Immediately after the death of Buddha schismatic tendencies began to develop within the religion which he had founded. Even in Buddha's lifetime there were tendencies to schism among his followers, but his magnetic personality was able to prevent their development.¹ The first great doctrinal controversy in Buddhism was about the nature of Buddha. The school of the great council (Mahasanghikas) maintained that Buddha's nature was transcendent, and free from all earthly limitations. The conservatives, while exalting Buddha, above common humanity, would not admit that he was exempt from all the limitations of mankind.

These were but the first steps in a path which led to a radical transformation of Buddhism. The progressive group gave itself the name Mahayana, “the great vehicle,” that is, the comprehensive scheme of

---

¹ S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, vol. 1, (New York, Macmillan, 1923), p. 581: “Even in the lifetime of Buddha there were tendencies to schism among his followers, though they did not develop on account of the magnetic personality of the founder.”
28 Apr 1950

salvation; with a derogatory comparison they called the old fashioned religion Hinayana, “the little vehicle,” a scheme of individual salvation.

Hinayana Buddhism was called Southern Buddhism, since it prevailed in southern countries like Burma and Ceylon. On the other hand Mahayana Buddhism was called Northern Buddhism, since it flourished in northern countries like China and Japan. However this division seems to be an artificial one. Says Rhys Davids: “There is not now, and never has been, any unity either of opinion or of language in what is called Northern or in what is called Southern Buddhism.”*2 Although the division is artificial from a geographical point of view it is all important on higher grounds: the “southern” school insists that it has preserved the original teachings of Buddha with no accresions; the “northern” school is manifestly a broader interpretation. The northern school has never been essentially dependent upon the historical Buddha. Dates and documents have never mattered much to this Idealism.

As time passed on Hinayana Buddhism became the “incarnation of dead thought and the imprisonment of spirit.” It could give neither a warm faith for which to work {live, nor a real ideal for which to work.} It set forth a sort of world hatred as its inspiring motive. It preferred negative philosophical speculation, rather than a warm and positive religious expression. But this negative philosophy of the Hinayana could never become a popular religion.3 Its cold, passionless metaphysics could never inspire a real emotional uplifting.4 “The Hinayana ignored the groping of the spirit of man after something higher and wronged the spiritual side of man. The philosophical atheism of the Hinayana is the skeleton in the box, the diseased worm in the beautiful box.”†5 Thus the Hina-

---

† S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, p. 589.

2. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, p. 584: “Hinayāna Buddhism was called Southern Buddhism, since it prevailed in southern countries like Ceylon, while Mahāyāna is called the Northern, since it flourished in the North, Tibet, Mongolia, China, Korea and Japan. But this division seems to be an artificial one. Rhys Davids observes: ‘There is not now, and never has been, any unity either of opinion or of language in what is called Northern or in what is called Southern Buddhism.’”
4. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, p. 589: “A cold, passionless metaphysics devoid of religious teaching could not long inspire enthusiasm and joy.”
5. The end of the quotation should read “the diseased worm in the beautiful flower” rather than “in the beautiful box” (Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, p. 589).
yana Buddhism had to give way to a more positive and religious mode of expression. As Buddhism became more catholic, the Hinayana became less useful. As Buddhism spread throughout India and even beyond it, it had to adjust itself to new modes of thought. It had to present its message in language understandable to the masses. This challenge was met by Mahayana Buddhism. Mahayanism was able to capture the minds of the masses by giving up the icy coldness of some forms of early Buddhism and framing a religion that could appeal to the inner emotions.6

The Mahayana Buddhism gives us positive ideas of the ultimate issues of life. The Mahayana, or Great Vessel, offers to all beings salvation, by faith and love as well as by knowledge, while the Hinayana only seeks those few strong souls who require no external aid nor the consolation of worship. The Hinayana is exceedingly hard; whereas the burden of the Mahayana is light, and does not require one to totally renounce the world and his affections for humanity.

