

A Study on the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism

SASAKI SHIZUKA

I

EVER SINCE the Meiji period, Japanese Buddhist scholars have been attempting to clarify when, where, for what reason, and by whom Mahāyāna Buddhism was established. With the introduction from the West of the modern text critical approach using Pāli texts, a controversy arose as to whether the Mahāyāna sūtras were indeed the true words of the Buddha, with scholars such as Murakami Senjō 村上專精 (1851–1929) and Maeda Eun 前田慧雲 (1857–1930) exchanging heated debates over the issue. In academic circles, the existence of the Southern tradition of Pāli Buddhism became the determining factor which led scholars to conclude that the Mahāyāna sūtras were not the Buddha's words, subsequent to which there arose yet another question: if the Buddha did not establish Mahāyāna Buddhism, who then compiled the Mahāyāna sūtras?

As early as the mid-Edo period, Tominaga Nakamoto 富永仲基 (1715–1746) set forth a theory of historical accretion (*kajō* 加上) which claimed that Mahāyāna Buddhism was not established by the Buddha.¹

* This is a revised version of a paper published in Japanese, “Daijō bukkyō zaïke kigen setsu no mondaiten” 大乘仏教在家起源説の問題点 [A Study on the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism], *Hanazono Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 花園大学文学部研究紀要 [*Bulletin of Faculty of Letters, Hanazono University*] 27 (1995): 29–62. The translation was made by Mayumi Iacobacci, and edited and revised by Jonathan Silk.

¹ See Hubert Durt, *Problems of Chronology and Eschatology: Four Lectures on the*

This view was denounced so strongly by scholars of the time that no one paid heed to it thereafter. It was not until the Meiji period, when the view that Mahāyāna Buddhism was not established by the Buddha became the dominant one, that the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism became a significant research theme in Japan.² Many scholars have since dealt with the issue, mainly by investigating the different doctrinal positions of early Mahāyāna sūtras and comparing them with the doctrines established prior to the emergence of the Mahāyāna, thus allowing one to speculate on the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism. The efforts of these scholars were fruitful in the sense that they were able to clarify the nature of Mahāyāna Buddhism, but they were still unable to answer the crucial questions of when, where, for what reason, and by whom Mahāyāna Buddhism was established.³

This was the situation that prevailed until Hirakawa Akira 平川彰 published his innovative work, *Shoki Daijō Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 初期大乘佛教の研究 (*A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism*) in 1968.⁴ Hirakawa's study created quite a sensation, since his research methods and conclusions were a significant departure from existing theories. What made his work so sensational was that, while grounded in the study of Mahāyāna doctrines, it also took into consideration the social conditions of the Buddhist communities of the time, searching therein for clues to the nature of the Mahāyāna Buddhist communities alluded to in the Mahāyāna sūtras. Prior to Hirakawa's work, the generally accepted view was that Mahāyāna Buddhism developed from out of sectarian Buddhism.⁵ As Mahāsāṃghika doctrines are quite similar to

'*Essay on Buddhism*' by Tominaga Nakamoto (1715–1746). The Italian School of East Asian Papers, Occasional Papers 4 (Kyoto: Istituto Italiano di Cultura/Scuola di Studi sull'Asia Orientale, 1994), and Michael Pye, *Emerging from Meditation* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1990).

² See Hirakawa Akira 平川彰, *Shoki Daijō Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 初期大乘佛教の研究 [*A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism*] 1. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 [*Collected Works of Hirakawa Akira*] 3 (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha 春秋社, 1989): 10–17. See also Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元, *Kyōten: Sono seiritsu to tenkai* 経典—その成立と展開 (Tokyo: Kōsei shuppankai, 1990): 29–48. Found in English in *Buddhist Sutras: Origin, Development, Transmission* (Tokyo: Kōsei Publishing, 1982).

³ See *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* 1, pp. 17–25.

⁴ Tokyo: Shunjū-sha. The two-volume revised edition of this work is included in the *Collected Works of Hirakawa Akira* III (1989) and IV (1990).

⁵ There is a theory that Mahāyāna Buddhism appeared as a countermovement to the

those of Mahāyāna Buddhism, the sectarian Mahāsāṃghika school was widely thought to be the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Hirakawa, however, firmly rejected this view and presented ample evidence from his detailed research findings to discount it. He went even so far as to deny any direct relation between sectarian Buddhism and Mahāyāna Buddhism, advocating what is now known as the “Hirakawa theory”⁵: that Mahāyāna Buddhism was not established by the ordained members of the sectarian communities but by lay Buddhists who engaged in religious activities connected with *stūpa* worship. His detailed research and consistent argumentation were enough to convince a broad group of scholars and as a result, for the past two decades in Japan, the mystery of the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism was considered largely solved.

Recently, however, scholars have begun to question the validity of the Hirakawa theory from various angles,⁶ although no one has presented a consistent argument that can soundly refute the whole theory. Now, in the present paper, after uncovering significant contradictions in his argument, I will reexamine Hirakawa’s work from a critical perspective. In the course of my research I met several other scholars who were also critical of the Hirakawa theory, and we came to hold regular meetings to discuss our findings on the origins of Mahāyāna Bud-

Abhidharma study of a sectarian Buddhism that had become overly complicated and specialized. Regarding this argument, see Mizuno Kōgen, “Buha bukkyō yori daijō bukkyō e no tenkai” 部派仏教より大乘仏教への展開 [The Development from Sectarian Buddhism to Mahāyāna Buddhism], in Miyamoto Shoson 宮本正尊, ed., *Daijō Bukkyō no Seiritsushiteki Kenkyū* 大乘仏教の成立史的研究 [Study of the Formation History of Mahāyāna Buddhism] (Tokyo: Sanseidō 三成堂, 1954): 259–268. The majority of Western scholars subscribe to the theory that lay Buddhism established Mahāyāna Buddhism. Jonathan Silk provides arguments critical of this stance in “The Victorian Creation of Buddhism” (review article), *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 22 (1994): 171–196.

⁶ See Gregory Schopen, “Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit,” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10 (1985): 9–47; Yamaguchi Zuihō 山口瑞鳳, “Sanrinshōjō no fuse: Daijō bukkyō no mokuteki wa gedatsu de wa nai” 三輪清浄の布施—大乘仏教の目的は解脱でない [What should be realized by the Mahāyāna Buddhist], *Naritasan Bukkyō Kenkyūsho Kiyō* {*Journal of Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies*} 成田山仏教研究所紀要 15 (1992): 577–608; Hakamaya Noriaki 袴谷憲昭, “Hokeyō to hongaku shisō” (法華経と本覚思想 [The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* and the Original Enlightenment Theory], *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu Ronshū* {*Journal of Buddhist Stu-*

dhism. At one such meeting some years ago, I presented a summary of my research regarding the contradictions in the Hirakawa theory, out of which this paper grew. Needless to say, a detailed treatment of Hirakawa's voluminous study would require further consideration, and at this point I am not fully prepared for the challenge. However, I do believe that the present study will contribute to clarifying the major strands of a critical approach to the Hirakawa theory. As a preliminary examination of Hirakawa's *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism*, this paper introduces the main points of the Hirakawa theory, followed by counterarguments to each point. It is hoped that these arguments will suggest to scholars new directions that ongoing research can take regarding the origins of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

II

Hirakawa's *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism*, first published in 1968, was later revised and republished in two volumes (III and IV) of his *Collected Works* in 1989 and 1990.⁷ For this paper, I have used the newer version, since it represents Hirakawa's latest views. *A Study of*

dies, Department of Buddhist Studies, Komazawa University 駒澤大学仏教学部論集 21 (1990): 111-141; "Akugō fusshoku no gishiki kanren kyōten zakkō" 悪業払拭の儀式関連経典雑考 [Sūtras concerned with Rites for Extinguishing Evil]: Part 1: *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu Kenkyū Kiyō/Journal of the Faculty of Buddhism, Komazawa University* 駒澤大学仏教学部研究紀要 50 (1992): 274 (1)-247 (28); part 2: *Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 23 (1992): 442 (15)-423 (34); part 3: *Journal of the Faculty of Buddhism*, 51 (1993): 337 (1)-298 (40); part 4: *Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 24 (1993): 434 (37)-413 (58); part 5: *Komazawa Tankidaigaku Kenkyū Kiyō/Bulletin of Komazawa Junior College* 駒澤短期大学研究紀要 23 (1995): 95-127; part 6: *Bulletin of Komazawa Junior College*, 24 (1996): 67-91; and Shimoda Masahiro 下田正弘, *Nehangyō no kenkyū, Daijōkyōten no kenkyūhōhōshiron* 涅槃経の研究—大乘経典の研究方法試論 [A Study of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, with a Focus on the Study of Mahāyāna Sūtras] (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha 春秋社, 1997). In 1992, Hirakawa published his counterarguments against the criticisms so far presented in "Shoki daijō bukkyō ni okeru zaike to shukke" 初期大乘仏教における在家と出家 [The Meaning of the *Gṛhastha* and the *Pravrajita* or *Kumārabhāta* in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism], *Bukkyōgaku* 佛教学 31 (1991): 1-39.

⁷ See note 4. The English reader may get some idea of Hirakawa's method of presentation from "The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relationship to the Worship of Stupas," *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 22 (1963): 57-106.

