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

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

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

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

In all Buddhist Vinayas - Theravādin preserved in Pāli, Mūlasarvāstivādin (MSV) preserved in all three classical Buddhist languages, Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan, Mahiśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, Sarvāstivādin and Mahāsāṅghika in Chinese translations⁹ - Devadatta is found as the creator of the first, be it the only, interim schism of the saṅgha. He tries to persuade the Buddha to hand the leadership of the saṅgha over to him, but the Buddha turns him down, even insulting him,
as Étienne LAMOTTE has proposed as the climax of an older version of the episode. He then tries to split the order with temporary success in bringing 500 young bhikṣus to his side, after he had already a group of four, respectively three monks as his retainers, Koka (P. Kokā) Khaṇḍadravya, Kaṭamorakatiṣya (P. Kaṭamorakatissaka) and Samudradatta (P. Samuddadatta). It is not before the senior disciples of the Buddha, Mahāmaudgalyāyana and Śāriputra, lead the renegades back to the Buddha that this very first schism of the saṅgha comes to an end.

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

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

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

The Chinese pilgrim monks Faxian and Xuanzang give information that in the times of their travels in India there were still
groups of adherents of Devadatta. These passages in the two Chinese travelogues gave reason for eminent modern Buddhologists to assume that there existed a saṁgha of Devadatta in India from the time of the Buddha until the early fourth or even until the seventh century, the periods when the two Chinese monks travelled the regions\textsuperscript{30}. The best known among these scholars is certainly Étienne LAMOTTE in his "Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien"\textsuperscript{44}, followed by André BAREAU in his paper "Les agissements de Devadatta selon les châpitres relatifs au schisme dans les divers Vinayapiṭaka"\textsuperscript{15} and Erich FRAUWALLNER in his well-known book The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature (Roma 1956)\textsuperscript{46}. For a Japanese scholar who subscribes to the same opinion one could, for instance, refer to IWAMOTO Yutaka's "Hokke-kyō to sono ta no butten to no kankei"法華経とその他の仏典との関係（"The Lotussūtra and its relation to Buddhist literature"\textsuperscript{17}). RAY, in his already mentioned book, makes a similar statement and goes even so far as to propose a relative date for the rise of the legend of Devadatta’s schism\textsuperscript{48}: because the Mahāsāṅghika-Vinaya differs strongly from the other Vinaya-traditions, the formation of the legend must have happened after the split of the original saṅgha into Sthaviravādin and Mahāsāṅghika, which he puts into the fourth century B.C.\textsuperscript{19}

The conclusion, that there existed a community of followers of Devadatta from the Buddha’s lifetime until the travels of the Chinese pilgrims, should have given rise to doubts from the very beginning by the following facts, even without going into deeper investigations of the contexts: 1. The Vinayas despite the differences in singular points univocally state that Devadatta was not able to establish a continuous schism\textsuperscript{30}, nay, they insist that the arch-rival of the Buddha was even driven to utmost outrage and assaults by the fact that he did not succeed in doing so. For the Vinayas the problem of the first schism is thereby solved and the whole story is taken as contextual for the rules which the
Buddha establishes against the creation of such schisms. 2. There is no evidence, whatsoever, of an archaeological or inscriptive nature, nor are glimpses of such an existing group gained in the later Buddhist texts which should be expected at least in the form of polemic allusions. And still another question: why are there no traces of the group of Devadatta in the well-known writings of the other emminent pilgrim, Yijing, either in his Nanhai-jigui-neifa-zhuan "Report about the Buddhist Law, sent home from the Southern Sea", or in his Datang-xiyu-qiufa-gaoseng-zhuan "Biographies of eminent monks of the Great Tang who went to the Western Regions in search of the Law"?

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

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

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

Xuanzang describes three monasteries in Western Bengal, in Karṇasuvartana / Jieluonasufalana 羯羅拏蘇伐剌那 as belonging tot he saṅgha of Devadatta:

"Furthermore, there are three saṅghārāmas, in which they do not drink milk [which is the] teaching of Devadatta."

These two places of textual evidence are rather short to make any statements on the situation of the community of Devadatta but at least
one can see, that the adherents placed themselves in a Buddhist tradition by referring to the three Buddhas of the past but - and this should be kept in mind - not claiming the Buddhahood for Devadatta. In the 7th century then Xuanzang describes them as living in monasteries and follow a rule corresponding to one of the rules (dhūtāṅga) ascribed to Devadatta in certain Vinaya-texts which will be discussed below.

