper begins to address the origin of a perception of Buddhism as another worldly religion and the vicissitudes of academic tropes that follow. Recent scholarship and nuanced insights have brought about a different trajectory of the renunciatory tradition within Buddhism. The paper attempted to unravel the layers of understanding, working and camaraderie of the components of the Buddhist community. *Jātakas* though canonical were recited to the laity and were meant to develop their understanding towards Buddhism and hence can prove to lay ground for convergence. Through an analysis of everyday experiences culled out from dually timed, multi layered narratives of the Jatakas, interfaces of the various components of the Buddhist community can be drawn which in turn vehemently questions the image of the romanticized renunciation.

ENDNOTES

[1] Brumm, 2018, 'A Solitude of Permeable Boundaries: The Abbey of La Trappe between Isolation and Engagement', in Enenkel Karl and Gottler Christine ed. Solitudo: Spaces, Places and Times of Solitude in Spaces, Places and Times of Solitude in late Medieval and Early Modern Cultures, Brill, Leiden, pp.452.

[2] Weber, Max, 1958 trans., The religion In India: The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism, London, pp.122 It was weber's third book on the sociology of religion where he places the two religions in the larger context of Asian Belief systems and the specific structure of society in India. Weber called Buddhism as "virtuosos", Buddhist monks who performed heroic feats of fasting and meditation in pursuit of absolute truth.

[3] Swearer, K., Donald, 1997, 'The Worldliness of Buddhism', The Wilson Quarterly, Vol-21, No.2, Spring, pp.81.

[4] Gombrich, Richard, 2018, 'Max Weber and the Study of Buddhism Today', Max Weber Studies, Vol 18, No 1, pp.20-41.
[5] Clarke, Shayne, 2014, Family Matters in Indian Buddhism, University of Hawai Press, Honolulu, pp.1.
[6] Hodgson, Brian, 1828, 1972 edn., 'Essays on the languages, literature and Religion of Nepal and Tibet; together with further papers on the Geography, Ethnology and Commerce of these countries', Corrected and augmented edn ed. by Mahadeva Prasad Saha and other additions, Philo Press, Amsterdam.
[7] Buchanan, Francis, 1799, 'On the Religion and literature of the Burmas', Transactions of the Society instituted in Bengal, for inquiring into the history and the antiquities, the arts, sciences and literature of Asia, 6:163-308,
[8] Spence, R., Hardy, 1850, 1990 edn., 'An account of the law, Discipline, Sacred Writings, Mysterious Rites, Religious Ceremonies and the present Circumstances of the order of the Mendicants founded by Gotama Buddha', Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series 49, Sat guru Publications, Delhi.
[9] Oldenberg, H., 1896, Ancient India: Its languages and Religions, Open Court Publishing Company, London.
[10] Horner, I.B., 1930, Women Under Primitive Buddhism: Almswomen and Laywomen, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi.
[11] He divides the categories of Buddhist monks as a). Cenobites b). Anchorites c). Sarabites d). Gyrovagi. See Dutt, 1924, 1996 edn. Early Indian Monasticism, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi.
[12] Ibid, pp.93
[13] Spiro, Melford, 1970, Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and its Burmese Vicissitudes, University of California Press, Berkeley, pp.19. Also, Spiro proposed three forms of Buddhism being distinct from each other 1). 'Apotropaic': It involved day to day activities of the community and individuals to improve conditions involving magical means like amulets, chants and so on. 2). 'Kammatic': Practice that is concerned with acquiring merit and producing a better rebirth. This is acquired through generosity and ethical conduct. 3).' *Nibbānic*': Buddhist practice that aimed directly at the attainment of *nibbāna* which was to be through the practise of meditation.
[14] Gombrich, Richard, 1975, 'Buddhist Karma and Social Control', Comparative Studies in Society and History, 17, no.212-220, pp.216. Gombrich in turn basis his argument on the writings of Dumont harping on the view of renunciation of the social world (Sansar) but not of the material universe (Jagat). pp.216
[15] Bailey and Mabbet, 2003, The Sociology of Early Buddhism, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.163
[16] Collins, Steven, 1992, Selfless Persons, Imagery and Thought in Theravada Buddhism, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[17] Salomon, Richard, 2000, A Gandhari version of the Rhinoceros Sutra, University of Washington, Seattle.
[18] Brekke, Torkel, 1997, 'The Early Sangha and Laity', Journal of International Association of Buddhist Studies, Vol 20, Nov.2.
[19] Brekke, Torkel, 2002, Religious Motivation and the origin of Buddhism, Routledge-Curzon, London. Brekke highlights through the Vinaya texts in particular that not all converts were drawn to Buddhism because of the intrinsic merit of the doctrine. Early converts were depicted as being won or spell bound by the eloquence of the disciples and the greatness of the master himself. But he posits that many of the converts joined for other reasons. He illuminates with specific examples from the sources to display extrinsic factors like some soldiers joined to escape military service, debtors joined to escape debt, and poor joined to acquire basic necessities that was provided for being in the sangha. pp.22-24
[20] Schopen, Gregory, 1997, 'Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: Lay/Monk Distinction and the Doctrine of the Transference of Merit', in Bones, Stones and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India, University of Hawai Publication, Honolulu. pp.23
[21] Hinüber, Oskar Von, 2006, 'Everyday Life in Ancient Indian Buddhist Monastery', Annual report of the International Research Institute of Advanced Buddhology at Soka University.
[22] Ohnuma, Reiko, 2012, Ties that Bind: Maternal Imagery and Discourse in Indian Buddhism, OUP, New York.
[23] Clarke, Shayne, 2014, Family Matters in Indian Buddhism, University of Hawai Press, Honolulu.
[24] Chakravarti, Uma, 1981, Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism, Munshiram Manoharlal and Sons, Delhi, pp. 65-93
[25] Roy, Kumkum, 2014, 'Contextualising Caste: Co-option, Circumvention and Contestation as Exemplified in the *Jātakas*', Studies in People's History, 1.1, 7-20; Roy, Kumkum, 2015, 'Society at the time Of Buddha", In Nathan and French ed. Buddhism and Law: An Introduction', Cambridge University Press, pp.31-45; Roy, Kumkum 2015, 'Worlds within and World's Without: Representations of the Sangha in Popular Tradition', in Roy and Sahai ed. Looking Within, Looking Without: Exploring Households in the subcontinent Through Time, Essays in Memory of Nandita Prasad Sahai, Primus, New Delhi.
[26] Gethin, Rupert, 1998, Foundations of Buddhism, OUP, Oxford, pp.108.
[27] Gethin, Rupert, op.cit, pp105
[28] The table is not comprehensive but only exemplifies some of the suttas meant for the laity. Some of these suttas are found in the *Jātaka* stories for example, Mangala sutta is presented through a story in the Maha- mangala *Jātaka* no. 453
[29] The Early historical period.
[30] *Jātaka* I, no. 40, story of the present and the story of the past