Early Mahāyāna Buddhism (hereafter all references are to the new edition) I and II deal with different themes, with the major theory Hirakawa develops contained in volume II; volume I, also including many important points, serves as a prolegomenon to volume II. I will provide a summary of volume I here.

In the preface, Hirakawa offers a detailed refutation of the theory that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from the Mahāsāṃghika sect.⁸ First, Hirakawa discusses the *Ekottarikāgama* 增一阿含 that includes various Mahāyāna elements. This sūtra collection is believed to have belonged to the Mahāsāṃghika sect, and became the main reason for the widely accepted view that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from the Mahāsāṃghika. Hirakawa claims, however, that since the *Ekottarikāgama* contains doctrines similar to those of the Dharmaguptaka sect, it cannot serve as irrefutable evidence that Mahāyāna Buddhism developed from the Mahāsāṃghika. Hirakawa then goes on to discuss such texts as the *Fenbie gongde-lun* 分別功德論 and the *Buzhiyi lunshu* 部執異論疏 that have traditionally been regarded as evidence that the Mahāsāṃghika was the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism, only to conclude that they too do not support the extant theory. Finally, Hirakawa supplements the revised 1989 edition of his work with a study of Mahāsāṃghika Sanskrit materials.⁹ In *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism*, then, Hirakawa denies the traditional theory of the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism that he had followed in an earlier phase of his work. His new stance is understandable in light of the structure of the Hirakawa theory: since the major point of the Hirakawa theory is to prove that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from lay Buddhists, Hirakawa was compelled to deny the traditional theory that sees the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism in the Mahāsāṃghika sect.

⁸ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* I, pp. 25–73.

⁹ See Sanghasena Singh, *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā* (Patna: 1968). Hirakawa mentions Derrett's English translation of this text in *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* I, p. 71, n. 101: John Duncan Martin Derrett, *A Textbook for Novices: Jayaraṣita's "Perspicuous Commentary on the Compendium of Conduct by Śrīghana"*. Pubblicazioni di Indologica Taurinensia 15 (Torino: Indologica Taurinensia, 1983). There is also a translation by the editor, Singh, who published the text in 1975 and republished it in 1983, with further research results and an English translation: *A Study of the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha-ṭīkā* (New Delhi: 1975), and (Patna: 1983).

In the present paper, I will take a critical look at the Hirakawa theory in order to suggest the possibility that sectarian communities were deeply involved in the establishment of Mahāyāna Buddhism. However, I must emphasize that it is not my intention to refute the opinions Hirakawa presents in part I of his work. Hirakawa developed his theory primarily by denying the then current traditional view, and subsequently by trying to prove that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged out of lay Buddhism. However, to prove that the origins of Mahāyāna Buddhism are found among lay Buddhists and to deny that the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism lies in the Mahāsāṃghika sect are two entirely different issues. Future research may still prove that the Mahāsāṃghika sect was the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism, or it may also prove that a totally different sect served as its origin. It may even be possible that Mahāyāna Buddhism developed from various sects. This is unrelated to the issue of the relationship between Mahāyāna Buddhism and the laity.

In the first chapter of part I, Hirakawa provides arguments regarding “the time of the establishment of the Mahāyāna sūtras.”¹⁰ Needless to say, in order to clarify when Mahāyāna Buddhism was established, we must determine the dates of compilation of the various extant Mahāyāna sūtras and conduct intensive research on the oldest ones. However, since it is virtually impossible to determine the dates of compilation of Indian Buddhist sūtras with any accuracy, we must rely on the Chinese translations, using them as clues to determine the order of compilation. What is more important is the fact that the period in which Mahāyāna Buddhism was established and developed coincides with the time frame when Indian Buddhist texts were being translated into Chinese. If Mahāyāna Buddhism was established during the Christian Era as Hirakawa claims, although the Chinese translation work had not yet been initiated in its earliest phases, the developmental era of Mahāyāna Buddhism would still coincide well with the immediately following period during which many Chinese translations were being made. Therefore, it is quite natural to assume that the background conditions for the Chinese acceptance and translation of Mahāyāna sūtras and the development of Mahāyāna Buddhism itself were somehow related. Hirakawa was aware of this possibility and provides detailed

¹⁰ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* 1, pp. 75-234.

studies on the history of the sūtras and on the early Chinese translators in the first chapter of his work. Hirakawa says, "It is almost impossible to investigate the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism by studying only the evidence of inscriptions."¹¹ I agree fully with Hirakawa that thorough research on the Chinese translations is indispensable in order to clarify the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

In chapters two through four, Hirakawa provides detailed discussions regarding the bodhisattva, the most important concept in all of Mahāyāna Buddhism.¹² He discusses the process of philosophical development of the concept of the bodhisattva as well as the bodhisattva's training process. These discussions are not directly related to his theory that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from lay Buddhism, which he discusses in volume II of his work. However, we must pay attention to the lay characteristics of the *kulaputra* and *kuladuhitṛ* (善男子 and 善女人, respectively), or "good sons and daughters," that he points out in these discussions.¹³ Many of the Mahāyāna sūtras were written for *kulaputra* and *kuladuhitṛ*, who are virtually ignored in the Nikāya-Āgama materials. That is, *kulaputra* and *kuladuhitṛ* are terms that came to be used with especially high frequency in Mahāyāna Buddhism. There were many female Mahāyāna devotees, but since the term *bodhisattva* was exclusively male, Hirakawa claims that the terms *kulaputra* and *kuladuhitṛ* came to be separately used in order to include female devotees. And since this term refers to lay Buddhists in the Nikāya-Āgama materials, this fact provides supportive evidence that the Mahāyāna community originally had a lay character.¹⁴ However, even if the terms *kulaputra* and *kuladuhitṛ* refer to lay Buddhists, this is not sufficient evidence to determine that the Mahāyāna community was a lay one, as Hirakawa has stated. The major characteristic of Mahāyāna Buddhism

¹¹ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* 1, p. 157. In the article mentioned in note 6, Schopen presents some innovative ideas by taking a totally new approach to already known inscriptions. This work is quite momentous in that it placed considerably more value on the existence of inscriptions than had hitherto been the case. However, I am still convinced that written texts, especially those that are contemporary with the formation of Mahāyāna Buddhism, are, as Hirakawa claims, indispensable and most important for determining the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

¹² *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* 1, pp. 235–564.

¹³ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* 1, pp. 356–375.

¹⁴ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* 1, p. 371.

is that even lay Buddhists can accumulate training to achieve Enlightenment as bodhisattvas, which is the point that distinguishes the Mahāyāna from early Buddhism in which the way to Enlightenment is open only to ordained Buddhists. Therefore, it is likely that in its formative period Mahāyāna Buddhism flourished by appealing to lay Buddhists with this new idea, integrating those who became aware that they too could also achieve Enlightenment. If we assume that many of the Mahāyāna sūtras were compiled as just such a means to attract lay Buddhists, it would seem natural for the terms *kulaputra* and *kuladuhitṛ* to be used frequently, but it does not prove that the Mahāyāna community was a lay group. It is quite possible to assume that the Mahāyāna movement developed among a core of the ordained who propagated the concept that the way to salvation is open also to lay Buddhists, and so we cannot claim that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from the laity only by focusing on the lay character of the *kulaputra* and *kuladuhitṛ*. In order to claim that the Mahāyāna community possessed a lay character, one would need to locate a statement that declares something such as, "the ordained, bhikṣu and bhikṣuṇī, cannot achieve true Enlightenment." In volume II, Hirakawa presents a number of examples of what he claims are such statements, but below I will clarify why these examples are inadmissible as determining evidence for his theory.

III

As A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism II is fully devoted to a discussion of the Hirakawa theory, in order to probe that theory we need to focus on this volume. There we learn that the Hirakawa theory consists of four major points:

1. Mahāyāna bodhisattvas adopt the *daśakuśalakarmapatha* (十善業道) as their commandments instead of the *prātimokṣa* of the Vinaya.
2. Many of the Mahāyāna sūtras criticize bhikṣus.
3. *Stūpas* are considered the personal property of the Buddha and not of the Buddhist communities. However, Mahāyāna Buddhists lived in *stūpas*.
4. Since those who adhered to different doctrines could not live

together, it is impossible to assume that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from sectarian Buddhist communities.

In view of the above points, Hirakawa claims that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from groups of lay people who lived in the *stūpas*.

Of the four points presented above, it is convenient to treat points one and two together, and so I will first introduce Hirakawa's discussion on these points and then present my comments about them. I will discuss points three and four separately.¹⁵

HIRAKAWA'S POINT ONE

In China and Japan, it is thought that bodhisattvas who trained themselves as Mahāyāna Buddhists had to receive ordination and become bhikṣus like *śrāvakas*. This is based on the *Yogācārabhūmi* (瑜伽師地論) and the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* (大智度論), but these texts were compiled much later than the emergence of Mahāyāna Buddhism and therefore they cannot be used as valid materials to judge the conditions of the early Mahāyāna. According to the *Prajñāpāramitā sūtras*, representative texts of early Mahāyāna Buddhism, the precepts the bodhisattvas were to observe were the *daśakuśalakarmapatha* and not the *prātimokṣa*. In early Buddhism, the *daśakuśalakarmapatha* were not treated as precepts, but were considered virtues which create good karma. In Mahāyāna Buddhism, however, they were newly adopted as precepts for bodhisattvas.