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

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

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

"What is called 'group of followers' is called so because they are followers of Devadatta; what is called 'group of non-followers', these are followers of the Buddha. When [the distribution of the donated objects] is performed according to the places [where they live], they distribute
the donations according to the living place. Is it, however, [performed] between the places [where the groups live], that is if there are not two [living] places then the two groups should be handed over equally. In these days the ascetic-descendants of Devadatta are spread all over the Western Regions. Their rules are in most points identical with those of the Buddhist teaching such as the five forms of existence (wudao 五道 / pañca gatayāḥ[^1]), saṃsāra, rebirth in heaven, salvation. The Tripiṭaka which they study is on the whole the same [as the Buddhist canon]. There are no big monasteries or common facilities; they live between village and dam [that means probably: at the border of the village], they beg for their food in the village where they live, they practice asceticism (brahmacarya / jingxing 淨行). They use gourds as alm-bowls and only two pieces of garment whose colour is similar to that of cracked mulberry bark. They do not consume fermented dairy products. A lot of them are living in the monastery of Nālandā. They listen to religious texts undiscriminately [that means probably: texts of different schools]. Once I asked one of them: 'Your rules are quite similar to those of the Great Master [i.e.: the Buddha], [but] the bad portions are similar to those of Devadatta. Are you therefore not an adherent of Devadatta? ', and he answered: 'My patriarch is really not Devadatta.' For it is a fact that he was afraid that people would despise him, would avoid him, would not be of service to him. They follow in most points the Buddhist teachings, but when they gather for meetings the eldest (sheng 净 / ārya, sthavira) fix the ranks. Everybody acts on his own and they worship separately. Are they not like the other heretics [in that they] adhere to the ephemeral [phenomena], to the [conception] of permanence? They foster wrong views and are united in void statements. When it is time to eat they sit dispersed; they do not differ between [noble] and common. They follow an obsolete tradition making it the criterion of their comprehension. [The heretics] mingle more and more like the waves of
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the [river] Jing with the [waters of the river] Wei. A noble one, [however,] has to investigate their mistakes and treat each according to his position - that is adequate to him.  

The first thing to verify the correctness of Yijing's interpretation of the term "group of followers" (suidang 隨黨) as members of the sañgha of Devadatta has to be a search for the corresponding terms in the Vinaya-terminology. After checking the episodes of the first schism caused by Devadatta one discovers that in Pāli-Vinaya the four disciples of Devadatta are called anuwattaka, that is "followers, adherents, disciples". The Skt. equivalent anuvartin is found in the Prātimokṣasūtra of the Sarvāstivādin to refer to monks who provoke a schism, and the same text of the MSV has sahāyaka. In the Prātimokṣasūtra of the Mahāsāṅghika such monks are first called sahāyaka and are qualified as anuvattaka later in the text. The Chinese Sarvāstivādin-Vinaya has tongdang 同黨, "belonging to the same group", or bandang 伴黨, "group of followers", for the four followers of Devadatta, which already corresponds fairly closely to Yijing's terminology. The key for Yijing's suidang seems to be the Vinaya of the MSV, where the four disciples of Devadatta are called sahāyakāḥ anuvartinaḥ. Yijing has probably translated a similar passage in the original of his Karmavācanā-text, sui 隨 standing for anuvartin and dang 黨 for sahāyaka in the meaning given above, creating a Chinese binom for two Indian words. Unfortunately enough the MSV-Vinaya translated by Yijing does not corroborate this terminology, because here we read the verbal expression gong bi weiban 共彼為伴, "They all together followed him [i.e.: Devadatta]". There is no correspondent terminus technicus in the Vinaya-texts for Yijing's privative fei-suidang, but this is also not to be expected because in the time when the core of the Vinayas was established there was no need to distinguish the followers of Devadatta from the Buddhist sañgha. This need arose in a later period when - as will be shown
below - a real saṅgha of Devadatta existed, the certainly relatively late Karmavācāna-text of the MSV-tradition being an appropriate example of such a development⁴³, and it seems to be such a late period that the antithetical terminology suidang 随黨 - fei-suidang 非隨黨 belongs to, fei-suidang probably being the translation of an Indian * asahāyaka. This is also supported by the fact that Yijing himself explains the slightly different terminological pair suidang 隨黨 - feidang 非黨 in his commentary to the MSV-Vinaya in the same sense as in his commentary on the Karmavācāna: "One should know the following matter: those who follow the five heretical rules, which Devadatta proclaimed, are called suidang ('group of followers'); if they rely on the Venerable they are called feidang (lit.: 'non-group' = * asahāyaka)"⁴³.

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

Comparing this information with the different sets of rules which, according to the Vinayas of the different schools, Devadatta had instituted on occasion of the first schism, it becomes clear that it corresponds greatly with those of the Vinaya of the MSV (Skt.)⁴⁰:
"... [Devadatta] taught [his] dharma to [his] hearers by means of the [following] five points: the śramaṇa Gautama, oh venerables! partakes of curdled milk: from today we should not do so; ... the śramaṇa Gautama partakes of meat: we should not do so; ... the śramaṇa Gautama partakes of salt: we should not do so; ... the śramaṇa Gautama wears garments with cut fringes: we should wear garments with long fringes; ... the śramaṇa Gautama lives in the forest: we should live in villages; ..."

