

The Saṅgha of Devadatta:  
Fiction and History of a Heresy  
in the Buddhist Tradition

Max Deeg

One of the most fascinating personalities in the legends about the life of the Buddha is his cousin and adversary *Devadatta*. William Woodville ROCKHILL has stated about *Devadatta*: "his name became in later times synonymous with everything that is bad, the object of the hatred of all believers."<sup>1)</sup> Although he acted as an opponent to the Master, *Devadatta* also continued to fascinate the Buddhists of later periods. It has been pointed out that *Devadatta* has probably not been the paradigmatic "bad guy" from the very beginning<sup>2)</sup> and that in later times he obviously had gained some kind of rehabilitation<sup>3)</sup>, which can be seen by the famous example of the "chapter of *Devadatta*" (*Devadatta-parivarta*) in the *Lotussūtra*, which will be discussed below. Reginald A. RAY in his book on "*Buddhist Saints in India*" goes even so far as to call him "a *Condemned Saint*"<sup>4)</sup>.

When we are doing research on history the sometimes hidden but always present claim for what we are doing is always that we somehow succeed in reconstructing the objective reality of the past as truly as possible, even though criticism has arisen in the last few decades about the possibility of achieving this ideal. No one else, probably, is more aware of these restrictions than the Buddhologist. Especially in the field of Buddhist history and not less of Indian history in general, we are very often forced to act as a reconstructor because the situation of the materials we have at our disposition for research is in most cases not an ideal one. This is so for reasons of quantity as well as for reasons of quality. In studying Indian history or the history of Indian religions we

have sources very scant and brief and on the other hand an overwhelming flow of texts which, however, have a restricted value for reconstructing history mainly because of their mythological or idealizing character.

So returning to the initial question: what is meant by discerning between "Buddhist history" and the "History of Buddhism"? The author's intention lay in pointing out the always present danger of a discrepancy between the History we reconstruct and the History, the first being the History - and consequently - the Histories we write of some subject and the second being the probably never completely reconstructable reality of the past - may it be a past some years ago or some centuries or even millenaries back. This does, however, not mean that we should give up trying to come as close to this ideal as possible; and the consequence of this statement is that we always have to re-reconstruct the Histories already having been constructed. Practically speaking this means that we should not take the contents of historical handbooks for granted - this would probably be the worst thing we could do towards their author.

One may ask: but what have these considerations to do with *Devadatta*? Nothing, if one does not care about details of history but the more if one looks critically at the remarks about this individual in the current handbooks on the *History of Buddhism* - that is: the *Histories of Buddhism*. But before having a look at what these handbooks have to say about *Devadatta* one should investigate the legends about this personality in Buddhist literature in general.

In all Buddhist *Vinayas* - *Theravādin* preserved in *Pāli*, *Mūlasarvāstivādin* (MSV) preserved in all three classical Buddhist languages, Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan, *Mahīśāsaka*, *Dharmaguptaka*, *Sarvāstivādin* and *Mahāsāṅghika* in Chinese translations<sup>5)</sup> - *Devadatta* is found as the creator of the first, be it the only, interim schism of the *saṅgha*. He tries to persuade the Buddha to hand the leadership of the *saṅgha* over to him, but the Buddha turns him down, even insulting him,

as Étienne LAMOTTE has proposed as the climax of an older version of the episode<sup>6)</sup>. He then tries to split the order with temporaneous success in bringing 500 young *bhikṣus* to his side, after he had already a group of four, respectively three monks as his retainers, *Kokālika* (P. *Kokālika*) *Khaṇḍadravya*, *Kaṭamorakatiṣya* ( P. *Kaṭamorakatissaka* ) and *Samudradatta* (P. *Samuddadatta*)<sup>7)</sup>. It is not before the senior disciples of the Buddha, *Mahāmaudgalyāyana* and *Śāriputra*, lead the renegates back to the Buddha that this very first schism of the *saṅgha* comes to an end.

The reason for this splitting of the *saṅgha* as the texts inform was not so much points of dogmatic concern<sup>8)</sup> but rather the question of what was the right style of living for a *śramaṇa*, *Devadatta* being the one who demanded a stricter and more ascetic course. Until this point the *Vinayas* are quite identical, but concerning the rules (*dhūtāṅga*) in which *Devadatta* differed from the Buddha they show more or less the differences which have been the subject of discussion.

As is well known from the legend of the Buddha after these events *Devadatta* launches or causes some vicious attacks on the Buddha's life<sup>9)</sup>. None of these attacks is successful and finally *Devadatta* dies of a violent haemorrhoid attack, probably caused by his outrage about the outcome, with blood issuing from his mouth; the Buddha's comment on the event is that *Devadatta* will be driven to hell (*niraya*) and will stay there for an aeon (*kalpa*) without a chance of being relieved<sup>10)</sup>.

The schism of *Devadatta* and his attacks on the Buddha are subsequently taken up again and again in Buddhist narrative and commentary literature<sup>11)</sup>. We read of the chasing of a drunken elephant on the Buddha or the attack by a rock thrown on the Buddha, motifs which are frequent in Buddhist art<sup>12)</sup>.

The Chinese pilgrim monks *Faxian* 法顯 and *Xuanzang* 玄奘 give information that in the times of their travels in India there were still

groups of adherents of *Devadatta*. These passages in the two Chinese travelogues gave reason for eminent modern Buddhologists to assume that there existed a *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* in India from the time of the Buddha until the early fourth or even until the seventh century, the periods when the two Chinese monks travelled the regions<sup>13)</sup>. The best known among these scholars is certainly Étienne LAMOTTE in his "*Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien*"<sup>14)</sup>, followed by André BAREAU in his paper "*Les agissements de Devadatta selon les chapitres relatifs au schisme dans les divers Vinayapitaka*"<sup>15)</sup> and Erich FRAUWALLNER in his well-known book *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature* (Roma 1956)<sup>16)</sup>. For a Japanese scholar who subscribes to the same opinion one could, for instance, refer to IWAMOTO Yutaka's "*Hokke-kyō to sono ta no butten to no kankei*" 法華經とその他の佛典との關係 ("*The Lotussūtra and its relation to Buddhist literature*"<sup>17)</sup>). RAY, in his already mentioned book, makes a similar statement and goes even so far as to propose a relative date for the rise of the legend of *Devadatta*'s schism<sup>18)</sup>: because the *Mahāsāṅghika-Vinaya* differs strongly from the other *Vinaya*-traditions, the formation of the legend must have happened after the split of the original *saṅgha* into *Sthaviravādin* and *Mahāsāṅghika*, which he puts into the fourth century B.C.<sup>19)</sup>

The conclusion, that there existed a community of followers of *Devadatta* from the Buddha's lifetime until the travels of the Chinese pilgrims, should have given rise to doubts from the very beginning by the following facts, even without going into deeper investigations of the contexts: 1. The *Vinayas* despite the differences in singular points univocally state that *Devadatta* was not able to establish a continuous schism<sup>20)</sup>, nay, they insist that the arch-rival of the Buddha was even driven to utmost outrage and assaults by the fact that he did not succeed in doing so. For the *Vinayas* the problem of the first schism is thereby solved and the whole story is taken as contextual for the rules which the

Buddha establishes against the creation of such schisms. 2. There is no evidence, whatsoever, of an archaeological<sup>21)</sup> or inscriptional<sup>22)</sup> nature, nor are glimpses of such an existing group gained in the later Buddhist texts<sup>23)</sup> which should be expected at least in the form of polemic allusions. And still another question: why are there no traces of the group of *Devadatta* in the well-known writings of the other eminent pilgrim, *Yijing* 義淨, either in his *Nanhai-jigui-neifa-zhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳, "Report about the Buddhist Law, sent home from the Southern Sea", or in his *Datang-xiyu-qiufa-gaoseng-zhuan* 大唐西域求法高僧傳, "Biographies of eminent monks of the Great Tang who went to the Western Regions in search of the Law" ?

The question arising from all these facts is, whether there existed really a *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* in India after the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha. The reports of *Faxian* and *Xuanzang* at least are to be taken as evidence that in the period in which they toured India there was actually a group deriving its origin back to the rival of the Buddha.

The earliest proof of such a group is the following text of *Faxian* from the beginning of the 5th century. After having described the 96 heretical teachings to be found in Central India (*Zhongguo* 中國 = *Madhyadeśa*)<sup>24)</sup>. *Faxian* says:

"There is also the group of *Devadatta* existing, [whose members] give donations to the three Buddhas of the past, but they exclusively do not donate to the Buddha *Śākyamuni*.<sup>25)</sup>"

*Xuanzang* describes three monasteries in Western Bengal, in *Karṇasuvarṇa* / *Jieluonasufalana* 羯羅拏蘇伐剌那 as belonging to the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta*:

"Furthermore, there are three *saṅghārāmas*, in which they do not drink milk [which is the] teaching of *Devadatta*.<sup>26)</sup>"

These two places of textual evidence are rather short to make any statements on the situation of the community of *Devadatta* but at least

one can see, that the adherents placed themselves in a Buddhist tradition by referring to the three Buddhas of the past but - and this should be kept in mind - not claiming the Buddhahood for *Devadatta*. In the 7th century then *Xuanzang* describes them as living in monasteries and follow a rule corresponding to one of the rules (*dhūtāṅga*) ascribed to *Devadatta* in certain *Vinaya*-texts which will be discussed below.

