ON SOME KEY-TERMS IN NEWAR BUDDHISM*

An exceedingly difficult field of learning in which most of the work still remains to be done, is, as we know, the history of Newar Buddhism. Though there is no paucity of material and though researchers can draw on vast and manifold sources, such as large numbers of manuscript colophons and inscriptions, several chronicles (vamśāvalī) and, last but not least, quite a few foreign reports, from Chinese pilgrims to Catholic missionaries and British government officers, we are still ignorant of even the main lines of this history and have only a faint idea of the development of Newar monasteries and Buddhist monastic life in the Kathmandu Valley.

An extremely disturbing obstacle in investigations concerning Newar Buddhism is undoubtedly the fact that its scholars have not yet been able clearly to define certain terms given to some of its fundamental institutions and thus, to mention only the two most important examples, fail to interpret the words bāhā: and bāhī correctly. The present paper attempts to elucidate a few key-terms in Newar Buddhism. In recent years, the meaning of some of these terms has been repeatedly discussed1.

---

* In honour of the eminent scholar Siegfried Lienhard, we republish, as a token of affection and gratitude, his article from Change and Continuity: Studies in the Nepalese Culture of the Kathmandu Valley (Torino, Cesmeo, 1996, p. 241-256).

In Newar Buddhism, objects and persons have either a Sanskrit or a Newari name or, which is most useful for all sorts of research, both a Sanskrit and a Newari denomination. In Newari a Vajrācārya is called a guhāju, which goes back to the older forms gurubhāju < gurubharādaṇju and means “guru saint”, “holy guru”, while the term Śākya(bhikṣu), though often replaced by the word bare, has no exact equivalent in Newari. bare (from Skt. vandya) is ambiguous, since, above all in older Newari, Vajrācāryas were also considered to be bares, especially as long as they had not yet undergone their ācāryabhiseṇa. Strangely enough, there is no native word corresponding to Skt. vihāra, which is pronounced bhīrā in Newari and is the most widely used term in the whole Buddhist world, to designate the monastery building. There are, it is true, the words bahā: and bahī which, however, do not mean “monastery” or “temple building” in general, but are, as is well-known, two different types of vihāra. In the bahī, the community consists of Śākya(bhikṣu)s; in the bahā:, however, it may consist either of Vajrācāryas only, of Śākya(bhikṣu)s only, or of a mixture of Vajrācāryas and Śākya(bhikṣu)s. The deity installed in the main-shrine of a bahā: is invariably called the kvā:pa:dya:, whereas, in a bahī, the deity is termed gāmdhūridya:. Both expressions appear arcane and have, since no Sanskrit equivalents have been found, continued to puzzle curious scholars.

We may assume that things which are known only by a Newari, and not also a Sanskrit, term are institutions which perhaps arose in a later phase of development, when Newar Buddhism, a survival of the Indian Buddhist tradition, had proceeded its own way and that they are therefore specifically Newar. Such is the case with bahā: and bāhī. As can be shown by comparing the Sanskrit names of Newar monasteries with the Newari names of the same monasteries, the Sanskrit word vihāra, which has been in use since early Buddhist times, stands not only for Newari bahā: but also for bahī. The Ratnākaramahāvihāra, one of the most famous bahā:s in Patan, is in Newari called Ha:khabahā:,
‘the bahā: near the River Ha:’ (Ha:khusi < Ha:kha)\(^2\), while the Vikramaśīlāmahāvihāra, one of the oldest bahīs in Kathmandu, was also called the Thambhī in Newari because of its location, meaning ‘the bahī of the Upper Town (of Kathmandu)’.

No scholar has so far seriously questioned the commonly accepted assumption that Newari bahā: is derived from Skt. vihāra / bhihāra. Since there is a striking similarity between the word bahā: (the older, literary form of which is bahāla / bahāra) and Skt. vihāra. More thought, on the other hand, has been devoted to the expression bahī, the meaning of which has been considered to be more problematic. Various scholars have pointed out certain differences in the architectural structure of the bahā: and that of the bahī\(^3\). Some observe that bahīs seem to be older and, as has already been mentioned above, are connected with Sākya (bhikṣu)s (or Brahmacaryabhikṣus\(^4\), whereas bahā:s house Vajrācāryas and/or Sākya(bhikṣu)s. But practically all scholars stress the fact that many bahīs, as opposed to bahā:s, lie ‘outside’ the cities. As this observation could be corroborated by linguistically approximating Newari bahī to Skt. bahis ‘outside’, the term bahī has a rule been taken to mean an ‘outside’-town-monastery\(^5\).

