

# The Mahāsāṃghikas and the Origin of Mahayana Buddhism: Evidence Provided in the \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*

BART DESSEIN

## INTRODUCTION

THE QUESTION whether or not the rise of Mahayana Buddhism occurred within one particular school of Nikāya Buddhism—whereby the Mahāsāṃghikas are often credited with this important development—has been answered differently by various scholars in the field. A related question is in which geographical region did this development start. In favor of the claim that Mahayana Buddhism arose within the Mahāsāṃghika school seems to be the fact that some historical accounts connect the origin of this school to the so-called “five points of Mahādeva” that demote the position of an *arhat*. A closer investigation into these “five points,” however, shows that Mahādeva most likely has to be connected with the later fragmentation of the Mahāsāṃghikas into different subschools. These subschools became prominent in the south of the Indian subcontinent. Epigraphical evidence for the presence of these southern subschools is dated to the second and third centuries CE, i.e., posterior to the epigraphical evidence for the presence of the Mahāsāṃghikas in the north.

An investigation of Mahāsāṃghika literature reveals a growing preoccupation with abhidharmic questions and a gradual evolution toward the Mahayana, as is also seen among the Mahāsāṃghika subschools that resided in the north. It is therefore rewarding to investigate the references to the Mahāsāṃghikas in the *Apidamo dapiposha lun* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論 (T no. 1545, hereafter \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*), as this text should

geographically be situated in the northwestern domains of the spread of the doctrine, and must be dated prior to the flourishing of the southern sub-schools of the Mahāsāṃghikas and their connection with Mahādeva. These references to the Mahāsāṃghikas concern the supramundane characteristics attributed to the Buddha and the position attributed to the mind in the process of attaining liberation. They thus show that a development toward the Mahayana was also present among the northern Mahāsāṃghikas.

Judging from epigraphical evidence, the Bahuśrutīya subschool was the only Mahāsāṃghika subschool that was present both in the north and in the south. It is therefore not improbable that this particular subschool was instrumental in the mutual influence between the northern and the southern Mahāsāṃghikas. This, however, does not imply that the development of Mahayana Buddhism was a singular Mahāsāṃghika phenomenon. We would rather suggest that the development toward the Mahayana was a general development, and that, within the Mahāsāṃghika school, the Bahuśrutīya subschool might have functioned as an intermediary between the north and the south.

## ORIGIN AND SPREAD OF THE MAHĀSĀMĀGHIKAS

All historical accounts of the origin of the different Buddhist schools agree that the first schism in the Buddhist community is the one that divided the Mahāsāṃghikas from the Sthaviravādins.<sup>1</sup> The different sources do not agree, however, on the cause of this schism. According to the sources of the northern tradition, the first schism was caused by the “five points of Mahādeva” that demote the *arhat* from his status of near-perfection which the Buddhist tradition had ascribed to him;<sup>2</sup> texts that belong to the south-

<sup>1</sup> According to Bareau (1955a, pp. 15–22), the oldest of these accounts are the *Dīpavaṃsa* (hereafter *Dīp*) chap. 5, v. 16 (Oldenberg 1879, p. 35), the Sammatīya list of Bhavya (see also Rockhill 1992, p. 186 and Bareau 1956, pp. 172–73), the *Shelīfu wen jing* 舍利弗問經 (T 24, no. 1465: 900b20–28), *Yibu zonglun lun* 異部宗輪論 (T 49, no. 2031: 15a17–21), *Shibabu lun* 十八部論 (T 49, no. 2032: 17b23–c1), *Buzhiyi lun* 部執異論 (T 49, no. 2033: 20a17–26), and *Wenshushili wen jing* 文殊師利問經 (T 14, no. 468: 501b1–25). See also Bareau 1954, pp. 235–36.

<sup>2</sup> Rockhill 1992, p. 186; Bareau 1956, pp. 172–73; *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 15a24–25, 15c17–18; *Shibabu lun*, T 49, no. 2032: 18a9–14, 18b25–27; *Buzhiyi lun*, T 49, no. 2033: 20a22–27, 20c20–21. See also \**Nikāyabhedovibhaṅgavyākhyāna* (hereafter *Nbhv*), list 3; \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 510c23–512a19; *Sanlun xuanyi* 三論玄義, T 45, no. 1852: 8b22–c13; *Dazhidu lun* 大智度論, T 25, no. 1509: 70a4ff. The “five points” are the claim that (1) *arhats* can be tempted by others (*paropahṛta*), (2) [some *arhats*] are subject to ignorance (*ajñāna*), (3) [some *arhats*] have doubts (*kāṅkṣā*), (4) [some *arhats*]

ern tradition mention the so-called “ten points” (*daśa vastūni*) of laxity in monastic behavior.<sup>3</sup> According to tradition, this schism took place 100–110 years after the Buddha’s *parinirvāṇa*, at the so-called Council of Vaiśālī, during the reign of King Aśoka.<sup>4</sup> After Marcel Hofinger had first shown that the first schism had nothing to do with the Council of Vaiśālī, André Bareau further proved that at the council perfect concord was attained.<sup>5</sup> Paul Demiéville suggested that the differences in the accounts of the formation of the early Buddhist schools were due to the standpoints of the respective authors: the dharma-keepers (*dharmadhāras*) are hereby supposed to have accentuated dogmatic matters, while the *vinaya*-keepers (*vinayadhāras*) are then supposed to have accentuated monastic matters.<sup>6</sup> The problems concerning the Council of Vaiśālī and the first schism in the Buddhist community were

---

attain enlightenment through the help of others (*paravitīrṇa*), and (5) obtain their path by emission of voice. On the “five points,” see La Vallée Poussin 1910, pp. 413–23; Demiéville 1924, pp. 60–62; Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 30–40; Demiéville 1951, p. 262ff.; Lamotte 1956, pp. 148–62; Bareau 1957, pp. 241–50; Nattier and Prebish 1976–77, pp. 250–57; and Przyluski 1926–28, p. 310ff.

<sup>3</sup> In Pāli, the “ten points” are (1) *siṅgiloṇa*, (2) *dvaṅgula*, (3) *gāmantara*, (4) *āvāsa*, (5) *anumati*, (6) *āciṅṇa*, (7) *amathita*, (8) *jalogi*, (9) *adasakanisīdana*, (10) *jātarūparajata*. See *Dīp* chap. 5, v. 16 (Oldenberg 1879, p. 35); *Mahāvamsa* (abbreviated as *Mhv*) chap. 4, vv. 9–11 (translation, Geiger 1912, pp. 19–20). On the tenth of the “ten points,” the *Mohe sengzhi lu* 摩訶僧祇律 (The *Vinaya* of the Mahāsāmghikas) and the *Pāli Vinaya* (hereafter *Vin*) agree. The monks of Vaiśālī were accepting monetary donations, the precept-keepers objected to this, and this gave rise to a controversy. See *Vin* vol. 2, pp. 294–98 (translation, Horner 1938–66, vol. 5, pp. 407–14) and *Mohe sengzhi lu*, T 22, no. 1425: 231a29–b22. See also *Mishasaibu hexi wufen lu* 弥沙塞部和醯五分律, T 22, no. 1421: 192a27ff.; *Sifen lu* 四分律, T 22, no. 1428: 968c19–969c3; *Shisong lu* 十誦律, T 23, no. 1435: 450a28–29; *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye zashi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事, T 24, no. 1451: 411c4–413c26. Also, the *Shelifu wen jing* (T 24, no. 1465: 900b20–28) mentions disciplinary grounds as the cause of the schism between the Mahāsāmghikas and the Sthaviravādins. However, this work does not call this “the ten points.” The first list of Bhavya in the *Nbhv* mentions “various points of controversy” as the cause of the schism, but without further specification; the second list of Bhavya lists eighteen schools, but does not give reasons for the schisms that provoked their establishment. See also Bareau 1956, p. 168; Buswell and Jaini 1996, p. 78.

<sup>4</sup> According to the Theravāda *Vinaya* and the *Vinaya* of the Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas, and Haimavatas, 100 years after the demise of the Buddha; according to the Sarvāstivādins and Mūlasarvāstivādins, 110 years after that event. See Hofinger 1946, pp. 23, 131. For accounts of this synod, see La Vallée Poussin 1908, pp. 81–85; Lamotte 1958, pp. 138–40; Dutt 1962, pp. 102–3; Allen 1956, p. 226; *Vin*, vol. 2, pp. 294–308 (translation, Horner 1938–66, vol. 5, pp. 407–30).

<sup>5</sup> Hofinger 1946; Bareau 1955a, p. 32. See also Pachow 1951, p. 53; Prebish 1974, p. 246; and Pachow 2000, pp. 22–29.

<sup>6</sup> Demiéville 1951, pp. 260–61.

further investigated by Jan Nattier and Charles Prebish. They concluded that the first schism in the Buddhist community, for which a date 116 years after the demise of the Buddha is proposed,<sup>7</sup> was most likely invoked by disciplinary matters—the later Mahāsāṃghikas did not accept the Sthaviravāda expansion of a root *vinaya* text.<sup>8</sup> This renders the claim that the “five points of Mahādeva” caused the first schism in the Buddhist community doubtful.

The Mahāsāṃghika school was the subject of further schismatic movements. In the *Yibuzong lun lun*, a translation of the \**Samayabhedoparacanacakra* (hereafter *Sbc*) by Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664), a work attributed to the Sarvāstivāda master Vasumitra,<sup>9</sup> we read that in the course of the first two hundred years after the Buddha’s *parinirvāṇa*, the Ekavyavahārikas, Lokottaravādins,<sup>10</sup> Kukkuṭikas,<sup>11</sup> Bahuśrutīyas,<sup>12</sup> and Prajñaptivādins<sup>13</sup> issued from the Mahāsāṃghikas. After these first two hundred years, the

<sup>7</sup> Nattier and Prebish 1976–77, pp. 239, 271–72.

<sup>8</sup> Nattier and Prebish 1976–77, p. 267. See also *Shelifu wen jing*, T no. 1465: 900b20–21; *Mohe sengzhi lu*, T 22, no. 1425: 493a28–c22; Hofinger 1946, p. 173; Frauwallner 1956, pp. 9–10; Prebish 1974, p. 252. This supports the claim by Bechert (1985, p. 41) that the first schisms were due to matters of discipline. See also Dutt 1922, p. 120; Demiéville 1951, p. 239; and Frauwallner 1971a, p. 120. Most likely, the difference in accounts is then to be explained by the sectarian affiliation of the respective texts—Theravāda and Mahāsāṃghika sources claim monastic reasons to have caused the schism, Sarvāstivāda works give dogmatic reasons.

<sup>9</sup> According to Bareau (1950, p. 70), this work was compiled between the third and the first centuries BCE and the first century CE. Lamotte (1958, pp. 301–2) dates Vasumitra 400 years after the Buddha’s *parinirvāṇa*. Masuda (1925, p. 8) situates Vasumitra in the first century CE. On the dates of the three Chinese versions of the \**Sbc*, i.e., *Yibuzong lun lun* (T no. 2031), *Shibabu lun* (T no. 2032), and *Buzhiyi lun* (T no. 2033), see Masuda 1925, pp. 5–6, Lamotte 1958, p. 302, and Wang 1994, pp. 171, 175–6. On the problem of Vasumitra’s authorship, see Cousins 1991, p. 28, where he proposes a date from the third to fourth century CE. On the problem of the attribution of the *Shibabu lun* to Paramārtha or Kumārajīva (344–413), see Masuda 1920, p. 1, Masuda 1925, pp. 5–6, and Demiéville 1924, p. 48, n. 1.

<sup>10</sup> On the identity of the Ekavyavahārikas and the Lokottaravādins, see Bareau 1955b, p. 75 and Cousins 1991, p. 48. On the meaning of these names, see also the section “The Supramundanity of the Buddha” in this article.

<sup>11</sup> For a discussion on the names Gokulika, Kukkuṭaka, Kukkuṭika, Kaukkuṭika, see Bareau 1955b, p. 79. According to Cousins (1991, p. 49), this name most probably originated from the name of the Kukkuṭārāma in Pāṭaliputra, a monastery associated in some sources with the Mahāsāṃghikas. Their precise place of residence is not known. Warder (1980, p. 293) situates them in the east, probably at Vārāṇasī.

<sup>12</sup> Bhavya explains this name in the *Nbhv*: “Because they follow the instructions of master Bahuśruta, they are called ‘Bahuśrutīya.’” See also Rockhill 1992, p. 183 and Bareau 1956, p. 169.

<sup>13</sup> According to Bareau (1955b, p. 84), the name “Prajñaptivādin” probably refers to their doctrine that everything is merely nominal (*prajñapti*). A similar standpoint is to be seen in

Caityaśaila, Aparāśaila, and Uttaraśaila schools were further formed.<sup>14</sup> Also the *Shelifu wen jing*, a work that equally belongs to what André Bareau described as the historical accounts of the first period,<sup>15</sup> claims that the Bahuśrutīyas issued from the Mahāsāmghikas in the second century after the *parinirvāṇa*<sup>16</sup> and situates the rise of the Caitikas (Caityaśailas) and Uttaraśailas in the third century after the *parinirvāṇa*.<sup>17</sup> The second list of Bhavya, included in the *Nbhv*, a text that belongs to a second period of texts recording the affiliation of Buddhist schools,<sup>18</sup> informs us that the following schools issued from the Mahāsāmghikas:<sup>19</sup> the Pūrvaśailas, Aparāśailas, Rājagiriyas, Haimavatas, Caitiyas, Saṃkrāntivādins (Siddhatikas),<sup>20</sup> and Gokulikas.<sup>21</sup> Taranātha attributes this list to the Mahāsāmghika tradition.<sup>22</sup> More precisely, it should then be situated in the Andhra region around

---

the *Chengshi lun* 成実論 (hereafter \**Satyasiddhiśāstra*), T 32, no. 1646: 327a8–c28, 328a1–c23. See also Masuda 1925, pp. 36–38; Bareau 1954, pp. 247–48; Bareau 1956, pp. 176, 195–96; and Bareau 1955b, pp. 85–86. On their residing in the Himalaya mountains, see Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 49–50. According to Warder (1980, p. 293), the Prajñaptivādins are not known to have spread outside the original eastern territory of Buddhism.