One could even go further and suggest a kind of historical development of the so-called *saṅgha* of *Devadatta*. Such a reconstruction of history seems possible by a commentary on a *Vinaya*-text which was discovered in the Chinese Buddhist canon by Prof. WANG Bangwei, University of Beijing, and which is mentioned in a chapter on *Devadatta* in his annotated edition of *Yijing's Report*<sup>27)</sup>. It is *Yijing's* commentary on a *Karmavācānā*-text of the *Mūlasarvāstivādin*<sup>28)</sup>, in a section concerning the spreading of the donated cloth, the *kaṭhina*, in which is said:

"Considering what is called here 'reveiver (*lābhin*) according to the settled rules (*kriyākāra*)<sup>29)</sup>', both *bhikṣus* of the 'group of followers' (*suidang* 隨黨) as well as of the 'group of non-followers' (*fei-suidang* 非隨黨) arrange themselves according to their need. After that [they take] the summer-retreat at a certain place, within a village, a district, a community of families [speaking the words]: 'Family X belongs to me, household X belongs to you.' When it is the time for the reception of the objects [of donation], they take them according to the rules. In general it is as [described] in the Great *Vinaya* [i.e.: the *Mūlasarvāstivādin-Vinaya*].<sup>30)</sup>"

*Yijing* then continues with his commentary which is so far the longest document on an existing *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* in India:

"What is called 'group of followers' is called so because they are followers of *Devadatta*; what is called 'group of non-followers', these are followers of the Buddha. When [the distribution of the donated objects] is performed according to the places [where they live], they distribute

*the donations according to the living place. Is it, however, [performed] between the places [where the groups live], that is if there are not two [living] places then the two groups should be handed over equally. In these days the ascetic-descendants of Devadatta are spread all over the Western Regions. Their rules are in most points identical with those of the Buddhist teaching such as the five forms of existence (wudao 五道 / pañca gatayaḥ)<sup>31)</sup>, saṃsāra, rebirth in heaven, salvation. The Tripitaka which they study is on the whole the same [as the Buddhist canon]. There are no big monasteries or common facilities; they live between village and dam [that means probably: at the border of the village], they beg for their food in the village where they live, they practice asceticism (brahmacarya / jingxing 淨行). They use gourds as alm-bowls and only two pieces of garment whose colour is similar to that of cracked mulberry bark. They do not consume fermented dairy products. A lot of them are living in the monastery of Nālandā. They listen to religious texts indiscriminately [that means probably: texts of different schools]. Once I asked one of them: 'Your rules are quite similar to those of the Great Master [i.e.: the Buddha], [but] the bad portions are similar to those of Devadatta. Are you therefore not an adherent of Devadatta?', and he answered: 'My patriarch is really not Devadatta.' For it is a fact that he was afraid that people would despise him, would avoid him, would not be of service to him. They follow in most points the Buddhist teachings, but when they gather for meetings the eldest (sheng 聖 / ārya, sthavira) fix the ranks. Everybody acts on his own and they worship separately. Are they not like the other heretics [in that they] adhere to the ephemeral [phenomena], to the [conception] of permanence? They foster wrong views and are united in void statements. When it is time to eat they sit dispersed; they do not differ between [noble] and common. They follow an obsolete tradition making it the criterion of their comprehension. [The heretics] mingle more and more like the waves of*

the [river] Jing with the [waters of the river] Wei. A noble one, [however,] has to investigate their mistakes and treat each according to his position - that is adequate to him.<sup>32)</sup> ”

The first thing to verify the correctness of *Yijing*'s interpretation of the term "group of followers" (*suidang* 隨黨) as members of the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* has to be a search for the corresponding terms in the *Vinaya*-terminology. After checking the episodes of the first schism caused by *Devadatta* one discovers that in *Pāli-Vinaya* the four disciples of *Devadatta* are called *anuvattaka*,<sup>33)</sup> that is "followers, adherents, disciples"<sup>34)</sup>. The Skt. equivalent *anuvartin*<sup>35)</sup> is found in the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the *Sarvāstivādin* to refer to monks who provoke a schism<sup>36)</sup>, and the same text of the MSV has *sahāyaka*.<sup>37)</sup> In the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the *Mahāsāṅghika* such monks are first called *sahāyaka* and are qualified as *anuvattaka* later in the text<sup>38)</sup>. The Chinese *Sarvāstivādin-Vinaya* has *tongdang* 同黨, "belonging to the same group", or *bandang* 伴黨, "group of followers"<sup>39)</sup>, for the four followers of *Devadatta*, which already corresponds fairly closely to *Yijing*'s terminology. The key for *Yijing*'s *suidang* seems to be the *Vinaya* of the MSV, where the four disciples of *Devadatta* are called *sahāyakāḥ anuvartina[ḥ]*:<sup>40)</sup> *Yijing* has probably translated a similar passage in the original of his *Karmavācanā-text*, *sui* 隨 standing for *anu[vartin]* and *dang* 黨 for *sahāyaka* in the meaning given above, creating a Chinese binom for two Indian words. Unfortunately enough the MSV-*Vinaya* translated by *Yijing* does not corroborate this terminology, because here we read the verbal expression *gong bi weiban* 共彼爲伴, "They all together followed him [i.e.: *Devadatta*]"<sup>41)</sup>. There is no correspondent *terminus technicus* in the *Vinaya*-texts for *Yijing*'s privative *fei-suidang*, but this is also not to be expected because in the time when the core of the *Vinayas* was established there was no need to distinguish the followers of *Devadatta* from the Buddhist *saṅgha*. This need arose in a later period when - as will be shown



below - a real *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* existed, the certainly relatively late *Karmavācāna*-text of the MSV-tradition being an appropriate example of such a development<sup>42)</sup>, and it seems to be such a late period that the antithetical terminology *suidang* 隨黨 - *fei-suidang* 非隨黨 belongs to, *fei-suidang* probably being the translation of an Indian \**asahāyaka*. This is also supported by the fact that *Yijing* himself explains the slightly different terminological pair *suidang* 隨黨 - *feidang* 非黨 in his commentary to the MSV-*Vinaya* in the same sense as in his commentary on the *Karmavācānā*: "One should know the following matter: those who follow the five heretical rules, which Devadatta proclaimed, are called *suidang* ('group of followers'); if they rely on the Venerable they are called *feidang* (lit.: 'non-group' = \**asahāyaka*)"<sup>43)</sup>

The description of the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* and his members, according to the commentary of *Yijing*, may be summed up as follows: 1. they were called *bhikṣus* (*bichu* 苾芻) as the Buddhist monks (*Karmavācānā*); 2. they seem to have lived in the open air near the border of the villages and townships, but also mingled with Buddhists in big monasteries such as *Nālandā*, even if *Yijing* shows his indignation over the fact that they conceal their denominational origin; 3. their teachings and their literature were similar to the Buddhists; 4. they begged for alms and performed asceticism; 5. in appearance they differed slightly from the Buddhists, in using gourds instead of alm-bowls made of metal or clay and in wearing only two pieces of garment instead of the Buddhists' three robes which were also of a different colour; 6. they did not consume fermented lacteous food; 7. *Yijing* reproaches them with having no common ceremonies and no rules for the life in the community.

Comparing this information with the different sets of rules which, according to the *Vinayas* of the different schools, *Devadatta* had instituted on occasion of the first schism, it becomes clear that it corresponds greatly with those of the *Vinaya* of the MSV (Skt.)<sup>44)</sup>:

"... [*Devadatta*] taught [*his*] *dharma* to [*his*] hearers by means of the [*following*] five points: the *śramaṇa Gautama*, oh venerables! partakes of curdled milk: from today we should not do so; ... the *śramaṇa Gautama* partakes of meat: we should not do so; ... the *śramaṇa Gautama* partakes of salt: we should not do so; ... the *śramaṇa Gautama* wears garments with cut fringes: we should wear garments with long fringes; .. . the *śramaṇa Gautama* lives in the forest: we should live in villages; ...<sup>45)</sup>"

The rules of *Devadatta* which are given in the various *Vinayas* differ in a striking way<sup>46)</sup>; in the tradition of the MSV there is even a difference between the Skt.-text and the Chinese translation<sup>47)</sup>. The rules shifted obviously from a more ascetic set<sup>48)</sup> to the strange, rather contradictory combination of rules found in the MSV-*Vinaya*. The *dhūtāṅgas* of *Devadatta* in the *Pāli-Vinaya* are: 1. to live in the forest and not in villages; 2. to live from alms and not to accept invitations; 3. to use only rags for garments and not to use clothes of laypeople; 4. to live under a tree and not to take shelter under a roof; 5. not to eat meat<sup>49)</sup>. There is only one common point with the set in the *Vinaya* of the MSV, the abstention from eating meat, which obviously was extended to three prohibitions concerning food in the MSV-tradition: curdled milk, meat and salt - the last item, salt, incidentally, almost impossible to implement in a country like India<sup>50)</sup>. On the other hand there is the rule about living in villages which runs contrary to what is ascribed to *Devadatta's* severe rules in the *Pāli*-text, where it is said, that his followers should live in the forest at the bottom of a tree, meaning unsheltered. The rule for garments is reduced to a pure matter of form. One may sum up the development from the *Theravādin-Vinaya* to the MSV-*Vinaya* as going from an ascetic conservatism of sticking to living in the forest without shelter, to the real *bhikṣu*-like way of begging for food, and furthermore vegetarian food, wearing rags, which is still a somehow idealized option for Buddhist monks in the canonical texts, to a life-style

which seems to be taken more from a realistic background. That these rules of *Devadatta* in the MSV-*Vinaya* reflect really what was practiced by his followers centuries later, when the final redaction of the MSV-*Vinaya* (Skt.) was made, is clear by the fact that both *Xuanzang* and *Yijing* stress the rule of not eating fermented dairy products<sup>51)</sup>, which may have come from the ordinary practice of the *śramaṇas* in those days<sup>52)</sup>. At least we can make the statement that this rule must have been introduced in the *Vinayas* in a period before 400 C.E., because it is - together with the prohibition of salt - found in the *Vinaya* of the *Mahīśāsaka*, brought back from India by *Faxian* and translated into Chinese by *Buddhajīva* / *Fotuoshi* 佛陀什<sup>53)</sup> and as well in the *Vinaya* of the *Dharmaguptaka*, translated by *Buddhayaśas* in 410<sup>54)</sup>.

