

51. The Pratyeka-Buddha in Buddhism and Jainism*

1. Introduction

<92> Until recently, the most detailed account on the subject of the pratyeka-buddha available in a Western language was that of L. de La Vallée Poussin in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.¹ This was based on Sanskrit sources. In 1974 Ria Kloppenborg published a monograph which aimed to study the concept of the pratyeka-buddha in the Pāli canonical and commentarial literature.² Although this was useful as a supplement to the earlier Sanskrit-based study, it seems likely that the value of any study based on one tradition alone will be limited, even if carried out well. To judge from published reviews,³ Kloppenborg’s study is not entirely satisfactory.

In his review J.W. de Jong has drawn attention to recent work done by others on the subject.⁴ Although Fujita Kotatsu’s article on the pratyeka-buddha⁵ is accessible only to those who can read Japanese, the translation into English of his article on “One vehicle or three?”,⁶ and the publication of de Jong’s review⁷ of L. Hurvitz’s translation of the Lotus Sūtra, in which he comments upon certain remarks which Hurvitz makes about the form of the word pratyeka-buddha, have made welcome contributions to the study of the subject.

In the article just mentioned, Fujita states that he abides by his earlier conclusion that the pratyeka-buddhas are non-Buddhist in origin.

---

⁴ His review (see previous note), p. 322.
⁶ K. Fujita “One vehicle or three?”, Journal of Indian Philosophy, 3 (1975), pp. 79–166.
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and he supports this by reference to the occurrence of the concept of pratyeka-buddhas in Jainism. He states that “a natural conclusion would be that the word pratyeka-buddha was already in general use by the time Buddhism and Jainism made their appearance”.¹ I would agree with Fujita in this matter, and in this paper I should like to consider certain pieces of evidence to which Fujita does not refer, but which support his main argument and at the same time throw light upon some of the problems which still remain in connection with the concept of the pratyeka-buddha.

2. The four pratyeka-buddhas

<93> The four pratyeka-buddhas common to Buddhism and Jainism are named in a śloka verse in the Jain Uttarajhayana-sutta (18.46), together with the names of the cities where they ruled.² They are not designated as pratyeka-buddhas nor are the signs which led to their enlightenment named there. They appear in an ārya verse in the nijjuti, which is quoted with the śloka verse by Devendra in his commentary (and quoted from there by H. Jacobi): Karakaṇḍu (bull), Dummuh (banner), Nami (bracelet), and Naggai (mango tree).³ The prose stories given by Devendra are much later than the nijjuti, but three of the stories conclude with verses in the triṣṭūḥ metre, which is normally found only in early Jain texts, so the verses may be quotations from an older text. These verses link the kings, not by name, but by city title, to the signs.⁴ Again they are not specified as pratyeka-buddhas in the verses.

¹ Fujita, op. cit., p. 103.
² Karakaṇḍu Kalingesu Pamečalesu ya Dummhuho.
³ Nami rāyā Videhesu Gandhāresu ya Naggai.
⁴ vashe ya indakeū valae ambe ya pupphie bohī.
Karakaṇḍu-Dummuhassā Namissa Gandhāra-ranno ya. (H. Jacobi, Erz., p. 34).
seyaṃ sujayaṃ suvibhata-siṅgaṃ jo pāṣyā vasaham goṭṭha-majhe riddhiṃ ariddhiṃ samupehiyāṇaṃ Kalinga-rāya vi samikkha dammanaṃ. jo indakeū suvalaṃkiyaṃ tam daṭṭhām padantām paviluppamānaṃ riddhiṃ ariddhiṃ samupehiyāṇaṃ Paṅcāla-rāya vi samikkha dammaṃ. baluyāna saddayaṃ soccā egassa ya asaddayaṃ valayāna Nami rāyā nikkhanto Mahilāhivo.
sou cūya-rukkhaṃ tu maṃabhirāmaṃ sa-maṅjarī-pallava-puppha-cittam riddhiṃ ariddhiṃ samupehiyāṇaṃ Gandhāra-rāya vi samikkha dammaṃ.
The Pāli tradition similarly has a verse in śloka metre naming the four kings and their cities, which closely resembles the Jain verse. It does not designate them as pratyeka-buddhas. There is similarly no ancient verse which specifically states which sign enlightened which king, but there are four verses (in the triṣṭubh metre apart from one jagati pāda) which give the four signs, viz. a mango tree, a bracelet, a bird, and a bull. Not only is one sign different from the Jain list, but the precise details also differ somewhat from the Jain account. The prose portion of the Jātaka, much later of course than the verses, links them as follows: Karaṇḍu (mango tree), Naggaji (bracelet), Nimi (bird), and Dummukha (bull). The slight change in two of the names (Namī/Nimi and Karakandul/Karaṇḍu), the difference of one sign, and the total rearrangement of signs for each king make it quite clear that neither religion borrowed the stories from the other.