<sup>14</sup> *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 15a26–b8. See also Masuda 1920, pp. 5–6; Masuda 1925, pp. 15–16; Bareau 1954, pp. 236–37. The same chronology is found in the *Shibabu lun* (T 49, no. 2032: 18a14–23) and *Buzhiyi lun* (T 49, no. 2033: 20a26–b7). This chronology is, for the schools and sects that have issued from the Mahāsāmghikas, parallel to the one presented in the *Dīp* chap. 5, vv. 30–54 (translation, Oldenberg 1879, pp. 162–64). See also Bareau 1955b, pp. 16–18. For the reliability of the chronology of the schools issuing from the Mahāsāmghikas, see Rhys Davids 1892, pp. 5–6 and Bareau 1955b, p. 28.

<sup>15</sup> Bareau 1955b, pp. 16–27. Bareau (1955a, p. 21) dates the existing version of the *Shelifu wen jing* to ca. 300 CE. The affiliation of the *Shelifu wen jing* is still a matter of scholarly debate. Bareau (1955b, p. 17), Nattier and Prebish (1976–77, p. 249), Cousins (1991, p. 28), and Wang (1994, p. 170) ascribe the text to the Mahāsāmghikas.

<sup>16</sup> *Shelifu wen jing*, T no. 1465: 900c6–7.

<sup>17</sup> *Shelifu wen jing*, T no. 1465: 900c9–10. Bareau (1955b, p. 32) specifies this date as “the end of the second, beginning of the third century after the Buddha’s nirvāṇa.” Lamotte (1958, p. 586) claims that the Caityaśailas split from the Mahāsāmghikas due to matters of ordination. Hereby, the partisans of Mahādeva II are claimed to have gone to the mountainous region (probably the region of Andhra), where they formed the Caityaśaila sect which soon divided into Easterners (Pūrvaśaila) and Westerners (Uttaraśaila).

<sup>18</sup> See Bareau 1955b, p. 22 and Lamotte 1958, pp. 592–93.

<sup>19</sup> Lamotte (1958, p. 592) calls them “Mūlamahāsāmghikas.”

<sup>20</sup> Bareau (1955b, p. 23; 1956, p. 171) and Lamotte (1958, pp. 592–93) call them “Siddhārthikas.”

<sup>21</sup> See Schiefner 1868, p. 271 and Bareau 1956, p. 171.

<sup>22</sup> See Schiefner 1868, p. 271. See also Rockhill 1992, p. 186; Walleser 1927, p. 81; Bareau 1955b, pp. 22–23; and Kiefer-Pülz 2000, p. 291.

Amarāvātī.<sup>23</sup> The four schools that Buddhaghosa in his fifth century commentary to the *Kathāvatthu* grouped under the name “Andhaka,”<sup>24</sup> are mentioned here: the Rājagirikas, Siddhathikas, Pubbadeliyas, and Aparaseliyas.<sup>25</sup>

In the *Sanlun xuanyi jianyou ji* 三論玄義檢幽集, Paramārtha (499–569), commenting on Vasumitra’s treatise, informs us that it was a discussion on the authenticity of the Mahayana sutras and on the nature of the mundane and the supramundane factors (*dharma*) that evoked the rise of the Ekavyavahārikas and the Lokottaravādins, while the Kukkuṭikas are reported to have only recognized the *abhidharma* as the true words of the Buddha:<sup>26</sup>

In the course of the second two hundred years [after the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha], three schools issued from within the Mahāsāṃghikas. . . . The [Mahāsāṃghika] school recited. . . . Mahayana sutras. In this school, there were some who believed these sutras and some who did not. Those who did not believe them . . . said that such sutras are made by man and are not proclaimed by the Buddha, . . . that the disciples of the Lesser Vehicle only believe in the *tripiṭaka*, because they did not personally

<sup>23</sup> Bareau 1955b, p. 23.

<sup>24</sup> See *Kathāvatthupparakaṇa-aṭṭhakathā* (abbreviated as *Ktva*), pp. 104, 195, 199, 200.

<sup>25</sup> For further chronologies of the origination of the Mahāsāṃghikas and their subjects, see Vinītadeva’s *Samayabhedoparacanacakre nikāyavhedopadarśanasamgraha* (abbreviated as *Sns*. See also Bareau 1956, pp. 192–200); *Wenshushili wen jing*, T 14, no. 468: 501a29–b12 (on this text, see Wang 1994, p. 172); *Nanhai jigūneifa zhuan* 南海寄歸內法伝 T 54, no. 2125: 204a26ff. (translation, Takakusu 1966, pp. xxiii–xxiv, 7–20); the *Sanlun yi zhuan* (Julien 1859, pp. 330–31, 334–35, 336–38, 341–42, 343–45); the *Varsāgraprçchāsūtra* (see Rockhill 1992, p. 183, n. 1); Bareau 1955b, pp. 19–27; and Law 1969, pp. v–vi.

<sup>26</sup> *Sanlun xuanyi jianyou ji*, T 70, no. 2300: 459b9–c19 (see also Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 43–47). Demiéville (1931–32, pp. 21–22) states that: “Il semble du reste . . . que cette première scission en trois écoles ait été due à des discussions survenues, au sein même de l’église Mahāsāṃghika, sur l’authenticité des sūtra du Grand Véhicule. La troisième école (i.e., Kaukūlika), enseignait que, des trois Corbeilles, seule importe celle de l’Abhidharma, car seule elle représente l’enseignement réel du Buddha.” Further, Demiéville (1931–32, p. 41, n. b) says that: “Toutefois, d’après le commentaire de Paramārtha, c’est au sein même de l’école Mahāsāṃghika que la controverse sur le Mahayana provoqua une scission en trois (et non deux) écoles . . . des trois premières écoles issues de l’église Mahāsāṃghika, deux seulement, Ekavyavahārika et Lokottaravāda, se formèrent à cause de la controverse sur le Mahayana, la troisième, Kaukūlika, n’ayant pour thèse que la prééminence de l’Abhidharma.” See also *Sanlun xuanyi*, T 45, no. 1852: 8b18–19. Singh (1978, p. 8): “It is the Mahāsāṃghikas who first of all gave expression to Buddha’s ontological perceptions which were first embodied in the Mahayana sūtras and were later developed into Mahayana philosophy and religion.” See also Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 20, 30, 41; Lamotte 1956, pp. 153–54; Williams 1996, pp. 17–18.

hear the Buddha proclaim the Greater Vehicle. Among those who believed these sutras, there were some who did so because they had personally heard the Buddha proclaim the Greater Vehicle and therefore believed these sutras; others believed them, because it can be known through logical analysis that there is this principle [of the Greater Vehicle]; and some believed them because they believed their masters. Those who did not believe [them] did so because these sutras were self-made and because they were not included in the five *Āgamas*. . . . The Ekavyavahārikas . . . held to it that both the mundane and the supramundane factors are merely nominal (*prajñapti*). They therefore claimed that all factors have no real essence, and that hence the same name applies to all [factors]. This explains their name as “Ekavyavahārika.” . . . The Lokottaravādins held to it that the mundane factors have arisen from perversion (*viparyāsa*) and are only nominal (*prajñapti*). [According to them, and in contradistinction to the Ekavyavahārikas,] the supramundane factors are not nominal but are real. . . . According to the Kukkuṭikas, the *Sūtrapiṭaka* and the *Vinayapiṭaka* are *upāya* teachings of the Buddha, and are not the real teaching. Only the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* is the real teaching. They do not proclaim the *Sūtrapiṭaka* and the *Vinayapiṭaka* but only the *Abhidharmapiṭaka*.

On the rise of the Bahuśrutīyas, the *Sanlun xuanyi jianyou ji* gives us the following information:<sup>27</sup>

The *Buzhi[yi] lun* says that in the course of the second two hundred years, another school arose from the Mahāsāṃghikas. [This school is] called “Bahuśrutīya.” The *[Yibu]zong lun lun* says that hereafter, in the course of the second two hundred years, another school arose from within the Mahāsāṃghikas. [This school is] called “Bahuśrutīya.” The *Shibabu lun* says that in the course of these more than one hundred years, from within the Mahāsāṃghika school, another school arose. [This school is] called “Bahuśrutīya.” . . . When the Buddha was in the world,

<sup>27</sup> *Sanlun xuanyi jianyou ji*, T 70, no. 2300: 460c2–22. See also Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 22, 47–49; Warder 1980, pp. 220, 278; and *Yibuzong lun lun shuji* 異部宗輪論述記 (hereafter *Ylls*) 17a1–9. According to Bareau (1955b, p. 82), it is indeed not impossible that the doctrinal matter outlined here caused the first schism within the Mahāsāṃghika community.



there was an *arhat* who was called “the one dressed in treebark” (\*Yājñavalkya) because, before, he had been a seer (*rṣi*) and dressed in treebark to worship the gods. Later, already having left home, he could recite and remember all the words spoken by the Buddha. When the Buddha had not yet gone into *parinirvāṇa*, he went to stay in the Himalaya mountains and entered meditation. He was not aware [of the fact that] the Buddha had gone into *parinirvāṇa*. In the course of the two hundred years after the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha, he left the mountains and went to the country of Āṅguttara. Searching for companions, he saw that the Mahāsāṃghikas only proclaimed the superficial meaning of the *tripiṭaka* and were unable to proclaim the profound meaning. He was very surprised, and said that the Mahāsāṃghikas were unable to understand the very profound meaning of the words the Buddha had proclaimed, had rejected [this very profound meaning], were no longer proclaiming it, and were only proclaiming the superficial meaning. This *arhat* thereupon provided the Mahāsāṃghikas with both the superficial and the profound meaning. In the profound meaning, there were ideas of the Mahayana. Some among them, did not believe this. Those who did believe it, recited and remembered it. There were some among the Mahāsāṃghikas who proclaimed what he taught, and some who did not proclaim what he taught. Those who proclaimed what he taught, established a different school, called Bahuśrutīya, because what they heard was more than what they had heard before. From this school, the \**Satyasiddhiśāstra* developed.<sup>28</sup> That is why [this text] is mingled with ideas of the Mahayana.

On the rise of the Prajñaptivādins, we read:<sup>29</sup>

The *Buzhi*[*yi*] *lun* says that in the course of the second two hundred years, a further school arose from the Mahāsāṃghikas. [This school is] called “Prajñaptivāda.” The [*Yibu*]zong *lun lun* says that hereafter, in the course of the second two hundred years, a

<sup>28</sup> The concepts of conventional truth and absolute truth are indeed mentioned in the \**Satyasiddhiśāstra*. See T 32, no. 1646: 242b13ff., 248a23ff., 327a20ff. It is further to be remarked that Lamotte (1967, p. 106) claims Mahayana influence also in the \**Ekottarāgama*.

<sup>29</sup> *Sanlun xuanyi jianyou ji*, T 70, no. 2300: 461a10–25. See also Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 49–50; Lamotte 1958, p. 208; and Warder 1980, p. 278.



further school arose from within the Mahāsāṃghikas. [This school is] called “Prajñaptivāda.” The *Shibabu lun* says that in the course of these more than one hundred years, the Mahāsāṃghika school further gave rise to another school, called “Prajñaptivāda.” . . . When the Buddha was in the world, Mahākātyāyana composed a treatise, in order to explain [his teachings] distinctively. In the course of the two hundred years following [the Buddha’s] nirvana, Mahākātyāyana emerged from Lake Anavatapta, reached Magadha, and entered the Mahāsāṃghika school, where he drew up distinctions in the sacred teachings of the *tripiṭaka*, making clear what of them was uttered by the Buddha as a nominal concept (*prajñapti*), what is the real (*paramārtha*) teaching of the Buddha; what is absolute truth (*paramārthasatya*), what is conventional truth (*samvrtisatya*), and what is causality (*hetuphala*). Some within the Mahāsāṃghika school faithfully accepted the teachings of Mahākātyāyana. They formed a separate school known as the Prajñaptivādins.

It thus appears that the first schismatic movements within the Mahāsāṃghikas are fundamentally related to two items: the development of the notions of conventional and absolute truth—concepts that became peculiar to the Mahayana—and the creation of the Mahayana sutras in which these new concepts were deployed.

In the *Sanlun xuanyi jianyou ji*, the origin of the Caityaśailas and the Uttaraśailas is then related to the famous Mahādeva.<sup>30</sup> An analysis of the doctrinal viewpoints of the Caityaśailas, Uttaraśailas, and Pūrvaśailas shows that the “five points of Mahādeva” are indeed primarily related to the further schismatic development that gave rise to these schools.<sup>31</sup> Further, as remarked by André Bareau, because the time elapsed between the first schism of the Sthaviravādins and Mahāsāṃghikas and the further fragmentation of the Mahāsāṃghikas into the Ekavyavahārikas, Lokottaravādins, Kukkuṭikas, Bahuśrutīyas, and Prajñaptivādins at most half a century later is most likely too short to have made a textual evolution as the one referred to in Paramārtha’s work possible,<sup>32</sup> this suggests that we have to connect not only the “five points of Mahādeva,” but also the development

<sup>30</sup> *Sanlun xuanyi jianyou ji*, T 70, no. 2300: 461c23–462a11. See also Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 50–53.

<sup>31</sup> See Dessein 2008.

<sup>32</sup> Bareau 1955b, p. 32.

of Mahayana texts with the latter Mahāsāṃghika schools. Here, we also have to mention the *Sanlun xuanyi* 三論玄義.<sup>33</sup> In this relatively late—for Mahāsāṃghika history—text, Jizang (549–623) states that “in addition to advocating the heretical five points,” Mahādeva also “tried to incorporate Mahayana sutras into the *tripiṭaka*.”<sup>34</sup>

The history of the Mahāsāṃghikas as it is presented in textual records is affirmed by epigraphical evidence.<sup>35</sup> In the second half of the first century BCE, it was especially in Mathurā that the Mahāsāṃghikas were predominant. The earliest epigraphical evidence for the existence of the Mahāsāṃghikas in this region is an inscription found in Mathurā with the term “Mahasaghia,” dated to the first century CE.<sup>36</sup> Another Mathurā inscription has the term “Mahāsaghikā” that records a gift to the Mahāsāṃghikas.<sup>37</sup> Other attestations of the name of this school found in the inscriptions of northern India include “Mahāsaghiya” in a cave at Kārli (district of Bombay), from the year eighteen of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi (ca. 106–130);<sup>38</sup> “Mahāsaghiya,” also in a cave at Kārli, from the year twenty-four of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulomā (ca. 130–159);<sup>39</sup> and “Mahasamghiga” on a vessel of Wardak, from the year fifty-one of the Kaniṣka era (ca. 179 CE).<sup>40</sup>

Also the textual evidence on the further dissemination of the Mahāsāṃghika school is corroborated by epigraphical sources. In the Andhra region, we find inscriptions at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa and Amarāvati<sup>41</sup> that date back to the reign of the Śatavāhanas (second century CE) and

<sup>33</sup> For a general description of this text and its importance, see Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 17–18.