A great step forward in ascertaining the function and, to some extent, the history of vihāras has been achieved by David N. Gellner in his study on The Newar Buddhist Monastery\(^6\). In one of its parts, the author attempts to outline the history of the bahīs and their relation to bahā:s on the basis of the Bhāṣāvamsāvalī written in Patan about 1800\(^6\). As we know, this

\(^2\) This was the old site of the Ha:khabahā: which, being a lāykābahā:, a bahā: of the Royal House (of Patan), was originally situated in the vicinity of the Royal Palace in Mangal Bazar. However, it retained its old name Ha:khabahā: when, during the 17th century, the Royal Palace in Patan was extended and the monastery, to make space, had to move to its present site opposite Bubahā:.


\(^4\) A.W. Macdonald and A. Vergati-Stahl, op. cit., p. 73. — The Brahmacaryabhikṣus have, in later times, called themselves Sākya(bhikṣu)s.

\(^5\) Cf. footnote 1.

\(^6\) Cf. L. Petech, Mediaeval History of Nepal (e. 750-1492), Rome 1984 (Serie Orientale Roma LIV), p. 8.
modern chronicle composed in Nepali covers Nepalese history from its very beginnings and has become known to a wider circle of readers through the – thrice reprinted – free translation into English⁷. Having gone to the original text, Gellner shows that the chronicler speaks of those living in bahīs as of nirvāṇik vānaprasthas⁸. In the same Vāṃśāvalī, the bahī is, as Gellner points out, paraphrased in Nepali by nirvāṇik vānaprasthabihār, which, freely translated, means ‘monastery of the non-married (and) nirvana-orientated’, while bahā: is glossed in Nepali as sāṃśārik tāmtrik bhīhār, which, of course, means ‘monastery of the tantric (and) world-orientated’. The term vānaprastha bhikṣu, used to denote the inhabitants of the bahīs, is further contrasted with the expression grhaṣṭha ācārya, which clearly designates residents in bahā:s. As Gellner rightly remarks, bahīs nowadays do not differ profoundly from bahā:s, since, in the course of time, bahīs have adopted most of the features characteristic of bahā:s. bahīs, which are older, were vihāras frequented by celibate monks, whereas bahā:s, which are newer, were inhabited by the married followers of Vajrayāna, who were naturally tantric and, at least from the Malla period onwards, came to represent the main stream of the Doctrine. The Bhikṣus of the bahīs embraced the nirvanic form of the Doctrine, the Ācāryas in bahā:s on the other hand, accepted karmatic or, to employ the term used in the Bhāṣāvāṃśāvalī, samsaric Buddhism⁹.

We should, however, be careful when interpreting the word vānaprastha, which, in this context, is used in a very particular manner. I cannot subscribe to Gellner’s opinion that, though vānaprastha ‘usually denotes a Hindu forest ascetic, the third of the classic four stages (āśrama) of a Hindu’s life’, the

---


⁸ Wright 1958, pp. 143 ff. - The word vānaprastha is a tatsama and should thus not be rendered with न, as has consistently been done by Gellner. See the Nepāli Brhat Śabdaśūla edited by the Nepāla Rājakīya Prājnā-Prātiṣṭhān, Kathmandu 2040, sub verbo.

Bhāṣāvamśāvalī seems ‘to use vānaprastha as a synonym for Skt. vanavāsī, ‘living in a forest’, which is precisely the term used for Theravada monks.’ On the contrary, the chronicler employs the term vānaprastha to refer to those individuals who, like Hindus, have withdrawn from house and family to live an ascetic life. Writing in Nepal – a language, which for the most part is spoken by Hindus – the author, however, used this predominantly Hindu expression to define not certain Hindus, but certain Buddhists. When describing people living in bahīṣ as vānaprasthas, the author of the Vamśāvalī by no means intends to say that these people were forest-dwellers (vanavāsin) and thus lived ‘outside’ (Skt. bahīṣ) the cities. He simply stresses the fact that the inhabitants of the bahīṣ were not ‘householders’, as are the Ācāryas of the bahāṣ. While the Ācāryas have always lived in the bosom of their families and could therefore be described as saṃśaric, the Bhikṣus in the bahīṣ were celibate and, according to the chronicle, still aimed at Nirvana as their soteriological goal.

It is fascinating to discover that definitions very similar to those found in the Bhāṣāvamśāvalī are given by the Newar informant of B.H. Hodgson. As Hodgson, who was the British Resident in Nepal from 1833 to 1843, had entered Nepal already in 1821, a gap of only about twenty years lies between Hodgson’s arrival in Nepal and the date of completion of the Bhāṣāvamśāvalī (ca. 1800). To this may be added that both the chronicler and B.H. Hodgson’s informant were born in Patan. Hodgson refers to his learned Newar informant Amṛtānanda, who was a Sākya (bhikṣu) by birth, in his essay On the the Languages, Literature and Religion of Nepal and Tibet⁴ and, in the same work, reproduces Amṛtānanda’s answers to twenty questions on Newar Buddhism.

