

UNITED WISDOM

Theravāda, Mahāyāna, and Vajrayāna: A Map of Differences

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-22-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Theravāda, Mahāyāna, and Vajrayāna: A Map of Differences

Epigraph

“Suffering is to be understood.”

The Buddha in SN 56.11, the task associated with the first noble truth. Editorial English translation of our Russian rendering of a short passage from Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu’s translation, “Setting the Wheel of Dhamma in Motion”; not a verified quotation of published English wording.

About this article

In one temple someone hears Pāli chanting; in another they see a many-armed bodhisattva; in a third they observe silent sitting. From outside, these can look like three different religions. Conversely, they may look like one universal technique for calm decorated with local customs. Both impressions are premature.

“Theravāda,” “Mahāyāna,” and “Vajrayāna” help us find our way through Buddhism if we understand that they designate different levels of the map. Theravāda is a particular historical tradition. Mahāyāna is a broad range of movements, texts, and paths united by the special significance of the bodhisattva ideal. Vajrayāna primarily denotes tantric forms of the path, usually within a Mahāyāna horizon. These three words do not divide all Buddhists into three sealed camps. We will examine shared foundations, differences in goals and practices, the place of texts and communities, and then test several common stereotypes. The map’s purpose is to enable precise questions, not to rank traditions by spiritual advancement.

I. Why three names do not make three identical boxes

A good map begins by acknowledging its own provisional character. A country, a mountain range, and a climatic zone may occupy the same space on a geographical map, yet belong to different ways of describing it. Similar care is needed here: a historical community, a current of religious thought, and a particular form of practice need not be mutually exclusive categories.

Theravāda connects its textual foundation with the Pāli canon and has a long history in Sri Lanka and several Southeast Asian countries. Its own introductory account is available at Access to Insight. Mahāyāna embraces a much wider range of traditions, so the word alone says little about how a particular community lives.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

To understand Vajrayāna, we must not automatically place it alongside Mahāyāna as an entirely separate religion. In Alexander Berzin's explanation, Buddhist tantra is presented as a Mahāyāna practice presupposing an existing foundation in the path. This is an internal account of a particular tradition, not proof of its superiority.

A hypothetical visitor might meet a Tibetan teacher who explains general ethics, reasons about emptiness, and leads a tantric ritual. All three activities can belong to one religious life. Calling only the last "real Tibetan Buddhism" removes the first two from the picture without justification.

The mistake is familiar outside religion too. We choose the most striking feature and make it represent the whole. Quiet meditation looks rational, colorful ritual mystical, monastic discipline strict. But outward form does not automatically tell us the activity's goal, its place in the path, or the quality of human relations within the community.

II. A shared foundation goes deeper than a shared atmosphere

We cannot establish what Buddhist traditions share by saying that they all supposedly teach us to "be here and now." That contemporary formula is too broad. In the early text "Setting the Wheel of Dhamma in Motion," SN 56.11, the path is organized around suffering, its arising, its cessation, and the path to cessation. Each noble truth has its own task: understanding, abandoning, realizing, or developing.

This pattern matters even to a reader who does not accept the religious horizon. It distinguishes knowing a problem from working with its conditions. Noticed suffering does not vanish because it has been named; understanding the path is not the same as following it. This is why Buddhism is difficult to reduce to a collection of attractive sayings.

A living tradition includes Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha—the awakened teacher, teaching, and community. Their meanings and forms of engagement differ. But the community is not incidental scenery surrounding a private experience. It transmits texts, sustains a way of life, and creates relationships between laypeople and monastics. The institutional overview of Chinese Buddhism shows the material and social dimensions of these three jewels particularly well.

Imagine someone borrowing a breathing practice from a Buddhist context and using it before a presentation. We can describe this as borrowing a particular element. They have not thereby reproduced a religious path involving teaching, ethics, community, and an understanding of liberation. Respect for a tradition does not require prohibiting borrowing; it requires naming its scale accurately.

A shared foundation also does not mean that every question receives the same answer. Disagreements about paths, texts, and ideals have generated the rich history of Buddhist thought. Attributing one contemporary slogan to that history replaces investigation with a recognizable advertising formula.

III. Theravāda: discipline, liberation, and communal life

The ideal of the arahant occupies a central place in Theravāda: someone who has completed the path of liberation from defilements. Nibbāna, the Pāli form of “nirvāṇa,” designates a religious goal that cannot be reduced to a good mood. The Pāli canon includes disciplinary texts, discourses, and systematic analyses of teaching. But this textual foundation lives through transmission, interpretation, and instruction.