In view of the above discussion, we may assume that bodhisattvas were lay people and not ordained bhikṣus belonging to sectarian communities. But with the passage of time they developed a close relationship with the sectarian communities, and there appeared ordained bodhisattvas who observed the *prātimokṣa* rules in the same way as sectarian bhikṣus. They formed bodhisattva

¹⁵ Hirakawa's arguments in *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism II* are interrelated, and therefore I cannot clearly differentiate the sections regarding points 1 to 4. Therefore, what I provide here are general distinctions. For this reason, reviewing my argument only by referring to these sections may result in misleading conclusions. For a thorough review of my argument, Hirakawa's whole work must be read with points 1 to 4 in mind, but the main spots are as follows: Point 1: pp. 3–78; Point 2: pp. 22, 23, 44, 35, 63, 124, 128, 137, 229, 349, 484; Point 3: pp. 189–316; Point 4: pp. 332–356.

groups (*gaṇa*), independent from the sectarian Buddhist communities. The existence of such ordained bodhisattvas already appears in the *Prajñāpāramitā sūtras*. The *Yogācārabhūmi* and the *Mahā-prajñāpāramitopadeśa* reflect such conditions.

HIRAKAWA'S POINT TWO

Since many of the early Mahāyāna sūtras severely criticize the sectarian bhikṣus as inferior to the Mahāyāna bodhisattvas, it is impossible to think that the Mahāyāna bodhisattvas were also sectarian bhikṣus. Therefore, the only rational conclusion is that the Mahāyāna bodhisattvas who played the major role in the early Mahāyāna movement were lay people.

As Hirakawa points out, the bodhisattvas observed the Ten Good Precepts (*daśakuśalakarmapatha*) as their precepts. Although Hirakawa is aware that a considerable number of Mahāyāna sūtras also adopt the *prātimokṣa* as the bodhisattvas' precepts, we cannot deny that the Ten Good Precepts were considered to be the most important precepts for the bodhisattvas, as Hirakawa claims. Therefore, the sūtras that adopt the *prātimokṣa* cannot be used to refute the Hirakawa theory, nor can texts such as the *Yogācārabhūmi* or the *Mahā-prajñāpāramitopadeśa*, which were written after Mahāyāna Buddhism developed to a certain degree, offer convincing evidence. This is because, according to Hirakawa, Mahāyāna Buddhism, which first emerged as a lay movement, began to imitate the renunciant life of the sectarian communities and gradually merged with them, and therefore, although later Mahāyāna materials point to characteristics of renunciant Buddhism, he deals with these materials as reflecting conditions of Mahāyāna Buddhism after it had adopted sectarian elements. At present, as we have no piece of evidence by which to definitely claim that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from ordained Buddhists, we must first examine whether the Hirakawa theory itself contains any internal contradictions in its logic of suggesting that the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism is to be found among lay Buddhists.

What led me to first raise questions about the Hirakawa theory were his arguments concerning the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* (十住毘婆沙論), a text that enumerates the daily guidelines for lay and ordained bodhisattvas to observe. Hirakawa makes the claim that the early Mahāyāna bo-

dhisattvas were lay people, and so it may seem contradictory to focus on the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* which speaks of the ordained bodhisattvas. However, as I stated earlier, Hirakawa assumes that the Mahāyāna movement arose from lay people and in due course became monasticized, forming communities of renunciant bodhisattvas independent from the communities of sectarian Buddhism. Therefore, if the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* explains these later conditions of Mahāyāna Buddhism, this presents no contradictions for the Hirakawa theory. The problem lies in another direction, for which I will quote at length the relevant section from Hirakawa's work.¹⁶

The *Zhuniēnfo sanmei* Chapter (助念佛三昧品) of the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*, after presenting the rules of conduct for lay bodhisattvas, presents 60 daily rules for ordained bodhisattvas. They begin (T. 1521 [XXVI] 87a13-b16):

Those who are ordained bodhisattvas and practice those *samādhis* should:

First, not destroy the precepts.

Second, not disgrace the upholding of the precepts.

Third, not defile the upholding of the precepts.

Fourth, purify the precepts.

Fifth, not break the precepts.

Sixth, not take the precepts.

Seventh, not rely upon the precepts.

Eighth, not achieve the precepts.

Ninth, not retreat from the precepts.

Tenth, observe the precepts praised by the holy.

Eleventh, observe the precepts praised by the wise.

Twelfth, follow the precepts of the *prātimokṣa*.

Thirteenth, possess good conduct and behavior.

Fourteenth, fear even small violations.

Fifteenth, purify acts of body, speech and mind.

Sixteenth, purify livelihood.

. . . (continuing in this manner to the sixtieth: Sasaki¹⁷)

The twelfth precept for the renunciant bodhisattvas in the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* is the most characteristic one in the sense that it orders one to

¹⁶ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, pp. 59–63.

¹⁷ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 59.

observe the *prātimokṣa*. Clearly, this indicates the 250 precepts for the ① *śrāvakas*. A typical statement in the early literature is: “One who lives restrained by the restraint of the *prātimokṣa*, who is possessed of good behavior and lawful resort, who sees danger in the slightest faults.”¹⁸ Therefore, precepts twelve through fourteen in the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* clearly reflect this typical statement. The **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* seems to consider that ordained bodhisattvas must receive the 250 precepts identical to those of the ② *śrāvakas*. Once the Mahāyāna specialized as a movement of renunciant bodhisattvas, not having its own rules of discipline for the ordained it could not avoid adopting rules of discipline for ③ *śrāvakas*. However, although they adopted rules of discipline, as far as their attitude in observing the precepts was concerned, Mahāyāna bodhisattvas were strongly opposed to the ④ *śrāvakayāna*. If we read the *Lüexing* Chapter (略行品) of the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*, we can see that Mahāyāna Buddhists were extremely wary of possessing the spirit of the practice of the ⑤ *śrāvakayāna*; for example (T. 1521 [XXVI] 93a8–13):

Falling into the realm of *śrāvaka* or *pratyekabuddha* is called the death of a bodhisattva, and is called the loss of everything. The bodhisattva should not be afraid even if he falls into hell. He should fear, instead, that he might fall into the realm of the two *yānas*. Even falling into hell does not cut off the path to Buddhahood forever, but falling into the realm of the two *yānas* will completely cut off the path to Buddhahood.

The same text also says (T. 1521 [XXVI] 93a16–17),

There are, again, three faults. Stay far away from them. First, abhor bodhisattvas. Second, abhor bodhisattvas’ conduct. Third, abhor the profound Mahāyāna sūtras.

From this, we learn that ⑥ the bhikṣus of sectarian orders abhorred bodhisattva Buddhism. The *Prajñāpāramitā sūtras* include several episodes in which Māra disguised as a bhikṣu approaches bodhisattvas to make them give up their devotion to Mahāyāna Buddhism. Furthermore, many of the Mahāyāna texts record that a number of bhikṣus criticized the Mahāyāna as heterodox (i.e., as not a teaching of the Buddha).¹⁹

¹⁸ I have utilized the English translation of the Pāli Vinaya by I. B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. II (London: 1940): 265.

¹⁹ To support his arguments, Hirakawa presents such materials as the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 小品般若經, *Mārakarmaparivarta* 魔事品第十一, T. 227 (VIII) 555c; *Avinivartanīyākāraliṅganimittaparivarta* 阿惟越致相品第十六, T. 227 (VIII) 564b; *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 小品般若經, 信毀品第四十一, 魔事品第四十六, 不

Although the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* adopts the *prātimokṣa*, Mahāyāna bodhisattvas observed it in their own manner and therefore, it does not mean that Mahāyāna Buddhists accepted the *śrāvakayāna* as is. That is, we should not assume that the bodhisattvas were ⑦ bhikṣus who belonged to some sectarian Buddhist communities just because they observed the *prātimokṣa*.

In the section presented above, Hirakawa uses the terms *śrāvaka*, *śrāvakayāna*, and bhikṣu several times. The terms *śrāvaka* underlined and numbered ①, ② and ③ refer to the bhikṣus following a renunciant life who lived in the traditional sectarian Buddhist communities that had existed since the time of the Buddha, that is, since before the rise of the Mahāyāna, and so we may replace them with the term “bhikṣu” without change in meaning. Hirakawa points out that the ordained bodhisattvas in the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* lived according to rules similar to those of the bhikṣus. On the other hand, the term *śrāvaka* in *śrāvakayāna*, items ④ and ⑤, is not synonymous with bhikṣu. It refers to those who train according to the *śrāvakayāna* which is often despised as inferior to the supreme bodhisattva vehicle (*bodhisattvayāna*) in Mahāyāna sūtras. Therefore, *śrāvaka* here refers to a new concept that stood in opposition to the *bodhisattvayāna* that emerged with Mahāyāna Buddhism, hence is not identical with the use of *śrāvaka* numbered ①, ② and ③. Whether the *śrāvaka* who followed the *śrāvakayāna* and the bhikṣus of traditional sectarian Buddhism were synonymous has yet to be established, and resolving this question is perhaps the most important task in determining the validity of the Hirakawa theory. If the *śrāvaka* of the *śrāvakayāna* and bhikṣu are synonymous, since many of the Mahāyāna texts criticize the *śrāvakayāna*—which would mean, since Mahāyāna Buddhism criticizes the bhikṣus ordained in the sectarian communities—we must then assume

退品第五十五, etc. However, although these works mention episodes of Māra disguised as a *śramaṇa* forcing bodhisattvas to give up their beliefs, they do not mention that Māra appears in the form of a sectarian bhikṣu. Even if he were to appear as a Buddhist bhikṣu, we do not have to think that this bhikṣu is an enemy of Mahāyāna Buddhism. If we interpret Māra’s disguise as a bhikṣu to be a means for making bodhisattvas believe in him, it follows, then, that bhikṣus are people upon whom bodhisattvas can rely. Further, these works warn of the peril of a bodhisattva turning to the *śrāvakayāna* or *pratyekabuddhayāna*; they do not state that bhikṣus are enemies of the bodhisattvas.

that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from those who were not sectarian Buddhists, that is, it must have emerged from lay Buddhists, as Hirakawa claims. However, if they are not synonymous, we would be forced to draw a totally different conclusion.