[31] Ibid, pp.101 “attano *pacchimakālaṁ anoloketvā dhanaṁ niharitvā samaṇaṁ Gotamaṁ* yeva *pūreti*, n’eva *vanjjaṁ* payojeti na kammante *paṭṭhapeti*.”

[32] *Jātaka* III, no. 340, story of the past

[33] Visayha’s wife is recognised as Rahul’s mother in the *Samodhāna*.

[34] *Jātaka* III, no.316, story of the present

[35] *Jātaka* IV, no. 494, story of the present

[36] Ibid, pp.223

[37] *Jātaka* IV, no.506, story of the present

[38] *Jātaka* V, no. 511, story of the present

[39] *Jātaka* V. no. 524, story of the present

[40] *Jātaka* VI, no. 543, story of the present

[41] *Jātaka* IV, no. 505, story of the past

[42] *Jātaka* III, no.332, story of the past

[43] Ibid, pp. 279 and Ibid, pp.70 respectively “Alaso *gihī kāmabhogi* na *sādhu*, asaññato pabbajito na *sādhu rājā* na *sādhu anisammakāti* yo *paṇḍito* kodhano *taṁ* na *sādhu*.”

[44] *Jātaka* I, no. 16, story of the present

[45] *Jātaka* I, no.37, story of the present

[46] Ibid, pp.93 “na hi bhikave *mayhaṁ sāsane aggāsanādini* patva *khattiyakulā* pabbajito *pamāṇaṁ*, na *brahmaṇkulā* na *gahapatikulā* pabbajito na vinayadharo na suttantiko *nā* bhi dhammiko na *pathamajjanādilābhino*

[47] *Jātaka* IV, no.496, story of the present

[48] *Jātaka* I, no. 92, story of the present

[49] Ibid, pp.

[50] *Jātaka* I, no. 133, story of the present

[51] *Jātaka* I, no.136, story of the present

[52] *Jātaka* III, no. 321, story of the present

[53] *Jātaka* III, no. 323, story of the present

[54] Shoes with more than a single lining were not to be worn by the monastics, except when they were warded off. *Mahāvagga*, I, pp.28

[55] *Jātaka* IV, no. 442, story of the present

[56] *Jātaka* III, no. 346, story of the present

[57] *Jātaka* IV, no. 495, story of the present

[58] Ibid, pp.227 “avuso *rājā asadisadānaṁ* dento *viciniṭvā mahāphalaṭṭhāne adās*îti.”

[59] *Jātaka* IV. no. 499, story of the present and past

[60] *Jātaka* III, no. 324, story of the past and present.