It does not follow that every layperson pursues the same immediate goal every day. Religious life may include generosity, ethical commitments, support for a monastery, commemorative ceremonies, listening to teaching, and meditation. Distinguishing the path’s ultimate goal from a person’s participation today prevents us from treating them as a failed philosopher merely because their religious life is arranged differently.

Contemporary observers often contrast “real meditation” with “folk customs.” That is already an evaluation rather than a neutral description. Before accepting it, we should ask what participants themselves find significant and how they connect actions, care for others, and teaching. Someone providing food for a community may participate in religious life in a way unlike our chosen ideal of individual searching.

Nor should Theravāda symbolize emotional coldness. Personal liberation does not exclude goodwill and help. A comparison framed as “they think only of themselves” has already defeated one tradition using another’s language and ceased to be a map.

It is more useful to examine a tension common to any path: how do work on one’s own condition and responsibility toward others fit together? Helping others can become avoidance of one’s difficulties. Self-examination can become indifference. The name of a tradition alone resolves neither human task.

IV. Mahāyāna: the significance of the bodhisattva path

The bodhisattva has particular significance in Mahāyāna: someone directing the path toward awakening for the benefit of living beings. Bodhicitta means aspiration to awakening for this purpose. It is neither mere sympathy nor a demand to forget oneself constantly. Within its religious horizon, it concerns a complete transformation of understanding and action.

Mahāyāna literature is diverse. For example, BDK's publisher description of the Lotus Sutra points to the idea of one vehicle and chapters important to East Asian Buddhism. This example shows a particular textual world; it does not mean that one sutra exhausts Mahāyāna.

The bodhisattva path also has a more concrete description than a general call to kindness. Geshe Sonam Rinchen's account of the six perfections names generosity, ethical discipline, patience, effort, concentration, and wisdom. Their connection matters: help does not compensate for harm caused at the same time, intention requires sustained effort, and concentration requires understanding what should be developed. The author considers them within the religious horizon of awakening and future births; these consequences do not become scientifically established facts through our paraphrase.

This framework changes the comparative question too. Instead of "Which school is kinder?" we can ask how generosity is taught, how ethical obligations relate to meditation, and why wisdom is necessary for helping. Naming one virtue does not reveal an entire path. Even similar actions may acquire different meanings according to their goal and foundation. The recognizable human side of a teaching helps begin a conversation, but does not let us discard its religious side as unnecessary decoration.

For a contemporary reader, a difficulty in the bodhisattva ideal appears in an ordinary question: can we help without making another person material for our moral self-image? In a hypothetical example, someone insists that a loved one accept help because they need to feel like a rescuer. Outwardly they act selflessly; in practice, the other person's freedom disrupts their script.

This is our application, not a Buddhist interpretation of a particular episode. It helps show why a broad aspiration still needs wisdom. Wanting to benefit someone does not automatically tell us what helps, where competence ends, or what consequences will arise. Compassion may require listening, learning, and abandoning a comfortable role.

We should not, however, redefine a bodhisattva as a contemporary social worker. The historical ideal involves awakening, saṃsāra, and a long path. A contemporary ethical analogy can be substantive as long as we do not present it as complete equivalence.

The difference from the arahant ideal matters within some Mahāyāna accounts. But readers should distinguish a school's self-description from an impartial judgment of everyone in another tradition. Religious polemic belongs to history; it need not become the tone of our comparison.

V. Vajrayāna: special means require a foundation

Vajrayāna involves tantric means of the path: ritual, mantra, visualization, and particular relationships of transmission. In Berzin's account, these presuppose ethical discipline, bodhicitta, an understanding of emptiness, and preparation. Initiation means entering a particular framework of commitments, not obtaining an attractive impression.

For an outside reader, the most important boundary lies between describing a practice and instructing someone to perform it independently. We can learn that visualizing a Buddha image has a particular place in a tradition. It does not follow that an image found online and a few words from a book provide sufficient conditions for practicing.

Consumer logic readily operates here: the most unusual looks strongest, and the strongest promises the shortest path. But complexity and speed cannot be judged by outward effect. A hypothetical person chooses an intensive course because they are tired of ordinary life, then treats every difficulty as confirmation of their "unreadiness." Yet they never established what obligations they were accepting or who was responsible for teaching.

Our conclusion is limited: a religious means should be understood in context. It does not confirm a ritual's effectiveness or assess a particular teacher without evidence. Respect for transmission does not require trusting anyone who uses its language.