The rules of Devadatta which are given in the various Vinayas differ in a striking way; in the tradition of the MSV there is even a difference between the Skt.-text and the Chinese translation. The rules shifted obviously from a more ascetic set to the strange, rather contradictory combination of rules found in the MSV-Vinaya. The dhūtāṅgas of Devadatta in the Pāli-Vinaya are: 1. to live in the forest and not in villages; 2. to live from alms and not to accept invitations; 3. to use only rags for garments and not to use clothes of laypeople; 4. to live under a tree and not to take shelter under a roof; 5. not to eat meat. There is only one common point with the set in the Vinaya of the MSV, the abstention from eating meat, which obviously was extended to three prohibitions concerning food in the MSV-tradition: curdled milk, meat and salt - the last item, salt, incidentally, almost impossible to implement in a country like India. On the other hand there is the rule about living in villages which runs contrary to what is ascribed to Devadatta's severe rules in the Pāli-text, where it is said, that his followers should live in the forest at the bottom of a tree, meaning unsheltered. The rule for garments is reduced to a pure matter of form. One may sum up the development from the Theravādin-Vinaya to the MSV-Vinaya as going from an ascetic conservatism of sticking to living in the forest without shelter, to the real bhikṣu-like way of begging for food, and furthermore vegetarian food, wearing rags, which is still a somehow idealized option for Buddhist monks in the canonical texts, to a life-style
which seems to be taken more from a realistic background. That these rules of Devadatta in the MSV-Vinaya reflect really what was practiced by his followers centuries later, when the final redaction of the MSV-Vinaya (Skt.) was made, is clear by the fact that both Xuanzang and Yijing stress the rule of not eating fermented dairy products, which may have come from the ordinary practice of the śramaṇas in those days.

At least we can make the statement that this rule must have been introduced in the Vinayas in a period before 400 C.E., because it is - together with the prohibition of salt - found in the Vinaya of the Mahiśāsaka, brought back from India by Faxian and translated into Chinese by Buddhajiva / Fotuoshi 佛陀世 and as well in the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka, translated by Buddhayaśas in 410).

The gourds which were used as alm-bowls may represent the strict will with regard to begging for alms of the Devadatta-monks in contrast to their Buddhist counterparts who also used bowls made of clay or metal. The author still feels unable to explain the difference between Yijing's report of the Devadatta-bhikṣus wearing two robes and the MSV-Vinaya proscribing robes with long fringes (dirghadaśani vastrāṇi). In the framework of the MSV-tradition it may be a reflex of the opposition of Devadatta against the Buddhist "wearing of rags" (pāṃsukūlikatva), which is, however, still in contradiction to e.g. the Theravādin-tradition.

Because all the rules of Devadatta are conservative in as much as they are kept against the Buddha's reformed rules which are presented by the Vinaya, it may well be that the two garments of which Yijing is speaking were the number which was common in the Buddhist community before the Buddha allowed the use of three. This may be the case even if the Vinayas univocally report in the aitiological story of the rule that the Buddha at that time wore only one garment increasing this to three because of the cold of the night.

The reconstruction of the history of the saṅgha of Devadatta on
the basis of the information of the three pilgrims and the legend of Devadatta in the various Vinayas would be, that there was no continuous tradition of Devadatta-followers after the parinirvāṇa of the Buddha, but that such a group had developed in the time of the Kuśāṇa-empire as a reasonable period of time for the formation of an institutionalized group which Faxian already witnessed in the beginning of the 5th century.

Why exactly such a group connected itself to the "wicked" Devadatta while keeping up a kind of Buddhist framework for its organizational form (Yijing) and doctrinal teachings (Faxian) is a question which cannot, of course, finally be answered on the basis of information available, but it is less astonishing if one considers the fact that the rules of Devadatta were not at all far from the style of living which obviously was advocated even by a certain fraction of the Buddhist saṅgha in the past and even at present in Theravāda-countries, namely the hermits in their recluse in the forests (Skt. āraṇyaka-vāsin, P. āraṇṇa-vāsin), sometimes even despising the other easy-going members of the ordinary saṅgha, while they themselves were accused by the "orthodox" members of the saṅgha of being heretics. It should be kept in mind that the Devadatta of the Buddhist tradition and legend as well as the saṅgha of Devadatta of which Faxian gives an account did not consider themselves to be heretics; they rather claimed orthopraxy (rules of Devadatta) not far from the assumed (and sometimes practiced) original Buddhist lifestyle and therefore disowned the authority of the Buddha Śākyamuni.

A really existing saṅgha of Devadatta, institutionalizing itself with the help of the old Devadatta-legend in the Vinaya, would then have had an impact on especially the Devadatta-legend in the relatively late MSV-tradition, which actually in its Chinese translations shows the strongest reflex of such an existing group: the rules established by Devadatta would have been changed according to the rules of the historical
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saṅgha of Devadatta, the story keeping, however, - quite understandable from an orthodox Buddhist standpoint - the negative outcome for the rival of the Buddha who did not succeed in establishing a lasting schism.

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

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

An indirect support for the reconstruction of the history of the saṅgha of Devadatta can also be gained from one of the most popular Mahāyānasūtras, the Lotusūtra, especially in connection with the problematic Devadattaparivarta, the "Chapter of Devadatta". As is well known, this chapter is the crux in the Lotusūtra both by position and contents. It describes how the Buddha related a Jātaka-story, at
the end of which he identifies Devadatta with a brahman who had taught the Buddha in a previous existence the teaching of the Lotussūtra. The Buddha then calls Devadatta his close and good friend (kalyāṇamitra), through whose help he, the Buddha, had attained the six unlimited wisdoms (ṣaṭpāramitā) and predicts that in a future kalpa he will become a Buddha under the name Devarāja whose relics after his death will be enshrined in a stūpa and revered by the living beings who will thereby attain arhatship.

