

法華經と大乘經典の研究 抜刷

Xuanzang's Portrayal of the Buddhist Mahādeva

Jonathan A. SILK

Xuanzang 玄奘 (600-664) is one of the most important transmitters of Indian Buddhist ideas to China, a position solidified not only by his numerous precise translations of Indian works, but also by his long residence and study in India.¹⁾ How he understands particular issues in Buddhist theory, practice and legend is, thus, always of considerable interest. In this light, we encounter a thought-provoking passage in his *Great Tang Records of the Western Regions* (*Datang Xiyuji* 大唐西域記) regarding the famous Mahādeva, the individual accused in Sthavira sources of causing the basic schism of the previously unified Buddhist monastic community into two groups, the Sthavira and Mahāsāṃghika. The text reads:²⁾

有凡夫僧摩訶提婆。闊達多智、幽求名實、潭思作論、理違聖教。

Thomas Watters, in his generally superb notes on Xuanzang's text, rendered this as follows:³⁾

Among the ordinary Brethren was one Mahādeva, a man of great learning and wisdom, a subtle investigator of name and reality [= *nāma-rūpa*] who put his extraordinary thoughts into a treatise which taught heresy.

This understanding of Xuanzang's text has been followed by many scholars, not only Étienne Lamotte,⁴⁾ but also more recent Japanese specialists on the text such as

Mizutani Shinjō and Kuwayama Shōshin.⁵⁾ Lamotte seems to have gone furthest, however, drawing large conclusions from the passage:⁶⁾

Even while blaming this Mahādeva for heresy, Xuanzang makes no mention of the five theses which are generally attributed to him; he praises his knowledge and talent, and specifies him as “a subtle investigator of *Nāma-rūpa*,” in other words, the five *Skandhas*. But the question of the *Nāma-rūpa* preoccupies the Sarvāstivādins much more than the Mahāsāṃghikas. One may ask whether, in the mind of the Chinese master, Mahādeva was not in fact a Sarvāstivādin scholar, which would be contradictory to the tradition according to which the heretic was the initiator of the Mahāsāṃghika schism.

Lamotte appears to have been most disturbed here by what he perceived to be a discontinuity in scholastic orientation. The Mahādeva he understands Xuanzang to have praised in this passage seems to be the same individual as the almost universally despised instigator of the initial schism in the Indian Buddhist monastic community, the monk (or quasi-monk) whose actions in putting forward the famous “Five Theses” (*pañca-vastūni*) prompted the split which led to the creation of the Mahāsāṃghika and Sthavira lineages. For Lamotte, the central question seems to be why Xuanzang would attribute to the alleged patriarch of the Mahāsāṃghika tradition dogmatic views proper to the Sarvāstivāda, a Sthavira school. But we might also ask another question: How could it be that Xuanzang would praise Mahādeva in his *Great Tang Records of the Western Regions*, a text which in theory reflects his own views, when at the same time his translation of the authoritative **Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* so directly castigates Mahādeva, offering a background story which paints him as an Oedipal criminal who has sex with his mother, kills father, mother, and an arhat, and then instigates the schism?⁷⁾

To understand this, it may be valuable to examine how Mahādeva is portrayed in Xuanzang's works more broadly. Let us begin, however, with what Xuanzang actually says of Mahādeva in his *Great Tang Records of the Western Regions*. The key to Lamotte's discomfort with Xuanzang's characterization of Mahādeva in the *Great Tang Records of the Western Regions*, I believe, lies in the vocabulary of the passage. Pace Watters, Lamotte and others, the text neither speaks of *nāma-rūpa*, nor does it inordinately praise Mahādeva. The crucial term in the Chinese passage is *míngshí* 名實, which Watters, Lamotte and others take as a rendering of the Buddhist technical term *nāma-rūpa*, thus occasioning Lamotte's concern. However, following Kanakura Enshō I understand the word rather as non-technical, ordinary Chinese, with the standard meaning of "fame and fortune."⁸⁾ Indeed, I do not know that *míngshí* ever renders *nāma-rūpa*, a term Xuanzang consistently, and perhaps without exception, translates as *míngsè* 名色, as found for instance throughout his iconic translations of the *Abhidharmakośa* and *Yogācārabhūmi*.⁹⁾ In fact, I have not been able to identify any example in Chinese Buddhist texts in which *míngshí* is used in the sense of *nāma-rūpa*. Although I would not go so far as to say such a usage is absolutely impossible, if it exists, it is extremely rare.

Given this interpretation of *míngshí*, I subsequently interpret the compound *yōuqiú* 幽求 in a sense something like "seek with deep concentration," or perhaps "seek secretly."¹⁰⁾ In light of these understandings of the two key vocabulary items, I translate the verse as follows:

There was a monk, who was not an Arhat, named Mahādeva. He had broad understanding, and was very learned, but he secretly sought fame and fortune. He considered deeply and wrote a treatise, the principle(s) of which contradict(s) the Noble Teachings.

Here, then, Xuanzang balances his praise of Mahādeva's intelligence with criticism of his motives and orthodoxy. And this indeed appears to conform to his characterizations of Mahādeva elsewhere, as we will discover below. Despite the positive words Xuanzang has for Mahādeva's mind, the overall sense is certainly a negative one, in which in particular Mahādeva is deprecated for his inappropriate pursuit of fame and fortune, in contrast to the dedicated search for Buddhist truth ideally expected of a monk. This interpretation is only reinforced by the explicit designation of Mahādeva as a **prthagjana* (*fánfū* 凡夫), a technical term designating not an ordinary person (although it can have this meaning), but rather an "ordinary monk" who does not have special spiritual attainments, thus conveying plainly and unambiguously that Mahādeva was "not an Arhat," as the false Mahādeva of the legend claimed to be.¹¹⁾ My translation, then, in this sense is somewhat interpretive, but the meaning is beyond dispute. Since the entire point of the so-called Five Theses attributed to Mahādeva is to establish a definition of arhatship at odds with orthodoxy, an idea which his opponents claim Mahādeva invented in order to justify his own (false) claim to the perfected state, Xuanzang's explicit statement that Mahādeva was not an arhat but rather an "ordinary monk" is a direct denial of his claim to usurpation of the title, and consequently a rejection of his entire position. Finally, we notice that under this reading, the scholastic discontinuity seen by Lamotte of a Mahāsāṃghika monk maintaining a Sarvāstivāda doctrinal stance does not arise; the text simply does not speak of *nāma-rūpa*. There is thus no question of Xuanzang attributing to the Mahāsāṃghika Mahādeva any Sarvāstivādin view. I believe this picture of Mahādeva is in complete conformity with what we find elsewhere in Xuanzang's works.