Vajrayāna must also not be equated with all Tibetan Buddhism. Tibetan Buddhism includes philosophical education, general ethics, and nontantric forms of the path. The opposite mistake is to regard tantric Buddhism as exclusively Tibetan. The Japanese Shingon tradition in Kongōbu-ji's own account preserves another historical form of esoteric Buddhism. This distinction is enough for the map; conditions from one lineage cannot be transferred to another without checking.

VI. Texts, teachers, and forms of knowledge

We should now unfold a second map: collections of texts. It does not coincide completely with the map of three currents. The Pāli, Chinese, and Tibetan canons developed in different languages and historical circumstances. They overlap, but shared teaching does not mean identical books or identical histories of transmission.

The Pāli Tipiṭaka distinguishes three major collections: Vinaya Piṭaka, Sutta Piṭaka, and Abhidhamma Piṭaka. Vinaya primarily concerns the organization and discipline of monastic life; suttas contain discourses and instruction; Abhidhamma offers systematic analysis of teaching. Even within one canon, readers therefore encounter different textual tasks. A communal rule, a discourse, and an analytical classification need not sound alike or answer the same question.

The Tibetan textual world offers a particularly clear example. The 84000 translation project's overview distinguishes the Kangyur, translations of texts accepted as the Buddha's word, from the Tengyur, translations of treatises by Indian teachers. "The Buddha's word" is a category of traditional authority here: it includes not only speech directly attributed to the Buddha but some teachings by others. It is not equivalent to a historically established record of every conversation.

The Kangyur includes disciplinary works, sutras, and tantras. The Tengyur includes commentaries, philosophy, logic, and other fields of knowledge. The library's organization itself therefore challenges the idea that Tibetan tradition consists only of unusual rituals. The overview also notes several editions differing in contents, order, and textual details. Naming a canon is insufficient when investigating a particular passage: the work and version used matter.

84000's answers about the canon help compare collections without declaring them three completely alien worlds. Many Mahāyāna works exist in Chinese and Tibetan translations; some survive only in Tibetan. The Tibetan collection has extensive tantric sections, the Chinese some tantric works, and the Pāli no Buddhist tantras. Meanwhile, teachings and narratives corresponding to Pāli ones may appear in Tibetan texts as parallel passages rather than a separate book with the same arrangement.

In our hypothetical case, a beginning researcher takes a monastic timetable rule from one collection and a philosophical commentary on consciousness from another. The first seems mundane, the second profound. They conclude that one tradition concerns only external order, the other inner understanding. But the result was built into the choice of pages: different textual tasks were compared. Correcting the comparison does not require declaring the traditions identical in advance. We must first choose a common question and find passages actually discussing it.

If the question concerns monastic communal life, a philosophical commentary does not replace a disciplinary source. If it concerns explaining experience, a timetable alone does not establish a school's position. Real differences may emerge only after this alignment; they will be more substantive because they no longer depend on an accidental contrast of genres. This changes how we read the map: a name indicates where to begin searching, but a conclusion requires a particular passage, its audience, and its purpose. Keeping teaching, transmission, and present participation distinct prevents one selected page from becoming a portrait of all adherents.

A cautious reading rule follows: absence of a familiar title does not establish absence of corresponding content. An identically translated term does not establish an identical role

either. Particular passages, genres, and interpretations must be compared. A vast library does not answer for us how a particular community reads one page.

Differences of language also involve more than convenient wording. Translators must decide how to render a concept whose boundaries do not match a familiar English word. We have already encountered nibbāna and nirvāṇa—forms coming through different languages. An introduction should explain such differences; serious comparison benefits from retaining the original term beside its translation. Otherwise a difference can arise or disappear unnoticed in translation, and readers attribute it to the school itself.

A tradition’s name tells us much about its textual foundation but does not remove interpretation’s role. Even when a community accepts one canon, questions remain: how should it be read, what should beginners learn, how should passages be reconciled, and what matters in this situation? Transmission of text and transmission of understanding are connected without automatically coinciding.

Our hypothetical example from professional training makes this visible. Two people read one manual. One can reproduce its terms; the other can notice an error in actual work. The second has knowledge memorization does not guarantee. Yet experience does not make them infallible: documentation, checks, and colleagues’ objections remain useful.

The analogy raises a question about religious teachers without replacing the internal meaning of guidance. In different Buddhist traditions, a teacher may carry a lineage, exemplify a way of life, interpret texts, and guide practice. These roles are not organized identically, and addressing someone as “teacher” does not always imply the same degree of commitment.

