Universiteit Leiden
The Netherlands

Challenging the Buddha's Authority: a narrative perspective of power dynamics between the Buddha and his disciples

Li, C.

Citation

Li, C. (2019, October 15). *Challenging the Buddha's Authority: a narrative perspective of power dynamics between the Buddha and his disciples*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/79261

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/79261

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

Leiden University Repository

The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:
http://hdl.handle.net/1887/79261

Author: Li, C.
Title: Challenging the Buddha's Authority: a narrative perspective of power dynamics between the Buddha and his disciples
Issue Date: 2019-10-15

Chapter 3. Splitting the *Saṅgha* of Śākyamuni: Devadatta's Life Story and His Role as the First Schismatic

勿得効大龍, 大龍不可効。

以効大龍故, 食泥致死苦。

Never should one imitate the great dragon,

as the great dragon cannot be emulated.

It is by imitating the great dragon,

that one will suffer the misery of death caused by ingesting mud.[214]

※※※※※

In Buddhist literature, Devadatta, the notorious schismatic and evil-doer, is branded as perhaps the most troublesome challenger of the Buddha. The verse above, cited from the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, is chanted by Śākyamuni after the death of Devadatta. In this Vinaya story, Devadatta, driven by the desire to gain great fame, plots to split the *saṅgha* by propounding five practices of austerity. However, his plans to create a schism are foiled by Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, Śākyamuni's two major disciples, who manage to restore Śākyamuni's *saṅgha* quite soon. Having learned of his failure, Devadatta spits up blood, dies, and descends to hell. "Devadatta dies due to imitating me not only in this life but also in past lives," says Śākyamuni, adducing a Jātaka story in which Devadatta played the same role, that of a failed challenger of Śākyamuni. In that time, an elephant that was a previous incarnation of the Buddha took lotus roots from a pond and ate them after washing off the mud, whereas the elephant that was Devadatta tried to imitate the Bodhisattva, but ate the lotus roots without cleaning them off beforehand. In the end, Devadatta died of illness caused by ingesting the mud. The above verse thus summarizes the lesson of Devadatta's failure—any attempt to compete with the Buddha would end in nothing but failure, as the Buddha is unchallengeable and inimitable. The ignorant, ineffective, and depraved character of Devadatta undoubtedly reflects the prevailing Buddhist attitude toward challenges to the

[214] 彌沙塞部和醯五分律 T. 1421 (XXII) 164c21–165b2. Scholars have not yet determined the exact meaning of the term 和醯 *hexi* (cf. Clarke 2015: 69). I tentatively propose that the wrong word order may have caused the confusion and *mishasai bu hexi* 彌沙塞部和醯 should be restored to *mihexishasai bu* 彌和醯沙塞部 as the phonetic transliteration of Sanskrit *Mahīśāsaka*, in which 和醯 transliterates the Sanskrit syllable *hī*.

Buddha, since dividing the community and following a different leader is perhaps the gravest threat to the Buddha's authority.

However, this way of reading Devadatta's function as the foil to the Buddha's excellence, although widely present and accepted throughout Buddhist texts, somehow impedes us from establishing a more comprehensive and contextualized understanding of this figure. In fact, the life stories of Devadatta have rarely been studied in their broader ideological context: there are indeed several—not many—academic works devoted to Devadatta's life stories, but these works are mostly aimed at unveiling a "historical" Devadatta by means of combing related literature and sorting them into different historical layers.[215] Regardless of whether a "historical" Devadatta could be restored in this way or not, the proposal of different layers of narrative elements indeed contributes greatly to a more historical reading of Devadatta's stories. However, studies of Devadatta should not be confined to the task of merely collating data; in fact, the vibrant, striking, and multifaceted stories can offer a medium for animating otherwise unseen facts, intertextualizing rambling tales and latent ideologies, and illuminating the religious significance hidden in ostensibly tangled stories. But first of all, we have to carefully re-read the Devadatta narrative[216] and understand what is actually narrated.

---

[215] Studies of Devadatta's full biography have been undertaken by Mukherjee (1966), Bareau (1991), and Mori & Motozawa (2006). In addition, Ray (1994) argues that Devadatta is a representative of the forest monks, who is hated and therefore vilified by settled monks. However, his reading is not entirely accurate, which I will demonstrate in the following discussion. The journal *Buddhist Studies Reviews* has published a special issue (1997, vol. 14, issue 1) on the theme of Devadatta, collecting three papers (Lamotte 1997, Bareau 1997, Tinti 1997) that each focus on different aspects of Devadatta's legends. Moreover, Deeg (1999a) has investigated the Chinese records of Devadatta's followers as witnessed by Chinese pilgrims, reconstructing the formation of Devadatta's *saṅgha* through information collected from Buddhist texts. More recently, Borgland (2018) has examined the stories in the MSV in which Devadatta tries to persuade other monks not by means of five ascetic practices, but by taking an anti-ascetic position.

[216] In the following discussion, I sometimes use the expression "the Devadatta narrative" to denote the life stories that are commonly attributed to the figure of Devadatta in non-Mahāyāna Buddhist literature (I will discuss the image of Devadatta in Mahāyāna texts separately in the fourth chapter). In doing so, I temporarily ignore the sectarian school, language, and geographical distribution of each story.

3.1 The core image of Devadatta in the Vinayas: Devadatta as the first schismatic

As scholars agree, the portrait of Devadatta as a foolish, rebellious, yet impotent evildoer, is the end product of a long history of development, during which increasingly more lurid stories have been composed to attribute crimes to him. When these stories from different times or contexts are put together, they are apt to create tensions, because many stories were initially created under ideologies that are mutually incompatible or even contradictory. That is to say, alongside the elaboration of Devadatta's evildoings, his image becomes a collection of heterogeneous components, containing multiple conflicting elements. If we fail to grasp the heterogeneous nature of Devadatta's stories, the tensions between the contradictory aspects of these stories may hinder us from comprehending their multilayered significance.

In order to establish a deeper understanding of how Devadatta's multifaceted image comes into being, and to apprehend the ideological messages conveyed in the composition of the stories related to him, many questions still await answers. First of all, how should we approach the fundamental image of Devadatta—as that of a schismatic or an evil person? As the present study reveals, the answer to this question is crucial in comprehending the significance of Devadatta's stories in both religious and historical contexts. In order to answer this fundamental question, we should first clarify what major elements construct Devadatta's core image, and which of these elements constitute an overarching theme upon which subsequent stories are produced. In this process, we inevitably also hypothesize the relative chronological order of the major elements underlying Devadatta's image, which contributes to our understanding of how Devadatta's different stories come together, and what kinds of ideologies play a role in this formation of Devadatta's complex biography.

3.1.1 Basic sources and previous scholarship

Devadatta's life stories are mainly found within the Vinaya literature (Table 3.1.1): five Vinayas descending from the ancient Sthaviras, namely, the Theravaṃsa Vinaya in Pāli, the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya in Chinese (*Mishase bu hexi wufen lü* 彌沙塞部和醯五分律, T. 1421), the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya in Chinese (*Sifen lü* 四分律, T. 1428), the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya in Chinese (*Shisong lü* 十誦律, T. 1435), and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya in Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese; the sixth Vinaya is the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya preserved in Chinese (*Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律, T. 1425). The Vinayas belonging to the schools of Theravaṃsa, Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, Sarvāstivāda, and Mūlasarvāstivāda each contain

two versions of Devadatta's biography, one in the *vibhaṅga* section and the other in the *vastu*/*khandhaka* section of each Vinaya. The Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya contains the Devadatta stories in its *vibhaṅga* part.

Texts of other genres sometimes do contain parts of the biographical stories of Devadatta, but usually in fragmentary or over-embellished ways.[217] The Chinese *Zengyi ahan jing* 增一阿含經, an *āgama* text, also contains an extended version of his biography (cf. the French introduction in Bareau 1992); however, considering the fact that the other Āgama/ Nikāya texts rarely include long stories about Devadatta, in addition to the textual history of the *Zengyi ahan jing* as "an open-ended repository for a long time [in northwest India],"[218] I tend to believe that Devadatta stories were not first created in the *āgama* genre, and that the Chinese *Zengyi ahan jing* must have adapted his biography from other textual sources. Overall, regarding the textual distribution of Devadatta's stories, we can say that the Devadatta narrative is closely associated with the Vinaya literature. As I will elaborate in this chapter, the content of the Devadatta narrative further proves that the image of Devadatta as a literary product would initially have been specifically created within the context of the Vinaya and therefore chiefly suited to it.

[217] Mukherjee (1966), Bareau (1991), and Mori & Motozawa (2006) survey how Devadatta's stories are distributed across primary sources. Devadatta stories are also spread throughout Āgama/Nikāyas, Jātakas, Avadānas, and Sūtras. However, among Āgama/Nikāya texts, detailed biographical accounts are only found in the Chinese *Zengyi ahan jing.* In addition, some Jātakas and Avadānas (e.g., Dhp-A. 133ff, J. 113, 139, 150, 445, 466, 533) also contain biographies of Devadatta, but perhaps in more developed forms.

[218] Palumbo 2013: 154.

Table 3.1.1 Location of the Devadatta narrative in the six Vinayas

	Vinaya	*Vibhaṅga*	*Vastu/Khandhaka*
1	Mahīśāsaka	T. 1421 (XXII) 16c–21b (僧殘法)	T. 1421 (XXII) 164a–166b
2	Dharmaguptaka	T. 1428 (XXII) 590b13–596c16(僧殘法)	T. 1428 (XXII) 909b–913c
3	Pāli Vinaya	iii. 171–176 (*saṅghādisesa*)	ii. 180–206 (*cullavagga*)
4	Sarvāstivāda	T. 1435 (XXIII) 24b22–26b8 (僧殘法)	T. 1435 (XXIII) 257a–267a.
5	Mūlasarvāstivāda	T. 1442 (XXIII) 700a29–705a8 (破僧違諫學處); D. 3, *'dul ba*, *ca*, 286a2 – *cha,* 13b6	T. 1450 (XXIV) 99a21–206a14; D.1, *'dul ba, ga*, 255b1 – *nga,* 302a6; Gnoli 1977–1978.
6	Mahāsāṅghika	T. 1425 (XXII) 281c12–284c21 (明僧殘戒)	T. 1425 (XXII) 489c9–25 (a part of *varga*, not *vastu*)

According to Mukherjee (1969) and Bareau (1991; 1997), who have independently conducted the so-far most exhaustive studies of the historical construction of Devadatta's image, there exist different historical layers of Devadatta's image.[219] Here I briefly summarize their discoveries with my own comments. They divide the stories of Devadatta into several chronological layers:

(1) The earliest core of Devadatta's image, as their studies reveal, portrays no more than an active separatist who advocates dissenting ideas in the *saṅgha*. [220] This conclusion is based on the fact that only the schismatic activities of Devadatta are commonly shared by all six Vinayas.

(2) In the second layer are stories that are shared by all five of the Sthavira-derived Vinayas but are absent from the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya; these include Devadatta's ascetic

[219] For a more recent study, see Mori Shoji & Tsunao Motozawa (2006), which is tremendously rich in material and organizes the data in a very systematic manner.

[220] Nota bene that both Mukherjee (1966: 141ff.) and Bareau (1997: 32), based on the wrong idea that the *Zenyi ahan jing* is attributed to the Mahāsāṅghika school (cf. Palumbo 2013: 4n.10), conclude that the ascetic tendency of Devadatta is shared by the Mahāsāṅghika school. However, although the school affiliation of the *Zenyi ahan jing* still remains unclear, the hypothesis to associate it with the Mahāsāṅghika is now discarded by recent scholarship. Hiraoka (2007a, 2008) argues that the *Zengyi ahan jing* is a "patchwork" stitching together elements of different schools upon a Sarvāstivādin foundation. Palumbo has expressed a similar idea that the *Zengyi ahan jing* is possibly not a direct translation of a mature, fixed Indic text, but remained a body of developing text for a long time before the compilation was completely closed (Palumbo 2013: 5, 154). In this light, we find no records of Devadatta's ascetic tendencies in the Mahāsāṅghika texts. Thus, I dismiss asceticism as one of the earliest elements in the Devadatta narrative, and place it in the second layer.

propositions, his attempted murders of the Buddha, his intimacy with Ajātaśatru,[221] and so forth (cf. "Betrachtungsstufe A" in Mukherjee 1966; Bareau 1991: 101–102, 1997: 21). This layer, although not the earliest part of his image, was still formed in early time as it is widely preserved in Buddhist texts, including both the Mainstream Āgama/Nikāyas and many early Mahāyāna Sūtras (e.g., the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*[222]).

(3) The third layer contains stories only adopted by some of the five Sthavira offshoots: for instance, his kinship with the Buddha of the Śākya family (Bareau 1997: 32); his murder of the nun Utpalavarṇā; his activities during youth, and so forth (cf. "Nebenüberlieferung B" in Mukherjee 1966).

(4) The most recent layer contains stories that are accepted by only one of the five schools, for instance, those unique to the Mūlasarvāstivāda school(s) (cf. "Einzelberichte C" in Mukherjee 1966).

Apart from observing different chronological layers, Mukherjee and Bareau also note that Devadatta's personality diverges between the Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika accounts. The portraits of Devadatta in the Vinayas of the Sthavira offshoots overlap considerably, although each tale must have undergone different degrees of textual revision and expansion. The Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, however, preserves relatively limited accounts of Devadatta. The *vibhaṅga* section of its Chinese translation contains the simplest version, an account of a failed separatist whose schismatic activities mainly involve composing dissenting Sūtras, Vinayas, and other texts; no information is mentioned about his ascetic propositions (Mukherjee 1969: 141; Bareau 1991: 102). In the Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravāda *Mahāvastu*, as I elaborate later, although the profile of Devadatta can be summarized as arrogant, vicious, and hostile, there is no account of his evil deeds apart from his wooing of Yaśodharā. The *bhikṣuprakīrṇaka* recitation of the *Varga* (*zasong baqu fa* 雜誦跋渠法) of the *Mohe sengqi*

---

[221] It is noteworthy that the Ajātaśatru's narrative traditions in the *Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra* (e.g., DN. i. 47, T. 1 [I] 107a21ff.; *Foshuo jizhiguo jing* 佛說寂志果 T. 22 [I] 271a1ff.; T. 125 [II] 762ff., etc.) and the **Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodanāsūtra* (e.g., *Asheshiwang jing* 阿闍世王經 T. 626; *Wenshushili puchao sanmei jing* 文殊師利普超三昧經 T. 627; D. 216, *mdo sde, tsa,* 211b2 ff.; cf. Harrison & Hartmann 2000: 167) do not mention Devadatta at all, which implies that Devadatta's famous role as the instigator may not be part of the nucleus in Ajātaśatru's patricide narrative. That is to say, the story of Devadatta suborning Ajātaśatru to commit patricide may have been later added into and conflated with Ajātaśatru's stories.

[222] For the discussion of the way of naming the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* in the Mahāyāna tradition, see Radich 2015: 13. He argues to name the Mahāyāna version *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*, while the "Mainstream" versions *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*.

lü—once incorrectly assumed to a parallel to the *vastu* section of the Sthavira Vinayas (Clarke 2004)—does not mention Devadatta in its discussion of the issue of *saṅghabheda*.

Moreover, acknowledging the differences between the Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika descriptions of Devadatta, Mukherjee proposes that, although Devadatta's earliest image as a schismatic monk predates the separation between the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṅghikas, his other early stories were probably composed by the Sthaviras independently after their split from the Mahāsāṅghikas (Mukherjee 1966: 145–146; Ray 1994: 168). Analyzing the same six Vinaya texts brings Bareau to a more radical conclusion that the association of Devadatta with schism, from the very beginning, was forged by the ancient Sthaviras and later incorporated into the Mahāsāṅghika version (Bareau 1991: 90–91). [223]

It goes without saying that the above studies have significantly contributed to our scholarly understanding of Devadatta. However, the evidence adduced in these works is not always justified, especially their interpretation of the scarcity of Mahāsāṅghika records of Devadatta. Nowadays, scholars have widely accepted that the *varga*s of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya are closer to the *mātṛkā* texts of the Sthaviras, rather than parallel to the Sthavira *vastu/khandhaka*s (Clarke 2004). In a similar fashion to the *varga*s of the Mahāsāṅghikas, the Sthavira *mātṛkā* texts also omit Devadatta in their discussion of *saṅghabheda* (e.g., T. 1435 [XXIII] 417c15–21). Therefore, the lack of reference to Devadatta in the *varga* section of the *Mohe sengqi lü* cannot necessarily be interpreted as a total ignorance of Devadatta among the Mahāsāṅghikas, especially when the nature of the Mahāsāṅghika *varga*s and their position within the history of Buddhist literature are not absolutely clear. It is still possible that Devadatta's image could date back to an ancient time when the original, unified Buddhist community had not yet split. We must first re-investigate the Devadatta materials before jumping to any conclusion.

[223] His argument is predicated on the assumption that "a simpler version means an earlier version". In the first place, he finds that the *varga* section of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya contains the briefest *saṅghabheda* discussion in all the Vinayas and thus he presumes the *varga* version to be the most primitive form of the *saṅghabheda* discussion of the Vinayas. Since the *varga* version mentions nothing about Devadatta but only Upāli's inquiries, Bareau argues that Devadatta was initially not mentioned in the *saṅghabheda* discussions in the Vinayas. It must have been the Sthaviras who initially charged Devadatta with the creation of the first schism and added the Devadatta stories to the *saṅghabheda* discussion, which was then borrowed by the Mahāsāṅghikas.

3.1.2 Devadatta in the Vinayas of the Sthavira offshoots

First of all, we have to admit that the Sthavira-derived Vinayas present the Devadatta stories in a rather unorganized and repetitive manner. Every Vinaya reports Devadatta's stories twice, one in the *vibhaṅga* and the other in *vastu*/*khandhaka*, but the content of these two sections overlaps considerably. In addition, episodes seem to be distributed arbitrarily between the *vibhaṅgha* and the *vastu*/*khandhaka* sections—many episodes that occur in the *vibhaṅgha* section of one school appear in the *vastu* section of another school. As a result, the *vastu/khandhaka*s of the Theravaṃsa, Sarvāstivāda, and Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya share more episodes in common with the *vibhaṅga*s of the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka schools than with their respective *vastu*s. It seems the editors of these Vinayas each developed their own ways of storytelling and showed no agreement on the "proper" distribution of episodes between the *vastu/khandhaka* and *vibhaṅga*. Given such a confusing textual structure which confronts modern scholars, in addition to the aforementioned episodes composed in different times being mixed together, the Devadatta narrative could not easily lend itself to a semantically continuous "surface reading," not to mention a meaningful "symptomatic reading" of the underlying ideologies.[224] Therefore, my first task is to propose a rationale behind this confusing organization of Devadatta's stories in these Vinayas, explaining why Sthavira-derived Vinaya editors chose to separate the narration of Devadatta's stories into two parts, and also clarify the different historical layers within the development of stories concerning Devadatta.

[224] Although I orientate myself mainly as a historian, I sometimes touch upon some basic ideas in the field of literary criticism simply because the main sources for my research are narratives. In understanding the Devadatta stories, I believe two levels of reading can be applied, namely, the "surface reading" (Best & Marcus 2009), or "just reading" (Marcus 2007: 75-76), and its counterpart, the "symptomatic reading." According to literary scholars, while "symptomatic reading looks for patterns in order to break free of and reach beyond them to a deep truth too abstract to be visible or even locatable in a single text" (Best & Marcus 2009: 11), the surface readings "account more fully for what texts present on their surface" (Marcus 2007: 75), and "locate narrative structures and abstract patterns on the surface, as aggregates of what is manifest in multiple texts as cognitively latent but semantically continuous with an individual text's presented meaning." The surface can be perceptible in text, but it still requires skills to uncover its significance. In the case of Devadatta, the surface reading can be done through re-arranging his biographical events, clarifying what his exact accusations were, comparing different versions of his stories, etc., so as to reach a critical description of who was Devadatta/ what was the image of Devadatta. On the other side, the symptomatic reading is to disclose the deeply hidden and repressed ideas behind the composition of Devadatta's various sins—for instance, what is the latent meaning conveyed by the stories in which Devadatta was associated with asceticism? Or, what drove the composers to create stories of Devadatta's illegal ordination? Why was Mahāyāna approach to Devadatta utterly opposite to that of the Mainstream "schools"?

As I have already mentioned, the five Vinayas of the Sthavira offshoots contain stories of Devadatta mainly in two sections, namely, the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* (Pāli *saṅghādisesa*) of the *vibhaṅga*s, and the *saṅghabhedavastu/cullavagga* of the *vastu*s (Cf. again Table 3.1.1). On the basis of the works of Mukherjee and Bareau, I also list 23 frequently shared episodes. In line with describing how the Vinayas of Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka distribute these episodes between the *vibhaṅga* and *vastu* sections,[225] I draw two storylines (A and B) as illustrated in Table 3.1.2 (I). I also add Table 3.1.2 (II) to illuminate the distribution of these episodes in each *vibhaṅga* and *vastu/khandhaka*. As we can see, episodes in storyline A are contained in the *Vinayavibhaṅga*s of the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka schools and partially in the *Vinayavastu*s of the Theravaṃsa, Sarvāstivāda, and Mūlasarvāstivāda schools. Episodes in storyline B are contained in the *Vinayavastu*s of every school, but the versions in the Theravaṃsa, Sarvāstivāda, and Mūlasarvāstivāda schools further add storyline A before storyline B, conflating the two storylines.

Overall, Devadatta's activities as contained in these two storylines can operate independently of each other. Storyline A—seen, e.g., in the Mahīśāsaka and the Dharmaguptaka *vibhaṅga*s—merely treats his scheme of separating the community as an aborted plan, in light of the Buddha's instruction to hold a *karman* ceremony to prevent a schism. In comparison, in storyline B—adopted, for instance, in the Mahīśāsaka and the Dharmaguptaka *vastu*s—Devadatta indeed splits the *saṅgha* for a short while, but Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana successfully reunite it. However, there is another way to understand the narrative logic between the two storylines. In the Theravaṃsa, Sarvāstivāda, and Mūlasarvāstivāda *vastu*/*khandhaka*s, storyline A and storyline B are taken as two continuous stages of the same narrative: the stories in storyline A occur first, narrating how Devadatta becomes a schismatic and how the Buddha (temporarily) quells his schismatic intentions, and storyline B ensues, telling how Devadatta finally manages to instigate a schism and falls into hell as punishment.

[225] The reason why I choose these two Vinayas is that, compared to the other Vinayas, the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka Vinayas possess a relatively clearer distinction between the *vibhaṅga* stories and the *vastu* stories of Devadatta. In other words, there are less overlapping episodes of Devadatta between the *vibhaṅga* and the *vastu* in these two Vinayas.

Table 2.1.2 (I). Basic episodes of the Devadatta narrative in the Sthavira offshoots

(Cf. Mukherjee [1966: i–iii] and Bareau [1991: 122–123] for more or less similar schemes)

Storyline A:

1. Devadatta joins the *saṅgha* together with other Śākya princes.
2. Devadatta gains magical power.
3. Devadatta wins the favor of Ajātaśatru.
4. The Buddha is informed of Devadatta's evil intentions.
5. The Buddha explains what the five kinds of teachers are.
6. The Buddha warns monks of the danger of excessive honors and gifts.
7. Devadatta demands that the Buddha retire and transfer leadership to him.
8. The Buddha refuses and insults Devadatta.
9. The Buddha sends Śāriputra (or Ānanda in the Sarvāstivāda *Vinayavastu*) to Rājagṛha to expose Devadatta's depravity.
10. Devadatta provokes Ajātaśatru to kill his father, Bimbisāra.
11. Devadatta attempts to kill the Buddha by sending assassins after him.
12. Devadatta attempts to kill the Buddha by hurling a stone at him, thereby drawing blood.
13. The disciples of the Buddha attempt to protect the Buddha.
14. Devadatta attempts to kill the Buddha by letting loose an intoxicated elephant.
15. Devadatta hatches a plan to split the *saṅgha* by proposing five points (*pañcavratapada*) to guarantee his future reputation.
16. Śākyamuni instructs the *saṅgha* on how to deal with the crime of *saṅghabheda*; a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* ruling against inciting a schism is released.
17. The same measures are taken toward abetting a schism when Devadatta's supporters attempt to assist him.

Storyline B:

18. Devadatta proposes the five points (*pañcavratapada*).
19. Devadatta calls a vote on the five points at a venue in Rājagṛha and splits the *saṅgha*.
20. Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana successfully lure back the followers of Devadatta.
21. Devadatta dies.
22. Followers of Devadatta commit the offense of *sthūlātyaya* (Pāli *thullaccaya*, Chn. *touluozhe* 偷羅遮).
23. Upāli asks the Buddha how to define the offense of *saṅghabheda*.