⁴ Essay on the Languages, Literature and Religion of Nepal and Tibet, together with further papers on the geography, ethnology and commerce of those countries, Serampore 1841, Calcutta 1857; London 1874 (reprinted, with corrections and additions); and Amsterdam 1982 (reprinted, with a supplement by Dr. Mahadeva Prasad Saha), p. 35: ‘Soon after my arrival in Nepal (1821), I began to devise means of procuring some accurate information relative to Buddhism... My first object was to ascertain the existence or otherwise of Buddhist scriptures in Nepal; and to this end I privately instituted inquiries in various directions, in the course of which the reputation for knowledge of an old Baudhā residing in the city of Pātan, drew one of my people to his abode...’ See also ibid., p. 65: ‘These extracts were made for me... some years ago by Amṛita Nanda Bandya, the most learned Buddhist then, or now, living in that country.’
In his reply to Hodgson’s twentieth question on ‘How many castes are there amongst the Bánras?’ \(^{11}\), Amṛtānanda says *inter alia:* ‘The Bandyas are divided into two classes; those who follow the Váhyा-charya, and those who adopt the Abhyantara-charya – words equivalent to the Grihastha áśrama and Vairágí áśrama of the Bráhmanas. The first class is denominated Bhikshu, the second Vajra Achárya. The Bhikshu cannot marry; but the Vajra Achárya is a family man.’ \(^{12}\) This is indeed an extremely important statement, as it not only confirms what has been said in the Patan *Vamśāvalī* but also offers a clue to what I think is the correct interpretation of the word *bahi.*

caryā, a term often used both in Hinduism and in Buddhism, denotes a certain religious ‘attitude’, ‘state’ or ‘course of life’ adopted by a group of believers. Thus, for example, *brahmacarya* is ‘the state of an unmarried student’, *bhikṣucarya* ‘the course of life of a bhikṣu’ and, a term well-known in Newar Buddhism, *upāsakacarya* ‘the religious attitude of a layman’. Instead of the Hindu term aśrama employed in the *Bhāṣāvamsāvalī,* Amṛtānanda makes use of the word *caryā,* which, as we said, is not exclusively Hindu but occurs in Buddhist terminology, too. It is characteristic of the four Hindu stages of life that they are regulated by age and follow one after the other, while there is no such succession as regards the Buddhist *caryā.* The terms *abhyantara-* and *vāhyacarya,* both of which are tatsamas, are opposites: whereas *abhyantara* has the meaning of ‘inside’ and is used in phrases such as ‘inside the house’, ‘inside the door’ but also ‘inside a (certain) community’, *vāhya,* which would better be rendered as *bahiya,* means ‘outside’ and occurs in constructions such as, for example, ‘outside the house’, ‘outside the door’, but also ‘outside a community’, be that a caste, a family or a country. It is in exact conformity with this latter use, that is to say, ‘inside’ or ‘outside’ a (certain) community’, that we must interpret *abhyantara-* and *bahiacarya,* for *abhyantara,* on the one hand, denotes a ‘course of life inside the family, *bahiacarya,* on the other hand, a course of life outside the family’.

\(^{11}\) *bāṃrā* (also *bāndā*) is the Nepali equivalent for Newari *ba(n)re,* *Skt.*vandyā. Cf. S. Lienhard, *A Note on the Newari Term bān,* IT XIV (1987/88), pp. 265-268.

Arranging the material we have discussed until now under the headings bahā: and bahi, we get the following label:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bahā</th>
<th>bahi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ācārya = Vajrācārya</td>
<td>Bhikṣu = Sākyabhikṣu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grhaṣṭha</td>
<td>vānapraṣṭha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhyantaracārya</td>
<td>bāhyacārya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saṃśāric</td>
<td>nirvāṇic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tantric</td>
<td>non - tantric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We now see that the bahā:s are inhabited by (Vajra-)ācāryas, who are householders and thus have adopted the ‘inside-the-family-way’; they are furthermore world-orientated and tantric. The bahi, however, house Bhikṣus, who, in older times, were celibate and thus followed the ‘outside-the-family-way’. Most of the expressions given in my table are found in the Bhāṣāvamsāvalī. The terms ācārya (vajrācārya) and bhikṣu, however, are also employed by Amṛtānanda, while it is only Amṛtānanda who uses the words bāhyacārya and abhyantaracārya.