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

The most common translation of the sūtra, that of Kumārajīva, presents the Devadattaparivarta as an independent 12th chapter, but it is now communis opinio that it was added to the sūtra later on. If the Devadattaparivarta was really not originally included in the translation of Kumārajīva, this does not nevertheless really prove that it was not integrated into the sūtra at an early stage as shown for instance by the older Chinese translations. It is possible that Kumārajīva had omitted the chapter because it was in contradiction to another, highly estimated
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text translated by him and containing the śrāvaka-position which stuck
to the condemnation to hell of Devadatta: the Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra / Da-zhidu-lun 大智度論 attributed to Nāgārjuna; the śāstra gives
tree reasons for this irreversible fate of Devadatta: 1. the causing of
the schism, 2. the wounding of the Buddha and 3. the killing of a Buddhist
nun [sic!] the last of which LAMOTTE interprets correctly as a late
addition to the tradition in order to gain a triad of sins committed by
Devadatta. It should be noted, however, that the śāstra’s interpretation
of the schism is not totally incompatible with the Mahāyāna-tradition
of Devadatta as a saint, because it does not give the stereotype cause for
the schism of the earlier texts - Devadatta demanding a stricter lifestyle;
it rather stresses the point that Devadatta caused the schism because he
considered himself a Great Man and wanted to become a real Buddha by
gathering followers around him: "[Devadatta] thought by himself: 'I
possess the 30 signs (lakṣaṇa) [of a Great Man] (mahāpuruṣa), only
some less than the Buddha; my disciples are not yet gathered (in sufficient
number). If a big community (mahāsaṅgha) gathered around me, what
would be the difference (between me) and the Buddha?' Having reflected
so he decided to cause a schism of the saṅgha and got 500 disciples.""

RAY in the framework of Devadatta as a "Condemned Saint" seems
to assume that this episode in the Lotusūtra is proof that in some
Buddhist traditions - and what one would like to know is: 'in which'? -
Devadatta has been always a "simple bhikṣu in good standing" and not
the "vinaya-breaker". Another model of explication was offered by
GOSHIMA Kiyotaka, who tried to show how the episode of the five-
hundred renegade monks of Devadatta who are finally brought back to
Buddha’s saṅgha has become a wandering motif in the framework of the
conception of upāyakausālyā in all kind of Mahāyānasūtras leading
to the prophecy (vyākaraṇa) of Devadatta’s future Buddhahood by the
Buddha. Most interpretations of the Devadattaparivarta try to do
away with it as a younger inserted portion of the whole sūtra.\textsuperscript{80} Even if this proves to be true\textsuperscript{80} there is still the question why it was inserted.

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

The time-setting proposed would also be subscribed by the fact that the oldest Avadāna-literature, e.g. the Mahāvastu\textsuperscript{84} or the Divyāvadāna, does remain silent about the schism of Devadatta. There is, however, an episode in the Avadānaśataka, which seems to be a narrative reflex of what Faxian says about the followers of Devadatta: that they do not venerate the Buddha Śākyamuni. In the sixth varga and the 54th avadāna, called Śrimati, it is related how Devadatta instigates king Ajātaśatru to a royal decree prohibiting the veneration of the stūpa of the hairs and nails (keśanakhastūpa)\textsuperscript{85} of the Buddha\textsuperscript{85}. As it is known
that the custom of constructing stūpas for the hair and nail śarīra of the Buddha belongs to a relatively late period of Buddhist relic-cult, this episode, which is not found anywhere else in Buddhist narrative literature, is a quite interesting support for the assumption that the saṅgha of Devadatta has its historical origin in the period in which North-India was ruled by the Kuśāna. Faxian's account would make it possible to explain how the episode came to be inserted into the Avadānaśataka before a quite realistic background: it was intended to blame Devadatta of having already caused in the days of the Buddha what was praxis of the members of the saṅgha of Devadatta: not to venerate the Buddha Śākyamuni.

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

Notes:

3) In the Milindapañha, for instance, it is said, that Devadatta, after having been driven into hell, will become a pratyekabuddha and that the whole
matter was a device of the Buddha to lead Devadatta to the final stage: cp. TSUKAMOTO Keishō, *Daiba-hon no seiritsu to heikei* ("Formation and Background of the Devadattaparivarta"), in: KANAKURA Enshō (ed.), *Hokke-kyō no seiritsu to tenkai / The Lotus Sutra and the Development of Buddhist Thought (Hokke-kyō-kenkyū III)*, Kyoto 1970, 165-220 (English summary in appendix 6-9) 塚本啓祥, 提婆品の成立と背景, in: 金倉円照編, 法華経の成立と展開（法華経研究 III）210f..