Table 3.1.3 (II). How the episodes of the Devadatta narrative are distributed in each of the five Vinayas

***Vibhaṅga*s**	**Sequence of episodes**																					
Mahīśāsaka *Vibhaṅga*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	14	11	13	12	**15**	**16**	**17**					
Dharmaguptaka *Vibhaṅga*	1	2	3	6	7	8	10	11	12	13	5	9	**15**	**16**	**17**							
Theravaṃsa *Vibhaṅga*	**15**	**16**	**17**																			
Sarvāstivāda *Vibhaṅga*	**15**	**16**	**17**																			
Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vibhaṅga*	2	3	6	4	7	8	5	**15**	**16**	**17**												
***Vastu/Khandhaka*s**	**Sequence of episodes**																					
Mahīśāsaka *Vastu*	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**	**22**	**23**																
Dharmaguptaka *Vastu*	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**	**22**	**23**																
Theravaṃsa *Khandhaka*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	13	12	14	15	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**	**22**	**23**	
Sarvāstivāda *Vastu*	1	2	3	6	4	7	8	5	15	16	17	12	11	13	9	10	14	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**	**23**
Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vastu*	1	2	3	6	4	7	8	5	15	16	17	10	11	12	14	13	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**	**22**	**23**

By closely examining how these episodes are distributed across the *vastu/khandhaka*s and *vibhaṅga*s, it is also possible to shed light on why the Vinayas feature two separate versions of Devadatta's stories between the *vibhaṅga* and *vastu/khandhaka.* To be specific, as illustrated in Table 3.1.2 (II), regardless of whether or not the first fourteen episodes from storyline A are incorporated into the *vibhaṅga*s, all *vibhaṅga* sections possess a formulaic ending: Devadatta intends to split the monastic community (episode 15); the Buddha, having learned of the deeds of Devadatta and his group, instructs the community members on how to cope with this situation, and issues rulings against *saṅghabheda* (episodes 16, 17). That is to say, these three episodes stabilize the basic structure of the Devadatta narrative in the *vibhaṅga*s, and thereby construct a core narrative in which Devadatta becomes a schismatic and the Buddha establishes policies that address his schismatic activities. The preceding episodes serve to expand on this core narrative, adding more details on how Devadatta grows into a corrupted schismatic. Based on the three episodes (15, 16, 17) which constitute the essential part of the *vibhaṅga* narration, we can see that the primary function of the *vibhaṅga* section is how to prevent, punish, and remedy schismatic acts.

On the other hand, all of the *vastu/khandhaka* versions end with another fixed series of stories: Devadatta proposes the five ascetic practices and successfully splits the *saṅgha* (episodes 18, 19); however, Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana defeat him and win back his followers (episodes 20, 21, 22); and, in the end, Upāli questions the Buddha on how to define the crime of splitting the *saṅgha* (episode 23). In this regard, the most essential content of the *vastu/khandhaka* version comprises episodes 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23. From the dialogue between Upāli and the Buddha, the focus of the *vastu/khandhaka*s is quite different from that of the *vibhaṅga* section: here, the primary function is to define what kinds of deeds are categorized as *saṅghabheda*, instead of proposing countermeasures as narrated in the *vibhaṅga*s. In this sense, we can see that the basic function of the *vibhaṅga*s is distinguished from that of the *vastu/khandhaka* sections, and the separate compositions of the Devadatta stories in the Vinayas are not meaningless repetitions but are actually designed to serve different ends.

This having been said, we can draw some tentative conclusions regarding the relative chronology of the 23 episodes. On this point, Mukherjee (1966: 75) argues that the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* rulings of the *vibhaṅga*s (namely, episodes 16 and 17) form the original basis of the Devadatta narrative, because they are found in every Vinaya and serve as the core elements around which the other stories developed. To follow up on Mukherjee's argument,

comparing the group of episodes that comprises the essential content of the *vibhaṅga* versions (i.e., episodes 15/16/17) and that of the *vastu/khandhaka* versions (i.e., episodes 18/22/23), we find these two groups of core episodes are in actuality quite similar: in either group, a charge is issued against Devadatta and his supporters, and solutions are proposed to deal with them (cf. Mukherjee 1966: 74–86; a similar framework is also found in the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinayavibhaṅga*, T. 1425 [XXII] 281c12–282b8, as seen below). In this regard, the *vibhaṅga* and *vastu/khandhaka*s versions of Devadatta's stories can be reduced to the same set of core episodes.

According to these central episodes (i.e., episodes 15, 16, 17 = 18, 22, 23), Devadatta is merely a separatist, who—possibly intending to impose stricter monastic codes—creates a schism in the early *saṅgha* and incurs no more than the transgression of *saṅghāvaśeṣa*, which falls only within the category of the second serious crimes. In these episodes that set out the basic structure of the Devadatta narrative in the Vinayas, we find only a legal discussion of how to define and how to stop schismatic activities. In contrast, further episodes in the *vibhaṅga*s and *vastu/khandhaka*s provoke a polemic against an increasingly evil Devadatta, a heinous character who is corrupted by material benefits, commits myriad evil deeds, and is destined to go to hell. This expanded part includes stories such as Devadatta's instigating Ajātaśatru to commit patricide and his attempts to murder Śākyamuni, which highlight Devadatta's intensified depravity and capacity for evil. The obvious divide between the two images heavily suggests extensive historical development. The image of Devadatta as a schismatic was likely created earlier, as it encompasses the core of the Devadatta narrative that is consistent across all early Buddhist schools.

In conclusion, we have examined in this section the seemingly repetitive and unorganized records of Devadatta in the two sections of the five Sthavira-derived Vinayas, namely, the *vibhaṅga*s and *vastu/khandhaka*s. Based on previous scholarship, I list 23 commonly shared episodes of the Devadatta narrative in these Vinayas. On the grounds of the content and function of these episodes in the *vibhaṅga*s and *vastu/khandhaka*s, my investigation sheds light on the possible rationale behind the separate compositions of the Devadatta narrative in the Vinayas: The Devadatta stories in the *vibhaṅga*s aim to demonstrate how to prevent a schism, whereas the narrative in the *vastu/khandhaka*s defines a schism. The two versions of the Devadatta stories can be reduced to similar core narrative (episodes 15, 16, 17, or 18, 22, 23) in which Devadatta is accused of committing *saṅghabheda*, and the monastic community takes collective measures to prevent this

transgression. It is noteworthy that these central episodes are situated in a legal context, discussing how to identify and punish such a schismatic. The other episodes, expanding the core narrative in which Devadatta is a schismatic, add more evildoings to Devadatta's biography. Consequently, the image of Devadatta is developed into an evildoer which encompasses many other aspects in addition to the schismatic one. However, Devadatta's evil stories could not completely fit in with the legal discussion of schismatics in the Vinayas. The most obvious contradiction is that in the legal discussion, Devadatta merely incurs the transgression of *saṅghāvaśeṣa*; however, in the other evil stories, when Devadatta kills a nun and attempts to murder the Buddha, he should have been convicted of *pārājika*, which is the category of gravest violation in the Vinaya, but he is never convicted as such. In this regard, there is little doubt that Devadatta's current image was a result of extensive historical developments, the initial parts of which, as reflected in Devadatta's core narrative, paint him as just a schismatic in the legal discussion. As further revealed in section 3.2, we see more evidence that Devadatta's stories are deliberately constructed to augment the basic narrative of a schismatic, and the Devadatta stories should be read fundamentally as a schismatic narrative.

Appendix: Sketch of storyline A

Under King Śuddhodana's orders that every Śākya family is obligated to send one son to take up the religious life, Devadatta sets forth, together with several other Śākya princes, who are listed as the Śākya chieftain Bhaddiya, Anuruddha, Bhagu, Kiṃbila, and Ānanda, according to the Pāli version (Vin. ii. 180–181; Dhp-A. i. 133–138; Mil. 107–108). Some texts further add prophecies about Devadatta's future religious career: when Devadatta departs from home riding a well-adorned elephant, he hits his head on a gate and his crown is knocked off, predicting a futile religious pursuit in the future (Mvu. iii. 178). The *Saṅghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, in the form of a story in which a bird flies off with a jewel from Devadatta's crown (T. 1450 [XXIV] 145b1–3; D. 1, *'dul ba*, *nga*, 104b6–7; Gnoli 1977–1978: I. 204), portends that Devadatta will fall to hell after several failed attempts to murder the Buddha.

During his early religious career, especially during the first 12 years, Devadatta assiduously pursues the correct path and enjoys an excellent reputation. He gains access to the knowledge of magical power from Ānanda, although Śākyamuni and other major disciples refuse to impart this knowledge to him.[226] These magical power, however, while helping Devadatta gain greater fame and other benefits, also induce depravity in him. He first wins the support of Prince Ajātaśatru by magically transforming his own body into that of an elephant, a horse, or a young boy, and mystically appearing and disappearing.[227] Later, Devadatta comes up with the idea of replacing Śākyamuni as the leader of the *saṅgha*. He approaches Śākyamuni to openly demand leadership of the monastic community on the pretext that Śākyamuni is old and weak and should retire. However, Śākyamuni refuses him, and further states that he would not even transfer leadership to Śāriputra or Maudgalyāyana, let alone to the foolish Devadatta, who is a "saliva drinker" (§4.1.2.2). As most texts agree, Devadatta is annoyed by Śākyamuni's words and develops hatred toward him and his major disciples.

---

[226] T. 212 (IV) 687b11–c23; T. 1464 (XXIV) 859b7–13. It is Daśabala Kāśyapa who teaches him in the MSV (Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 60–70, D. 1, *'dul ba*, *nga*, 170b4–171a4, T. 1450 [XXIV] 172b19–c4); however, in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, it is indeed the Buddha who teaches him magical skills (T. 1421 [XXII] 17c15–19).

[227] Vin. ii. 183–184; T. 1421 (XXII) 17c21–25; T. 1428 (XXII) 582a9–b1; T. 1435 (XXIII) 257c4–12; T. 1442 (XXIII) 701a1–10; D. 3, *'dul ba, ca*, 289a4–b4; Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 70–71, D. 1, *'dul ba*, *nga*, 160a2–7, T. 1450 (XXIV) 168b28–c23.

In order to usurp the Buddha's leadership, Devadatta turns to Ajātaśatru, inducing the prince to murder his father, King Bimbisāra, so as to accede to the throne and confirm Devadatta as the new buddha. With the assistance of Ajātaśatru, Devadatta attempts several times to murder Śākyamuni. At one point, he sends a group of assassins, who are then all converted by the Buddha. Devadatta also hurls a rock down from Mount Gṛdhrakūṭa to crush the Buddha. The Pāli texts narrate that this rock hits another rock and is broken into pieces, while other Vinayas state that a god intercepts the rock (it is yakṣa Kumbhīra in Gnoli 1977-1978: II. 168). In either case, one small piece of the rock hits the foot of the Buddha and draws his blood (see Zin 2006b: 332–337 for artistic representations). Due to this sin, Devadatta is doomed to be reborn in hell for a long time after.[228] Furthermore, Devadatta bribes an elephant-tamer to release a drunk elephant named Nālāgiri (or Dhanapāla) to trample the Buddha; again, the elephant is disciplined by the majesty of the Buddha (Schlingloff 2013: 435ff; Zin 2006a: 69–95). Several texts report that, just after this event, Devadatta comes to lose the patronage of Ajātaśatru (Vin. ii. 195; Dhp-A. i. 141–142; T. 125 [II] 803c16–23; Sp. iv. 811).

[228] Vin. ii. 187–195; Pāli Kuruṅga Jātaka (J. 21); T. 1421 (XXII) 17c19–20b2; T. 1428 (XXII) 592b1–c29; T. 1435 (XXIII) 258a9–12; Gnoli 1977-1978: II. 74–75, 167–170, 186–191, D. 1, *'dul ba*, *nga*, 161a5–162b5, 222b2–224a4, 238a2–241b4, T. 1450 (XXIV) 169a12–c8, 192a14-193b26, 197b28–198c6; T. 1463 (XXIV) 823c11–26; T. 125 (II) 810c14–26; T. 2087 (XLIX) 920c13–15.

Left: Figure 5. From Taxila. Kurita No. 431. Taxila Museum, Case III B. Cf. Zin 2015: 333. Devadatta hurled a rock to the Buddha but was intercepted by a *yakṣa*.

Right: Figure 6. Kumtura, Cave 46, barrel vault, left side. Adapted from Zin 2015: 335. Devadatta threw a stone to the Buddha.

Figure 7. Kurita No. 556. Private collection, Japan. Cf. Zin 2015: 334. The feet of the Buddha was injured by Devadatta.

In order to obtain future fame, Devadatta then proposes a list of five ascetic practices to be obeyed by the whole community, and attempts to drive the ignorant monks into a schism. Having learned of this event, Śākyamuni admonishes Devadatta and temporarily suppresses his schismatic intentions. Śākyamuni then issues rulings against *saṅghabheda*: monks should first attempt to dissuade a schismatic by orally reprimanding him. If the reprimand does not work, monks should perform the three-round *karman* ceremony.[229] If a schismatic still continues his schismatic activities, he incurs the transgression of *saṅghāvaśeṣa*. Moreover, upon learning that Devadatta's supporters actively assist the schismatic, Śākyamuni applies the same ruling toward supporters of a schismatic.

[229] In the Vinaya context, *karman*s (Chn. *jiemo* 羯磨) refer to authoritative, collective proceedings of the *saṅgha* conducted in special occasions, such as in the ceremonies for ordaining new members, for confession and absolution, and for expulsion. Clarke (2015: 81) defines it as "formal ecclesiastical acts of the *saṅgha*." For a more detailed discussion of the *karman*, see Chung 1988: 19. A legal *karman* ceremony include the procedure of a motion (*bai* 白. Skt. *jñapti*) to the *saṅgha* and at most three rounds of voting on the proposed motion, and therefore it is usually called 白三羯磨 or 白四羯磨 in Chinese (Skt. *jñapticaturtha-karman,* Tib. *gsol ba dang bzhi'i las*; Cf. the detailed discussion of this concept in Heirman 2002: II. 280–281). If the decision is made after one or two rounds of voting, the *karman* is then named 白一羯磨 or 白二羯磨 (*jñaptidvitīya*). Cf. also Chung 1988: 27-28 for different types of *karman*s.

Appendix: Sketch of storyline B

Motivated by the possibility of great fame, Devadatta determines to split the monastic community (T. 1421 [XXII] 164a20–22; T. 1435 [XXIII] 259a9–16; T. 1442 [XXIII] 702b24–27, D. 3, *'dul ba*, *cha*, 4a5–7). He thus summons his group of four friends, namely, Kokālika (Chn. 孤迦里迦 or 瞿婆離), Khaṇḍadravya (Pāli Khaṇḍadeviyāputta, Chn. 褰荼達驃), Kaṭamorakatiṣya (Pāli Kaṭamorakatissaka, Chn. 羯吒謨洛迦底灑) and Samudradatta (Pāli Samuddadatta, Chn. 三沒達羅達多, Tib. *rGya mtshos byin*). Given the great power possessed by Śākyamuni and his disciples, Devadatta's followers question Devadatta on how to put their plan into practice. Devadatta proposes a list of five ascetic practices to be obeyed by the whole community (Table 3.3.1). He presumes that Śākyamuni will not approve of this proposal, and therefore, his group could urge those monks with ascetic tendencies to split from Śākyamuni's *saṅgha*. The image of Devadatta as a supporter of asceticism is quite clear here.[230]

As Devadatta expects, Śākyamuni refuses him and announces that the monks are free to accept or reject these ascetic practices. Consequently, Devadatta brings this issue to a vote during a *poṣadha*[231] (Chn. *busa* 布薩; Vin. ii. 199; Dhp-A. i. 142; T. 1421 [XXII] 164b6) in Rājagṛha. Five hundred monks, mostly depicted as newly-ordained, naive, and foolish in

[230] Vin. ii. 196; 善見律毘婆沙 T. 1462 (XXIV) 768c11–12; T. 1421 (XXII) 164a26–164b1; T. 1428 (XXII) 594b14–15; T. 1463 (XXIV) 823a17–26; T. 1435 (XXIII) 264b28–c4; T. 212 (IV) 696b4–14. This is adduced by Ray (1994: 162–178) as evidence that Devadatta was originally a forest saint but was maligned by the later monks who settled themselves in monasteries. However, we possess three versions of the five points in the Mūlasarvāstivāda texts, and what Devadatta proposes there is not purely ascetic practices: in one version, although Devadatta proposes not eating fish, flesh, curdled milk, or salt, he also argues for living indoors and wearing long robes instead of living in the open air and keeping robes of rags (T. 1450 [XXIV] 149b9–20; 根本薩婆多部律攝 T. 1458 [XXIV] 546b29–c3). In another paragraph of the MSV *Saṅghabhedavastu*, a dramatically reversed story is narrated, in which Devadatta is purely obsessed by secular enjoyment—he does not espouse ascetic practices such as begging and living in the open air, but precisely the opposite (Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 204–205, D. 1, *'dul ba*, *nya*, 250b4–251a1, T. 1450 [XXIV] 202c13–14; Borgland 2018). The typical Mūlasarvāstivāda attempts at tarnishing the reputation of Devadatta are evident here.

[231] The *poṣadha* (or *upoṣadha*, Pāli *[u]posatha*) is a bimonthly Buddhist ceremony in which the monastic community observe the practice of fasting, recite the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, invite other monastic members to reveal their transgressions, and so forth, for the aim of confessing and expiating sins. It is usally held on the day preceding the day of the new and of the full moon. Cf. Heirman 2002: I. 215–217 (nota bene the difference between the *poṣadha* for the monastic communities and that for the lay community); Tieken 2002: 280.

Buddhist texts, vote for Devadatta's proposition.[232] After the vote, Devadatta leads his five hundred followers to Mount Gayāśīrṣa and founds his community there.

Having known of Devadatta's schism, Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, the Buddha's two foremost disciples, pretend to join Devadatta's community for the purpose of winning back Devadatta's followers. Most Vinayas include the subplot that one monk becomes exceptionally distressed upon hearing of the pair's departure, assuming that the two top disciples have abandoned Śākyamuni's teachings. Śākyamuni comforts him, declaring that the two will bring all five hundred monks back.

Upon hearing of the arrival of Śākyamuni's two major disciples, Devadatta becomes immensely joyful. Even though he is warned by his own fellow Kokālika (or Samudradatta in the Mahīśāsaka tradition) that Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana may come to lure away his followers, Devadatta still welcomes them; in the Pāli Vinaya, he even gives half of his seat to Śāriputra (Vin. ii. 199–200). In imitation of the Buddha, Devadatta entrusts Śāriputra with preaching the Dharma when Devadatta claims to have backaches. Unwittingly, Devadatta falls into a deep sleep.[233] Śāriputra seizes this opportunity to preach the correct Dharma, and successfully brings Devadatta's community back to Śākyamuni.

Later, Devadatta is kicked awake by Kokālika (or Samudradatta in the Mahīśāsaka tradition) and realizes what happened (it is Devadatta who beats his followers in the MSV tradition, e.g. T. 1450 [XXIV] 204b9–11). The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya states that, at that very moment, Devadatta spits blood and falls to hell (T. 1421 [XXII] 164c14–15). The Buddha then tells several Jātakas of Devadatta's past life. The whole narrative concludes with Upāli's inquiries on the definition of *saṅghabheda*.

---

[232] In the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, only Ānanda and another monk with the *śrotāpanna* fruit vote against them (T. 1421 [XXII] 164b10–11). Cf. T. 1428 (XXII) 909b14–15, in which Ānanda and another 60 elders vote against Devadatta).

[233] Vin. ii. 199; T. 1421 [XXII] 164 b15–165c14; T. 428 [XXII] 909c13–910a11; T. 1435 [XXIII] 265b9–266a2; MSV *Saṅghabhedavastu* [Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 208], T. 1450 [XXIV] 203a11–b6).

3.1.3 Devadatta in the Mahāsāṅghika literature

Our present understanding of the image of Devadatta in the Mahāsāṅghika context relies purely on two texts, namely, the Chinese *Mohe sengqi lü* and the *Mahāvastu*, the only two Mahāsāṅghika texts that contain details of Devadatta's activities.

3.1.3.1 The accounts of the Mohe sengqi lü

The *Mohe sengqi lü* contains stories about Devadatta in two main parts, one in the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* (*sengcan fa* 僧残法) section of the *vibhaṅga*,[234] and the other in the **bhikṣuprakīrṇakavarga* (*zasong baqu fa* 雜誦跋渠法).[235] Note that the **bhikṣuprakīrṇaka* part does not mention Devadatta's schismatic activities in its tenth *varga*, where the issue of *saṅghabheda* is discussed.[236] Instead, his stories are included in the second *varga*—a section which offers explanations to a list of mnemonic key words—and more particularly, in its brief discussion of who is a *nānāsaṃvāsa-varta* (Chn. *yizhu* 異住, "dwelling separately").[237] I append a full English translation of these stories to the end of this section.

In the *saṅghāvaśeṣa*, Devadatta's schismatic activities are described as follows. When Śākyamuni Buddha dwells in the city of Rājagṛha, Devadatta reverses monastic rules in the *Prātimokṣasūtra* and applies his new regulations to both monastic and lay Buddhists; moreover, he revises the content of the whole Canon, redefining meanings conveyed by the scriptures, and introduces Buddhists to his misunderstandings.[238] Here, Devadatta's strategies to split the *saṅgha* mainly consist of composing divergent monastic codes and divergent scriptures, which differ considerably from the Sthavira accusation, in which he proposes five controversial points of ascetic practice. Later, having learned of Devadatta's schismatic intentions, Śākyamuni formalizes the procedure to prevent the monastic

---

[234] T. 1425 (XXII) 281c12–282c23, 284a26–b13. The text and its translation are seen in the appendix of this section.

[235] T. 1425 (XXII) 442c29–443a26. The text and its translation are seen in the appendix of this section.

[236] The discussion of schism is quite brief in the tenth *varga* (T. 1425 [XXII] 489c9–17) which contains no information about Devadatta. See below §3.2.1.2 and n. 296 for the text and English translation.

[237] Roth 1970: 328ff. for the Sanskrit text of the summary of the *bhikṣuprakīrṇaka*. Bareau's study on the origin of Devadatta's legends clearly ignores this part of the account, perhaps because it is not contained in the tenth *varga,* the section focusing particularly on *saṅghabheda.*

[238] T. 1425 (XXII) 281c12–28. 提婆達多欲破和合僧故勤方便，執持破僧事，於十二修多羅 ... 不制者制，已制者便開，乃至在家出家共行法 ... 於此九部經，更作異句、異字、異味、異義，各各異文辭說，自誦習持，亦教他誦持。For its English translation, see the appendix to this chapter.

community from being split: Monks are supposed to persuade and reprimand (Chn. *jian* 諫; Skt.[*sam*]-*anu*-√*bhāṣ*)[239] the separatist repeatedly, both in private and public. If these reprimands fail, a formal act (*karman*) should be performed three times to collectively determine the punishment of the instigator. Nevertheless, Devadatta persistently continues his schismatic activities and refuses to stop. Therefore, when the *saṅgha* reports the issue to the Buddha, the Buddha declares that the *saṅgha* should hold a ceremony for a formal act of suspension (*utkṣepaṇīyaṃ karman*) to decide the punishment of Devadatta. However, this act does not come into effect because Devadatta's followers, vaguely termed "the group of six" (六群比丘)—a phrase almost synonymous with offenders of monastic codes—raise an objection in the third round of the *karman* ("有多人遮，羯磨不成 [Because many people raised objection, this *karman* ceremony was not carried out]"). In the aftermath of the objection of Devadatta's followers, the Buddha established a formal procedure to punish monks who would assist in causing a schism. On the condition that they still refuse to stop after three reprimands by the *saṅgha*, the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* ruling against abetting a schism will be incurred.

The *varga* section supplements the Devadatta narrative with many fresh details. The schismatic story takes place in Gayā. When a *poṣadha* assembly is supposed to be held, Śākyamuni sends Ānanda to summon Devadatta. However, motivated by the future fame a schismatic would gain, Devadatta refuses to join the assembly and declares that he will no longer worship the same three jewels, no longer share the same *poṣadha, pravāraṇa,* and *karman*, and will choose whether or not to obey the monastic codes. Conspiring with his supporters, Devadatta finally manages to split from Śākyamuni Buddha's *saṅgha* by performing a separate *poṣadha* ceremony in the city of Gayā. From the context, we can say that the performance of a separate *poṣadha* ceremony officially marks the success of Devadatta's schism.[240]

---

[239] Heirman (2002: II. 422–423) points out that in the *Sifen lü*, "the formal act 'to admonish' is a *jñapticaturtha karman*, an act consisting of one motion, three propositions and a conclusion."

[240] Here, an important message is conveyed: a separate performance of *poṣadha* ceremony signifies Devadatta's official separation from the Buddha's monastic community. Although I choose to elaborate on the connection between the Devadatta narrative and the different definitions of schism in the Vinayas mainly in §3.2.2, here I briefly introduce the academic work done by Sasaki, since he pays particular attention to the Devadatta stories in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya.

Sasaki has published a series of eight articles titled "Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period (I-VIII)" to discuss different types of schisms. Based on the above-mentioned paragraph T. 1425 (XXII) 489c9–17 (see

In sum, in the *Mohe sengqi lü,* we notice that the schismatic activities of Devadatta consist of at least two aspects: composing new literature and holding a separate *poṣadha*. There is no clue to associate Devadatta with ascetic tendencies as usually narrated in the Sthavira-derived Vinayas. Confronted with the fact that Devadatta is active in causing a schism, the monastic community intends to release a formal act of suspension to dissuade him, which, however, ends up in failure due to the objection of the group of six monks in the *karman*. That is to say, Devadatta is possibly not subject to monastic punishment in his schismatic career. Later, through the performance of a separate monastic ceremony, he finalizes the schism and establishes his own monastic community.

---

above n. 236 and below §3.2.1.2 and n. 296) in the *Mohe sengqi lü*, Sasaki (1992: 167–168) argues that the Mahāsāṅghikas define schism as the split due to the separate performances of *poṣadha* and *karman*s. Moreover, he (ibid. 168) argues that this Mahāsāṅghika definition contrasts with the Sarvāstivāda approach in which schism is defined differently as the separation due to different understandings of the Buddhist teachings. However, this dichotomy is not fully established in my reading of the same paragraph. In this paragraph, what the Buddha denies as a schism is the situation in which monks with conflicting views of Buddhist teachings still reside in the same place and perform the same monastic ceremonies. That is to say, the separate monastic ceremonies must be combined with the different understanding of the teaching so as to constitute a schism. It is ambiguous whether the performance of separate monastic ceremony alone suffices to define schism. At least in the Devadatta's case, Devadatta's schismatic activities involve both the proposal of a different teaching and a separate performance of *poṣadha*. Therefore, the Mahāsāṅghika definition of schism cannot be simply understood as the split solely due to separate performances of monastic ceremonies.