[61] *Jātaka* III, no. 344, story of the present

[62] *Jātaka* III, no. 337, story of the present

[63] *Jātaka* I, no. 137, story of the present

[64] *Jātaka* III, no. 376, story of the present

[65] *Jātaka* II, no. 213, story of the present

[66] *Jātaka* III, no. 309, story of the present

[67] It led to transgressing the Sekhia rule no. 68,69, Oldenberg, V.T. IV, Sutta Vibhanga, pp.203

[68] Gombrich, (1998) and Schopen, (1997)

[69] *Jātaka* III, no. 379, story of the present

[70] A Festival that is celebrated to mark the end of rainy season.

REFERENCES:

1. Cowell et.al, 1957 edn. Jatakas or Stories of Buddhas Former Births, vol 1and 2., Luzac, London.
2. Brumm, 2018, 'A Solitude of Permeable Boundaries: The Abbey of La Trappe between Isolation and Engagement', in Enenkel Karl and Gottler Christine ed. Solitudo: Spaces, Places and Times of Solitude in Spaces, Places and Times of Solitude in late Medieval and Early Modern Cultures, Brill, Leiden
3. Weber, Max, 1958 trans., The religion In India: The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism, London
4. Swearer, K., Donald, 1997, 'The Worldliness of Buddhism', The Wilson Quarterly, Vol-21, No.2, Spring,
5. Gombrich, Richard, 2018, 'Max Weber and the Study of Buddhism Today', Max Weber Studies, Vol 18, No 1,
6. Hodgson, Brian, 1828, 1972 edn., 'Essays on the languages, literature and Religion of Nepal and Tibet; together with further papers on the Geography, Ethnology and Commerce of these countries', Corrected and augmented edn ed. by Mahadeva Prasad Saha and other additions, Philo Press, Amsterdam.
7. Spence, R., Hardy, 1850, 1990 edn., 'An account of the law, Discipline, Sacred Writings, Mysterious Rites, Religious Ceremonies and the present Circumstances of the order of the Mendicants founded by Gotama Buddha', Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series 49, Sat guru Publications, Delhi.
8. Oldenberg, H., 1896, Ancient India: Its languages and Religions, Open Court Publishing Company, London
9. Horner, I.B., 1930, Women Under Primitive Buddhism: Almswomen and Laywomen, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi.
10. Dutt, 1924, 1996 edn. Early Indian Monasticism, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi.

11. Spiro, Melford, 1970, Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and its Burmese Vicissitudes, University of California Press, Berkeley
12. Gombrich, Richard, 1975, 'Buddhist Karma and Social Control', Comparative Studies in Society and History, 17, no.212-220
13. Collins, Steven, 1992, Selfless Persons, Imagery and Thought in Theravada Buddhism, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
14. Bailey and Mabbet, 2003, The Sociology of Early Buddhism, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
15. Salomon, Richard, 2000, A Gandhari version of the Rhinoceros Sutra, University of Washington, Seattle.
16. Brekke, Torkel, 1997, 'The Early Sangha and Laity', Journal of International Association of Buddhist Studies, Vol 20, Nov.2.
17. Brekke, Torkel, 2002, Religious Motivation and the origin of Buddhism, Routledge-Curzon, London.
18. Schopen, Gregory, 1997, 'Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: Lay/Monk Distinction and the Doctrine of the Transference of Merit', in Bones, Stones and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India, University of Hawai Publication, Honolulu.
19. Hinüber, Oskar Von, 2006, 'Everyday Life in Ancient Indian Buddhist Monastery', Annual report of the International Research Institute of Advanced Buddhology at Soka University.
20. Ohnuma, Reiko, 2012, Ties that Bind: Maternal Imagery and Discourse in Indian Buddhism, OUP, New York.
21. Clarke, Shayne, 2014, Family Matters in Indian Buddhism, University of Hawai Press, Honolulu.
22. Chakravarti, Uma, 1981, Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism, Munshiram Manoharlal and Sons, Delhi,
23. Roy, Kumkum, 2014, 'Contextualising Caste: Co-option, Circumvention and Contestation as Exemplified in the *Jātakas*', Studies in People's History, 1.1.
24. Roy, Kumkum, 2015, 'Society at the time Of Buddha", In Nathan and French ed. Buddhism and Law: An Introduction', Cambridge University Press.
25. Roy, Kumkum 2015, 'Worlds within and World's Without: Representations of the Sangha in Popular Tradition', in Roy and Sahai ed. Looking Within, Looking Without: Exploring Households in the subcontinent Through Time, Essays in Memory of Nandita Prasad Sahai, Primus, New Delhi.
26. Gethin, Rupert, 1998, Foundations of Buddhism, OUP, Oxford.
27. Gombrich, Richard, 1998, Theravada Buddhism: A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo, London

28. Baudh, S. (2025). Prominence of Jataka tales in Indian history. Bodhi-Path, 29, 1–4.
29. Singh, A. (2024). Dhamma in practice: The life of Vessantara. Bodhi-Path, 26(1), 20–28.