The gourds which were used as alm-bowls may represent the strict will with regard to begging for alms of the *Devadatta*-monks in contrast to their Buddhist counterparts who also used bowls made of clay or metal<sup>55)</sup>. The author still feels unable to explain the difference between *Yijing*'s report of the *Devadatta-bhikṣus* wearing two robes and the MSV-*Vinaya* proscribing robes with long fringes (*dirghadaśāni vastrāṇi*)<sup>56)</sup>. In the framework of the MSV-tradition it may be a reflex of the opposition of *Devadatta* against the Buddhist "wearing of rags" (*pāṃsukūlikatva*)<sup>57)</sup>, which is, however, still in contradiction to e.g. the *Theravādin*-tradition<sup>58)</sup>. Because all the rules of *Devadatta* are conservative in as much as they are kept against the Buddha's reformed rules which are presented by the *Vinaya*, it may well be that the two garments of which *Yijing* is speaking were the number which was common in the Buddhist community before the Buddha allowed the use of three<sup>59)</sup>. This may be the case even if the *Vinayas* univocally report in the aitiological story of the rule that the Buddha at that time wore only one garment increasing this to three because of the cold of the night.

The reconstruction of the history of the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* on

the basis of the information of the three pilgrims and the legend of *Devadatta* in the various *Vinayas* would be, that there was no continuous tradition of *Devadatta*-followers after the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha, but that such a group had developed in the time of the *Kuṣāna*-empire as a reasonable period of time for the formation of an institutionalized group which *Faxian* already witnessed in the beginning of the 5th century. Why exactly such a group connected itself to the "wicked" *Devadatta* while keeping up a kind of Buddhist framework for its organizational form (*Yijing*) and doctrinal teachings (*Faxian*) is a question which cannot, of course, finally be answered on the basis of information available<sup>60</sup>, but it is less astonishing if one considers the fact that the rules of *Devadatta* were not at all far from the style of living which obviously was advocated even by a certain fraction of the Buddhist *saṅgha* in the past and even at present in *Theravāda*-countries, namely the hermits in their recluse in the forests (Skt. *āraṇyakavāsin*, P. *āraṇṇavāsin*), sometimes even despising the other easy-going members of the ordinary *saṅgha*, while they themselves were accused by the "orthodox" members of the *saṅgha* of being heretics<sup>61</sup>. It should be kept in mind that the *Devadatta* of the Buddhist tradition and legend as well as the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* of which *Faxian* gives an account did not consider themselves to be heretics<sup>62</sup>; they rather claimed orthopraxy (rules of *Devadatta*) not far from the assumed (and sometimes practiced) original Buddhist lifestyle and therefore disowned the authority of the Buddha *Śākyamuni*.

A really existing *saṅgha* of *Devadatta*, institutionalizing itself with the help of the old *Devadatta*-legend in the *Vinaya*, would then have had an impact on especially the *Devadatta*-legend in the relatively late MSV-tradition, which actually in its Chinese translations shows the strongest reflex of such an existing group: the rules established by *Devadatta* would have been changed according to the rules of the historical

*saṅgha* of *Devadatta*, the story keeping, however, - quite understandable from an orthodox Buddhist standpoint - the negative outcome for the rival of the Buddha who did not succeed in establishing a lasting schism.

The *saṅgha* had obviously already from an early period, maybe from the very beginning of its formation, given up the living in forests. The monks lived near villages<sup>63)</sup>, in the time of *Xuanzang* already in monasteries - *Xuanzang* uses the expression *jialan* 伽藍 = (*saṅ*)*ghārāma*- and in the period when *Yijing* was in India, some decades after *Xuanzang*, they lived together with regular Buddhist monks in the great monastic university of *Nālandā*. That this had been practiced for quite a long time before is clearly shown by the commentary to the MSV-*Vinaya* translated by *Yijing* and composed by *Viśeṣamitra* / *Shengyou* 勝友, probably in the second half of the sixth century, giving several rules for the *suidang*- and *feidang*-fraction of *bhikṣus*<sup>64)</sup>.

In the MSV-*Karmavācanā* and the commentary of the MSV-*Vinaya* the *Devadatta*-monks were already called *bhikṣus* like the Buddhist monks and were not radically designated as heretics, even if *Yijing* in his last comments of the *Karmavācanā*-commentary seems to criticize the indiscriminated treatment of Buddhist and *Devadatta*-monks as *bhikṣus*, though blaming mainly the latter for pretending that they were Buddhist monks. This is an indication that the whole *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* was underlying a kind of reintegration-process into the Buddhist *saṅgha*<sup>65)</sup> even though it had started off as the heretical opponent of the Buddhist *saṅgha* and had relied on the latter's traditions and customs.

An indirect support for the reconstruction of the history of the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* can also be gained from one of the most popular *Mahāyānasūtras*, the *Lotussūtra*, especially in connection with the problematic *Devadattaparivarta*, the "Chapter of *Devadatta*"<sup>66)</sup>. As is well known, this chapter is the *crux* in the *Lotussūtra* both by position and contents. It describes how the Buddha related a *Jātaka*-story, at

the end of which he identifies *Devadatta*<sup>67)</sup> with a *brahman* who had taught the Buddha in a previous existence the teaching of the *Lotussūtra*. The Buddha then calls *Devadatta* his close and good friend (*kalyāṇamitra*)<sup>68)</sup>, through whose help he, the Buddha, had attained the six unlimited wisdoms (*ṣaṭpāramitā*)<sup>69)</sup> and predicts that in a future *kalpa* he will become a Buddha under the name *Devarāja*<sup>70)</sup> whose relics after his death will be enshrined in a *stūpa* and revered by the living beings who will thereby attain *arhatship*<sup>71)</sup>.

The chapter is treated very differently in the various versions of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*: the Nepalese Skt.-version integrates it into the chapter of the "Appearance of the *stūpa*", *Stūpasamdarśana* (-*parivarta*). In the earliest Chinese translation from a *Prākṛt*-original, the *Zhengfahua-jing* 正法華經 (T.263) made by *Dharmarakṣa* / *Zhu Fahu* in the third century C.E., the plot of the chapter is already there and - as can be seen through the research of S.KARASHIMA<sup>72)</sup> - has been a homogenous part of the *sūtra*, being integrated - like in the Skt.-version - in the 11th chapter. There even exists what seems to be the Chinese translation of an early extract of the whole *Lotussūtra*, uniting the contents of the chapters "Appearance of the *stūpa*" and "Devadatta" in one work; this is the *Satanfentuoli-jing* 薩曇芬陀利經 / *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*]-*sūtra* (T.265) from about the same time as *Dharmarakṣa*'s translation.

The most common translation of the *sūtra*, that of *Kumārajīva*, presents the *Devadattaparivarta* as an independent 12th chapter, but it is now *communis opinio* that it was added to the *sūtra* later on<sup>73)</sup>. If the *Devadattaparivarta* was really not originally included in the translation of *Kumārajīva*, this does not nevertheless really prove that it was not integrated into the *sūtra* at an early stage as shown for instance by the older Chinese translations. It is possible that *Kumārajīva* had omitted the chapter because it was in contradiction to another, highly estimated

text translated by him and containing the *śrāvaka*-position which stuck to the condemnation to hell of *Devadatta*: the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra* / *Da-zhidu-lun* 大智度論) attributed to *Nāgārjuna*;<sup>74)</sup> the *śāstra* gives three reasons for this irreversible fate of *Devadatta*: 1. the causing of the schism, 2. the wounding of the Buddha and 3. the killing of a Buddhist nun [sic!] the last of which LAMOTTE interprets correctly as a late addition to the tradition in order to gain a triad of sins committed by *Devadatta*. It should be noted, however, that the *śāstra*'s interpretation of the schism is not totally incompatible with the *Mahāyāna*-tradition of *Devadatta* as a saint, because it does not give the stereotype cause for the schism of the earlier texts - *Devadatta* demanding a stricter lifestyle; it rather stresses the point that *Devadatta* caused the schism because he considered himself a Great Man and wanted to become a real Buddha by gathering followers around him: "[*Devadatta*] thought by himself: 'I possess the 30 signs (*lakṣaṇa*) [of a Great Man] (*mahāpuruṣa*)<sup>75)</sup>, only some less than the Buddha; my disciples are not yet gathered (in sufficient number). If a big community (*mahāsaṅgha*) gathered around me, what would be the difference (between me) and the Buddha?' Having reflected so he decided to cause a schism of the saṅgha and got 500 disciples."<sup>76)</sup>

RAY in the framework of *Devadatta* as a "Condemned Saint" seems to assume that this episode in the *Lotussūtra* is proof that in some Buddhist traditions - and what one would like to know is: 'in which'? - *Devadatta* has been always a "simple bhikṣu in good standing" and not the "vinaya-breaker"<sup>77)</sup>. Another model of explication was offered by GOSHIMA Kiyotaka, who tried to show how the episode of the five-hundred renegade monks of *Devadatta* who are finally brought back to Buddha's saṅgha has become a wandering motif in the framework of the conception of *upāyakauśalya*<sup>78)</sup> in all kind of *Mahāyānasūtras* leading to the prophecy (*vyākaraṇa*) of *Devadatta*'s future Buddhahood by the Buddha<sup>79)</sup>. Most interpretations of the *Devadattaparivarta* try to do

away with it as a younger inserted portion of the whole *sūtra*.<sup>80)</sup> Even if this proves to be true<sup>81)</sup> there is still the question why it was inserted.