Having argued that the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya defines schism as the monastic separation incurred by separate performances of *poṣadha* ceremonies, Sasaki (1993) then equates the Mahāsāṅghika definition of schism with *karmabheda*, a concept advanced not by the Mahāsāṅghikas but instead in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharmas. He also terms the Sarvāstivāda definition as *cakrabheda* as he believes that the Sarvāstivādins defined schism as a monastic split due to different understandings of the teachings. For reasons unclear to me, Sasaki (1992: 175) further argues that the Mahāsāṅghika way of defining schism (i.e. *karmabheda*) represents a definition later than that reflected in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya (i.e. *cakrabheda*). He (1993c: 185) even makes a chart to show how other schools (Theravaṃsa, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka) combine the two types of definitions in their Vinayas.

Sasaki has provided many useful observations which definitely deepen our understanding of schism in the Buddhist Vinayas. However, his conclusions are not without problems, especially because these two types of schism are never clearly distinguished. As I have demonstrated already, the definition of schism in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya also involves disagreement in interpreting Buddhist teachings: for instance, in its version of the Devadatta stories, Devadatta indeed first establishes a different understanding of the teaching and then performs a separate *poṣadha* ceremony. In terms of how the Sarvāstivādins defined schism, Sasaki (1999: 1–4) later already realizes that they also accept the role of separate monastic ceremonies in splitting a monastic community. Therefore, the definitions of the Mahāsāṅghikas and Sarvāstivādins cannot be understood as two totally different ideas. Moreover, the dichotomy of the two concepts *karmabheda* and *cakrabheda* was first advanced in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharmas (§3.2.3.3). A more plausible chronology, as I perceive it, is that the Vinayas first formed a general concept of schism, and later Sarvāstivāda developed this definition into two nuanced levels; these two leveled definition became popular among certain groups of Buddhists and then influenced some Vinaya editors in later days. That is to say, when the discussions of schisms were formalized in Vinaya, the two concepts *karmabheda* and *cakrabheda* were possibly still undeveloped.

3.1.3.2 The accounts of the **Mahāvastu**

There are only two scenes from Devadatta's current lifetime preserved in the *Mahāvastu*. One story narrates that after the going forth of the Buddha, Devadatta goes to woo Yaśodharā but is refused.[241] The text then states that this is not the first time that Yaśodharā rejects Devadatta's marriage proposal. In a past life, Yaśodharā, as a tigress, also refused both Devadatta's and Sundarananda's courtship because she yearned for the Buddha.[242] Even in this life, before Yaśodharā gets married, the Buddha, Devadatta, and Sundarananda all participate in a tournament to win her hand. When Devadatta goes to the venue of the tournament, he finds a stray elephant running at him. Devadatta slaps the elephant to death but cannot drag its body away, leaving the giant corpse blocking the passage to the city of Kapilavastu. Sundarananda, the Buddha's younger brother, comes to drag it out of the gateway, but he cannot move it further. In contrast, the Buddha effortlessly hurls the dead elephant over the seven walls and out of the city.[243] In the tournament, which consists of shooting an arrow clear through palm trees, Devadatta's arrow only advances as far as the third palm tree, while Sundarananda's arrow pierces three trees and then falls to the ground before the fourth. Śākyamuni, with his grandfather's bow that only he can string, shoots the arrow through all seven palm trees and even the drum at the far end of the trees, after which the arrow finally strikes the earth. In this way, the Buddha triumphs over Devadatta and the other Śākya princes.[244]

The second scene from Devadatta's current life is narrated when the young Śākya princes go forth. As Devadatta leaves home, he is riding a well-adorned elephant, but his crown is knocked off when his head hits the gate. This portends the futility of his future religious pursuits.[245] Based on this plot alone, even though we have no other records of Devadatta's religious career in his present life elsewhere in the *Mahāvastu*, we can easily conjecture that his religious journey must be a failed one.

---

[241] Mvu. ii. 68–69 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: II. 66–67.

[242] Mvu. ii. 69–72 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: II. 67–69.

[243] Mvu. ii. 74–75 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: II. 71–72.

[244] Mvu. ii. 75–77 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: II. 72–74.

[245] Mvu. iii. 178 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: III. 174.

Apart from the above descriptions of Devadatta as a rival of the Buddha in marriage, several past-life stories are also preserved. I summarize them below according to the sequence in which they appear in the text:

(1). In the first Jātaka, Devadatta appeared as an evil king named Jaṭhara. He desired Apratimā, the wife of a merciful king named Kuśa; Queen Apratimā, Yaśodharā's past incarnation, physically punished Jaṭhara. However, at the request of the compassionate king Kuśa, she spared him.[246]

(2). In another Jātaka, Devadatta, being a wretched hunter, managed to shoot a lion that was a former existence of the Buddha. However, the lion expressed no intention of revenge, even though it had the capability to kill the hunter.[247]

(3). The third Jātaka relates that Devadatta was a treacherous pathfinder who conspired with a group of bandits to kill a caravan leader, the former existence of the Buddha. However, after Devadatta's conspiracy failed, the caravan leader granted pardon to Devadatta out of compassion.[248]

(4). In the fourth Jātaka, the Buddha and Devadatta were reincarnated as the deer Nyagrodha and Viśākha, two brothers each leading a herd of deer. When a pregnant doe from Viśākha's herd was ordered to go to the king's kitchen and offer her own life, she pleaded with Viśākha to let her survive until she delivered her fawn. Viśākha did not absolve her because no other deer agreed to be offered in her place; in the end, Nyagrodha decided to take her place in order to save her baby. Having figured out what had happened, all the people applauded Nyagrodha for being a good leader and condemned Viśākha's evil leadership.[249]

On the basis of the above past-life stories, more pieces of the puzzle can be added to the concept of Devadatta's image in the Mahāsāṅghika tradition(s). Generally speaking, each of the above Jātakas contrasts the evilness of Devadatta with the Buddha's compassion, agreeing with the Sthavira accounts that the mercy of the Buddha is frequently contrasted

[246] Mvu. i. 128–131 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: I. 101–103.

[247] Mvu. i. 132 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: I. 103.

[248] Mvu. i. 132 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: I. 104.

[249] Mvu. i. 359–366 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: I. 305–311.

with Devadatta's ingratitude.[250] Specifically, in the first story, Devadatta coveted the wife of the Buddha in a past life, which incurred severe punishment. This reminds us of his competition with the Buddha for Yaśodharā in the present life, a motif that we frequently encounter in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.[251] Based on the accounts in the second and third Jātakas, in which Devadatta vainly conspired to murder the Buddha, we deduce that the composers of the *Mahāvastu* must have been familiar with Devadatta's aborted plans to murder the Buddha. From the fourth Jātaka, in which Devadatta's leadership was particularly condemned, we surmise that the *Mahāvastu*'s composers must have been familiar with the Devadatta who acted as the leader of the schismatic community.

3.1.3.3 The overall image of Devadatta in the Mahāsāṅghika tradition(s)

We can sketch out the Mahāsāṅghika notion of Devadatta based on the information contained in the above two texts:

1. The core of the Devadatta narrative in the *Mohe sengqi lü* is still his schismatic activities, which can be summarized as follows: Devadatta intends to cause a schism by composing different Buddhist literature. Śākyamuni in response issues a ruling stating that a *karman* ceremony must be held to decide the punishment of the schismatic. Devadatta's supporters, however, raise an objection during the third round of the *karman* targeted at Devadatta, which helps Devadatta escape penalty. Afterward, Devadatta holds an independent *poṣadha* with the group of six monks in Gayā and splits the Buddha's monastic community.

2. The basic structure of the core narrative of the *Mohe sengqi lü* is quite similar to the central episodes (15/16/17 or 18/22/23) of the Sthavira offshoots. However, some of their details nonetheless differ. The Mahāsāṅghika tradition reports that Devadatta composes different monastic rulings and new teachings in Rājagṛha in order to split the *saṅgha*, with the help of the group of six monks. In comparison, the Vinayas of the five Sthavira offshoots state that Devadatta plots to split the *saṅgha* by proposing five ascetic practices. Aided by his four friends, Devadatta brings this issue to a vote in a *poṣadha* assembly in Rājagṛha and then departs for the city of Gayā to establish a separate community.

---

[250] Cf. J. 174 (*Dubhiya-Makkata-jātaka*); T. 202 (IV) 366b3–9; T. 1450 (XXIV) 180a22–c10.

[251] Cf. Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 259–261, D. 1, *'dul ba*, *nga*, 289b3–290a7, T. 1450 (XXIV) 149b23–150a.

3. The stories contained in the *Mahāvastu* display a more developed narrative tradition. As we read in the other five Vinayas, Devadatta always possesses bad intentions toward the Buddha, habitually competing with the Buddha not only in this life but also during their past lives. Many stories, such as Devadatta's several attempts to murder the Buddha and his attempted wooing of Yaśodharā, may have been known among the Mahāsāṅghika monks.

Appendix: The Devadatta stories in the Mohe sengqi lü

Since the two parts of the Devadatta stories in the *Mohe sengqi lü* — i.e., one in the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* section of the *vibhaṅga* and the other in the second *varga* of the *bhikṣuprakīrṇaka* section—can be combined to form a more or less logically coherent narrative, I present them together in translation.

The *saṅghāvaśeṣa* ruling concerning the chief schismatic: [252]

> The Buddha dwelled in the city of Rājagṛha, as narrated extensively in the preceding part. At that time, Devadatta pursued ways to split the harmonious *saṅgha*, and took up legal issues conducive to a schism. With regard to the twelvefold *Prātimokṣasūtras*,[253] namely, the introduction to precepts, four *pārājika*s, 13 *saṅghāvaśeṣa*s, two *aniyata*s, 30 *naiḥsargika-pāyantikā*s, 92 *pāyantikā*s, four *pratideśanīya*s, *śāikṣa*, seven *adhikaraṇaśamatha*s, and *anudharma*, he forbade what was not forbidden, but allowed what was prohibited ... [repeating the previous text up to the part that] he applied this to the precepts shared by lay practitioners and renunciants. There are nine divisions of the Canon, namely, *sūtra*s, *geyas, vyākaraṇa*s, *gāthā*s, *udāna*s, *itivṛttaka*s, *jātaka*s, *vaipulya*s, and *adbhutadharma*s. In the case of the nine divisions of the Canon, he even composed sentences, words, interpretations, and meanings different [from the Buddha's]. He himself recited and practiced each of these different readings and expressions, and further instructed other monks to recite and retain them.[254]

---

[252] T. 1425 (XXII) 281c12–282c23.

[253] Literally, *Shi'er xiuduoluo* 十二修多羅 means "the 12 *sūtra*s." However, here it refers to the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, as explained elsewhere in the *Mohe sengqi lü* ("波羅提木叉者，十修多羅也." T. 1425 [XXII] 338c20). The number *Shi'er* 十二 ("12") seems to be an error for ten, because there are only ten divisions indicated in this context, as also observed by Yinshun (1994: 115n.19, 21).

[254] 佛住王舍城，廣說如上。是時，提婆達多欲破和合僧故勤方便，執持破僧事，於十二修多羅，戒序、四波羅夷、十三僧伽婆尸沙、二不定法、三十尼薩耆波夜提、九十二波夜提、四波羅提提舍

At that time, the monks spoke: "Devadatta! Do not create ways to break the harmonious *saṅgha*! Do not take up [legal] issues conducive to a schism! Do not pursue ways to split the harmonious *saṅgha*! Do not dispute with elders because of upholding [legal] issues conducive to schism! You should stay together with the *saṅgha*! Why? The *saṅgha* should be harmonious, stay joyful without dispute, share the same teaching, remain as united as the mixture of water and milk, illuminate the teaching according to the teaching of [the teacher], and dwell in comfort."[255]

However, Devadatta did not cease when he was reprimanded the first time; nor did he stop after the second and third reprimands. Because of this, the monks approached the Buddha, saying: "Blessed One! Devadatta is pursuing ways to split the harmonious *saṅgha*, and taking up [legal] issues conducive to a schism. Concerning the *introduction to precepts* ... [repeating the previous text up to the part that] regarding the nine divisions of the Canon, he has composed different sentences, words, interpretations, and meanings; he not only recites all the different readings and expressions by himself but also instructs others [to do so]. The monks then reprimanded him a first time, a second time, and a third time, but he behaved as before and refused to abandon [these activities]." [256]

The Buddha spoke to the monks: "If Devadatta, the foolish one, pursues ways to split the harmonious *saṅgha* and take up [legal] issues conducive to a schism ...

尼、眾學法、七滅諍法、隨順法，不制者制，已制者便開，乃至在家出家共行法。所謂九部經，修多羅、祇夜、授記、伽陀、優陀那、如是語經、本生經、方廣、未曾有法，於此九部經，更作異句、異字、異味、異義，各各異文辭說，自誦習持，亦教他誦持.

[255] 時諸比丘語："提婆達多！*汝莫作方便壞和合僧！莫執持破僧事！汝莫為破和合僧故勤方便！莫受破僧事故共諍長老！當與僧同事！何以故？*僧和合歡喜不諍，共一學如水乳合，如法說法照明，安樂住。"

*汝莫作方便, ... 故共諍長老: The Pāli parallel reads (Vin. iii. 172): *māyasmā samaggassa saṅghassa bhedāya parakkami bhedanasaṃvattanikaṃ vā adhikaraṇaṃ samādāya paggayha aṭṭhāsi, samet' āyasmā saṅghena samaggo*. Previous scholarship on *adhikaraṇa* is seen in Borgland 2014: 26ff. & 95ff.

*僧和合歡喜不諍 ... 安樂住: The Sanskrit *Abhisamācārika* of the Mahāsāṅghika school contains a parallel expression: *kasya tvaṃ bhikṣūṇāṃ samagrāṇāṃ sahitānāṃ saṃmodamānānāṃ avivadamānānāṃ ekoddeśakānāṃ kṣīrodakībhūtānāṃ śāstuḥ śāsanaṃ dīpayamānānāṃ sukhañ ca phāsuñ ca viharantānāṃ.* (Karashima 2012: 289, §38.6.30B1; cf. Heirman 2002: II. 424-425).

[256] 如是一諫不止，第二、第三諫亦復不止。諸比丘以是因緣，往白佛言："世尊！提婆達多欲破和合僧故勤方便，執持破僧事。從戒序乃至九部法，異句、異字、異味、異義，各各異文辭說，自誦習，亦教他。時諸比丘一諫不止，二諫、三諫猶故不止。"

[repeating the previous text up to the part that] regarding the nine divisions of the Canon, he composes different sentences, words, interpretations, and meanings; if he recites each of these variant readings and expressions and refuses to stop after being reprimanded three times—you should go to reprimand him three times on private occasions, reprimand him three times in front of many people, and reprimand him three times in the monastic community, in order to dissuade him from these activities. On private occasions, the monks should speak thus: 'Devadatta, do you really intend to split the harmonious *saṅgha*; take up [legal] issues conducive to a schism ... [repeating the previous text up to the part] concerning the nine divisions of Canon, you compose different sentences, words, interpretations, and meanings; and you recite and practice all the different readings and expressions not only by yourself but also to instruct others [to do so]?' He will answer: 'Yes, really.' Then, you should say to Devadatta: 'You should not pursue ways to split the harmonious *saṅgha*! You should not take up [legal] issues conducive to a schism! Elder Devadatta, to split the harmonious *saṅgha* is the most heinous crime that constitutes the gravest sin. You would fall into the bad realms and go to hell. You would endure punishment for *kalpa*s. Devadatta! We are reprimanding you out of a compassionate mind. If you want to benefit yourself, you should heed our words. The first reprimand has been made, but you still have (the chance to heed) the second reprimand. Will you abandon such acts?' If he does not abandon them, issue the second and third reprimands in the same way. Again, in front of many people, issue the three reprimands in the same way.[257]

On the condition that he still refuses to stop, go to the *saṅgha* and request permission for the ceremony of *karman* (求聽羯磨). The one who petitions for the *karman* should speak thus: 'Venerable Monks, please let the *saṅgha* listen to me! This elder Devadatta is pursuing ways to split the harmonious *saṅgha* and persisting in taking up [legal] issues conducive to a schism. With regard to the

[257] 佛告諸比丘："若是提婆達多愚癡人，欲破和合僧故勤方便，執持破僧事，乃至九部法，作異句、異字、異味、異義，各各異文辭說，三諫不止者，汝去應當屏處三諫，多人中三諫，僧中三諫，令捨是事。比丘屏處諫者，應作是說：'汝，提婆達多，實欲破和合僧，執持破僧事，乃至九部法，異句、異字、異味、異義，異文辭說，自誦習，亦復教他不？'答言：'實爾。'復應語提婆達多：'汝莫破和合僧故勤方便！莫執持破僧事！長老提婆達多！破和合僧最是大惡重罪，當墮惡道，入泥犁中，經劫受罪。提婆達多！我今慈心，饒益故，當受我語。'一諫已過，二諫在：'捨此事不？'不捨者，第二、第三諫亦如是。復於多人中，三諫亦如是.

twelvefold subjects of the precepts ... [repeating the previous text up to the part that] regarding nine categories of Canon, he has created different sentences, words, interpretations, meanings, readings, and expressions. He not only recites by himself but also instructs others. We have already reprimanded him three times in private and three times in front of many people. However, he still refuses to abandon [these activities]. If the *saṅgha* is ready, may the monks in the *saṅgha* agree to reprimand him three times to force him to stop.' In the monastic community, one should ask (Devadatta): 'Devadatta! Is it true that you have composed different sentences, words, interpretations, and meanings concerning the texts of the twelvefold subjects ... [repeating the previous text up to the part] regarding the nine divisions of the Canon, you have recited and practiced all the different readings and expressions not only by yourself but also to instruct others; and, after the monks reprimanded you three times in private and three times in front of many people, you still refuse to stop?' He will answer: 'It is true.' The *saṅgha* should [thus] admonish him, saying: 'Devadatta, do not pursue ways to split the harmonious *saṅgha*! Do not take up [legal] issues conducive to a schism! Do not compose different sentences, words, interpretations, meanings, and readings and expressions with regard to the texts up to the nine divisions of the Canon. Do not split the harmonious *saṅgha*! To split the harmonious *saṅgha* is a heinous act, a grave offense, which causes you to fall into the bad realms and go to hell. You will suffer from punishment for one *kalpa*. Now, the monastic members are reprimanding you out of a compassionate mind. If you want to benefit yourself, accept the words of the *saṅgha*.' The first reprimand has been made, but you still have (the chance to heed) the second reprimand. You should abandon (schismatic) activities." If not, issue the second reprimand and the third in the same way.'"[258]

[258] 猶不止者，將詣僧中，應作求聽羯磨。羯磨者作如是說：'大德僧聽！是長老提婆達多，欲破和合僧故勤方便，執持破僧事住。於十二事，乃至九部經，異句、異字、異味、異義，異文辭說，自誦亦教他。已屏處三諫，多人中三諫，猶故不止。若僧時到，僧今於僧中，當三諫令止。僧中應問：'提婆達多！汝實於十二法，乃至九部經，異句、異字、異味、異義，異文辭說，自誦復持教他，諸比丘已屏處三諫，多人中三諫，猶故不止耶？'答言：'實爾。'僧中應諫言：'汝，提婆達多，莫為破和合僧故勤方便，莫執持破僧事，乃至於九部經中，異句、異字、異味、異義，異文辭說。汝莫破和合僧！破和合僧者，是大惡事，是重罪，墮惡道，入泥犁中，經劫受罪。今日眾僧中慈心諫汝，欲饒益故，當受僧語。一諫已過，二諫在，當捨此事。' 若不捨，如是第二、第三諫。"

Still, he refused to abandon [his activities]. The monks again reported the issue to the Blessed One: "That Devadatta has already been reprimanded three times in private, three times in public, and three times in the *saṅgha*. But he still does not stop." The Buddha said to these monks: "The foolish Devadatta is pursuing ways to split the harmonious *saṅgha* and taking up [legal] issues conducive to a schism. He has already been reprimanded three times in private, three times in public, and three times in the *saṅgha*, but still refused to abandon [his activities]. The *saṅgha* should hold the ceremony for an act of suspension (**utkṣepaṇīyaṃ karma*). "[259] ... (Here, I omit a Jātaka in my translation)

The Buddha said to monks: "Summon all the monks based in the city of Śrāvastī. We are going to make precepts on behalf of the monks for the sake of ten benefits ... [repeating the previous text up to the part that] monks who have already heard them should hear again. If a monk pursues ways to split the harmonious *saṅgha*, takes up [legal] issues conducive to a schism and consequently has disputes with others, the monks should say to this [disruptive] monk: 'Elder, you should not pursue ways to split the harmonious *saṅgha*, and take up [legal] issues conducive to schism and consequently dispute with [the other monks]. You should work together with the *saṅgha*! Why? The harmonious *saṅgha* should stay joyful, without dispute, share the same teaching, remain as united as the mixture of water and milk, illuminate the teaching according to the teaching [of the teacher], and dwell in comfort. Elder, you should abandon reasons for schism." If this monk, when reprimanded by other monks, remains committed to schismatic affairs and refuses to abandon them, other monks should reprimand him a second and third time in order to stop his schismatic activities. If he abandons the activities after the second or the third reprimand, then it is fine. If not, he is committing a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* offense." [260]

---

[259] 猶故不止，諸比丘復以是事，往白世尊："是提婆達多，已於屏處三諫，多人中三諫，僧中三諫，此事猶故不捨。"佛語諸比丘："是提婆達多癡人，破和合僧勤方便，執持破僧事，已屏處三諫，多人中三諫，僧中三諫，此事猶故不捨者，僧應與作舉羯磨。"……

[260] 佛告諸比丘："依止舍衛城比丘皆悉令集，以十利故為諸比丘制戒，乃至已聞者當重聞。若比丘欲破和合僧故勤方便，執持破僧事故共諍，諸比丘語是比丘言：'長老！莫破和合僧故勤方便，執持破僧事故共諍。當與僧同事。何以故？和合僧歡喜不諍，共一學如水乳合，如法說法照明，安樂住。長老捨此破僧因緣事。' 是比丘諸比丘如是諫時，堅持是事不捨者，諸比丘應第二、第三諫，為捨是事故。第二、第三諫時，捨是事好。若不捨者，僧伽婆尸沙。

The *saṅghāvaśeṣa* ruling on people who assist the chief schismatic: [261]

The Buddha dwelled in the city of Śrāvastī, just as extensively illustrated above. At that time, the monks were going to conduct an act of suspension (**utkṣepaṇīyaṃ karma*, 舉羯磨). On that occasion, no objection was raised during the first *karman*. When the second *karman* was finished, still nobody objected. When the third *karman* was conducted, Devadatta confronted the group of six monks and spoke: "Group of six monks! You have been obedient to me for a long time and cooperated with me in doing things. Today, the monastic community is holding an act of suspension *karman* against me. It has proceeded to the second round, but you keep silent. You now place me at the disposal of those people, just as you feed a bird curds mixed with crumbed grain, feed a crocodile (**nakra,* 那俱羅) cakes spread with butter, feed a jackal rice blended with oil. People are now censuring the one who cultivates pure practices, but you just sit and watch!"[262]

Then, the group of six stood up and spoke thus: "Such and such elder is a monk preaching the Dharma, a monk explaining the Vinaya. We wish to assent to what is stated by him. We are willing to assent to all the things that this monk intends to assent to. This monk speaks [for us] while knowing us; it is not the case that he speaks while he does not know us." Thus, due to the objection of many people, the *karman* was not carried out.[263]

Then, the [other] monks spoke to the group of six: "Elders! Do not support Devadatta. Do not share the same sayings and views as one who desires to split the harmonious *saṅgha*. You should work together with the *saṅgha*. The complete *saṅgha* should be harmonious, stay joyful without dispute, share the same teaching,

---

[261] T. 1425 (XXII) 284a26–b13.