“The Hinayana emphasises the necessity of saving knowledge, and aims at the salvation of the individual, and refuses to develop the mystery of nibbana in a positive sense; the Mahayana lays as much or greater stress on love, and aims at the salvation of every sentient being, and finds in nirvana the One Reality, which is void only in the sense that it is free from the limitations of every phase of the limited or contingent experience of which we have empirical knowledge.”7 The Hinayanist would protest that the Mahayanist too easily capitulated the pure teachings of Buddha to the necessities of human nature. But such

---

6. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, p. 591: “The Mahāyāna found that it could capture the peoples' minds only if it gave up the icy coldness of some forms of Buddhism and framed a religion which could appeal to the human heart.”

7. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, pp. 591–592, quoting A. Coomaraswamy, Buddha and the Gospel of Buddhism, pp. 226–227: “The Mahāyāna Buddhism gives us positive ideas of God, soul and human destiny. 'The Mahāyāna, or Great Vessel, is so called by its adherents in contradistinction to the Hinayāna, or little vessel, of primitive Buddhism; the former offers to all beings in all worlds salvation by faith and love as well as by knowledge, while the latter only avails to convey over the rough sea of becoming to the farther shore of nibbāna, those few strong souls who require no external spiritual aid nor the consolation of worship. The Hinayāna, . . . is exceeding hard; whereas the burden of the Mahāyāna is light, and does not require that a man should immediately renounce the world and all the affections of humanity. . . . The Hinayāna emphasizes the necessity of saving knowledge, and aims at the salvation of the individual, and refuses to develop the mystery of nibbāna in a positive sense; the Mahāyāna lays as much or greater stress on love, and aims at the salvation of every sentient being, and finds in nirvāṇa the One Reality, which is “void” only in the sense that it is free from the limitations of every phase of the limited or contingent experience of which we have empirical knowledge.'"
capitulation was inevitable if Buddhism was to win converts. The Hinayana Buddhism was a religion for the thinking and the strong in spirit. Its lack of any supernatural power, its morbid way of solving the central problems of life, its reduction of nirvana to ultimate extinction, and its relegation of the ethical life to a strenuous asceticism, could never satisfy the masses. A new development had to arise for the emotional and the worshipful. Such was found in Mahayana Buddhism. At this point we may turn to a more detailed study of the chief characteristics and doctrines of Mahayana Buddhism.

The Mahayana Metaphysics

The metaphysics of Mahayana is monistic in character. All that exist in the world is of one reality. The nature of this reality is beyond description. "Things in their fundamental nature cannot be named or explained. They cannot be adequately expressed in any form or language. They are beyond the range of perception, and have no distinctive features. They possess absolute sameness, and are subject neither to transformation nor to destruction. They are nothing else but one soul, for which tathata is another designation." No relativity whatsoever can be attributed to the absolute. However it is the self-existent and the source of all. It is "the effulgence of great wisdom; the universal illumination of the dharmadhatu (universe), the true and adequate knowledge, the mind pure and clean in its nature; the eternal, the blessed, *

8. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, p. 592: "The Hinayāṇa protests against the Mahāyāṇa as an accommodation of the pure teaching to the necessities of human nature. . . . The absence of the supernatural and the consequent lack of any scope for imagination, the morbid way of solving the central problems of life, the reduction of nirvāṇa to extinction and ethical life to a monastic asceticism, made the Hinayāṇa a religion for the thinking and the strong in spirit, while a new development had to arise for the emotional and the worshipful."

9. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, p. 593: "Mahāyāṇa metaphysics is monistic in character. All objects in the world are of one reality. The nature of this reality is beyond language and description."

10. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, p. 593, quoting Suzuki's translation of The Awakening of Faith, p. 56: "Things in their fundamental nature cannot be named or explained. They cannot be adequately expressed in any form of language. They are beyond the range of perception, and have no distinctive features. They possess absolute sameness, and are subject neither to transformation nor to destruction. They are nothing else but one soul, for which tathatā is another designation."
The Mahayana Buddhists see the world of experience as phenomenal and not real. They liken it to a maya, mirage, flash of lightning or froth.† All existent things have three aspects: (1) quintessence, (2) attributes, and (3) activities. This may be illustrated by a simple jar. Its quintessence is the earth, its attribute is the form of the jar, and its activity is to keep water. The attribute and activity are by nature mutable, subject to the law of birth and death. On the other hand the quintessence is indestructible. The whole universe has its unchanged aspect as well as its changeable one. The term most frequently used to name the ultimate cosmic principle or the unchangeable aspect of the universe is Bhutatathata. This universal absolute is above all predicates. It can best be expressed in terms of the mystic, i.e., by negatives: "Bhutatathata is neither that which is existence nor that which is plurality, nor that which is at once unity and plurality."‡