7) *Saṅghabhedavastu* (ed. R. GNOLI), 81, where is expressively given the number of four monks (*catvāraś ca bhikṣaṇaḥ* ...), while the P.- Vinaya —213—
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8) There is only one passage in the Buddhist texts alluding to teachings of Devadatta: Aṅguttara-nikīya IV, 402f.: "I have heard. Once the venerable Sāriputta and the venerable Candikāputta were dwelling in Rājagaha, in the Bamboo Grove, in the Kalandakanivāpa. There the venerable Candikāputta spoke to the monks: "Devadatta, oh friends, teaches the Law to the monks in the following way: 'If, oh friends, a monk's heart is well-gathered by his mind, then it is proper to that monk to think [and] state: (re)birth is gone, accomplished is ascetic life, what has to be done is done, there is no further existence here.'" It is not quite clear from the Pāli sutta if Candikāputta, who in the canon is only found here, gives the teaching of Devadatta before or after the schism, but by comparison with the corresponding sūtra in the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama / Za-ahan-jing, 雜阿含經 T.99.131a.25ff., translated by the Central-Indian monk Guṇabhadra / Qiunabatuoluo 求那跋陀羅 it becomes clear that at least in the time of the translation (mid-5th century) and probably some time before Caṇḍri(kā)putra (Yuezi 月子) was taken as a disciple of Devadatta (Tipodaduo-dizi 提婆達多弟子), the episode thus being placed after the schism. E.LAMOTTE, Le Traité ... II, 694, note 3, after having quoted these passages (p.693f.), gives the striking commentary: "Ajoutons que l'orthodoxie de cette prédication n'est pas mise en suspicion.",

gives only three: Kokāliko Kaṭamorakatissako Khaṇḍadeviya putto Samuddadatto... The Shisong-lü, T.1435.259a.11 support the MSV-version: 有四同黨弟子. See also MSV-Vinaya translated by Yijing, T.1442.701c.8ff.. [T. = Taishō-shinshū-daizokyo:kiE~*:kiiU!, cited according the number, page of respective volume, column and line]
which fits quite well to Yijing’s statement in the Karmavācanā-text cited below on the “doctrines” of the group being not really different from Buddhist teaching.


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

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

11) The later systematization of the vita of the Buddha has even led to the inclusion of Devadatta in the legend of the youth of the Buddha where he is projected as the jealous loser in the sportive competitions and even as a rival for the Buddha’s bride Yaśodharā respectively Gopā: cp. Alfred FOUCHER, La vie du Bouddha ..., 85f., Edward J.THOMAS, The Life of the Buddha as Legend and History, 3London 1949, 131. A late example in Tibetan tradition of Devadatta as the ultimate evil is found in the Bod-kyi yul-du chos-dan chos-smra-ba ji-ltar byun-ba’i rim-pa deb-ther sni on-po, the "Blue Annals, the Stages of the Appearance of the Doctrine and Preachers in the Land of Tibet", compiled between 1476 and 1478, where Māra tries to disturb the Buddha’s search for enlightenment by telling him that Devadatta had captured his hometown Kapilavastu, an obvious reminiscence of the the episode of the destruction of the Sākyas by king Virūḍhaka reprojected on

—211—


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


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

22) We would expect to find at least allusions in the so-called schism-edicts of Aśoka. In the catalogue of SHIZUTANI Masao, Indo-Bukkyō-himeimokuroku II: Pāra-jidai-bukkyō-hime-i-mokuroku ("A Catalogue of Indian Buddhist Inscriptions II: Buddhist Inscriptions of the Pāla-Dynasty"), [Kyōto] 1970 静谷正雄, インド仏教碑銘目録IIパーラ時代仏教碑銘目録, 京都, 19, No.114, there is only one inscription containing the name of Devadatta, edited by E.HULTZSCH, A Buddhist Sanskrit Inscription from Kota, in: The Indian Antiquary 14, February 1885, 45-48. It is an inscription from Shergaḏh in Koṭā (Rajasthan), in which a "feudal chief (sāmanta)" Devadatta is donating a temple (mandira) or / and a monastic establishment (vihāra)
to the Sugata (the Buddha). The interesting point of this inscription is that
the name was given to a member of a noble family who at least himself had
inclinations to Buddhism. Unfortunately I was not able to check the
interpretation of the inscription given by D.R. Bhandharkar, *List of
Inscriptions of Northern India, Appendix to EI, vols. XIX-XXII*, 21, cited
by Shizutani, who dated it to the year 847, while Shizutani himself
thinks that the era is Vikrama which would give 790-791.

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

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

25) 861a.

26) XJ 10 (Jl, 807f.) 别有三伽藍不食乳遂提婆達多遺訓也

傳校注, 北京 ("Commented edition of the NJNZ"), Beijing 1995, 108ff.. It
should be said beforehand that Prof. Wang maintains however the old
interpretation that the saṅgha of Devadatta existed in India from the
Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha; see also Wang Bangwei, *Buddhist Nikāyas
through Ancient Chinese Eyes*, in: F. Bandurski, Bhikkhu Pasadika,
M. Schmidt, Bangwei Wang, *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*,
Göttingen 1994 (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den
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Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 9), 180f..