[262] 佛住舍衛城，廣說如上。爾時諸比丘為提婆達多作舉羯磨。時，初羯磨竟，無有遮者。第二羯磨竟，亦無有遮者。第三羯磨時，提婆達多看六群比丘面，而作是言："六群比丘，汝等長夜承事我，共我從事。今眾僧為我作舉羯磨，已至再說，而皆默然。汝等今日持我任於眾人，如酪塗麨與烏，如酥塗餅與那俱羅，如油和飯與野干。修梵行者，為人所困，而坐觀之。"

[263] 六群比丘即起作是言："如是如是長老，是法語比丘 (*dhammavādī*)，律語比丘 (*vinayavādī*)。是比丘所說，皆是我等欲忍可事。是比丘所見欲忍可事，我等亦欲忍可。是比丘*知說，非不知說。"是時，有多人遮，羯磨不成。"

*知說: Pāli parallel *jānati no bhāsati* (Vin. iii. 175). Horner (1938-1952: I. 304) in her translation notes that this phrase means "he knows our desires, and so on," according to the commentary of the Vinaya (Sp. 611).

remain as united as the mixture of water and milk, illuminate the teaching according to the teaching [of the teacher], and dwell in comfort." In this way, the reprimand was filed, but they did not stop. The second and third reprimands were made, but they still refused to stop.[264]

Monks reported the situation to the Blessed One. The Buddha spoke to monks: "This group of six share the same sayings and views as the foolish Devadatta who desires to split the harmonious *saṅgha*. If you have admonished them three times, but they still refuse to abandon [these activities], you should admonish them three times in private, three times in public, and three times in the monastic community, to force them to stop." The monks obeyed the teaching of the Buddha. (repetitious part elides in my translation).[265]

The Buddha said to the monks: "Summon all the monks who are based in the city of Rājagṛha. We shall make precepts on behalf of the monks for the sake of ten benefits. [The text elides until the part that] monks who have already heard them should hear again. Suppose there are sympathetic monks, one, or two, or many in number, who share the same sayings and views as the monk who attempts to split the harmonious *saṅgha*. When the other monks reprimand the (schismatic) monk, those sympathetic monks will say: 'Elder! Please do not speak good and bad things about this monk! Why? He is the monk preaching the Dharma, the monk explaining the Vinaya. We wish to consent to all his statements. We are willing to endorse all the things that this monk intends to endorse. This monk speaks [for us] while knowing us; it is not the case that he speaks while he does not know us.' Other monks should reprimand the sympathizing monks: 'Elders! Please do not say that 'he is a monk preaching the Dharma, a monk explaining the Vinaya.' Why? He is not a monk preaching the Dharma, nor a monk explaining the Vinayas. (You) elders should not sympathize with schismatic activities. You should take delight in

---

[264] 時諸比丘語六群比丘："長老！莫助提婆達多作，破和合僧同語同見。當與僧同事。一切僧和合歡喜不諍，共一學如水乳合，如法說法照明，安樂住。"作如是一諫不止，第二、第三諫猶故不止。

[265] 諸比丘以是因緣，具白世尊。佛告諸比丘："是六群比丘，與愚癡提婆達多，欲破和合僧，同語同見，已一諫、二諫、三諫不止者，汝去屏處三諫，多人中三諫，應僧中三諫，令捨是事。"比丘受教.

This paragraph is followed by the Buddha's instructions of how to reprimand the sympathizing monks in private, in front of many people, and in the saṅgha, which in actuality repeats the aforementioned Buddha's instructions of how to reprimand Devadatta in private, in public, and in the *saṅgha*. Therefore, I omit this repetitious part in my translation.

supporting the harmonious *saṅgha*. Why? The *saṅgha* should be harmonious, stay joyful without dispute, share the same teaching, remain as united as the mixture of water and milk, illuminate the teaching according to the teaching [of the teacher], and dwell in comfort. Elders, abandon [these] schismatic activities!' If these monks, when reprimanded by other monks, refuse to quit, other monks should reprimand them a second and third time, in order to stop the schismatic affairs. If they abandon such affairs after the second or the third reprimand, it is good. If not, a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* offense will be declared."[266]

The account in the second *Varga*:[267]

The Buddha dwelled in the city of Rājagṛha. Stories are extensively narrated in the stories of Devadatta, up to the part where Devadatta goes to the city of Gayā.[268] The Buddha went to the city of Gayā afterward. On that day, a *poṣadha* assembly was supposed to be held. The Buddha spoke to Ānanda: "Come to summon Devadatta. Today, the *saṅgha* is going to perform the formal act of *poṣadha*." Then, Ānanda came to Devadatta and spoke thus: "Elder! Today the *saṅgha* is going to hold a ceremony for *poṣadha*. The Blessed One summons you, Devadatta." (Devadatta) responded: "I will not go. From now on, I no longer worship the Buddha, *saṅgha*, and Dharma together [with the Buddha's side]. I no longer perform *poṣadha, pravāraṇa*, or *karman* jointly [with the Buddha's side]. From now on, I will choose to follow or abandon *prātimokṣa*s as I wish."[269]

---

[266] 佛告諸比丘："依止王舍城比丘皆悉令集。以十利故為諸比丘制戒，乃至已聞者當重聞。若比丘同意相助，若一、若二、若眾多，同語同見欲破和合僧是比丘，諸比丘諫時，是同意比丘言：'長老！莫說是比丘好惡事。何以故？是法語比丘，律語比丘。是比丘所說，皆是我等欲忍可事。是比丘所見欲忍可事，我等亦欲忍可。是比丘知說，非不知說。'諸比丘諫是同意比丘：'長老！莫作是語——是法語比丘，律語比丘。何以故？是非法語比丘，非律語比丘。諸長老莫助破僧事，當樂助和合僧。何以故？僧和合歡喜不諍，共一學如水乳合，如法說法照明，安樂住。諸長老！當捨此破僧事。'是同意比丘，諸比丘如是諫時，堅持不捨者，諸比丘應第二、第三諫，捨此事故。第二、第三諫時，捨是事好，若不捨者，僧伽婆尸沙。"

[267] T. 1425 (XXII) 442c29–443a26.

[268] We have no further clue as to which narrative the "stories of Devadatta (提婆達多因緣)" refers to. No extant stories of Devadatta contain the detail in which Devadatta goes to the city of Gayā. Does it refer to the Devadatta story narrated in the *vibhaṅga* section? Or is it a different story that the Mahāsāṅghika monks once knew about?

[269] 佛住王舍城。如提婆達多因緣中廣說，乃至提婆達多走向伽耶城。佛於後向伽耶城。其日應布薩。佛語阿難："汝去語提婆達多來，今日僧作*布薩羯磨事。"阿難即往作是言："長老！今日僧作布薩

Having heard those words, Ānanda thought: "It is indeed a weird thing that he speaks such evil words. Won't he harm the *saṅgha*?" Having returned, Ānanda reported this issue to the Blessed One. The Buddha spoke thus to Ānanda: "You should go to Devadatta's place again." (The story repeats) until the part where Ānanda thought thus: "It is a weird thing that he utters such evil words. Won't he harm the *saṅgha*?"[270]

After Ānanda returned, the group of six monks spoke to each other: "Śramaṇa Gautama must send messengers three times! (Since) we all possess true intentions [to split the *saṅgha*], let us conduct the *poṣadha* affairs in advance. We shall establish great fame in the future." While the Buddha was still alive, Devadatta and the group of six monks together split the *saṅgha* and immediately completed the *poṣadha* ceremony.[271]

Ānanda spoke to the Blessed One about the situation. The Buddha spoke: "You should go to summon Devadatta again, for the third time. Today, the *saṅgha* is going to hold a ceremony for *poṣadha*." Ānanda immediately departed and spoke thus (to Devadatta): "The Blessed One summons you. Today the *saṅgha* is going to hold a ceremony for *poṣadha*." Devadatta answered: "I will not go. From now on, I will not worship the same Buddha, *Saṅgha,* or Dharma. I will not share the [same] *poṣadha, pravāraṇa* or *karman.* From now on, I will decide to follow or abandon the *prātimokṣa* codes at will. We have already finished (our own) *poṣadha*."[272]

Having heard thus, Ānanda thought to himself: "It is a rare thing that he has already harmed the *saṅgha*." He thus returned and spoke to the Blessed One about

---

羯磨，世尊喚提婆達多。"答言："我不去。從今日後，不共佛法僧，不共布薩自恣羯磨。從今日後，波羅提木叉欲學不學自從我意。"

*布薩羯磨: In the *Mohe sengqi lü*, *busa* 布薩 and *jiemo* 羯磨 are frequently combined to refer to the ceremony held for *poṣadha* affairs (e.g., T. 1425 [XXII] 447c22–448a9, a11, 449a22, 541b8). Therefore, I translate the phase as a compound "the ceremony for *poṣadha*."

[270] 阿難聞是語已，作是念："此是奇事。出是惡聲，將無壞僧耶？"阿難還，以上事具白世尊。佛語阿難："汝更往提婆達多所。"乃至阿難作是念："奇事，出是惡聲，將無壞僧？"

[271] 阿難還後，六群比丘自相謂言："沙門瞿曇必當三遣使來。我等各各正意，先作布薩事。我等作後世名譽。"佛在世時，提婆達多、六群比丘共破僧，即布薩竟。

[272] 阿難以是因緣，具白世尊。佛言："汝更第三往語提婆達多來，今日僧作布薩羯磨。"阿難即往，作是言："世尊喚。今日僧作布薩羯磨。"答言："我不去。自今日後，不共佛法僧，不共布薩自恣羯磨。從今日後，波羅提木叉毘尼，欲學不學自從我意。但我等已作布薩竟。"

the situation. Having heard thus, the Blessed One pronounced the following verse: "Pure and clean as the full moon, through purity can one fulfill the *poṣadha*. Possessing pure physical and verbal actions, in this way one should participate in the *poṣadha*." The Buddha said to Ānanda: "Those not faithful to the Dharma have already conducted and completed the *poṣadha*. We who are faithful to the Dharma should conduct the *poṣadha* ceremony." At that moment, Devadatta split the *saṅgha*, and the group of six monks were his schismatic companions. They were called "those living in different places" (Skt. *nānāsaṃvāsika*).[273]

3.1.4 Summary: The Devadatta narrative in the historical development

Insofar as the available information is concerned, the image of Devadatta as a schismatic seems to have already existed before the split of the ancient Sthaviras and Mahāsāṅghikas. To briefly summarize what we have discussed above, in both the Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika offshoots, the core image of Devadatta is no doubt that of a schismatic who attempted to split the monastic community of Śākyamuni Buddha. The whole Devadatta narrative, in both Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika traditions, can be reduced to the same basic skeleton: when Devadatta intended to split the *saṅgha*, the Buddha legalized a procedure to prevent and punish schismatics; furthermore, the Buddha also legalized a procedure to punish the supporters of the schism when Devadatta's followers attempted to assist with his schismatic activities (episodes 15/16/17 or 18/22/23). Within this narrative skeleton, we find the earliest and most fundamental image of Devadatta.

As the Devadatta narrative was further developed in the Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika offshoots, he became a cruel, depraved, but ineffective, antagonist of Buddha Śākyamuni, and committed various kinds of crimes. There are noticeable differences between the Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika versions of the Devadatta stories. The five Sthavira-derived Vinayas associate Devadatta's schism with his ascetic tendencies, an aspect that cannot be found in extant Mahāsāṅghika tradition(s). Devadatta's supporters are also not represented consistently: on the Sthavira side, they are usually four major followers, while the *Mohe sengqi lü* refers to the group of six monks. Of course, the exact degree of depravity exhibited in the Mahāsāṅghika account is still unknown due to the lack of records. Nevertheless, the

[273] 阿難聞已，作是念："奇哉！已壞僧竟。"即還，以上因緣，具白世尊。世尊聞已，即說此偈："清淨如月滿，清淨得布薩。身口業清淨，是乃應布薩。"佛告阿難："非法人已作布薩竟，如法人應作布薩。"爾時提婆達多破僧，六群比丘破僧伴黨，是名異住。

composers of the *Mahāvastu* seemed to share some stories with the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition, who were quite enthusiastic in ascribing more sins to Devadatta.

If we perceive a gap between Devadatta's image as a schismatic and as a villain, can we further clarify what motivated the transformation of the Devadatta narrative from a legal discussion into a story of a morally reprehensible character? In the following analysis of the ideologies underlying the composition of the Devadatta narrative, we can offer at least one possible answer to this question.

3.2 Devadatta's biography in the context of *saṅghabheda*

The analyses of the content and distribution of Devadatta's episodes in Vinayas drive us to the conclusion that the core image of Devadatta is that of the first schismatic who dares to challenge the Buddha. However, surrounding this core image are additional aspects that seem irrelevant to or even conflict with his image as an unfavorable schismatic. For instance, the Vinayas consistently report that Devadatta had a successful early life, but why do none of the Vinayas choose to omit this favorable detail of Devadatta's biography to create a more coherently evil character? In addition, generally speaking, advocating a more self-disciplined lifestyle would seem to warrant a favorable reception in the Buddhist context, but why are Devadatta's ascetic propositions condemned as incorrect? Do these different aspects of Devadatta's image create tensions and consequently prevent the Devadatta narrative from being a classic schismatic story? Or, can these diverse aspects combine to form a coherent and compatible unit, collectively serving the polemical rhetoric against schism?

In this section, I discuss several elements of Devadatta's biography against the ideological background of schism and analyze the meaning these stories produce in the Buddhist schismatic context. As we shall see, the real significance of the figure of Devadatta must be understood within the Buddhist schismatic context—his biography is modeled on Buddhist understandings of the definition of a schismatic; and many elements of his schismatic stories, some appearing to be loosely-bound or contradictory, indeed reflect particular discussions of schism. The investigation of the Devadatta narrative in a schismatic context also contributes to our awareness that Buddhists have possessed different and complicated attitudes toward the issue of schism.

3.2.1 Who is a schismatic? Understanding the early achievements of Devadatta

The core—probably also the earliest part—of Devadatta's image is as the first schismatic monk during the Buddha's lifetime, which even alone can largely account for the forceful resentment towards Devadatta among generations of Buddhists. However, every version of Devadatta's biography consistently acknowledges the remarkable achievements of his early years. Why do all the Buddhist traditions, despite endeavoring to portray him as heinously as possible, invariably relate the successes of his early life? Why not just delete these details to make Devadatta a consistently despicable figure? To venture a basic answer, I will

demonstrate that this positive portrait is crucial to the process of making Devadatta the paradigm of a schismatic.

3.2.1.1 The successes of Devadatta's early life

Devadatta was once an accomplished monk. This statement is consistently supported by all versions of his biography. However, the exact records of his attainment vary from one source to another. In the Dharmaguptaka *Sifen lü*, his achievement is portrayed as *shenzu* 神足 ("magical power"):[274]

> At that moment, having received the teachings from the Buddha and other elders, all the Śākya princes went to their own lands. They reflected by themselves and achieved superior states. Devadatta attained the achievement of magical power.

In the Sarvāstivāda tradition(s), more details of his early religious pursuits are added to his biography. The *Shisong lü*, for instance, stresses that Devadatta once assiduously pursued the correct path and enjoyed great fame during his early religious career, especially in his first 12 years of monkhood:[275]

> The Buddha dwelled in Rājagṛha. At that moment, Devadatta entertained a pure, faithful mind toward the Buddhist teaching. He went forth into the homeless life with an ornament that was worth three hundred thousand gold coins. He rode an elephant worth one hundred thousand gold coins. The elephant was ornamented with golden nets and other things, which were worth another one hundred thousand gold coins. Devadatta wore clothes that were again worth ten hundred thousand gold coins. Devadatta went forth and became a monk, and for 12 years he cultivated the path with wholesome thoughts. He read *sūtra*s, chanted *sūtra*s, asked about

---

[274] T. 1428 (XXII) 591b22–24: 爾時，諸釋子受世尊及諸上座教授已，往詣彼國，各自思惟，*證增上地。提婆達得神足證.

*證增上地: Chinese Vinaya commentaries understand this attainment as one that was not obtained by Devadatta and explain it as the *chuguo* 初果 ("first realization," i.e. *srota-āpanna*). See 四分律疏飾宗義記 X. 733 [XLII] 122a12-13; 四分律含注戒本疏行宗記 X. 714 (XXXIX) 891b6.

[275] T. 1435 (XXIII) 257a7–12: 佛在王舍城。爾時調達，於佛法中信敬心清淨，著三十萬金錢直莊嚴具出家，乘調善象直十萬金錢，是象以金網等莊嚴，亦直十萬金錢。調達所著衣服，復直十萬金錢。是調達出家作比丘，十二年中善心修行，讀經、誦經、問疑、受法、*坐禪，爾時佛所說法皆悉讀誦。

**Zuochan* 坐禪 sometimes corresponds to inflections of the stem *ni-sad* (其坐禪定 fr. T. 76 [I] 884b15 = *nisīdati* fr. MN. ii. 193), sometimes to inflections of *jhā* in Pāli Nikāyas (i.e., 坐禪思惟 f. T.1 [I] 38c8–10 = *jhāyanti* fr. DN. iii. 94).

doubts, received the Dharma, and sat to meditation. At that time, he read and chanted all the teachings preached by the Buddha.

A similar portrait is also painted in the *Chuyao jing* 出曜經 (T. 212),[276] a version of the *Udānavarga* with prose explanations and narratives added, possibly also affiliated with the early Sarvāstivāda school:[277]

> The Buddha once dwelled in a place [called] Kalanda, the Bamboo Grove in Rājagṛha. At that time, there was a monk named Devadatta. He was intelligent and extensively learned. For 12 years, he sat to meditation with a composed mind. He never wavered from this intent. He never dismissed any of the 12 austerity practices. He generated the contemplation on impurity and the mindfulness of inhalation and exhalation. He discriminated each dharma ranging from the "Foremost Worldly dharmas" to the "Peak dharmas." He chanted 60 thousand *sūtra*s which even an elephant was incapable of carrying.

Similar acknowledgment of his early achievements is widespread in other texts related to the (Mūla)Sarvāstivāda schools.[278] The famous Chinese pilgrim Xuanzang also heard that

---

[276] According to Hiraoka 2007b, the stories in the *Chuyao jing* mostly conform to the Sarvāstivāda *Shisong lü* but with one story closer to the *Aṅguttaranikāya* and the *Zengyi ahan jing*. Cf. Also Tomotatsu 1970: 98–102. Mitzuno (1981: 12–15) argues that the *Udānavarga* was the (or a) version of the *Dharmapada* that was popular in the Sarvāstivāda schools. The *Chuyao jing*'s textual relationship with the *Udānavarga* is explained in Mitzuno (ibid. 58, 62).

[277] T. 212 (IV) 687b7–11: 昔佛在羅閱城竹園加蘭陀所。爾時有比丘名曰調達，聰明廣學，十二年中坐禪入定，心不移易，十二頭陀初不缺減，起不淨觀 (*aśuhabhāvanā*)，了出入息 (**ānāpāna-smṛti*)，*世間第一法 (**agra-dharma*) ，乃至頂法 (**mūrdhana*) 一一分別，所誦佛經六萬，象載不勝。

The above description of Devadatta's religious cultivation resembles the cultivation process advanced in the *Abhidharmkośabhāṣya*, in which *aśubha-* and *ānāpāna-smṛti* are regarded as two paths to enter into meditation for those who are predominated by desire (*rāga*) and conjecture (*vitarka*); and practitioners on different stages of the four roots of wholesome (*si shan'gen* 四善根; which are, in ascending order according to their superiority, *uṣma-gata*, *mūrdhana*, *kṣānti*, and *agra-dharma*) will go through varying situations to attain deliverance. Abhidh-k-bh. 337-348; Abhidh-k-k. verses 6.9–6.23; T. 1558 [XXIX] 117b6–120c15; Fr. La Vallée Poussin 1923–1931: IV. 148–176 = Eng. Pruden 1988–1990: III. 916–941.

[278] For instance, one Sarvāstivāda Vinaya named the *Binaiye* 鼻奈耶 (T. 1464 [XXIV] 857c11-15) ; Also the *Da zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 164c1–9: 是時，斛飯王子提婆達多，出家學道，誦六萬法聚，精進修行，滿十二年。Translation: At that moment, Devadatta, a prince of King Droṇodana, went forth to pursue the religious path. He recited 60 thousand collections of Buddhist teachings and practiced in an earnest way for 12 entire years. The connection between the *Da zhidu lun* and the Sarvāstivāda Vinayas has already discussed by Lamotte, see above n. 145.

Devadatta once maintained a proper religious life in his first 12 years of monkhood[279] before deciding to split the saṅgha and poisoning the Buddha. [280]

In the Pāli Vinaya, Devadatta is also one of the Śākya princes who enjoys an immediate achievement after ordination, although his attainment is presented as inferior to those of the other Śākya princes: While Bhaddiya, Anuruddha, and even Ānanda all obtain supernatural achievements, what Devadatta masters immediately after his ordination is only mundane magical power (*pothujjanikaṃ iddhiṃ*, Vin. ii.183), or elsewhere as [eight] meditative attainments (*aṭṭha samāpatti*, Mp. i.191; *jhānalābhī jāto*, *Sukhavihāri-jātaka* [J. 10]).[281]

Nevertheless, some other Pāli texts present a more favorable picture of Devadatta's position in the *saṅgha*, listing him as one of Śākyamuni's top-ranked disciples. In the PTS edition of the *Udāna*,[282] Devadatta is regarded as one of the 11 Buddhist sages whom

---

[279] *Datang xiyu ji* 大唐西域記 T. 2087 (LI) 900a1–3: 提婆達多(唐言天授)，斛飯王之子也。精勤十二年，已誦持八萬法藏. Devadatta—the meaning of which is "given by god" in Chinese—a prince of King Droṇodana, practiced in a diligent way for 12 years and had already recited 80 thousand collections of the Dharma.

[280] In Xuanzang's record, Devadatta later put poison into his fingernails and planned to kill the Buddha when pretending to venerate the Buddha. However, the earth opened and swallowed Devadatta (T. 2087 [LI] 900a7–9:提婆達多惡心不捨，以惡毒藥置指爪中，欲因作禮，以傷害佛。方行此謀，自遠而來，至於此也，地遂坼焉，生陷地獄). This story resembles the version narrated in the *Da zhidu lun* (T. 1509 [XXV] 165a6–11). It seems to reflect a narrative tradition combining both the Mūlasarvāstivāda story of Devadatta's plan to poison the Buddha and the Pāli story of Devadatta being swallowed by the earth. For the MSV story, see T. 1450 (XXIV) 150a1–28, D 1, '*dul ba*, *nga*, 290b1–291a1, Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 261; T. 125 (II) 804a1–2. For the Pāli tradition, see Dhp-A. i.143, 146–148; Mil. 101, 107, 108; Pāli *Virocana-jātaka* (J. 143).

[281] Vin. ii. 183: *Atha kho āyasmā bhaddiyo teneva antaravassena tisso vijjā sacchākāsi. Āyasmā anuruddho dibbacakkhuṃ uppādesi. Āyasmā ānando sotāpattiphalaṃ sacchākāsi. Devadatto pothujjanikaṃ iddhiṃ abhinipphādesi*. Cf. Dhp-A. i. 138.

Eng. Horner 1938–1952: V. 257: "Then, during the rainy season, the venerable Bhaddiya realized the threefold knowledge, the venerable Anuruddha obtained *deva*-sight, the venerable Ānanda realized the fruit of stream attainment, [while] Devadatta acquired ordinary psychic power."

In the *Manorathapūraṇī* (i. 191), Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Aṅguttaranikāya*, Devadatta is claimed to gain eight meditative attainments (*aṭṭha samāpatti*; cf. *jhānalābhī jāto*, Pali *Sukhavihāri-jātaka* [J. 10]), while the achievements of Bhaddiya and Anuruddha were higher: *evaṃ Anupiyambavanam gantvā pabbajitesu pana tesu tasmiṃ yeva antovasse Bhaddiyatthero arahattaṃ pāpuṇi, Anuruddhatthero dibbacakkhuṃ nibbattesi, Devadatto aṭṭha samāpattiyo nibbattesi, ānandatthero sotāpattiphale patiṭṭhāsi, Bhagutthero ca Kimbilatthero ca pacchā arahattaṃ pāpuṇiṃsu* .

[282] Note that Devadatta's name is only recorded in the PTS edition of the *Udāna*, which is based on one manuscript in Burmese script and two manuscripts written in Sinhalese (Ud. vii-viii). Since Paul Steinthal, the editor of the PTS edition does not mark a variant reading here, I assume these three manuscripts all contain the name Devadatta. However, in the *Mahāsaṅgīti* edition of the Sixth Council recension, the name Devadatta is skipped and there are only ten saints. Cf. Ray 1994: 162, 176n.32. More editions of Ud. need to be checked in the future. Compared to the conjuncture that Devadatta's name was added into the list by the editors of the PTS

Śākyamuni praises:[283]

> At that moment, the venerable Sāriputta, the venerable Mahāmoggallāna, the venerable Mahākassapa, the venerable Mahākaccāyana, the venerable Mahākoṭṭhika, the venerable Mahākappina, the venerable Mahācunda, the venerable Anuruddha, the venerable Revata, the venerable Devadatta, and the venerable Ānanda approached the Blessed One.
>
> The Blessed One saw those elders coming from afar. Upon seeing them, he addressed the monks: "Monks! These brāhmins are coming. These brāhmins are coming." With these words thus spoken, a monk from the brāhmin caste addressed the Blessed One: "Now, lord, in which respect is one regarded as a brāhmin? What are the qualities that make one a brāhmin?"
>
> Then, having reflected upon this matter, the Blessed One uttered this saying: "Those who have already exhausted the evil dharmas constantly conduct themselves in the correct ways; those buddhas whose fetters are destroyed, are the true brāhmins in the world."

Alongside Śākyamuni's other top disciples, Devadatta is praised as the true brāhmin who has already vanquished these evils and continually follows the right path, and he is regarded to be almost—if not equally—as saintly as the famous Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana.

Furthermore, the *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*[284] narrates a more exciting story in which Devadatta is promoted to be one of Śākyamuni's top two disciples (Pāli *dvinnaṃ aggasāvakānaṃ*), alongside Śāriputra. As the legend goes, a householder donates a robe to

---

editions during later editorial works, I tend to agree with Ray in that the *Mahāsaṅgīti* version reflects a later editorial process of deleting Devadatta's name from the list.