We may rather deduce that, as Charpentier pointed out, the stories are common to both religions because they stem from a common tradition. The variations just mentioned are consistent with a theory that Buddhism and Jainism took over the stories of the four pratyeka-buddhas in an early form consisting of the list of names and the list of signs, but not so closely linked that rearrangement was impossible. Similar changes in linked names and verses can be pointed out elsewhere. The fact that the differences are found in the Uttarajjhayana-sutta and the Jātaka, two of the oldest Jain and Buddhist texts, makes it clear that the origin of the story of <94> the four pratyeka-buddhas must be dated at a time appreciably earlier than those two texts, to allow time for the confusion

1 Karaṇḍu nāma Keliṅgānaṁ Gandhārānaṁ ca Naggaji Nimīrāja Vidēhānaṁ Paṅcāldaṇaṁ ca Dummuṅka
(ete raṭṭhāni hiśvāna pabbajīṣu akiṃcanā). (Ja III 381,16–17)
2 amb’ ahaṁ adānaṁ vanamantarasmiṁ nilobhāsaṁ phalinaṁ saṃvīraḷhaṁ
tam adāsaṁ phalaḥetū vibhaggam tamaṁ disvā bhikkhacariyaṁ carāmi.
selam suṣṭhaṁ naravāranaṁ nāri yugam dhāraya oppasadām
dutiyaṁ ca ēgamma adosi sado maṁ disvā bhikkhacariyaṁ carāmi.
dījā dījā kunapam āharantar ekam samānaṁ bahukā samecca
āhaaraceta paripātyavīmaṁ tam disvā bhikkhacariyaṁ carāmi.
usabh’ āhaṁ adānaṁ yūhassa majjhe calakkakum vannabali-pappam
tam adāsaṁ kāmaheṭā viṭṭham tamaṁ disvā bhikkhacariyaṁ carāmi. (Ja III 380,6–21).
3 Jarl Charpentier, Paceckabuddhageschichten, Uppsala 1908, pp. 35 foll.
to arise.

As stated above, the kings are not called pratyeka-buddhas in these early texts. In the oldest Jain account we have of Nami in the Uttarajjayana-sutta, there is no mention of the sign which led to his enlightenment, and he is called saha-sambuddha.\(^1\) There seems to be no reason to doubt that this means the same as pratyeka-buddha, but elsewhere in the Jain canon the word saha-sambuddha (glossed by Devendra as “one enlightened by himself, not by another”) is used of Mahāvīra himself,\(^2\) or the tīrthamkaras as a whole.\(^3\) Devendra explains that saha- means svayaṃ (“self”),\(^4\) but other commentaries give an explanation which includes the usual meaning for saha- “with”.\(^5\)

In later canonical texts, however, the adjective applied to Mahāvīra is svayaṃ-sambuddha,\(^6\) which would seem to support Devendra’s explanation. When the word buddha occurs in the Jain Āyāranga-sutta, the commentary explains that there are three sorts of buddha: those enlightened by themselves (svayaṃ-buddha), those enlightened by some particular thing (pratyeka-buddha), and those enlightened by another buddha (budhha-bodhita).\(^7\) In the Āyāranga-sutta passage, the commentary can be certain that the buddha being described is buddha-bodhita, because he is said to have heard the words of the wise ones.\(^8\)

---

\(^1\) jāṁ sarītu bhayaṃ saha-sambuddha anuttare dhamme puttam thavettu rajje abhiṇikkamaṁ Nami rōyā (Utt. 9.2).

\(^2\) samane bhagavaṇṇa Mahāvīre āigare tīthagare sahasambuddhe (Aupapātika-sūtra, 16 = 38) = Viyāhappannattī I, 1.5 (= Sutt. 1, 384).

\(^3\) arahantānaṃ bhagavantaṇāṃ āgarānaṃ tīthagarānaṃ sahasambuddhanāṇaṃ (Aupapātika-sūtra, 20).


\(^6\) E.g. Samavēya 2 (= Sutt. I, 316). The change -y- > -h- is rare in Pāli and Prakrit and was doubtless replaced by this. See K.R. Norman, “Two Pāli etymologies”, BSQAS, XLII, 2, pp. 323-34.

\(^7\) Quoted by H. Jacobi, Jaina Sutras I (SBE, Vol. 22), Oxford 1884, p. 66, note 1.