28) Mülasarvāstivādaikaśatarakarman/Genben-shuo-yiqie-youbu-baiyi-jiemo

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

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

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

32) T.1453.495c.15ff. 此言隨黨者謂是隨提婆達多所有伴屬言非隨黨者即是佛弟子此乃由其住處則令物隨處判處中既非兩處故遠兩眾均分現令西方在處皆有天授種族出家之流所有軌儀多同佛法至如五道輪迴生天解脫所智三藏亦有大同無寺舍居村塲間乞食自居多修靜行葫蘆為鉢衣但二巾色類桑毘不炊乳酪多在那羅陀寺離聽諸典曾聞之日汝之軌式多似大師有僻邪處復同天授豈非天授之種胃乎彼便答曰我之所祖實非天授此即恐人此雖多似佛法若行聚集則聖制分途各自為行別呈供養豈況諸餘外道計斷計常妄自然虛賤得一食時難坐流俗無分鍾留之徒養為通鑑更相染觸淪陷同波髙尚之實須察斯濫殊行各席深是其宜

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

34) Saṃghādisesa XI, 1 (p.175).

35) Cp. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvāstivāda-Schule, Göttingen 1994, 70a., s.v., "folgend, anhängend; folgsam", which in the context of magic comes very close to the negative connotations as a term for the followers of Devadatta.
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37) A.Ch.BANERJEE, Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit - Prātimokṣasūtra and Bhikṣukarmacārya, Calcutta 1977, 19.
38) W.PACHOW / R.MISHRA, The Prātimokṣasūtra of the Mahāsāṅghikās. Critically edited for the first time from palm-leaf manuscripts found in Tibet, Allahabad 1956, 10.9f.
39) Shisong-lū + 諱律 / Sarvāstivādin-vinaya, T.1435.259a.11 and 259c.4. The first terminus could well stand for sahāyaka and the second for anuvartin.
41) T.1442.704c.29. Some lines before (13f.), however, we find the expression bandang 伴黨 which fairly corresponds to the Skt. text.
42) There is another younger text, a commentary on the MSV-Vinaya, who has almost the same terminology suidang 隨黨 versus fei-suidang 非隨黨 (T. 1458.567a.5ff.).
43) Genben-sapodo-bu-lū-she 根本薩婆多部律攝 / Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya-saṅgراha T.1458.568b.11ff. 准事應知提婆婆多說五部法心許可者名為隨黨若依伏世 尊名為非黨
44) SATO Mitsuo, op.cit., 791, goes even so far to assume that the followers of Devadatta which Faxian and Xuanzang have seen followed the rules of Devadatta of this Vinaya.
45) Saṅghabhedavastu (ed. GNOLI), II, 259: ... pañcabhiḥ padaiḥ śrāvakānāṁ dharmam deśayati; śramaṇo bhavanto gautamo dadhikṣirāṁ paribhūṅkte; asmābhir adyāgreṇa (na) paribhoktavyam; ... śramaṇo gautamo māṁsaṁ paribhūṅkte; asmābhir na paribhoktavyam; śramaṇo gautamo lavanam paribhūṅkte; asmābhir na paribhoktavyam; ... śramaṇo gautamaś chinnadaśāni vastrāṇi dhārayati; asmābhir dīrgaḥ padaśāni vastrāṇi dhārayitavyāni; ... śramaṇo gautamo 'raṇye prativasati; asmābhir grāme vastavyam; ...
46) Cp. the table in MUKHERJEE, op.cit., 76f., and in SATO, op.cit., 790.
These rules make no sense at all, because here we have two rules concerning clothes, one being identical with the Buddhist rule (traicivarakaṭva / sanyi 三衣).


The original meaning of this rule may have been to refrain from eating...
salt in the periods of severe religious practice, or to prohibit the possession of pure salt which could serve as a bartering object.

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

52) Prof. M. HARA informed me, that the Śaiva-ascetics refrained from eating dairy products and salt, too. MUKHERJEE, op.cit., 79, points out that this is against the rule according to which the Buddha allowed the monks to partake of the five dairy products. But it still needs to be explained why it was exactly dairy products which Devadatta is said to have prohibited. The Pāli terms are (Mahāvagga 6.34): khira, dadhi, takka, navanīta, sappi. The passages in the Chinese Vinayas are: Dharmaguptaka: T.1428.873a. 聽飲乳法應爾有極五種牛汁乳酥生酥熟酥醍醐; very short in Mahāśāāka: T.1422. 長者先令一人供一牛乳與一比丘 (“Venerables! I first let one man give one [donation] of milk for one bhikṣu.”).