<sup>34</sup> *Sanlun xuanyi*, T 45, no. 1852: 8b18–19.

<sup>35</sup> For some reflections on the traditional view of the primacy of literary sources over epigraphical evidence, see Schopen 1997, pp. 1–9. Kieffer-Pülz (2000, p. 292) remarks that: “Schulen sind inschriftlich meist erst ab dem 1. Jh. n. Chr. belegt, als die meisten der frühen Nikāyas bereits existierten. Die Inschriften können daher nicht für die Entstehung der Schulen, wohl aber für ihre geographische Verbreitung herangezogen werden.”

<sup>36</sup> See Konow 1969, pp. 48–49. See also Lamotte 1958, p. 580 and Roth 1980, p. 85.

<sup>37</sup> See *Epigraphia Indica* (hereafter *EI*) vol. 30, pp. 181–84 and Schopen 1997, p. 37. See also Shizutani 1965 for epigraphical evidence on the Mahāsāṃghikas in Mathurā. See further Hirakawa 1990, p. 102.

<sup>38</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1105.

<sup>39</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1106.

<sup>40</sup> Konow 1969, pp. 165–70. See also Harrison 1982, p. 228.

<sup>41</sup> For a general overview and description of the Nāgārjunakoṇḍa and Amarāvati sites, see Burgess 1887; Foucher 1928, pp. 9–24; Longhurst 1938; Sivaramamurti 1942.

the Ikṣvākus (third century CE).<sup>42</sup> For these periods, the following Mahāsāmghika groups are documented:

- (1) Bahuśrutīya: Two inscriptions, each on a pillar in Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, that mention the “Bahusūtiya.” The first of these dates from the reign of Mātharīputra Vīrapuruṣadatta (ca. 250–275),<sup>43</sup> the second inscription is dated to the second year of Ehuṅvula Śāntamūla II of the Ikṣvākus (end of the third century CE).<sup>44</sup>
- (2) Caitika:<sup>45</sup> An inscribed stone in Amarāvati mentions the “Cetikiya.”<sup>46</sup> This inscription dates from the reign of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulomā. Further references to the Caitikas are “Cetika” on an undated tile from Amarāvati;<sup>47</sup> and “Cetiyaṅḍaka,”<sup>48</sup> “Cetiyaṅḍaka,”<sup>49</sup> “Cetika of Rājagiri,”<sup>50</sup> and “Mahāvanasala,”<sup>51</sup> all four on undated sculptures in Amarāvati; and further “Jaḍikiya,”<sup>52</sup> “[Se]liya,”<sup>53</sup> and “Mahāvanaseliya,”<sup>54</sup> all on undated pillars in Amarāvati.

<sup>42</sup> See Lamotte 1954, p. 382; Renou and Filliozat 1985, pp. 238–41; Sastri 1955, p. 71. Majumdar (1953, pp. 380–81) states that: “The Mahāsāmghika sect . . . originated at the time of the Second Council. . . . At its early stage it had its centre at Vaiśālī and was scattered all over northern India. Later, it became located in the Andhra country, having its principal centre at Amarāvati and Nāgārjunakoṇḍa.” For linguistic evidence on the spread of the Mahāsāmghikas, see Roth 1980, p. 85.

<sup>43</sup> *EI* vol. 20, p. 24. See also Lamotte 1958, p. 580; Ramachandra Dikshitar 1945, pp. 349–50; Mitra 1971, p. 206.

<sup>44</sup> *EI* vol. 21, pp. 61–62. See also Lamotte 1958, p. 580 and Mitra 1971, p. 206.

<sup>45</sup> Bhavya explains this name in the *Nbhv* as “those who reside on the mountain that has a tumulus (*caitya*) are the Caitikas.” See also Rockhill 1992, p. 183 and Bureau 1956, p. 169.

<sup>46</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1248. See also Burgess 1887, pp. 100–101; Renou and Filliozat 1985, p. 238.

<sup>47</sup> Sivaramamurti 1942, no. 33. See also Lamotte 1958, p. 580. Also in Nāsik, we find an inscription with the word “Cetika,” referring to the Caitikas. See Lüders 1973, no. 1130 and Lamotte 1958, pp. 381, 580.

<sup>48</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1223.

<sup>49</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1263.

<sup>50</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1250.

<sup>51</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1272.

<sup>52</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1244. See also Burgess 1887, p. 103.

<sup>53</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1270. See also Hultzsch 1883, p. 554.

<sup>54</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1230. Bühler (1892, p. 597) claimed that: “Possibly the term Mahāvanasāliya, which occurs repeatedly in the Amarāvati inscriptions as an epithet to teachers, may refer to a Buddhist school.”

(3) Pūrvaśaila:<sup>55</sup> “Puvasel[ī]ya,” mentioned on a pillar in Dhanikota, probably dating from Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulomā;<sup>56</sup> and an undated inscription with “Puvaseliya” in Allūru.<sup>57</sup>

(4) Aparāśaila:<sup>58</sup> two inscriptions with “Aparamahāvinaseliya,”<sup>59</sup> both on a pillar in Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, from the year six of Māṭharīputra Vīrapuruṣadatta of the Ikṣvākus. We further find “Aparamahāvinaseliya” in a temple in Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, from the year eighteen of the same king;<sup>60</sup> and “[A]raseliya” on a tile from Ghaṇṭaśālā.<sup>61</sup> The Aparamahāvinaseliya are also referred to as “Ayirahaṃgha”<sup>62</sup> and “Ayirahagha,”<sup>63</sup> i.e., “Holy Community.” Both these latter inscriptions are found in Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, and must be dated to the sixth year of Māṭharīputra Vīrapuruṣadatta of the Ikṣvākus.<sup>64</sup>

(5) Siddhatika: an inscription with the term “Sidhata”<sup>65</sup> on an undated sculpture at Amarāvātī.

(6) Rājagirika: an inscription with “Rājagirinivāsika”<sup>66</sup> on an undated sculpture at Amarāvātī; and “Rājagiri” (toponym)<sup>67</sup> found on an equally undated sculpture at Amarāvātī.

Our textual sources situated the rise of the southern schools posterior to that of the northern schools; epigraphical sources in the south do not predate the epigraphical sources of the north. Textual and epigraphical

<sup>55</sup> In the *Nbhv*, Bhavya explains this name as follows: “Those who reside on the Eastern mountain (*pūrvaśilā*) . . . are the Pūrvaśailas.” See also Rockhill 1992, p. 184; Sivaramamurti 1942, p. 7; Bureau 1956, p. 169.

<sup>56</sup> *EI* vol. 24, pp. 256–60 and Government of Madras 1924, p. 97.

<sup>57</sup> Jouveau-Dubreuil 1914, p. 83. See also Dutt 1922, p. 125 and Mitra 1971, p. 213.

<sup>58</sup> In the *Nbhv*, Bhavya explains this name as “those who reside on the Western mountain (*aparaśilā*) . . . are the Aparāśailas.” See also Rockhill 1992, p. 184; Sivaramamurti 1942, p. 7; Bureau 1956, p. 169.

<sup>59</sup> *EI* vol. 20, pp. 17, 19–20. See also Ramachandra Dikshitar 1945, p. 350. On the Aparamahāvinaseliyas, see Rosen 1980, pp. 114–15 and Schopen 1997, pp. 159–61.

<sup>60</sup> *EI* vol. 20, pp. 21–22; vol. 35, pp. 7–9. See also Mitra 1971, p. 206.

<sup>61</sup> *EI* vol. 27, pp. 1–4.

<sup>62</sup> *EI* vol. 20, pp. 15–17. See also Lamotte 1958, p. 580.

<sup>63</sup> *EI* vol. 20, pp. 19–20. See also Lamotte 1958, p. 580.

<sup>64</sup> According to Lamotte (1958, p. 582), “Āryasaṃgha” is the title that the Mahāsaṃghikas of the region of Guntur assumed in the first centuries of the Christian era. For a Cetika and Aparāśaila inscription in Ajanṭā, see Cohen 1995, pp. 9–11.

<sup>65</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1281. See also Sivaramamurti 1942, p. 298.

<sup>66</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1250.

<sup>67</sup> Lüders 1973, no. 1225.

evidence thus shows that we can distinguish two groups of Mahāsāmghika schools: the northern schools ([Mūla-]Mahāsāmghika, Ekavyavahārika, Lokottaravādin, Kukkuṭika, Bahuśrutīya, and Prajñaptivādin),<sup>68</sup> and the southern schools (Bahuśrutīya, Caityāsāila, Pūrvasāila, Aparasāila, Uttarasāila, Siddhatika, and Rājagirika). The Bahuśrutīyas thus were situated both in the northwest and in the southeast (Andhra). As will be shown below, it is probably this subschool that formed the connection between the two major Mahāsāmghika subgroups, both in time and space, and thus provided for a mutual influence of ideas between the north and the south.<sup>69</sup>

## MAHĀSĀMĠHIKA LITERATURE

The *Mohe sengzhi lu* (The *Vinaya* of the Mahāsāmghikas) gives us some brief indications on the actual format of the literature of the Mahāsāmghikas.<sup>70</sup> They appear to have had a *Vinayapiṭaka* in five parts, an *Abhidharmapiṭaka*, and a *Sūtrapiṭaka*. Of these texts, their *Vinayapiṭaka* was translated into Chinese by Buddhahadra and Faxian between 416 and 418 CE at the Daochang Monastery in Nanjing, capital of the Eastern Jin dynasty.<sup>71</sup> In this text, their *abhidharma* is defined as “the *sūtrānta* in nine parts” (*navāṅga*).<sup>72</sup> This

<sup>68</sup> See Windisch 1909, p. 469; *Datang xiyu ji* 大唐西域記, T 51, no. 2087: 873b13 (translation, Beal 1994, vol. 1, p. 50), Watters 1904–5, vol. 1, pp. 116–20; Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 41, 43; Bareau 1955b, p. 75; and Konow 1969, pp. 120–22. Warder (1980, p. 293) mentions that the extant Lokottaravāda texts declare that they are works of the Lokottaravāda “of the middle country,” i.e., the central region of northern India.

<sup>69</sup> See Bareau 1955b, p. 82.

<sup>70</sup> *Mohe sengzhi lu*, T 22, no. 1425: 489c26–493a19 (esp. 491b22–492c6, 492c17–19); *Mohe sengzhi lu*, T 22, no. 1425: 295a26, 334c28, 340c1, 347c3, 347c28, 442a27–c28, 475b29–c22, 501c24–26, and 533c2–8. See also Majumdar 1953, pp. 380–81; Bareau 1955b: pp. 55–56.

<sup>71</sup> *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳, T 50, no. 2059: 338b16. See also Yuyama 1979, p. 39; the biography of Buddhahadra in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2059: 334b27–335c14 (translation, Shih 1968, pp. 90–98); the biography of Faxian in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2059: 337b19–338b25 (translation, Shih 1968, pp. 108–15). See also the *Gaoseng Faxian zhuan* 高僧法顯傳, T 51, no. 2085: 866b16–17. On the Chinese translation of this *Vinaya*, see Roth 1970, pp. i–ii.

<sup>72</sup> *Mohe sengzhi lu*, T 22, no. 1425: 475c13–14 and 501c24–25. Nakamura (1996, p. 28) describes the process of formalization of the “*sūtras* in nine parts” viz. *sūtra*, *geya*, *vyākaraṇa*, *gāthā*, *udāna*, *itivṛttaka*, *jātaka*, *adbhuta*, and *vedalla*, as a process in two stages. He explains that in the first stage, the first five of the above enumerated *aṅgas* were grouped, and that to these five, the last four of the above mentioned *aṅgas* were added in the second stage. This format of “*sūtrānta* in nine parts” is claimed to be the format in which the teachings of the Buddha were at first comprised and conveyed. The Mahāsāmghika order reverses the two last “*aṅgas*” (Hirakawa 1963, p. 63).

suggests that the early Mahāsāṃghikas rejected the abhidharmic developments that occurred within Sarvāstivāda circles.<sup>73</sup>

As is the case with their *Vinayaṭīka*, also their *Sūtraṭīka* seems to have consisted of five parts (*āgama*): \**Dīrghāgama*, \**Madhyamāgama*, \**Samyuktāgama*, \**Ekottarāgama* and \**Kṣudrakāgama*.<sup>74</sup> The extant Chinese version of the \**Ekottarāgama*, *Zengyi ahan jing* 增一阿含經 (T no. 125), which was completed in 397–398 CE by Saṃghadeva and Saṃgharakṣa,<sup>75</sup> is generally accepted to be of Mahāsāṃghika origin.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>73</sup> See Hirakawa 1963, p. 61; Dutt 1930, p. 9; Cousins 1991, p. 47.

<sup>74</sup> *Mohe sengzhi lu*, T 22, no. 1425: 491c16–22. See in this respect Lamotte 1958, p. 166. On the relative chronology of the *āgamas/nikāyas*, see Anesaki 1908a, pp. 82–84.

<sup>75</sup> According to the *Gaoseng zhuan* (T 50, no. 2059: 329a23), Saṃghadeva translated the \**Madhyamāgama* and other texts. According to the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (T 55, no. 2154: 505b4), Saṃghadeva translated the \**Ekottarāgama* together with the \**Madhyamāgama*. See also *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記, T 49, no. 2034: 70c5–6 and the *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄, T 55, no. 2153: 422a16–26. The first translation of the \**Ekottarāgama* was done by the Tocharian Dharmanandin and Zhu Fonian in 384–385 CE. See the *Zengyi ahan jing* T 2, no. 125: 549a10ff., *Gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2059: 328b25–c1; *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集, T 55, no. 2145: 10b21–22; *Lidai sanbao ji*, T 49, no. 2034: 75c18–19; *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu*, T 55, no. 2153: 422a27–29; *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, T 55, no. 2154: 511b14–15. See also Shih 1968, pp. 48–49 and Mayeda 1985, p. 102. Judging from the *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* (T 55, no. 2153: 422a29), Dharmanandin’s version still existed in 695 CE, but, according to the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* (T 55, no. 2154: 637c19–20), it was reported lost in 730 CE. According to Zürcher (1972, p. 204), Saṃghadeva’s version is a later redaction of this translation by Dharmanandin. See also Lamotte 1967, p. 105; Waldschmidt 1980, p. 169ff.; and Schmithausen 1987, pp. 318–19. On the dating of the \**Ekottarāgama*, see Bareau 1963, p. 312; Lamotte 1967, p. 106; Schmithausen 1976, p. 247, n. 14a and p. 249, n. 17a; and Bronkhorst 1985, pp. 312–15. See also the biography of Saṃghadeva in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2059: 328c22–329a27 (translation, Shih 1968, pp. 51–55). According to the *Gaoseng zhuan* (T 50, no. 2059: 329a23–24 [translation, Shih 1968, p. 54]), Saṃgharakṣa was a native of Kāśmīra.