\(^8\) mājhimēnām vayasa vī ege sambujhamāṇā samuṣṭhitā soccā medhāvī
The distinction between hearing and not hearing is emphasized by a passage in the Viyāha-pannatti where the commentary glosses the words “not having heard” by the statement “not having heard means like the pratyeka-buddhas, etc.”

It seems clear that the distinction we find drawn in later Jain texts between svayam-sambuddha, pratyeka-buddha, and buddha-bodhita represents a later attempt to find technical differences between the various terms. There is no evidence that there was thought to be any difference between the first two, at least, of the three terms in the earliest Jain texts. This would support the view that the concept of the pratyeka-buddha was taken over into Jainism from some other source, and the pratyeka-buddha was at first equated with other Jain buddhas. Only later, when a difference was felt to exist between them, did it become necessary to set out the details which made the difference clear.

3. Prakrit patteya-buddha

In Jain texts written in Prakrit the form used as the equivalent of Sanskrit pratyeka-buddha is patteya-buddha. Although this fact is well known, I have not seen any attempt made to draw any conclusions about the strange form of the word. It is unusual for Prakrit in that it shows, not palatalization of -ty- > -cc- as is customary for Middle Indo-Aryan, but assimilation of -ty- > -tt-. Only a handful of examples of such non-palatalization can be given, and with the exception of Pkt patteya, pattiya, pattiyai and Pā. pattiya, pattiyāyati, dūta (cf. jūta < Skt dyūta), dosinā (< *dyotsnā; cf. Skt jyotsnā) and addhābhavati (< adhy-), most of them can be explained in some other way. The CPD suggests that the

\[ \text{vayāṇaṃ pāṃḍiyāṇaṃ nisāṃttā (Āyāraṇga-sutta I, 7, 3, 1).} \]


2 svayambuddhapratyekabuddhānāṃ ca bodhy-upadhi-śruta-linga-kṛto višeṣaḥ (AR, V, 428).

3 Some are abstract nouns, e.g. Pā. vecitta (Skt vaicittha), Pkt āhivatta (Skt ādhipatya), Pkt sāmattha (Skt sāmarthya), Pkt durttha (Skt dauḥṣthya), Pkt satthā (Skt svāsthā). Although the Skt forms are made by taking vyādhi of the first syllable and adding -ya, it is probable that the MIA nouns are analogical formations, following the pattern of those words where the addition of -ya produced doubling of the final consonant, e.g. Pā. ussuka (Skt uṣukya)/Pā. ussukka (Skt autsukya). In MIA, therefore, the rule was effectively “lengthen the first syllable and double the final consonant”. Other examples are absolutives,
last of these examples shows the influence of Sinhalese where \( j \) becomes \( d \), but since the examples of non-palatalization in Prakrit cannot be due to Sinhalese influence, I have elsewhere rejected this suggestion. I believe that the sound change is dialectal, and the forms are borrowings into Prakrit and Pāli from an otherwise unknown dialect of Middle Indo-Aryan where assimilation, not palatalization, was the rule. If this view is correct, then we have to assume that the dialect is an ancient one, since dosinā must have been formed at an early time, before the development \(-dy- > -jy-\), which we find already in Sanskrit, had taken place.

Since the change \(-ty- > -tt-\) is so rare in Pāli and Prakrit, it is unlikely that a redactor coming across for the first time a word containing the group \(-ty-\) (if the word was in its Sanskrit form) or \(-cc-\) (if it was in a Middle Indo-Aryan form), would change it into \(-tt-\). The most likely reason for the appearance of the group \(-tt-\) in Pāli and Prakrit is that the redactor did not recognize the fact that the word containing \(-tt-\)

e.g. Pā. uḍāvata (Skt udāvṛya), Pkt pakkhanda (Skt praskandya). In Skt the absolutes of compound verbs are formed by adding \(-ya\). In MIA we again have analogical formations, based on the pattern of verbs where the addition of \(-ya\) produces a double consonant, e.g. Pā. upagamma (Skt upagamya). The MIA rule, therefore, was “double the final consonant, unless already doubled (or nasalized)”1. Other apparent examples of non-palatalization may not be direct equivalents, e.g. Pkt āitta “sun” may not be from Skt ādīrya but from ādīpta “blazing”.

1 CPD, I. 123, s.v. addhābhavati.

2 K.R. Norman, “The role of Pāli in early Sinhalese Buddhism”, Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries, Göttingen 1978, p. 32. Brough, The Gāndhārī Dharmapada, London 1962, p. 186, suggests the existence of a dialect showing, at least sporadically, the change \( j > d \). If this dialect had also, as is probable, the change \( c > t \), then it could be the source of our forms. From my point of view it makes no difference. I am concerned only with showing that the change \(-ty- > -tt-\) comes from a dialect other than Jain Pkt.