It is well known that Xuanzang's translation of the perhaps second century C.E. *Great Commentary on the Abhidharma* (*Apidamo dapiposha lun* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論, **Abhidharma-Mahāvibhāṣā*—below, *Vibhāṣā*) provides a detailed account of Mahādeva and his multiple crimes. Having recounted his sins, this text acknowledges

that “Mahādeva had, indeed, committed a host of crimes,” but goes on to add that “However, he had not destroyed his roots of good.”¹²⁾ Earlier the same *Vibhāṣā* had spoken of Mahādeva as “quite brilliant” (*cōnghuì* 聰慧), recorded that soon after his renunciation of the world he was able to memorize the entire Tripiṭaka, and added that “His words were clear and precise and he was skillful at conversion,” (*yáncí qīngqiǎo shànnéng huádāo* 言詞清巧善能化導). In the capital of Pāṭaliputra, everyone revered him.¹³⁾ While it details his offences, and accuses him of bringing about the schism in order to conceal that he was not, in fact, an arhat, as he had claimed, thus clearly criticizing Mahādeva, the *Vibhāṣā* also includes references to his positive intellectual traits, and his skill at missionizing, the former of which, at any rate, is also explicitly mentioned by Xuanzang in his *Great Tang Records of the Western Regions*.

Mahādeva is referred to in other Indian works as well, of course, of which one is our main source for many varieties of information about the various doctrines and ideas held by the sects of Indian Buddhism, as well as the mutual relations of those sects, Vasumitra's *Wheel of the Formation of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Assemblies* (*Samayabhedoparacanacakra*). The lost Indic original of this treatise we have access to only through one Tibetan and three Chinese translations, the latter of which were translated by an unknown translator in the fourth century (perhaps Kumārajīva), by Paramārtha in the sixth century, and by Xuanzang in the seventh.¹⁴⁾ Of these, only the newest Chinese translation, that of Xuanzang, contains a reference connecting the initial schism between the Mahāsāṃghika and the Sthavira with the Five Theses and with Mahādeva, about whom, however, no information is provided.¹⁵⁾

This is heard according to tradition: About one hundred years after the Parinirvāṇa of the Bhagavat, the time after the sage had gone was dark as if the sun had long ago set. In the land of Magadha in the town of Kusumapura (= Pāṭaliputra) there was a king named Aśoka. He ruled over Jambudvīpa (= India), (his protection

like) a white umbrella, converting gods and men everywhere. At that time the great community of the Buddhist Teachings split for the first time. It is said that the reason is that the four communities argued among themselves over the Five Theses of Mahādeva, and because they could not agree, they split into two groups: the Mahāsāṃghikas and the Sthaviras.¹⁶⁾

The other versions of Vasumitra's text contain basically the same information, save for the mention of Mahādeva, although Paramārtha's translation does say that the Five Theses were established by a "heretic," *wàidào* 外道.¹⁷⁾ All versions of Vasumitra's *Wheel* do, however, mention that, two hundred years after the Buddha's nirvāṇa—that is, a further century after the events we have just cited in Xuanzang's version—a "heretic"¹⁸⁾ Mahādeva founded several sub-sects within the Mahāsāṃghika order, including the Caityaśailas, Uttaraśailas and Aparāśailas. According to the Tibetan translation:¹⁹⁾

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*, **Aparāśaila* and **Uttaraśaila*.

When Xuanzang renders this same episode, his account perforce contrasts this Mahādeva with the one he had mentioned previously:²⁰⁾

When the second century [after the Buddha's death] was complete, there was a renunciant wandering ascetic who had given up heresy and returned to the truth; he too was called Mahādeva. He renounced the world into the Mahāsāṃghika

community and was ordained. Learned and diligent, he dwelt at Caityaśaila. Together with the monks of that order he once again fully detailed the Five Theses, and for this reason a dispute broke out which resulted in the division into three orders: 1) *Caityaśailas. 2) *Aparaśailas. 3) *Uttaraśailas.

Here Xuanzang uses two expressions which can be seen as complimentary. He states that Mahādeva “had given up heresy and returned to the truth,” (*shěxié guīzhèng* 捨邪歸正), and that he was “learned and diligent,” (*duōwén jīngjìn* 多聞精進). The same basic content as in Xuanzang's translation can be found also in the closely related *Commentary on the Classification of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Communities* (*Nikāyabhedavibhaṅgavyākhyāna*) of Bhāvaviveka (or Bhavya).²¹⁾ This text also knows a Mahādeva and his theses (their number not mentioned), again connected with a branch of the Mahāsāṃghikas, but notably omits any words of praise for this Mahādeva.²²⁾

Again, as a division of the *Gokulikas there are the Sthaviras called *Caityaka. A wandering ascetic named Mahādeva renounced the world and dwelt at *Caityaśaila. Again, when he proclaimed the Theses of the Mahāsāṃghikas, the *Caityaka order was created.