<sup>76</sup> See the *Fenbie gongde lun* 分別功德論, T 25, no. 1507: 31c27–32b5; Anesaki 1908b, pp. 139–40; Bareau 1955b, pp. 55–56; Lamotte 1956, p. 156; Nakamura 1996, pp. 32–39; Waldschmidt 1980, pp. 136–37; Bronkhorst 1985, pp. 313–14; Mayeda 1985, pp. 102–3. Hirakawa (1963, pp. 63–64) objects to this because the \**Ekottarāgama* employs “*dvādaśāṅga*” (*Zengyi ahan jing* T 2, no. 125: 635a11–13, 657a2–4, 728c3–5, 794b14–16, 813a25–b2). See Hirakawa 1963, pp. 62–63 and also Anesaki 1908b, p. 139. The *Zengyi ahan jing* was not translated from the Sanskrit, but from some Middle Indic or mixed dialect of Prakrit with Sanskrit elements (see Waldschmidt 1980, pp. 137, 169). Schmithausen (1987, p. 321): “Es liegt nahe . . . für die Schulzugehörigkeit des chinesischen Ekottarikāgama und der Großen Prajñāpāramitā die Hypothese abzuleiten, daß die verschiedenen Gruppen einer größeren Einheit, vermutlich verschiedenen Mahāsāṃghika-Gruppierungen, zuzuordnen sind.” Based on the fact that the \**Ekottarāgama* fragments found in Ujjain are closer to the Tibetan

Judging from this text, the \**Kṣudrakāgama* would have been transformed into a fourth “*piṭaka*”: the *Samyuktapiṭaka*.<sup>77</sup> It is in this latter *piṭaka* that the *vaipulya* would have been deployed.<sup>78</sup> Judging from Xuanzang’s *Da Tang xiyu ji*, to these four *piṭakas* (*Sūtrapiṭaka*, *Vinayapiṭaka*, *Abhidharmapiṭaka*, and *Samyuktapiṭaka*), later, a fifth *piṭaka* would have been added: the *Dhāraṇīpiṭaka*, thus forming five *piṭakas*.<sup>79</sup> This textual development points to a growing interest in and development of *abhidharma* among the later Mahāsāmghika subgroups<sup>80</sup> and corroborates the development of Mahāsāmghika literature as it is described in the historical literature. This is further affirmed in Harivarman’s \**Satyasiddhiśāstra*, a work that—as quoted—is attributed to the Bahuśrutīyas.<sup>81</sup> Harivarman is supposed to have been a native of central India<sup>82</sup> who lived around the third century CE, and to have been a disciple of the Sautrāntika master Kumāralāta.<sup>83</sup>

---

*Udānavarga* than to the Indian text of the latter work, Dietz (1985, pp. 172–79) attributes these fragments to the Mūlasarvāstivādins. See also Schmithausen 1970, p. 89ff. and Harrison 1997, pp. 279–80.

<sup>77</sup> *Zengyi ahan jing*, T 2, no. 125: 549c24ff. See also Bareau 1951b, p. 7, n. 2 and Rahder 1939, p. 9.

<sup>78</sup> *Mohe sengzhi lu*, T 22, no. 1425: 491c20–22. See also Przymuski 1926–28, pp. 211, 217 and Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 21, 41, 43.

<sup>79</sup> *Datang xiyu ji*, T 51 no. 2087: 923a6–9 (translation, Beal 1994, vol. 2, pp. 164–65; Waters 1904–5, vol. 2, pp. 160–61). See also Bareau 1950, pp. 89–90; Bareau 1955b, p. 296; and Prebish 1975, pp. 36–37.

<sup>80</sup> In the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (abbreviated as *Bbh*), 96: 1–5, it is said that the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* corresponds to the *vaipulya* genre of the twelve traditional branches of Buddhist scriptures. See, in this respect, Pagel 1995, p. 11.

<sup>81</sup> Potter (1999, p. 255) prefers the title “*Tattvasiddhi*” to “*Satyasiddhi*.” Bahuśrutīya affiliation is also confirmed by internal criticism of the text. See, in this respect, Johnston 1972, pp. xxxi–xxxv. See also Fukuhara 1969, pp. 49–52; Warder 1980, pp. 338, 419–20; Schmithausen 1987, pp. 370–71; and Pagel 1995, p. 15.

<sup>82</sup> Sastri (1975, vol. 1, p. i) claims he was a native of Kaśmīra. According to Warder (1980, p. 293, n. 2), he wrote near Pāṭaliputra.

<sup>83</sup> See the *Apidamo jusheshi lun* 阿毘達磨俱舍積論, T 29, no. 1559: 161a15–16. This may explain why the preface to Paramārtha’s Chinese version of the *Abhidharmakośa* states that the \**Satyasiddhiśāstra* is a Sautrāntika work. On the relation of Harivarman to Kumāralāta, see Przymuski 1940; Sastri 1975, vol. 1, pp. i, iii; and Willemsen, Dessein, and Cox 1998, p. 107. The biography of Harivarman in the *Chu sanzang jiji*, T 55, no. 2145: 78c3–79b25. Sastri (1975, vol. 1, p. xxiii): “The tradition tells us that the author is a *Bahuśrutīya* and *Prajñaptivādin*. He, however, makes no statement in his treatise that he has followed any particular school or sect. He, on the other hand, states eloquently that he adhered strictly to the spirit of the *sūtras*, and composed his treatise setting it up as a separate school, *i-pu*.”



The Indian original of the \**Satyasiddhiśāstra* is lost,<sup>84</sup> but the work is preserved in a Chinese translation by Kumārajīva (T no. 1646).<sup>85</sup> Though the \**Satyasiddhiśāstra* affirms the existence of a *Samyuktapiṭaka*, it does not mention a *Dhāraṇīpiṭaka*, but rather a *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*.<sup>86</sup> It is hereby further noteworthy that the \**Satyasiddhiśāstra* utilizes the “*dvādasāṅga*.”<sup>87</sup> The development of a *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, along with the use of the “*dvādasāṅga*” that is typical of the Sarvāstivādins and became predominant in Mahayana sutras and *śāstras*,<sup>88</sup> affirms a gradual evolution toward the Mahayana, and shows that it probably was the Bahuśrutīyas who were instrumental in the mutual influence between the northern and southern Mahāsāṃghikas. It is noteworthy that the \**Satyasiddhiśāstra* three times refers to a group of “Six *Abhidharma* Texts,” i.e., an *Abhidharmapiṭaka* as we know it from the Vaibhāṣika Sarvāstivādins.<sup>89</sup>

The last work connected with the Mahāsāṃghikas is the *Mahāvastu*. This work belongs to the Lokottaravāda subschool of the Mahāsāṃghikas.<sup>90</sup> It

<sup>84</sup> See Sastri (1975, vol. 1, p. vii) and Nakamura (1996, p. 113).

<sup>85</sup> Sastri (1975, vol. 1, p. vii) gives 412 CE as the date of translation into Chinese. The biography of Kumārajīva in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2059: 330a11–333a12 (translation, Shih 1968, pp. 60–81).

<sup>86</sup> \**Satyasiddhiśāstra*, T 32, no. 1646: 352c14–15. See also Bareau (1955b, pp. 81, 296). Pagel (1995, p. 7) remarks that the content of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* in all likelihood “consisted of texts that formed part of the early development of the bodhisattva path as an alternative career to that of the arhant, perhaps serving as a foundation for the later developments of the bodhisattva doctrine.” However, as noted by Pagel (1995, p. 5), we should also keep in mind that the Dharmaguptakas, known to have resided in northwest India, Central Asia, and China had a *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. The existence of a Dharmaguptaka *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* is affirmed in the *Sanlun xuanyi jianyou ji*, T 70, no. 2300: 465b21–22. See Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 32, 61–62 and Bareau 1955b, p. 296. Wayman (1991, p. 9) and Warder (1980, p. 357) ascribe the origin of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* to Mahāsāṃghika circles in southern India.

<sup>87</sup> \**Satyasiddhiśāstra*, T 32, no. 1646: 244c12ff.

<sup>88</sup> See Hirakawa 1963, pp. 62–63.

<sup>89</sup> \**Satyasiddhiśāstra*, T 32, no. 1646: 297c7, 300b28, 318c12. See also Przyłuski 1926–28, pp. 357–58; Bareau 1951b, p. 268; Bareau 1955b, p. 296. As we know that the earliest mention of the “Six *Abhidharma* Texts” (Ch. *liuzu lun* 六足論) to designate the six Sarvāstivāda *abhidharma* treatises is an additional note at the end of vol. 24 of the *Apitan bajiandu lun* 阿毘曇八捷度論 (T 26, no. 1543: 887a19–24), this must be an addition by Kumārajīva. See Willems, Dessein, and Cox 1998, p. 121. On the Sarvāstivāda “Six *Abhidharma* Texts,” see Willems, Dessein, and Cox 1998, pp. 63–80.

<sup>90</sup> This is stated in the work itself as follows: “*Ārya-Mahāsāṃghikānām lokottaravādinām madhyadeśikānām pāṭhena vinayapiṭakasya mahāvastuye ādi*.” See Sénart 1882, vol. 1, p. 2; Windisch 1909, p. 469; Oldenberg 1912, p. 183. This work has been the subject of many studies. It was edited by Sénart (1882–97) and translated by Jones (1949–56). See also Harrison 1982, pp. 21–213.

is a compilation<sup>91</sup> of which the material shows to have been derived from the Lokottaravāda *Vinayapiṭaka*,<sup>92</sup> and further also shows connections with a *Sūtrapiṭaka* that must have consisted of texts that are identical or at least very similar to Pāli texts and were reworked for the *Mahāvastu*.<sup>93</sup> As to the content, the work is an account of the life of the Buddha until his appearance in this world as savior of sentient beings.<sup>94</sup> This content is in line with the pre-eminence of the new role the Mahayana ascribed to the bodhisattva (and to the Buddha), to the disadvantage of the *arhat*.

The idea that the Mahayana arose solely in the south is thus not tenable.<sup>95</sup> Neither was the movement restricted to Mahāsāṃghika circles only. As Akira Hirakawa states, “It would be premature to conclude that the Mahayana is a development from the Mahāsāṃghika simply because the latter advocated a number of progressive ideas.”<sup>96</sup> Certain progressive ideas

<sup>91</sup> Jones (1949–56, vol. 1, p. xi) suggests that the compilation was begun in the second century BCE and was not completed until the third or fourth century CE.

<sup>92</sup> See Windisch 1909, pp. 473–74, 476ff. See also Oldenberg 1898, p. 644 and Oldenberg 1912, p. 152.

<sup>93</sup> Oldenberg 1912, pp. 141–42; Jones 1949–56, vol. 1, p. xii.

<sup>94</sup> See Windisch 1909, p. 472. For a detailed description of the different parts of the text, see the introductions to the three volumes of Sénart’s edition. Ross Reat (1993, p. 2) remarks that “The *Mahāvastu* . . . may contain Mahāsaṅghika material, but most of the content is mythological and therefore uninformative regarding the nature of early doctrine.”

<sup>95</sup> A southern origin for the Mahayana sutras, and more particularly for the *Prajñāpāramitā*, was proposed by, among others, Dutt (1930, p. 41; 1931, pp. 633–53), La Vallée Poussin (1931–32, p. 382), Majumdar (1953, p. 388), Sastri (1955, pp. 72–73), and Warder (1980, p. 357). See, in this respect, also Demiéville 1931–32, pp. 19, 23–24; Lamotte 1954, pp. 386–88; Singh 1978, pp. 2, 7; Hirakawa 1990, p. 159.

<sup>96</sup> Hirakawa 1963, p. 57. See also Bechert 1964, p. 531. On the same subject, Durt (*Hōbōgin*, s.v. “Daijō”) states: “Sans doute ses origines (=Mahayana) ont-elles été multiples parce que suscitées par différents courants de pensée en des endroits et à des moments divers.” Williams (1996, p. 14) claims that: “It would be wrong . . . to portray the Mahāyāna as originating or occurring exclusively, or even mainly, within the Mahāsāṃghika group of schools. . . . Mahāyāna did not originate on a sectarian basis, and we have no historical evidence to identify the Mahāyāna as a whole with one particular group of pre-Mahāyāna schools.” Pagel (1995, p. 5) states that: “It is incorrect to link the origin of the bodhisattva ideal specifically with the Mahāsaṅghika school.” Schopen (1997, p. 148): “There has been a persistent series of attempts . . . to see elements of the Mahāyāna in the early phases of Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, in spite of the fact that there is no actual epigraphical or art-historical evidence for this movement anywhere in the Andhra area prior to the fifth or sixth centuries C.E., and in spite of the fact that what epigraphical and art-historical evidence we actually have richly documents the presence of non-Mahāyāna groups.” See also Dutt 1929, pp. 794–96; Dutt 1931, pp. 633–53; Sarkar 1966, pp. 74–96; Wayman and Wayman 1974, pp. 1–4; Wayman 1978, pp. 42–43; Rosen 1980, pp. 112–26.

also existed within other Śrāvakayāna groups.<sup>97</sup> The origin of this important new movement in Buddhism appears rather to have been a general development within different Buddhist schools and subschools. The Bahuśrutīya subgroup of the Mahāsāṃghikas is likely to have played an important role as intermediate between the north and the south in this process. This can be inferred from the doctrinal positions attributed to them in the *Sbc*. The three theses that are said to be fundamental to them are (1) the opinion that the teachings of the Buddha on impermanence (*anityatā*), suffering (*duḥkha*), emptiness (*śūnyatā*), selflessness (*anātmatā*), and the peace (*śānta*) of nirvana are the supramundane teachings (*lokottarāśāsana*) because the teachings on these five themes lead one to the attainment of the path of emancipation; (2) the opinion that the teachings of the Tathāgata on the themes other than the above are then mundane teachings; and (3) the five points of Mahādeva on the status of an *arhat*.<sup>98</sup> Point number three here, as we have shown elsewhere,<sup>99</sup> is connected to the Mahāsāṃghika schools that

<sup>97</sup> It may be noted here that also in Theravāda philosophy, elements of “Mahayanism” can be discerned. See Bechert 1973, pp. 16–17 and Bechert 1977. We can also refer here to the so-called “Sthavira Mahayana” referred to by Xuanzang in the *Datang xiyu ji*, T 51 no. 2087: 934a15 (translation, Beal 1994, vol. 2, p. 247. Cf. Watters 1904–5, vol. 2, p. 138). See also Lamotte 1958, p. 596; Bechert 1976, pp. 36–37, 47; Wang 1994, pp. 177–78. For Mahayana elements in the Sarvāstivāda, see Dutt 1930, pp. 26–28; Wayman 1978, pp. 35, 42; Schopen 1997, pp. 30–43. On the subject, see also Bechert 1964, p. 535; Bechert 1973, pp. 12–13; Cohen 1995, pp. 7–9, 16–19; Harrison 1995, pp. 56–57; and Walleser 1979, p. 17. Ross Reat (1993, p. 9): “in the early stages of its development, the movement which eventually resulted in Mahāyāna Buddhism was not self-consciously schismatic. Instead, it participated in a general movement within early Buddhism to systematize and elaborate ancient material into a more coherent and persuasive doctrine. It appears that the Theravāda, as well as the other schools of so called ‘Hīnayāna’ Buddhism, chose to record such elaborations in the *Abhidhamma* and then the commentarial literature, whereas the originators of Mahāyāna Buddhism chose to incorporate them into the *sūtras* themselves.”