Whatever the origin of the *Devadattaparivarta* may be and how and why it became inserted into the *Lotussūtra*, it is clear by the early Chinese versions that it had gained a considerable popularity in the third century C.E.. This being relatively close to the assumed formation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* in the first century C.E. gives another hint for the time of the formation of the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta*, because in the author's opinion there is an interrelation between the two processes, although it is of course not possible to say definitely if it was the integration of *Devadatta* into the doctrine of salvation of *Mahāyāna* buddhism<sup>82)</sup> as is demonstrated by the *Lotussūtra* or the existence of a *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* which caused the respective counterpart to arise. It may well be that the real existence of a *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* caused the *Mahāyānins* to totally reconsider the role of the "wicked" one of orthodox Buddhism, which they called *śrāvakayāna*. If the interrelation of both processes is accepted, one comes to assume that the formation of an order of *Devadatta* may have occurred in the period when the foreign *Kuṣāna* dynasty ruled over North India, and that time with its multiculturalist and multireligious tendencies in turn would have been an ideal soil for the spread of a new religious group<sup>83)</sup>.

The time-setting proposed would also be subscribed by the fact that the oldest *Avadāna*-literature, e.g. the *Mahāvastu*<sup>84)</sup> or the *Divyāvadāna*, does remain silent about the schism of *Devadatta*. There is, however, an episode in the *Avadānaśataka*, which seems to be a narrative reflex of what *Faxian* says about the followers of *Devadatta*: that they do not venerate the Buddha *Śākyamuni*. In the sixth *varga* and the 54th *avadāna*, called *Śrīmatī*, it is related how *Devadatta* instigates king *Ajātaśatru* to a royal decree prohibiting the veneration of the *stūpa* of the hairs and nails (*keśanakhastūpa*)<sup>85)</sup> of the Buddha<sup>86)</sup>. As it is known



that the custom of constructing *stūpas* for the hair and nail *śarīra* of the Buddha belongs to a relatively late period of Buddhist relic-cult, this episode, which is not found anywhere else in Buddhist narrative literature, is a quite interesting support for the assumption that the *saṅgha* of Devadatta has its historical origin in the period in which North-India was ruled by the *Kuṣāna*. Faxian's account would make it possible to explain how the episode came to be inserted into the *Avadānaśataka* before a quite realistic background: it was intended to blame *Devadatta* of having already caused in the days of the Buddha what was praxis of the members of the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta*: not to venerate the Buddha *Śākyamuni*.

To come to a conclusion: if the process of formation of the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta*, which has been reconstructed above, is correct, it would be an interesting example of how a religious group arose not only as a heretic faction from the "orthodox" main religious institution - an example found over and over again in the history of religions - but even by taking up a tradition about an heresy of an already existing powerful religious group in order to legitimate its own origin. This group then would have been drawn back into the mainstream of the orthodox tradition and finally be reabsorbed by it.<sup>87)</sup>

#### Notes:

1) William Woodville ROCKHILL, *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of His Order*, London 1884, 83.

2) Cp. e.g. Alfred FOUCHER, *La vie du Bouddha d'après les textes et les monuments de l'Inde*, Paris 1987 (Reprint of the edition 1949), 286.

3) In the *Milindapañha*, for instance, it is said, that *Devadatta*, after having been driven into hell, will become a *pratyekabuddha* and that the whole

matter was a device of the Buddha to lead *Devadatta* to the final stage: cp. TSUKAMOTO Keishō, *Daiba-hon no seiritsu to heikei* ("Formation and Background of the *Devadattaparivarta*"), in: KANAKURA Enshō (ed.), *Hokke-kyō no seiritsu to tenkai / The Lotus Sutra and the Development of Buddhist Thought (Hokke-kyō-kenkyū III)*, Kyōto 1970, 165-220 (English summary in appendix 6-9) 塚本啓祥, 提婆品の成立と背景, in: 金倉圓照編, 法華経の成立と展開 (法華経研究 III) 210f..

4) Reginald A. RAY, *Buddhist Saints in India. A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations*, New York / Oxford 1994, 162. See also SATO Mitsuo, *Genshi-bukkyō-kyōdan no kenkyū* ("Studies in the saṅgha of early Buddhism"), Tōkyō 1956 (Reprint 1993) 佐藤密男, 原始仏教教団の研究, 東京, 793, who, on the background of the interpretation of the rules of *Devadatta* calls *Devadatta's* standpoint "idealistic" (*risō-shugi*), the Buddha's "realistic" or "pragmatic" (*genjitsu-shugi* 現実主義).

5) The material has been gathered and discussed at length by B. MUKHERJEE, op.cit., É. LAMOTTE, *Le traité de la grande vertue de sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra), tōme II, chapitres XVI-XXX*, Louvain 1949, Réimpr. 1967, 873ff., note 1, and A. BAREAU, *Les agissements de Devadatta selon les chapitres relatifs au schisme dans les divers Vinayapīṭaka*, originally in: BÉFEO 78 (1991), reprinted in: *Recherches sur la Biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtrapīṭaka et les Vinayapīṭaka anciens, III. Articles complémentaires*, Paris 1995 (ÉFEO, Monographies, n° 178); cp. also A. BAREAU, *Devadatta and the First Buddhist Schism*, in: *Buddhist Studies Review* 14.1 (1997), 19-37 (English translation of: *Devadatta et le premier schisme bouddhique*, in: *Oriente e Occidente (Pūrvāparam)*, Marsala 1989-90); a convenient overview is given in RAY, op.cit., 162ff..

6) É. LAMOTTE, *Le Buddha insulta-t-il Devadatta?*, in: BSOAS 33 (1970), 107-115.

7) *Saṅghabhedavastu* (ed. R. GNOLI), 81, where is expressively given the number of four monks (*catvāraś ca bhikṣavaḥ ...*), while the P.- *Vinaya*

gives only three: *Kokāliko Kaṭamorakatissako Khaṇḍadeviya putto Samuddadatto...* The *Shisong-lü*, T.1435.259a.11 support the MSV-version: 有四同黨弟子. See also MSV-*Vinaya* translated by *Yijing*, T.1442.701c.8ff.. [T. = *Taishō-shinshū-daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, cited according the number, page of respective volume, column and line]

8) There is only one passage in the Buddhist texts alluding to teachings of *Devadatta*: *Aṅguttara-nikāya* IV, 402f.: *Evaṃ me sutam. Ekaṃ samayaṃ āyasmā ca Sāriputto āyasmā ca Candikāputto Rājagahe viharanti Veḷuvane Kalandakanivāpe. Tatra kho āyasmā Candikāputto bhikkhū āmantesi: Devadatto āvuso bhikkhūnaṃ evaṃ dhammaṃ deseti 'yato kho āvuso bhikkhuno cetasā cittaṃ suparicitaṃ hoti, tass' etaṃ bhikkhuno kallaṃ veyyākaraṇāya: khīṇājāti, vusitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ, kataṃ karaṇiyaṃ nāparaṃ itthattāyā ti pajānāmi 'ti.* ("So I have heard. Once the venerable Sāriputta and the venerable Candikāputta were dwelling in Rājagaha, in the Bamboo Grove, in the Kalandakanivāpa. There the venerable Candikāputta spoke to the monks: "Devadatta, oh friends, teaches the Law to the monks in the following way: 'If, oh friends, a monk's heart is well-gathered by his mind, then it is proper to that monk to think [and] state: (re)birth is gone, accomplished is ascetic life, what has to be done is done, there is no further existence here.'") It is not quite clear from the *Pāli sutta* if *Candikāputta*, who in the canon is only found here, gives the teaching of *Devadatta* before or after the schism, but by comparison with the corresponding *sūtra* in the Chinese *Samyuktāgama / Za-ahan-jing*, 雜阿含經 T.99.131a.25ff., translated by the Central-Indian monk *Guṇabhadra / Qiunabatuoluo* 求那跋陀羅 it becomes clear that at least in the time of the translation (mid-5th century) and probably some time before *Caṇḍri(kā)putra* (Yuezi 月子) was taken as a disciple of *Devadatta* (*Tipodaduo-dizi* 提婆達多弟子), the episode thus being placed after the schism. E.LAMOTTE, *Le Traité ... II*, 694, note 3, after having quoted these passages (p.693f.), gives the striking commentary: "Ajoutons que l'orthodoxie de cette prédication n'est pas mise en suspicion."

which fits quite well to *Yijing's* statement in the *Karmavācanā*-text cited below on the "doctrines" of the group being not really different from Buddhist teaching.