Since it is improbable that the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* are not bhikṣus, Hirakawa assumed that they are equivalent. However, just because the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* are bhikṣus, this does not necessarily mean that they are identical. Although I agree that the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* are bhikṣus (or bhikṣuṇīs) who train to become Arhats, there is no evidence that all bhikṣus are *śrāvaka* of the *śrāvakayāna*. It is possible that there were bhikṣus who were not *śrāvaka* of the *śrāvakayāna*. I present below a chart comparing Hirakawa's idea and the alternate idea of my own.



*groups of ordained Bodhisattvas
existed outside these circles

The bhikṣus in the right-hand circle include the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* and those who practiced in ways different from them. Practitioners who did not belong to the *śrāvakayāna* could only refer to those of the *bodhisattvayāna*, or Mahāyāna Buddhists; that is, those who created Mahāyāna Buddhism were not lay Buddhists who did not belong to the traditional sectarian groups, but were bhikṣus within

these monastic communities. Some bhikṣus who belonged to the sectarian groups opposed the traditional way to enlightenment and thought of a new training concept called *bodhisattvayāna*. They became the main proponents of the formation of the Mahāyāna movement. This hypothesis forms an opposite pole to the Hirakawa theory of the lay origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

I have briefly explained the outcome when we assume that the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* are not synonymous with bhikṣus. The conclusion we can draw is that if the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* and bhikṣus are synonymous, then the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism inevitably derives from the laity. On the other hand, if the two terms are not synonymous, then ordained Buddhists must have established Mahāyāna Buddhism, at least in part. However, even in the latter case, those who formed early Mahāyāna Buddhism need not be limited to ordained Buddhists. What this assumption points out is the possibility that two types of bhikṣus—those who followed the *śrāvakayāna* and those who followed the *bodhisattvayāna*—existed within the sectarian monastic communities. It says nothing concerning the situation of lay Buddhists who lived outside of the sectarian groups. As Hirakawa has repeatedly stated in his work, there is no doubt that there were bodhisattvas who lived as lay Buddhists. If such lay bodhisattvas existed since the emergence of the Mahāyāna, there must have been both ordained and lay Mahāyāna bodhisattvas. In either case, the conclusion drawn from the assumption that the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* and bhikṣus are not synonymous denies the Hirakawa theory in the sense that ordained Buddhists were involved in the emergence of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Following this logic, the focal point of the Hirakawa theory, i.e., the question of whether Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from lay or ordained Buddhists, may be replaced with the question of whether the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* and bhikṣus are identical or not. Let us return to the quotation from Hirakawa's work. In items ①, ② and ③ Hirakawa uses the term *śrāvaka* to refer to ordained Buddhists in the sectarian Buddhist communities, that is, ordained Mahāyāna bodhisattvas who observed the same 250 precepts that sectarian bhikṣus observed. However, with the term *śrāvakayāna*, numbered ④, he regards these sectarian bhikṣus as identical to the *śrāvakayāna*. When we review the use of the terms numbered ⑥ and ⑦, we can confirm that

Hirakawa considered *śrāvakayāna* and bhikṣus to be identical. Hirakawa rephrases the term *śrāvakayāna* by saying "bhikṣus of sectarian groups" or "bhikṣus who belonged to some certain sectarian groups." Here we can see a logical contradiction: In order to prove that the early Mahāyāna bodhisattvas were lay Buddhists, Hirakawa makes the assumption that bhikṣus of the sectarian groups equal *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna*. As I have explained, to regard the sectarian bhikṣus as identical to the *śrāvakayāna* means to assume that the Mahāyāna bodhisattvas were lay Buddhists. In short, Hirakawa tries to prove that the Mahāyāna bodhisattvas were lay Buddhists on the assumption that Mahāyāna bodhisattvas were lay Buddhists. Here he excludes from the outset the possibility of the coexistence of the *śrāvakayāna* and *bodhisattvayāna* within the sectarian groups.

Having pointed out a logical contradiction in Hirakawa's argument concerning the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*, needless to say I do not think I can deny the validity of the Hirakawa theory by this argument alone. What I wish to clarify is that fact that Hirakawa makes an initial assumption that the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* and bhikṣus are identical. If Hirakawa's entire subsequent theory is based on this assumption, the only conclusion that can be drawn from it is that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from lay Buddhists. Therefore, being thus entirely circular, Hirakawa's arguments are quite inadequate as a method of investigating the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Let us look a little further at the first two points of the Hirakawa theory. Hirakawa himself presents possible counterarguments against point one, and naturally he provides reasons why such counterarguments are invalid. I have some questions about these arguments as well. I will present these problems to show how they can be solved by denying the assumption of the equation between the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* and bhikṣus.

1) According to Hirakawa, if bodhisattvas are ordained members of sectarian groups, their precepts must be the *prātimokṣa*. However, since they observe the Ten Good Precepts, Hirakawa thinks that these bodhisattvas must have been lay people. However, if the bodhisattvas were originally lay Buddhists, they should have observed the precepts for lay Buddhists, the five or the eight precepts. Since the Ten Good Precepts were originally made neither for lay nor ordained Buddhists exclusively, their adoption as the precepts for Bodhisattva conduct

does not in and of itself preclude the possibility that these bodhisattvas were ordained. The argument Hirakawa uses to deny the possibility that the bodhisattvas were ordained may also be applied to deny the possibility that the bodhisattvas were lay Buddhists. The Ten Good Precepts were not treated as precepts in early Buddhism, but were adopted as such for the bodhisattva in Mahāyāna Buddhism. Thus, it seems more reasonable to think that the newly emerging Mahāyāna bodhisattva belonged to neither of the traditional categories of lay or ordained; that is to say, Mahāyāna bodhisattvas are both ordained and lay Buddhists. What I consider the most reasonable interpretation is that, from the early stages of Mahāyāna Buddhism, bodhisattvas were in groups formed of both ordained sectarian Buddhists and lay Buddhists supporting those sectarian communities. Hirakawa does not touch upon this possibility at all, because his thinking is locked into the assumption of the equation of the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* with bhikṣus. According to Hirakawa, bodhisattvas can only be ordained Buddhists or lay Buddhists, but not both.

2) According to Hirakawa, with the passage of time the originally lay Mahāyāna bodhisattvas began to have a close interrelationship with the sectarian communities, and gradually there emerged ordained bodhisattvas who would live a monastic life, observing the *prātimokṣa* as did the bhikṣus of the sectarian communities. The *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras* already mention the existence of such ordained bodhisattvas.²⁰ If we accept the Hirakawa theory, all the materials that mention the existence of ordained bodhisattvas refer to the conditions of Mahāyāna Buddhism after it went through the initial change, and thus are not valid as materials to study early Mahāyāna Buddhism. However, Hirakawa does not present any texts that indicate the changes he assumes took place in the bodhisattva communities. He claims that the lay Buddhists created early Mahāyāna Buddhism, and only the later Mahāyāna texts mention the existence of ordained bodhisattvas. In order to solve this contradiction, Hirakawa comes up with the idea that it was the Mahāyāna bodhisattvas who underwent an internal change, not the texts. Hirakawa's logic holds up to a certain point, but if we argue, as I stated earlier, that both ordained and lay bodhisattvas could

²⁰ *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 大品般若經, T. 223 (VIII), 序品第一 218b; 發趣品第二十 256c; 放光般若經治地品第二十一, T. 221 (VIII) 27a.

have coexisted in early Mahāyāna Buddhism, then Hirakawa's logic fails. In this case, the Mahāyāna bodhisattvas would not have had to undergo any changes, and the coexistence of both ordained and lay bodhisattvas as mentioned in such texts as the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* could have continued from the early stages of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