<sup>98</sup> *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 16a12–15; *Shibabu lun*, T 49, no. 2032: 18c14–17; *Buzhiyi lun* T 49, no. 2033: 21a14–18. See Bareau (1954, pp. 236, 246–47); Bareau (1956, pp. 175–76, 198); and Bareau (1955b, p. 2). See also *Ylls* 34b6–15. Warder (1980, p. 13): “On the question of the transcendental nature of the Buddha, though all the Mahāsāṃghika groups probably affirmed this in some form, they appear to have disagreed on the details. Thus one among them actually seceded from the group on this ground, calling itself the ‘Transcendental School’ (Lokottaravāda), presumably in opposition to the others who may have held the view only in a much less extreme form. It is further clear that among the Mahāsāṃghika group the transcendentalist ideas continued to grow in influence until they gave birth to the ‘Great Vehicle.’”

<sup>99</sup> See Dessein 2008.

resided in the south. On all other doctrinal items, the Bahuśrutīyas are said to have shared the opinions of the Sarvāstivādins, whom we know were situated in the north.<sup>100</sup>

### THE \**ABHIDHARMAMAHĀVIBHĀŚĀŚĀSTRA* AND MAHĀSĀMĠHIKA GROUPS

As the precise doctrinal content of the *Nikāya/Āgama* literature prior to the fourth century CE is not known,<sup>101</sup> and as we do not possess a “Mahāsāmghika *abhidharma*” comparable to the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of the Theravādins or the Sarvāstivādins,<sup>102</sup> an investigation of the presence of Mahayana ideas in early Mahāsāmghika philosophy necessarily has to depend on secondary sources. Apart from the above-mentioned accounts on the history of the different Buddhist schools and sects, our most important source of knowledge is the Sarvāstivāda \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāśāśāstra*. This text gave its name to the Vaibhāśikas, one of a number of geographically and chronologically differentiated philosophical schools and subschools that developed within the Sarvāstivāda. The Vaibhāśikas were based in Kaśmīra. The \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāśāśāstra* is one of three extant *vibhāśās* (commentaries) on Kātyāyanīputra’s *Apitan bajiandu lun* (T no. 1543) and *Apidamo fazhi lun* 阿毘曇磨發智論 (T no. 1544).<sup>103</sup> The text was translated by Xuanzang between

<sup>100</sup> *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 16a15–16; *Shibabu lun*, T 49, no. 2032: 18c17; *Buzhiyi lun* T 49, no. 2033: 21a18–19. See also Bareau 1954, p. 147. Bareau 1955b, p. 7: “Certains faits font penser que les Bahuśrutīya ont peut-être emprunté l’*Abhidharmapiṭaka* des Sarvāstivādin, bien qu’ils sont au contraire, ceux-ci, issus des Mahāsāmghika. Vasumitra signale que leur doctrine est très semblable à celle des Sarvāstivādin. Les seuls éléments que nous en connaissions, transmis par Bhavya et par lui-même, sont des thèses Mahāsāmghika qui peuvent très bien avoir été surajoutées à une doctrine fondamentalement Sarvāstivādin.” See also Walleser 1927, p. 32.

<sup>101</sup> See Schopen 1997, p. 30.

<sup>102</sup> Bareau 1951a, p. 4: “Une inscription du IIIe siècle de notre ère à Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, signalant un don fait aux Apāramahāvīnaselīya, mentionne cinq Mātuka qui peuvent fort bien être les sommaires d’*Abhidharma* de cette secte, laquelle n’aurait pas encore possédé, à cette époque tardive, d’*Abhidharmapiṭaka* proprement dit.” See also *EI* vol. 20, p. 20.

<sup>103</sup> The *vibhāśā* on the *Apidamo fazhi lun* is called the *Apitan piposha lun* 阿毘曇毘婆沙論 (T 28, no. 1546, hereafter \**Abhidharmavibhāśāśāstra*). According to the *Chu sanzang jiji*, T 55, no. 2145: 11b29–c5 and the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* (T 55, no. 2154: 521b14–17), it was translated by Buddhavarman between 437–439 CE. These dates are contradicted by the preface to this Chinese translation (T 28, no. 1546: 1a7ff., 414c22ff.), according to which the translation was done between 425–427 CE. See also the *Chu sanzang jiji*, T 55, no. 2145:

656–659 CE.<sup>104</sup> The *vibhāṣās* are characterized by a highly polemical nature and elements of scholarly debate.<sup>105</sup> Tradition dates the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāsāstra* to the reign of King Kaniṣka.<sup>106</sup> In Xuanzang’s Chinese translation of the work, however, Kaniṣka is twice referred to as a “former king.”<sup>107</sup> This means that at least some parts of the work must postdate Kaniṣka. Zhisheng’s *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*<sup>108</sup> states that the work was composed 400 years after the passing of the Buddha. As long as the dates of Kaniṣka or of the Buddha are not decisively settled,<sup>109</sup> we cannot but date the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāsāstra* to roughly somewhere around the end of the first to the end of the second century CE,<sup>110</sup> i.e., prior to our epigraphical evidence for the existence of the southern Mahāsāṃghika subgroups. This implies that the references to the Mahāsāṃghikas in this work concern the northern Mahāsāṃghika groups.

Despite its scope, the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāsāstra* only contains nine references to the Mahāsāṃghikas.<sup>111</sup> These references concern two

---

73c28ff. and the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, T 55, no. 2154: 620c1–11. On these two sets of dates, see Kawamura 1974, 131, n. 6. The *\*Abhidharmavibhāṣāsāstra* contains seven references to the Mahāsāṃghikas (all as *Mohe sengzhi* 摩訶僧祇). The items concerned are the same as in the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāsāstra*. The third *vibhāṣā* is the *\*Vibhāṣāsāstra* (*Piposha lun* 鞞婆沙論, T 28, no. 1547). This work is attributed to Sitapāṇi (or Śitapāṇi), and translated by Saṃghabhadra. This is the oldest of the three *vibhāṣā* compendia. It has been suggested that it derives from a different recension than the other two *vibhāṣās*. See, on this, Willemen, Dessein, and Cox 1998, pp. 234–37.

<sup>104</sup> *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, T 55, no. 2154: 557a18–19 and 620c12–16. There is much controversy about the original date of the composition of these works. See, on this issue, also Willemen, Dessein, and Cox 1998, pp. 231–33.

<sup>105</sup> See Cox 1995, pp. 33–34.

<sup>106</sup> *Datang xiyu ji* (T 51, no. 2087: 882a17ff.), e.g., states that: “King Kaniṣka and the venerable Pārśva invited five hundred nobles to Kaśmīra to compile the *Vibhāṣāsāstra*.” See also Zürcher 1968, p. 378 and Willemen, Dessein, and Cox 1998, pp. 78, 117–119, 232. On Pārśva, see Watters 1904–5, vol. 1, pp. 208–9 and the *Datang daciensi sanzang fashi zhuan* 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳, T 50, no. 2053: 231b23.

<sup>107</sup> *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāsāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 593a15 and 1004a5.

<sup>108</sup> *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, T 55, 2154: 620c14–16.

<sup>109</sup> On the subject, see Basham 1968 and Bechert 1986.

<sup>110</sup> Kimura (1937, pp. 205–57) dates the work to around the middle of the second century CE. Given the fact that the Sarvāstivāda works were, from the third century onwards, heavily influenced by Vaibhāṣika viewpoints, it is not unlikely that the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāsāstra* should be dated to around the second century CE. On the different traditions on the date of the compilation of this work, see Nakamura 1996, p. 107 and Willemen, Dessein and Cox 1998, pp. 119, 231–32.

<sup>111</sup> Six as *Dazhong bu* 大衆部 and three as *Mohe sengzhi bu* 摩訶僧祇部.

items: the supramundanity of the Buddha and the functioning of the mind while developing the path to salvation. They thus are in line with the early Mahayanistic ideas, referred to in Paramārtha's *Sanlun xuanyi jianyou ji*. In what follows, the references in the \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra* will be interpreted in light of the Mahāsāmghika positions we find in Vasumitra's *Sbc* and in Buddhaghosa's *Kathāvatthupparakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā*.

### *The Supramundanity of the Buddha*

One of the ideas that became peculiar for the Mahayana and that was embryonically present in early Mahāsāmghika philosophy, mentioned in the \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, concerns the nature of the “turning of the wheel of the doctrine.” This has been a major point of controversy among the different Buddhist sects and schools. We find opinions on this issue already in the earliest Buddhist literature.<sup>112</sup> The \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra* discusses this problem, to the disfavor of the Mahāsāmghikas. We read:

(1) In order to stop the Mahāsāmghikas, who claim that speech is the specific nature of the wheel of the doctrine. They say that all words of the Buddha are all the wheel of the doctrine.<sup>113</sup>

The idea that all words of the Buddha are the wheel of the doctrine is related to the idea, attributed to the Mahāsāmghikas in the *Sbc*, that everything the Buddha preached is in conformity with the truth (*yathārtha*)<sup>114</sup> and that, therefore, the sutras he proclaimed are all perfect in themselves.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>112</sup> *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經, T 2, no. 99: 104a15, with parallels in the *Majjhimanikāya* (abbreviated as *MN*) vol. 3, p. 29 and the *Saṃyuttanikāya* (hereafter *SN*) vol. 1, p. 191. See also *Vin* vol. 1, pp. 20–21 (translation, Horner 1938–66, vol. 4, p. 28). See also Pāsādika 1989, p. 109. For a discussion of the version of the *Dharmacakrapravartanasūtra* in Pāli and Chinese translation, see Bareau 1963, pp. 172ff., esp. 179–82. See also the *Za ahan jing*, T 2, no. 99: 103c13 ff.; *Zhuan falun jing* 轉法輪經, T 2, no. 109; and the *Sanzhuan falun jing* 三轉法輪經, T 2, no. 110; *Zengyi ahan jing*, T 2, no. 125: 593b24ff. See, on this issue, also Dessein 2007.

<sup>113</sup> \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 912b7–9.

<sup>114</sup> *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 15b28–29; *Shibabu lun*, T 49, no. 2032: 18b13; *Buzhiyi lun* T 49, no. 2033: 20b29. See further also *Ylls* 24a4–11; Masuda 1925, p. 19; Bareau 1954, p. 239; Bareau 1956, p. 173; and Bareau 1955b, p. 58.

<sup>115</sup> *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 15c24; *Shibabu lun*, T 49, no. 2032: 18c2–3; *Buzhiyi lun* T 49, no. 2033: 20c26–27. See also *Ylls* 31a2–7; Masuda 1925, p. 28, n. 2; Bareau 1954, p. 244; Bareau 1955b, p. 67. This may refer to a remark, to be read in the *Daban niepan jing* 大般涅槃經, T 1, no. 7: 195c5ff., where the Buddha himself alludes to “imperfect sutras.” According to the Mahāsāmghikas, “imperfect” in the above sutra refers to “heretic” sutras. See, in this respect, also Masuda 1925, p. 28, n. 2, in which he further claims that this proposition is aimed at the Sarvāstivādins.



Related to this is the idea, equally mentioned in the *Sbc*, that the Buddha expounds all the doctrines (*dharma*) with a single utterance.<sup>116</sup> Here, we have to remark that the name “Ekavyavahārika” has alternatively been explained as meaning that the Buddhas have only one kind of utterance, i.e., a transcendent utterance, transcendence being the nature of the truth itself. The latter also is a possible explanation of the name “Lokkotaravādins”: “those whose doctrine is transcendent” or “those who affirm the transcendent speaking (of the Buddha).”<sup>117</sup>

As was mentioned above, Paramārtha explains the rise of the Lokkotaravādins as connected to the development of the idea that mundane factors are only nominal and have to be distinguished from supramundane factors that are real. Also, as the Buddha experienced birth in this life and assumed a body, this led to the Mahāsāṃghika interpretation that this body can only be nominal. As his birth is purely apparitional, and his existence is mere fiction, the human qualities and gestures he manifests, being alien to him, are solely in order to conform to the world.<sup>118</sup> Therefore, they concluded that everything in the Buddha, including his physical body, is undefiled. This is also discussed in the \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāsāstra*. Here:

(2) This is said in order to stop other schools and to display the right interpretation. There namely are some who claim that when the Buddha assumed a body, this was [a] pure [body]. The Mahāsāṃghikas, e.g., claim that the scriptures say<sup>119</sup> that when the Tathāgata was born in the world and grew up in the world, when he moved or when he abided, he was not afflicted by mundane factors (*laukikadharma*), and that, therefore, it is to be known that the body the Tathāgata assumed is also pure. In

<sup>116</sup> *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 15b28; *Shibabu lun*, T 49, no. 2032: 18b13; *Buzhiyi lun* T 49, no. 2033: 20b28–29. See also *Yls* 23b17–24a3; Masuda 1925, p. 19; Bareau 1954, p. 239; Bareau 1955b, p. 58. Hirakawa (1963, pp. 57–58) claims that this idea was inherited by such Mahayana texts as the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*.