It is quite significant to note the similarity of this conception with the Brahman of the Upanishads. However it seemed that the Mahayanists were quite aware of the similarity of their position with the Upanishadic view. In fact there was a steady influence of the spiritualistic monism of the Upanishads upon the thought of Mahayana Buddhism. The acceptance of the cosmic and monistic Bhutatathata on the part of the Mahayanists was quite significant for later Buddhism, for it meant the transformation of

11. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, p. 593, quoting Suzuki’s translation of *The Awakening of Faith*, p. 96: “It is ‘the effulgence of great wisdom; the universal illumination of the dharmadhatu (universe), the true and adequate knowledge, the mind pure and clean in its nature; the eternal, the blessed, the self-regulating and the pure, the immutable and the free.'”

12. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, p. 593: “The world of experience is phenomenal and not real. . . . The Mahāyāna Buddhists liken the universe to a māya, mirage, flash of lightning or froth. All things of the world have the three aspects of (1) quintessence, (2) attributes, and (3) activities. If we take a jar, its quintessence is the earth, its attribute is the form of the jar, and its activity is to keep water. The attribute and activity are subject to law of birth and death, while the quintessence is indestructible.”

13. J. B. Pratt, *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism* (New York: Macmillan, 1928), pp. 249–250, quoting Suzuki’s translation of *The Awakening of Faith*, p. 59: “Pure being, if so I may for the moment render Bhutatathata, is above all predicates. It can best be expressed as the mystics have always expressed it, by negatives: ‘Bhutatathata is neither that which is existence nor that which is non-existence; it is neither that which is unity nor that which is plurality, nor that which is at once unity and plurality, nor that which is not at once unity and plurality.’”

14. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, p. 594n: “The Mahāyānists seemed to have been aware of the similarity of their position to the Upanishad view.”
Buddhism from an individualistic and either pluralistic or nihilistic philosophy into a monistic and spiritualistic view, strikingly similar to neo-Hegelian absolute idealism.*

The rise of the world of multiplicity is accounted for by a metaphysics of metaphors. Ignorance or avidya is said to be the cause of the world. As stated previously Bhutatathata is pure spirit or pure awareness without multiplicity or character; but it is infected with multiplicity through the action of ignorance, a process which the author of the Awakening seeks to make plainer by the simile of "perfuming." Just as clothes when new have no odor but are scented by the perfumes which one puts upon them, so the pure, undifferentiated mind is "perfumed" by ignorance. From this perfuming there results the mind of man, and from the mind of man results the dream or vision of an external world. However this illusion of an external world is a defect of true vision; it is "a cataract on the spiritual eye." This world of multiplicity is indeed ultimately attributable to, it flows from, the One Reality. At this point, as Pratt reminds us,† we find the Mahayana asserting the same general thesis as Spinoza. Like Spinoza again, the Mahayana does not pretend to be able to follow out the details of derivation. They are quite aware of the impossibility of ascertaining where the many appear and where they disappear; for that we must look to the Supreme Nature. However we can know that the many are illusory, like the "flower-shaped apparition" which a man would get, "who with perfect sight, beheld the pure void of space, but fixed his eyes on one particular spot, beyond which he did not look or move his eyes, staring until his sight was fatigued."†

---

15. Pratt, Pilgrimage of Buddhism, p. 248: "It meant the transformation of Buddhism from an individualistic and either pluralistic or nihilistic philosophy into a monistic and spiritualistic view, an absolute idealism in many ways strikingly similar to neo-Hegelianism."

16. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, p. 594: "The rise of the world is accounted for as usual by a metaphysics of metaphors. Ignorance or avidya is said to be the cause of the world."

