SĀMAṆERA

Rāhula to Venerable Sāriputta to be ordained as a sāmaṇera (Vin. 1.82).

The Vinaya Mahāvagga (Vin. 1.78) records the story of a father and his young son who was below the age of fifteen joining the order of monks due to some calamity in the family. The young sāmaṇera’s childish behaviour in the vihāra annoyed some of the other bhikkhus in the vihāra and they complained the matter to the Buddha. The Buddha thereupon set down the rule that a child who was below the age of fifteen should not be ordained. But this rule had been subsequently set aside by the Buddha himself on account of different circumstances. It is said that a family who were benefactors of elder Ananda and were great supporters of the Order were stricken with a deadly disease and the parents and other elders of the family had succumbed to the disease, only two young children of the family were surviving, Elder Ananda reported to the Buddha that the two children who were under 15 years of age cannot be recruited as sāmaṇeras to the Order to save them from peril as the Buddha himself had laid down the injunction that children below the age of fifteen should not be recruited to the Order as sāmaṇeras. The Buddha at this situation relaxed the previous injunction to accommodate even very young children in the Order as sāmaṇeras (Vin. 1.79).

New recruits or sāmaṇeras in the community of bhikkhus are to practise ten precepts constantly. (A.1.83). They are: to refrain from killing or injuring living beings (pāṇāśīpāda viramāna), to refrain from theft (adinnā ādinnā viramāna), to refrain from sexual behaviour (kāmesu micchācāra viramāna), to refrain from falsehood (mussavaṇḍa viramāna), to refrain from taking intoxicating drinks (surāmeraya maippahamadāthāna viramāna), to refrain from eating at improper times (vikāṭa bhojanatā viramāna), to refrain from seeing shows of dancing, singing and music and using garlands scents, unguents and wearing finery (nacca gaṇavādita viśeka dassana mālā ghandā vilepana dhāranamaṇḍana vibhūsanaatāthāna viramāna), to refrain from using high and luxurious beds (uccaśīyana mahāsāyana viramāna) and to refrain from accepting gold and silver (jītarūpa rajata paṭīggahanā viramāna).

Persons with physical defects (cripples, eunuchs and hermaphrodites etc.) were not allowed to become sāmaṇeras. Also persons with serious moral defects (patricides, matricides, murderers of arahants, persons guilty of raping women etc.) were also not recruited as sāmaṇeras (Vin. 1.73). It is prohibited to admit children as sāmaṇeras to the Order without the consent of their parents or elders (Vin. 1.82-83).

D. Saddhasena

SĀMAṆAṆA PHALA SUTTA, the ‘discourse on the fruits of reclusion-ship’, is the second discourse in the Dīgha Nikāya (D. I. 47). Two versions of this discourse have been preserved in the Chinese Āgamas, occurring as the twenty-seventh discourse in the Dīgha Āgama (Taishō I. 107) and as the seventh discourse in the forty-third chapter of the Ekottara Āgama (Taishō II. 762). The same discourse has also found its way into the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, where it occurs in the context of Devadatta’s attempt at creating a schism in the Saṅgha, included probably in order to document how Devadatta lost his main supporter king Ajātasattu through a change of heart of the latter after the present discourse.

The Sāmaṇaṭṭhala Sutta reports the patricide Ajātasattu, king of Magadha, visiting the Buddha and inquiring after visible fruits of living the life of a recluse, a question he had on an earlier occasion posed to several other renowned religious teachers. Beneath the king’s inquiry into the purpose of living the life of a recluse, in contrast to the productive life of a craftsman, two underlying aspects can be discerned. One aspect, related to king Ajātasattu being an active part of a growing tendency towards political centralization in ancient India, would seem to be a wish to inquire into the rationale and to some extent also the right of the growing number of wandering ascetics roaming his kingdom and demanding support. The other aspect, on a more personal level, could be related to his feeling of guilt at having murdered his father, being to some extent a question about the fruit of action in general and thereby implicitly also about the fruits of his patricide.

The other teachers he had approached earlier had not been able to give a full answer to all aspects of this question. Quite probably being aware of his patricide, they had to some extent addressed the question of action and its fruit, with Pūraṇa Kasapa pointing out
that there is not evil in killing. Makkhali Gosāla telling the king that there is no cause for the moral purity or impurity of beings. Ajīta Kesakambali explaining that there is no retribution for good and bad deeds, Pakudha Kaccāyana even proclaiming that there is no such thing as ‘killing’ at all, Nigantha Nātaputta advocating the restraint of action and Sañjaya Belaṅṭhaputta presenting what could be a form of scepticism as to the possibility of stating anything definitely. None of these answers was able to satisfy the king, since they did not respond to the evident and practical aspect of his question after a visible fruit of the life of a recluse, a failure the king compared to discoursing on mango when being asked about breadfruit. Their replies also did not tackle the political implications of his question, nor were they able to allay his feelings of guilt.

In contrast to the other teachers, the Buddha directly replied to the king’s question by bringing up the practical example of a servant of the king who, on going forth as a monk, will no longer have to obey the king’s commands but rather receive the king’s worship. With this example the Buddha succeeded not only in showing a practical and visible benefit of the life of a recluse to the king, but also made the king right away reaffirm the right of a recluse to be independent of the king, thereby addressing the political aspect of the king’s question.

This much achieved, the Buddha turned to a detailed description of the gradual path of training that comes into being once a Tathāgata arises in the world and proclaims the Dhamma, a description recurring in several other discourses in the Dīgha Nikāya. During his description of the gradual path, the Buddha highlighted the different types of happiness gained with progressive mental purification, ‘fruits’ of the life style of a recluse standing in stark contrast to the guilty ridden conscience of the king. This description of gradual mental purification thus directly addressed the third and more personal aspect of king Ajātasattu’s question.