<sup>117</sup> Cousins 1991, p. 49.

<sup>118</sup> See Lamotte 1958, p. 690.

<sup>119</sup> See the *Aṅguttaranikāya* (hereafter *AN*) vol. 2, p. 39, where we read: “*evam eva kho brāhmaṇa loke jāto loke samvaḍḍho lokam abhibhuyya viharāmi anupalitto lokena. Buddhō ti maṃ brāhmaṇa dhārehīti.*” In the *SN* vol. 3, p. 140, a similar passage runs: “*Evam eva kho bhikkhave Tathāgato loke samvaddho lokam abhibhuyya viharati anupalitto lokenāti.*” Cf. *Za ahan jing*, T 2, no. 99: 28a29–b8. See also La Vallée Poussin 1906, p. 969; Windisch 1909, p. 472; Dutt 1937, p. 551; and Lamotte 1974, p. 94.



order to stop their claim and to display that the body the Buddha assumed definitely is impure, [there is this discussion];<sup>120</sup>

and:

(3) The Vibhajyavādins and the Mahāsāmghikas claim that when the Buddha assumed his body, this is a pure factor (*anāsravadharma*). Why do they say this? They rely on what was said in the scriptures. For it was said in the scriptures<sup>121</sup> that the Tathāgata was not afflicted by worldly factors (*laukikadharmā*) neither when born in the world, nor when abiding in the world, nor when manifesting himself in the world. Basing themselves on this, they say that when the Buddha assumes a body, it is a pure factor. Since they further say that, with a Buddha, all defilements (*kleśa*) and passions (*vāsanā*) are eternally broken off, how then can the body that arises be impure (*sāsrava*)? In order to stop their idea and to make clear that the body of the Buddha that arises is only impure and is not a pure factor, this discussion is done.<sup>121</sup>

This may have developed into the idea, held by some Mahāsāmghika subschools, that the Buddha had two kinds of speech: transcendent and ordinary, the latter when speaking about ordinary things.<sup>122</sup> This is an idea adhered to by the Kukkuṭikas.<sup>123</sup> As mentioned above, also the Bahuśrūtīyas appear to have held this idea.

The idea of transcendent speech is only one of a series of supramundane characteristics that became ascribed to the Buddha. In this way, it is claimed that he understands all things (*sarvadharmā*) with a mind of one *kṣaṇa* (*ekakṣaṇīkacitta*);<sup>124</sup> and that he knows all things with the *prajñā* associated

<sup>120</sup> \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 239a16–20 (repeated at 391c26–392a4 and 871c1–8). This is also discussed in \**Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra*, T 28, no. 1546: 176a24–26, 293b8–11. See also La Vallée Poussin 1971, vol. 1, pp. 58–59, n. 4; *Kṭv* chap. 4, sec. 3 and chap. 14, sec. 4 (translation, Aung and Rhys Davids 1915, pp. 160–61, 286–87).

<sup>121</sup> \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 871c2–8.

<sup>122</sup> See Roth 1980, p. 79.

<sup>123</sup> Cousins 1991, p. 49.

<sup>124</sup> *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 15c4–5; *Shibabu lun*, T. 49, no. 2032: 18b16–17. *Kṭv* chap. 5, sec. 9 (translation, Aung and Rhys Davids 1915, p. 183) ascribes this opinion to the Andhakas. See also *Ylls* 25b11–17; Masuda 1925, p. 20; Bareau 1954, p. 240; Bareau 1956, p. 193; Bareau 1955b, p. 60. *Buzhiyi lun*, T 49, no. 2033: 20c4–5: “The Tathāgata understands all objects (*viśaya*) with a moment’s mind.” Cf. \**Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra*, T 28, no. 1546: 239b6, b19, c2. This view was shared by the Dharmaguptakas and Mahīśāsakas. See Masuda 1925, pp. 20–21, n. 6.

with a mind of one *kṣaṇa* (*ekakṣaṇikacittasamprayuktaprajñā*).<sup>125</sup> Also the latter is a possible interpretation of the name “Ekavyavahārika.”<sup>126</sup>

*The Functioning of the Mind while Developing the Path to Salvation*

We know that when the Buddha said to Ānanda, “The doctrine (*dharma*) and the discipline (*vinaya*) I have taught you should serve as guide also after I have gone,”<sup>127</sup> this doctrine did not actually consist of much more than the four noble truths (*catvāryāryasatyāni*) and the concept of man as constituted from five aggregates (*skandha*). Gradually, a dharma-theory on the path to salvation—laid down in an *Abhidharmapiṭaka*—developed.<sup>128</sup>

Being endowed with faculties (*indriya*) and not having attained liberating insight (*prajñā*),<sup>129</sup> humans (*manuṣya*) are subject to suffering (*duḥkha*). Contact (*sparśa*) of the faculties with their respective objects (*viśaya*) makes feelings (*vedanā*) arise. These lead to conditioning factors (*samskāra*) that, in their turn, add to the karmic result (*vipāka*), and, eventually, to a new birth and further suffering. The path to salvation serves to disconnect the faculties from their object supports.

The \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra* informs us that, according to the Mahāsāṃghikas, in this process of apprehending their respective objects, two thoughts (*citta*) can arise simultaneously:

(4) Some, such as the Mahāsāṃghikas, claim that a *pudgala* has two thoughts that arise simultaneously. In order to stop this school<sup>130</sup>

<sup>125</sup> *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 15c5; *Shibabu lun*, T 49, no. 2032: 18b17; *Buzhiyi lun*, T 49, no. 2033: 20c5–6. See also *Ylls* 25b18–26a5; Masuda 1925: p. 21; Bareau 1954, p. 240; Bareau 1956, p. 193; Bareau 1955b, p. 50. Cf. \**Satyasiddhiśāstra*, T 32, no. 1646: 239c12–23.

<sup>126</sup> Bareau (1955b, p. 78), referring to Bhavya’s *Nbhv*, explains the name Ekavyavahārika as related to the following doctrinal position: “Connaissant complètement (*vijñamāna*) par une seule pensée (*ekacittena*) toutes les Lois (*sarvadharma*) des Buddha Bhagavant, en un seul instant (*ekakṣaṇe*) on connaît complètement toutes choses (*sarvadharma*) par la sagesse (*prajñā*) dont on est pourvu.”

<sup>127</sup> See Waldschmidt 1950–51, vol. 2, p. 303. Cf. *Dīghanikāya* (abbreviated as *DN*) vol. 2, 154; *Chang ahan jing* 長阿含經, T 1, no. 1: 118ff.; *Fo bannihuan jing* 仏般泥洹經, T 1, no. 5: 160b8ff.; *Bannihuan jing* 般泥洹經, T 1, no. 6: 176a5ff.; *Daban niepan jing*, T 1, no. 7: 191b5ff.; *Genben shuoyiqiyoubu pinaïye zashi*, T 24, no. 1451: 382c23–29.

<sup>128</sup> See Malalasekera 1961–, pp. 40–41 and Bronkhorst 2000, p. 76ff.

<sup>129</sup> Schmithausen (1981, p. 199) prefers to restrict the term “enlightenment” exclusively to the Buddha, and the term “liberating insight” with special reference to his disciples, or, in a comprehensive sense, to both enlightenment and the liberating insight of the disciples.

<sup>130</sup> \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 47b1–3. See also Masuda 1925, p. 33, n. 2.

and:

(5) In order to stop the Mahāsāmghikas who claim that one *puḍgala* has two thoughts that arise simultaneously.<sup>131</sup>

From Vasumitra's *Sbc* we know that this has to be understood thus: The six forms of consciousness (*ṣaḍvijñānakāya*) exist in the realm of form (*rūpadhātu*) and in the realm of formlessness (*arūpyadhātu*), as they exist in the sensual realm (*kāmadhātu*).<sup>132</sup> This implies that, for the Mahāsāmghikas, the eighteen elements—the six elements (*dhātu*), six sensual faculties (*indriya*), and their corresponding six forms of consciousness (*vijñāna*)—exist throughout the three realms. The Sarvāstivādins objected to this. They only attribute fourteen elements to the realm of form,<sup>133</sup> and only three to the realm of formlessness: the mental faculty (*manāyatana*), the factor sense-field (*dharmāyatana*), and mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*).<sup>134</sup> They further claimed that mental consciousness excluded the other five forms of consciousness (in addition to the faculties and their respective objects), as they are only defiled (*sāsrava*) and hence are incompatible with the development of the path.<sup>135</sup> This explains why the Sarvāstivāda path to liberation is characterized by a gradual decrease in the number of elements. When all eighteen elements exist in the three realms,<sup>136</sup> liberation cannot hinge on the decrease

<sup>131</sup> \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 47b26–27. This is also discussed in the \**Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra*, T 28, no. 1546: 35b4–5 and in the *Za apitan xin lun* 雜阿毘曇心論, T 28, no. 1552: 944c2–3, 963a17–18.

<sup>132</sup> *Yibu zonglu lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 15c12–13; *Shibabu lun*, T 49, no. 2032: 18b22; *Buzhiyi lun*, T 49, no. 2033: 20c15. See also *Ktv* chap. 8, sec. 7 (translation, Aung and Rhys Davids 1915, pp. 218–20); *Ylls* 28a8–b1; Walleser 1927, pp. 26, 33–34; Bareau 1954, p. 241; Bareau 1956, p. 193; Bareau 1955b, pp. 62, 223–24.

<sup>133</sup> While the faculties of the nose (*ghrāṇendriya*) and the tongue (*jihvendriya*) are present throughout the whole realm of form, olfactory consciousness (*ghrāṇavijñāna*) and gustatory consciousness (*jihvāvijñāna*) and their respective objects smell (*gandha*) and taste (*rasa*) are absent above the stage of the second trance (*dhyāna*) of this realm. See the *Za apitan xin lun*, T 28, no. 1552: 875b22–23 and the *Apidamo jushe lun* 阿毘達磨俱舍論, T 29, no. 1558: 7b28–8a3. See further also Dessein 1999, vol. 2, 71, n. 574; La Vallée Poussin 1971, vol. 1, pp. 56–58.

<sup>134</sup> See *Za apitan xin lun*, T 28, no. 1552: 875b22–23; *Apidamo jushe lun*, T 29, no. 1558: 7b28–8a3; Dessein 1999, vol. 2, p. 71, n. 574; La Vallée Poussin 1971, vol. 1, pp. 56–58.

<sup>135</sup> See *Za apitan xin lun*, T 28, no. 1552: 875b13–19; *Apidamo jushe lun*, T 29, no. 1558: 8a5–8.

<sup>136</sup> See *Ktv* chap. 8, sec. 7 (translation, Aung and Rhys Davids 1915, p. 219) and Masuda 1925 (pp. 22–23, n. 2) for the claim that the existence of faculties presupposes the existence of their respective types of consciousness and vice versa.

of the number of these elements until only the mental elements remain. Liberation instead relies on the intrinsic quality of the elements. This explains why, according to the Mahāsāṃghikas, visual consciousness (*caḅsurvijñāna*), auditory consciousness (*śrotravijñāna*), olfactory consciousness (*ghrāṇavijñāna*), gustatory consciousness (*jihvāvijñāna*), and tactile consciousness (*spraṣṭavyavijñāna*) can both be with attachment (*sarāga*) and without attachment (*vairāgya*).<sup>137</sup> This means that it is not consciousness itself that determines rebirth, but the state of this consciousness—its being with or without attachment. One may thus develop the path while enjoying the fivefold cognitions of sense.<sup>138</sup> The argument with this is that one who develops the path, although possessing the five faculties, is not attracted by their respective objects.<sup>139</sup> This is possible because consciousness of the mind is originally clean (*śuddha*) but becomes defiled when stained by secondary afflictions (*upakleśa*).<sup>140</sup> Put differently, the path to salvation is presented as a mental process of gradual interiorization. Hereby, the external

<sup>137</sup> *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 15c12; *Shibabu lun*, T 49, no. 2032: 18b22; *Buzhiyi lun*, T 49, no. 2033: 20c15. See also *Ylls* 28a3–7; Masuda 1925, p. 22, n. 1; Walleser 1927, p. 26; Bareau 1954, p. 240; Bareau 1956, p. 193; and Bareau 1955b, pp. 62, 225. Bhavya mentions “six” forms of consciousness in the *Nbhv*. See, in this respect, Walleser 1927, p. 33.

<sup>138</sup> See *Ktv* chap. 10, sec. 3 (translation, Aung and Rhys Davids 1915, p. 245).

<sup>139</sup> For this interpretation, according to Buddhaghosa’s commentary on the *Ktv*, the Mahāsāṃghikas referred to *AN* III, 16 (vol. 1, p. 113), where it can be read that when a *bhikṣu*’s sensual faculties (*indriya*) come into contact with their respective objects (*viṣaya*), this *bhikṣu* does not grasp at the general or specific characteristics of it. Cf. *Zengyi ahan jing*, T 2, no. 125: 603c22–28. See, further, Aung and Rhys Davids 1915, p. 246; and Dutt 1937, pp. 574–76.