3) In addition to the Ten Good Precepts, some Mahāyāna texts mention that ordained bodhisattvas should observe the *prātimokṣa* and the unordained the five and eight precepts. Needless to say, there is no doubt that the Ten Good Precepts were considered to be the most important precepts for the bodhisattva. Why, then, are other precepts mentioned? The mention of the *prātimokṣa* in these texts presents a stumbling block to the Hirakawa theory, and while Hirakawa cites quite a few texts that mention the *prātimokṣa*, he denies their validity by claiming that they were compiled after Mahāyāna bodhisattvas began to imitate the life of the ordained bhikṣus of the sectarian orders by becoming ordained themselves. However, Hirakawa also recognizes that some of these texts belong to the early Mahāyāna period.²¹ This leads him to speculate that these works were compiled by the ordained bodhisattvas who were originally sectarian Buddhists but had changed their belief to Mahāyāna. However, this conclusion is not one that goes down so easily. On the other hand, if we deny the assumption of the equation of the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* with the bhikṣus, this problem can be solved quite readily. If both the ordained and lay Buddhists formed early Mahāyāna Buddhism, the Ten Good Precepts could have been adopted as the new precepts applicable to both. In that case, it is only natural that the Ten Good Precepts frequently appear as the "precepts for the bodhisattvas" in Mahāyāna texts. At the same time, unordained bodhisattvas observed the five or the eight precepts for lay Buddhists while the ordained bodhisattvas observed the rules of the *prātimokṣa*. Therefore, there is no contradiction in the fact that the Mahāyāna texts distinguish the five and the ten precepts from the *prātimokṣa* in order to explain the precepts for the bodhisattvas in detail. Thus, if we assume that the Ten Good Precepts were observed in order to unify both the ordained and the unordained while other precepts

²¹ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 34: *Upāyakaṣālyajñānottarabodhisattvapariṣeṣa* 慧上菩薩問大善權經, T. 345 (XII) 157a; 大法積經, 大乘方便會, T. 310 (38) (XI) 595c; 大方廣善功方便經, T. 346 (XII) 167b.

were distinguished for the ordained and the unordained, it would seem altogether rational that many of the Mahāyāna texts mention the *prāti-mokṣa*.

Let us look at Hirakawa's point two now. Here, Hirakawa's idea of the equivalence of the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* with bhikṣus is opposed to the possibility that I have proposed. It is an undeniable fact that many Mahāyāna texts criticize the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna*. Therefore, if the *śrāvakas* mentioned in these texts were bhikṣus, the Hirakawa theory would be valid. However, all the materials Hirakawa presents to support his second point criticize the *śrāvakas*, not the bhikṣus. Nonetheless, Hirakawa regards these materials as criticisms against bhikṣus. His misinterpretation stems from the presumption of the equivalence of the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* with bhikṣus. There is only one source among those cited by Hirakawa that would seem to criticize bhikṣus. I will quote the relevant passage from the earliest Chinese translation of the **Kāśyapaparivarta* (遺日摩尼寶經), itself an early Mahāyāna text.²²

佛語迦葉。有四事。不持戒像類持戒人。何等爲四。一者若有比丘禁戒所說不犯缺也。雖有是有著呼有人。二者若比丘悉知律經著行是我所行。三者若有比丘著我是我所。四者常行等心。等心於人著怖畏於死生。是爲沙門不持戒名持戒。

Here four examples enumerate "those who do not observe the precepts but resemble those who do." Hirakawa interprets this section as follows:

The first is the bhikṣus who observe the precepts, possess good conduct and are pure. Since they admit the existence of Ātman, they are at fault. Second is those who are thoroughly familiar with the precepts and observe the vinaya, but hold to the view of the substantial existence of the body. The third is those who have compassion for all sentient beings but are astonished to hear that no Dharma exists. The fourth is those who observe the twelve *dhūtaguṇas* perfectly but are attached to the belief that Ātman exists. Those

²² *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 44. See also 遺日摩尼寶經, T. 350 (XII) 193a17-23. See also Alexander von Staël-Holstein, *The Kāśyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class: Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese* (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1926): §134.

are the people who do not observe the precepts but resemble those who do.

The Chinese translation is difficult to read, and Hirakawa's interpretation is not a straightforward one. The problem lies with the first of the four cases. According to Hirakawa, "the bhikṣus who observe the precepts, possess good conduct and are pure" are "at fault since they admit the existence of Ātman," and therefore, it seems as though Hirakawa considers this text to criticize the bhikṣus. However, what the original means is that even though one may be a splendid bhikṣu observing the precepts, if he is attached to Ātman then he is not a true upholder of the precepts. This interpretation applies to the second through fourth cases as well. In *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism*, this is the only example from a Mahāyāna sūtra that can be interpreted as a criticism of bhikṣus, but as I think is plain, it is clearly not such a criticism. Therefore, none of the Mahāyāna texts Hirakawa presents criticize the bhikṣus of sectarian Buddhism. However, I am aware that arguing only about the materials presented by Hirakawa himself is not an appropriate approach to the issue. On the other hand, the fact that Hirakawa presents many texts that criticize the *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna*, but is not able to mention even one text that criticizes the bhikṣus, indicates the possibility that the ordained bodhisattvas were bhikṣus of the sectarian communities, as I suggested when discussing point one.

IV

Having concluded my examination of points one and two, I would like to proceed to point three.

HIRAKAWA'S POINT THREE

Stūpa worship has played an important role since the early stage of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Many Mahāyāna texts mention that the bodhisattvas dwelt in *stūpas* and worshipped them. There is no doubt that *stūpa* worship was central to the Mahāyāna movement. *Stūpas* were considered the personal property of the Buddha or even to be the Buddha himself, and were not the personal property

of the Buddhist orders. Therefore, the bhikṣus of the sectarian communities could not have lived in the *stūpas*. The Vinaya texts, except for that written in Pāli, contain various records regarding the *stūpas*, prohibiting bhikṣus to sleep or eat there. These materials allow us to confirm that bhikṣus of the sectarian orders did not live in *stūpas*. On the other hand, texts like the *Jingxing* (Pure Practice) Chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra* (華嚴經淨行品), the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* (郁迦長者經), or the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* mention that bodhisattvas lived in *stūpas*. Since they lived in *stūpas*, they could not have been sectarian bhikṣus. They were lay people who dwelt in and took care of *stūpas*. For this reason, we may assume that Mahāyāna Buddhism was formed by lay people who dwelt in *stūpas*. The reason why many of the Vinaya texts include records regarding *stūpa* worship is that the Hīnayāna groups adopted the *stūpa* worshipping practices that were thriving in Mahāyāna Buddhism. The only difficulty for this theory is the fact that no word referring to the bodhisattva communities is found in any inscription about *stūpas*. This is probably because Mahāyāna Buddhists of the time did not form organized communities.

As Hirakawa points out, there is no doubt that the Mahāyāna Buddhists worshipped *stūpas*. Since there are virtually no records regarding *stūpa* worship in the Pāli Tipiṭaka, it is plausible to suppose that *stūpa* worship was limited to Mahāyāna Buddhism.²³ However, this alone cannot be cited as incontrovertible evidence that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from outside sectarian Buddhism. By reading some of the Mahāyāna texts that Hirakawa provides, we can confirm that ordained bodhisattvas lived around *stūpas*, where lay bodhisattvas would visit and worship. If Hirakawa's first two points were correct, ordained bodhisattvas must have lived in places away from the sectarian communities, since they were not sectarian bhikṣus, and we must allow for the possibility, envisioned by Hirakawa, that some religious orders worshipped *stūpas*. However, as mentioned above, the validity of points

²³ Schopen claims that the Pāli Vinaya originally included rules regarding *stūpas*, which were later dropped from the texts. However, O. von Hinüber subsequently denied this theory. Gregory Schopen, "The Stūpa Cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya," *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 13 (1989): 83-100; O. von Hinüber, "Khandhakavatta: Loss of Text in the Pāli Vinaya-piṭaka?" *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 15 (1990): 127-138.

one and two is in doubt. On the other hand, there would be no problem in applying my hypothesis that Mahāyāna Buddhism arose among sectarian bhikṣus and lay believers who supported them. *Stūpas* would naturally also have been built in places away from the site of sectarian communities, but it is apparent from Vinayas of the Northern tradition that *stūpas* were, in some cases, built inside the monastic communities. These Vinayas also mention that the sectarian bhikṣus actively worshipped *stūpas*. Hirakawa claims that the Vinaya records regarding *stūpa* worship were added later when the sectarian communities adopted the practice that was thriving outside their communities. Since these records do not appear in the Pāli Vinaya, it is fairly certain that these references were added at a later time, but this fact does not necessarily mean that the movement of *stūpa* worship emerged from outside the sectarian communities. *Stūpa* worship may have emerged from within the sectarian communities, which resulted in the addition of such references to the Vinaya texts. That is, it is my assumption that the records regarding *stūpa* worship in the Vinayas are not the influence of a Mahāyāna movement which arose outside the sectarian communities, but rather they are evidence that the sectarian communities themselves gave birth to the movement of *stūpa* worship. Through *stūpa* worship, the ordained bodhisattvas who belonged to the sectarian communities contributed to the flourishing of Mahāyāna Buddhism in collaboration with the lay bodhisattvas who supported them. The Mahāyāna texts that Hirakawa presents include records of lay bodhisattvas visiting places where ordained bodhisattvas lived in order to worship *stūpas*, train themselves, as well as undertake the precepts of ordination there. In my opinion, however, the places where the lay bodhisattvas visited were the sectarian communities, not some place established away from such communities. I would therefore contend that the sectarian bhikṣus played a central role in *stūpa* worship, one of the main characteristics of Mahāyāna Buddhism. The texts Hirakawa presents mention that bhikṣus such as **Bahuśruta* (多聞), **Dharmabhāṣaka* (說法), **Vinayadhara* (持律), **Āgamadhara* (持阿含), and **Bodhisattvapiṭakadhara* (持菩薩藏) lived where the ordained bodhisattvas were.²⁴ From these terms, Hirakawa suggests the possibility not that Mahāyāna bodhisattvas but rather that *śrāvakayāna* followers lived in these places.