3 Perhaps the change \(-ny- > -nu- not -ānī-\) is also from the same dialect. See Lüders, Beob., §§ 168–72.

4 I use the word “redactor” loosely, to indicate the person or persons who first adopted and adapted a word from one dialect/language into their own dialect/language.
had an equivalent with -ty- or -cc- in his own dialect or language, and therefore did not “translate” it. In the case of the word pattiya, this is easily understood. It is to be derived from Skt pratyaya in the sense of “trust, confidence”, but since it shows palatalization of the second -a- > -i- after the -y- in the consonant group -ty-,¹ it was probably unrecognizable to the redactor. The verbs pattiyaśīlpaṭṭiyyādāti are denominatives from pattiya, and since it is unlikely, though not impossible, that both the Buddhist and Jain traditions would independently invent a denominative verb to the borrowed noun, it is probable that the denominative already existed in the source dialect together with the word pattiya, and was borrowed with it.

It is probable, therefore, that the Prakrit redactor when first faced with the term patteya-buddha did not realize that it was the equivalent of pratyeka-buddha. The most likely reason for his failing to do this is that he did not recognize the concept of the word, that is, both the word patteya-buddha and the concept of a patteya-buddha <96> were borrowings into the Jain tradition. The fact that the Pāli redactor did not write patteya-buddha implies either that the word did not contain the group -tt- when it was first encountered, or that it was there but he was able to “translate” to paccika-buddha, either on his own initiative or because he possessed a commentarial tradition which told him that this was the correct form for his dialect.

¹ K.R. Norman, “MIA Studies XIII: The palatalisation of vowels in MIA”, JOI(B), XXV, p. 331. I can quote pattiya only from late canonical texts in Pāli (Pv, Nidd I, Nidd II) and the non-canonical prose portions of Ja, in the compound para-pattiya. The meaning and etymology seem to have been lost to the tradition underlying Pāli which glosses (125.1): parāpaṭtiyāṁ pareṇa pāpetabbam sādhetabbam. In Nidd I and Nidd II it occurs in the stock phrase na paraneyyo na parapattiyo na parappacayo na parapaṭṭibuddhagu used in the former text of the brāhmaṇa and in the latter of the paccika-buddha. Nidd-a II (136.20) explains na parappacayo as: na assa paro paccayo, na parassa sādhaṁ yattai, rightly seeing the sense of sādha “faith” for paccaya, and explains na parappattiyo as: paccakkadhammattā na aññehi sādahāpetabbo, which correctly connects pattiya with the meaning of sādha. Where pattiya occurs in the Uttarārajāyana-sutta (1.41) it is explained: pattiyaṁ prīyā priyavacabhāṣānādinā, giving the meaning “kindness” (as a development of “faith (in someone)”?), but it cannot be ruled out that the commentator was actually proposing an etymological connection between the two words. The negative apattiya is glossed as krodha “anger”.

4. Sanskrit pratyaya-buddha

Although the fact that in Buddhist Sanskrit texts and in Chinese pratyeka-buddhas are sometimes called pratyaya-buddhas has frequently been commented upon, it is generally assumed that this is a later development based upon a misinterpretation of exegesis.¹ I have seen only one attempt to relate the two words phonologically. That was by Hurvitz, who suggested that pratyeka- could be derived from pratyayika.-² This attempt was properly rejected by de Jong,³ and yet nevertheless I think a good case can be made out for believing that the explanation of the two terms does lie in a phonological relationship between the two words.

The Taxila silver scroll (in Gândhārī Prakrit) contains the word pracaga-budha,⁴ and if this form of the word were known to any redactor, he could well have back-formed it into pratyaya. However, as J. Brough has pointed out,⁵ this form of the word merely reflects the fact that in the Gândhārī Prakrit scribes sometimes did not bother to write a front vowel when the frontness was quite obvious from the phonetic environment, that is when the vowel was in contact with a palatal consonant. It represents, therefore, only a lax method of writing, and has no bearing upon the pronunciation of the word. Such a form would only provide an explanation for the form pratyaya if we could believe that the redactor saw, not heard, this spelling of the word, and standardized it first in his redaction, and then in the whole tradition. This is, perhaps, not very likely.