<sup>140</sup> *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 15c27–28; *Shibabu lun*, T 49, no. 2032: 18c5; *Buzhiyi lun*, T 49, no. 2033: 21a1. See also *Ktv* chap. 3, sec. 3 (translation, Aung and Rhys Davids 1915, pp. 144–45); *Ylls* 31a13–32a1; Bareau 1954, p. 244; Bareau 1956, pp. 175, 195; Bareau 1955b, pp. 67–68, 217. *Shelifu apitan lun* 舍利弗阿毘曇論 (T 28, no. 1548: 697b18–22) explains that with worldlings, the mind is defiled, but not with noble persons. This may explain why \*Bhavya mentions six forms of consciousness (see n. 139 in this article). Related to this, Jaini (1959, p. 249) states that: “The theory of an innate, indestructible, and pure element existing in the midst of destructible, phenomenal, and impure elements shows an affinity with the Mahāyāna doctrine of prakṛti-prabhāsvara-citta, according to which mind is essentially and originally pure but becomes impure by only adventitious afflictions. This prakṛti-prabhāsvara-citta is further described as identical with the dharmatā, tathatā, and, therefore, with the dharma-kāya of the Buddha.” On the early notions of “*rūpakāya*” and “*dharmakāya*,” see also Régamey 1938, pp. 23–24. Buddhaghosa’s commentary on the *Ktv* chap. 3, sec. 3 (translation, Aung and Rhys Davids 1915, p. 144), compares the latter statement thus: “just as a soiled garment is released from its stains on being washed, so emancipation means that a heart beset with lust is emancipated from lust.”

world is cut off from staining the adept's mind.<sup>141</sup> It is thus obvious that we have to give prominence to mental consciousness over the other—secondary—form of consciousness that is active whenever an object (*viṣaya*) is perceived.<sup>142</sup> Thus, in the \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra* we read:

(6) Some, among whom are the Mahāsāmṭghikas, adhere to [the opinion] that only thoughts and thought concomitants have a cause of retribution (*vipākahetu*) and a fruit of retribution (*vipākaphala*).<sup>143</sup>

That the Mahāsāmṭghika interpretation of the path to salvation is conceived of as a process of gradual interiorization is visible in their opinion on the “highest worldly factor” (*laukikāgradharma*). The “highest worldly factor” is the moment of transition from being a worldling (*prthagjana*) to being a noble person (*āryapudgala*),<sup>144</sup> i.e., at the moment one goes onto the noble path (*āryamārga*), one leaves the state of ordinarieness (*prthagjanatva*). This point of transition, according to the Mahāsāmṭghikas, belongs both to the realm of sensual passion and to the realm of form, as is stated in the \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*:

(7) The Mahāsāmṭghikas claim that the highest worldly factor belongs to both the realm of sensual passion and to the realm of form.<sup>145</sup>

<sup>141</sup> See also *AN* vol. 3, p. 411.

<sup>142</sup> Masuda (1925, pp. 34–35, n. 4) denies a “plurality of the mind.” He claims that: “Like other schools the Mahāsāmṭghikas divided consciousness into six classes according to the differences of the mediums through which presentations appear. But they did not admit the theory of plurality of mind consisting of separate entities. . . . The Mahāsāmṭghikas maintained on the contrary that there is only one mind and this mind, they said, adapts itself to the various sense organs and objects.” Judging from the *Kīv* chap. 2, sec. 5 (translation, Aung and Rhys Davids 1915, p. 121), also the Theravādins objected to the co-existence of two kinds of consciousness: “a combination of . . . two consciousnesses [at a given moment], (which is absurd).” See also Walleser 1927, p. 34.

<sup>143</sup> \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 96a27–29. This is also discussed in the \**Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra*, T 28, no. 1546: 80a3–5. See also Bareau 1955b, p. 69.

<sup>144</sup> In the \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 11b7–10, three reasons why this stage is the stage of the transformation of personality are given.

<sup>145</sup> \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 14a5–8. This discussion is also included in the \**Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra*, T 28, no. 1546: 9b11–12: “As the Mahāsāmṭghikas who claim that the highest worldly factor is [also] bound to the realm of sensual passion.” On the question as to which realm the highest worldly factor belongs, and the Sarvāstivāda opinions on this, see Frauwallner 1971b, p. 83. See also Bareau 1955b, p. 72.

Three stages precede arhatship (*arhattvaphala*): the stage of the stream-winner (*srotāpanna*), the stage of the once-returned (*sakṛdāgāmin*), and the stage of the non-returned (*anāgāmin*). In the *Sbc*, only statements concerning the *srotāpanna* and the *arhat* are found. We read that, according to the Northern Mahāsāṃghikas, the thoughts (*citta*) and thought concomitants (*caitasikadharmā*) of streamwinners are capable of knowing their specific nature (*svabhāva*).<sup>146</sup>

The following statement—which in the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra* is attributed to the Mahāsāṃghikas, and to which the latter work objects—is related to this:

(8) Is there somehow one knowledge (*jñāna*) that knows all factors (*sarvadharmā*)? Answer: “No.” [Objection:] “Since all factors are without self (*anātmaka*), [it has to be so that] when this knowledge [that knows all factors] arises, there would be nothing that is not known by it.” Answer: “It does not know the specific nature and all factors that are associated with it (*saṃprayuktadharmā*).” Not knowing its specific nature among this is exactly [stated] in order to stop the Mahāsāṃghikas.<sup>147</sup>

and:

(9) Why this discussion? Answer: “In order to stop other schools and to display their own idea. It is namely so that some, as the Mahāsāṃghikas, hold to it that thoughts and thought concomitants can know their specific nature. They claim that knowledge can understand its own specific nature. Being able to know oneself and [to know] something else is as a torch that would be able to light its own specific nature and, therefore, would be able to

<sup>146</sup> *Yibu zonglun lun*, T 49, no. 2031: 15c16–17; *Shibabu lun*, T 49, no. 2032: 18b25; *Buzhiyi lun*, T 49, no. 2033: 20c18–19. See also *Ktv* chap. 5, sec. 9 (translation, Aung and Rhys Davids 1915, p. 183). See, further, also *Ylls* 29a11–15; Masuda 1925, p. 24, n. 1; Walleser 1927: p. 26; Bareau 1954: p. 242; Bareau 1955b: pp. 64, 92. This item is also discussed in the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 21c13–14.

<sup>147</sup> *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 42c24–29, 43c6. This is also discussed in the *\*Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra*, T 28, no. 1546: 31c9–11 (no knowledge knows its specific nature) and 32b18–21 (there is no factor that knows everything, as the specific nature is never known). See also La Vallée Poussin 1971, vol. 5, p. 45, n. 1.

light itself and [to light] something else.”<sup>148</sup>

The statements concerning the functioning of the mind while developing the path to salvation show that the Mahāsāṃghikas interpreted this development as a technical process of gradual interiorization. In this process, the faculties are cut off from staining the adept’s mind. Having reached the stage of the streamwinner, thoughts and thought concomitants are capable of knowing their specific nature. Going further on the path of spiritual practice, the adept eventually attains arhatship.

## CONCLUSION

The above references to the Mahāsāṃghikas in the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra* are in line with the development of the concept of a twofold truth and a docetic interpretation of the body of the Buddha. As the true nature of the factors, including the words of the Buddha, is transcendental, the devotee—on the path to salvation—has to develop the state of transcendence in himself. This implies that the *dharm*a-theory of the Mahāsāṃghikas accentuates the nature of these *dharm*as, not the number of elements in each of the realms.

As the viewpoints referred to in the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra* are also held to by the Mahāsāṃghika groups that resided in the north, this implies that Mahayanistic elements were also present in the northern schools. This renders the claim that the Mahayana originated in the south untenable. As the Bahuśrutīyas were the only Mahāsāṃghika subgroup that resided both in the north and in the south, it is not unlikely that they served as an intermediary in a general process in which Mahayanistic ideas that were developed and matured in the north were transmitted to the south and vice versa. More precisely, it appears that it was in the north that early Mahayanistic ideas were fitted into the framework of Sarvāstivāda abhidharmic developments.

<sup>148</sup> *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, T 27, no. 1545: 42c10–14. Notice that the example of the torch that lights itself is very well known from the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, chap. 7, v. 11: “*Aprāpyaiva pradīpena yadī vā nihataṃ tamaḥ / ihasthaḥ sarvalokasthaṃ sa tamo nihaniṣyati*” (Inada 1970, p. 66).



## ABBREVIATIONS

- AN* *Aṅguttara-nikāya*. 5 vols., ed. R. Morris and E. Hardy, 1885–1900. Reprint, London: Pali Text Society, 1961–79.
- Bbh* *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, ed. Nalinākṣa Dutt. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1966.
- Dīp* The Chronicle of the Island of Ceylon or the Dipavamsa: A Historical Poem of the 4th Century A.D., ed. B. C. Law. *The Ceylon Historical Journal* 7, nos. 1–4.
- DN* *Dīgha-nikāya*. 3 vols., ed. T. W. Rhys Davids and J. E. Carpenter, 1889–1910. Reprint, London: Pali Text Society, 1982–92.
- EI* *Epigraphia Indica*. 43 vols. to date. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 1888–.
- Ktv* *Kathāvatthu*, ed. A. C. Taylor. 2 vols., 1894–97. Reprinted as one volume, London: Pali Text Society, 1979.
- Ktva* *Kathāvattuppakarana-aṭṭhakathā*, ed. N. A. Jayawickrama. London: Pali Text Society, 1979.
- Mhv* *Mahāvamsa*, ed. by Wilhem Geiger. London: Pali Text Society, 1908.
- MN* *Majjhima-nikāya*. 3 vols., ed. V. Trenckner and R. Chalmers. 1888–1902. Reprint, London: Pali Text Society, 1993–94.
- Nbhv* \**Nikāyabhedavibhaṅgavyākhyāna*. Sde pa tha dad par byed pa dañ nram par bśad pa. Ota 5640, Toh 4139.
- Sbc* \**Samayabhedoparacanacakra*. See T no. 2031, 2032, 2033.
- Sns* *Samayabhedoparacanacakra nikāyabhedopadeśanasamgraha*. Gshuñ tha dad pa rim par klag pañi ḥkhor lo las sde pa tha dad pa bstan pa bsdus pa shes bya ba. Ota 5641, Toh 4140.
- SN* *Samyutta-nikāya*. 5 vols., ed. L. Feer, 1884–1898. Reprint, London: Pali Text Society, 1975–2006.
- T* *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經. 100 vols., ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–34.
- Vin* *Vinaya Piṭakam: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*. 5 vols, ed. H. Oldenberg. 1879–83. Reprint, London: Pali Text Society, 1969–93.
- Ylls* *Yibuzong lun lun shuji* 異部宗輪論述記. In Collection 1, vol. 83, no. 3 of the *Dainihon zokuzōkyō* 大日本統藏經. Kyoto: Zōkyō Shoin, 1910.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, G. F. 1956. The Origin of the Mahasamghikas. *The Mahābodhi* 64, no. 5, pp. 225–32.
- Anesaki Masaharu. 1908a. Some Problems of the Textual History of the Buddhist Scriptures. *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 35, part 2, pp. 81–96.
- . 1908b. The Four Buddhist Āgamas in Chinese, a Concordance of their Parts and of the Corresponding Counterparts in the Pāli Nikāyas. *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 35, part 3, pp. 1–149.

- Aung, Shwe Zan and C. A. F. Rhys Davids, trans. 1915. *Points of Controversy or Subjects of Discourse: Being a Translation of the Kathāvattu from the Abhidhamma-piṭaka*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Bureau, André. 1950. Les origines du Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra. Le Muséon 63, nos. 1/2, pp. 69–95.
- . 1951a. Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule et leurs Abhidharmapitaka. *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient* 44, no. 1, pp.1–11.
- . 1951b. Dhammasaṅgaṇi: traduction annotée. Thèse complémentaire présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris pour le Doctorat Es-Lettres.
- . 1954. Trois traités sur les sectes bouddhiques dus à Vasumitra, Bhavya et Vinīta-deva: Première Partie. *Journal Asiatique* 242, pp. 229–66.
- . 1955a. *Les premiers conciles bouddhiques*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- . 1955b. *Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule*. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- . 1956. Trois traités sur les sectes bouddhiques attribués à Vasumitra, Bhavya et Vinīta-deva: Deuxième Partie. *Journal Asiatique* 244, pp. 167–200.
- . 1957. Les controverses relatives à la nature de l'arhant dans le Bouddhisme ancien. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 1, pp. 241–50.
- . 1963. *Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtrapitaka et les Vinayapitaka anciens: de la quête de l'éveil à la conversion de Śāriputra et de Maudgalyāyana*. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Basham, A. L., ed. 1968. *Papers on the Date of Kaṇiṣka*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Beal, Samuel, trans. 1994. *Si-yu-ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World: Translated from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsiang (A.D. 629)*. 2 vols. 1884. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Bechert, Heinz. 1964. Zur Frühgeschichte des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 113, no. 3, pp. 530–35.
- . 1973. Notes on the Formation of Buddhist Sects and the Origins of Mahāyāna. In *German Scholars on India: Contributions to Indian Studies*, ed. The Cultural Department of the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, New Delhi. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- . 1976. Buddha-Feld und Verdienstübertragung: Mahāyāna-Ideen im Theravāda-Buddhismus Ceylons. *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques*. 5e Série 62, pp. 27–51.
- . 1977. Mahāyāna Literature in Sri Lanka: The Early Phase. In *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems: Studies in Honor of Edward Conze*, ed. L. Lancaster. Berkeley Buddhist Studies 1. Berkeley: Regents of the University of California.
- . 1985. Einleitung. In *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, ed. H. Bechert. Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1986. *Die Lebenszeit des Buddha: Das älteste feststehende Datum der indischen Geschichte?* Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1985. Dharma and Abhidharma. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48, no. 2, pp. 305–20.