These texts, then, do not attribute to Mahādeva the foundation of the Mahāsāṃghika sect itself, and of course only Xuanzang, who mentions a first Mahādeva, feels the need to distinguish this “second” Mahādeva from any other, which he does plainly when he uses the words “he *too* was called,” *yì míng* 亦名, and “*once again* fully detailed,” *chóngxiáng* 重詳.²³⁾ It is likewise only Xuanzang who offers the conciliatory words we noticed above. We must also recall that although traditions preserved in Pāli sources, most notably the doxological *Points of Controversy* (*Kathā-*

vatthu), know the Five Theses, they do not associate them with any Mahādeva, of whom in fact they are quite ignorant.²⁴⁾

Because it is only in the newest Chinese translation of the *Wheel* of Vasumitra that we find mention of this first Mahādeva, it is generally presumed that Vasumitra's original text itself contained no such reference. This led Étienne Lamotte to comment that:²⁵⁾ "While for Vasumitra the author of these Five Theses remained anonymous, the *Vibhāṣā*, a century later, finds a name for him and attributes to him an entire history. It treats him resolutely as an adversary, charges him with all the inexpiable crimes, and invents for him a bad end." Probably Lamotte reasons here that since the *Vibhāṣā* elsewhere quotes Vasumitra, the latter must precede the former. However, as Lamotte himself carefully points out in another context, it is unclear whether the Vasumitra quoted in the *Vibhāṣā* is in fact the same as the author of the *Wheel of the Formation of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Assemblies*.²⁶⁾ Since we cannot determine whether the name Vasumitra, which is hardly uncommon, necessarily indicates a single individual, there is consequently no way to tell whether Vasumitra as the author of the *Wheel of the Formation of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Assemblies* is even to be dated before the *Vibhāṣā*, within which some, possibly different, Vasumitra is referred to, much less placed one hundred years before it.²⁷⁾ It therefore remains to be seen if the characterization of the *Vibhāṣā* as innovator can be maintained in this respect and on this basis. It is quite certain, however, that the seventh century Chinese scholar Xuanzang translated the *Vibhāṣā* from Sanskrit into Chinese several years before he rendered Vasumitra's treatise itself into Chinese,²⁸⁾ a sequence which makes it certain that Xuanzang himself knew the story of Mahādeva as associated with the Mahāsāṃghika-Sthavira schism before he translated Vasumitra's text. The possibility exists, then, that Xuanzang the translator could have added at the relevant place in his Chinese rendering of Vasumitra's *Wheel of the Formation of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Assemblies* a reference to the story of (this first) Mahādeva as a sort of gloss or

historical background, even if no such reference occurred in the treatise as it was transmitted in and from India, or in the source from which he worked. This, indeed, seems to be the most likely scenario.²⁹⁾

This raises a very interesting and important question for the sectarian history of Indian Buddhism. If Vasumitra knew Mahādeva only as the founder of, or party responsible for the emergence of, several sub-sects within the larger Mahāsāṃghika sect, what grounds are there for associating him with the fundamental first schism at all? Partly in response to such problems, it has been suggested that only Xuanzang's second Mahādeva, the Mahādeva he shares with other versions of Vasumitra's treatise and with the *Commentary on the Classification of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Communities*, had any historical reality, and the association of (the first) Mahādeva with the Mahāsāṃghika-Sthavira schism is based on a confusion of accounts; in fact Mahādeva and his Five Theses are to be correctly associated only with the later intra-Mahāsāṃghika schism. Nattier and Prebish state the case clearly:³⁰⁾

The name of Mahādeva (who was known to be involved with a schism affecting the Mahāsāṃghikas), and with him the Five Theses, was only later read back into the original schism by subsequent sources. As a result, the later texts attribute the original schism of the Mahāsāṃghikas from the Sthaviras to the activities of Mahādeva, when in fact he was involved only with the second. ... Mahādeva and his Five Theses should be associated not with the original Mahāsāṃghika-Sthavira schism, but rather with a later schism which developed among the ranks of the Mahāsāṃghikas themselves, resulting in the founding of the Cetīya sect (which later produced the Śailas or Andhakas, and the rest of the southern schools) by the followers of Mahādeva.

While the *Wheel* of Vasumitra itself does not provide many details, and in its

original Indic form was, as we have just seen, most likely even altogether ignorant of the story associating Mahādeva with the first schism, several commentaries upon the text are more forthcoming. Xuanzang's disciple Kuiji 窺基 (632-682)³¹⁾ recorded his teacher's oral commentary on the *Wheel of the Formation of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Assemblies*, available to us as the *Expository Account of the Treatise [called] The Wheel of Tenets of Diverse Sects* (*Yibuzonglunlun shuji* 異部宗輪論述記),³²⁾ at the same time broadly summarizing an earlier commentary called *Commentary on the Treatise on the Diversity of Sects* (*Buzhiyilun-shu* 部執異論疏), a work of Paramārtha, a mid-sixth century Indian scholar resident in China, which was itself lost by the eleventh century and is thus not available to us as an integral unit.³³⁾ As we might rightly expect from a direct disciple of Xuanzang who professes to be relating his teacher's own comments, the version of the Mahādeva story cited by Kuiji here is a quotation of the version found in Xuanzang's translation of the *Vibhāṣā*, with a few minor textual variants, and therefore presents no independent evidence in this regard.³⁴⁾