²⁴ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 123.

However, he finds it difficult to understand why lay bodhisattvas would go out of their way to visit the residences of *śrāvakayāna* bhikṣus to pay their respects, and so denies such a possibility. His conclusion is reasonable if all who lived in these places were *śrāvakayāna* bhikṣus.²⁵ However, if ordained bodhisattvas arose from a group of originally sectarian bhikṣus, it is only natural for *śrāvakas* and bodhisattvas to live together in the same sectarian communities, hence there is no contradiction if bhikṣus of the *śrāvakayāna* were to live in places where lay bodhisattvas would visit to pay their respects to ordained bodhisattvas. Hirakawa probably did not entertain such a possibility because from the outset he distinguished the bhikṣus of the *śrāvakayāna* from the communities of ordained bodhisattvas under the influence of his preconceived notion that *śrāvakas* of the *śrāvakayāna* and bhikṣus are synonymous. Following my logic, however, it becomes clear that the references regarding *stūpa* worship that appear in the Mahāyāna texts which Hirakawa presents cannot effectively support the Hirakawa theory that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from the laity. The only evidence that supports point three is the fact that the place where bodhisattvas lived were called *stūpas* according to the Pure Practice Chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra*, the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*, and the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*.

There are five versions of the Pure Practice Chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra*:²⁶

- a) Zhi Qian's 支謙 *Pusa benye-jing* 菩薩本業經, T. 281 (A.D. 222–253).
- b) Zhe Daozhen's 聶道真 *Zhupusa qiufu benye-jing* 諸菩薩求佛本業經, T. 282 (A.D. 280–313).
- c) Buddhahadra's 佛陀跋陀羅 sixty *juan Huayan-jing* 六十卷本華嚴經, T. 278, seventh chapter (A.D. 418–421).
- d) Śikṣānanda's 實叉難陀 eighty *juan Huayan-jing* 八十卷本華嚴經,

²⁵ Here, Hirakawa confirms that ordained bodhisattvas were also called bhikṣus. However, his definition of these bhikṣus is not bhikṣus properly ordained by receiving the precepts in a sectarian community, but rather those who were ordained in the communities that the Mahāyāna bodhisattvas formed to separate themselves from the sectarian communities. Although they were not bhikṣus ordained in the sectarian communities, they called themselves bhikṣus using the traditional term of the sectarian communities. Therefore, his presumption of the equation of the *śrāvaka* of the *śrāvakayāna* with bhikṣus is still maintained.

²⁶ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, pp. 80–81.

Pure Practice chapter (11) 淨行品, *T.* 279 (A.D. 695–699).

e) Tibetan translation (ninth century)

These texts describe the rituals to be performed when a lay bodhisattva becomes ordained. As a part of such rituals, the place where a lay bodhisattva would visit to be ordained, that is, the place where ordained bodhisattvas lived, is mentioned. The original term for this place is the question we must deal with. I will quote Hirakawa's translation regarding these places.²⁷

- a) Make a wish when entering the 宗廟 of the Buddha (*T.* 281 [IX] 447c11).
- b) . . . 佛寺 . . . (*T.* 282 [IX] 451c13)
- c) . . . 僧坊 . . . (*T.* 278 [IX] 430c18)
- d) . . . 僧伽藍 . . . (*T.* 279 [X] 70a20)
- e) . . . *dge 'dun gyi ra ba* . . . (**saṃghārāma*) (Peking Tripiṭaka vol. 25, p. 94 = 229b3–5)

By looking at c), d), and e), we can make a general assumption that the original term for these items was *saṃghārāma*, and therefore the places where the ordained bodhisattvas lived were “monasteries” in a general sense. In that case, they could either have been places where the sectarian communities lived or places where the ordained bodhisattvas lived, if they called their residences *saṃghārāma* as sectarian Buddhists did. In the face of these two possibilities, it is impossible to determine whether Mahāyāna Buddhism developed away from the sectarian communities, as Hirakawa would have us believe. Hirakawa suggests that terms a) through e) are presented in chronological order, and that the original term behind a) and b) is *stūpa* and not *saṃghārāma*, while the term changed to *saṃghārāma* for c), d), and e). In his view, the ordained bodhisattvas of early Mahāyāna Buddhism lived in *stūpas*. However, as mentioned earlier, *stūpas* were not the personal property of the Buddhist communities but were the property of the Buddha and therefore, sectarian bhikṣus could not have lived there. If ordained bodhisattvas lived in *stūpas*, they could not have been members of the sectarian communities. In that case, they must have been independent and did not belong to any Buddhist communities, and thus we can conclude that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from the laity. The same theory can

²⁷ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, pp. 89–91.

be applied to the references in the *Ugradattapariṣcchā*. The following are the materials Hirakawa presents regarding this sūtra.²⁸

- a-1) An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fotiao (Buddhadeva)'s 嚴佛調 *Fajing-jing* 法鏡經, *T.* 322 (A.D. 168–189).
- b-1) Dharmarakṣa's 竺法護 *Yuqieluo yuewen pusaxing-jing* 郁伽羅越問菩薩行經, *T.* 323, (A.D. 265–312).
- c-1) Kang Sengkai's 康僧鎧 *Yuqie zhangzhe-hui* 郁伽長者會, the nineteenth sūtra of the *Mahā-ratnakūṭa*, *T.* 310 (19).²⁹
- d-1) A quotation in the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*, *T.* 1521, translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 in the early fifth century.
- e-1) The Tibetan translation (ninth century).

The *Ugradattapariṣcchā* includes descriptions of lay bodhisattvas visiting ordained bodhisattvas and worshipping *stūpas*. Hirakawa provides these references in chronological order.³⁰

- a-1) Those who enter the 廟 shall reside outside the hall, bow to the ground with the entire body, and enter the hall. (*T.* 322 [XII] 19a15).
- b-1) When the lay bodhisattvas enter the 佛寺精舍, they shall reside outside the gates, perform the rituals wholeheartedly, and enter the monasteries. (*T.* 323 [XII] 27a5).

c-1) and d-1) include descriptions of worshipping *stūpas* and giving rise to the three thoughts.

- c-1- i) If a lay bodhisattva enters a 僧坊 and resides at the gate, he shall pay respect with his whole body and enter. (*T.* 310 [XI] 476a18–19).
- c-1-ii) He would enter 僧坊, worship the *stūpa* of the Tathāgata, and give rise to the three thoughts. (*T.* 310 [XI] 476c25).
- d-1- i) If a lay bodhisattva enters a 佛寺, when he first wishes to enter the 寺 he shall throw his entire body onto the ground. (*T.* 1521 [XXVI] 61c3–4).
- d-1-ii) When he enters the 塔寺 and pays respect to the Buddha, he

²⁸ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, pp. 82–84, 121–122.

²⁹ According to Hirakawa, it is likely that this was translated not by Kang Sengkai but by Dharmamitra 曇摩蜜多 (who came to China in 424 A.D.).

³⁰ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 121.

shall give rise to the three thoughts. (T. 1521 [XXVI] 62c22-23).

- e-1) *byang chub sems dpa' khyim de gtsug lag khang du 'jug par 'dod na* (when a lay bodhisattva wants to enter a *vihāra*). (Peking Tripiṭaka vol. 23, p. 265 = 313b2).

By looking at these materials, we learn that the terms 廟, 佛寺精舍, 僧坊 and 佛寺 correspond to *vihāra*. Thus, a rational assumption is that the original term was *vihāra*. However, Hirakawa claims that the original term was *stūpa* and not *vihāra*. As before, he makes such a claim to support his theory that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from the laity.

Needless to say, "Mahāyāna Buddhism continued to expand and change with the course of time," as Hirakawa states.³¹ However, if there was a change of appellation for the dwelling place of bodhisattvas from *stūpa* to *saṃghārāma* or *vihāra*, it did not result from a simple transition of philosophy or general concept. Rather, it would indicate that the actual living conditions of the bodhisattvas went through a drastic change, and therefore, in order to support his theory, Hirakawa would need to provide much stronger evidence. I would like to examine Hirakawa's argument regarding this point in detail.

Hirakawa does not make any argument that is directly relevant to the materials of the Pure Practice chapter in the *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra*. Regarding the Chinese translation of Zhi Qian, a), which is the oldest translation of this sūtra, Hirakawa comments:

In China, the term 廟 refers to the ancestral hall where people worshipped the wooden tablets of their ancestors. . . . [Therefore], the original word must have indicated an object of worship. . . . The corresponding Sanskrit term should either be *stūpa* or *caitya*. Although it could have been *caitya*, for the following reasons, I believe that the term was *stūpa*.³²

However, Hirakawa nowhere clarifies what he means by the "following reasons," and therefore, we cannot agree that the original term of "ancestral hall" was *stūpa*. Furthermore, Zhi Qian's Chinese translation itself contains a strong counterargument to the Hirakawa theory:

³¹ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 122.