17. Pratt, Pilgrimage of Buddhism, p. 250: "Bhutatathata and Alaya-vijnana are pure spirit or pure awareness without multiplicity or character; but they are infected with multiplicity through the action of ignorance, a process which the author seeks to make plainer by the simile of 'perfuming.' Just as our clothes when new have no odor but are scented by the perfumes which we put upon them, so the pure, undifferentiated mind is 'perfumed' by ignorance. From this perfuming there results the mind of man, and from it the dream or vision of an external world—a world of things which are nothing but the percepts of the various observers."

18. Pratt, Pilgrimage of Buddhism, p. 253: "The illusion of a real material world is a defect of true vision; it is, as it were, the effect of a cataract on the spiritual eye. This world of multiplicity
We are immediately led to ask the question, whence arises in our finite minds the illusion of the many? This question is never completely and satisfactorily answered. The Mahayana struggles with it, but its attempts at explanation seldom satisfy the western reader. It seems that their explanation boils down to this point: since an illusion is really a negation of reality, consisting of non-being, no explanation is required. In other words, since it is a form of nothing, it is not necessary to attribute a cause to it.

This then is the explanation of the phenomenal world; this expresses the way in which the many evolve from the one through the intervention of ignorance. Obviously this is not wholly clear. But it need not perplex us too much, for even the author of the Awakening does not claim to have full understanding of the matter himself. In fact, he tells us that “the mind which starts from the perfuming influence of ignorance which has no beginning cannot be comprehended by common people nor even by Sravakas and Pratyekabuddhas. It is partly comprehended by some Bodhisattvas; but even those who have reached the highest stage of Bodhisattvahood cannot thoroughly comprehend it. The only one who can have a clear and consummate knowledge of it is the Tathagata.”

The Mahayana Religion

From a doctrinal point there is no unity in the Mahayana religion. It is characterized by a great degree is indeed ultimately attributable to, it flows from, the One Reality—here we find the Mahayana philosophy asserting the same general thesis as Spinoza. Like Spinoza again, the Mahayana does not pretend to be able to follow out the details of the derivation. To ascertain the precise point where the many appear and where they disappear is not possible; for that we must look to the Supreme Nature, and beyond that we can ascertain nothing. But we know that the many are illusory, like the ‘flower-shaped apparition’ which a man would get ‘who with perfect sight, beheld the pure void of space, but fixed his eyes on one particular spot, beyond which he did not look or move his eyes, staring until his sight was fatigued.’"
of diversity. This lack of doctrinal unity in Mahayana Buddhism may be attributed to its amazing amount of tolerance, something quite conspicuously missing in Hinayana Buddhism. Wherever Mahayana Buddhism prevailed the indigenous religions were tolerated, while it took care to teach them a new respect for life, kindness to animals and resignation. So long as they followed certain ethical rules, the new converts were not forced to give up their numerous superstitions. Any god could be believed in so long as one was ethical. This protean character of Mahayana Buddhism is another example of that universal historical law, viz., that that culture which conquers is in turn conquered. This universal law is especially true of religion. It was true when Christianity proved victorious in the Roman empire and it was true when Mahayana Buddhism won converts from the regions of China, Korea, Siam, Burma and Japan. “The more crusading a religion is, the more it absorbs.”

The amazing amount of tolerance of Mahayana Buddhism is in consonance with its metaphysical views. It is asserted that all religions are revelation of the same Dharmakaya and bring out some aspects of truth. Dharma is the all-pervading spiritual force, the ultimate and the supreme principle of life. It is interesting to note that there is an attempt to personify dharma in the conception of Buddha. He is considered the first cause, the eternal God, superior to all things the supreme and first of all Buddhas.

He is the devatideva, the paramount God of gods. He is the creator of all bodhisattvas. All beings are his children. “The tathagata, having left the conflagration of the three worlds, is dwelling in peace in the tranquillity of his forest abode, saying to himself all three worlds are my possession, all living beings are

* Radhakrishnan, op. cit., p. 597.

20. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, pp. 596–597: “There is no unity in the Mahayâna religion. It suffered religious superstitions gladly. Wherever it prevailed, India, China, Korea, Siam, Burma and Japan, the indigenous religions were tolerated, while it took care to teach them a new respect for life, kindness to animals and resignation. So long as men conformed to certain ethical rules and respected the order of monks, the Buddhist teachers did not feel called upon to condemn the superstitious usages. It does not matter what gods you worship, so long as you are good. The protean character of Mahayâna Buddhism is due to this tendency.”

21. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, p. 597: “The freedom of opinion in religious matters is in consonance with the metaphysical views of the Mahayâna. All religions are revelations of the same Dharmakâya and bring out some aspects of truth. Dharma is the all-pervading spiritual force, the ultimate and the supreme principle of life. The first attempt at personifying dharma is in the conception Âdi Buddha, the first cause, the eternal God, superior to all things, the supreme, the first of all the Buddhas, without equal or comparison.”
my children, the world is full of intense tribulation, but I myself will work out their salvation." "To all who believe me I do good, while friends are they to me who seek refuge in me."*

However there is more than one Buddha. There are a number of Buddhas endowed with the highest intelligence and love. They too are working constantly to save the world. There have been an infinite number of these Buddhas in the past, and there will be an infinite number in the future. All of these Buddhas are transitory manifestations of the one eternal being.

Many of the Vedic gods are brought over into Mahayana, and thus become aspects of the One Supreme Reality. Nagarjuna who, with Asvaghosha is commonly considered the founder of Mahayana Buddhism, by his precept and practice taught that the Hindu gods of Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva and Kali had the attributes assigned to them in Brahmanical scriptures, and were proper objects of worship. The traditional Hindu gods were easily adjusted to this new system, and their function and assignments were readily given.† A close analysis of Mahayanism will reveal that a vast number of its bodhisattvas, archangels and saints are only Vedic Aryans "thinly disguised by Buddhistic symbolism."‡

On the surface Mahayana religion seems to be polytheistic, in contrast to its monistic metaphysics. But a more scrutinizing study would reveal that the several gods are subordinate to a single head.§ It is the Dharma which is the ultimate foundation of existence.


* Quoted in Radhakrishnan, op. cit., p. 600.
† Indra becomes Satamanyu and Vajrapani, with his own kingdom of heaven. Brahma had his chief characters transferred to Manjusri, the lamp of wisdom. Vishnu passes his attributes to Avalokitesvara or Padmapani. Virupaksa is one of the names of Shiva, though in Buddhistic legend he is one of the four kings. Ganesa is taken over both as Vinayaka and demon Vinatakn. Ajita formed with Sakyamuni and Avalokitesvara a triad.
‡ Radhakrishnon, op. cit., p. 598.

22. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, p. 600: "All beings are his children. ‘The Tathagata, having left the conflagration of the three worlds, is dwelling in peace in the tranquillity of his forest abode, saying to himself all three worlds are my possession, all living beings are my children, the world is full of intense tribulation, but I myself will work out their salvation.’ ‘To all who believe me I do good, while friends are they to me who seek refuge in me.’"

23. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, p. 597: "The work of saving the world is done by the Buddhas, or the beings endowed with the highest intelligence and love. There have been an infinite number of these Buddhas in the past, and there will be an infinite number in future. . . . They are all transitory manifestations of the One Eternal Being."

24. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, p. 598n: "Indra becomes Satamanyu and Vajrapâni, with his own kingdom of heavens (svarga), called Trayastrmâloka. Brahmâ had his chief characters transferred to Manjusri, the lamp of wisdom. Sarasvatî continued to be one of his wives, the other being Lâksâmi. Avalokiteśvara or Padmapâni has the attributes of Viśou or Padmanâbhâ. Virûpâkṣa is one of the names of Śiva, though in Buddhistic legend he is one of the four kings. Gâneśa is taken over both as Vinayaka and demon Vinataka. The Sapta tathâgatas are the seven rṣis. Ajita formed with Śâkyamuni and Avalokiteśvara a triad."

25. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, p. 598: "The monistic metaphysics of the Mahâyâna has given rise to an apparently polytheistic religion, but we should note that the several gods are subordinate to a single head."
This metaphysical conception of Dharmakaya as the ground of all existence makes Mahayana religion essentially compatible with its metaphysics.

**The Ethics of Mahayana**

The ethical ideal of the Mahayana is the Bodhisattva. Etymologically the term Bodhisattva means simply one whose being consists of insight. But historically it means “one who is on the way to the attainment of perfect knowledge, a future Buddha.” The term was first applied to Gotama during his previous births and throughout the earlier years of his historical life up to the time of his enlightenment. It therefore came to mean a man destined to become a Buddha in this or some future life.* To understand this ideal it is necessary to go back to the teaching and life of the founder. His own example was quite free from selfishness and narrowness. He taught that each man should avoid giving pledges to Fortune and should seek the desireless and sorrow-free life. But beyond this his own heart was so full of love for every form of suffering creature that he long postponed Parinivana for their sake. It was this point of the Buddha’s teaching and example that the Mahayanist seized upon and it was upon this that they based their moral ideal. The Arat of the Hinayana, busy about his own salvation, was considered too narrow and selfish by the Mahayana, and they erected in his stead the ideal of the earnest seeker after the welfare of others, who in unselfish devotion to his fellow creatures accumulates great stores of merit and dedicates it not to his own salvation but to that of all suffering beings. Merit is thought by the Mahayana as being transferable. There is also the element of vicarious suffering in Mahayana religion. The Bodhisattva is able to present his merit to a needy world, and for its sake he is willing to be a meritless sinner.† It is interesting at

---

26. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, p. 600: “But historically it means ‘one who is on the way to the attainment of perfect knowledge, a future Buddha.’”

27. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, p. 600: “It therefore came to mean ‘a Buddha designate,’ or a man destined to become a Buddha in this or some future life.”

28. Davis corrected “Arat” to “Arhat.”

29. Pratt, *Pilgrimage of Buddhism*, pp. 217–218: “To understand this ideal it is necessary to go back to what I have referred to as the heart element in the teaching and life of the Founder. His own example, as I have so often pointed out, was quite free from that implication of selfishness.
this point to note the similarities of this conception of vicarious suffering and the transference of merit to many of the theories of atonement that have appeared in the history of Christian thought.

The Mahavastu, a late Hinayana work, gives a list of ten stages in the progress of the Bodhisattva, and the same number is retained, with modifications in detail, by the Mahayana authorities. The first stage is the joyful (pramudita) one characterised by the rise of the thought of bodhi. It is here that the Bodhisattva makes sincere resolutions which determine the future course. One such vow is the resolution of Avalokitesvara not to accept salvation until the last particle of dust shall have attained to Buddhahood. The recognition of the impermanence of things brings the stage of Vimala or purity into being. In it came the practice of morality and the exercise of wisdom (adhicitta). In the next stage the Bodhisattva goes through the process of blotting out anger, hatred, and error, and promoting faith, compassion, charity, and disinterestedness. This is the third stage (prabhakari), where the seeker shines with patience and forbearance. In the fourth stage the Bodhisattva surrenders all traces of egoism by training himself in good work and applying himself specially to the cultivation of virtues connected with bodhi. In the fifth

or narrowness . . . Whatever might be the natural deduction from his teaching that each of us should avoid giving pledges to Fortune and should seek the desireless and sorrow-free life, his own heart was so full of love for every form of suffering creature that he long postponed Parinirvana for their sake, and fired the imaginations of many of his disciples with the longing to be of service to others at any cost. It was this aspect of the Buddha's teaching and example that the Mahayana thinkers seized upon and it was on this that they based their moral ideal. The typical Arhat (= Arahant), busy about his own salvation, wandering alone as a rhinoceros, they felt to be narrow and unworthy, and they erected in his stead the ideal of the earnest seeker after the welfare of others, who in unselfish devotion to his fellow creatures accumulates great stores of merit and dedicates it not to his own salvation but to that of all suffering beings. For in the faith of the Mahayana, there are many such ardent saviors of others. All the Buddhas had dedicated themselves, for ages before their complete enlightenment, to this unselfish task: and as there will be an endless line of Buddhas in the infinite future, as there has been in the infinite past, so there must now be an incalculable multitude of future Buddhas, i.e., Bodhisattvas, who have dedicated themselves to the same endless task as that for which Gotama went through so many births and deaths. This faith involves not only a new ideal but a new conception of the acquisition of merit and of salvation.Merit is thought of by the Mahayana as being transferable. Suffering and goodness are vicarious. The Bodhisattva is able to present his merit to a needy world, and for its sake he is willing to be himself a meritless sinner.”