There is a more likely explanation. In the Gândhārī Prakrit the word pratyaya occurs in the form prace'ā,⁶ with palatalization of the second -a- > -e- (cf. the explanation of pattiyā above). This differs from the

¹ "... meditating on the ... pratyayasamotpāda. This idea gave rise to the use of the term pratyayabuddha” (Kloppenberg, op. cit., p. 10).
³ His review (see above, p. 233, note 7), p. 173.
⁵ Brough, op. cit., p. 82.
⁶ Gândhārī Dharmapada, verse 88.
failure to write -e-, just discussed, in that it reflects not only a spelling change but also a change of pronunciation. This is clear from the other examples of palatalization which I have discussed elsewhere. This form, however, is identical with the form which pratyeka might be expected to have in the Gândhārī Prakrit. A redactor who met the term prace'abuddha might therefore backform it into pratyeka-buddha, or if he was acquainted with the <97> phenomenon of palatalization of vowels he might backform it to pratyaya-buddha.

This could, therefore, be the explanation for the appearance of the form pratyaya-buddha, but the argument, in fact, can work both ways. Not only can prace'a (< Skt pratyeka) be wrongly backformed into pratyaya, but prace'a (< Skt pratyaya) can also be wrongly backformed into pratyeka. The only way to decide which of these two possibilities is correct is to consider the relative chronology of the sound changes involved.

Since we find the form pacceka-buddha (and only pacceka-) in Pāli, and since we find pattaya-buddha (and only pattaya-) in Prakrit, the suggested derivation from pratyaya-buddha can only be correct if we can show that palatalization of vowels took place early enough for it to have occurred before both Pāli and Prakrit adopted the word. Since I have already shown that comparable palatalization had occurred in the word pattiya, which is also to be derived from pratyaya, in the dialect showing -tt- < -ty- from which both Pāli and Prakrit borrowed it, it is clear that this point causes no difficulty.

If the Pāli redactor wrongly backformed prace'a to pacceka, then he must have known of the change of -k- > -y-, which would enable him to replace the -y- he received by -k-. There is no Prakrit literature extant, showing this change, which can be proved to be older than Pāli, but Lüders has given examples2 from Pāli itself which prove that the change of -k- > -y- was earlier than Pāli, and in a discussion of the etymologies found in the Pāli Sabhiya-sutta, I have elsewhere3 given additional reasons for believing that it was certainly possible for such incorrect backformations to be incorporated in the Pāli canon.

---

2 Lüders, Beob., §§133–38.
In our present state of knowledge we can probably go no further than this, but there is certainly no reason on philological grounds to reject out of hand a suggestion that the original form of the word was *pratyaya-buddha*. If we accept this suggestion, then we can deduce the line of transmission. The original must have been transmitted through a dialect which had a palatalized form based upon *pratyeya-buddha*. This in turn, through a dialect of Middle Indo-Aryan which had -tt- < -ty-, produced Prakrit *patteya-buddha*. There is no way of telling whether the Pāli form *pacceka-buddha* was directly derived from the -tt- dialect, but since the Pāli form also shows palatalization and Pāli was (as noted above) long enough in contact with the -tt- dialect to borrow a number of words from it, it <98> seems very likely. Although we cannot rule out the possibility that the Sanskrit and Chinese versions are based upon a source which preserved the original pratyaya unchanged, it seems more likely that, since most Buddhist Sanskrit texts seem to be based upon Prakrit originals, their redactors inherited a palatalized form which they were able to backform correctly, either because they were acquainted with the phenomenon of palatalization (and were capable of recognizing that this was an example of it), or because they had a commentarial tradition which retained the correct meaning of the word.

There is no way of telling whether the Chinese obtained their version of the term from Sanskrit or independently from Prakrit. Brough has shown1 that some Chinese texts were translated from Middle Indo-Aryan versions (possibly, but not certainly, Gāndhārī), not from Sanskrit. Since, as we have seen, the very form which would explain the simultaneous existence of *pratyeka-buddha* and *pratyaya-buddha* actually existed in the Gāndhārī Prakrit, it is very tempting to believe that the Chinese gained their knowledge of the form *pratyaya-buddha* via Gāndhārī. Gāndhārī cannot, however, be the direct source of the Jain Prakrit *patteya-buddha*, since Gāndhārī is not a dialect which forms -tt- from -ty-.

5. “Awakened by pratyaya(s)”

In the two preceding paragraphs I have shown that the term *pratyeka-buddha* could be an incorrect backformation from *patteya-l pacceka-buddha*, and the latter terms could in fact be derived from

---

pratyaya-buddha, and I have indicated the way in which the various
developments of pratyaya-buddha could have been transmitted into the
dialects of Middle Indo-Aryan, Sanskrit and Chinese. Is there any
evidence which might persuade us that this is anything more than a mere
academic exercise?

