

Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism

Volume II:
Lives

Editor-in-chief
Jonathan A. Silk

Editors
Richard Bowring
Vincent Eltschinger
Michael Radich

Editorial Advisory Board
Lucia Dolce
Berthe Jansen
John Jorgensen
Christian Lammerts
Francesco Sferra



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Contents

Prelims

Contributors.....	xi
Editors and Editorial Board.....	xxxiii
Primary Sources Abbreviations.....	xxxv
Books Series and Journals Abbreviations.....	xxxvii
General Abbreviations.....	xlii
Introduction.....	xliv

Section One:

Śākyamuni: South Asia.....	3
Barlaam and Josaphat.....	39

Section Two:

South & Southeast Asia:

Ajātaśatru.....	51
Āryadeva.....	60
Āryaśūra.....	70
Asaṅga/Maitreya(nātha).....	73
Bhāviveka.....	81
Brahmā, Śakra, and Māra.....	85
Buddhaghoṣa.....	92
Buddhas of the Past: South Asia.....	95
Buddhas of the Past and of the Future: Southeast Asia.....	109
Candragomin.....	121
Candrakīrti.....	125
Ḍākinī.....	132
Devadatta.....	141
Dharmakīrti.....	156
Dharmapāla.....	168
Dharmottara.....	173
Dignāga.....	179
Early Sarvāstivāda Masters.....	186
Gavampati in Southeast Asia.....	191
Gopadatta.....	196
Guṇaprabha.....	198
Haribhadra.....	204
Haribhaṭṭa.....	209
Harivarman.....	211
Harṣa.....	214
Hayagrīva.....	218
Indian Tantric Authors: Overview.....	228
Jñānagarbha.....	261
Jñānapāda.....	264

Jñānaśrīmitra	269
Kamalaśīla	272
Karuṇāmaya	279
Kṣemendra.....	286
Kumāralāta	293
Mahādeva.....	298
Maitreya.....	302
Mārīcī.....	325
Mātrceta	332
Nāgārjuna.....	335
Paccekabuddhas/Pratyekabuddhas in Indic Sources	348
Phra Malai in Thailand and Southeast Asia.....	357
Prajñākara Gupta	363
Ratnākaraśānti.....	366
Ratnakīrti	371
Saṅghabhadra	374
Śāṅkaranandana	378
Śāṅkarasvāmin	382
Śāntarakṣita	383
Śāntideva.....	391
Sarasvatī/Benzaiten.....	398
Śāriputra.....	409
Scholars of Premodern Pali Buddhism	420
Seers (<i>ṛṣi/īsi</i>) and Brāhmaṇas in Southeast Asia.....	437
Siddhas.....	443
Śrīlāta	452
Sthiramati	456
Śubhagupta.....	458
Tantric Buddhist Deities in Southeast Asia	463
<i>Thera/Therī</i> in Pali and Southeast Asian Buddhism	474
Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmin	479
Upagupta.....	481
Vāgīśvarakīrti	490
Vasubandhu.....	492
Vināyaka	507
Yama and Hell Beings in Indian Buddhism	513
East Asia:	
Ākāśagarbha in East Asia.....	521
Arhats in East Asian Buddhism	529
Aśvagoṣa (East Asian Aspects)	540
Avalokiteśvara in East Asia.....	546
Dizang/Jizō	562
Jianzhen (Ganjin)	571
Mahākāla in East Asia.....	576
Mahākāśyapa in Chan-inspired Traditions.....	586
Mañjuśrī in East Asia	591
Maudgalyāyana (Mulian).....	600
Musang (Wuxiang).....	608
Tejaprabhā	612
Yinyuan Longqi (Ingen)	616

China:

Amoghavajra	623
An Shigao	630
Chengguan.....	642
Daoxuan	648
Falin	653
Faxian.....	657
Fazun.....	662
Hanshan Deqing	668
Hongzhi Zhengjue	673
Huihong (see Juefan Huihong)	
Huineng (see Shenxiu)	
Huiyuan (see Lushan Huiyuan)	
Jigong.....	679
Juefan Huihong	684
Liang Wudi.....	689
Lokakṣema.....	700
Luo Qing.....	707
Lushan Huiyuan.....	711
Mazu Daoyi.....	722
Mingben (see Zhongfeng Mingben)	
Nāgārjuna in China	727
Nenghai.....	735
Ouyang Jingwu	741
Ouyi Zhixu	748
Paramārtha	752
Qian Qianyi.....	759
Qisong	764
Shenhui (see Shenxiu)	
Shenxiu, Huineng, and Shenhui	768
Śubhākarasiṃha.....	777
Wumen	782
Wuxiang (see East Asia: Musang)	
Wuzhu.....	787
Xiao Ziliang.....	791
Yinshun.....	795
Yixing	800
Yuan Hongdao	806
Yuanwu Keqin.....	810
Zhanran	814
Zhi Qian.....	818
Zhili.....	826
Zhixu (see Ouyang Zhixu)	
Zhiyi.....	833
Zhongfeng Mingben.....	839
Zhuhong.....	844

Korea:

Chinul.....	853
Hyujōng	860
Ich'adon	864

Kihwa	869
Kim Sisŭp	873
Kyŏnghŏ.....	877
Kyunyŏ	882
Muhak Chach'ŏ.....	887
Musang (see East Asia)	
Pou	891
Tosŏn	895
Ŭich'ŏn.....	900
Ŭisang	903
Wŏnch'ŭk.....	908
Wŏnhyo.....	913
Yi Nŭnghwa	918
Japan:	
Amaterasu Ōmikami.....	923
Annen.....	930
Benzaiten (see South and Southeast Asia: Sarasvatī)	
Dōgen.....	933
Dōhan.....	941
Eisai (see Yōsai)	
Eison.....	944
En no Gyōja	951
Enchin.....	956
Ennin.....	961
Ganjin (see East Asia: Jianzhen)	
Genshin	967
Hachiman	971
Hakuin	976
Hōnen	980
Ikkyū Sōjun.....	987
Ingen (see East Asia: Yinyuan Longqi)	
Ippen Chishin	991
Jakushō	995
Jiun Sonja	998
Jizō (see East Asia: Dizang)	
Jōjin.....	1002
Jōkei.....	1006
Kakuban	1011
Keizan Jōkin	1016
Kōmyō.....	1020
Kūkai	1026
Kūya.....	1036
Menzan Zuihō	1041
Monkan	1047
Mugai Nyodai.....	1057
Mujaku Dōchū.....	1062
Musō Soseki.....	1066
Myōe.....	1071
Nichiren.....	1076
Nōnin.....	1088

Raiyu.....	1094
Ryōgen.....	1097
Saichō.....	1102
Saigyō.....	1107
Shinran.....	1111
Shōtoku Taishi.....	1117
Tenjin.....	1122
Tenkai.....	1128
Yōsai/Eisai.....	1134
Zaō.....	1139
Tibetan Cultural Sphere	
Atiśa and the Bka' gdams pa Masters.....	1145
Ge sar of Gling.....	1159
<i>Gter ston</i> : Tibetan Buddhist Treasure Revealers.....	1165
Gtsang smyon Heruka.....	1171
Lcang skya Rol pa'i Rdo rje.....	1175
Mi la ras pa.....	1181
The Mongolian Jebdzundamba Khutugtu Lineage.....	1191
Padmasambhava in Tibetan Buddhism.....	1197
The Sa skya School's Five Forefathers.....	1213
Spirits of the Soil, Land, and Locality in Tibet.....	1226
Ston pa Gshen rab: The Bön Buddha.....	1233
Tibet's Crazy Yogins.....	1239
Tsong kha pa and his Immediate Successors.....	1246
Worldly Protector Deities in Tibet.....	1254
Appendix To Volume I:	
Buddhist Narrative Literature in Japan.....	1269
Poetry: Japan.....	1286
Korean Sōn Literature.....	1294