9) E. WALDSCHMIDT has edited fragments from the *Saṅghabhedavastu* of the *Vinaya* of the *Sarvāstivādin*: E. WALDSCHMIDT, *Reste von Devadatta-Episoden aus dem Vinaya der Sarvāstivādins*, in: *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften* (hrsg.v. H. BECHERT u. P. KIEFFER-PÜLZ), Stuttgart 1989 (Glasenapp-Stiftung Bd.29), 201-209 (originally in: ZDMG 113 (1964), 552-558).

An interesting aspect in our context - beside the usual differences existing in the different *Vinaya*-redactions which WALDSCHMIDT points out in giving the parallel portion of the *Theravādin-Vinaya* - is that *Devadatta* is said to have pupils (*saparṣatka*), a fact that is omitted in the *Pāli*-version.

10) It is quite interesting that even in the oldest canonical texts *Devadatta* is not condemned forever and that there was even discussion in the scholastic literature about how long such a *kalpa* in hell would last: cp. É. LAMOTTE, *Le Traité ... I*, Louvain 1949 (to be corrected to 1944), Réimpr. 1966, 407, note 1.

11) The later systematization of the vita of the Buddha has even led to the inclusion of *Devadatta* in the legend of the youth of the Buddha where he is projected as the jealous loser in the sportive competitions and even as a rival for the Buddha's bride *Yaśodharā* respectively *Gopā*: cp. Alfred FOUCHER, *La vie du Bouddha ...*, 85f., Edward J. THOMAS, *The Life of the Buddha as Legend and History*, London 1949, 131. A late example in Tibetan tradition of *Devadatta* as the ultimate evil is found in the *Bod-kyi yul-du chos-dan chos-smra-ba ji-ltar byuñ-ba'i rim-pa deb-ther sñ on-po*, the "*Blue Annals, the Stages of the Appearance of the Doctrine and Preachers in the Land of Tibet*", compiled between 1476 and 1478, where *Māra* tries to disturb the Buddha's search for enlightenment by telling him that *Devadatta* had captured his hometown *Kapilavastu*, an obvious reminiscence of the the episode of the destruction of the *Śākyas* by king *Virūdhaka* reprojected on

*Devadatta*: George N. ROERICH, *The Blue Annals*, Part I, Delhi 1976 (orig. Calcutta 1949), 19.

12) In Gandhāran art see e.g. KURITA Isao, *Gandāra-bijutsu I. Butsuden / Gandhāran Art I. The Buddha's life story*, Tōkyō 1988 栗田功, *ガンダーラ美術 I. 佛傳*, 東京, 51ff. and 283f. (youth); 208ff. and 307f. (attacks). Cp. also A. FOUCHER, *La vie du Bouddha ...*, 287ff.; E.J. THOMAS, *op.cit.*, 132ff..

13) The only exception I know is E.J. THOMAS, *op.cit.*, 137f., whose suppositions come close to our argumentation: "*There is no reason why Devadatta's party, if it had continued to exist, should have been ignored, ... When we come down to the fifth century A.D., we find that Fa Hien mentions the existence of a body that followed Devadatta, and made offerings to the three previous Buddhas, but not to Śākyamuni. It may even be the case that this body conciously adopted Devadatta's rules, but there is nothing to suggest that it had continued to exist in complete obscurity from the time of Devadatta for a thousand years.*"

14) *Histoire du bouddhisme indien des origines à l'ère Śaka*, Louvain 1958 (Bibliothèque du Muséon, Vol.43; English translation, Louvain 1988), 572: "*Du vivant même du Buddha, deux schismes éclatèrent: celui de Kausambi qui fut résorbé rapidement, celui de Devadatta qui aboutit à la création d'un ordre dissident dont les traces subsistaient encore au VII<sup>e</sup> siècle à l'époque de Hiuan-tsang.*"

15) *Les agissements de Devadatta*, 258 (= 124): "*Ces deux témoignages [i.e.: de Faxian and Xuanzang] montrent clairement aussi que le schismatique avait réussi à s'attacher fidèlement un nombre assez important de moines qui, devenus ses propres disciples, avaient formé sous sa direction une communauté distincte, assez solide pour exister encore douze siècles plus tard.*"; cp. also A. BAREAU, *Devadatta and the First Buddhist Schism*, 33.

16) P.139, note 1: "*In fact, the sect of Devadatta still existed in much later times [than the Buddha]; see the evidence of Faxian ...*"

17) Originally in "*Indo-bukkyō to Hokke-kyō*" インド佛教と法華經 ("Indian

*Buddhism and the Lotussūtra*"), 1974, reprinted in: *Iwamoto-Yutaka-chosakushū, Daiikkan: Bukkyō no kyozō to jitsuzō* 岩本裕著作集, 第一卷佛教の虚像と実像, 京都 ("Collected works of Iwamoto Yutaka", vol.1: *The void and real form of Buddhism*) Kyōto 1988, 250-257. See also TSUKAMOTO, op.cit., 210f..

18) RAY, 172: "There can be no doubt that Devadatta's schism is not an event imagined by Buddhist authors but is a historical fact, as shown by the evidence provided by the two Chinese pilgrims, Fa-hsien and Hsüan-tsang."

19) RAY, op.cit., 168. In the *Mahāsāṅghika-Vinaya* the legend of the schism of Devadatta is only found in the *saṅghāvaśeṣa*-section of the *Vibhaṅga*, not in the *Skandhaka*-portion as in other *Vinayas*.

20) A.BAREAU, *Devadatta and the first schism*, 33, vehemently denies the reliability of the *Vinayas* in this term: "... contrary to what the accounts in the *Vinaya Piṭakas* give us to understand, the school thus constituted did not rapidly disappear with the ignominious death of its founder but lasted for more than ten centuries, as is proved by the evidence of Fa-hsien and especially Hsüan-tsang; ...".

21) It is mainly in the Buddhist art of *Gandhāra* that *Devadatta*-scenes are found, and there especially the motives of the attacks on the Buddha's life performed by his cousin.

22) We would expect to find at least allusions in the so-called schism-edicts of *Aśoka*. In the catalogue of SHIZUTANI Masao, *Indo-Bukkyō-himeimokuroku II: Pāra-jidai-bukkyō-himeimokuroku* ("A Catalogue of Indian Buddhist Inscriptions II: Buddhist Inscriptions of the Pāla-Dynasty"), [Kyōto] 1970 静谷正雄, インド仏教碑銘目録IIパーラ時代仏教碑銘目録, 京都, 19, No.114, there is only one inscription containing the name of *Devadatta*, edited by E.HULTZSCH, *A Buddhist Sanskrit Inscription from Kota*, in: *The Indian Antiquary* 14, February 1885, 45-48. It is an inscription from *Shergaḍh* in *Koṭā* (Rajasthan), in which a "feudal chief (*sāmanta*)" *Devadatta* is donating a temple (*mandira*) or / and a monastic establishment (*vihāra*)

to the *Sugata* (the Buddha). The interesting point of this inscription is that the name was given to a member of a noble family who at least himself had inclinations to Buddhism. Unfortunately I was not able to check the interpretation of the inscription given by D.R.BHANDHARKAR, *List of Inscriptions of Northern India, Appendix to EI, vols.XIX-XXIII*, 21, cited by SHIZUTANI, who dated it to the year 847, while SHIZUTANI himself thinks that the era is *Vikrama* which would give 790-791.

23) E.g. in the legend of *Aśoka (Divyāvadāna)* where the name does not even show up.

24) It is by a non-contextual reading of *Faxian's* text, that almost all authors writing on the subject, state that *Faxian* had seen the disciples of *Devadatta* in *Śrāvastī*, because he commented on this city in the passages before. The whole portion preceding *Faxian's* cited account on the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* is an insertion into the report on *Śrāvastī* stimulated by the reported attacks of the heretics - including *Devadatta's* - on the Buddha and on the competition between the *Jetavana* monastery and the heretic temple called "*Overshadowed*" (*Yingfu* 影覆) - because it could never gain the sunlight because of the shadow thrown by *Jetavana*. After *Faxian* has described the 96 heretical teachings in Central India he feels it to be in place to mention also the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta*.

25) 861a. 調達亦有眾在供養過去三佛唯不供養釋迦文佛

26) XJ 10 (JI, 807f.) 別有三伽藍不食乳遵提婆達多遺訓也

27) WANG Bangwei, *Nanhai-jigui-neifa-zhuan-xiaozhu* 王邦維, 南海寄歸內法傳校注, 北京 ("*Commented edition of the NJNZ*"), Beijing 1995, 108ff.. It should be said beforehand that Prof.WANG maintains however the old interpretation that the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* existed in India from the *Parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha; see also WANG Bangwei, *Buddhist Nikāyas through Ancient Chinese Eyes*, in: F.BANDURSKI, Bhikkhu PASADIKA, M.SCHMIDT, Bangwei WANG, *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*, Göttingen 1994 (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den

Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 9), 180f..

28) *Mūlasarvāstivādaikaśatakarman / Genben-shuo-yiqie-youbu-baiyi-jiemo*  
根本說一切有部一百一羯摩 T.1453.495c.10ff.; cp. Akira YUYAMA, *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur / A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*, hrsg.v. H.BECHERT, *Erster Teil: Vinaya-Texte*, Göttingen 1979, 18.

29) For the identification of (*li*)zhi (立) 制 = *kriyākāra* and *deli* 得利 = *lābhin* cp. HIRAKAWA Akira, *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary* 佛教漢梵大辭典, Tōkyō 1997, 190b., resp. 912b..