- . 2000. Die buddhistische Lehre. In *Der Buddhismus I: Der indische Buddhismus und seine Verzweigungen*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Burgess, Jas. 1887. *The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta in the Krishna District, Madras Presidency, Surveyed in 1882*. London: Trübner & Co.
- Buswell, R. E. and P. S. Jaini. 1996. The Development of Abhidharma Philosophy. In *Abhidharma Buddhism to 150 A.D.* Vol. 7 of *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, ed. Karl H. Potter. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Bühler, G. 1892. Correspondence. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pp. 597–98.
- Cohen, Richard S. 1995. Discontented Categories: Hīnayāna and Mahayana in Indian Buddhist History. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 63, no. 1, pp. 1–25.
- Cousins, L. S. 1991. The ‘Five Points’ and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools. In *The Buddhist Forum*, vol. 2, ed. Tadeusz Skorupski. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Cox, Collett. 1995. *Disputed Dharmas: Early Buddhist Theories on Existence: An Annotated Translation of the Section on Factors Dissociated from Thought from Saṅghabhadra’s Nyāyānusāra*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Demiéville, Paul. 1924. Les versions chinoises du Milindapañha. *Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* 24, pp. 1–253.
- . 1931–32. L’origine des sectes bouddhiques d’après Paramārtha. *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 1, pp. 15–64.
- . 1951. A propos du concile de Vaiśālī. *T’oung Pao* 40, pp. 239–96.
- Dessein, Bart, trans. 1999. *Heart of Scholasticism with Miscellaneous Additions: Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*. 3 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- . 2007. The First Turning of the Wheel of the Doctrine: Sarvāstivāda and Mahāsāṅghika Controversies. In *The Spread of Buddhism*, ed. Ann Heirman and Stephan Peter Bumbacher. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- . 2008. Of Tempted Arhats and Supermundane Buddhas: Abhidharma in the Kṛṣṇā Region. In *Buddhism in the Krishna River Valley of Andhra*, ed. Sree Padma and A. W. Barber. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Dietz, Siglinde. 1985. Untersuchungen zur Schulzugehörigkeit der in Ujjain liegenden Gilgit-Fragmente. In *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, ed. Heinz Bechert. Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1922. The Mahāsāṅghika School of Buddhism. *University of Calcutta: Journal of the Department of Letters* 8, pp. 117–29.
- . 1929. Discovery of a Bone-Relic at an Ancient Centre of Mahāyāna. *The Indian Historical Quarterly* 5, pp. 794–96.
- . 1930. *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relation to Hīnayāna*. London: Luzac & Co. Ltd.
- . 1931. Notes on the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa Inscriptions. *The Indian Historical Quarterly* 7, pp. 633–53.
- . 1937. Doctrines of the Mahāsāṅghika School of Buddhism. *The Indian Historical Quarterly* 13, pp. 549–80.
- Dutt, Sukumar. 1962. *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries in India: Their History and their Contribution to Indian Culture*. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.

- Foucher, Alfred. 1928. Les sculptures d'Amarāvati. *Revue des arts Asiatiques* 5, no. 1, pp. 9–24.
- Frauwallner, Erich. 1956. *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*. Roma: Is. M.E.O.
- . 1971a. *Die Entstehung der buddhistischen Systeme*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1971b. Abhidharma-Studien III: Der Abhisamayavādaḥ. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 15, pp. 69–121.
- Fukuhara Rōgon 福原亮巖. 1969. *Jōjitsuron no kenkyū: Bukkyō shoha no gakusetsu hihan* 成実論の研究: 仏教諸派の学説批判. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō.
- Geiger, Wilhelm, trans. 1912. *The Mahāvamsa or the Great Chronicle of Ceylon*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Government of Madras, ed. 1924. *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy: For the Year Ending 31 March 1923*. Madras: Government Press.
- Harrison, Paul. 1982. Sanskrit Fragments of a Lokottaravādin Tradition. In *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. L. A. Hercus et al. Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies.
- . 1995. Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What Are We Looking For? *The Eastern Buddhist* 28, no. 1, pp. 48–69.
- . 1997. The *Ekottarikāgama* Translations of An Shigao. In *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Swisttal-Oldendorf, Germany: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Hirakawa Akira. 1963. The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relationship to the Worship of Stūpas. *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 22, pp. 57–106.
- . 1990. *A History of Indian Buddhism: From Śākyamuni to Early Mahāyāna*, trans. and ed. Paul Groner. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Hofinger, M. 1946. *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī*. Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon.
- Horner, I. B., trans. 1938–66. *The Book of the Discipline (vinaya-piṭaka)*, 6 vols. London: Luzac & Co. Ltd.
- Hultzsch, E. 1883. Amarāvati-Inschriften. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 37, pp. 548–61.
- Inada, Kenneth K. 1970. *Nāgārjuna: A Translation of his Mūlamadhyamakārikā, with an Introductory Essay*. Tokyo: Hokuseido Press.
- Jaini, P. S. 1959. The Sautrāntika Theory of Bīja. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 22, no. 2, pp. 236–39.
- Johnston, E. H., ed. 1972. *The Buddhacarita, or, Acts of the Buddha*. 2 vols. 1936. Reprint, Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation.
- Jones, J. J., trans. 1949–56. *The Mahāvastu*. 3 vols. London: Luzac & Co. Ltd.
- Jouveau-Dubreuil, G. 1914. *Archéologie du sud de l'Inde*. Paris: P. Geuthner.
- Julien, S. 1859. Listes diverses des noms des dix-huit écoles schismatiques qui sont sorties du Bouddhisme. *Journal Asiatique* 14, pp. 327–61.
- Kawamura Kōshō 河村孝照. 1974. *Abidatsuma ronsho no shiryōteki kenkyū* 阿毘達磨論書の資料的研究. Kyoto: Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 2000. Die buddhistische Gemeinde. Chapter 2, section 3 of *Der Buddhismus I. Der indische Buddhismus und seine Verzweigungen*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

- Kimura Taiken 木村泰賢. 1937. *Abidatsumaron no kenkyū* 阿毘達磨論の研究. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Konow, Sten, ed. 1969. *Kharoshthī Inscriptions: With the Exception of those of Asoka*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum 2, part 1. Varanasi: Indological Book House.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1906. The Three Bodies of a Buddha (*Trikāya*). *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pp. 943–77.
- . 1908. The Buddhist Councils. *Indian Antiquary* 37, pp. 1–18 and pp. 81–106.
- . 1910. The ‘Five Points’ of Mahādeva and the Kathāvattthu. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pp. 413–23.
- . 1931–32. Notes et bibliographie bouddhiques. *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 1, pp. 377–424.
- . 1971. *L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu: traduction et annotations*. New ed. 6 vols. Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises.
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1954. Sur la formation du Mahāyāna. In *Asiatica: Festschrift Friedrich Weller zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet van seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*, ed. Johannes Schubert and Ulrich Schneider. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, pp. 377–96.
- . 1956. Buddhist Controversy over the Five Propositions. *The Indian Historical Quarterly* 32, pp. 148–62.
- . 1958. *Histoire du bouddhisme Indien: des origines à l’ère Śaka*. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste.
- . 1967. Un sūtra composite de l’*Ekottarāgama*. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 30, pp. 105–16.
- . 1974. Passions and Impregnations of the Passions in Buddhism. In *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I. B. Horner*, ed. L. Cousins, A. Kunst, and K. R. Norman. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Law, B. C., trans. 1969. *The Debates Commentary (Kathāvattthuppakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā)*. 1940. Reprint, London: Pali Text Society.
- Longhurst, A. H. 1938. *The Buddhist Antiquities of Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, Madras Presidency*. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India 54. Delhi: Swati Publications.
- Lüders, H. 1973. *A List of Brahmi Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to about A.D. 400 with the Exception of Those of Asoka*. 1912. Reprint, Varanasi: Indological Book House.
- Majumdar, R. C., ed. 1953. *The Age of Imperial Unity*. 2nd ed. Vol. 2 of *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
- Malalasekera, G. P. 1961–. *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*. 7 vols. to date. Colombo: Government of Ceylon.
- Masuda, J. 1920. Early Indian Buddhist Schools: A Translation from the Hsüan-chwang Version of Vasumitra’s Treatise. *University of Calcutta: Journal of the Department of Letters* 1, pp. 1–11.
- . 1925. Origin and Doctrines of Early Indian Buddhist Schools: A Translation of the Hsüan-chwang Version of Vasumitra’s Treatise I-pu tsung-lun lun. Translated with Annotations. *Asia Major* 2, pp. 1–78.
- Mayeda, E. 1985. Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas. In *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, vol. 1, ed. H. Bechert. Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Mitra, Debala. 1971. *Buddhist Monuments*. Calcutta: Sahitya Samsad.

- Nakamura, Hajime. 1996. *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*. 1980. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Nattier, Jan and Charles S. Prebish. 1976–77. Mahāsāmghika Origins: The Beginnings of Buddhist Sectarianism. *History of Religions* 16, pp. 237–72.
- Oldenberg, Hermann, trans. 1879. *The Dīpavaṃsa: An Ancient Buddhist Historical Record*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- . 1898. Buddhistische Studien. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 52, pp. 613–94.
- . 1912. Studien zur Mahāvastu. *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse*, pp. 123–54.
- Pachow, W. 1951. A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa. *Sino-Indian Studies* 4, no. 2, pp. 51–114.
- . 2000. *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa: On the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pāli Versions*. Revised and enlarged ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Pagel, U. 1995. *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka: Its Doctrines, Practices and their Position in Mahāyāna Literature*. Tring, U.K.: The Institute of Buddhist Studies.
- Pāsādika. 1989. *Kanonische Zitate im Abhidharmakośabhāṣya des Vasubandhu*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Potter, Karl H., ed. 1999. Harivarman, Tattvasiddhi. In *Buddhist Philosophy from 100 to 350 A.D.* Vol. 8 of *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, ed. Karl H. Potter. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Prebish, Charles S. 1974. A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils. *Journal of Asian Studies* 33, no. 2, pp. 239–54.
- , ed. 1975. *Buddhism: A Modern Perspective*. University Park; London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Przyluski, Jean. 1926–28. *Le Concile de Rājagṛha: introduction à l'histoire des canons et des sectes bouddhiques*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- . 1940. Dārṣṭāntika, Sautrāntika and Sarvāstivādin. *The Indian Historical Quarterly* 16, pp. 246–54.
- Rahder, J. 1939. Daijo, sk. Mahayana. *Acta Orientalia* 17, pp. 1–16.
- Ramachandra Dikshitar, V. R. 1945. Buddhism in Andhradeśa. In *B. C. Law Volume*, part 1, ed. D. R. Bhandarkar et al. Calcutta: The Indian Research Institute.
- Régamey, K. 1938. *Three Chapters from the Samādhirājasūtra*. Warsaw: Publications of the Oriental Commission.
- Renou, Louis and Jean Filliozat. 1985. *L'Inde classique: manuel des études indiennes*. Vol. 1. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Rhys Davids, T. W. 1892. Schools of Buddhist Belief. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pp. 1–37.
- Rockhill, W. W. 1992. *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of his Order: Derived from Tibetan Works in the Bkah-ggyur and Bstan-ggyur: Followed by Notices on the Early History of Tibet and Khoten*. 1884. Reprint, Delhi: Asian Educational Services.
- Rosen, E. 1980. Buddhist Architecture and Lay Patronage at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa. In *The Stūpa: Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance*, ed. A. L. Dallapiccola and S. Z. Lallemand. Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag.
- Ross Reat, N. 1993. *The Śālistamba Sūtra*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.



- Roth, G., ed. 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya: Manual of Discipline for Buddhist Nuns*. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- . 1980. Particular Features of the Language of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins and their Importance for Early Buddhist Tradition. In *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung: The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, ed. H. Bechert. Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Sarkar, H. 1966. *Studies in Early Buddhist Architecture of India*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Sastri, N. A., ed. 1975. *Satyasiddhiśāstra of Harivarman*. 2 vols. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Sastri, P. S. 1955. The Rise and Growth of Buddhism in Andhra. *The Indian Historical Quarterly* 31, pp. 68–75.
- Schiefner, A., trans. 1868. *Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien: aus dem Tibetischen übersetzt*. St. Petersburg: Eggers et Co.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 1970. Zu den Rezensionen des Udānavargaḥ. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 14, pp. 47–124.
- . 1976. Die vier Konzentrationen der Aufmerksamkeit. Zur geschichtlichen Entwicklung einer spirituellen Praxis des Buddhismus. *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 60, pp. 241–66.
- . 1981. On Some Aspects of Descriptions or Theories of “Liberating Insight” and “Enlightenment” in Early Buddhism. In *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus: Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf*, ed. K. Bruhn and A. Wezler. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- . 1987. Beiträge zur Schulzugehörigkeit und Textgeschichte kanonischer und postkanonischer buddhistischen Materialien. In *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, vol. 2, ed. H. Bechert. Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schopen, G. 1997. *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Sénart, É., ed. 1882–97. *Le Mahāvastu: texte Sanscrit publié pour la première fois et accompagné d'introductions et d'un commentaire*. Société Asiatique. 3 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Shih, R., trans. 1968. *Biographies des moines éminents (Kao Seng Tchouan) de Houei-kiao*. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste.
- Shizutani Masao 静谷正雄. 1965. Matorā to Daishubu マトラーと大衆部. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 13, no. 1, pp. 100–105.
- Singh, J. 1978. *An Introduction to Madhyamaka Philosophy*. 1968. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Sivaramamurti, C. 1942. *Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum*. Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum, New series, General section 4. Madras: Government Press.
- Skorupski, T., ed. 1991. *The Buddhist Forum*, vol. 2. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Takakusu, J., trans. 1966. *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671–695)*. 1896. Reprint, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.



- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1950–51. *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra: Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, verglichen mit dem Pāli nebst einer Übersetzung der Chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- . 1980. Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas. In *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung. The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, ed. H. Bechert. Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Walleser, M. 1927. *Die Sekten des alten Buddhismus*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- . 1979. *The Life of Nāgārjuna from Tibetan and Chinese Sources*. Delhi: Nag Publishers.
- Wang, B. 1994. Buddhist Nikāyas through Ancient Chinese Eyes. In *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literature*, ed. Frank Bandurski, Bhikkhu Pāsādika, Michael Schmidt and Bangwei Wang. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfanfunden, Beiheft 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Warder, A. K. 1980. *Indian Buddhism*. 1970. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Watters, Thomas., trans. 1904–5. *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*. 2 vols. Oriental Translation Fund New Series 14–15. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Wayman, Alex. 1978. The Mahāsāṃghika and the Tathāgatagarbha (Buddhist Doctrinal History, Study 1). *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 1, no. 1, pp. 35–50.
- . 1991. *Ethics of Tibet. Bodhisattva Section of Tsong-Kha-Pa's Lam Rim Chen Mo. Translation from the Tibetan Original*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Wayman, Alex and Hideko Wayman 1974. *The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā: A Buddhist Scripture on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory*. New York; London: Columbia University Press.
- Willemen, Charles, Bart Dessein and Collett Cox. 1998. *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*. Handbuch der Orientalistik. Zweite Abteilung, Indien 11. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Williams, Paul. 1996. *Mahāyāna Buddhism*. 1989. Reprint, London; New York: Routledge.
- Windisch, E. 1909. Die Komposition des Mahāvastu. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde des Buddhismus. *Abhandlungen der Philologisch-historischen Klasse der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 27, pp. 469–511.
- Yuyama, A. 1979. *A Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature: Erster Teil, Vinaya Texte*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.
- Zürcher, E. 1972. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. 2 vols. 1959. Reprint, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- . 1968. The Yüeh-chih and Kaniṣka in the Chinese Sources. In *Papers on the Date of Kaniṣka*, ed. A. L. Basham. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