Meeting a person should not erase questions about foundations. Why is this explanation trusted? What texts support it? Which lineage does it belong to? Can unclear points be clarified? What are the limits of promises? These questions help us understand a relationship before strong personal attachment develops.

Nor should everything be replaced by distrustful comparison of quotations. A text needs context, and an isolated phrase can appear to prove almost any position. Independence as a reader means understanding what is trusted and on what basis, not never trusting anyone.

VII. Internal diversity matters more than a convenient stereotype

The three names are often turned into three psychological portraits: Theravāda is strict, Mahāyāna compassionate, Vajrayāna mystical. This is memorable, but mixes doctrine, outward style, and personal characteristics. One community may be strict and caring, philosophical and ritualistic, simultaneously.

Even Zen, often presented as rejection of words, belongs to a world of texts, services, and teaching. The official list of Sōtō daily texts includes sutras and instructions. This small but useful counterexample challenges the idea that silent sitting abolishes written tradition.

Diversity exists within one country too. Communities may differ in language, teaching emphases, relations with local society, and access to practice for laypeople. “What Buddhism is common in this country?” therefore does not replace “What happens here, and how do participants explain it?”

During a hypothetical tourist visit, a temple may appear primarily as architecture. For a local family it may connect with remembrance of the dead; for a monk, with discipline and education. These views intersect, but none should automatically declare the others misunderstandings. A substantive encounter begins when we notice our own angle of vision.

Noticing this does not oblige us to accept every explanation as equally true. It merely prevents confusing the limitations of our encounter with the limitations of the tradition. We may not know a ceremony’s meaning; this is not evidence that meaning is absent.

VIII. A shared language of discipline does not make religious paths interchangeable

A similar action receives different meanings according to a path’s goal. We can therefore test the map of Buddhism through comparison with a tradition that also involves learning, ethical qualities, and human transformation, but grounds them differently. This does not turn differences into a competition. It reveals what the contemporary picture of a universal spiritual technique omits.

In Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics, II.1, moral virtue develops through habit. This allows comparison between education in sustained action and Buddhist discipline, without treating ethics as one intense experience. Aristotle’s goal nevertheless does not become nirvāṇa: similar work on character belongs to another account of human life. “Virtue” alone does not ensure an identical understanding of suffering’s causes or liberation.

Al-Ghazālī addresses the difference between information and realized religious knowledge differently again. In the academic account of his Sufi path, §4c, experiential knowledge of God involves purification of the heart. We can compare this with Buddhist paths by asking what cannot be learned from description alone and what work a person must do. But the object of religious understanding differs. We cannot rename God “emptiness,” bodhicitta any inner uplift, and announce agreement.

This limit returns us to the three temples. A visitor may encounter discipline in each, but discipline alone does not identify the path. Reduce all forms to an exercise in patience and

Theravāda loses its liberating goal, Mahāyāna its particular orientation of awakening, and Vajrayāna the conditions of transmission and place of its means. A convenient general framework becomes accurate only after specifying what it preserves and what it leaves outside.

Comparison therefore requires two scales. One investigates a similar human task: developing the capacity to act and joining understanding with life. The other retains the particular religious foundation. We may discuss the first without converting. We may not present it as the complete content of the second. This makes a mature intercultural conversation possible: recognition helps begin reading, while difference prevents ending it prematurely.

IX. Conclusion: a map should leave room for people

A map of differences is useful while it helps us see. Theravāda, Mahāyāna, and Vajrayāna designate real historical and religious distinctions without replacing particular communities' lives. Liberation, the bodhisattva path, and tantric means cannot be arranged neatly on a scale of "selfishness—altruism—supreme wisdom."

Comparison needs precise questions: what goal is named, what foundations accepted, what means followed, what commitments arise, and how are wisdom and ethical action connected? Differences then acquire substance. "Spiritual" alone answers none of these questions.

The map has another consequence. Respect does not require agreement with every religious premise; disagreement does not require making another person's life primitive. We can read, ask, notice limits, and leave unknowns unknown. Such an encounter preserves the dignity of both tradition and visitor.

The three temples from the opening remain different. But difference is no longer exhausted by clothing color, the number of arms on an image, or silence. Behind the outward impression emerge teaching, transmission, human participation, and a path. This is why the map was worth unfolding.

What this means in practice

If you want to learn about Buddhism, first identify what you seek: historical knowledge, philosophical discussion, participation in religious life, or a particular practice. These goals can combine, but should not silently replace one another. A lecture about religion does not create a disciple's commitments; a ceremony may carry a meaning you should learn beforehand.