³² *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 190.

a description of a scene in which a bodhisattva visits *stūpas* and worships them, with the term *stūpa* correctly rendered as 塔 in Chinese.³³ Since this scene undoubtedly describes *stūpa* worship, the original term for 塔 must have been *stūpa*. It is thus unnatural to ignore this fact and assume that the original term for 廟 was *stūpa*. In b), Zhe Daozhen translates this word as 佛寺, and Hirakawa seems to believe that the original term was also *stūpa*, although there is no evidence to support his assumption. Since he touches upon the original term behind 佛寺 in the discussion regarding the materials relevant to the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*, perhaps it is on this basis that he claims that the original behind 佛寺 in b) was also *stūpa*. Hirakawa points out that Zhe Daozhen assisted Dharmarakṣa who translated b-1). I assume that Hirakawa pointed out this fact with the intention of resolving the problem of the original term behind 佛寺.³⁴

I would now like to look at the materials related to the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*. Hirakawa begins his argument with an examination of the term in the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* translated by Kumārajīva presented in d-1).³⁵ Kumārajīva also translated the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* of which Sanskrit texts still exist. Hirakawa therefore examines how Kumārajīva translated certain terms by comparing them with the Sanskrit text. The term 塔寺 appears three times in Kumārajīva's translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, twice in the *Puṇya-paryāya-parivarta* (分別功德品) and once in the *Utsāha-parivarta* (勸持品). Following Hirakawa's survey, I will provide a translation of this term as it occurs in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* translations of Kumārajīva and Dharmarakṣa, as well as the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions.

① First example, from the *Puṇya-paryāya-parivarta*

Kumārajīva	塔寺	僧坊 (T. 262 [IX] 45b26)
Dharmarakṣa	佛塔廟	精舍講堂 (T. 263 [IX] 117a11)
Sanskrit version	<i>stūpa</i>	<i>vihāra</i> (Kern-Nanjio 338.5–6)
Tibetan version	<i>mchod rten</i>	<i>gtsug lag khang</i>

② Second example, from the *Puṇya-paryāya-parivarta*

Kumārajīva	塔寺 (T. 262 [IX] 45c14)
------------	------------------------

³³ T. 281 (x) 449b14–15.

³⁴ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 190.

³⁵ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 192.

Dharmarakṣa	(no corresponding word)
Sanskrit version	<i>dhātu-stūpa</i> (339.8)
Tibetan version	<i>mchod rten</i>

③ Third example, from the <i>Utsāha-parivarta</i>	
Kumārajīva	塔寺 (T. 262 [IX] 36c23)
Dharmarakṣa	(no corresponding word)
Sanskrit version	<i>vihāra</i> (274.2)
Tibetan version	<i>gtsug lag khang</i>

By reviewing the above, we learn that the original term that Kumārajīva translated as 塔寺 was either *stūpa* or *vihāra* (① and ② support *stūpa*, while ③ supports *vihāra*). However, Hirakawa does not recognize the possibility for ③ and claims that Kumārajīva translated *stūpa* as 塔寺 in every case, presenting three pieces of evidence:³⁶ First, in ③, there is no corresponding word in Dharmarakṣa's translation and therefore, it is possible that there were different versions of the corresponding section of the sūtra. Thus, 塔寺 and *vihāra* may not have corresponded directly. However, Dharmarakṣa's translation of ② also does not have any corresponding term. Thus, Hirakawa's argument is not convincing. Second, he claims that we cannot determine that the original term behind 塔寺 was *vihāra* because ① and ③ do not refer to the same word. The difference in expression in ① and ③ is a self-evident fact and therefore we must find out why Kumārajīva translated both *stūpa* and *vihāra* as 塔寺. It is not logical to claim that the original term was *stūpa* only because the translated versions are inconsistent. Third, he claims that since Kumārajīva always translated *vihāra* as 僧坊, therefore the original term behind 塔寺 must be *stūpa* and not *vihāra*. Hirakawa presents various examples in which Kumārajīva translated *vihāra* as 僧坊. However, these examples also include cases in which *vihāra* is translated into words other than 僧坊. Thus, Hirakawa's argument here too is not convincing. (Hirakawa does not allow this possibility because he believes that such differences resulted from variations of the original term in different versions.³⁷) Therefore, we cannot determine that the original term which Kumārajīva translated as 塔寺 was always *stūpa*. It

³⁶ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, pp. 196–198.

³⁷ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 197.

is quite possible that Kumārajīva translated *vihāra* as 塔寺, as seen from example ③.

Thus, we cannot determine whether the word 塔寺 in Kumārajīva's **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* presented in d-1-ii) represents *stūpa* or *vihāra*. However, since the scene of d-1-ii) in which the word 塔寺 is used clearly refers to *stūpa* worship, we can safely assume that the original Sanskrit was *stūpa*. The critical issue is example d-1-i) that describes the scene in which a lay bodhisattva visits the residence of ordained bodhisattvas. In this case, we must make clear whether the original behind 佛寺 and 寺 was *stūpa* or *vihāra*. Even if we accept Hirakawa's argument and determine that the original behind 塔寺 was *stūpa*, unless the original behind 佛寺 and 寺 is also clarified, point 3 of the Hirakawa theory becomes invalid. That is, Hirakawa must prove that the words 廟, 佛寺精舍, 僧坊 佛寺 and *gtsug lag khang* listed in order of their chronological appearance represent a change in the original term from *stūpa* to *vihāra*. Therefore, even by presenting the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* materials, Hirakawa has not proved that the residence of ordained bodhisattvas was called *stūpa*.

The above is an outline of Hirakawa's argument concerning the Pure Practice Chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra*, the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*, and the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*. Hirakawa relies on the materials related to the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* in order to prove that the original behind Zhe Daozhen's translation of 佛寺 in b) was *stūpa*. However, since his discussion concerning the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* is not convincing, he cannot prove his point.³⁸

³⁸ **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*, 十住毘婆沙論, *juan* 16, 解頭陀品第五, *T.* 1521 (XXVI) 112a mentions the directions to be followed when an *āranyaka bhikṣu* (阿練若處比丘) visits a 塔寺. Since the 塔寺 mentioned here is a place where sick bhikṣus and bhikṣus who would take care of them, as well as many other bhikṣus, live, it is clearly a residence for bhikṣus. Therefore, if the original word behind 塔寺 is *stūpa*, it would be strong supportive evidence for the Hirakawa theory. However, when considering the words translated in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*, we cannot determine whether the original behind 塔寺 was *stūpa*, *vihāra*, or *saṃghārāma*. The Sarvāstivāda Vinaya that Kumārajīva translated with the help of Puṇyatara 弗若多羅 and others also includes a case in which the original behind 塔寺 cannot be determined. The Sarvāstivāda Vinaya (*T.* 1435 [XXIII], 279b3) contains the following account:

One man donated blended incense to the Buddhist community. . . . The Buddha ordered the bhikṣus to apply the incense to the walls of the monastery, and the bhikṣus applied it to the exterior wall. Many people came and saw the 塔寺, and

Hirakawa's argument concerning the term of the lay Buddhists' residence is quite complicated. He touches upon a similar issue in his examination of the *Pratyutpannasamādhi-sūtra* (般舟三昧經), in which the name of the place where the lay bodhisattvas observe the eight commandments (八關齋) is mentioned. According to Hirakawa, the following terms are found in this sūtra:³⁹

- 1) Lokakṣema's 支婁迦讖 *Banzhou sanmei-jing* 般舟三昧經 in 3 volumes, *T.* 418 ([XIII] 910b18): 佛寺
- 2) Wrongly attributed to Lokakṣema,⁴⁰ *Banzhou sanmei-jing* 般舟三昧經 in 1 volume, *T.* 417 ([XIII] 901b2): 佛寺
- 3) Jñānagupta's 闍那崛多 *Dafengdeng daiji-jing* *Xianhu-fen* 大方等大集經賢護分, *T.* 416 ([XIII] 884a14): 伽藍
- 4) Tibetan translation (Harrison 96.15 = 11C⁴¹): *gtsug lag khang* (*vihāra*)

seeing the outside covered in incense they took it for a 佛塔、声聞塔 (*stūpa* of the Buddha or *śrāvaka*) and many gathered there with their elephants, horses, cattle, carts, men and women, and created a great racket, preventing the bhikṣus from carrying out their seated meditation or sūtra recitation. The Buddha ordered the bhikṣus to apply the incense to the inner wall instead of the outer wall.

If the original behind 塔寺 was *stūpa*, this episode does not make any sense, because this would mean a *stūpa* built inside another *stūpa*. Therefore, the word 塔寺 in this episode designates a place where the bhikṣus lived. On the other hand, the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya (*T.* 1435 [XXIII] 411a19–20) also includes the phrase 應灑掃塔寺布薩處及中庭次第敷座 as a direction for a bhikṣu when he performs the *uposatha* ritual alone. There is another corresponding phrase (*T.* 1435 [XXIII] 160a8–9) which says 應掃塔掃布薩處掃地竟次第敷繩床. Since these phrases mean to clean the facilities within the residence in order of their importance, it is natural to think that the words 塔寺 or 塔 mean *stūpa*. If this assumption is correct, the original behind 塔寺 in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya could either be *stūpa* or a residence for members of a Buddhist order which existed outside a *stūpa* (a *vihāra* perhaps), which brings us to the same conclusion as that which was drawn from the examination of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*.