[283] Ud. 3: *Tena kho pana samayena āyasmā ca sāriputto āyasmā ca mahāmoggallāno āyasmā ca mahākassapo āyasmā ca mahākaccāyano āyasmā ca mahākoṭṭhiko āyasmā ca mahākappino āyasmā ca mahācundo āyasmā ca anuruddho āyasmā ca revato āyasmā ca Devadatto āyasmā ca ānando yena bhagavā tenupasaṅkamiṃsu.*

Addasā kho bhagavā te āyasmante dūratova āgacchante; disvāna bhikkhū āmantesi: "ete, bhikkhave, brāhmaṇā āgacchanti; ete, bhikkhave, brāhmaṇā āgacchantī"ti. Evaṃ vutte, aññataro brāhmaṇajātiko bhikkhu bhagavantaṃ etadavoca: "kittāvatā nu kho, bhante, brāhmaṇo hoti, katame ca pana brāhmaṇakaraṇā dhammā"ti?

Atha kho bhagavā etamatthaṃ viditvā tāyaṃ velāyaṃ imaṃ udānaṃ udānesi: "Bāhitvā pāpake dhamme, ye caranti sadā satā; Khīṇasaṃyojanā buddhā, te ve lokasmi brāhmaṇā"ti.

[284] Dhp-A. i. 79–80 = Eng. Burlingame 1921: I. 190–191.

the community. The monks then have to choose between Devadatta and Śāriputra, the two chief disciples of Śākyamuni, as the recipient of the robe. After a lengthy debate, the majority of the monastic members agree that Devadatta, rather than Śāriputra, should receive the robe. Although in the following development of the story Devadatta is not treated in a favorable light (as it turns out that the robe does not fit Devadatta at all, and the Buddha also steps in and criticizes Devadatta for habitually wearing robes made not for him), a remarkably high prestige is still credited to him: he once possessed enough charisma to overshadow Śāriputra.

In sum, we see a wide range of accounts of the glorious early religious career of Devadatta. Even the Mahīśāsaka and Mūlasarvāstivāda traditions, which treat Devadatta as the only Śākya prince who attains nothing immediately after ordination,[285] also confirm that Devadatta later gains great fame through the mastery of magical power.[286] However, we must see that Devadatta's early achievement in the Mahīśāsaka and Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayas are no longer respectful and laudable, as his motivation is to win more fame and offerings and he deceives other monks in the process (§4.1.2). While the defaming of Devadatta in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayas can be easily understood as the reflection of a peculiar mentality of Mūlasarvāstivāda monks, the Mahīśāsakas' neglect of positive details about Devadatta can be read in a more interesting light: it serves as evidence for the strong, positive connection between the Devadatta story and the Vinaya regulation on schismatic issues, an argument I will elaborate in the next section.

3.2.1.2 The significance of Devadatta's successful early life in the schismatic context

In the past few decades, the extensive spread of the seemingly incongruous accounts of Devadatta's successful early life in Devadatta's biographies has aroused the attention of many Buddhist scholars. Their attempts to uncover the significance of these early successes, however, conclude with more or less the same answer. An example is found in the writing of Bareau. As I have already demonstrated, based on the hypothesis that the figure's ascetic tendencies are included in the original layer of the Devadatta narrative (with which I disagree; See above n. 220), Bareau argues for reading Devadatta originally as a schismatic who had a sincere mind to return to the austere style of life. Since the harsh condemnation of

[285] T. 1421 (XXII) 17b15–16; T. 1450 (XXIV) 167c26–28.

[286] A particular discussion of the Mahīśāsaka and Mūlasarvāstivāda version of Devadatta's early achievement is given in §4.1.2.

Devadatta seems to have arisen only later in his history, Bareau believes that these positive accounts should be read as a relic of the historic Devadatta, a portrait of the "real" Devadatta which later Buddhist editors could not eliminate. Bareau's positive reading of Devadatta is then fully adopted by Ray (1994: 162–178) in which Devadatta is argued to have been a forest saint who was maligned by the later, settled monastic community: As an advocate of the lifestyle of the forest monks, Devadatta's promotion of austere practices would jeopardize the interests of the settled monks who controlled the writing of scriptures. Consequently, out of detestation of Devadatta, the settled Buddhists fabricated stories of his evil deeds. In Ray's argument, the diabolization of Devadatta reflects the opposition between the two Buddhist lifestyles, the forest-dwelling life, and settled monasticism.[287]

The above interpretation is no more than pure speculation as such. Reading the positive accounts as a reflection of an original, historic Devadatta is based on the premise that Devadatta actually existed. However, apart from Buddhist texts, which are religious—not historical—texts in nature, there is no evidence for the historicity of Devadatta, let alone the existence of a naive, saintly Devadatta.[288] After all, in the core of the Devadatta narrative (episode 15/16/17 and 18/22/23), Devadatta already appears as a schismatic who deserves reprimand. There are no grounds to state that the accounts of his early achievements definitively predate those of his evildoings.

In fact, there is no need to resurrect a "historical" Devadatta in order to understand the significance of his early achievements. Since the Devadatta stories are closely associated with the Vinaya discourses on schismatic issues, I argue that we can and should read the Devadatta stories as a Buddhist schismatic narrative, which particularly reveals the religious significance of his early achievements within the narrative as a whole. As we will soon discover, this positive portrait of Devadatta perhaps contains the same degree of fiction as that of the evil Devadatta.

---

[287] Ibid. 171–172: "It seems clear that the core of the Devadatta legend, and particularly the vitriolic nature of the condemnation of this saint, is best understood as the expression of a controversy between a proponent (and his tradition) of forest Buddhism and proponents of settled monasticism, a controversy that in the sources is seen from the viewpoint of the monastic side."

[288] Although scholars have discovered many images depicting the figure of Devadatta (e.g., Zin 2006a: 69–95; 2006b: 332–337), beyond the testimony of legends, we have no evidence to claim that a historical Devadatta ever existed. I only notice the name Devadatta discovered in archaeological findings once. The name Devadatta appears in a first-century Kharoṣṭhī inscription carved on a volute bracket excavated in Sirkap (Konow 1929: 99–100). However, we have little idea whether or not this name has any connection with our Devadatta.

Then, how is a schismatic defined in a Buddhist context? We can start our investigation from the Pāli texts. The Vinaya of this school gives us the following definition:[289]

> Upāli, a nun does not split a monastic community, even if she strives for a schism ... a probationer ... a novice ... a woman novice ... a lay follower ... a female lay follower does not split a monastic community even if she strikes for a schism. Only a **regular** monk, Upāli, living in the same residence, abiding within the same district, can split a monastic community.

In light of this discussion, the first condition for being a schismatic is to be a monk, not a nun, nor a novice, nor a lay follower. Moreover, one must also be a *pakatatta* monk, which is usually explained as "a regular (monk)," free from any monastic punishment.[290] That is to say, to qualify as a separatist, being a monk is a basic requirement, but is not enough; one must be a proper monk, free from formal punishment for an infraction.

In the Sarvāstivāda *Shisong lü*, a schismatic monk is also required to be a regular monk of good standing. To be specific, this Vinaya uses the term "purified monks with the same view (*qingjing tongjian biqiu* 清淨同見比丘)" to refer to qualified schismatic monks,[291] which can be seen as a parallel to the Pāli term *pakatatta.* Elsewhere, the *Shisong lü* further emphasizes that the *bin biqiu* (擯比丘, **parivāsa*),[292] those who are temporarily or permanently expelled from the monastic community, cannot split the *saṅgha*. This again confirms proper monkhood as the necessary condition for being a schismatic in the Sarvāstivāda school(s). In a similar fashion, the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya also states that a

---

[289] Vin. ii. 204: *Na kho, upāli, bhikkhunī saṃghaṃ bhindati, api ca bhedāya parakkamati, na sikkhamānā saṃghaṃ bhindati ... na sāmaṇero ... na sāmaṇerī ... na upāsako ... na upāsikā saṃghaṃ bhindati, api ca bhedāya parakkamati. Bhikkhu kho, upāli,* ***pakatatto****, samānasaṃvāsako, samānasīmāyaṃ ṭhito, saṃghaṃ bhindatī.*

See also Sp. vi. 1160: *pakatattānaṃ bhikkhūnan ti ṭhapetvā navakataraṃ pārivāsikaṃ avasesānaṃ antamaso mūlāya paṭikassanārahādīnaṃ pi.*

[290] Nolot 1996: 122n.18, "a regular monk"; Silk 2009: 238n.18: "[*pakatatta*] indicates a monk who is not subject to any disciplinary restrictions on his monastic status and is thus not only a monk but in good standing *vis-à-vis* the rules of monastic conduct."

[291] T. 1435 (XXIII) 267a6–12: 比丘僧極少乃至九清淨同見比丘，能破和合比丘僧. (There must be a minimum of nine purified monks with the same view to split a harmonious monastic community)

In a Chinese Vinaya commentary 四分律刪補隨機羯磨疏正源記, "清淨同見" is explained as those with no violation of the body of the precepts and with the same correct view (X726 [XL] 888c6: 戒體無違，同一正見也).

[292] T. 1435 (XXIII) 266b15–267a21.

monk on probation (被捨置人, *utkṣiptaka*) does not have the potential to split the *saṅgha*,[293] which reveals the Mūlasarvāstivāda standpoint on this issue.

Moreover, the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharmas conduct further discussions on the question of the monkhood of a schismatic. The **Abhidharma-samayapradīpika* (阿毘達磨藏顯宗論, T. 1563), preserved in its Chinese translation, states as follows:[294]

> (Commentary:) The one who can cause a schism must be a great *bhikṣu*, definitely not a layperson, a *bhikṣunī*, or so forth, because (the latter categories) could not constitute majestic reliance [for believers]. He must be the one whose activities are based on [correct] view (*dṛṣṭi-carita*), not on emotion (*tṛṣṇā-carita*), because evil inclinations can be extremely solid and deep, and also because (emotion) can be agitated by both defilement and purity. Only one abiding in purity can split the *saṅgha* because violators of monastic codes possess no majesty (*prabhāva*). In view of the above argument, it can be deduced that one who already committed other heinous crimes has no opportunity to cause a schism. This is because the perpetrator of other heinous crimes (*ānantaryakarma*, *nizui* 逆罪) would receive subsequent retributions and be reborn in an unfixed location (**avyasthāna*, Tib. *rnam par mi gnas pa*).[295]

Many interesting points are mentioned here. First, it stresses the majesty that a schismatic must possess to cause a schism. Only a great monk (*da biqiu* 大苾芻) is endowed with such grandeur. A nun or a layperson does not possess such a qualification and therefore cannot split the *saṅgha*. Moreover, a schismatic monk should neither be affectionate nor emotional. He must maintain a proper monastic life and not violate Vinaya rules, much less commit the

---

[293] MSV *Saṅghabhedavastu*: Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 272–273, D.1, *'dul ba*, *nya*, 298a4–299a1, T. 1450 (XXIV) 153c10–154a14.

[294] This passage is contained in two texts, **Abhidharma-samayapradīpika* (阿毘達磨藏顯宗論, T. 1563 [XXIX] 886b27–c3) and **Abhidharma-nyāyānusāra* (阿毘達磨順正理論, T. 1562 [XXIX] 587c19–24): 論曰：能破僧者，要大苾芻，必非在家、苾芻尼等，以彼依止無威德故。唯*見行人，非*愛行者，以惡意樂極堅深故，於染淨品俱躁動故。要住淨行，方能破僧，以犯戒人，無威德故。即由此證，造餘逆後不能破僧，以造餘逆，及受彼果，處無定故。

*見行&愛行: e.g., T. 1559 (XXIX) 247c14: "是比丘多見行,非貪愛行" = Abhidha-k-bh. 261.10: "*sa ca dṛṣṭicarita eva na tṛṣṇācaritaḥ*."

[295] Index Abhidh-k-bh. s.v. 處無定& *avyasthāna.* For a detailed discussion of what is *avyasthāna*, see Abhidh-k-bh. 227.21–228.1; T. 1559 (XXIX) 237b2–9.

other four *ānantarya* sins (for the relation between the transgression of schism and the *ānantarya-karma*s see §3.2.3.2 & §4.1.3). Based on this discussion, the image of a schismatic does not seem negative, but rather positive, as only proper, pure, majestic monks are able to split the monastic community.

Not to be restricted to the texts of Sthavira offshoots, a similar statement is also given by the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya:[296]

> Regarding the definition of *saṅghabheda*, (it is said thus): the Buddha dwelled in Śrāvastī. At that time, the venerable Upāli came to the Buddha's place. He bowed his face to the Buddha's feet, sat to one side, and spoke to the Buddha, saying: "The Blessed One speaks of *saṅghabheda*. What is *saṅghabheda*?"
>
> The Buddha spoke to Upāli: "For instance, a venerable *bhikṣu* behaves in accordance with the Dharma and the Vinaya, and is adept at comprehending their profound meanings. Such a *bhikṣu* is supposed to worship, respect, and conform to the Dharma. If other *bhikṣu*s accuse this *bhikṣu* of spreading the wrong Dharma and behaving out of harmony with the Dharma, this is a case of monastic dispute, not a

---

[296] T. 1425 (XXII) 489c9–15. 破僧者。佛住舍衛城，時尊者優波離往至佛所，頭面禮足，却住一面，白佛言："世尊說破僧，云何名破僧？"佛告優波離："如，大德比丘，如法、如律，善解深理，是比丘應禮拜、恭敬、隨順法教。若比丘謂彼比丘所說非法、不隨順行，僧諍，非破僧，乃至一*界一*住，同說戒，共作羯磨。我已制一界一住中別作*布薩自恣羯磨，是名破僧。"

**Jie* 界 and *zhu* 住: Kieffer-Pülz (1992: 43–45) discusses that *zhu* 住 (skt. *āvāsa*; "residence") indicates the area where monks and nuns spend their rainy season together. *Jie* 界 (skt. *sīmā*; "district") in legal context denotes the boundary of the residence of the monastic community ("Grenze eines Gemeindebezirks"), indicating the territory within which monastic ceremonies and formal acts have to be carried out. Heirman (2002: II. 964) explains the reason why the residence *āvāsa* need to have a boundary *sīmā*: "The territory occupied by an *āvāsa*, however, was not precisely determined. Consequently, since formal acts had to be carried out in the presence of all the monks/nuns of the *āvāsa*, i.e. in a harmonious order, problems could easily arise because one could not exactly determine what was 'harmonious' within an *āvāsa*. Therefore, one started to exactly define the borders of the *āvāsa*s."

* 布薩自恣羯磨: In my translation, I read this compound as a *dvandva* consisting of three separate ceremonies, which can be supported by the reading *āveniṃ uposathaṃ karonti, āveniṃ pavāraṇaṃ karonti, āveniṃ saṃghakammaṃ karonti* in the Pāli parallel (Vin. ii. 204). The *poṣadha/uposatha*, as explained in the previous note, is basically the ceremony in which monks confess and expiate their sins on the day "preceding the one on which a new phase of the moon begins" (Tieken 2002: 280). The *pravāraṇā*/*pavāranā* is basically a ceremony in which every member of the *saṅgha* invites other monks to point out his misbehavior and offence (cf., Chung 1998: 52ff.;Tieken 2002). Usually, the *pravāraṇā* takes place on *poṣadha* days, together with the recitation of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, serving the very purpose of expiating sins of the monastic members. At least originally, the *pravāraṇā* did not occur once a year on the last day of the rainy season, but was regularly held on the *poṣadha* day; however, because of its potentially disruptive nature, the *pravāraṇā* was later postponed to be held on the very last moment of the rainy season (Tieken 2002: 217–275).

case of *saṅghabheda*, so long as they live in the same district (*sīmā*) and the same residence (*āvāsa*), recite the *Prātimokṣasūtra* jointly, and hold *karman*s jointly. I formalize the definition of *saṅghabheda* as people in the same district and the same residence separately performing *poṣadha*s, *pravāraṇa*s, and *karman*s."

Just as we read in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharmas, this Mahāsāṅghika text accepts the viewpoint that a potential separatist must be free from monastic punishment. In this regard, we should be reminded of the aforementioned story that the formal act of suspension against Devadatta is obstructed by the group of six monks (see above n. 261–263 and the English translations)—since Devadatta is not subject to Vinaya punishment in the end, he is still a monk in good standing, which qualifies himself for being a legal schismatic. It is also noteworthy that in this Mahāsāṅghika discussion, a schismatic is required to be a virtuous monk who knows the profound meaning of the Dharma and acts in accordance with the Dharma and the Vinaya.

Having said above, we now look at the definitions of schismatics in the Mahīśāsaka Vinayas. This Vinaya confirms that a schismatic must be a monk, not any of the other categories of Buddhist followers. However, it does not make it explicit whether a schismatic must be a proper or prestigious monk.[297] We are not sure whether the requirement of a monk being in good standing is implicit here, or if such a condition is indeed missing. Nevertheless, just as what I mention at the ending of §3.2.1.1, the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya indeed chooses not to portray Devadatta as a prestigious monk in his early religious life: in accordance to the legal regulation in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, Devadatta, the potential schismatic, is also not described as a majestic monk as he attains nothing after ordination, far lagging behind the other Śākya princes in the spiritual achievement (§4.1.2.1).

As we can see, as a widespread view in such schools as the Theravaṃsa, Sarvāstivāda, Mūlasarvāstivāda, and Mahāsāṅghika, monks who can be accused of committing the crime of *saṅghabheda* are theoretically respectful and trustworthy; depraved and guilty people can never qualify as schismatics. In fact, the high requirements for being a schismatic have

---

[297] T. 1425 (XXII) 166a17–20: 若王助破僧，令僧不和合，而非破。若大臣、優婆塞、優婆夷、比丘尼、式叉摩那、沙彌、沙彌尼、一比丘乃至七比丘助破僧，亦如是.

Interestingly, the Dharmaguptaka *Sifen lü* also fails to mention whether the schismatic monk should be one in good standing or not. T. 1428 (XXII) 913b7–10: 一比丘不能破僧，雖求方便亦不能破僧, 亦非比丘尼，非式叉摩那、沙彌、沙彌尼破僧，雖求方便破僧亦不能破僧.

already been observed by Silk (2009: 23–24) in his book about another famous schismatic, Mahādeva. Silk comments that "according to a number of central Sthavira lineage texts, including both the Pāli Theravaṃsa Vinaya and the Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma-kośa-bhāṣya* (*Commentary on the Treasury of Abhidharma*), a monastic community can be split only by one who is a genuine monk in good standing within a regular monastic community."

Can we thus ask why the Vinayas specify that only a virtuous monk has the potential to split the *saṅgha*? In his discussion of the issue of schism, Silk (2009: 24) points out the possible internal logic of such an arrangement in historical context: "Buddhist technical literature acknowledges the possibility that schism may occur within a monastic community. In fact, it seems to accept this as an inevitability. It insists, however, that any action to instigate such a schism must be brought about by a legitimate, indeed a respected and honorable, member of the community in question, and only upon reflection, never impulsively." That is to say, this prerequisite is a wise safety precaution. It allows a certain leeway for schisms to take place within the monastic community, but with the aim of controlling and preventing any unnecessary, illegal, or unjustified schisms that may occur. After all, from a logical perspective, it is hard to imagine that a monk of bad reputation could lead a schismatic campaign to success. It is more feasible that a charismatic, majestic, and respectful monk could convince and encourage other Buddhists to separate from the preexisting authoritative unity.

Now it is easy to understand why the early achievements of Devadatta are consistently incorporated within the overall narrative. The Vinayas declare that only authentic monks, especially those who are venerable and respectable, can cause a schism. That is to say, in order to make Devadatta a potential schismatic, Buddhist writers and editors had to admit that Devadatta was once—if not always—a saintly monk. From another perspective, if Devadatta had never been a monk of certain achievement and prestige, logically he could not make a convincing appeal to the monastic community, much less persuade the majority of monks to vote for him.[298] Therefore, I interpret the early successful religious career of Devadatta not as a reflection of a more historical Devadatta, but as a literary composition, an ideological imperative with the aim of making Devadatta a "proper" schismatic.

[298] For instance, the *Wufen lü* (T. 1421 [XXII] 164b7–8): "時五百比丘皆取籌，唯除阿難及一須陀洹比丘 (Translation: At that moment, five hundred monks all took the voting sticks, with the sole exception of Ānanda and a monk of the *śrotāpanna* attainment)." In the *Sifen lü* (T. 1428 [XXII] 909b14–15), it is only Ānanda and 60 other elders who vote against Devadatta.

If the accounts of his early achievements make Devadatta a legal schismatic in the Vinayas, is the schism incited by him also regarded as a legal schism in the Vinayas as well? We will proceed to investigate how Devadatta's schism fits in with the definitions of *saṅghabheda* in the Vinayas of different schools in the next section.

3.2.2 What is a Buddhist schism? Devadatta's schism as a paradigm of Buddhist schisms

What is at stake here is not a discussion of the historicity of the schisms that occurred in early Indian Buddhism. Although Buddhist traditions inform us of more than one Buddhist council (*saṅgīti*) that led to early institutional divisions, it is impossible for us to figure out how much factuality is contained in such records.[299] Instead, our focus is on how Buddhist traditions define and understand schism, including questions such as how do we determine a monastic schism? What does a schism legally entail, besides proper monkhood? Does Devadatta's schism fulfill all these conditions? As I shall demonstrate, the Devadatta stories do reflect Buddhist discussions of schism. In the process of reading the Devadatta narrative alongside Buddhist discussions of schism, we can see how many elements of the Devadatta narrative make full sense in the Buddhist schismatic context.

As a first step, I shall investigate how schism (*saṅghabheda*) is defined in various Vinaya texts and what realizing a schism entails. Usually, the relevant discussions are found in the famous "inquiries of Upāli", the section that concludes the discussion concerning *saṅghabheda* in the *Vastu/Khandhaka.* After Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana foil Devadatta's schismatic attempts, Upāli asks the Buddha about the definition of schism. In the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, the definition of schism is given as follows:[300]

---

[299] Silk 2009: 12–14.

[300] T.1428 (XXII) 913b2–14: (優波離)：“云何破僧？齊幾人名為破僧？誰破和合僧？”佛言：“優波離！有二事破僧：*妄語、相似語，以此二事故破僧。優波離！復有二事破僧：作羯磨、取舍羅。優波離！一比丘不能破僧，雖求方便亦不能破僧，亦非比丘尼，非式叉摩那、沙彌、沙彌尼破僧，雖求方便破僧亦不能破僧。優波離！此眾一比丘、彼眾一比丘，彼行破僧舍羅、作羯磨，如是不能破僧，但令僧塵垢。二人、三人亦如是。優波離！若此眾四人若過、彼眾四人若過，行破僧舍羅、作羯磨，優波離，齊是名為破僧，是為破和合僧。Also see Sasaki (1993c: 178–179) which also offers an English translation.

*妄語: *saṃprajānamṛṣāvāda*. Cf. Heirman 2002: II. 539–540 n.8.

The same Vinaya also lists eighteen speeches that cause the separation of a monastic community: 破，有十八事: 法、非法、律、非律、犯、不犯、若輕、若重、有殘、無殘、麁惡、非麁惡、常所行、非常所

(Upāli asked:) "How is *saṅghabheda* defined? How many people need to be assembled to incite a *saṅghabheda*? Who is the schismatic splitting the harmonious *saṅgha*?"

The Buddha spoke: "Upāli! Two factors can induce schism, namely, false speech and similar speech. A monastic community can be split by these two factors. Upāli, two more factors can result in a schism: that is, holding a *karman* assembly and collecting voting sticks (*śalākā*).[301] Upāli, one *bhikṣu* could not split the *saṅgha*, even if he pursued every way [to split the *saṅgha*]. The same applies to *bhikṣuṇī*s, *śikṣamāṇa*s, *śrāmaṇera*s, and *śrāmaṇerikā*s, who could not split the *saṅgha* even if they were to try every means [to split the *saṅgha*]. Upāli! If one *bhikṣu* from this group and one *bhikṣu* from another group pass out voting sticks for a schism and arrange a *karman* ceremony, they could not split the *saṅgha*, but merely bring disgrace upon the *saṅgha*. The same situation applies to the case of two or three *bhikṣu*s on each side. Upāli! If this group contains four or more members and the other group includes four or more members, and they pass out voting sticks for a schism and arrange a *karman* ceremony, Upāli, such a situation is called a *saṅghabheda,* a division of a harmonious *saṅgha*."

As demonstrated by the above dialogues, there are several prerequisites for inducing a legitimate schism: only a monastic separation incited by monks (*bhikṣu*s) can be appropriately termed schism, not one induced by other monastic community members. The second condition concerns the schismatic activities, which include false speech, similar but

---

行、制、非制、說、非說，是為十八 (T. 1428 [XXII] 595a16-19). Translation: there are eighteen matters that cause a schism: (1). [to claim one matter not faithful to the Dharma] as in accord with the Dharma, (2). [one matter faithful to the Dharma] as not in accord with the Dharma, (3). [one matter not faithful to the Vinaya] as in accord with the Vinaya, (4). [one matter faithful to the Vinaya] as not in accord with the Vinaya, (5). [not an infraction] as an infraction, (6). [infraction] as not an infraction, (7). [grave violation] as minor [as a light infraction], (8). [light violation] as heavy [as a grave infraction], (9). [a sin without residue] as a sin with residue (i.e. *sāvaśeṣa*), (10). [a sin with residual] as a sin without residue (i.e. *niravaśeṣa*), (11). [no harsh speech] as a sin of harsh speech, (12). [harsh speech] as not a sin of harsh speech, (13). [what is not regularly practiced] as what is regularly practiced, (14). [what is regularly practiced] as what is not regularly practiced, (15). [not established] as what is established, (16). [established] as what is not established, (17.) [unsaid] as what is said [by the tathāgatas], (18). [said] as what is not said [by the tathāgatas].