A few precise questions suffice for a first encounter. Which tradition and lineage does the community belong to? Which texts are fundamental here? What is offered to beginners? What

commitments arise if you continue? How can questions be asked and participation ended? Obtain answers directly rather than infer them from a teacher’s photograph.

Keep the same scale when comparing two accounts. Do not compare one school’s complex philosophical explanation with one adherent’s everyday habit in another. That guarantees distortion. If discussing ethical practice, ask about it in both; if discussing the ultimate goal, compare goals.

Contemporary interest in individual exercises can be named separately. Someone may read Buddhist philosophy without becoming Buddhist, attend an open meeting as an observer, or reject religious premises while respecting people. Naming this position honestly is better than claiming membership that means only liking several quotations.

You need not immediately find “your” school. Sometimes an encounter is useful precisely because it reveals the initial question was wrong. You sought a way to eliminate irritation and encountered the problem of living with commitments. You sought exoticism and discovered years of ordinary discipline. A changed interest is not defeat.

The next step matters too. If continuing to read, choose a particular text and see what questions emerge. If visiting a community, clarify the meeting’s format. If stopping, do not turn the decision into a universal verdict on Buddhism. A small, checkable decision is more reliable than a large identity adopted under one evening’s impression.

Key quotation

> *“Everything subject to arising is subject to cessation.”*

SN 56.11, the conclusion of the episode about Koṇḍañña’s understanding. Editorial English translation of our Russian rendering from Thānissaro Bhikkhu’s English version, not a verified published English quotation. In the text this is religious realization, not a promise that every difficulty will disappear by itself. A map of paths is needed precisely because teaching connects understanding with particular work.

Connections across traditions

These are our analytical comparisons. The table shows a shared question and limits of similarity; matching formulations alone do not establish historical influence.

Positions	Similarity	Boundary
Theravāda ↔ Aristotle, II.1	Worthwhile action requires sustained education.	Nibbāna is not equivalent to developing Aristotelian virtue.

Positions	Similarity	Boundary
Six perfections ↔ al-Ghazālī, §4c	Ethical discipline belongs to religious transformation.	Awakening for beings and experiential knowledge of God have different foundations.
Vajrayāna in Berzin ↔ Shingon	Esoteric Buddhism has several historical forms.	Conditions in one lineage do not automatically extend to another.
Pāli canon ↔ Kangyur/Tengyur ↔ Chinese canon in 84000's comparison	Textual collections sustain transmission of the path.	Contents, genres, and editions differ; a shared term does not mean an identical book.
Three jewels in Chinese Buddhism ↔ Sōtō daily texts	Teaching exists through community and repeated forms of participation.	One Chinese overview or Sōtō list does not describe all Mahāyāna.

Sources

• John T. Bullitt. What is Theravada Buddhism? Access to Insight. Introduction, Pāli canon, and brief account of the path; traditional self-description.

• SN 56.11. Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta. Translated by Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu. Four truths and their distinct tasks.

• Buddhism: The "Imported" Tradition. Asia for Educators, Columbia University. Sections on bodhisattvas and the three jewels.

• Alexander Berzin. What Is Tantra? Study Buddhism. Preparation, initiation, and commitments; a particular internal account.

• The Lotus Sutra, Revised Second Edition. BDK America. Publisher description read, not the complete translated sutra.

• What is the Koyasan Shingon Sect? Kongobu-ji. Self-description of the Japanese esoteric tradition.

• Soto School Scriptures For Daily Services And Practice. SOTOZEN.COM. A checkable counterexample to the picture of Zen without texts.

• Geshe Sonam Rinchen. The Six Perfections. Snow Lion / Shambhala. Oral teaching edited and translated by Ruth Sonam; published excerpt read, not the whole book.

• Facts and figures about the Kangyur and Tengyur. 84000. Definitions, genres, and edition differences.

• FAQ. 84000. Sections on the Tibetan canon and comparison with Chinese and Pāli collections.

• Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, II.1 and 6, translated by W. D. Ross. Primary text: habit and the mean relative to the person..

• Al-Ghazālī. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, §4c. Academic account of Sufi experiential knowledge and ethical discipline..

Tags

Buddhism, Theravāda, Mahāyāna, Vajrayāna, Pāli canon, Tipiṭaka, Vinaya, suttas, Abhidhamma, Kangyur, Tengyur, Chinese canon, Buddha, Dharma, Sangha, four noble truths, eightfold path, arahant, bodhisattva, bodhicitta, nibbāna, nirvāṇa, tantra, initiation, Shingon, Sōtō, six perfections, ethical discipline, community, Aristotle, al-Ghazālī, comparison across traditions

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.