More valuable for us is the *Profound Collection of Investigations on the Mysterious Meaning of the Three Treatises* (*Sanron gengi kennyūshū* 三論玄義檢幽集) of the Japanese monk Chōzen 澄禪 (1227-1307),³⁵⁾ a commentary on the *Mysterious Meaning of the Three Treatises* (*Sanlun xuanyi* 三論玄義) of the Chinese Sanlun master Jizang 吉藏 (549-623). In his *Mysterious Meaning of the Three Treatises* Jizang has the following to say about Mahādeva:³⁶⁾ “After the 116th year [after the Buddha's nirvāṇa], there was a ship captain's son named Mahādeva; handsome and intelligent, he entered the Buddhist order after committing three sins of immediate retribution.”³⁷⁾ We should note the words of praise included here (*duānzhèng cōngmíng* 端正聰明). When we come to the commentary of Chōzen, we find that it too, according to Chōzen himself, relies on the (or a) version transmitted in Paramārtha's now lost commentary, a version which, Chōzen notes, differs from that recorded in the *Vibhāṣā*.³⁸⁾ Here the story of Mahādeva's crimes is recounted in some detail, and it is stated that after their

commission Mahādeva is unable to obtain ordination. Nevertheless, he ordains himself, and “being of bright intelligence (*cōngmíng* 聰明), within a short time he was able to recite from memory the [whole] Tripitaka.”³⁹⁾

What we find in these sources, then, are some expressions of respect for Mahādeva's intelligence, and his missionary ability, coupled with clear rejection of his doctrines. In this light, it is not only the characterizations of Mahādeva elsewhere in Xuanzang's works but those of other authors, including Paramārtha, which exhibit this grudging appreciation of the heretic.

It is interesting that we do, nevertheless, encounter one clearly complimentary, even apologetic, mention of the schismatic Mahādeva in our sources. A surprising aspect of this reference is its authorship, since the reference appears in a work of Xuanzang's own disciple Kuiji, to whose faithful transmission of Xuanzang's views we referred above. Kuiji's commentary to the *Yogācārabhūmi* (of course, this being another Chinese translation of his master, Xuanzang), the *Yuqieshidilun lüezuan* 瑜伽師地論略纂, recounts that one hundred years after the Buddha's decease, Mahādeva put forth his Five Theses:⁴⁰⁾

大天名高德大。果證年卑、王貴欽風、僧徒仰道。既而卓犖無侶。⁴¹⁾遂爲時俗所嫉、謗之以造三逆、加之以增五事。

Mahādeva's fame was widespread and his virtue great. He had attained the fruit [of the path], although young. Kings and nobles respected his deportment, and monastics and (lay) followers esteemed his (interpretation of) the Way. He was thus extraordinarily talented and peerless,⁴²⁾ and consequently the common people of the time became jealous of him. Thus they accused him of the three sins of immediate retribution, adding to this the charge of having promulgated the Five Theses.

Kuiji here appears to suggest that Mahādeva was falsely accused of the crimes detailed in the *Vibhāṣā* and elsewhere, this accusation coming from those who were jealous of his abilities and attainments. It has been suggested that since Kuiji as a Mahāyāna author believed the Mahāyāna itself to have arisen from the Mahāsāṃghika, he therefore felt the necessity to defend the personality of the maligned Mahāsāṃghika monk Mahādeva.⁴³⁾ When Kuiji mentions Mahādeva in his record of Xuanzang's oral commentary on Vasumitra's *Wheel of the Formation of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Assemblies*, however, no such justification is in evidence. While this commentary may not present direct evidence of Kuiji's own personal view of Mahādeva, being based as it is on the explanations of his teacher, it does make very clear his awareness that Xuanzang, and the Indian traditions transmitted by his teacher, while having something good to say about him, certainly considered the accusations leveled against Mahādeva to be legitimate and justified. Moreover, it is true that Xuanzang himself was every bit as much a Mahāyānist as was Kuiji, and yet he never explicitly justified or excused Mahādeva's conduct in any source known to us.

The contrary position is also sometimes taken, however. Some scholars, following the same reasoning of some putative Mahāsāṃghika-Mahāyāna connection, seem to make a virtue of necessity in considering the attacks of the Mahāyānists Jizang and Paramārtha on Mahādeva as all the more "authoritative," since—in this view—as Mahāyānists they should be inclined to defend him.⁴⁴⁾ I think there are no grounds for upholding such a view, and find Jizang's and Paramārtha's opinions of Mahādeva basically in concert with those of others. That said, it may not be possible to fully explain Kuiji's peculiar defence of the otherwise caluminated Mahādeva, a defence which sees in the stories surrounding him a sort of conspiracy theory. However, it is conceivable that Kuiji made too much of the complimentary remarks concerning Mahādeva's intelligence, the repeated mention of him in various sources as "learned and diligent," "of bright intelligence," and so on. How this might have developed into

a belief that Mahādeva was unjustly caluminated it is hard to say. Perhaps further, broader studies of Kuiji's thinking about Indian Buddhist history will shed light on this question.

Literature

- Bareau, André. 1954-1956. "Trois Traités sur les Sectes Bouddhiques attribués à Vasumitra, Bhavya et Vinīta-deva." *Journal Asiatique* 242/2: 229-266, 244 / 2: 167-200.
- Beal, Samuel. 1906. *Si-yu-ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Reprint: New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp, 1968).
- Cousins, Lance S. 1991. "The 'Five Points' and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools." In Tadeusz Skorupski, ed. *The Buddhist Forum, Volume II: Seminar Papers 1988-1990* (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London): 27-60.
- Demiéville, Paul. 1932. "L'origine des sectes bouddhiques d'après Paramārtha." *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 1: 15-64.
- . 1951. "A Propos du Concile de Vaiśālī." *T'oung Pao* 40/4-5: 239-296.
- Frauwallner, Erich. 1952. "Die buddhistischen Konzile." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 102/2: 240-261.
- Ji Xianlin 季羨林 et al. 1985. *Datang Xiyuji Jiaozhu* 大唐西域記校注 (Peking: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局).
- Kabata Ryōshun 賀 幡 亮 俊. 1959. "Daiten no gojihihō ni tsuite: shoki Indo Jōdo shisō to no kanren kara" 大天の五事非法について: 初期インド浄土思想との関連から [The Five Theses of Mahādeva: their connection with early Indian Pure Land thought]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 7/2: 561-564 (166-169).
- Kanakura Enshō 金倉圓照. 1962. *Indo Chūsei Seishi-shi* 印度中世精神史 (Reprint: Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1983).
- Katō Seishin 加藤精神. 1950. "Hakushuji Daiten no kenkyū" 舶主兒大天の研究 [A study of ship captain's son Mahādeva]. *Ishii Kyōju Kanreki Kinen Bukkyō Ronkō* 石井教授還暦起念佛教論攷 (*Jōdogaku* 浄土學 22/23) (Tokyo: Taishō Daigaku Jōdogaku Kenkyūkai 大正大學浄土學研究會): 32-43.
- Kuwayama Shōshin 桑山正進. 1987. *Daitō Saiiki* 大唐西域記. Daijō Butten: Chūgoku - Nihon hen 大乘仏典・中国・日本篇 9 (Tokyo: Chūōkōron 中央公論).
- Lamotte, Étienne Paul Marie. 1956. "Buddhist Controversy over the Five Propositions." *Indian Historical Quarterly* 32/2-3: 148-162.
- . 1958. *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien, des Origines à l'ère Śāka*. Bibliothèque du