There is one small piece of philological evidence, unfortunately not
conclusive. Since the other words in Prakrit which undoubtedly show
non-palatalization of the consonant group -ty- are derived from, or based
upon, the word pratyaya, it would seem likely that the third word which
shows the same change has the same etymology. Against this
assumption, however, is the fact that in every occurrence of the Prakrit
development from Skt pratyeka (except late grammatical texts), the
form is patteya. I stated above that the probable reason for the redactor
writing -tt- was the fact that he did not recognize that the word
containing -tt- had an equivalent with <99> -ty- or -cc- in his own dialect
or language, and he therefore did not “translate” it. On the face of it, it
seems unlikely that a redactor would be unable to recognise the word
patteya when it occurred in contexts with the clear meaning
“individual”. If the theory of “non-recognition” is rejected, then we must
fall back on the suggestion that after the term patteya-buddha had been
taken over into Prakrit it was assumed to have the meaning “individual
buddha”, and all other occurrences of the word paceya (which is what
we should expect the Prakrit form of the word to be) in the meaning
“individual” were replaced by the form patteya, by analogy.

It seems probable that the only criterion available for the assessment
of the correctness or otherwise of the suggestion that the original form of
the term was pratyaya-buddha is whether it makes better sense than the
traditional derivation from pratyeka-buddha. In his review of Huvitz’s
translation of the Lotus Sūtra, de Jong refers to Demiéville’s
interpretation of the Chinese term yüan-chüeh as “awakened by
conditions”, and points out that there are two different interpretations of
the compound given by the Chinese translations: (1) awakened through
(the effect of former) conditions, and (2) awakened through (the
understanding of) conditions, taking pratyaya in its usual Buddhist sense
of “condition”. This is, of course, not the only sense of pratyaya, and I
think the answer lies in another direction.

---

1 See Sheth, PSM, s.vv. paceya and patteya.
Among the differences which the Jain commentarial tradition states exist between svayam-buddhas and pratyeka-buddhas is their means of enlightenment. It is said that the former are enlightened without any external cause (nimitta), while the latter (referred to as Karakaṇḍu, etc.) need an external stimulus. Since the word pratyaya is quoted in the Sanskrit dictionaries in the sense of nimitta or hetu, I suggest that we should interpret pratyaya-buddha as “one awakened by an (external) cause”, as opposed to Gotama or Mahāvīra, who were “self-awakened” without any external cause.

Another Jain commentarial tradition does, in fact, give an explanation of pratyeka-buddha which includes the word “dependent upon” using a verbal form (pratītīya) from the same root as pratyaya, which perhaps indicates that the tradition was aware of the fact that the Jain Prakrit form paṭeya-buddha was really connected with pratyaya. If this is so, then it is not too far-fetched to imagine that the Tibetan explanation of a pratyaya-buddha as being “one who meditates upon the pratītiya-samutpāda” is due to the misunderstanding of an earlier explanation which included the word pratītya used in a non-Buddhist way.

6. Buddhist and Jain parallels

If the attempt to draw a parallel between the Buddhist and Jain traditions raises doubts, then it is perhaps worthwhile drawing attention to other similarities in the two traditions. As already stated, in the earliest Jain reference to a pratyeka-buddha he is called saha-sambuddha. The commentary explains saha as svayam, although Schubring suggested svaka. In Tibetan pratyeka-buddhas are called rang-sangs-rgyas, where rang equals Sanskrit sva(ka) or svayam. In Buddhism pratyeka-buddhas

---

2 His review (see above, page 233, note 7), p. 174.
1 tathā hi svayambuddhānām bhāyanimitam antarenāvabodhiḥ pratyeka-buddhānām tu tad-apekṣāyā Karakaṇḍvādīnām īvīti (AR, V, 428).
2 See MW, s.v. pratyaya.
3 pratītīyākāṁ kincid viṣabhādikām anityādibhāvanākāraṇām vasiṣu buddhāḥ buddhāvantaḥ paramārtham iti pratyekabuddhāḥ. (AR, V, 428).
4 Quoted by Kloppenborg, op. cit., p. 10.
5 See above, p. 236, note 4.
6 Walther Schubring, Ācārāṅga-sūtra, Leipzig 1910, p. 106, s.v. saha.
7 E.g. rangbyung as an epithet of Brahma (= Skt svayam-bhū). See Sarat
are regarded as coming between *samma-sambuddhas* and *savakas*. In the stock list in Jainism, the pratyeka-buddhas come between the *kevalins* (i.e. the sambuddhas) and the *savakas*, in precisely the same way.