30) T.1453.495c.10ff. 言立制所得利者謂諸苾芻或是隨黨或非隨黨共作制要然後安居於某處村街衢之內某家屬我某舍屬汝若得物時依制而受廣如大律

31) HIRAKAWA, op.cit., 89b.

32) T.1453.495c.15ff. 此言隨黨者謂是隨提婆達多所有伴屬言非隨黨者即是佛弟子此乃由其住處則令物隨處判處中既非兩處故遣兩眾均分現令西方在處皆有天授種族出家之流所有軌儀多同佛法至如五道輪迴生天解脫所習三藏亦有大同無寺舍居村塢間乞食自居多修靜行葫蘆爲鉢衣但二巾色類桑毼不煖乳酪多在那瀾陀寺雜聽諸典曾問之曰汝之軌式多似大師有僻邪處復同天授豈非天授之種胃乎彼便答曰我之所祖實非天授此即恐人此雖多似佛法若行聚集則聖制分途各自爲行別呈供養豈況諸餘外道計斷計常妄自然虛陳得一食時雜坐流俗無分踵舊之徒養爲通鑿更相染觸涇渭同波高尚之賓須察斯濫殊行各席深是其宜

33) V.TRENCKER, *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, vol.I, Copenhagen (1924-48), 216, s.v.: "a follower, adherent, partisan"

34) *Samghādisesa* XI, 1 (p.175).

35) Cp. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvāstivāda-Schule*, Göttingen 1994, 70a., s.v., "folgend, anhängend; folgsam", which in the context of magic comes very close to the negative connotations as a term for the followers of *Devadatta*.

36) L.FINOT, E.HUBER, *Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins*, in: *Journal Asiatique* 1913, 483.



- 37) A.Ch.BANERJEE, *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit - Prātimokṣasūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākya*, Calcutta 1977, 19.
- 38) W.PACHOW / R.MISHRA, *The Prātimokṣasūtra of the Mahāsāṅghikās. Critically edited for the first time from palm-leaf manuscripts found in Tibet*, Allahabad 1956, 10.9f.
- 39) *Shisong-lü* + 誦律 / *Sarvāstivādin-vinaya*, T.1435.259a.11 and 259c.4. The first terminus could well stand for *sahāyaka* and the second for *anuvartin*.
- 40) R.GNOLI (ed.), *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu, Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, Part II*, Roma 1978 (Serie Orientale Roma, vol.XLIX, 2), 81.
- 41) T.1442.704c.29. Some lines before (13f.), however, we find the expression *bandang* 伴黨 which fairly corresponds to the Skt. text.
- 42) There is another younger text, a commentary on the MSV-Vinaya, who has almost the same terminology *suidang* 隨黨 versus *fei-suidang* 非隨黨 (T. 1458.567a.5ff.).
- 43) *Genben-sapoduo-bu-lü-she* 根本薩婆多部律攝 / *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya-saṃgraha* T.1458.568b.11ff. 准事應知提婆達多說五邪法心許可者名為隨黨若依伏世尊名為非黨
- 44) SATO Mitsuo, op.cit., 791, goes even so far to assume that the followers of Devadatta which Faxian and Xuanzang have seen followed the rules of Devadatta of this Vinaya.
- 45) *Saṅghabhedavastu* (ed. GNOLI), II, 259: ... *pañcabhiḥ padaiḥ śrāvakānāṃ dharmam deśayati; śramaṇo bhavanto gautamo dadhikṣiram paribhuṅkte; asmābhir adyāgreṇa (na) paribhoktavyam; ... śramaṇo gautamo māṃsam paribhuṅkte; asmābhir na paribhoktavyam; śramaṇo gautamo lavanam paribhuṅkte; asmābhir na paribhoktavyam; ... śramaṇo gautamaś chinnadaśāni vastrāṇi dhārayati; asmābhir dīrghadaśāni vastrāṇi dhārayitavyāni; ... śramaṇo gautamo 'raṇye prativasati; asmābhir grāme vastavyam; ...*
- 46) Cp. the table in MUKHERJEE, op.cit., 76f., and in SATO, op.cit., 790.

47) T.1450.202c.13f. 一者乞食二者糞掃衣三者三衣四者露坐 ( " 1. food through begging, 2. garment [made of] rags, 3. three garments, 4. sitting in the open air." ) These rules make no sense at all, because here we have two rules concerning clothes, one being identical with the Buddhist rule (*traicīvarakatva* / *sanyi* 三衣).

48) Cp. e.g. TSUKAMOTO Keishō, *Shoki-bukkyō-kyōdan-shi no kenkyū. Buha no keisei ni kan-suru bunka-shi-teki-kōsai* / *A History of the Early Buddhist Order. A Historical Study on the Formation of the Indian Buddhist Schools*, 塚本啓祥, 初期佛教教團史の研究-部派の形成に關して文化史的考察, 東京 (改増訂補) Tōkyō 1980 (Revised Issue), 576.

49) *Saṅghādisesa* X.1.1 (ed. PTS, H.OLDENBERG, vol.3, p.171) *sādhu bhante bhikkhū yāvajīvaṃ ārañṇakā assu, yo gāmantāṃ osareyya vajjaṃ naṃ phuseyya. yāvajīvaṃ piṇḍapātikā assu, yo nimantanāṃ sādīyeyya vajjaṃ naṃ phuseyya. yāvajīvaṃ paṃsukūlikā assu, yo gahapaticīvaraṃ sādīyeyya vajjaṃ naṃ phuseyya. yāvajīvaṃ rukkhāmūlikā assu, yo channaṃ upagaccheya vajjaṃ naṃ phuseyya. yāvajīvaṃ macchamaṃsaṃ nakhādeyyuṃ, yo macchamaṃsaṃ khādeyya vajjaṃ naṃ phuseyya 'ti* (transl. I.B.HORNER, *The Book of Discipline (Vinaya-Piṭaka)*, vol.I (*Suttavibhaṅga*), London 1949, 297: "It were good, lord, if the monks for as long as life lasted, should be forest-dwellers; whoever should betake himself to the neighbourhood of a village, sin would besmirch him. For as long as life lasts let them be beggars for alms; whoever should accept an invitation, sin would besmirch him. For as long as life lasts let them be wearers of robes taken from the dust-heap; whoever should accept a robe given by a householder, sin would besmirch him. For as long as life lasts let them live at the foot of a tree; whoever should go under cover, sin would besmirch him. For as long as life lasts let them not eat fish and flesh; whoever should eat fish and flesh, sin would besmirch him." ). = *Cullavagga* VII.3.14 (ed.cit, vol.II, p.197; transl. cit., vol.5, p.276)

50) The original meaning of this rule may have been to refrain from eating

salt in the periods of severe religious practice, or to prohibit the possession of pure salt which could serve as a bartering object.

51) The idea could have been, that some of these products could have an intoxicating effect which was counterproductive to an ascetic life-style.

52) Prof.M.HARA informed me, that the Śaiva-ascetics refrained from eating dairy products and salt, too. MUKHERJEE, op.cit., 79, points out that this is against the rule according to which the Buddha allowed the monks to partake of the five dairy products. But it still needs to be explained why it was exactly dairy products which *Devadatta* is said to have prohibited. The Pāli terms are (*Mahāvagga* 6.34): *khīra, dadhi, takka, navanīta, sappi*. The passages in the Chinese *Vinayas* are: *Dharmaguptaka*: T.1428.873a. 聽飲乳法應爾有犂五種牛汁乳酥生酥熱酥醍醐; very short in *Mahīśāsaka*: T.1422. 長者先令一人搆一牛乳與一比丘 (“*Venerables! I first let one man give one [donation] of milk for one bhikṣu.*”).

53) T.1421.164a.26ff. 一不食鹽二不食酥 (lect.var.: 蘇) 乳三不食魚肉四乞食若受他請善法不生五春夏八月日露坐冬四月住於草菴若受人屋舍善法不生 (“*1. not to eat salt; 2. not to partake of buttermilk; 3. not to eat fish or meat; 4. to live off alms and not accept invitations from others; 5. to sit eight months in spring and summer in the open air, for months in winter in a bower and not to accept invitations from people to build houses.*”)

54) *Sifen-lü* 四分律, T.1428.594b.2ff. 盡形壽乞食盡形壽著糞掃衣盡形壽露坐盡形壽不食鹽酥 (lect.var.: 蘇) 盡形壽不食魚及肉 (“*... to beg for alms for the rest of the life; to wear rags for the rest of the life; to sit in the open air for the rest of the life; not to eat salt [and] dairy products for the rest of the life; not to eat fish and meat for the rest of the life.*”)

(55) Cp. *Pāli Vinaya* (ed. OLDENBERG) IV, 123 (*Pācittiya* LX) = IV, 243 (*Nissaggiya* I): *patto nāma dve pattā ayopatto mattikāpatto* (transl. HORNER, II, 115 and 415: “*A bowl means: there are two kinds of bowls: an iron bowl, a clay bowl.*”) Reference should also be made to *Vin.III*, 169 (*Samghādisesa* IX.2.3.) *pattaleso nāma: lohapattadharo dhiṭṭho hoti -*