[301]About diverse usages of *śalākā* (*chou* 筹) in Buddhist as well as Indian societies, see Durt 1974 and his contribution to the entry "*chū* 筹" in the *Hōbōgirin* (volume 5). The Vinayas stipulate two fixed cases in which monks should use sticks, namely, at the ceremonies like *poṣadha*, *varṣā*, and *pravāraṇa* as ration cards in the distribution of food or clothing, and at the meeting to express different opinions and solve disputes (i.e., *adhikaraṇaśamatha*).

misleading words, initiating a vote for schism, and a divergent *karman* ceremony. Another crucial prerequisite is the minimum number of monks involved. As we have previously discussed, only a proper monk can split the monastic community. However, a schism would not occur if it did not reach the required minimum number of participants. The Dharmaguptaka Vinaya stipulates that there must be at least four monks on each side to legally constitute a schism. That is to say, any separation involving fewer schismatic monks than the minimum number of four is not regarded as a legal schism.

If we turn to the Devadatta story in this Vinaya, we find that Devadatta's schism, in fact, meets all the above prerequisites:[302]

> At that time, the Blessed One dwelled in the city of Rājagṛha. Certain circumstances occasioned an assembly of the monastic community. At that time, Devadatta rose from his seat and passed out voting sticks, [saying]: "Elders who accept the five matters [of ascetic practices] as those [accordant to] the Dharma, to the Vinaya, to the teaching taught by the Buddha, take this voting stick." At that time, five hundred new monks who lacked intelligence took voting sticks. Then, Ānanda rose from his seat, draped his *uttarāsaṅga* robe over one side of his body, and spoke thus: "Elders who admit the five matters as those not [accordant to] the Dharma, to the Vinaya, to the teaching taught by the Buddha drape your *uttarāsaṅga* robe over one side of your body." Sixty elder monks from the assembly draped their *uttarāsaṅga* robe over one side of the body. Then, Devadatta spoke to the monks: "Elders! We no longer need the Buddha and the monastic community. We together perform our own *karman* and recitation of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*." They immediately went to Mount Gayā. At that time, Devadatta went to Mount Gayā, detached from the Buddha and the monastic community, and performed his own *karman* and recitation of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*.

---

[302] T. 1428 (XXII) 909b8–18: 爾時世尊在王舍城。有因緣眾僧集會。時提婆達多從坐起行舍羅：“誰諸長老，忍此五事是法、是毘尼、是佛所教者，便捉籌。”時有五百新學無智比丘捉籌。爾時阿難從坐起，以*欝多羅僧著一面，作如是言：“誰諸長老，忍此五事非法、非毘尼、非佛教者，以欝多羅僧著一面。”是中，有六十長老比丘，以欝多羅僧著一面。時提婆達多語諸比丘言：“長老！我曹不須佛及眾僧，自共作羯磨說戒。”即往至伽耶山中。爾時提婆達多至伽耶山中，離佛及僧，自作羯磨說戒。Cf. another English translation given in Sasaki (1993c: 179).

*欝多羅僧 (*uttarāsaṅga*): Heirman 2002: II. 801–802 introduces different types of monastic robes. The *uttarāsaṅga* is the upper robe, the *saṃghāṭī* 僧伽梨 is the out cloak, the *saṃkakṣikā* 僧祇支 is "the band to support the breasts."

First of all, Devadatta advances the false teaching of the five ascetic propositions, constituting at least one of the first two factors that induce a schism as stipulated by the same Vinaya: 妄語 ("false speech ") and/or 相似語 ("similar [but misleading] speech").[303] Moreover, his schismatic activities are then expanded into organizing a vote. Although Ānanda leads sixty senior monks to oppose Devadatta's five ascetic propositions, five hundred new monks still cast their votes in Devadatta's favor, and Devadatta wins the majority of the votes. After the voting ceremony, Devadatta performs a separate *karman* assembly and separately recites the *Prātimokṣasūtra* in Gayā, which marks his official split from the Buddha's monastic community. In this regard, Devadatta indeed takes all the steps that are formalized in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya as the factors necessary for monastic splits.

In addition, as the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya stipulates, there must be minimally four monks on each side so as to legalize the schism. In the above translation of Devadatta's schism, there are five hundred monks standing by the side of Devadatta, whereas sixty-one monks on the other side, which no doubt makes this schism a legal one. In the stories where the exact number of Devadatta's followers is not mentioned, the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya frequently narrates that Devadatta, as a monk, recruits four members: Kokālika, Khaṇḍadravya, Kaṭamorakatiṣya, and Samudradatta.[304] It seems that this detail about Devadatta's supports was created in accordance with the above legal discussion of minimum participants: There are always at least four supporters on the schismatic side, and consequently the requirement for the minimum number of four monks on the schismatic side is fully fulfilled. To sum up, the Dharmaguptaka version of Devadatta's schism fits in quite well with the definition of a legitimate schism stipulated by the Vinaya of the same school.

The high degree of conformity between the legal definition of schisms and the record of Devadatta's schismatic stories is also observed in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya. This Vinaya defines a schism in a slightly different way from that of the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, and we indeed observe Devadatta's schism is presented in a correspondingly different way from that

[303] Although the content of the five ascetic practices vary from one source to another (§3.3.1), the Chinese Vinaya commentaries commonly believe that, among Devadatta's five ascetic practices, the abstention from buttermilk/salt and that from fish fall into the category of false speech, while the other three are similar speech (e.g., T. 2792 [LXXXV] 665b19–23; X. 726 [XL] 816a2–5; X. 728 [XL] 275c12-19).

[304] T. 1428 (XXII) 594a3–5: 一名三聞達多，二名騫荼達婆，三名拘婆離，四名迦留羅提舍，及其身為五.

of the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya. [305] The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya's definition of a schism runs as follows:

> The Buddha spoke: "Four matters split the *saṅgha*, namely, preaching five practices, privately passing out voting sticks, taking a voting ticket, and conducting separate monastic ceremonies in the same district (*sīmā*)."
>
> Again, he (Upāli) asked: "What constitutes a monastic dispute (*saṃgharāji*) rather than a schism?"
>
> The Buddha responded: "If a king encourages separation and incites separation among monks, this is called a monastic dispute, not schism. The same applies to the situation in which ministers, or *upāsaka*s, or *upāsikā*s, or *bhikṣuṇī*s, or *śikṣamāṇā*s, or *śrāmaṇera*s, or *śrāmaṇerikā*s, or from one to seven *bhikṣu*s assist in the schism. If one conducts monastic ceremonies without consulting elder monks, it gives rise to a monastic dispute, not schism. The same situation applies to cases in which monks do not eat together, sit in separate places during meals, or engage in quarrels or resentment. Only when eight *bhikṣu*s in the same district split off into a second group and conduct their monastic ceremonies separately is it called a schism."

The most notable discrepancy between the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka definitions of schism lies in the minimum number of monks it requires. The Mahīśāsaka indicates that the schismatic party must number at least eight, instead of four as in the Dharmaguptaka version. Intriguingly, we find that the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya lists seven followers of Devadatta: besides the well-known four supporters (i.e., Kokālika, Khaṇḍadravya, Kaṭamorakatiṣya, and Samudradatta), there are three additional persons who support Devadatta, namely, Ebingfenna 頞鞞分那, Posoubona 婆藪般那, and Luxi 盧醯.[306] When we add Devadatta to the group, the schismatic party reaches the exact number of eight. The change from the Dharmaguptaka record of Devadatta's four companions to the Mahīśāsaka version of seven

---

[305] T. 1421 (XXII) 166a15–23: 優波離問佛："云何得名破僧？"佛言："有四事名破僧：說五法、自行籌、捉籌、於界內別行僧事。"又問："云何名僧不和合，而非破？"佛言："若王助破僧，令僧不和合，而非破。若大臣、優婆塞、優婆夷、比丘尼、式叉摩那、沙彌、沙彌尼、一比丘乃至七比丘助破僧，亦如是。若不問上座而行僧事，是即不和，亦非僧破；若不共同食，於食時異坐，鬪諍罵詈，亦如是。要於界內八比丘分作二部，別行僧事，乃名為破。" Cf. Sasaki's English translation (1993c: 180).

[306] T.1421 (XXII) 164a22–24:（調達）便語眷屬頞鞞分那、婆藪般那、盧醯伽、盧帝舍、瞿伽離、騫荼陀婆、三聞達多等.

sympathetic monks should by no means be read as an arbitrary alteration. Instead, the detail of Devadatta's supporters is arranged in correspondence with the definition of a schism, with the clear motivation to legitimize Devadatta's schism in each Vinaya tradition.

With respect to the four factors that conduce to a monastic community, the stipulation in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya is, in the main, similar to that in the Dharmaguptaka, both including the preaching of the five ascetic practices as the wrong Dharma and holding a voting ceremony for schism (the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya splits the latter item into two parts: organizing a vote and casting a voting ticket). However, the substantial divergence between the two schools is found in the fourth item, namely, 於界內別行僧事 ("conducting separate monastic ceremonies in the same district"). The corresponding item in the Dharmaguptaka version is simply to conduct [different] *karman*s (作羯磨), with no requirement of the venue for the ceremonies. Consequently, in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, Devadatta chooses to perform the *karman* in Gayā, a locality of residence different from that of Śākyamuni's monastic community. In comparison, the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya narrates that Devadatta performs a separate ceremony for *poṣadha* immediately after the voting, signifying that Devadatta's followers reside in the same region as Śākyamuni's monastic community.[307] In all respects, Devadatta's schism is also depicted as a legal schism in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya.

In the Pāli Vinaya, a schism must entail activities such as the proposition of eighteen [unjustified] matters ("*aṭṭhārasahi vatthūhi*")[308] and the separate performance of *poṣadha,*

---

[307] T. 1421 (XXII) 164b5–10: 於是調達十五日布薩時，於僧中說上五事，自行籌，唱言: "若忍樂此五法者，可捉此籌。" 時五百比丘皆取籌，唯除阿難及一須陀洹比丘。時舍利弗、目連、諸大羅漢皆不在彼布薩會中。調達行籌畢，即與五百比丘*和合布薩。Therefore, on the 15th day [of that month] which was a scheduled time for a *poṣadha*, Devadatta declared the five matters [of ascetic practices] in the monastic community and passed out voting sticks privately, proclaiming thus: "People who accept these five teachings take this voting stick." At that time, five hundred monks all took their voting sticks, with the exception of Ānanda and one monk who attained *srotāpanna*. At that moment, Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, and all the other great arhats were not present in that assembly for *poṣadha*. Having passed out all the voting sticks, Devadatta immediately assembled five hundred monks to perform a *sāmaggiupṣatha.* Also cf. Sasaki 1993c: 180–181.

*和合布薩 (Pāli *Sāmaggiupṣatha*): A *poṣadha* that is held for unifying the *saṅgha*. Cf. Sasaki 1993a. Here, the focalization seems to be shifted to that of Devadatta, and from Devadatta's viewpoint, his separate *poṣadha* is a *sāmaggiupsatha.*

[308] The list of the unjustified eighteen matters in the Pāli Vinaya is not entirely identical to that of the Dharmaguptaka version. Here, the eighteen matters include (Vin. ii. 204 = Eng. Horner 1938–1952: V. 286–287): to explain (1). Dharma as non-Dharma; (2). non-Dharma as Dharma; (3). Vinaya as non-Vinaya; (4). non-Vinaya as Vinaya; (5). what is not declared by the Tathāgata as spoken by the Tathāgata; (6). what is declared by the Tathāgata as unspoken by the Tathāgata; (7). what is not practiced by the Tathāgata as practiced by him; (8). what is practiced by the Tathāgata as not practiced by him; (9). what is not established by the Tathāgata as established by him; (10). what is established by the Tathāgata as not established; (11). what is not

pravāraṇa, and *karman* ("*āveṇi-uposathaṃ karonti, āveṇi-pavāraṇam karonti, āveṇi-saṅghakammaṃ karonti."* Vin. ii. 204; Sp. vi. 1280). In addition, those separate monastic ceremonies must be performed within the same district,[309] just in the same way as required in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya. The required minimum number of monks in a schism is instead specified as nine—four monks on one side, four monks on the other side, and a ninth on either side,[310] which is a scheme to avoid a draw when voting. When we check the Pāli version of Devadatta's schism, Devadatta's activities in this Vinaya are narrated in full compliance with this legal discussion of schism:[311] four companions[312] join Devadatta in the schismatic campaign, which makes Devadatta's schism fulfill the condition of a minimum of five monks on the schismatic side; Devadatta openly proclaims for the implementation of the five ascetic practices and wins support from 500 foolish monks; then, Devadatta confronts himself with Ānanda and openly declares that "from now on, Venerable Ānanda, in contradiction to the Bhagavat, in contradiction to the monastic community of *bhikṣu*s, I will conduct *poṣadha* and monastic *karman"* (*ajjatagge dānāhaṃ, āvuso ānanda, aññatreva bhagavatā, aññatreva bhikkhusaṃghā, uposathaṃ karissāmi saṅghakammaṃ karissāmīti*. Vin. ii. 198); as the final step, in one *poṣadha* held in Rājagṛha (which fits the condition that a *poṣadha* is held "within the same district"), Devadatta distributes and collects voting sticks, and five hundred Vajjan monks vote for the five ascetic propositions (Vin. ii. 199; Sp. vi. 1276). Later, Devadatta leads his own community to Gayā and settles down there.

---

an offence as an offence; (12). what is an offence as not an offence; (13). what is a light offence as a heavy one; (14). a heavy offence as a light one; (15). an pardonable offence (*sāvasesā āpatti*) as unpardonable (*anavasesā āpatti*); (16). an unpardonable offence as pardonable; (17). a grave offence (*duṭṭhullā āpatti*) as not grave; (18). a not grave offence as grave.

[309] Vin. ii. 204: *Bhikkhu kho, upāli, pakatatto, samānasaṃvāsako, samānasīmāyaṃ ṭhito, saṃghaṃ bhindatī* (Only a regular monk, Upāli, living in the same residence, abiding within the same boundaries, can split a monastic community).

[310] Vin. ii. 203: *Ekato, upāli, cattāro honti, ekato cattāro, navamo anussāveti, salākaṃ gāheti—'ayaṃ dhammo, ayaṃ vinayo, idaṃ satthusāsanaṃ, imaṃ gaṇhatha, imaṃ rocethā'ti. Evaṃ kho, upāli, saṃgharāji ceva hoti saṃghabhedo ca. Navannaṃ vā, upāli, atirekanavannaṃ vā saṃgharāji ceva hoti saṃghabhedo ca.*

Translation: On the one side, Upāli, there are four monks; on the other side, there are four. A ninth monk speaks out and takes a voting stick, saying: "This is the Dharma. This is the Vinaya. This is the Master's teaching. You people should take it and approve of it." In this way, Upāli, such a monastic dispute is a schism as well. There must be nine monks, Upāli, or more than nine, to constitute a monastic dispute as well as a schism.

[311] Vin. ii. 195–198 = Eng. Horner 1938–1952: V. 276–279.

[312] Still Kokālika, Khaṇḍadeviyāputta, Kaṭamorakatissaka, and Samuddadatta.

The Sarvāstivāda school(s) conforms to the Theravaṃsa tradition that a minimum of nine monks must be involved in a schism.[313] However, compared to the above schools, the Sarvāstivāda school(s) possesses a different understanding in the types of monastic ceremonies that lead to a schism — it only includes schismatic proclamation in public and organizing a vote, without the common item of assembling a *karman* ceremony: [314]

> The Buddha spoke to Upāli: "One *bhikṣu* cannot split the harmonious monastic community. Two, or three, or four, or five, or six, or seven, or eight still cannot split the harmonious *saṅgha*. It takes at least nine purified *bhikṣu*s with the same view to cause a schism. Upāli! One *bhikṣunī* cannot split the harmonious monastic community. Two, or three, or four, or five, or six, or seven, or eight, or nine purified *bhikṣuṇī*s with the same view still cannot split the harmonious monastic community. Not a *śikṣamāṇā,* a *śrāmaṇera*, a *śrāmaṇerikā*, a male or female [non-Buddhist] *pravrajita*s can split the harmonious monastic community. Two, or three, or four, or five, or six, or seven, or eight, or nine of them with the same view still cannot split the harmonious monastic community. Upāli! Two situations are regarded as schismatic: one is [jointly] proclamations, and the other is collecting

---

[313] The Mūlasarvāstivāda traditions also agree with the number of minimum nine monks; cf. MSV *Saṅghabhedavastu* T. 1450 (XXIV) 153c8–9.

[314] T. 1435 (XXIII) 267a4–15: 佛語優波離："*一比丘不能破和合僧，若二、若三、四、五、六、七、八，亦不能破和合比丘僧。極少乃至九清淨同見比丘，能破和合比丘僧。優波離！一比丘尼不能破和合僧，若二、若三、四、五、六、七、八、九清淨同見比丘尼，亦不能破和合僧。優波離！非一式叉摩尼、非一沙彌沙彌尼、非一出家出家尼*能破和合僧，若二、若三、四、五、六、七、八、九清淨同見，亦不能破和合僧。優波離！有二因緣，名破僧：一唱說、二取籌。唱說者，如調達於僧中乃至第二、第三唱言：'我調達作是語。'取籌者，如調達初唱竟，共四伴取籌。"

*一比丘不能破和合僧，若二、若三、 四、五、六、七、八，亦不能破和合: The same account appears more than once in the *Shisong lü*. Note that T. 1435 (XXIII) 372a20–21 seems to be partially corrupted, as it states that two to nine proper *bhikṣu*s can [*sic*] cause a schism (一比丘不能破僧，二、三、四乃至九比丘清淨同見者能破).

**Chujia chujiani* 出家出家尼 ("male and female *pravrajita*s"): Some dictionaries regard these two groups as two additional part of the monastic community (cf. DDB s.v. 九眾). However, the monastic community conventionally contain only seven groups (i.e., *bhikṣu, bhikṣuṇī, śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera, śrāmaṇerī, upāsaka, upāsikā, upavāsa*) and we find no records explaining these two extra groups (出家,出家尼). In my understanding, these two terms refer to non-Buddhist renunciants, which is supported by their other occurrences in the Vinaya texts. In the *Wufen biqiuni jieben* (T. 1437 [XXIII] 483b6–7) and *Mohe sengqi lü* (T. 1425 [XXII] 373c22–23), where a *pācattika* rule is issued against Buddhist monks/nuns who give food to the 出家/出家尼(or 出家男/出家女) with their hands, the parallel readings in other Vinayas always qualify them as groups of heretics (外道男, 外道女; e.g., T. 1428 [XXII] 664c20–21; T. 1435 [XXIII] 100c20–21).

voting sticks. As an example of the proclamation, Devadatta proclaimed among the monks, (the text repeats) to the point that he proclaimed a second and third time, saying: 'I, Devadatta, speak so and so.' When it comes to collecting voting sticks, the example is that Devadatta, having made the first proclamation, collected voting sticks together with his four companions."

Correspondingly, the story of Devadatta's schismatic activities in the same Vinaya includes the two activities (that is, repeated proclamations of the five ascetic propositions and collecting voting sticks) but leaves out the records of separate performances of *karman*.[315]

In the case of the Mūlasarvāstivāda school, if monks conduct *karman* ceremonies when they consider the legal teaching as illegal, the illegal teaching as legal, or discordance as accordance, this kind of split is a *saṅghabheda*.[316] Other prerequisites include that a schism must involve at least nine monks on two opposing sides, and they must perform *karman*s and hold a vote.[317] Devadatta's schismatic activities precisely illustrate the definition of schism

---

[315] T. 1435 (XXIII) 265a12-26: 爾時調達作是言："我調達僧中唱言：'比丘應盡形著納衣、應盡形乞食、應盡形一食、應盡形露地住、應盡形不噉肉魚。' *隨何比丘意樂是五法者，便起捉籌。" 唱已，調達及四伴，即起捉籌。調達第二復作是言："我調達僧中唱言：'比丘應盡形著納衣、應盡形乞食、應盡形一食、應盡形露地住、應盡形不噉肉魚。'隨何比丘喜樂是五法者，便起捉籌。" 唱第二語已，有二百五十比丘，從坐起捉籌。調達第三復作是言："我調達僧中唱言：'比丘應盡形著納衣、應盡形乞食、應盡形一食、應盡形露地住、應盡形不噉肉魚。'隨何比丘意樂是五法者，便起捉籌。" 第三唱，復有二百五十比丘，從坐起捉籌。爾時調達，即將是眾，還自住處，更立法制。 (*隨何: I surmise this could be the translation of the Sanskrit indefinite pronoun *kenacit* in the instrumental case).

At that moment, Devadatta spoke the following words: "I, Devadatta, proclaim in the monastic community that 'Monks must conduct the practice of wearing rag robes throughout the entire lifetime, conduct the practice of begging for alms throughout the entire lifetime, conduct the practice of one eating throughout the entire lifetime, conduct the practice of living in the open air throughout the entire lifetime, and conduct the practice of abstaining from eating meat and fish throughout the entire lifetime.' Any monk who delights in these five practices should rise up and take the voting stick." Having proclaimed thus, Devadatta and his four companions rose up and take voting sticks. Devadatta then spoke a second time ... (repeating the whole content of the first speech and I thus omit it in my translation). Having made the second proclamation, two hundred and fifty monks rose from their seats and take voting sticks. Devadatta then spoke a third time ... (repeating again). Having made the third proclamation, two hundred and fifty more monks rose from their seats and take voting sticks. At that time, Devadatta led the crowd to the place he lived, and changed the set of legal regulations.

[316] Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 271: *yataś copālin bhikṣavaḥ <dharme 'dharmasaṃjñinaḥ> adharme dharmasaṃjñino vyagre avyagrasaṃjñinaḥ karmāṇī kurvanti; ayam ucyate saṃghabhedaḥ*. D.1, *'dul ba, nga,* 297a7: *dge slong rnams chos kyis chos ma yin pa'i 'du shes dang | chos ma yin pas chos kyi 'du shes dang | mi mthun pa la mthun pa'i 'du shes kyis las rnams byed na 'di ni dge 'dun gyi dbyen zhes bya'o.* T. 1442 (XXIII) 153b8–9: 於其非法作非法想，現有別住作別住心，作羯磨者，齊此名為破壞羯磨僧伽也.

[317] Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 271: *yatra nava bhikṣava uttare vā tatra dvābhyāṃ kāraṇābhyāṃ saṃgho bhidyate; jñaptikarmaṇā śalākāgrahaṇena ca*. D.1, *'dul ba, nga,* 297b1-2: *gang na dge slong dgu 'am lhag par*

in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, including preaching the wrong teaching at the end of the rains retreat (which implies that it must have occurred in a *poṣadha* ceremony), organizing a vote for a schism, and leading five hundred monks astray.[318]

In the case of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, if we still remember what we have discussed in the previous section (§3.1.3.1), Devadatta first composes divergent monastic codes and divergent scriptures; later, the monastic community holds a formal act of suspension (*utkṣepaṇīyaṃ karman*) for him, but this legal procedure is obstructed by his followers, which implies that Devadatta still maintains his status as a monk then. Later, in the city of Gayā where Śākyamuni also dwells, Devadatta intends to perform his separate *poṣadha* ceremonies, although Śākyamuni sends Ānanda three times to order Devadatta to join the same *poṣadha* with Śākyamuni's *saṅgha*. We find that Devadatta's schism here also fits well into the legal discussion of a schism in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya: a schism must involve disagreements in understanding the Dharma, in addition to the requirement that the schismatic party must hold a separate *poṣadha*s, *pravāraṇa*s, or *karman*s in the same realm.

Now, having investigated how Devadatta's initiative fits into each school's definition of schism, we arrive at the conclusion that the Devadatta narrative is a self-contained schismatic story. Many elements of the stories related to Devadatta, which seem to be logically flawed and chaotic, in fact never lose their ideological aim: they agree with the definitions of schism in the Vinayas, serving to make Devadatta's schism as a paradigm of what a legal schism should be.[319] If we fail to read this narrative as a schismatic narrative, we

---

yod pa de na rgyu gnyis kyis dge 'dun gyi dbyen du 'gyur te | gsol ba'i las dang tshul shing len pas so. T. 1442 (XXIII) 153b13-14: 如其至九或復過斯，有兩僧伽，方名破眾，作其羯磨，并復行籌.

[318] T. 1450 (XXIV) 202c10–17: 滿三月已，提婆達多為諸大眾廣說妙法: "苾芻當知！沙門喬答摩常說法時，讚歎在山寂靜，離諸煩惱，解脫最疾最速。一者乞食，二者糞掃衣，三者三衣，四者露坐，如是四人去諸塵垢，證得解脫。若有人不樂如是四種修道，不樂解脫者，即合受籌出離眾外。" 說此語已，于時大眾五百苾芻人各受籌，隨提婆達多出離眾外行至門首. Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 204, D. 1, *'dul ba*, *nya*, 250b4–251a1. Borgland 2018: 98 offers an English translation from Sanskrit.

[319] Whether these Devadatta stories are composed under the sway the Vinaya regulations, or the other way round, namely, the Vinaya regulations are made to accommodate these Devadatta stories, is still a question for scholars including myself. However, considering the fact that this part of the Devadatta narrative, as it appears now, has already been deeply intertwined with the Vinaya rules, it is difficult, also useless, to argue for an absolute chronological order between them. This is also because, in order to answer the question of their chronological order, we have to deal with the obscure history of the formation of Vinaya literature. But we currently possess no concrete evidence to make any decisive conclusions about questions related to the formative period of Indian Buddhism. In this sense, to split the Devadatta stories from their ideological Vinaya context for a pure speculation on their relative ancientness would do no help in further understanding this narrative and the related Vinaya rules, and definitely go against my argument to regard them as a unity (or, a

will not comprehend the rich significance these stories have in the Vinayas.