The word bāhya brings us back to the discussion on the Newari word bahi, the older, literary form of which is bahiri / bahili. bahi, however, is not a genuine Newari term. It is an Indo-Aryan loan-word; in Nepali, for example, we have bāhirī, an adjective, and bāhira, which can be used as an adverb, a postposition or an adjective. Both words mean ‘outside’, ‘being outside’, ‘outsider’ and are related to Sanskrit bāhya and bāhis. Since not all bahi were situated outside the city, the term bahi can hardly be explained as meaning an ‘outside-town-monastery’. We arrive, as a matter of fact, at a much better and far more convincing interpretation, if we connect bahi with Skt. bāhya (or bāhis) in the specific sense that the term ‘outside’ bears in the compound bāhyacārya. If we interpret it in this way, the word bahi can be defined as designating an ‘outside-family-monastery’ or, in other words, a vihāra the inhabitants of which had (in the past) adopted a ‘course of life outside the family’.

In contradistinction to the bahi, the bahā: represents a newer type of vihāra, the inhabitants of which have embraced a ‘course of life inside the family’. As we have already said, the Bhikṣus
of the bahīs were formerly celibate but later largely adapted themselves to the tradition of Vajrayāna and are nowadays married, whereas the Vajrācāryas in the bahā:s have always been married. Unlike the word bahī, bahā: does not indicate anything about the state of the inhabitants of the bahā:. Scholars, in fact, never saw the need to explain its meaning or derivation, as bahā:, with an apocope of the ultimate syllable, goes back to the older form bahāra /bahāla which, being strikingly similar to Skt. vihāra / bihāra, was simply taken to be a Newarized variant of bihāra13. In reality, the word bahā: is not a Newari equivalent of bihara but is a modern contraction of the classical word bharāda, which is derived from Skt. bhaṭṭāra(ka) (m.), bhaṭṭārika (f.). It is noteworthy that the use of Skt. bhaṭṭāra(ka) and Newari bharāda is by no means restricted only to Buddhism and Buddhist monastery buildings. Just as Skt. bhaṭṭāra(ka) served to denote a ‘great man’ or a ‘great deity’14, in particular learned Buddhist teachers and a special class of Śaiva monks, so does New. Bharāda, as well as its modern forms bāhā: and, still more contracted, bhā, designate a ‘god’, a ‘great lord’ or a ‘worshipful person’. Thus, for example, God Kumāra is frequently spoken of as Kumāra-bharāda, the ‘great Lord Kumāra’, and a Vajrācārya is in Newari, as already mentioned, called a gubharādajū15, which

13 Even the vowel change (bihāra < bahāra) posed no serious problem, since i in unstressed syllables of tatasmas has been often pronounced as a and could thus be written as either i or a. The phenomenon is well-known from, for example, Bihari and Hindi. It is interesting to observe that H.A. Oldfield in his work on Nepal renders the name of the region Bihar, thus called on account of its numerous Buddhist monasteries and today one of the States of the Republic of India, not as ‘Bihar’ but as ‘Bahr’; Sketches from Nepal. Historical and Descriptive with an Essay on Nepalese Buddhism & Illustrations of Religious Monuments & Architecture, 2 vols., Delhi 1974 (reprint), vol. II, pp. 40 (‘Modern Bahar’), 52 (‘Bahar Proper’), 53, 58 and 59 (‘Bahr’).

14 Examples for this use are abundant in both the epigraphy and the historiography of Nepal. See, for instance, R. Gnoli, Nepalese Inscriptions in Gupta Characters (Rome 1956, Serie Orientale Roma, X), bhaṭṭāraka- mahārājasrī-Vasantadeva (pp. 22 and 22), bhaṭṭāraka-mahārājasrī-ṃGaṇadeva (pp. 26 and 28-29), bhaṭṭāraka-mahārājasrī-Śivadeva (pp. 31-32, 35, 37, 41 and 43) and Dhanuvajra Vajrācārya and Kamal P. Maila, The Gopālāvaravamsāvalī (Wiesbaden 1985, NRC Publications, 9); śrīmat-Pāśupati-bhaṭṭāraka (p. 25), śrī-Pāśupati-bhaṭṭāraka (pp. 31 and 36), śrī-Bugmalośvara-bhaṭṭāraka (p. 31), Viṣṇu-bhaṭṭāraka (p. 30) and Śankarēśvara-bhaṭṭārika (p. 32). It is not without interest to note that the word bhaṭṭ(i)āraka, when used for a king, precedes the respective name but, when used for a god, is put after the name.