- Muséon 43; Reprint Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 14 (Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1976.). An English translation is available: *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śaka Era*. Translated by Sara Webb-Boin. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 36 (Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain Institut Orientaliste, 1988). My references are to the French original.
- Luo Zhufeng 羅竹風. 1986-1993. *Hanyu Dacidian* 漢語大詞典 (Shanghai: Shanghai Cishu chubanshe 上海辭書出版社 / Hanyu Dacidian chubanshe 漢語大詞典出版社). Three volume edition.
- Malalasekera, George Peiris [Gunapala Piyasena]. 1938. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* (London: Pali Text Society).
- Masuda, Jiryo. 1925. "Origin and Doctrines of Early Indian Buddhist Schools: A Translation of the Hsüan-chwang Version of Vasumitra's Thesis." *Asia Major* 2: 1-78.
- Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元. 1967. "Bukkyō no bunha to sono keitō" 仏教の分派とその系統 [Buddhist sects and their lineages]. In *Kōza Bukkyō III: Indo no Bukkyō* 講座仏教Ⅲ インドの仏教 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan): 79-118.
- Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元, Nakamura Hajime 中村元, Hirakawa Akira 平川彰, Tamaki Kōshirō 玉城康四郎. 1977. *Butten Kaidai Jiten* 仏典解題事典. Second revised edition (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- Mizutani Shinjō 水谷真成. 1971. *Daitō Saiikiki* 大唐西域記. Chūgoku koten bungaku taikai 中国古典文学大系 22. Second edition, 1988 (Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社).
- Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋轍次. 1955-1960. *Dai Kanwa Jiten* 大漢和辭典 (Tokyo: Daishūkan shoten 大修館書店). 13 volumes.
- Nattier, Janice and Charles S. Prebish. 1977. "Mahāsāṃghika Origins: The Beginnings of Buddhist Sectarianism." *History of Religions* 16/3: 237-272.
- Oyama Kenyō 小山憲榮. 1891. *Ibushūrinron Jukki Hotsujin* 異部宗輪論述記發軔 (Kyoto: Bunseidō 文政堂).
- Rockhill, William Woodville. 1907. *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of His Order* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trübner & Co.).
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1990. "On the authorship of some works ascribed to Bhāvaviveka / Bhavya." In David Seyfort Ruegg and Lambert Schmithausen, eds., *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*. Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference: Kern Institute, Leiden: August 23-29, 1987. Vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill): 59-71.
- Saigusa Mitsuyoshi 三枝充憲. 1970. *Sanron Gengi* 三論玄義. *Butten Kōza* 仏典講座 27 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版).

- Shāstrī, Haraprasād. 1931. "Chips from a Buddhist Workshop." In Bimala Churn Law, ed., *Buddhistic Studies* (Calcutta: Thacker Spink; Reprint: Delhi/Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1983): 818-858.
- Takai Kankai 高井觀海. 1928/1978. *Shōjō Bukkyō Gairon* 小乘仏教概論. Expanded reprint edition with supplements by Miyasaka Yūshū 宮坂宥勝 (Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房佛書林).
- Teramoto Enga 寺本婉雅 and Hiramatsu Tomotsugu 平松友嗣. 1935. *Zōkanwa sanyaku taikō Ibushūrinron, Ibushūseishaku, Ibusesshū* 藏漢和三譯對校・異部宗輪論・異部宗精釋・異部說集 (Kyoto: Mokudōsha 默働社).
- 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).
- Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽. 1924. "Butsumetsu nendai-ron" 佛滅年代論 [On the date of the Buddha's death]. *Gendai Bukkyō* 現代佛教. Reprinted in *Indo Tetsugaku Kenkyū* 印度哲学研究 II (Tokyo: Kōshisha 甲子社, 1933): 3-111.
- Vassilief [Vasil'ev], V[asilii] P[avlovich]. 1863. *Le Bouddhisme: Ses dogmes, son histoire et sa littérature. Première partie, aperçu général.* Trans. G. A. La Combe (Paris: Auguste Durand / Benj. Duprat). Original Russian edition 1857.
- Walleser, Max. 1927. *Die Sekten des alten Buddhismus. Die buddhistische Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung 4* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung).
- Watters, Thomas. 1904-1905. *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India.* Oriental Translation Fund New Series 14-15 (London; Reprint: New York: AMS, 1971).
- Weinstein, Stanley. 1959. "A Biographical Study of Tz'ū-ên." *Monumenta Nipponica* 15/1-2: 119-149.
- Willemen, Charles, Bart Dessein and Collett Cox. 1998. *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Zweite Abteilung, Indien, 11. Band (Leiden: E. J. Brill).