30. Pratt, Pilgrimage of Buddhism, p. 221: “The Mahavastu, a late Hinayana work, gives a list of ten stages in the progress of the Bodhisattva, and the same number is retained, with modifications in detail, by the Mahayana authorities.”
stage the seeker begins a course of study and meditation to understand the four noble truths in their true light. In the next stage the seeker turns to the basic principles of "dependent origination and non-substantiality." This stage is called the abhimukhi, or "turned towards." The seeker now devotes himself to the attainment of that knowledge which would enable him to effect his aim of universal salvation. He is now in the seventh stage, called duramjama. Next the seeker comes to the eighth stage in which the supreme virtue of (anutpattiladharmacaksuh) seeing all things such as they are, dominates. In the ninth stage the seeker reaches the point when all his acts are unselfish, done without desire. Finally the Bodhisattva reaches the tenth stage in which he becomes a tathāgata, a cloud of dharma.*31

In this upward pathway from the phenomenal world to the Real world we see something of the Mahayana view of salvation. Just before his death, Buddha had said to his followers, "Work out your own salvation with diligence." The Mahayana accepts this

31. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, pp. 601–602. "The first stage is the joyful (pramudita) one characterised by the rise of the thought of bodhi. It is here that the bodhisattva makes those pregnant resolutions (pranidhāna) which determine the future course. The resolution of Avalokiteśvara not to accept salvation until the last particle of dust shall have attained to Buddhahood before him is such a vow. The insight is developed gradually so as to render the heart pure and the mind free from the illusion of self. The recognition of the impermanence of things enlarges the aspirant’s compassionate nature, and we get next the stage of vimala, or purity. In it we have the practice of morality and the exercise of wisdom (adhicitta). In the next stage the bodhisattva engages himself in the various bhāvanās which enable him to annihilate anger, hatred, and error, and promote faith, compassion, charity, and disinterestedness. This is the third stage (prabhakarī), where the seeker shines with patience and forbearance. The bodhisattva, to surrender all traces of egoism, trains himself in good work and applies himself specially to the cultivation of virtues connected with bodhi (bodhipakṣa dharma). It is the fourth radiant stage (arcsmati). Then does the seeker begin a course of study and meditation to understand the four noble truths in their true light. It is the fifth invincible (sudurjaya) stage where dhyāna and samsādhi predominate. As a result of moral practice and meditation, the seeker turns to the basic principles of dependent origination and non-substantiality. This stage is called abhimukhi, or ‘turned towards.’ Here prajñā reigns. Yet he is not completely free from passion, and still has the desires of becoming a Buddha and the intention of saving mankind. He devotes himself to the attainment of that knowledge which would enable him to effect his aim of universal salvation. He is now in the seventh stage, called dūramgama. When he is free from the eager desire for the particular, his thoughts are not bound to any special objects, and he becomes immovable (acala). This is the eighth stage where the supreme virtue of (anutpatti kadharmacaksuh) seeing all things such as they are, i.e. rooted in tathātā, dominates. The activity of the bodhisattva is tainted by no duality or selfishness. He is not content with tranquil repose, but is actually engaged in the teaching of dharma to others. It is the ninth stage, that of the good ones (sādhumati) when all his acts are unselfish, done without desire. . . . The bodhisattva becomes a tathāgata in the tenth stage, a cloud of dharma (dharmamegha).”
command and urges the necessity of individual effort in the salvation process. But they do not stop here. The help of a saviour is necessary. The Mahayana would reword the Buddha's sentence and cry with St. Paul: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God who worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure."* It is the Buddha nature within us that unites itself with our wills in the struggle for salvation. Without this more than human aid, salvation from ignorance and desire would be impossible.