15 ju placed after the noun is a Newari term of respect. bhāju in gubhāju is, however, not
in modern Newari is shortened to gubhāju, a ‘venerable guru’. In later times, the semantic field of bharāda as well as of bahā: and bhā was extended so much that the term came to denote any deity, person, place or object that was considered ‘sacred’.

Although all Buddhist monasteries inhabited by Vajrācāryas have been named bahā:ts, the same term, which simply means ‘sanctum’, is sometimes used of Hindu shrines, too. When in the summer of 1986 I visited the town of Saṃko and there made inquiries about its bahā:ts, some elderly people pointed out to me several buildings which were clearly Hindu. In Kathmandu we have, for instance, the Kuladipabahā: situated at Ṭeku, the confluence of the Rivers Bishnumati and Bagmati, as well as the Bincchebahā:, the āgam of the clan of the Bijugus16. Both are Hindu sanctuaries but are, as can be seen from their names, considered as bahā:ts.

The use of the term bahā: is also attested in connection with caityas, books and religious paintings, as all these things are regarded as sacred and worthy of worship. A current expression for caitya in modern Newari is cībahā: (or cīvahā:) which is especially common in Patan and refers to members of Buddhist castes below the rank of a Vajrācārya and Śākyabhikṣu who can only receive a lower type of bare ordination. They are called cībaḥāːː bare, i.e. ‘bare of a caitya sanctuary’, since their consecration takes place, not in a vihāra, as in the case for Vajrācāryas and Śākyabhikṣus, but near a caitya inside a courtyard.

The word bahā: appears furthermore in the technical term paubahā: or, shortened, paubhā:. It is derived from the older form patibharāda, a bahā:, that is to say, a holy object, in the shape of a painting (pati) and is the name given to a special type of narrative painting which depicts the various episodes of the

---

16 Also called Bincchem (< Bijugchem). The Bijugus were Pradhāns from Bhaktapur who later moved to Kathmandu.
story in successive scenes arranged below and contiguous to each other\textsuperscript{17}.

In the same way as \textit{bahā}: was used of \textit{caityas}, books (\textit{puthībharāḍa}, ‘holy book’) and sacred paintings, so did the same term serve to name that type of \textit{vihāra} which became representative of Vajrayāna, the main stream of Newar Buddhism. While the term \textit{bahī} should be connected with Skt. \textit{bāhya} or \textit{bahis} in the specific sense of ‘outside the family’ and thus characterizes a monastery of celibate Bhikṣus, \textit{bahā}: is a shortened form of \textit{bharāḍa} and designates the holy thing \textit{par excellence}: a sanctuary of Vajrācāryas.

It appears that for some time Vajrācāryas were the sole ministers of Vajrayāna, since we must bear in mind that Vajrayāna evolved inside Mahāyāna and we can, therefore, assume that Ācāryas living in \textit{bahā}:s were originally mahāyānic. Bhikṣus, on the other hand, were devotees not so much of Mahāyāna as of Hīnayāna. Of the two initiation ceremonies, \textit{pravrajyā} and \textit{upasampadā}, Vajrayāna communities performed only \textit{pravrajyā} (Newari bare \textit{chuyagu}), which was once the rite of admission into the Order but was gradually transformed into the ceremony of admission into the community of the respective \textit{bahā}:, while \textit{upasampadā} was replaced by the ordination into a Vajrācārya, the \textit{ācāryabhiseka} (Newari \textit{ācā}: \textit{luyagu}). It goes without saying that \textit{bahā}:s had no place for monk ordination, as all members lived as householders, whereas in older times Bhikṣus living in \textit{bahī}s must naturally have performed both \textit{pravrajyā}, the ceremony of acceptance into the Order, and \textit{upasampadā}\textsuperscript{18}.

When Vajrayāna became powerful, Bhikṣus in the \textit{bahī}s found difficulty in resisting this esoteric branch of Buddhism. Since


\textsuperscript{18} Since, before the time when Vajrayāna took over, there existed a clear dichotomy between householder-Ācāryas and celibate monks, that is to say, between \textit{bahā}:s and \textit{bahī}s, I can by no means subscribe to the opinion of Hemraj Shākya and other Newar scholars that \textit{bahī}s were a lower type of \textit{vihāra} where (Śākya) bhikṣus received preparatory training for entering a \textit{bahī}: and becoming Vajrācāryas. Cf. also M. Sh. Slusser, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. I, p. 295: ‘Some Nepalese Buddhist hold that the \textit{bahī} were schools for novices’. Others claim the term \textit{bahī} as the diminutive form of \textit{bahā}: see M. Sh. Slusser, \textit{ibid}.