(Footnotes)

- 1) I express my thanks to my friends Seishi Karashima and Max Deeg, each of whom kindly provided several suggestions on my translations.
- 2) T. 2087 (LI) 886b14-15 (*juan* 3) = Ji 1985: 327.
- 3) Watters 1904-1905: I. 267. Compare to this the translation of Samuel Beal (1906: I.150):
Among the latter* was a priest called Mahādēva, a man of deep learning and rare ability; in his retirement he sought true renown; far thinking, he wrote treatises the principles of which were opposed to the holy doctrine.

* Beal had the sentence before translated *fánfūsēng* as "schismatical priest," and

Yaniada
Ryūjo
1959

simply does not repeat the word here. This understanding of *fānfūsēng* is, however, not correct; see below.

- 4) Lamotte 1956: 155 = 1958: 306.
- 5) Mizutani 1971: 127 = 1988: 85, Kuwayama 1987: 86.
- 6) Lamotte 1956: 155-156 = 1958: 307.
- 7) I discuss these matters in detail in my forthcoming book, the working title of which is *Riven By Lust: Incest and Schism in Indian Buddhist Legend and Historiography* (University of Hawaii Press).
- 8) Kanakura 1962: 294, n. 2. Dictionaries support this sense: Morohashi 1955-1960: 3297.151 (2), Luo 1986-1993: 1517a.
- 9) The term *mingshi* may also have the sense of “name and reality,” or “designation and actual state of affairs,” as illustrated in Daoxuan’s *Guanzhong chuangli jietan tujing* 關中創立戒壇圖經 (*Illustrated Scripture on the Ordination Platform Created in Guangzhong*; T. 1892 [XLV] 817b25).
- 10) Morohashi 1955-1960: 4.534 (9205.107), s.v. *yūkyū* 幽求 offers the definition: “幽間の處で道を求める,” “to seek the Way in a place of quiet retirement.” But see Luo 1986-1993: 2329c for more general senses. Note that *yōu* 幽 itself, which may mean “dim,” “hidden” or “secluded,” among other things, is commonly used by Xuanzang in the positive sense of “profound” or “subtle,” or the neutral sense of “deep.”
- 11) While it is true that Xuanzang in his technical translations tends not to use *fānfū* as his equivalent of *prthagjana*, preferring instead the “literal” or “etymological” *yishēng* 異生, when *fānfū* once appears elsewhere in the *Datang Xiyuji* (T. 2087 [LI] 930c21 [juan 10] = Ji 1985: 843, a passage paralleled in the biography of Xuanzang, T. 2053 [L] 241b21 [juan 4]) it very explicitly refers to *prthagjana* in the technical sense of “ordinary monk,” since it is stated that a thousand *fānfū* monks enter the rain retreat, at the conclusion of which they all attain arhatship. Watters 1904-1905: II.219-220 already perfectly understood this meaning. It might be that in writing a work for “popular” consumption (in theory, the emperor), Xuanzang opted for less precise technical vocabulary, contenting himself with the established idiom for the sake of his readers. This is a question which could be addressed in a full study of the style of the work.
- 12) T. 1545 (XXVII) 511b20-21 (*juan* 99).
- 13) T. 1545 (XXVII) 511a16-17 (*juan* 99).
- 14) Paramārtha’s translation is T. 2033 (*Buzhiyi lun* 部執異論) Xuanzang’s T.2031 (*Yibu zonglum lun* 異部宗輪論) and that of an unknown translator T.2032 (*Shibabu lun* 十八部論). The last is attributed in many catalogues to Paramārtha (T. 2034 [XLIX] 99a; T. 2147

- [LV] 156a1; T. 2148 [LV] 188c24; T. 2149 [LV] 266a29, 301b10, 325a16; T. 2151 [LV] 364c15-16; T. 2153 [LV] 435b18-19). However, the detailed consideration in the *Kaiyuan shijiao-lu* 開元釋教錄 (T. 2154 [LV] 621c1-5, repeated in T. 2157 [LV] 955a15-20) refutes this, and mentions the suggestion that the translation is due to Kumārājīva. (See also T. 2154 [LV] 519a1, 538c16-17.) The issue has been discussed by Ui 1924: 81-82, Mochizuki 1932-1936:169bc, and Kanakura 1962:275-276 (the first and third of whom, at least, are willing to accept the attribution to Kumārājīva).
- 15) T. 2031 (XLIX) 15a17-23; Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 4-5 (Chinese). See Lamotte 1956: 149-153 = 1958: 301-305. An English translation of Xuanzang's translation is to be found in Masuda 1925: 14-15, French in Bareau 1954: 235-236.
- 16) The text continues: "What are the four communities? 1) *Nāga community. 2) Border community. 3) Bahuśrutīya community. 4) Sthavira community. The Five Theses are"
- 17) T. 2033 (XLIX) 20a22.
- 18) In Chinese he is once again called *wàidào*, in Tibetan *kun tu rgyu* = **parivrājaka*. Although the usual implication of these terms is "non-Buddhist sectary," here the context makes clear that one should understand something like "unorthodox Buddhist, not a real Buddhist."
- 19) The Tibetan is in Miyasaka in Takai 1928/1978: 2.15-20 (and see Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 3.1-5): *lo nyis brgya pa la gnas pa'i tshe kun du rgyu lha chen po zhes bya ba rab tu byung ste mchod rten gyi ri la gnas pas dge 'dun phal chen po'i lugs lnga po de dag yang dag par rjes su brjod cing | yang dag par rjes su bsgrags nas mchod rten pa'i sde dang | nub kyi ri bo'i sde dang | byang gi ri bo'i sde zhes bya ba sde pa gsum rnam par bkod do ||*. The Tibetan was already translated by Vassilief in 1863: 229.
- 20) T. 2031 (XLIX) 15b1-4. See also T. 2032 (XLIX) 18a17-20; T. 2033 (XLIX) 20b2-4. These texts are also found in Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 14. All three Chinese versions are translated side by side in Lamotte 1958: 309-310; T. 2031 is translated by Bareau 1954: 237 and Masuda 1925: 15. Note that in Paramartha's version only two sects are mentioned, the Caityaśailas and Uttaraśailas.
- 21) On the difficult question of the identity and date (sixth/seventh/eighth century?) of the author of the *Tarkajvālā*, see Ruegg 1990. Whether the name of this author is properly to be Bhavya, Bhāvaviveka or, as seems increasingly likely, Bhāviveka, and whether all these forms indeed refer to the same individual, are questions we need not address here. For the sake of convenience and familiarity only, in principle I use the heretofore generally adopted form Bhāvaviveka.
- 22) Miyasaka in Takai 1928/1978: 21.4-8 (Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 25.18-26.3 =