3.2.3 What is the sin of a schismatic? Understanding Devadatta's sin as a schismatic

Now I proceed to explore the third issue in situating the Devadatta stories against their schismatic background. As we have investigated above, the agent of schismatic activities, theoretically speaking, should be a decent monk who leads a proper monastic life. But what sins does such a schismatic incur after splitting a monastic community? Is Devadatta's downfall the sole outcome for a schismatic? Or, alternatively, is there any way to justify a schism? Bearing these questions in mind, I conduct a more thorough investigation of the sin that a schismatic incurs in legal texts. I demonstrate that Devadatta's sin earns him the most terrible retribution a schismatic can incur, but a schism as such is not necessarily a contemptible thing as in Devadatta's case; instead, under certain conditions, a schismatic can be fully justified. Following this line of thought, my next question is, if schismatics are not necessarily despicable, why is Devadatta condemned so forcefully in Buddhist literature? To answer this question, I explore different categories of schism and demonstrate how schism, as a Vinaya transgression, is mixed up and jumbled together with the concept of *ānantarya-karma*: The discussion surrounding Devadatta as the paradigm of a schismatic was first initiated in a legal context, rather than a polemic one, to illustrate the criteria for and consequences of schism; but in the conception of the *ānantarya-karmas*, schism becomes not a legal question but a morally reprehensible and gravely evil act. I argue that the popular understanding of schism and Devadatta's particular offense underwent a significant shift once the scholastic traditions (simply put, the Abhidharmas) began to dominate perceptions of these issues. Moreover, I view schism as an inevitability of historical development and suggest the use of scapegoat theory to explain the mentality underlying the condemnation of Devadatta.

3.2.3.1 Schism in the Buddhist value system: Justified schism and unjustified schism

> The venerable Upāli further asked the Buddha: "What is the sin for splitting the *saṅgha*?" The Buddha spoke: "The sin of falling into hell for one *kalpa*." [320]

---

symbiotic process): these Devadatta stories, as the illustration of what constitutes a schism, are already an integral part of the Vinaya rules.

[320] T. 1425 (XXII) 444c16–17: 尊者優波離復白佛言："破僧者得何等罪？" 佛言："一劫泥犁罪。" See also parallels in T. 1421 (XXII) 20b5–7, T. 1428 (XXII) 913b14–16, etc.

In the *vastu/khandhaka*s, the Devadatta narrative always concludes with Upāli's inquiry into the ultimate defeat of Devadatta. There, the Buddha confirms that Devadatta's sin as an instigator of schism is to descend into hell for a whole *kalpa*.[321] Such an upshot for a schismatic, as illustrated by the case of Devadatta, thus becomes the source of our paradigmatic understanding of schismatic sins. However, the discussion of schism in the Vinaya does not simply end here. Following this dialogue between Upāli and the Buddha is a more detailed and multifaceted discussion that sheds new light on another possible end of a schismatic. Let us start with how the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya continues this dialogue on schism:[322]

> (Upāli) further asked: "Would all instigators of schism be afflicted with great, hellish sufferings for a *kalpa*?"
>
> The Buddha responded: "They are not necessarily afflicted with great hellish sufferings for a *kalpa*. There are eight kinds of people who split the *saṅgha* and are afflicted with great hellish sufferings for a *kalpa*—
>
> "Those who perceive a righteous matter as righteous, but claim it to be unrighteous;
>
> "Those who perceive an unrighteous matter as unrighteous, but claim it to be righteous;
>
> "Those who perceive a righteous matter as unrighteous, but claim it to be righteous;
>
> "Those who perceive an unrighteous matter as righteous, but claim it to be unrighteous;
>
> "Those who perceive a righteous or unrighteous matter as righteous, but claim it to be unrighteous;
>
> "Those who perceive a righteous or unrighteous matter as unrighteous, but claim it to be righteous;

[321] E.g., T. 1425 (XXII) 444c14–16; T. 1421 (XXII) 20b5–7; T. 1428 (XXII) 913b14–16, etc.

[322] T. 1421 (XXII) 166a25–b7: 又問："凡破僧者，皆一劫受大地獄苦耶？" 佛言："不必皆一劫受大地獄苦。有八人破僧，受一劫大地獄苦：若法法想，說言非法；若非法非法想，說言是法；若法非法想，說言是法；若非法法想，說言非法；若法非法法想，說言非法；若法非法非法想，說言是法；若法非法疑，說言是法；若法非法疑，說言非法。有六人破僧，不墮大地獄一劫受苦：若法法想，說言是法；若非法非法想，說言非法；若法非法想，說言非法；若非法法想，說言是法；若法非法非法想，說言非法；若法非法法想，說言是法。"

"Those who doubt whether it is righteous or unrighteous, but claim it to be righteous;

"Those who doubt whether it is righteous or unrighteous, but claim it to be unrighteous.

"There are six kinds of people who split the *saṅgha* but are not afflicted with great, hellish afflictions for a *kalpa*—

"Those who perceive a righteous matter as righteous, and claim it to be righteous;

"Those who perceive an unrighteous matter as unrighteous, and claim it to be unrighteous;

"Those who perceive a righteous matter as unrighteous, and claim it to be unrighteous;

"Those who perceive an unrighteous matter as righteous, and claim it to be righteous;

"Those who perceive righteous or unrighteous as unrighteous, and claim it to be unrighteous;

"Those who perceive righteous or unrighteous as righteous, and claim it to be righteous."

To recapitulate the essence of the above paragraph, whether an instigator of schism will descend into hell is determined by whether he intentionally tells a lie. In other words, regardless of whether a matter is righteous or not, if the separatist claims this matter to be righteous but meanwhile realizes that it is unrighteous, he will incur retribution in hell for an entire *kalpa*. On the contrary, even if the matter is not righteous, if he claims it as righteous because he wrongly perceives it as righteous, he will escape punishment in hell. In the case of Devadatta, he knows that the five ascetic practices are not compulsory according to the teaching of the Buddha, but he insists on making them obligatory, which no doubt constitutes an unjustified schism.

A similar statement is also found in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya:[323]

---

[323] T.1428 (XXII) 913b22–c9. 優波離復問："一切破僧者皆墮地獄一劫受苦不？"

佛語："優波離！一切破僧人，不必盡墮地獄受苦一劫。優波離！若比丘，非法言法，堅持此法，破和合僧，彼自知非法，想破，便作非法想，說如是言：'此是法，此是毘尼，是佛所教。'異見異忍，行破僧舍羅。優波離！如此破僧者，一劫泥犁中受苦不療。

Again, Upāli asked: "Will all instigators of schism fall into hell and suffer from affliction for a *kalpa*?"

The Buddha spoke: "Upāli! Not all instigators of schism necessarily fall into hell and suffer from affliction for a *kalpa*. Upāli! There are cases in which a monk claims an unrighteous matter as righteous and stubbornly sticks to this matter to split the *saṅgha*. He knows quite well that it is an unrighteous matter, but for the purpose of causing a schism, he contemplates in an unrighteous way and speaks thus: 'So and So is the Dharma. So and so is the Vinaya. So and so is the teaching of the Buddha.' He establishes a different view and divergent belief and passes out voting sticks for a schism. Upāli! Such an instigator would suffer from afflictions in hell for a *kalpa* and not be cured.

"There are cases in which a monk claims an unrighteous matter as righteous and stubbornly sticks to this matter to split the *saṅgha*. With the aim of causing a schism, he claims an unrighteous matter to be righteous, saying, 'Such is the Dharma. Such is the Vinaya. Such is the teaching of the Buddha.' He passes out voting sticks for a schism and organizes a *karman* ceremony. Upāli! Such a separatist would suffer from afflictions in hell for a *kalpa* and not be cured. This also applies to the case in which a monk knows what is righteous, but for the sake of schism, he assumes and claims it to be unrighteous.

"Upāli! There are cases in which a monk claims an unrighteous matter to be righteous and stubbornly sticks to this matter to split the *saṅgha*. He assumes it to be righteous and claims it to be righteous for the sake of schism, saying, 'So and so is the Dharma. So and so is the Vinaya. So and so is the teaching of the Buddha.' He does not establish a different view and divergent belief. He passes out voting sticks for a schism and organizes a *karman* ceremony. Upāli! Such separatists would not descend to hell to suffer from afflictions for a *kalpa*."

The primary meaning of the above Dharmaguptaka statement is quite close to that of the Mahīśāsaka version: one should truthfully speak his mind. If somebody clearly knows what

---

若比丘，非法說法，堅持此事，方便破僧，非法想破法想說：'此是法，是毘尼，是佛所教。'行破僧舍羅，作羯磨。優波離！如是破僧人，一劫泥犁中受苦不療。法想破非法想說亦如是。

優波離！若比丘非法說法，堅持此事，破和合僧，彼法想破法想說：'此是法，是毘尼，是佛所教。'不異見，不異忍，行破僧舍羅，作羯磨。如是，優波離！此人不墮地獄一劫受苦."

is righteous or unrighteous but states otherwise, he shall definitely descend into hell to receive due punishment. On the contrary, even if one wrongly assumes an unrighteous matter as righteous and claims it to be righteous, he will not incur the punishment in the Avīci hell for a *kalpa*.

A relevant discussion is again found in the Sarvāstivāda *Shisong lü*:[324]

Question: Do all schismatics possess erroneous views? Do all possessors of erroneous views fall under the category of schismatics?

Answer: Some schismatics do not possess erroneous views. Some possessors of erroneous views are not schismatics. Some schismatics indeed possess erroneous views. Some are neither schismatics nor possessors of erroneous views. People who are schismatics but not possessors of erroneous views are schismatics possessed by righteous thoughts. They are called schismatics but not possessors of erroneous views. Those who are possessors of erroneous views but not schismatics are, for instance, the six heretical masters. They possess erroneous views, but are not schismatics. People who are both schismatics and possessors of erroneous views are like Devadatta. Those who are neither schismatics nor possessors of erroneous views are people other than the above cases.

Question: Are schismatics ignorant? Do all ignorant people fall under the category of schismatics?

Answer: Some schismatics are not ignorant. Some ignorant people do not cause a schism. Some schismatics are ignorant. Some are neither schismatics nor ignorant people. Those who are schismatics but not ignorant are schismatics who split with righteous thoughts. They are termed schismatics, but they are not ignorant. Those who are ignorant but not schismatics are people who kill their parents, murder arhats and draw the blood of the Buddha. They are ignorant, but they are not schismatics. Schismatics who are also ignorant people are, for instance,

[324] T. 1435 (XXIII) 376b29–c12 = 薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒伽 (**Sarvāstivādavinaya-mātṛkā*) T. 1441 (XXIII) 567a25–b19: “若破僧是邪見，邪見是破僧耶？” “有破僧非邪見，有邪見非破僧，破僧是邪見，有非破僧非邪見。破僧非邪見者，以法想破僧，是名破僧非邪見。邪見非破僧者，六師是，是名邪見非破僧。破僧是邪見者，調達是。非破僧非邪見者，除上事。” “若破僧是無明，無明是破僧耶？” “有破僧非無明，有無明非破僧，有破僧是無明，有非破僧非無明。破僧非無明者，以法想破僧，是破僧非無明。無明非破僧者，殺父母、殺阿羅漢、惡心出佛身血，是名無明非破僧。破僧是無明者，調達是，是名破僧是無明。非破僧非無明者，除上事。”

Devadatta. He is a schismatic and an ignorant person. Those who are neither schismatics nor ignorant are people other than the above cases.

In the Sarvāstivāda context, the emphasis is slightly different from that of the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka discussions. Here, the key is whether a schism is based on righteous thoughts, rather than whether the schismatic truthfully speaks his mind. If a schismatic possesses a righteous view, his schismatic activities are justified and are no longer treated as evil deeds, the claim of which is confirmed elsewhere in the *Sapoduobu pini modelejia* (薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒伽, **Sarvāstivādavinaya-mātṛkā*).[325]

The Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition also concurs with the Sarvāstivāda viewpoint. In the *Genben sapoduobu lü she* (根本薩婆多部律攝, **Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya-saṃgraha*), a commentary on the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, it is stated that if a schismatic's activities are motivated by good intentions, he would never commit the sin of instigating a schism. The example given by this commentary is that of the Kauśāmbī monks, who split off without a schismatic mind (無破眾心).

Keeping in mind the above discussions of schism in the Buddhist value system, we may find it easier to understand another element in the Devadatta narrative, that is, the statement of his motivation for schism. When Devadatta's group conspires to separate from Śākyamuni's *saṅgha*, their motivation is usually characterized as securing future fame. For instance, in the Chinese Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, when Devadatta's group conspires to separate from Śākyamuni's *saṅgha*, they state their motivation in the following way:[326]

The group of six monks said to each other: "*Śramaṇa* Gautama must send messengers three times! We should make up our mind to hold a *poṣadha* ceremony in advance. We people will reap great fame in future generations."

We find in the above statement not the condemnation of a schismatic but the potentiality that a schismatic, as the possible leader of a sect, could establish fame among his followers. If we assume that a schism had been wholly condemned, there would be no chance to seek fame

[325] T. 1441 (XXIII) 606b10–16: 云何破僧，得無間、墮阿鼻地獄？非法非法想破僧。

[326] T. 1425 (XXII) 443a10–12: 六群比丘自相謂言："沙門瞿曇必當三遣使來，我等各各正意，先作布薩事，我等作後世名譽。"

by means of splitting the *saṅgha*. The same reading of Devadatta's motivation is also recorded in the Sthavira offshoots. We take the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya as an example:[327]

> At that moment, Devadatta had a third thought: "Now, I am splitting *śramaṇa* Gautama's monastic community. I will gain great fame. All the people will say: '*Śramaṇa* Gautama possesses great magical power. Nevertheless, Devadatta could split his monastic community!'"

Slightly different from the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, future fame is not gained directly through the action of schism itself. The inner logic is that if Devadatta split Śākyamuni's *saṅgha*, he would prove himself more powerful than Śākyamuni—which is widely accepted by other Sthavira offshoots.[328] If schism was merely a taboo, what Devadatta, as a schismatic, would obtain in the future is not an excellent reputation but intense criticism. Therefore, I argue that Devadatta's motivation for fame itself reflects an equivocal attitude toward *saṅghabheda* among the Vinayas.[329]

So far, we have enough evidence to demonstrate that Devadatta's downfall reflects only one facet of the Vinaya discussion of schismatic issues. As a widespread view in the Vinayas,

---

[327] T. 1421 (XXII) 164a20–22: 爾時，調達第三念言："我今破沙門瞿曇僧，得大名稱，一切當言：'沙門瞿曇有大神力，而調達能破其僧。'"

[328] In the Dharmaguptaka *Vibhaṅga*, the direct cause for Devadatta's schism is stated as follows: The Buddha enacted a ruling against group begging, but Devadatta regarded this ruling as the Buddha's strategy of cutting off his supply of food. Devadatta's intention to gain great fame is also stated in the same way as in the Mahīśāsaka version: "未曾有！瞿曇沙門乃斷人口食。我寧可破彼僧輪，我身滅後可得名稱言：'沙門瞿曇有大神力、智慧無礙，而提婆達能破彼僧輪。'" (T. 1428 [XXII] 594a19–22).

T. 1435 (XXIII) 259a9–16: 調達到是四人所，作是言："我與汝等，當共破沙門瞿曇和合僧，壞轉法輪，我等當得如是名聲：'破沙門瞿曇和合僧，壞轉法輪，我等能破。'" (Devadatta went to the four people's places and made this statement: "You should join forces alongside me to split *śramaṇa* Gautama's *saṅgha* and impair the Dharma wheel. We will earn such a reputation: '(They can) split *śramaṇa* Gautama's *saṅgha* and impair the Dharma wheel.' We can instigate a schism.")

T. 1442 (XXIII) 702b24–27; D. 3, *'dul ba*, *cha*, 4a5–7: 爾時天授命四伴曰："汝等四人今應共我破彼沙門喬答摩和合僧伽，并破法輪，我歿代後，獲善名稱，聲滿十方。" (At that moment, Devadatta ordered his four companions: "You four people should join me in splitting *śramaṇa* Gautama's harmonious monastic community [**samagra saṅgha*] and splitting the Dharma wheel. In the future generations after we die, we will reap a good reputation. Our fame will be spread in the ten directions.")

[329] However, people may still argue that this motivation does not necessarily reflect a positive view of schism, considering that schism was first instigated by Devadatta and thereafter became taboo. While admitting that this is a good argument, we should keep in mind that the Devadatta stories must have been developed in the period when schisms had already been regarded as negative events, not meritorious actions that would bring about good fame. In the anti-schismatic milieu, the statement that Devadatta's motivation was to seek fame *per se* sounds quite absurd and implausible.

not all schismatics are doomed to descend into the Avīci hell, and not all schisms are evil in nature. From a historical perspective, schism—the reprehensible phenomenon that forms the core of Devadatta's legends—is an inevitable tendency within the historical development of Buddhism. No matter how severely Buddhists from diverse monastic institutions condemned the acts of schism in the Devadatta narrative, they could not extricate themselves from the schismatic history of Buddhism: they each came from different Buddhist institutions with their own varied sectarian identities; such groups must have split off or gradually evolved from a once-unified community. From a historical perspective, schism as such should not be reproached: without the settlement of numerous Buddhist groups in various geographical territories, without the growth of diverse local communities, Buddhism could not have developed into a pan-Asian religion and enjoyed such prosperity. This is to say, schism *per se* should not be regarded as an embodiment of corruption or evilness, but a historical process that promotes vitality and prosperity.

3.2.3.2 Schism as a Vinaya offense vs. an **ānantarya-karma***: One possible way to read the distinction between Devadatta and Mahādeva*

As we have already demonstrated, the Vinayas situate the discussion of schism in a legal context and view a schism as a neutral phenomenon, having both positive and negative implications. What, then, do the Vinayas usually stipulate about the punishment of a condemnable, unjustified schism? Is this punishment or sin different from what we find in Devadatta's case? In order to understand the sins of Devadatta as a schismatic, we need first to clarify the Vinaya regulations against unjustified schisms (in the following discussion, I simply use "schisms" to denote "unjustified schisms").

In fact, every extant Vinaya specifies a detailed procedure to determine the degree of severity of a schismatic sin and the corresponding punishment. The first thing we need to note is that the Vinayas do not condemn schism as severely as the *pārājika,* the crimes resulting in excommunication immediately. Instead, the transgression of inciting schism is categorized as one of the 13 crimes of *saṅghāvaśeṣa* (Pāli *saṅghādisesa*; Chn. *sengcan fa* 僧殘法; Tib. *dge 'dun lhag ma;* "offenses entailing temporary penance," as defined by Clarke [2015: 61]), which incur the punishment of temporary expulsion and require public confession to purge the sin. Under the normative procedure of issuing a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* punishment, the monks should first reprimand (Chn. *jian* 諫; Skt. [*sam*]-*anu*-√*bhāṣ*) the schismatic several times to dissuade him from splitting the *saṅgha*. If the reprimand turns out to be in vain, the monks should make a motion (Chn. *bai* 白; Skt. *jñapti*) in front of the monastic community, appealing for a monastic *karman* to be conducted. Under the condition that the motion does not put an end to the schismatic activities, the first *karman* must be convened. If the schismatic still refuses to abandon his activities, the second and third *karman*s should be summoned. After one motion and three *karman*s are undertaken (therefore, this kind of procedure is termed *jñapticaturtha-karma* [Chn. *baisi jiemo* 白四羯磨]), if the schismatic continues his schismatic activities, he finally incurs a *saṅghāvaśeṣa.*[330]

What if a schismatic monk chooses to abandon his schismatic activities? The Vinayas also have clear regulations depending on how far a schism proceeds. If a schismatic monk abandons his schismatic activities before the other monks finish their motion (白), he merely

[330] Vin. i. 174; T. 1462 (XXIV) 769b19; T. 1421 (XXII) 20c12–27; T. 1428 (XXII) 595a20–b15; T. 1435 (XXIII) 25b19–c15; T. 1442 (XXIII) 702c10–703a24; D. 2, *'dul ba*, *cha*, 4b5–6a4.

incurs a *duṣkṛta* (Chn. *tujiluo* 突吉羅; Pāli *dukkaṭa*; "misdemeanors"—not a grave offense), according to the Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka and Mahāsāṅghika Vinayas. However, the (Mūla)Sarvāstivāda Vinayas state that, at this point, he incurs the crime of *sthūlātyaya* (Chn. *toulanzhe* 偷蘭遮, Pāli *thullaccaya*), a serious offense that is "close to violating—or narrowly fails in a deliberate attempt to violate—a *pārājika* or *saṅghāvaśeṣa* rule."[331] All Vinayas then state that if he abandons his schismatic activities after the conclusion of the motion, or after the completion of the first two *karman*s, or he agrees to stop just before the third *karman* has finished, he incurs the offense of *sthūlātyaya* of varying degrees of severity.[332] Under the condition that the third *karman* has been fully completed, he commits the offense of *saṅghāvaśeṣa*, as mentioned above.[333]

Based on the above regulations, the attitude of the Vinayas toward the crime of *saṅghabheda* is quite analytical and rational. Instead of dramatically and indiscriminately condemning schismatics, the Vinayas endeavor to dissuade people from this offense by leaving enough room to backtrack: at every point, the offenders can find normative rules on how to expiate the offense and reverse the situation, if they are willing to stop their schismatic activities. Even if a monk does not abandon his schismatic activities after the third *karman* and incurs a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* offense, it is still reversible, theoretically speaking,

[331] Heirman 2016–2017: 171. Vin i. 174; T. 1421 (XXII) 20c7–11; T. 1425 (XXII) 284 c11–13 "越比尼罪 (**vinayātikrama*; almost equivalent to *duṣkṛta* in terms of seriousness)"; T. 1428 (XXII) 595b13–15; T. 1435 (XXIII) 25b19-20; T. 1442 (XXIII) 704b13–14.

[332] Vin i. 174; T. 1421 (XXII) 20c12–27; T. 1425 (XXII) 284 c12–15 (the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya proposes that, before the completion of the first *karman*, a schismatic can only incur *vinayātikrama*); T. 1428 (XXII) 595a28–b13; T. 1435 (XXIII) 25b19–c15; T. 1442 (XXIII) 704b15–17.

[333] In the case of Devadatta, the monastic community responds exactly in compliance with the above procedure. Let us take the Mahāsāṅghika *vibhaṅga* part as an example (T. 1425 [XXII] 283b15ff.): when Devadatta initially formulates his schismatic intentions, the Buddha temporarily quells his schismatic mind with earnest exhortations. Later, when Devadatta relapses into schismatic activities, the Buddha promulgates the aforementioned legal procedure to subdue his schismatic intentions and punish the offenders: the monks first admonish Devadatta many times, but do not manage to dissuade him. Then, they convoke three *karman*s to collectively determine his transgression. However, the three *karman*s do not proceed smoothly due to the objection issued by Devadatta's supporters. Because of this, the Buddha promulgates the procedure to punish the supporters of *saṅghāvaśeṣa*. In this sense, in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, Devadatta escapes the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* penalty. The same ambiguity also occurs in other Vinayas, in which no explicit mention is made as to whether the three *karman* in response to Devadatta's offense are fully conducted or not.

as he can return to the right track and rejoin the community by making a public confession, although the re-ordination of a schismatic is a rather controversial issue in the Vinayas.[334]

The Vinaya attitude toward schism differs considerably from the scholastic definition of schism, which has dominated our stereotypical understanding of sins of schism up to now. These scholastic traditions, represented by the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma texts, established and systematized a popular category of "five sins of immediate retribution" (*ānantarya-karma,* Chn. *nizui* 逆罪), which include killing one's father, mother, or an arhat, drawing the blood of a buddha and inciting a schism.[335] We are repeatedly warned that within this category, *saṅghabheda* is the gravest offense that a monk could ever commit, and will result in an immediate descent into hell in the next life. Both the *Abhidharma-kośa-bhāṣya* (阿毘達磨俱舍論, T. 1558) and **Abhidharma-nyāyānusāra* (阿毘達磨順正理論, T. 1562) further emphasize that while the other four sins of immediate retribution do not necessarily

---

[334] For instance, the *Binaiye* 鼻奈耶, a Sarvāstivāda Vinaya in Chinese translation, explicitly lays out the procedure by which *saṅghāvaśeṣa* offenders can redeem their sins: during the confession, 20 monks must be assembled; the offenders must repent for six days and nights, with his body prostrating on the ground, without concealing any of their offenses (T. 1464 [XXIV] 874a16–20. 優婆離問世尊: "云何僧伽婆尸沙？" "僧伽婆尸沙者，有怖於比丘僧、有怖於聖道、有望於果證、有怖於悔過。若悔過時，集二十僧，當自悔過六宿，五體布地，所犯過不得藏匿。僧決斷原如是，故曰僧伽婆尸沙). Furthermore, the *Shisong lü* also encourages the perpetrator of *saṅghāvaśeṣa* to go to the monastic community immediately after the *karman*s to publicly admit his offense; if not, the days that pass after the completion of the *karman* are counted together as his days of concealing his offense (T. 1435 [XXIII] 25 c12–15. 是比丘應即時入僧中自唱言："諸長老！我某甲比丘，得僧伽婆尸沙罪。"若即說者善。若不即說者，從是時來，名覆藏日數).

However, we also possess contradictory records in the Vinayas that a schismatic is forbidden to rejoin the community. Sp. iii. 1024: *ayaṃ saṅghabhedako nāma, etassa pabbajjā ca upasampadā ca vāritā*; T. 1462 (XXIV) 792c1–3: 破僧人不得度出家。云何破僧？若執十八事，三諫不捨. Cf. also T. 1428 (XXII) 838a18–22; T. 1441 (XXIII) 566b26–29, etc.