³⁹ *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, pp. 222–224.

⁴⁰ On this translation, see Paul Harrison, *The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present: An Annotated English Translation of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Sammukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra*. *Studia Philologica Buddhica*, Monograph Series V (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1990): 250–54. For the passage under discussion in the following, see p. 91, note 2.

⁴¹ Paul Maxwell Harrison, *The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Sammukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra*. *Studia Philologica Buddhica*, Monograph Series I (Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library, 1978).

Based on his discussion of the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* mentioned above, Hirakawa claims that here too the original term changed from *stūpa* to *vihāra*. However, as mentioned above, he does not successfully prove that the original term of 佛寺 was *stūpa* in his discussion of the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*. Furthermore, it is hard to believe that the word *stūpa* was changed to *vihāra* so frequently in the old sūtras.

Unless Hirakawa can prove that the bodhisattvas' residences were called *stūpa*, he cannot claim that they lived in places separate from the sectarian monastic communities. Considering the point that *śrāvaka-yāna* bhikṣus lived in such residences, and that bodhisattvas and śrāvakayānist often had close contact, as Hirakawa himself points out, it is more reasonable to think that ordained bodhisattvas and *śrāvakas* lived together.⁴² *Stūpas* may have been built inside sectarian communities, or they may have been built outside such communities. In the former case, lay Mahāyāna Buddhists must have visited the sectarian communities to worship the *stūpa* and recite the sūtras with the ordained bodhisattvas, while in the latter case, both the lay and the ordained Mahāyāna Buddhists must have gathered at the *stūpa* on fixed dates for religious activities. Even if we assume that both of these cases existed, many of the examples that Hirakawa provides regarding *stūpa* worship present no contradictions.

V

Finally, I would like to examine Hirakawa's point four.

HIRAKAWA'S POINT FOUR

Those who live in a monastic community must observe the same Vinaya and conduct all activities together. However, bhikṣus of the śrāvakayāna and Mahāyāna bodhisattvas who adhered to totally different doctrines could not have lived together. For this reason, it is impossible to think that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from the sectarian communities.

Whether those who adhered to different doctrines were able to live

⁴² *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 111.

together is the critical issue here. Point four is not based on any particular source. It is a conclusion that Hirakawa drew on the basis of a commonsense assumption. If those who adhered to different doctrines were to live together in a single community, it would cause friction and confrontations, making the smooth progress of a religious life impossible. Since the doctrines of Mahāyāna and those of the śrāvakayāna are so fundamentally different, there is no reason for their respective believers to choose to live together. For this reason, the Mahāyāna communities did not live together with the sectarian communities. Such is the logical pattern that Hirakawa follows. However, we have to be attentive to the fact that what we would like to clarify here is the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism. If from the first we assume that the Mahāyāna communities emerged independently from the sectarian communities, it may be true, as Hirakawa says, that the two separate communities would not have gone out of their way to choose to live together. However, if we consider the possibility that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from sectarian communities, then early Mahāyāna Buddhism existed within those sectarian communities. Mahāyāna Buddhists did not choose to live together with the sectarians, but that coexistence was merely the situation in which, like it or not, they found themselves. Therefore, the point we must clarify is not whether Mahāyāna and śrāvakayāna communities could have dwelt together later, but whether, before the emergence of Mahāyāna Buddhism, those who adhered to different doctrines could have lived together within sectarian communities. Hirakawa presents several Vinaya examples which prohibit those who adhered to different doctrines from living together, but my interpretations of these passages are different from those of Hirakawa. I believe these passages do not, as Hirakawa claims, prohibit those who adhered to different doctrines from living together.⁴³ Hirakawa claims that since the

⁴³ To support point four, Hirakawa refers to the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya and the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, which say, "If a bhikṣu joins a different group on the day of the *uposatha*, he will lose his status as a bhikṣu" (cf. *A Study of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* II, p. 336). This is not a correct interpretation of the phrase. What the description in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya means is: If the person who has been authorized by a bhikṣu who cannot attend the *uposatha* ritual goes to a different Buddhist community, the authorization becomes invalid. On the other hand, the phrase in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya means: If a disciple goes to a different Buddhist community, the dependent relationship between the *ācārya* and the disciple will no longer be valid (cf. T. 1428

prātimokṣa recited at the *uposatha* ritual is different depending on the sect to which it belongs, those who belonged to different sects could not perform the *uposatha* ritual together. However, the similarities among various *prātimokṣa* are more striking than the differences. The *prātimokṣas* list approximately 250 transgressions in the order of their severity, beginning with the four *pārājika*. Among them, the transgressions from *pārājika* to *pratidesāntya* that entail actual punishments are almost identical in every *prātimokṣa*. The reason why the *prātimokṣas* seem different in each Vinaya is that the daily instructions (*śaikṣadharmā*) that do not entail any actual punishments vary in each text.⁴⁴ Even Hirakawa admits that these daily instructions are not appropriately added to the *prātimokṣa*, if we judge from their style.⁴⁵ Needless to say, this does not mean that the daily instructions were not recited at the *uposatha* ritual. They were probably recited with other articles. What is important is the fact that even if articles that the bhikṣus were not familiar with were recited, it would not have affected the life in a Buddhist order. Previously I offered a discussion of the relation between monastic worship of *stūpas* and dance, in which I pointed out that careful arrangements were made when a new article was adopted so that it

[xxii] 822b7-10 and T. 1435 [xxiii] 416b29: reason number 4 for 捨依止法 is 捨此部到異部中). Hirakawa also presents a rule from the Pāli Vinaya (i.135; ii.32-33) that says, "a bhikṣu should not go to a monastery of other communities on the day of the *uposatha*." However, it is not clear what "other communities" (*nānasaṃvāsaka*) means here. Furthermore, since bhikṣus can visit other communities except for the day of the *uposatha*, we may assume that this rule permits bhikṣus to live with *nānasaṃvāsaka*. If this rule were established before the definitional change of a *saṃghabheda*, it cannot be used as a source to indicate the condition of early Mahāyāna Buddhism. Hirakawa then presents a rule from the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya (T. 1421 [xxii] 161c13-14) that says, "A karma (ecclesiastical action) is not valid when performed according to a different Dharma or Vinaya." Hirakawa seems to interpret this to mean a karma performed according to the doctrine or discipline of a different sect. However, by looking at the corresponding section in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya (T. 1428 [xxiii] 886b17, which discusses 非法非毘尼羯磨), the "different Dharma or Vinaya" here should be interpreted as that which does not correspond to the Dharma or Vinaya that the Buddha instructed. Therefore, it is not a rule established with other sects in mind.

⁴⁴ *Ritsuzō no Kenkyū* 律藏の研究 [A Study of the Vinaya Piṭaka] (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 1970): 434-435.

⁴⁵ *A Study of the Vinaya Piṭaka*, p. 472.

would not affect the existing *prātimokṣa*.⁴⁶

I have published several articles on the Buddhist sects in the Aśoka period.⁴⁷ Through these articles, I have attempted to clarify that the unification of the Buddhist communities took place during King Aśoka's reign, at which time the definition of *saṃghabheda* (schism) was changed in order to unify those who adhered to different doctrines in the name of Buddhism. The definition of *saṃghabheda* prior to this time was for "those who opposed the teachings of the Buddha to form a separate community." However, with the need to unify different communities without changing their doctrines, the definition was changed to "perform the commutative rituals such as the *uposatha* separately within a single community." With this change, as long as the commutative rituals were performed together, even those who adhered to different doctrines were able to live together in a single community. That is, performing commutative rituals such as the *uposatha* became the only qualification for ordained Buddhists. Therefore, the definitional change opened a new path for bhikṣus with the commutative qualification called *prātimokṣa* to develop various doctrines in the name of Buddhism. Hirakawa's point four becomes invalid when considering these facts. It was possible for Mahāyāna and śrāvakayāna Buddhists to live together.

In this paper, I have reviewed the four major points that support the Hirakawa theory. At this point, the validity of these points is not confirmed and therefore, there is no contradiction in thinking that both bhikṣus from within sectarian communities and the unordained bodhisattvas who supported them contributed to the development of Mahāyāna Buddhism. For this paper, I did not cite any materials other than those presented by Hirakawa himself. Therefore, I realize that some scholars may criticize this work for not being a thorough investigation of the Hirakawa theory. However, I believe that my approach

⁴⁶ Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑, "Biku to Gigaku" 比丘と伎楽 [Monastic worship of *stūpas* with music and dance in Vinaya texts], *Bukkyō Shigaku Kenkyū* 佛教史學研究 34/1: 1-24.

⁴⁷ "Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period," *Buddhist Studies* 佛教研究 18 (1989): 181-202; 21 (1992): 157-176; 22 (1993): 167-199; 23 (1994): 55-100; 24 (1995): 165-225; 25 (1996): 29-63.

SASAKI: A STUDY ON THE ORIGIN OF MAHĀYĀNA BUDDHISM

reveals the possibility that the materials Hirakawa presents to prove that Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged from the laity can also be used to support the theory that the Mahāyāna emerged from monastic Buddhism. Many scholars have already published studies criticizing the Hirakawa theory from different viewpoints. The main foci of these works vary, and therefore it is impossible to draw a single conclusion from them. Further research on the Hirakawa theory incorporating these studies is certainly a desideratum.