Tarkajvālā in Derge Tanjur 3856, *dbu ma, dza* 150b7-151a1): *yang ba lang gnas pa rnams kyi¹ bye brag las gnas brtan mchod rten pa zhes bya ba ste | de ni lha chen po zhes bya ba'i kun du rgyu zhig rab tu byung nas mchod rten can gyi ri la gnas pa yin te | yang de ni dge 'dun phal chen pa'i gzhi 'don par gyur pa na² mchod rten pa zhes bya ba'i sde par rnam par bzhag te³ |.*

1) T/H: *kyis* 2) *Tarkajvālā: ni* 3) *Tarkajvālā: gzhag ste.*

Translated in Rockhill 1907: 189; Bareau 1956: 176-177; Walleser 1927: 84.

- 23) The first point is made explicitly by Kuiji (in his *Yibuzonglunlun shuji* 異部宗輪論述記, *Dainihon Zokuzōkyō* 大日本讀藏經 [Kyoto: Zōkyō shoin 藏經書院, 1905-1912]: 1.83.3, 218d10-12), who says: “Previously in the first century [after the Buddha’s nirvāṇa] there was a Mahādeva who was the instigator of a dispute among the monks. This [Mahādeva] now has the same name as the former [Mahādeva], and thus [the text] says ‘again’.” See also the note to much the same effect cited in the *Sanron gengi kennyūshū* (T. 2300 [LXX] 461c23-25 [juan 5]), apparently from the *Sifenlü xingshichao pi* 四分律行事鈔批 compiled by the fifth patriarch of the Nanshan Vinaya school, Dajue 大覺. I owe this latter identification to the kindness of Dr. Yao Zhihua (Centre of Buddhist Studies, The University of Hong Kong).

Demiéville 1951: 268, note, without reference to this passage, remarks: “In other words, the recension translated by Xuanzang reduplicates the character, following a procedure which, it seems to me, may be considered absolutely normal among Indian historians of ancient Buddhism, when they find themselves having difficulty resolving contradictions posed by diverse traditions or opposing legends.” He then cites as an example the *Samantapāsādikā*’s conclusion that the *theras* of the third council were reincarnations of those of the second.

- 24) Of course, the name Mahādeva itself exists in the Pāli tradition, applied to at least nine separate persons, none of whom however can be connected with this issue; see Malalasekera 1938: ii.505-506.
- 25) Lamotte 1958: 305.
- 26) Lamotte 1958: 585.
- 27) For discussions of the problem of the identity and date of Vasumitra, see Masuda 1925: 7-8, Bareau 1954: 231, and for a careful and detailed review Yamada Ryūjō 1959: 391-416. The question has also been taken up by many of the Japanese authors who have discussed Vasumitra’s Treatise. One might also add, as Kanakura 1962: 282 points out, that since the old *Vibhāṣā* and the non-Xuanzang *Samayabheda*° texts are all ignorant of this schismatic Mahādeva, they are in this respect in complete harmony.

- 28) The *Vibhāṣā* was published between 656 and 659, and Vasumitra's text in 662. See the *Kaiyuan shijiao-lu* 開元釋教錄 T. 2154 (LV) 557a18 and 557b5 (*juan* 8).
- 29) Kanakura 1962: 278, 281 n. 9, and again 282, states that the reference to Mahādeva was later added to the original text from which Xuanzang translated. Demiéville 1951: 268, note, appears to agree, at least in part, saying that "without doubt this name was extracted from the *Mahāvibhāṣā* in order to be interpolated into the recension brought back from India by Xuanzang." It is not, however, absolutely clear when or by whom Demiéville considers the interpolation to have taken place, while Kanakura is clear in stating his opinion that the addition was made to the original text (*genbun* 原文) from which the translation was made, not at the time of its translation (281, n. 9), yet adding (278) "here we can recognize the influence of the *Vibhāṣā*." Frauwallner 1952: 244, n. 2, clearly states his opinion that the addition is due to Xuanzang. Lamotte 1956: 150 = 1958: 302 states the borrowing as a fact: "Among the translators, Hiuan-tsang [Xuanzang] alone precisely states that the originator of the Five Propositions was Mahādeva, the information being taken from the *Vibhāṣā*." There may be no way to finally decide the issue, but it should be noted that there is ample evidence elsewhere of Xuanzang's willingness to add explanatory glosses to his translations. I am not aware of any systematic study of such additions, which would, however, be likely to produce interesting results.
- 30) Nattier and Prebish 1977: 261, 264. It is worth noting that essentially the same case was made with, if anything, more vigor and greater control of the relevant sources already by Ui Hakuju in 1924: 84-88, 91 (and see too the observations in Shāstrī 1931: 838-839), as well as by others afterwards (e.g., Frauwallner 1952: 248; Kabata 1959: 168; Mizuno 1967: 91; see also Tsukamoto 1980: 246—I do not know if the same was found in the first edition of his study in 1965). Katō 1950: 42-43, on the other hand, accepts the historical existence of two Mahādevas, one of whom was, for him, a great bodhisattva.
- 31) The proper name of this individual, that by which he referred to himself, is simply Ji 基; for a detailed discussion of this issue, see Weinstein 1959: 129-136 (who prefers the appellation Cien 慈恩). For the sake of convenience, however, I maintain the name by which he is generally known in scholarship, Kuiji.
- 32) *Dainihon Zokuzōkyō* (Kyoto: Zōkyō shoin, 1905-1912): I.83.3. For information on this and the points which follow, see Demiéville 1932: 15-18.
- 33) Demiéville 1932: 16, and 17, note c, citing T. 2300 (LXX) 455a22-23 (*juan* 5). Demiéville notices that Kuiji states that he will avoid pointing out differences between Xuanzang and Paramārtha; it therefore makes sense that he would quote the *Vibhāṣā* version in Xuanzang's translation, rather than the different version transmitted by

Paramārtha, on which see below.