Mahādeva

Mahādeva (Chn. Datian [大天], Tib. Lha chen po) is best known to Buddhist tradition as the schismatic monk blamed for prompting the split between the orthodox Sthavira and breakaway Mahāsāṃghika lineages, the first and most fundamental sundering of the theretofore unitary Buddhist monastic community, placed roughly one hundred years after the death of the Buddha. In order to vilify him and to discredit his putatively heretical doctrinal innovations, a fanciful tale of Oedipal corruption is recounted about Mahādeva's antecedents. However, the authenticity of this tale is highly suspect, and what seems most likely is that another figure, implicated instead in a later intra-Mahāsāṃghika sectarian subdivision, was transferred to this earlier role, and the calumnious story attached to what was originally an unrelated name. Whatever the historical reality, this Buddhist Mahādeva must not be confused with Mahādeva as an epithet of Śiva, a name that does appear in Buddhist sources, when they deal with non-Buddhist (Hindu) traditions. Likewise, although the name itself exists in the Pali tradition, applied to at least nine separate persons, none of these can be connected with the Mahādeva discussed here, who remains unknown to the Theravaṃsa traditions (see Malalasekera 1938, vol. II., 505–506). (A comprehensive study is Silk, 2009, upon which the present entry draws heavily.)

Vasumitra's *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* (Wheel of the Formation of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Assemblies) is a vital source for the various doctrines and ideas held by the sects of Indian Buddhism. We have access to this text through one Tibetan (D 4138/ P 5639) and three Chinese translations (T. 2031–2033). It recounts in its Tibetan translation (ed. Takai, 1928/1978, 2:15–20; trans. Silk, 2008b, 27; 2009, 39) that:

When two hundred years had passed [since the Buddha's death], a wandering ascetic (**parivrājaka*) named *Mahādeva renounced the world (**pravrajya*) and dwelt at *Caityaśaila; he taught the Five Theses of the Mahāsāṃghikas, and having publicized them thoroughly, he created the division into three sects called *Caityaka, *Aparaśaila and *Uttaraśaila.

Almost the same passage is found in the closely related *Nikāyabhedavibhaṅgavyākhyāna* (Commentary on the Classification of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Communities), which is in fact part of the fourth chapter of the *Tarkajvālā* (Blaze of Reasoning) of →Bhāviveka (or Bhavya; Takai, 1928/1978, 21:4–8; D 3856, *dbu ma, dza* 150b7–151a1; trans. Silk, 2009, 245n7; see Ui, 1924, 84–88, 91; Nattier & Prebish, 1977, 261, 264; further Silk, 2009, 246n12).

It is only the newest Chinese translation of the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*, that of Xuanzang (玄奘; 600/2–664), however, that contains a reference connecting together the initial schism between the Mahāsāṃghikas and the Sthaviras, a set of Five Theses (see below), and Mahādeva (T. 2031 [XLIX] 15a17–23; Silk, 2006, 2009, 38–40). This seems to be an innovation of Xuanzang, directly reliant on the basic source for the elaborated story, the **Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* (*Apidamo dapiposha lun* [阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論], T. 1545 [XXVII] 510c24–512a19, trans. Mair, 1986; this is the source drawn upon below for the narrative, quotations, and the Five Theses). This text recounts a story of a boy, Mahādeva, son of a merchant who went far away, leaving his wife and son alone. The son grew up and had an incestuous affair with his mother. When his father returned, the son murdered him in order to continue his affair with his mother. He then fled with her, but encountering in their new home an arhat who had known them before, and fearing exposure, he murdered the arhat as well. When he suspected, in turn, that he was losing the affections of his mother, he murdered her as well. However, this is not the end of the story, for the text continues:

Inasmuch as he had not entirely cut off the strength of his roots of goodness, [Mahādeva] grew deeply and morosely regretful. Whenever he tried to sleep, he became ill-at-ease. He considered by what means his serious crimes might be eradicated. Later, he heard that the Śākyaputra śramaṇas [Buddhist monks] were in possession of a method for eradicating crimes. So he went to the Kukkuṭārāma monastery. Outside its gate he saw a monk engaged in slow walking practice. The

monk was reciting a hymn.... When [Mahādeva] heard this, he jumped for joy. He knew that, by taking refuge in the Buddha's teachings his crimes could certainly be eradicated. Therefore he went to visit the monk. Earnestly and persistently, [Mahādeva] entreated the monk to ordain him. When the monk saw how persistent [Mahādeva's] entreaties were, he ordained him without making an investigation or asking any questions. He allowed him to retain the name Mahādeva and offered him admonitions and instructions.

Due to his natural aptitude, Mahādeva became a well-known, respected monk. But he was not an arhat as he claimed to be. He therefore had to explain away, as in accord with correct doctrine, the specific failings to which he himself was prey. These explanations or rationalizations came to constitute the Five Points or Theses (*pañcavastūni*), to which the group which eventually became the Sthavira order objected. The five, characteristic of Mahādeva in the continuing story, are that:

- (1) Arhats can be led astray by others.
- (2) Arhats are still subject to "undefiled ignorance."
- (3) Arhats are subject to doubt.
- (4) Arhats can be taught by others, and rely on the affirmation by others of their attainment.

The fifth point may be related again from the same narrative in the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā*:

Mahādeva had, indeed, committed a host of crimes. However, since he had not destroyed his roots of good, during the middle of the night he would reflect upon the seriousness of his crimes and upon where he would eventually undergo bitter sufferings. Beset by worry and fright, he would often cry out, "Oh, how painful it is!" His disciples who were dwelling nearby were startled when they heard this and, in the early morning, came to ask him whether he were out of sorts. Mahādeva replied, "I am feeling very much at ease." "But why," asked his disciples, "did you cry out last night, 'Oh, how painful it is!'?"

He proceeded to inform them: "I was proclaiming the noble path (**āryamārga*). You should not think this strange. In speaking of the noble path, if one is not utterly sincere in the anguish with which he heralds it, it will never become manifest at that moment when one's life reaches its end. Therefore, last night I cried out several times, 'Oh, how painful it is!'"

This is termed the "origins of the fifth false view."

According to this account, then, these five theses attracted support and led to the creation of the Mahāsāṃghika order. Although the details of these highly contentious theses (differently formulated in a variety of texts), dealing as they do with the very definition of religious perfection in earlier Buddhist traditions, are to be discussed elsewhere, and whether or not they really represent the doctrinal points that led to an institutional split in the earlier Indian monastic community, the accompanying narrative of Mahādeva is without doubt ahistorical and, almost equally certainly, actually unrelated to these theses. That is, the question of the historical status of the "Five Points" must be separated from the narrative in which they came to be embedded. (The best discussions of the points themselves include Tsukamoto, 1980, esp. 229–246, 262–266 [earlier Tsukamoto, 1965]. A careful study of the Mahāsāṃghika–Sthavira schism, the Five Theses, and the role of Mahādeva is Kanakura, 1962, 265–311 [esp. 266–267]. See also, among others, La Vallée Poussin, 1910; Demiéville, 1932; Bareau, 1955, 88–111; Lamotte, 1956, 1958, 297–312; Prebish, 1974; Nattier & Prebish, 1977; Sasaki, 1991; Cousins, 1991; Lee, 1998, 2000, 2001.) It is not at all incidental, moreover, that the sins with which Mahādeva is associated correspond closely to the pan-Buddhist set of five "sins of immediate retribution" (*ānantarya*), namely killing one's father, mother, an arhat, drawing the blood of a buddha, and creating a schism in the monastic community (Silk, 2007). Mahādeva, blamed for creating the circumstances for the division of the community, the fifth of these sins, is also, according to the embellished story, already guilty of the rest as well.