The Buddha’s reply did satisfy the king, with the result that he expressed his regret at having murdered his own father in order to gain the throne and moreover proclaimed himself a lay follower of the Buddha.

The Sāmaññaphalasutta takes its importance not only from the successful conversion of king Ajātasattu, but also as a source for the philosophical positions taken by the other contemporary religious teachers to whom the king had posed his question. The various versions of this discourse do however differ in regard to the positions assumed by these teachers. In relation to the account found in the Pāli version of the Sāmaññaphalasutta, two points can be made.

Concerning the position taken by Makkhali Gosāla, all versions agree with the Pāli discourse on attributing to him the denial of causality in relation to the purification of beings. The Pāli discourse stands however alone in also having him teach a fixed samsāric process through which all beings have to pass before going beyond suffering, a doctrine which according to some other versions should rather be attributed to Pakudha Kaccāyana. Such a fixed samsāric process would seem to fit well with Pakudha’s other propositions, which were based on a set of firmly fixed principles, while it would seem to be to some extent at odds with Makkhali’s earlier denial of any causal principle.

Concerning Nigantha Nātaputta, the Pāli discourse stands alone in having him teach a fourfold restraint. Some of the other versions have him explain that one’s present condition is the result of past action, through penance previous karma is eradicated and through refraining from doing new deeds one puts an end to suffering, a view which does seem to accord well with what is known about the Jain teachings from other sources and as such also recurs in the Pāli discourses (e.g. at M. I, 93).

These two points are not the only instances where the various versions differ on what doctrine should be attributed to which teacher, a more detailed discussion of which would however go beyond the scope of the present article. Such differences can also be found in the Pāli discourses, which sometimes attribute aspects of Makkhali Gosāla’s view to Pūraṇa Kassapa (S. III, 69 and A. III, 383). Similarly, while according to the Sāmaññaphalasutta’s account Makkhali Gosāla proclaimed various types of kamma, another discourse attributes the denial of kamma to him (A. I, 286). Since this discourse begins with a reference to the custom of wearing a blanket made of human hair (kesambala), it could be referring to Ajīta Kesakambali instead. In relation to the same Ajīta Kesakambali it could be noted that even though according to the Sāmaññaphalasutta he explicitly denied rebirth, another Pāli discourse includes him among a list of teachers making a pronouncement on the rebirth of their disciples (S. IV, 398).
Despite these differences, the general picture to be gained from an examination of these various philosophical propositions recorded in the *Sāmaṇāṇaphala Sutta* remains the same, namely that at the time of the Buddha various teachings denying causality, action and *karma* were in vogue. These form the philosophical background for the Buddha’s affirmation of karmic retribution and his teaching of dependent origination (*pañcika samuppāda*).

**References**

1. In addition to these two, an individual Chinese translation of this discourse can be found as discourse number 22 at Taishō I, 270.


**SAMANTAKÜṬA.** From the central highlands of Sri Lanka arises Adam’s Peak which is one of the highest peaks in the land. It is also called Sri Pāda (in common parlance) which means “the sacred footprint”. It is also called Samanala-kanda (Peak of god Saman). This peak is also regarded as the water shed of Sri Lanka for the reason that four of the principal rivers in the island have their source in this mountain. These rivers fall to the sea on eastern, western and south eastern coasts. Sri Lanka has also been given the name Ramadviṣa which means ‘the island of gems’. Districts lying in the neighborhood of Adam’s Peak produce gems such as rubies, sapphires and emeralds etc. Therefore the ancient appellation ‘Ramadviṣa’ is justifiable.

This mountain has become sacred for religious reasons. The indentation on its summit in the form of a footprint has been a place of worship by Buddhists, Hindus as well as Muslims. The Buddhists regard the footprint as of the Buddha. The Muslims believe that it is of Adam and Hindu regard it as of god Śiva. Every year devotees belonging to these faiths perform the difficult ascent to the summit of the mountain for purposes of veneration. There is also the belief among Buddhists that this mountain is the abode of God Saman (P. Sumana). He is regarded as one of the four guardian deities of Sri Lanka. The other three are Uppalavāṇa, Skanda and Vibhiṣāṇa. The Pāli word Uppalavāṇa is the same as Upulvan.

The Pāli chronicle named *Mahāvāṇa* which deals with the traditional history of Sri Lanka narrates how the Buddha visited Sri Lanka on three occasions and placed his footprint on its summit on the third occasion. When the Buddha arrived in Sri Lanka, a prominent deity who greeted Him was Mahā Sumana of the Samanakūṭa mountain. When he begged for an object of worship, the Buddha gave him a lock of hair from his head. This was enshrined in a stūpa at Mahiyagana. Later, when the Buddha visited Sri Lanka for the third time, he arrived at Samanakūṭa and placed his footprint there.

It is in the reign of Vijayaṃabhū I (1055-1111) that a village named Gilimala was dedicated for purposes of providing facilities for the pilgrims proceeding to Samanakūṭa. He also granted villages on two routes to the peak for the same purpose and recorded the donation in a stone inscription. He also caused to be constructed rest houses on the way. These inscriptions are from Gilimala and Ambaganavu. The king himself is said to have ascended the peak and worshipped the footprint. Nissankamalla who ascended the throne in 1187 A. C. is also said to have gone up the peak and worshipped the footprint with great devotion.

Nissankamalla’s inscription at Bhagavālēna confirms this visit to the sacred mountain. It is apparent that by about the 12th century, much importance was attached to the cult of the footprint. During this period, a Pāli poem of 802 stanzas named
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