*pa - sātākapattadharo diṭṭho hoti - pa - sumbhakapattadharo diṭṭho hoti ...*  
 (transl. HORNER, I, 293: "The pretext of a bowl means: one carrying a copper bowl is seen ... one carrying a bowl of hide is seen ... one carrying a cracked bowl is seen ...") It is not quite clear what *sātāka* means. The *Vinaya*-commentary gives: *Samantapāsādikā* III, 602: (*sātākapatto*) *ti lohappattasadiṣo susaṅṭhāno succhavi siniddho bhamaravaṅṅo mattikāpattro vuccati* ("like the copper bowl it is well-turned, of beautiful hide, glossy, of black colour (lit. bee-coloured), it is called a clay bowl.", transl. HORNER, loc.cit., note 2), probably mixing the word up with *sāta* "pleasant, agreeable" (EDGERTON, BHSD, 525b., s.v.). R.L. TURNER, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London 1966, 717b., no.12381, puts it to *śāṭa*, "strip of cloth", and the word *sātāka* occurs indeed in the *Pāli*-canon in the sense of "garment, cloth" (cp. T.W. RHYS DAVIDS, W. STEDE, *PTS-Pali-English Dictionary*, 161b., s.v. *Sātāka* and *Sātika*), so one could conclude that a *sātika*-bowl was a nice bowl, probably made of clay (*mattikāpattro*), with a surface resembling the structure of cloth and looking as if it had been glazed (*siniddho*). The third word, *sumbhaka*, which HORNER translates "cracked" (?) - the commentary gives only: *Samantapāsādikā* III, 602: (*sumbhakapatto*) *ti pakatimattikāpattro* ("it was an ordinary clay bowl", transl. HORNER, note 3) -, belongs rather to the doublette root Skt. *śumbh-*: *śubh-*, "to shine, to be bright", in the meaning of "bright" (cp. TURNER, op.cit., 727a, no.12541: "\*sumbhaka-, 'bright'"). What is important in our context is that all three bowls would have looked rather luxurious so that they gave the observer a pretext for blame.

56) See MUKHERJEE, op.cit., 80: "*Kleider mit abgeschnittenen Säumen*" (*chinnadaśāni vastrāṇi*) and "*Kleider mit langen Säumen*" (*dirghadaśāni vastrāṇi*).

57) Ed. GNOLI, II, 204. In this episode *Devadatta* succeeds in drawing the 500 *bhikṣus* to his side by summoning them to give up the Buddha's way of life, consisting of the *pañca vratapadāni* as the "living in forests"

(*āraṇyakatva*), the "alms-begging" (*piṇḍapātikatva*), the "wearing of rags" (*pāṃsukūlikatva*), the "wearing of the three robes" (*traicīvarikatva*) and the "living under open sky" (*ābhyavakāśikatva*), practices which he has made exclusive duties according to the *Pāli-Vinaya*. Even the wording of the invitation to leave used by *Devadatta* points to the direction of a more easy-going lifestyle: *yasya cāyuṣmantaḥ imāni pañca vratapadāni na rocante, na kṣamante, na saṃprakhyānti, sa śramaṇasya gautamasya ārād bhavatu, dūrād bhavatu; śalākāṃ grhṇātu iti* ("... Who, venerables, does not like these five vows, is not pleased, eludicated [by them] should stay away from the śramaṇa Gautama, should leave him, should accept [my] invitation' said [*Devadatta*]."); the expression *śalākāṃ grh-* is normally used when the monks are offered entertainments by laymen.

58) To eliminate the difference between report and *Vinaya*, one could propose that the longish garments were supposed to reduce the number of garments, but the *Vinaya* clearly gives a plural (*vastrāṇi*), not a dual (*vastre*). On the other hand the same text reports (ed. GNOLI, 204) *Devadatta's* opposition to the Buddhist "bearing of three garments" (*traicīvarikatva*).

59) Cp. MUKHERJEE, *op.cit.*, 80.

60) One of the reasons may have been the tendency of the newly formed group to gain the (economical) support of Buddhist laymen who were attracted more by a severe asceticism represented by the original rules of *Devadatta* than by the ordinary Buddhist lifestyle: in this case giving alms to the *Devadatta-śramaṇas* instead of the ordinary Buddhist monks would have meant gaining a higher degree of merit (*puṇya*).

61) Cp. H.BECHERT, *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft in den Ländern des Theravada-Buddhismus, Band I: Grundlagen. Ceylon (Sri Lanka)*, Göttingen 1988 (reprint of the edition 1966), 257ff., especially the reaction of the "orthodox" monks described on p.258, calling the ascetics "heretics"; Richard F.GOMBRICH, *Buddhist Precept and Practice. Traditional Buddhism in the Rural Highlands of Ceylon*, Oxford 1971 / <sup>2</sup>Delhi 1991, 376f.; for a

monography on the subject of *āraṇṇavāsin* cp. Michael CARRITHERS, *The Forest Monks of Sri Lanka*, Delhi 1983; Stanley Jeyaraja TAMBIAH, *The Buddhist saints of the forest and the cult of amulets. A study in charisma, hagiography, sectarianism, and millennial Buddhism*, Cambridge 1984.

62) This may have been, in the given context, the underlying meaning of *Yijing*'s report that the *Devadatta*-monk in *Nālandā* denied belonging to the group: despite *Yijing*'s rendering and interpretation of his answer he just may have stated that he considered himself not as a heretic but as an orthopractic.

63) The Chinese MSV-*Vinaya* has a kind of compromise, promoting the life in - or probably rather near villages but under open sky, which is also found in the Chinese *Mahīśāsaka-Vinaya* giving a *terminus ante quem* for this custom: before the beginning of the 5th century.

64) E.g. for the *kaṭhina*: 567a.4ff.; for the distribution of the belongings of deceased *bhikṣus*: 568b.8ff.; for alms-begging: 585a.5ff.

65) I think there are indications that the Chinese Buddhist denomination of the "Teaching of the three stages", *Sanjiejiao* 三階教, being reproached as being heretical by the Buddhist orthodoxy, had at least in the period of the *Tang* shaped its practice after the model of the strict "rules of *Devadatta*": cp. Kenneth CH'EN, *Buddhism in China - A Historical Survey*, Princeton 1964, 299. This can also be seen from an imperial edict from 698, unfortunately only preserved in the form of a citation in the "Catalogue of the Scriptures Established at the Time of the Great Zhou", *Dazhou-kanding-zhongjing-mulu* 大周刊定眾經目錄, where it is stated that the sect pursues the following five practices (T.2153.475a.12f.): begging (*qishi* 乞食), long fasting (*changzhai* 長齋), abstaining from [eating] cereals (*juegu* 絕穀), keeping the precepts (*chijie* 持戒), practicing *dhyāna* (*zuochan* 坐禪), which are to be considered as "wrong rules (*dharma*: sic!)" 此行輒皆是違法; for a different interpretation cp. Antonino FORTE, *Some Considerations on the Historical Value of the Great Zhou Catalogue*, in: MAKITA Tairyō (ed.), *Catalogues of Scriptures*

and their Commentaries in China and Japan, *The Long Hidden Scriptures of Nanatsu-dera*, Research Series Vol. VI, Tōkyō 1998, 528. These reactions of Empress Wu may well have been in some connection with *Yijing*, having come back in 695 and being welcomed by Empress Wu herself, and his reports of a saṅgha of *Devadatta* in India. To come to a final conclusion regarding this question, however, a more thorough study of the history of the *Sanjiejiào*, especially in the era of *Wu Zetian*, has to be done - on the basis of the voluminous work of YABUKI Keiki, *Sangaikyō no kenkyū* ("Studies on the Teachings of the Three Stages"), Tōkyō 1927, repr. 1973 矢吹慶輝, 三階教之研究, 東京 - which is not possible in the scope of the present article.

66) The only vague attempt to connect the *Devadattaparivarta* with the saṅgha of *Devadatta* which the author is aware of is that of IWAMOTO Yutaka, *Bukkyō-setsuwa-kenkyū* II ("Research in the narrative literature of Buddhism"), Kyōto 1978, 176 岩本裕, 佛教說話研究第二卷, 京都

67) S. and D. [see below, note 69] have the old transcription *Tiaoda* 調達, K. the younger one, *Tipodaduo* 提婆達多.

68) S. even goes so far as to have the Buddha call *Devadatta* his "good master", *shanshi* 善師, while K. follows the Indian original: *shan-zhishi* 善知識. In D. there is no correspondent rendering saying only that the Buddha owed all his spiritual accomplishment to the strength of virtue of *Devadatta*: 皆由調達恩德之力.

69) *Dharmarakṣa* (D.): *liu du-wuji* 六度無極; *Satanfentuoli-jing* (S.) and *Kumārajīva* (K.): *liu boluomi* 六波羅蜜

70) S.: *Tiheluoye* 提和羅耶; D. and K.: *Tianwang rulai* 天王如來. The transcriptional form of S. gives rise to some suspicion that the Indian underlying original was a *Prakṛt*-version like D.'s, the reconstructed form of the name being \**devarāya*. The discrepancy between the two ways of transcribing *Deva-*, *Tiao-*調 and *Tihe* 提和, is to be attributed to an automatical use of the common name of *Devadatta*, *Tiaoda* 調達.

71) See the English translation of L.HURWITZ, *Scripture of the Lotus Blossom*

of the *Fine Dharma (the Lotus Sūtra)*, Translated from the Chinese of Kumārajīva, New York 1976; the three Chinese versions are conveniently arranged in juxtaposition in TSUKAMOTO's work, 181ff., the *Devadatta-parivarta* starting at p.198.