they were celibate, they were called — or called themselves — Brahma-caryabhikṣus (Brahmacārins for short), a title which they replaced with Śākyabhikṣu or, for short, Śākya, when Vajrayāna became more and more dominant and Vajrācāryas began to look down upon Bhikṣus. The strange fact that there exist today not only bahā:ś and bahīś which are exclusively inhabited by Śākyabhikṣus, but also bahā:ś with Vajrācāryas and Śākyabhikṣus can help us to trace the development. It seems Bhikṣus in all the bahīś divided into three groups which eventually embraced the prevailing form of Buddhism, although in different ways and at various stages. Some Bhikṣus, having abandoned both their customs and their bahīś, sought admission to some of the bahā:ś, which led to the formation of mixed saṅghas (Vajrācāryas and Śākyabhikṣus). Others founded their own bahā:ś (consisting exclusively of Śākyabhikṣus), while the third and biggest group remained in their time-honoured bahīś, though these Bhikṣus, too, finally adjusted themselves to the practices of the bahā:ś. Features which distinguish them from Vajrācāryas are, above all, that Śākyabhikṣus are not entitled to perform sacrifices with fire (homa) and that their councils of elders (stavira) consist of only five elders, not ten as is the case in Vajrācārya- bahā:ś.

Other marks that distinguish Vajrācāryas from Śākyabhikṣus, in the past as well as today, are their head-dresses and the insignia they carry. Nowadays, the use of the ceremonial dress is restricted to Sthaviras of both classes; they shave their hair in connection with certain rituals only and wear their robes solely at religious ceremonies. It may, however, be taken for granted that, originally, many Ācārya-householders and certainly all celibate monks always had shorn heads and wore their priestly clothes all day long. Vajrācāryas and Bhikṣus dressed identically in their priestly capacity, wearing the same clothes as they do today: the upper part of the body covered by a wide jacket with sleeves, the cīvara, the lower part by a long skirt, the nivāsa, fastened round the waist and reaching down to the ankles. There is, however, as already H.A. Oldfield, a fine observer, has noted, a marked difference with regard to head-dress and instruments. The insignia Śākyabhikṣus carried with them are a begging-bowl
(Skt. \textit{piṇḍapātra}^{19}, New. \textit{gulupā:} < \textit{gurupātra}) and a sceptre-like metal staff (Skt. \textit{khakkhara, khikkhira, khikkhirika, khikkhilikā}, New. \textit{silāpūpa}\textsuperscript{20}) which, in older times, was used by alms-begging monks to keep dangerous dogs and cattle at bay\textsuperscript{21}. The begging-bowl and metal staff are even today handed over to the newly ordained monk in the \textit{bare chuyagu} rite. Since for the inhabitants of the \textit{bahā:s} monkhood is only a transitory stage and is succeeded by higher initiations, a Vajrācārya is characterized by other insignia. He wears a rosary around his neck and should hold in his hand, or carry with him, a book and the thunderbolt (\textit{vajra}) he receives at the end of his \textit{ācāryābhiseka}. As headaddresses, which like the other insignia are today only worn during ceremonies and on festive occasions, Vajracāryas use splendidly ornamented copper-gilt crowns; Śākyas, however, cloth-caps coloured bright red.

It is clear that, with the exception of the cloth-cap, an apparently recent innovation added to the insignia proper when Bhikṣus in the \textit{bahā:s} gradually adapted themselves to Vajrayāna, the whole outfit of Śākyabhikṣus is that of a monk and thus corroborates what we have stated above. Although it proves difficult to date the period of their conversion to the form of Buddhism practised in the \textit{bahā:s}, we may not be wrong if we tentatively place the main part of transition between the reign of King Jayasthiti Malla (1382-1395 A.D.), when the caste system became consolidated, and the middle of the 17th century.

Two terms extremely difficult to account for are \textit{kvā:pā:dyā:} and \textit{gāṃdhūridyā:}. As I have mentioned at the beginning of this article, \textit{kvā:pā:dyā:} is the name given to the main deity in the non-tantric shrine in \textit{bahā:s}, while quite another word, namely \textit{gāṃdhūridyā:}, is used for the same deity in \textit{bahīs}\textsuperscript{22}. Both terms