The principles of the moral life for the Mahayana are five in number, viz., dāna (charity), virya (fortitude) sīla (morality), ksānti (patience), and dhyāna (meditation). The severity of monasticism is relaxed. It is possible for one to reach the goal and remain married. Asceticism and poverty are not emphasized as they are in Hinayāna ethics. The doctrine of karma is tempered with mercy. Emphasis is placed on faith as a way of salvation.32 The Mahayana insists on the turning over of ethical merit to the advantage of others. They insist that no man lives to himself alone. The good or evil of one affects the whole. Whether the metaphysical truth that nothing on earth is real, can be reconciled with the ethical law that we should work and suffer for our neighbor, is apparently a problem which the Mahayanist never solved.33 He would still insist that he must save the world. When the question of nirvana is brought forth the Mahayanists are anxious to make out that it is not annihilation.34 It is real freedom where ignorance is overcome.35 It is the union with the great soul of the

---

* Philippians 2:12.
Conclusion

Now we may see why Mahayana Buddhism gradually won out over Hinayana Buddhism. The Hinayana was for the Buddhist elect chiefly; the Mahayana is for everybody. It has its obstruse philosophical appeal for the thinker, as was noticed in its metaphysical system; and at the same time it provides something for the most naive mind, as was noticed in the amazing degree of tolerance in its religion. “Its thinkers were well aware of Hegel’s distinction between religion and philosophy at least sixteen hundred years before Hegel was born. The truths of philosophy need not be studied in their obstruse form by the beginner; for him the simpler and symbolic figures that speak to the imagination may well suffice.”

Thus Buddhism became a religion for the laymen as well as for the monk. The emphasis on fleeing from the world was replaced by a desire to live in the world, while yet being not of the world. In the words of Coomaraswamy, “the development of the Mahayana is the overflowing of Buddhism over the limits of Order into the life of the world.”
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On 12 June 1950, King, Walter R. McCall, Pearl E. Smith, and Doris Wilson had a confrontation with a New Jersey tavern owner, Ernest Nichols, who refused to serve them. King and his friends charged Nichols with violation of a state civil rights law. Nichols's statement, prepared by his lawyer, defends his refusal to serve the group and his brandishing of a gun. McGann implies wrongdoing on the part of one of the complainants, who was described as "quite insistent that Mr. Nichols sell him package goods or a bottle and this caused Nichols to become upset and excited because he knew that he was being asked to do something which constitutes a violation." McGann argues that Nichols did not generally refuse to serve blacks: "it is well known and can be proven without doubt, that for years Mr. Nichols has served colored patrons." Nichols promises to obey the civil rights statute in the future: "Mr. Nichols steadfastly maintains that he is willing to serve colored folks and knows that under the law he must serve colored patrons." The case was dropped when three witnesses refused to testify on behalf of the complainants.

State of New Jersey Vs. Ernest Nichols, Defendant.

Around 12:45 A.M., Monday morning June 12th, 1950 four colored persons came into the tavern of Ernest Nichols, which is located at Route S-41 and Camden Pike, in the Township of Maple Shade, and County of Burlington. At the time in question, one of the four walked up to the proprietor, Ernest Nichols, and asked him for "package goods." This Mr. Nichols refused to sell and stated that it was Sunday and that he could not sell "package goods" on Sunday or after 10:00 P.M. on any day. Then the applicant asked for a bottle of beer and it is alleged that Mr. Nichols answered "no beer, Mr! Today is Sunday." The

1. Walter Raleigh McCall (1923–1978), a Morehouse classmate of King’s, graduated from Crozer in 1951. He later pursued postgraduate work at Temple University in 1952–1953 and at Atlanta University in 1958. McCall served as dean and chaplain at Fort Valley State College from 1951 until 1957, when he became pastor of Providence Baptist Church in Atlanta. He was the director of Morehouse’s School of Religion from 1965 until 1969.