The argument for the artificial connection between the schism story and the biography of Mahādeva is related, on the one hand, to the absence of this account in schism sources uninfluenced by the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā*, and on the other to the existence of an independent source of the story, namely the tale of Dharmaruci (*Dharmarucyavadāna*), preserved in the *Dīvyāvadāna* (and secondarily in the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* of →Kṣemendra [both reedited and trans. in Silk, 2008a; trans. 2009, 64–75; 100–109]). Although hypothesized earlier, the link between the story of Dharmaruci in the *Dīvyāvadāna* and that of Mahādeva in the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* was confirmed beyond reasonable doubt by the discovery of Sanskrit manuscript fragments of a story verbally very close

to that of Dharmaruci, but in which the main character's name is none other than Mahādeva (Silk, 2016). Therefore, the likely development is clear: a figure originally associated with an intra-Mahāsāṃghika schism, some two hundred years after the Buddha's nirvāṇa, was transferred about one century earlier instead to the rift between the Mahāsāṃghika and Sthavira, and then the lurid story of Dharmaruci borrowed and attached to this "villain" Mahādeva.

One of the most important schism accounts independent of the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* is the abovementioned *Samayabhedoparacacakra*, but since it is only in Xuanzang's Chinese translation that we find reference to Mahādeva in connection with the initial schism between the Mahāsāṃghika and the Sthaviras, it is reasonable to conclude that it was Xuanzang himself, translator of the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā*, who glossed the schism account by adding a reference to Mahādeva, something originally not found in his Indian source. However, once Xuanzang connected Mahādeva to the initial schism, later traditions in China were able to elaborate on this connection. The hypothesis of the central role of the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* is made all the more likely by a statement in the *Yibuzonglunlun shuji* (異部宗輪論述記, X. 844 [LIII] 572a24–573c4; ed. Koyama, 1891, 1.27b7–29a5; Expository Account of the Treatise [called] The Wheel of Tenets of Diverse Sects) by Xuanzang's disciple Kuiji (窺基; 632–682). In commenting on Vasumitra's text, this quotes the Mahādeva story using Xuanzang's translation of the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā*, suggesting that Xuanzang, in lecturing on Vasumitra's text, referred directly to the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* for his account of Mahādeva.

Other versions of the Mahādeva story are transmitted in Chinese (e.g. Silk, 2010), and subsequently in Japanese, sources, some of which, like the *Dhyāvadāna* but evidently not directly related to it, recount the same history but without any connection to the schism. That is, rather than being lineal descendants of the account originally unconnected with the schism story, they are probably further developments of the latter which then independently transmit the story removed from any explicit association with the schism, although some versions, for instance, retain a reference to the main character's nocturnal exclamations of pain, associated with the fifth of the Five Points.

An earlier Japanese example is found in the 11th-century *Konjaku monogatari* (今昔物語集

I; NKBT vol. XXII, 306, *kan* IV, 33; trans. Mair, 1986, 26–27), another in the *Hōbutsushū* (寶物集, SNKBT vol. XL, 316–317; detailed study in Koizumi, 1971, 186–286; trans. Silk, 2009, 45–46), attributed to Taira no Yasuyori (平康頼; 1145?–1200 or after). The version in the *Sangoku denki* (三國傳記, DNBZ 148, 84a4–16 [266–267], *kan* III, 28; trans. Mair, 1986, 27–28), compiled in the first half of the 15th century by the Tendai (天台) monk Gentō (玄棟; d.u.), likewise mentions no connection with the schism account, while, like the other sources, nevertheless crediting Mahādeva with the same set of sins. However, it is explicit in ending on a positive note, saying that after Mahādeva encountered the Dharma, "he sought to renounce the world, whereupon the monks pardoned him. Before long he became versed in the profundities of the Tripiṭaka and conversant with all the twelve-fold divisions of the teaching."