Both these traditions show the same ambivalence about whether pratyeka-buddhas teach or not. As Fujita has pointed out, the Theravāda canon does not support the idea that Gotama was a pratyeka-buddha until Brahmā persuaded him to teach. The Theravāda distinction between samma-sambuddhas and pacceka-buddhas is that the former are omniscient, while the latter are not. In the late canonical *Apadāna* we read of the fate of fools who do not listen to the words of the pacceka-buddhas, and Buddhaghosa tells of the thera Nālaka, who was taught by the pacceka-buddhas and achieved *pacceka-bodhi*. It is only in the *Suttanipāta-āṭṭhakathā* (probably not by Buddhaghosa, although the author would, like Buddhaghosa, have been following earlier tradition) that we first find the statement in Pāli that a pacceka-buddha cannot bring another to enlightenment. I know of no statement in the early Jain canon that patteya-buddhas do not teach, and in fact S.B. Deo refers to

---


1 Fujita, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

2 See the list given by J. Deleu, *Viyāhapannatti*, Brugge 1970, p. 109. W. Schubring, *Die Lehre der Jainas*, Berlin and Leipzig 1935, § 14 states: "Viy. 895a sehen sie (the patteyabuddhas) neben den letzteren (the titthagaras), doch ohne nähere Angabe, die auch an den beiden einzigen weiteren und übrigens jüngeren Stellen Samav. 123a; Nandi 203a fehlt".


5 *pacceka-buddhānaṃ subhaśītāni caranti lokamhi sadevakamhi.*


6 *Nālakatherasadiso ... pacceka-buddhānaṃ santike ovādam labhiivā paṭivīdha-pacceka-bodhinīna ca* (Mp II 192.7–9).

7 *buddhā sayantã ca bujhanti pare ca bodhenti; pacceka-buddhā sayantã bujhanti na pare bodhenti* (Pj II 51.21–23).
regulations about reading books ascribed to pratyeka-buddhas. A.M. Ghatage, however, quotes a Jain commentary stating that pratyeka-buddhas do not teach others, and Jacoby and Schubring make the same statement, although without quoting their authority for doing so.

7. The assimilation of the pratyeka-buddha into Buddhism and Jainism

In his review of Kloppenborg's study of the pratyeka-buddha, R.F. Gombrich has made a very interesting suggestion. He points out that in early Buddhism one might differentiate a buddha who discovered the dharma for himself and taught it to others, from a disciple (śrāvaka), who learnt of the dharma from such a buddha, who became technically known as sanyās-sambuddha. This doctrine raised the logical possibility of an interstitial category: one who, like a buddha, discovers the dharma for himself, but unlike him does not teach it. This possibility was actualized, and the interstitial figure was called a pratyeka-buddha.

I would put the matter slightly differently, more in line with Fujita's theory. Early Buddhism and Jainism learned of a category of buddhas (from another sect, preaching in a different dialect of Middle Indo-Aryan), whom they wished to incorporate in their own systems. There was a gap between buddha and sāvaka, and it was into that gap that they placed them, gradually defining their attributes until they exactly filled the gap in the way which Gombrich suggests. I think it is possible to see something of the way in which the development of the concept of the pratyeka-buddha occurred, as a result of the attempt to fit it into the existing pattern.

As we have seen, in the oldest Jain reference to Nami he is called saha-sambuddha, i.e. svayam-sambuddha. This is the term used of Mahāvīra and the other tīrthaṅkaras, and Nami is thus being equated

---

3 "The Pratyekabuddhas or Swayamsambuddhas (Sahasambuddha in Prakrit) do not, however, propagate the true Law, as the Tirthankaras do" (Jaina Sūtras II (= SBE, Vol. 45), Oxford 1895, p. 35, note 2).
4 "Wenden wir uns nun den geistlichen Heroen zu, so kahn man zwischen Heilfindern und Heilskindern unterscheiden. Als die ersten wären die patteya-
buddha zu bezeichnen" (Die Lehre der Jaina, § 14).
5 His review (see above, p. 233, note 3), pp. 78–79.
6 Fujita, op. cit., p. 104.
with them. This conclusion is supported by the fact that in the older Jain canonical encyclopaedic texts we find a two-fold division of buddhas: “those who gain enlightenment by themselves” (svayam-sambuddhas) and “those enlightened by another buddha” (budhā-bodhiita).