\begin{footnote}{19} That is to say, ‘the bowl (\textit{pāra}) for the daily food ration (\textit{piṇḍa})’; for \textit{piṇḍa} cf. J. Fezas, \textit{Le droit nèpalais de la succession et ses sources classiques}, vol. 1, Paris 1985, pp. 309-12.
\footnote{20} \textit{siḷā-pā-pau} goes back to \textit{sīla-pavitra-pāṭhi}, ‘the pure staff of disciplined conduct’.
\footnote{22} Though the \textit{gāṃdhūridyā:} is said to belong only to \textit{bahīs}, according to an inscription dated 1388 A.D. mentioned by M. Sh. Slusser a \textit{gāṃdhūlibhatāraka} was installed in...}
have been interpreted in various ways. The word *kvā:paː-dyaː* has been twice explained by J. Locke, though each time differently. In his first interpretation, Locke considers *kvā:paː-dyaː* to be a ‘corruption’ of *kvācāpāladeva*, which, according to him, means ‘the guardian deity of the saṅgha’. The expression *kvācāpāla*, shortened to *kvā:paː* in modern Newari, is well attested in older documents. Some Newar scholars do indeed maintain that *kvāca* is an old term for *saṅgha* which since long fell into oblivion. Apart from its occurrence in the compound *kvācāpāladeva*, there is, however, no textual evidence for the use of *kvāca* as a separate word in the meaning of ‘saṅgha’. Gellner holds the view that ‘the term *kvācāpāladeva* may have been deliberately derived from (a) a piece associated with the Buddha and (b) a similar-sounding (though actually different) root (*kūṭ/kūṭa*) and made into the technical term for the main deity of a *bahā*. In another, recent and much more plausible, interpretation, J. Locke considers *kvā:paː-dyaː*, as before, to be a modern Newari contraction of *kvācāpāladeva* (also spelled *koça* / *kvoca*), though he now derives the word *kvāca*, with good reason, from Skt. *koṣṭha*. As Locke discovered, the word *koṣṭhapāla*, a Sanskrit equivalent for *kvācāpāla*, is used as an attribute for Buddha in a Nepalese copper-plate inscription in Sanskrit from the year Vikr. S. 1445 (A.D. 1387). This inscription celebrates the installation of a golden Buddha image by a donor named Mānacandra Śākya.
in the Kārtipunya-mahāvihāra in Lagan, Kathmandu. The word (vara)koṣṭhapāla occurs in stanza 6, which, like the majority of the 12 verses, is composed in Upajāti metre. Locke’s discovery is very important. In an article published in 1985, I gave kvāthapāla as the older form of kvā:pā:30. It is true that kvātha also means ‘fort’ and, in this sense, is connected with Skt. koṭṭa. But kvātha is, as a matter of fact, also an older variant of kvāca. Although kvātha, a Neo-Indo-Aryan loan-word, is not attested in literature, Skt. koṭṭha would, according to well-known rules of phonetic development, be transformed into koṭṭha in Middle-Indian. At a later stage koṭṭhaka (< Skt. koṭṭhaka), a form enlarged by the suffix ka, became koṭṭhā / koṭṭhā in many modern Indian languages, including Nepāḷī. In Newari the loan-word koṭṭhā / koṭṭhā is spelled koṭṭhā, kvoṭha or kvātha and can even be rendered as kvāca, since t, non-aspirated or aspirated, and c are interchangeable phonemes31.

Although it is clear that kvātha and kvāca are variants which both derive from the Sanskrit word koṣṭha, the main difficulty is how to understand the compound word kvācapāla. Locke translates the word simply as ‘guardian’, but comments, following his own first interpretation, that this guardian is a guardian of the saṅgha’. As koṣṭha(ka) / koṣṭhikā also means an ‘inner apartment’32 or ‘a room for keeping valuable books (and other things which are holy)’33, I am inclined to translate kvāca as ‘sacred room’, ‘shrine’. Locke is certainly right when he states that Skt. koṣṭhapāla ‘means a guard, a watchman or a storekeeper’. Nevertheless the word pāla

30 Cf. J.K. Locke, Unique Features of Newar Buddhism, footnote 6: ‘Some have interpreted kvāpā as a shortened form of kvātha (See for example Siegfried Lienhard, ‘Nepal: the Survival...’). Kvātha is a Newari term for a fort and it is true that some of the vihāra were referred to as forts... However, most of the vihāras were not forts and were not referred to as forts.’
33 For the latter meaning see F. Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary, Vol. II: Dictionary, Delhi - Patna - Varanasi 1970 (reprint), sub verbo koṣṭhikā.
in *kvācapāla* is not to be interpreted in this, its original meaning but in the much vaguer sense which the word *pāla*, or to be more precise *pālaka*, has acquired in Neo-Indo-Aryan where *pāla(ka)* and its derivations only indicate ‘(somebody who is) related (to something)’ *kvā:pāː* (*kvācapāla*), in my opinion, means, therefore, ‘the one related to the shrine’ and *kvā:pāː:dyāː*: ‘the God in the shrine’. We may perhaps assume that *kvāca* was the word used for the non-tantric shrine and thus, as a more or less technical term, standing in opposition to the term *āgaṃ*.