- 34) *Yibuzonglunlun shuji* I.83.3: 215d8-216a7; also found in Oyama 1891: 1.27b7-29a5, who carefully notes the variants. See Demiéville 1932: 33, note c. It is true, of course, that the verbatim presentation of Xuanzang's account in Kuiji's text might be of some different independent significance—for a study of the latter's working methods, for instance.
- 35) Demiéville 1932 refers to this monk by the name Chūkan 中觀, which may also be read Chūgan. I refer to him by his monastic name Chōzen.
- 36) T. 1852 (XLV) 8b17-19. See Demiéville 1932: 30, and Saigusa 1970: 162ff.
- 37) According to Paul Demiéville (1932: 18), the content of Jizang's work itself is, with a few minor exceptions, “borrowed from one end to the other from Paramārtha's commentary on the Treatise of Vasumitra,” referring to Paramārtha's now lost *Buzhiyilun-shu*.
- 38) Chōzen's note T. 2300 (LXX) 455b4-6 (*juan* 5) reads: “As for the controversy over the Five Points, [*juan*] 99 of the *Vibhāṣā* has this introductory account, which differs somewhat from that given by Paramārtha in the *Buzhi-shu* [= *Buzhiyilun-shu*]. I cannot recount it in full, so now I will just summarize the discussion.” See Demiéville 1932: 33. Later Demiéville 1951: 267, n. 2 suggested that Paramārtha summarized and “on many points modified” the version in the *Vibhāṣā*.
- 39) For the whole passage see T. 2300 (LXX) 455b6-21 (*juan* 5). At 455b20, the first character in the line, *sui* 歲, is a misprint for *zàng* 藏.
- 40) T. 1829 (XLIII) 1b2-4 (*juan* 1); see Demiéville 1951: 264, note, Lamotte 1956: 156 = 1958: 307, and Kanakura 1962: 294, n. 5.
- 41) I owe to Dr. Yuet-keung Lo the obviously correct suggestion that *láo* 牢 in the Taishō text is an error for *luò* 犖, thus giving the common term *zhuōluò* 卓犖, “extraordinary, very talented.” [Also so read by Katō 1950: 36, without note.]
- 42) Demiéville 1951: 264, n. 1, understands “but his superiority isolated him,” taking *wúlǚ* 無侶 differently. However, see Luo 1986-1993: 4117a.
- 43) This is the argument of Kanakura 1962: 293. He offers the opinion that, compared with the account in the *Vibhāṣā*, the tenor of the attacks on Mahādeva in the works of such authors as Xuanzang and Paramārtha is considerably attenuated, and he wonders whether this is due to some implicit influence on the authors' thinking exercised by their awareness that the Mahāyāna had its origins in the Mahāsāṃghikas, a sect which resulted from the advocacy of Mahādeva.

One additional reference to (some) Mahādeva should be noted, if only in passing. The apparently Mahāyānist commentary on the *Ekottarikāgama*, *Fenbie gongde lun* 分別功德論, contains the following passage (T. 1507 [XXV] 32c8-11 [*juan* 1]):

昔大王聖王、具四梵堂。展轉相紹、乃至八萬四千王、皆有梵堂。唯大王一人是大士、其餘皆是小節。以是言之、大乘難辯、多趣聲聞。

Long ago there was a sage king, Mahādeva, endowed with the four immeasurables (**brahmavihāra*). Through the ages, one after another as many as 84,000 kings have all possessed the immeasurables, but only Mahādeva was a **Mahāsattva*; the rest were all small-fry. Thus it is said, the Mahāyāna is hard to comprehend, but many seek after the Śrāvaka (teaching).

This passage has been mentioned by Lamotte 1956: 156 = 1958: 307 and Katō 1950: 36, both of whom seem, at least tacitly, to assume that we are dealing with the same Mahādeva here. I think this is questionable. Katō, in fact, suggests that this passage is telling us that in the time of Aśoka Mahādeva was the only great Mahāyāna bodhisattva, and all the rest were Hīnayāna śrāvakas. (He also asserts that the *Fenbie gongde lun* is a Mahāsāṃghika text, again without giving reasons. However, Suguro Shinshō 勝呂信靜 in Mizuno et al. 1977: 116 suggests that it is the praise of Mahādeva which indicates the author's affinity with the Mahāsāṃghika; the circularity of such an argument is obvious. The text may, nevertheless, have doctrinal affinities with the Mahāsāṃghika position, but—as far as I know—this remains to be studied.) See also Kanakura 1962: 294, n. 6.

44) Nattier and Prebish 1977: 247-248. It is not clear if they mean this to imply the historicity of the related account, which may also be implied by their statement (1977: 261) that accounts in various texts are “valid.” Cousins 1991: 44-45 seems clearly to believe in the historicity of a Mahādeva, to whom he goes so far as to attribute motives. (Cp. p. 50). See also Dessein in Willems, Dessein and Cox 1998: 48, who quite uncritically says “There are good reasons to believe that the actual schism took place at Pāṭaliputra on account of the Five Theses of Mahādeva, derogatory to the status of an *Arhat*.”

〈key word〉 Xuanzang, Mahādeva, Kuiji