72) Seishi KARASHIMA, *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra in the light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*, Tokyo 1992 (Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 3), and recently: *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the Lotus Sūtra* 正法華經詞典, Tokyo 1998 (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica I)

73) For an English summary on this point see A.HIRAKAWA, *A History of Indian Buddhism. From Śākyamuni to Early Mahāyāna* (transl. by P. GRONER), Honolulu 1990 (reprint Delhi 1993 as Buddhist Tradition Series, vol.19), 282f.. For a full discussion of the formation of the *Devadattaparivarta* and its relation to the *Lotussūtra* see TSUKAMOTO, op.cit., 204ff..

74) Cp. É.LAMOTTE, *Le traité ... II*, 873ff.

75) The Buddha and a world ruler (*cakravartin*) possessing 32 signs: cp. É. LAMOTTE, *Le traité ... I*, 285f..

76) T.1509.164c.28ff. [提婆達多] 自念我有三十相減佛未幾宜以弟子未集若大眾圍繞與佛何異如是思惟已生心破僧得五百弟子; cp. É.LAMOTTE, *Le traité ... II*, 874. Strangely enough, to *Xuanzang* quoting part of this passage in his *Xiyu-ji* 6 has occurred a mistake - which has obviously slipped the attention of É. LAMOTTE, *Le traité ... I*, 186, note 2, where he quotes the passage - which may well have been influenced by the fact that for him the existing *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* and *Devadatta* as a leader and patriarch who actually had attained the same status as the Buddha from the viewpoint of his followers has been an undisputable fact: XJ 6 (JI, 494) 我相三十減佛未幾大眾圍何異如來思惟是已即事破僧 ("I possess 30 signs (of a Great Man), only some less than the Buddha; (I) am surrounded by a big crowd, so why should I be different from the Tathāgata? Thinking so, [Devadatta] caused a schism of the saṅgha.") This distorted quotation by *Xuanzang* is even more striking as



it creates a contradiction in itself, because if *Devadatta* had already gathered a big community the schism would have already occurred.

77) RAY, *op.cit.*, 173.

78) The same kind of conceptionalisation is also found in the *Mahāmeghasūtra* / *Dayun-jing* 大雲經, when the Bodhisattva *Dayun-mizang* 大雲密藏 explains *Devadatta*'s function as a wicked person being the plan of the *Tathāgata* himself, and that *Devadatta* is in reality a *Mahāpuruṣa*: cp. Antonino FORTE, *Political Propaganda and Ideology in China at the End of the Seventh Century. Inquiry into the Nature, Authors and Function of the Tunhuang Document S.6502 Followed by an Annotated Translation*, Napoli 1976, 256. It is a puzzling fact, that Empress *Wu Zetian* 武則天, who was a fervent Buddhist, called the first years of her official reign (690 and 691) *Tianshou* 天授, the Chinese translation of the name of *Devadatta*. Even if the motto (*nianhao* 年號) *Tianshou* must not necessarily and directly refer to *Devadatta* (cp. Antonino FORTE, *La secte des trois stades et l'hérésie de Devadatta - Yabuki Keiki corrigé par Tang Yongtong*, in: BÉFEO 74 (1985), 469-476), it should be kept in mind that *Wu Zetian* thought of herself as a Bodhisattva (and *cakracartin*). She even supported this idea by a faked commentary on the prophecy in the *Mahāmeghasūtra* 大雲經 (submitted 689!) and it would hardly have been possible for her to take such a motto as *Tianshou* if *Devadatta* had been purely taken as the notorious wicked person in Tang-China of her days. It should be kept in mind also, that she was changing mottos according to auspicious omens - on the preceding motto *Yongchang* 永昌 ("eternal prosperity"), taken from an auspicious inscription on a stone, called "Precious Chart", *Baotu* 寶圖, found 688 in the river *Luo* 洛, cp. Stanley WEINSTEIN, *Buddhism under the T'ang*, Cambridge 1987, 41 - and the "discovery" of the prediction on *Devadatta* in the *Mahāmeghasūtra* may well have had an influence on her choosing the *nianhao* 年號. The popularity of the motif of *Devadatta* helping the Buddha to attain spiritual perfection (*pāramitā*) can also be seen in a late *sūtra* translated or compiled - it may

well be a so-called apocryph - of the Song-dynasty by *Shihu* 施護, the *Dafang-guang-shanqiao-fangbian-jing* 大方廣善巧方便經 (T.346), for a discussion of which see TSUKAMOTO, *op.cit.*, 211f.

79) GOSHIMA Kiyotaka, *Daibadatta-denshō to Daijōkyōten* ("The legend of Devadatta and the Mahāyāna-literature") 五島清隆, 提婆達多傳承と大乘經典, 51-69. GOSHIMA expressively emphasizes that he intends not to discuss or solve the question of the historical order of *Devadatta*.

80) Cp. TAGA Ryūgen, *Juki-shisō no genryū to tenkai - Daijō-kyōten-keisei no shisōshiteki-tenkai* ("The origin and development of the conception of prophesy - the historical-intellectual background of the formation of Mahāyāna-literature"), Kyōto 1974, 215-217 田賀龍彦, 授記思想の源流展開-大乘經典形成の思想史的背景, 京都

81) It should be kept in mind that the main impetus for such an explanation, in the eyes of the author an *interpretatio difficilior*, is coming from the fact that one is not able to explain why the *parivarta* in its form is there instead of giving sound philological reasons. Cp. also W.BARUCH, *Beiträge zum Saddharmapūṇḍarikasūtra*, Leiden 1938, 42; H.BECHERT, *Über die "Marburger Fragmente" des Saddharmapūṇḍarika (Mit einem Beitrag von Jongchay Rinpoche)*, Göttingen 1972 (NAWG, Phil.-Hist.Kl. 1972.1), 14f. (text of the *Devadatta-parivarta* of the "Marburger Fragmente" on p.48f.); TSUKAMOTO, *op.cit.*

82) One should keep in mind that in the same chapter it is not only the canonical outlaw *Devadatta* who is rehabilitated but also a woman, the daughter of the dragon-king *Sāgara*.

83) Cp. J.HARMATTA, et.al., *Religions in the Kushan Empire*, in: HARMATTA (ed.), *History of civilizations of Central Asia, Volume II: The development of sedentary and nomadic civilizations: 700 B.C. to A.D.250*, Paris 1994, esp. pp.323ff.

84) See Bhikkhu Telwatte RAHULA, *A Critical Study of the Mahāvastu*, Delhi 1978, 142.

85) T.200.230a.3f. 世尊即以髮瓜與頻婆娑羅王於其宮內造塔寺 (“*The Venerable may give his hairs and nails to king Bimbisāra so that he may build [for them] a stūpa and a temple in his palace.*”)

86) Ed. J.S.SPEYER, *Avadanaçataka. A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hinayana* (Bibliotheca Buddhica III), vol.I, 308.5ff. *yadā punā rājñā ’ jātaśatruṇā devadattagrāhitena pitā dhārmiko dharmarājño jivitād vyavaropitaḥ svayaṃ ca rājyaṃ pratipannaḥ tadā bhagavacchāsane sarvadeyadharmāḥ samucchinnāḥ kriyākāraś ca kārīto na kenacit tathāgatastūpe kārāḥ kartavyā iti* (“*Now, after the the righteous king of the law, the father [Bimbisāra], had lost his life by the hands of king Ajātaśatru, instigated by Devadatta, and when [Ajātaśatru] himself had gained royal power, all meritorious donations to the teaching of the Venerable were brought to an end and [Ajātaśatru] issued an edict saying that nobody was allowed to venerate the stūpa of the Tathāgata.*”); for a slightly different French translation see L.FÉER, *Avadāna-Çataka. Cent légendes bouddhiques. La centaine d’Avadānas, commençant par Pūrṇa (Pūrṇamukha-Avadāna-Çataka)*, Paris 1981 (reprint Amsterdam 1979), 210. The Chinese version, *Zhuanji-bai-yuan-jing* 撰集百緣經, attributed to *Zhi Qian* 支謙, is almost running parallel with the Skt.-text (T.200.230a.5ff.): 時王太子阿闍世共提婆達多共爲陰謀殺害父王自立爲主尋勅宮內不聽禮拜供養彼塔 (“*At this time prince Ajātaśatru together with Devadatta planned an attempt on his royal fathers life and set himself on the throne; [he] issued an edict that in the palace one should not attend the ceremonies [for the Buddha] and should not venerate his [father’s] stūpa*”.)

87) Heresy - it should be remembered - is only a question of standpoint and was relativated by the situation of the Buddhist *saṅgha* in India with its obvious decentralized structure, denominational diversity and historical development of doctrine (*Mahāyāna, Vajrayāna*). The reconstructed context of the historical *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* would fit quite well in this historical setting and into the theroretical framework of the phenomenon heresy as for

example developed by the German scholar Christoph KLEINE in connection with the Japanese Buddhist Pure-Land-reformer Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212): cp. Ch.KLEINE, *Hōnens Buddhismus des Reinen Landes: Reform, Reformation oder Häresie?* ("The Buddhism of Pure Land of Hōnen: Reform, Reformation or Heresy?"), Frankfurt a.M. / Berlin / Bern / New York / Paris / Wien 1996, 319ff. See esp. his matching definition on p.328, according to which the *saṅgha* of *Devadatta* would have been a special case of heresy insofar as its members deliberately claimed to be different from the Buddhists - differing from a normal heresy where its member are excluded from the orthodoxy, often against their will - but therefore being even more Buddhist (in the tradition of the Buddhas of the past).