In the later encyclopaedic texts, however, we find a three-fold division of buddhas, with the patteya-buddhas placed between the other two categories. This presumably represents a situation where not only Nami’s name but also something of his background (and that of the other patteya-buddhas) had become known to the Jains, and it was realized that Nami was different from Mahāvīra. We may assume that this extra knowledge came with the adoption of the word patteya-buddha which, as seen above, is not used in the earliest Jain texts. Once a distinction had been made, academic reasons for differentiating between the two sorts of buddha were invented and enumerated. Since the patteya-buddhas had come into Jainism in two stages, so to speak, there were inconsistencies in connection with them. So we find that the texts make a contrast between tīrthaṅkaras and pratyeka-buddhas, but nevertheless feel them to be sufficiently close together to allow them both to be outside the tīthā.

<102> The Theravādin tradition similarly shows signs of inconsistency in its attitude towards paceeka-buddhas. The Buddha refers to them in the Isigili-sutta and states in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta that they are worthy of stūpas, without giving any hint at all about the way in which they fitted into the pattern of Buddhism. The inclusion of the paceeka-buddha verses of the Khaggavisāṇa-sutta in the Suttanipāta, one of the

---

1 Thānān̄ga II, I, 104 (Sutt. I, 189)  † Panmavaṇṇā I, 77 (Sutt. II, 289) mentions only the sayambuddha and buddhaboṭṭhiya.
2 Nandī 21 lists the sayambuddha, the patteya-buddha, and the buddhaboṭṭhiya.
3 See above p. 237, note 3.
4 See Deleu, Vijāhapanuati, p. 283.
5 M III 68–71.
6 D II 142.
7 Although the Sutta-nipāta itself (as opposed to its commentary) does not specifically indicate that the verses are by the paceeka-buddhas, they are attributed to them in the late canonical Apadāna and Cūlanīdasa. The fact that they are also attributed to the pratyeka-buddhas in the Mahāvaśu (I 357 foll.) proves that the attribution predates the schism between the Theravādins and the Mahāsāṅghikas.
oldest texts of the Theravāda canon, suggests that the decision to assimilate them into Buddhism had been taken at a very early stage of Buddhism. The definition of the pacceka-buddha given in the Puggala-panñatti\(^1\) shows that at the beginning of the Abhidhamma period the Buddhists (like the early Jains) still regarded both sammā-sambuddhas and pacceka-buddhas as being “self-enlightened” (sāman), and it was in their attributes and powers that the difference lay, not in the way of being enlightened. Only in the commentaries do we find the difference of bodhi being mentioned.\(^2\)

8. Conclusions

The fact that the concept of the pratyeka-buddha is pre-Buddhism and pre-Jainism is shown not only by its presence in both religions, but also by the fact that there are differences in the treatment of the stories about the pratyeka-buddhas in the oldest Buddhist and Jain texts of such a kind that they could only have arisen over a long period of time. The non-Jain nature of the concept is emphasized by the fact that the form of the term patteya-buddha is anomalous in Jain Prakrit, and must be a borrowing from another dialect, and probably another religion. The philological evidence shows that it is possible for the terms patteya/pacceka-buddha to be derived from pratyaya-buddha. The form pratyaya-buddha allows an interpretation which might be thought to be more appropriate than the customary “individual buddha, buddha for himself” which is given for pratyeka-buddha. The inconsistent and changing views about the pratyeka-buddha in Jain and Buddhist texts indicate an attempt to assimilate a concept which was alien to early Jainism and Buddhism,\(^3\) to find a place for pratyeka-buddhas in both religions, and to define more clearly the differences between them and the recognized buddhas of Jainism and Buddhism.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) See above, p. 245, note 4.

\(^2\) See above, p. 245, note 7.

\(^3\) The fact that the pacceka-buddhas were thought of as being inferior to the sammāsambuddhas seems to have led to the idea that the word pacceka meant ‘inferior’. This probably accounts for such compounds as pacceka-brahma in Pāli and pratyeka-brahman and pratyeka-rājan in Buddhist Skt.

\(^4\) Dr. T. Gelblum has drawn my attention to Vijñānabhikṣu’s Yogavārttika under Yogasūtra I. 19, where bhava-pratyaya (a bahuvrīhi compound) ‘obtained by virtue of one’s birth (janma)’ is contrasted with upāya-pratyaya (bahuvrīhi)
'obtained by (extraneous) means'. He states that this is the only occurrence in
the YS of *pratyaya* having the meaning 'cause' (*kāraṇam*). In all other
occurrences of the term in the YS it seems to mean 'cognition, knowledge'.
Apparently *bhava-pratyaya* in YS I, 19 is a fossilised cliché, perhaps borrowed
from outside the system. Not only is this valuable as giving an example of the
use of the word *pratyaya* in the sense of 'cause', but it also provides an
interesting parallel in the suggestion that there were two methods of becoming a
*siddha*. This must be assumed to be purely coincidental, since the wide gulf in
both time and tradition would seem to rule out any direct connection.