An extremely interesting word is *gāṃdhūridyaː* which, as *r* and *l* can be interchanged in Newari, is also frequently rendered as *gāṃdhūlidyaː*. A detailed account is given by M. Sh. Slusser who observes that it ‘presumably... derives from Sanskrit *gāṃdhūlīdeva*, a term encountered from time to time in Nepall sources’. As a possible variant of *gāṃdhūlī* she adduces Skt. *godhūlī* ‘earthdust’ While the correct spelling of *gāṃdhūliː / gāṃdhūriː* is *gāṃdhūriː/gāṃdhūlīː* (with *āː*) and *dyāː* of course represents the Newari equivalent of Skt. *deva*, the word *gāṃdhūriː* is not really Sanskrit but a Newari contraction and has nothing to do with Skt. *godhūlīː*. The only scholar who has hitherto tried to give an etymology of the expression is D. N. Gellner. He derives *gāṃdhūriː* from the Sanskrit word *gandhakuṭī* which means ‘perfumed hut’ and was, as is elaborated by Gellner, ‘an ancient honorific originally used to describe the place, wherever it was, that the Buddha happened to be staying. In Theravāda Buddhism *kuṭī*, hut, is still the term used for the room in which a monk lives’. Though Gellner’s derivation certainly looks very convincing, I cannot quite understand how Skt. *gandhakuṭī* could ever develop into Newari *gāṃdhūliː*. The syllables *gan* and *ṭī* do not cause any problem, since *gan / gam* remains and *ṭī* can become *ri* in Newari. The difficulty lies in the fact that, in this derivation, *gandhakuṭī* is strangely split up into *gan, dha-ku* and *ṭī* and that *dha-ku*, a very odd combination of the final syllable of

34 Such as, for example, *vālā* in Hindi.
36 For *godhūlī* see S. Lienhard, *Cow-dust and Sun-dust: Remarks on Skt. godhūlī and gorajas*, IT X (1982), pp. 147-53.
37 D. N. Gellner, op. cit., p. 390.
the word *gandha* and the initial part of *kūṭī*, could scarcely – both together – be abbreviated into Newari *dhū*.

My interpretation is different. If based on a Sanskrit lexeme, Newari *gāṃ* can only derive from *gana*, which designates a ‘group’ of gods, men, animals or things and is an old synonym of the word *saṅgha*. In Pāli a *gaṇācariya* is a teacher with (many) followers and the Pāli phrase *gaṇī ca saṅghī ca gaṇācariyo ca* frequently refers to Gautama Buddha. Interestingly enough, the word *gaṇa* occurs also in the Sanskrit Formula of the Threefold Refuge (*triśaranagamana*), in the specific form in which it is used in Newar *vihāras* whenever the bare *chuyagū* ceremony is performed. The third of the three refuges runs as follows:

*saṅghasya śaraṇaṃ gacchāmi gaṅānāṃ agryam*

‘I take refuge with the *saṅgha*, the foremost of (all) assemblies’.

The passage ‘the foremost of (all) assemblies’ is here expressed by the phrase *gaṅānāṃ agryam*. In this phrase the Skt. word *dhurya(m)*, which also means ‘best’, ‘foremost’, could be easily substituted for the Skt. word *agryam* and this substitution would result in the variant *gaṅānāṃ* likely that the Newari contraction *gāmdhūri/gāmdhūli* is based on Skt. *gaṇadhurya*. The *gāmdhūridya*: installed in the main shrine of the *bahīś* is thus the ‘God of the best of (all) assemblies’, that is to say, ‘of all *saṅghas’*. The first sentence of the *triśaraṇa* formula describes Buddha as the “foremost of (all) bipeds”, the second the Dharma as being the “foremost of (all doctrines that lead to) the freedom from passions”. As these ideas are intimately connected with the basic teaching of Buddhism, they fit well into the general atmosphere of the *bahīś*, the atmosphere which in former times pervaded this older form of the Newar *vihāra*.

---

39 The Formula of the Threefold Refuge is paraphrased in *Dīpavāṃsa* XI, 35 where the Emperor Aśoka is made to utter the following stanza:

*Buddho dakkhineyyān’ aggo Dhammo aggo virāgimanān/
Saṃgho ca puññakkhettaggo fini aggā sadevake/*

‘The Buddha is the foremost of (all) worthy of gifts, the (Buddhist) Doctrine is the foremost of (all teachings that lead to) the freedom from passions; the (Buddhist) Community is the foremost of (all) fields of merit. These three are the three foremost (things) in the world of men and gods’.