The story of Mahādeva is known in Tibet from at least the 9th century, if not somewhat earlier. The oldest known source is found in a Dunhuang manuscript (IOL Tib J 26; Borgland, 2016), which proclaims itself based on a Chinese source which, however, remains to be identified. This is a commentary by Nam kvang pad shi (the final element perhaps reflecting Chn. *boshi* [博士], "teacher," Borgland, 2016, 16–17n41, but Nam kvang is unknown) which may be connected with Vasumitra's treatise, noted above, although ambiguities remain. It seems probable that the ultimate source of the version preserved here in Tibetan is, after all, once again the Chinese *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* translated by Xuanzang. Later Tibetan texts also relate the same story, probably likewise based ultimately on Chinese sources (for a detailed examination of the sources, in which the relevant passages are edited and translated, see Silk, 2008b). These include the **Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* (Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels), a popular collection of moralistic sayings composed between 1215 and 1225 by the patriarch of the Sa skya school, and one of the greatest scholars in the history of Tibetan Buddhism, Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1182–1251, →Five Forefathers of the Sa skya School). This is expanded in a commentary on his work by his disciple, Dmar ston Chos kyi rgyal po (c. 1197 – c. 1258). The story also appears in Sa skya Paṇḍita's *Sdom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba* (A Clear Differentiation of the Three Codes), and in two later commentaries on this work by, respectively, Gser mdog paṇ chen Shākya mchog ldan (1428–1507) and Go rams pa Bsod nams

seng ge (1429–1489). Finally, an account is found in the *Rgya bod kyi chos 'byung rgyas pa* (Extensive History of Buddhism in India and Tibet) of the Rnying ma pa author Mkhas pa lde'u, dated in its present form to “later than 1261” (Martin & Bendor, 1997, 43–44; Chab spel tshe brtan phun tshogs, 1987, 98:20–101:3; trans. Silk, 2008b, trans. 35–36, ed. 46–47; Borgland, 2016, 25–28). This text is unique among these Tibetan accounts in making explicit the link between Mahādeva and the early Buddhist institutional schism. When the historian Bu ston (1290–1364) speaks of the schism, he connects it not with any Mahādeva, but rather with a certain *Bhadra, but Tāranātha (1575–1634) does know Mahādeva, connecting him to the schism, although here too the name Bhadra also appears (details in Silk, 2008b, 29–31).