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

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

55) Cp. Pāli Vinaya (ed. OLDENBERG) IV, 123 (Pācittiya LX) = IV, 243 (Nissaggiya I): patto nāma due pattā ayopatto makkāpatto (transl. HORNER, II, 115 and 415: "A bowl means: there are two kinds of bowls: an iron bowl, a clay bowl."). Reference should also been made to Vin.III, 169 (Samghādisesa IX.2.3.) pattalesso nāma: lohapattadharo dhīṭho hoti -
The pretext of a bowl means: one carrying a copper bowl is seen ... one carrying a bowl of hide is seen ... one carrying a cracked bowl is seen ...") It is not quite clear what sāṭaka means. The Vinaya-commentary gives: Samantapāsādikā III, 602: (sāṭakapatto) ti lohapattasadiso susaṇṭhāno succavī siniddho bhamaraṇṇo mattikāpatto vuccati ("like the copper bowl it is well-turned, of beautiful hide, glossy, of black colour (lit. bee-coloured), it is called a clay bowl.", transl. HORNER, loc.cit., note 2), probably mixing the word up with sāta "pleasant, agreeable" (EDGERTON, BHSD, 525b., s.v.). R.L.TURNER, A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages, London 1966, 717b., no.12381, puts it to sāṭa, "strip of cloth", and the word sāṭaka occurs indeed in the Pāli-canon in the sense of "garment, cloth" (cp. T.W.RHYS DAVIDS, W.STEDE, PTS-Pali-English Dictionary, 161b., s.v. Sāṭaka and Sāṭika), so one could conclude that a sāṭika-bowl was a nice bowl, probably made of clay (mattikāpatto), with a surface resembling the structure of cloth and looking as if it had been glazed (siniddho). The third word, sūmbhaka, which HORNER translates "cracked" (?) - the commentary gives only: Samantapāsādikā III, 602: (sūmbhakapatto) ti pakatimattikāpatto ("it was an ordinary clay bowl", transl. HORNER, note 3) -, belongs rather to the doublette root Skt. sūmbh-: sūbh-, "to shine, to be bright", in the meaning of "bright" (cp. TURNER, op.cit., 727a, no.12541: "*sūmbhaka-, 'bright'"). What is important in our context is that all three bowls would have looked rather luxurious so that they gave the observer a pretext for blame.

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

57) Ed. GNOLI, II, 204. In this episode Devadatta succeeds in drawing the 500 bhikṣus to his side by summoning them to give up the Buddha's way of life, consisting of the pañca vrata padāni as the "living in forests"
(āraṇyakatva), the "alms-begging" (piṇḍapātikatva), the "wearing of rags" (pāṃsukūlikatva), the "wearing of the three robes" (traicivarikatva) and the "living under open sky" (ābhyavakāśikatva), practices which he has made exclusive duties according to the Pāli-Vinaya. Even the wording of the invitation to leave used by Devadatta points to the direction of a more easy-going lifestyle: yasya cāyuṣmantaḥ imāni pāṇca vratapadāni na rocante, na kṣamante, na saṃprakhyānti, sa śramaṇasya gautamasya ārād bhavatu, dūrād bhavatu; śalākāṁ grḥātu iti ("... Who, venerables, does not like these five vows, is not pleased, eludicated [by them] should stay away from the śramaṇa Gautama, should leave him, should accept [my] invitation" said [Devadatta]."); the expression śalākāṁ grḥ- is normally used when the monks are offered entertainments by laymen.

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


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


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

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

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

65) I think there are indications that the Chinese Buddhist denomination of the "Teaching of the three stages", Sanjiejiao 三階教, being reproached as being heretical by the Buddhist orthodoxy, had at least in the period of the Tang shaped its practice after the model of the strict "rules of Devadatta": cp. Kenneth CH'EN, Buddhism in China - A Historical Survey, Princeton 1964, 299. This can also be seen from an imperial edict from 698, unfortunately only preserved in the form of a citation in the "Catalogue of the Scriptures Established at the Time of the Great Zhou", Dazhou-kanding-zhongjing-mulu 大周刊定眾經目錄, where it is stated that the sect pursues the following five practices (T.2153.475a.12f.): begging (qishi 乞食), long fasting (changzhai 長齋), abstaining from [eating] cereals (juegu 絕穀), keeping the precepts (chijie 持戒), practicing dhyāna (zuochan 坐禪), which are to be considered as "wrong rules (dharma: sic!)" 此行歸皆違法; for a different interpretation cp. Antonino FORTE, Some Considerations on the Historical Value of the Great Zhou Catalogue, in: MAKITA Tairyo (ed.), Catalogues of Scriptures
and their Commentaries in China and Japan, The Long Hidden Scriptures of Nanatsu-dera, Research Series Vol.VI, Tōkyō 1998, 528. These reactions of Empress Wu may well have been in some connection with Yijing, having come back in 695 and being welcomed by Empress Wu herself, and his reports of a saṅgha of Devadatta in India. To come to a final conclusion regarding this question, however, a more thorough study of the history of the Sanjiejiao, especially in the era of Wu Zetian, has to be done - on the basis of the voluminous work of YABUKI Keiki, Sangaikyō no kenyū ("Studies on the Teachings of the Three Stages"), Tōkyō 1927, repr. 1973 矢吹慶輝, 三階教之研究, 東京 - which is not possible in the scope of the present article.

66) The only vague attempt to connect the Devadattaparivarta with the saṅgha of Devadatta which the author is aware of is that of IWAMOTO Yutaka, Bukkyō-setsuwa-kenkyū II ("Research in the narrative literature of Buddhism"), Kyōto 1978, 176 岩本裕, 佛教說話研究第二巻, 京都

67) S. and D. [see below, note 69] have the old transcription Tiaoda 提婆達多.

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

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

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

71) See the English translation of L.HURWITZ, Scripture of the Lotus Blossom
of the Fine Dharma (the Lotus Sūtra), Translated from the Chinese of Kumārajiva, New York 1976; the three Chinese versions are conveniently arranged in juxtaposition in TSUKAMOTO's work, 181ff., the Devadatta-parivarta starting at p.198.