Bibliography

- Bareau, A., 1955. *Les Premiers conciles bouddhiques*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Borgland, J.W., 2016. “Mahādeva in Dunhuang: A Study of IOL Tibj 26,” *IJF* 59, 1–47.
- Chab spel tshe brtan phun tshogs, 1987. *Mkhas pa lde'us mdzad pa'i Rgya bod kyi chos 'byung rgyas pa*, Lhasa: Bod ljong mi dmangs dpe skrun khang.
- Cousins, L.S., 1991. “The ‘Five Points’ and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools,” in: T. Skorupski, ed. *The Buddhist Forum, Volume II: Seminar Papers 1988–1990*, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 27–60.
- Cowell, E.B., & R.A. Neil, 1886. *The Dīvyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends*, Cambridge UK; repr. 1970. Amsterdam: Oriental Press / Philo Press.
- Demiéville, P., 1932. “L'origines des sectes bouddhiques d'après Paramārtha,” *MCB* 1, 15–64.
- Kanakura Enshō (金倉圓照), 1962. *Indo chūsei seishi-shi* (印度中世精神史), repr. 1983. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Koizumi Hiroshi (小泉弘), 1971. *Hōbutsushū: Chūsei koshahon sanshu* (宝物集〈中世古写本三種〉), Tokyo: Koten Bunko.
- Koyama Ken'ei (小山憲榮), 1891. *Ibushūrinron jukki hotsujin* (異部宗輪論述記發軔), Kyoto: Bunseidō.
- Lamotte, É., 1958. *Histoire du bouddhisme indien, des origines à l'ère Śāka*, Louvain: Institut Orientaliste; repr. 1976.
- Lamotte, É., 1956. “Buddhist Controversy over the Five Propositions,” *IHQ* 32/2–3, 148–162.
- La Vallée Poussin, L. de, 1910. “The ‘Five Points’ of Mahādeva and the Kathāvattu,” *JRAS* 413–423.
- Lee Ja-rang (李慈郎), 2001. *Shoki Bukkyō kyōdan no kenkyū: Sanga no bunretsu to buha no seiritsu* (初期仏教教団の研究・サンガの分裂と部派の成立), diss., University of Tokyo.
- Lee Ja-rang (李慈郎), 2000. “Daiten no ‘goji’ shuchō no haikai ni tsuite,” (大天の「五事」主張の背景について), *SK* 324, 25–44.
- Lee Ja-rang (李慈郎), 1998. “Konpon bunretsu no gen'in ni kansuru ichikōsatsu” (根本分裂の原因に関する一考察), *ITBK* 5, 18–30.
- Mair, V. 1986. “An Asian Story of the Oedipus Type,” *AFS* 45/1, 19–32.
- Malalasekera, G.P., 1938. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, London: Pali Text Society.
- Martin, D., & Y. Bendor, 1997. *Tibetan Histories: A Bibliography of Tibetan-Language Historical Works*, London: Serindia Publications.
- Nattier, J., & C.S. Prebish, 1977. “Mahāsāṃghika Origins: The Beginnings of Buddhist Sectarianism,” *HR* 16/3, 237–272.
- Prebish, C.S., 1974. “A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils,” *JAS* 33/2, 239–254.
- Sasaki Shizuka (佐々木閑), 1991. “Ritsuzō ni arawareru ‘Arakan no rōsei’” (律蔵にあらわれる『阿羅漢の漏精』), *HDKK* 23, 1–20.
- Silk, J.A., 2016. “Two Mahādeva Fragments,” in: J. Braarvig, ed., *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection: Buddhist Manuscripts IV*. Oslo: Hermes, 351–358.
- Silk, J.A., 2010. “The *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing*—Translation, Non-translation, Both or Neither?” *JIAS* 30/1–2, 369–420.
- Silk, J.A., 2009. *Riven by Lust: Incest and Schism in Indian Buddhist Legend and Historiography*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Silk, J.A., 2008a. “The Story of Dharmaruci: In the *Dīvyāvadāna* and Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*,” *IJF* 51, 137–185.
- Silk, J.A., 2008b. “The Indian Buddhist Mahādeva in Tibetan Sources,” *ITBK* 15, 27–55.
- Silk, J.A., 2007. “Good and Evil in Indian Buddhism: The Five Sins of Immediate Retribution,” *JIP* 35/3, 253–286.
- Silk, J.A., 2006. “Xuanzang's Portrayal of the Buddhist Mahādeva,” in: Mochizuki Kaishuku (望月海淑) ed., *Hokekyō to daijō kyōten no kenkyū* (法華經と大乘經典の研究), Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 193–213 (622–602).
- Takai Kankai (高井観海), 1928/1978. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- Tsukamoto Keishō (塚本啓祥), 1980. *Shoki Bukkyō kyōdanshi no kenkyū* (初期仏教教団史の研究), Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- Tsukamoto Keishō (塚本啓祥), 1965. “Daiten no denshō to sōgya no kōsō” (大天の傳承と僧伽の抗争), *IBK* 13/1, 106–115.
- Ui Hakuju (宇井伯壽), 1924. “Butsumetsu nendai-ron” (佛滅年代論), *Gendai Bukkyō* (現代佛教); repr. 1933. *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū* (印度哲學研究) vol. II, Tokyo: Kōshisha, 3–111.

JONATHAN SILK