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

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

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

76) T.1509.164c.28ff. [提婆達多] 自念我有三十相滅佛未幾宜以弟子未集若大眾圍繞與佛何異如是思惟已生心破僧得五百弟子; cp. É.LAMOTTE, Le traité ... II, 874. Strangely enough, to Xuanzang quoting part of this passage in his Xiyu-ji 6 has occurred a mistake - which has obviously slipped the attention of É. LAMOTTE, Le traité ... I, 186, note 2, where he quotes the passage - which may well have been influenced by the fact that for him the existing saṅgha of Devadatta and Devadatta as a leader and patriarch who actually had attained the same status as the Buddha from the viewpoint of his followers has been an undisputable fact: XJ 6 (JI, 494) 我相三十滅佛未幾大眾圍與佛何異如來思惟是已即事破僧 ("I possess 30 signs (of a Great Man), only some less than the Buddha; (I) am surrounded by a big crowd, so why should I be different from the Tathāgata?" Thinking so, [Devadatta] caused a schism of the saṅgha.") This distorted quotation by Xuanzang is even more striking as
it creates a contradiction in itself, because if Devadatta had already gathered a big community the schism would have already occurred.

77) RAY, op.cit., 173.
78) The same kind of conceptionalisation is also found in the Mahāmeghasūtra / Dayun-jing 大雲經, when the Bodhisattva Dayun-mizang 大雲密藏 explains Devadatta's function as a wicked person being the plan of the Tathāgata himself, and that Devadatta is in reality a Mahāpuruṣa: cp. Antonino FORTE, Political Propaganda and Ideology in China at the End of the Seventh Century. Inquiry into the Nature, Authors and Function of the Tunhuang Document S.6502 Followed by an Annotated Translation, Napoli 1976, 256. It is a puzzling fact, that Empress Wu Zetian 武則天, who was a fervent Buddhist, called the first years of her official reign (690 and 691) Tianshou 天授, the Chinese translation of the name of Devadatta. Even if the motto (niánhao 年號) Tianshou must not necessarily and directly refer to Devadatta (cp. Antonino FORTE, La secte des trois stades et l'hérésie de Devadatta - Yabuki Keiki corrigé par Tang Yongtong, in: BÉFEO 74 (1985), 469-476), it should be kept in mind that Wu Zetian thought of herself as a Bodhisattva (and cakrācārin). She even supported this idea by a faked commentary on the prophecy in the Mahāmeghasūtra 大雲經 (submitted 689!) and it would hardly have been possible for her to take such a motto as Tianshou if Devadatta had been purely taken as the notorious wicked person in Tang-China of her days. It should be kept in mind also, that she was changing mottos according to auspicious omens - on the preceding motto Yongchang 永昌 ("eternal prosperity"), taken from an auspicious inscription on a stone, called "Precious Chart", Baotu 寶圖, found 688 in the river Luo 洛, cp. Stanley WEINSTEIN, Buddhism under the T'ang, Cambridge 1987, 41 - and the "discovery" of the prediction on Devadatta in the Mahāmeghasūtra may well have had an influence on her choosing the niánhao年號. The popularity of the motif of Devadatta helping the Buddha to attain spiritual perfection (pāramitā) can also be seen in a late sūtra translated or compiled - it may
well be a so-called apocryph - of the Song-dynasty by Shihu施護, the Dafang-guang-shanqiao-fangbian-jing 大方廣巧方便經 (T.346), for a discussion of which see TSUKAMOTO, op.cit., 211f.

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


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

82) One should keep in mind that in the same chapter it is not only the canonical outlaw Devadatta who is rehabilitated but also a woman, the daughter of the dragon-king Sāgara.
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85) T.200.230a.3f. 世尊即以髻髮與頻婆娑羅王於其宮內造塔寺（"The Venerable may give his hairs and nails to king Bimbisāra so that he may build [for them] a stūpa and a temple in his palace."）

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

87) Heresy - it should be remembered - is only a question of standpoint and was relativated by the situation of the Buddhist saṅgha in India with its obvious decentralized structure, denominational diversity and historical development of doctrine (Mahāyāna, Vajrayāna). The reconstructed context of the historical saṅgha of Devadatta would fit quite well in this historical setting and into the theroretical framework of the phenomenon heresy as for
example developed by the German scholar Christoph KLEINE in connection with the Japanese Buddhist Pure-Land-reformer Hōnen (1133-1212): cp. Ch. KLEINE, *Hōnens Buddhismus des Reinen Landes: Reform, Reformation oder Häresie*? ("The Buddhism of Pure Land of Hōnen: Reform, Reformation or Heresy?"), Frankfurt a.M. / Berlin / Bern / New York / Paris / Wien 1996, 319ff. See esp. his matching definition on p. 328, according to which the *saṅgha* of Devadatta would have been a special case of heresy insofar as its members deliberately claimed to be different from the Buddhists - differing from a normal heresy where its member are excluded from the orthodoxy, often against their will - but therefore being even more Buddhist (in the tradition of the Buddhas of the past).