[335] This is the standard list given by Silk (2007: 253). He (ibid. 255) further comments that, "there is general agreement that the most serious of the five is the instigation of a schism, which is no doubt motivated by the fact that this is the one crime which directly challenges the Buddhist monastic institution itself." In addition, Silk (2009: 21, 236n.1) also observes that this category of sins is mostly discussed in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma literature. However, he accepts the possibility that the concept of five *ānantarya-karma*s may have been formed in the canonical corpora (namely, Sūtras and Vinayas) and is reluctant to regard this concept as an innovation introduced by the Abhidharmas literature. Indeed, in the inscriptions of Sāñcī Stupa I, the term ānantarya has already appeared (Lamotte 1988: 415).

The *Suttanipāta* mentions a different concept of "six great crimes" (*cha abhiṭhānāni.* Sn. No. 231, Norman 1992: 26) without specifying which six crimes are referred to here. This concept is later cited by the later *Khuddakapāṭha* (Khp. 5 line 6) and the Pāli Abhidhamma work *Kathāvatthu* (Kv. 109 = Eng. Shwe & C.A.F. Rhys-Davids 1969: 80). According to the commentary of the *Khuddakapāṭha*, these crimes are listed as matricide, parricide, arahaticide, wounding a Buddha, schism, and heresy (Norman 1993: 193; Pj. I. 189: *ekanipāte vuttāni mātughāta-pitughāta-arahantaghāta-lohituppāda-saṅghabheda-aññasatthār uddesa kammāni*).

lead to rebirth in the Avīci, inciting a schism would undoubtedly result in such a rebirth.[336] That is to say, as one of the five *ānantarya-karma*s, schism is no longer a legal issue but a morally reprehensible act, a grave evil subject to intensive polemics.

From this we can see that our popular understanding of the sin of schism is in actuality a mixture of two traditions and two contexts: the first, as a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* transgression, innately belongs to the Vinayas, while the other belongs to the *ānantarya karma* of the scholastic tradition. We also have texts that attempt to combine the two traditions of schism into the same discussion. The *Genben sapoduobu lü she* (**Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya-saṃgraha*) states that if a monk harbors sinful thoughts when inciting a schism, he offends the five *ānantarya-karma*s and incurs the karma of *ānantarya*; however, if he does not harbor a sinful thought during schism, his behavior is a violation of the *ānantarya-karma*, but does not incur the corresponding retribution.[337]

With the above discussion in mind, we can also answer the question of why has Buddhism separately created Devadatta and Mahādeva, both of whom are notorious evildoers with such overlapping personalities and transgressions. My answer now is based on the different ideological contexts that produced their stories. Devadatta, as I have repeatedly mentioned, was initially conceived as a Vinaya figure, to be employed in the Vinaya discussion of schismatic issues to serve as an object lesson on unjustified schismatics. Mahādeva, on the other hand, was initially conceived in the Sarvāstivāda scholastic tradition as the evildoer who commits the five *ānantarya-karma*s.[338] That is to say, with most of his biography composed in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharmas, his religious significance is to illustrate the *ānantarya-karma*s.[339] Although Devadatta and Mahādeva were initially created

---

[336] T. 1558 (XXIX) 93b11–13 = T. 1562 (XXIX) 587b17–20: "此必無間大地獄中，經一中劫，受極重苦，餘逆不必生於無間." Translation: This (i.e. the sin of *saṅghabheda*) certainly leads to [a rebirth] in the great hell, Avīci, for a mid-length *kalpa*, during which time one will undergo extremely gruesome sufferings. Other sins of immediate retribution do not necessarily result in rebirth in the Avīci. See also T. 1545 (XXVII) 185a4–7, etc. Cf. also Silk 2007: 254n.2 for the Sanskrit version.

[337] T. 1458 (XXIV) 547b16–21: 隨事重輕有十八句，若苾芻於非法事作非法想，及正破時亦為非法想者，此則生無間罪亦成無間業。若破僧時不作非法想者，但生無間罪，不成無間業故。

[338] As Nattier & Prebish (1977: 239) already point out, the records attributing the schism between the Sthivaras and Mahāsāṅghikas to Mahādeva are at first those of Sarvāstivāda affiliation, for instance, the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* of Vasumitra and *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāśa*. In traditions such as the Pāli *Dīpamvaṃsa*, this figure is not mentioned.

[339] Mahādeva is well-known for committing four *ānantarya-karma*s, namely, matricide, patricide, murdering an arhat, and causing a schism. As for the fifth *ānantarya-karma,* namely, drawing the blood of the

in two separate traditions and bore different ideological or religious functions, the reverberation of the Abhidharmic concept of five *ānantarya-karma*s also influenced the development of Devadatta's image. Consequently, with the ever increasing severity attributed to schismatic sins, and with the wide spreading of the five *ānantarya-karma*s across the whole of Buddhist literature, these two figures, both regarded as notorious schismatics, came to share more and more evil details in their life stories.

In summary, Buddhism possesses at least two traditions that address the issue of schism. In the religious legacy of the Buddhist scholastic tradition, schism is included in the category of five *ānantarya-karma*s and dramatically condemned as the gravest sin a monk could even commit. In comparison, the Vinayas adopt a more rational attitude and even allow certain [justifiable] schisms. Moreover, the Vinayas set out a detailed procedure for determining different degrees of offense among schismatics, and offer potential schismatics ample opportunities to repent. The two traditions of approaching the sin of schism, one belonging to the Vinayas and the second belonging to the Abhidharmas, are projected into the narratives and undergird the creation of two different figures, Devadatta and Mahādeva.

Buddha, it seems that he could not commit it because he was born in the time when Buddha had already entered *parinirvāṇa*. However, as Silk (2009: 24) discusses, traditional Buddhist scholars find a way to preserve the five categories of the *ānantarya-karma*s in Mahādeva's case: they explain the "drawing the blood of a buddha" as "the destruction or damaging of a *stūpa*, the memorial mound that encases relics of a buddha in a buddhaless world."

The primary reason why Mahādeva could not completely fit into the category of the five *ānantarya-karma*s is that those stories are originally fictions from the *Dharmaruci-avadāna,* not belonging to the figure Mahādeva. According to Silk (ibid. 64), Buddhists recast the narratives of Dharmaruci, the sinner of the five *ānantarya-karma*s in the time of a past buddha, into the biographical stories of Mahādeva. In this direction, we can made a judgment that, in terms of chronological sequence, the concept of the five *ānantarya-karma*s predates the composition of the Dharmaruci story, which in turn predates the popular version of the Mahādeva story.

3.2.3.3 Devadatta's schism in the twofold-schism system of the Sarvāstivāda tradition(s)

We have discussed that a schism can be justified or unjustified; an unjustified schismatic will incur offenses ranging from *duṣkṛta*, to *sthūlātyaya*, to *saṅghāvaśeṣa*, according to the stage to which the schism has progressed. Devadatta's schism is classified as an unjustified one, and his offense is ambiguously located somewhere between *sthūlātyaya* and *saṅghāvaśeṣa*. In this sense, Devadatta's schism is just an ordinary schism among numerous other unjustified schisms. So what is it that makes Devadatta's schism different from other unjustified schisms, and casts Devadatta as the most condemned figure in Buddhist literature?

While there must be multiple ways to address this question, I try to propose an answer based on the theory of the twofold schism developed in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma texts. Many Abhidharma texts intensively discuss this theory. For instance, the *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā* comments as follows: [340]

> It takes a minimum of eight monks to split a monastic *karman* (破羯磨僧). Four or more monks, not three monks, can establish a monastic community. If two groups of monks in the same district reside separately [and endeavor] to conduct separate *poṣadha*s, *karman*s, or recitations of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, it is termed thus (i.e., a schism of monastic *karman*), because the monastic *karman* is impaired. In a split of a community of the Dharma wheel (破法輪僧), at least nine people must be involved. The two groups must reside separately in the same district. In the shameless group, there must be a monk who is venerated by the others and can give preachings and instructions; it should be known that he is Devadatta. There must be at least four monks in the righteous community and five persons in the evil community. Accordingly, there must be a minimum of nine monks involved to split the community of the Dharma wheel.

There exist two types of schisms: the splitting of monastic *karman* (破羯磨僧; Skt. *karmabheda*) and the schism of a community of the Dharma wheel (破僧輪; Skt. *cakrabheda*). The two schisms each require a different minimum number of participants: Splitting the monastic *karman* requires a minimum of eight monks, whereas for splitting a

[340] T. 1545 (XXVII) 602c5–13: 破羯磨僧極少八人。四人已上，方名為僧，三人不爾。於一界內有二部僧，各各別住，作布灑陀、羯磨、說戒，乃得名，為羯磨壞故。破法輪僧極少九人，以一界內有二部僧，各各別住，於無慚愧部中，定別有一眾所尊重能教誨者，當知則是提婆達多。於正眾中極少四人，於邪眾中極少五人，如是極少下至九人，則法輪僧壞。

community of the Dharma wheel, there must be at least nine. Another difference between the two schisms is embodied in the activities that occur during the split: if monks carry out separate monastic ceremonies such as *poṣadha*s, *karman*s, or recitations of the *Prātimokṣasūtra,* the schism falls under the category of splitting a monastic *karman.* In contrast, if there appears a majestic monk in the schismatic party who preaches and interprets the teaching, in a divergent way from that of the Buddha, this schism is the one splitting a community of the Dharma wheel. As a concept widely spread among the Abhidharama texts, this definition of two-fold schism is also accepted by one Sarvāstivāda Vinaya text in defining schism.[341]

According to the above criteria, Devadatta's schism, consisting of at least four supporters and involving the illegal proposition of five ascetic practices, best matches the second category of schism, the split of a community of the Dharma wheel. Indeed, we have a clear statement to categorize Devadatta's schism into this group: [342]

> As for schismatics who split (the community of) the Dharma wheel, they establish a different master and a different path. An example is Devadatta, who claimed that "I am the master, not the *śramaṇa* Gautama; the correct path is the five practices, not the eightfold righteous path proposed by Gautama."

Moreover, a more sophisticated categorization of schism is developed in the 薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙 (**Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-vibhāṣā*), a *Vibhāṣā* text preserved in its Chinese translation.

---

[341] For instance, one Sarvāstivāda Vinaya text, *Pini mu jing* 毘尼母經 (**Vinaya-mātṛka*) defines schism as: T. 1463 (XXIV) 830b2–8: 云何名為破？破有二種：一破法輪，二破僧。法輪者，八正道不行，邪法流布，以智為邪，用愚為正，智障邪顯，是名壞法輪。破僧者，一僧伽藍中一人布薩，乃至五人布薩；或一人為二人羯磨，乃至為大眾羯磨, 大眾為大眾羯磨，是名破僧. There are two types of schism, namely, the schism of the Dharma wheel and the schism of the monastic community. The schism of the Dharma wheel refers to the situation in which the eight righteous paths are not propounded; erroneous teachings are disseminated; the wise is regarded as evil, while stupidity is taken as decency; the wise is hidden, while the evil is visible. This is called the impairment of the Dharma wheel. The schism of the monastic community refers to the situation in which one conducts *poṣadha* in a monastery, up to five monks conduct *poṣadha*; alternatively, one person conducts the *karman* ceremony on behalf of anywhere from two to a large group of monks, while a large group of monks conduct the *karman* ceremony for the large group. This is termed the schism of the monastic community."

[342] T. 1545 (XXVII) 602b26–28: 破法輪者，謂立異師異道，如提婆達多，言："我是大師，非沙門喬答磨。五法是道，非喬答磨所說八支聖道." A similar classification of Devadatta's schism as a Dharma wheel schism can be found elsewhere in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharmas; for instance, T. 1440 (XXIII) 524a1–13, T. 1562 (XXIX) 588a4–8, T. 1563 (XXIX) 886c12–16, etc.

Through the lens of its discussion, we can recognize more particularities of Devadatta's schism:[343]

> What is the difference between a schism of the monastic wheel and that of the monastic *karman*? Answer: There are multiple ways to distinguish them. Although a schism of the monastic wheel and that of monastic *karman* both incur a *sthūlātyaya* offense, the schismatic of the monastic wheel commits a *sthūlātyaya* of immediate retribution, which is not able to be remitted; however, the schismatic of the monastic *karman* commits a *sthūlātyaya* without immediate retribution, which is remittable. Furthermore, the schismatic of the monastic wheel will descend into the Avīci hell to receive punishment for a *kalpa*, while the schismatic of the monastic *karman* does not necessarily descend into the Avīci hell. Again, a schism of the monastic wheel requires a minimum of nine participants, while a schism of the monastic *karman* entails a minimum of eight participants. Then, in a schism of the monastic wheel, one monk must call himself a buddha, while in a schism of the monastic *karman*, nobody calls himself a buddha. Furthermore, the splitting of the monastic wheel occurs both within and outside the district (*sīmā*), while the splitting the monastic *karman* only entails that the *karman*s be done separately within the district. Moreover, only a male can split the monastic wheel, while either a male or female can split the monastic *karman*. Moreover, only monks of the ultimate truth can split the monastic wheel, while monks of either the conventional truth or the ultimate truth can split monastic *karman*. Again, to split the monastic wheel, the schismatic activities must occur in Jambudvīpa, while the schism of monastic *karman* can occur throughout the other three worlds.

Several points need to be reiterated here to clarify the particularity of Devadatta's schism. The first difference between the two schisms lies in the degree of severity. According to the

---

[343] T. 1440 (XXIII) 524a1–13: 破僧輪、破羯磨僧，有何差別？答曰：有種種差別。破僧輪、破羯磨僧，俱偷蘭遮；而破僧輪，犯逆罪偷蘭遮，不可懺；破羯磨僧，犯非逆罪可懺偷蘭遮。復次，破僧輪入阿鼻獄受罪一劫；破羯磨僧，不墮阿鼻獄。復次，破僧輪下至九人，破羯磨僧下至八人。復次，破僧輪一人自稱作佛；破羯磨僧，不自稱作佛。復次，破僧輪，界內界外一切盡破；破羯磨僧，要在界內別作羯磨。復次，破僧輪必男子；破羯磨僧，男子女人二俱能破。復次，破僧輪破俗諦僧；破羯磨僧，俗諦僧、第一義諦僧二俱能破。復次，破僧輪但破閻浮提；破羯磨僧通三天下. Cf. also Sasaki 1993a, b, and c.

Similar discussions are widely found in Abhidharma texts, e.g. 1545 (XXVII) 602b16–603a4; T. 1558 (XXIX) 93c4–11; T. 1562 (XXIX) 587c29–588a18 = T. 1563 (XXIX) 886c11–c27.

text, a schism of the monastic *karman* (*karmabheda*), while abominable, is not irredeemable, and schismatics of this type do not necessarily descend into the Avīci. In comparison, the schism of the [monastic] wheel (*cakrabheda*) is a felony: it is irredeemable and the schismatic is doomed to the Avīci. In terms of how to determine whether a schism is one of splitting the monastic wheel or of splitting the monastic *karman*, the first criterion is the minimum number of participants, as mentioned above.[344] The second criterion is whether a schismatic monk claims himself to be a buddha. Splitting the monastic wheel must involve someone proclaiming himself to be a buddha, while a schism of monastic *karman* does not.[345] Other requirements cover the gender of participants (only monks can incur a *cakrabheda*, while both monks and nuns can cause a *karmabheda*); the place where a schism takes place (i.e. Jambudvīpa in the case of *cakrabheda*, whereas other three continents for incurring a *karmabheda*), and so forth.[346] In Devadatta's case, his schism fulfills all the requirements for a *cakrabheda*: there are at least nine monks involved, the schism occurs in Jambudvīpa, and he indeed intends to become a buddha by urging Ajātaśatru to kill King Bimbisāra.[347] In light of these distinctions, we can be quite confident in categorizing Devadatta's case as a schism of the monastic wheel (*cakrabheda*).

Furthermore, the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma literature introduces an additional prerequisite, namely, the correct period for a schism of the monastic wheel, which sheds more light on the religious significance of Devadatta's schism. To be specific, the six periods

---

[344] Sasaki 1993b also notices the different requirements of the minimum number of participants for the two different types of schisms.

[345] The same criterion is also preserved in the *Abhidharma-kośa-bhāṣya.* In this text, one condition entailing a *cakrabheda* is described as follows: [the schismatic party] recognizes a master other than the Tathāgata and upholds the path other than what is instructed by the Tathāgata. Sasaki 1993c: 168–170 and Pradhan 1975: 261. I just cite the verse here: *śāstṛmārgāntarakṣantau bhinnaḥ ... cakrabhedaḥ sa ca mataḥ.* T. 1558 (XXIX) 93b19: 忍異師道時. Fr. La Vallée Poussin 1923–1931: II. 209 = Pruden 1988–1990: II. 683)

[346] I choose not to elaborate on these additional prerequisites as they have relatively less to do our main topic, Devadatta. An additional requirement, for instance, is that a schism of the monastic wheel must occur in Jambudvīpa. As for the reason why it cannot take place in the other worlds, another text, the *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā*, states that it is because the great master (namely, the Buddha) and real path only exist in Jambudvīpa, not in other places (T. 1545 [XXVII] 602b16–22). As for the condition that only a male can split the monastic wheel, the *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā* explains that this is because women do not possess enough majesty to compete with buddhas (1545 [XXVII] 602c25–29).

[347] T. 1435 (XXIII) 260 c14–17: 即往阿闍世太子所言："汝殺父，我殺佛。汝於摩竭國作王，我當作佛。此摩竭國便有新王新佛，不亦快乎！" Devadatta went to Prince Ajātaśatru and spoke: "You kill your father and I kill the Buddha. You become the king of Magadha while I become a buddha. This kingdom of Magadha will have a new king and a new buddha. Isn't it a happy thing?" Also cf. T. 1421 (XXII) 19a25–b1; T. 1428 (XXII) 592 b17–21; Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 163, D. 1, *'dul ba*, *nga*, 221a2–7, T. 1450 (XXIV) 191b26–c9.

in which a schism of the monastic wheel cannot occur are listed enigmatically as the "(1). beginning, (2). end, and (3–4). period before the (emergence of) the abscesses and the pair; (5). after the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* and (6). when the district has not yet been established: a *cakrabheda* cannot occur in these six situations ("初後皰雙前, 佛滅未結界。於如是六位， 無破法輪僧"; "*ādāv ante 'rbudāt pūrvaṃ yugāc coparate munau sīmāyāṃ cāpy abaddhāyāṃ cakrabhedo na jāyate*")."[348] According to the *Jushelun songshu lunben* (俱舍論頌疏論本), one commentary on the *Verses of the Abhidharma-kośa* (阿毘達磨俱舍論本頌), the six periods are explained as follows: [349]

> The "beginning" refers to the time shortly after the Blessed One turned the Dharma wheel. The "end" means the time when the Buddha was about to enter *parinirvāṇa*. This is because, in these two periods, the monastic community possessed only one taste and was not able to be split. [In the sentence] "the period prior to [the emergence of] abscesses," "abscesses" mean pustules. Against righteous precepts, erroneous precepts are called abscesses; against righteous views, erroneous views are called abscesses. The time when abscesses had not yet arisen is called the period prior to the emergence of abscesses, as a schism can only occur after the appearance of the "two abscesses" (the five practices are the erroneous precepts, and vilifying the noble eightfold path as the incorrect path is the erroneous view). As for the phrase "prior to the [emergence of] the pair," Maudgalyāyana is the foremost disciple in *śamatha,* and Śāriputra is the foremost disciple in *vipaśyanā.* They are called the foremost pair. [The period] when the foremost pair had not yet appeared is described as "prior to the pair". [During the schism,] the pair is required [to show

---

[348] T. 1558 (XXIX) 93c12–13. For the Sanskrit version, see Sasaki 1993c: 169–170 and Pradhan 1975: 262. Fr. La Vallée Poussin 1923–1931: II. 211 = Eng. Pruden 1988–1990: II. 685. Cf. also 1545 (XXVII) 602b16–603a4, T. 1558 (XXIX) 93c11–20, T. 1562 (XXIX) 588a22–23 = T. 1563 (XXIX) 887a1–2.

[349] T. 1823 (XLI) 917b29–c9: 初者，謂世尊轉法輪未久。後者，謂佛將般涅槃。此二時中，僧一味故，不可破壞。皰前者，皰謂瘡皰，於正戒上，邪戒為皰。於正見上，邪見為皰。皰未起時，名為皰前。要二皰生，方可破故(五法是邪戒也，謗八聖非道，是邪見也)。 雙前者，目連止第一也，舍利弗觀第一也，名第一雙。未有止觀第一雙時，名為雙前。要彼和僧法爾，由彼速還合故。佛滅者，佛滅度後，無真大師為敵對故。未結界者，無一界中僧分二部故。於上六位。無破法輪。For similar explanations, see also 1545 (XXVII) 603a4–20, T. 1558 (XXIX) 93c11–20, T. 1562 (XXIX) 588a24–b5 = T. 1563 (XXIX) 887a3–14, etc.

A shorter explanation is offered in the *Abhidharma-kośa-bhāṣya*, but I choose to translate the above passage as this text expounds the meaning of the verses in a clearer and more elaborate way. The explanation in the *Abhidharma-kośa-bhāṣya* is found in Sasaki 1993c: 170-171; Pradhan 1975: 262; T. 1558 (XXIX) 93c14–20; Fr. La Vallée Poussin 1923–1931: II. 211–212 = Eng. Pruden 1988–1990: II. 685.

> up] to restore the monastic community as it is originally because they can quickly make the monastic community reunite. The rule concerning "the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*" is because, after the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*, there was no real master to challenge. "District not yet established" is because, otherwise, there would exist no district in which the monastic community splits into two parts. In the above six situations, there is no split of the monastic wheel.

In the above explanation, a schism of the monastic wheel is restricted to quite a limited time span: it could not occur shortly after the Buddha initially turned the wheel of the Dharma, nor immediately before the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*. It must postdate the emergence of the erroneous precepts and erroneous views, and also take place after the appearance of the noble pair (Maudgalyāyana and Śāriputra). The period after the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* is excluded, which also applies to the period when the district had not yet been established. In this sense, a schism of the monastic wheel can only occur between the time when the monastic community and district were established and the time of the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*; schismatics must challenge the Buddha directly with erroneous precepts and views but do so in futility because the two leading disciples will quickly defeat the schismatics.[350] If we read these conditions carefully, we find that Devadatta's schism, commonly recognized as "the first schism in Buddhist history," is the unique schism which fulfills all the prerequisites for a schism of the monastic wheel. Any subsequent schism, justified or unjustified, cannot be termed a schism of the monastic wheel because, in the first place, it would have occurred after the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*. In this sense, Devadatta's schism constitutes the sole example of a schism of the monastic wheel, whose punishment is the descent into the Avīci. This may provide a reasonable explanation of why Devadatta is particularly condemned among schismatics.

However, we must keep in mind that the above discussion only demonstrates the Abhidharma understanding of the Devadatta's schism, which is not necessary to be agreed in the Vinaya texts.[351] Some Vinaya editors, who must have known the concept of the twofold

---

[350] The *Abhidharma-kośa-bhāṣya* clearly states that a *cakrabheda* cannot last for more than a night: "*tām eva rātriṃ navivasaty asau*" (Sasaki 1993c: 168; Pradhan 1975: 261); "名破不經宿" (T. 1558 [XXIX] 93b19; Fr. La Vallée Poussin 1923–1931: II. 209 = Eng. Pruden 1988–1990: II. 683).

[351] One major argument in Sasaki's series of eight papers (see above n. 240) is that the *Shisong lü* intentionally describes Devadatta's schism as one splitting the Dharma wheel (Sasaki 1992: 162ff.). Indeed, we see that the *Shisong lü* skips most records of Devadatta's separate performance of monastic ceremonies but concentrates on his propositions of a discrepant teaching. However, as Sasaki admits in a later publication

classification of schism quite well (since they clearly mentioned both *cakrabheda* and *karmabheda*), claimed that Devadatta impaired both the harmonious *saṅgha* and the Dharma wheel,[352] without following the exact dichotomy between the two types of schism as advanced by the Abhidharma.

To recapitulate my discussion above: in multiple ways, Devadatta's schism represents both a typical and a unique case of a schism of the Dharma wheel that leads to a rebirth in hell in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma traditions. His schismatic activities involve all the essential elements that should appear in a schism of the monastic wheel (*cakrabheda*): self-establishment as a buddha, a minimum of nine male participants, propagation of illegal teachings, and a legitimate time and realm. These conditions are together responsible for the particularity and uniqueness of Devadatta's schism, which any schisms occurring later could never share. This may provide one explanation for the intense and widespread detestation of Devadatta among Buddhists.

3.2.3.4 A scapegoat for the schismatic history of Buddhism: A possible way to understand the accusation of Devadatta

Beyond the discussion of Devadatta's position in the twofold-schism system in the Sarvāstivāda traditions, can we find other ways to account for the widespread condemnation of Devadatta? To understand the frequent criticism of Devadatta's schism, I find it useful to explore this question from a much broader perspective, going beyond the boundaries of

---

(1999: 1–3), the Sarvāstivāda *Shisong lü* does mention Devadatta's separate performance of monastic ceremonies, and therefore, this dichotomy cannot hold true in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya. Just as I have previously stated, the differentiation between the two types of schisms was most plausibly a development postdating the main body of Vinaya discussions of schism. That is to say, most likely, the real and strict dichotomy had not yet taken place when stories of Devadatta and Vinaya discussions of schisms were fixed in large part. This explains the situation in which every Vinaya, when explaining schisms, does not clearly distinguish the two types of schisms but mix their features together.

[352] For instance, the *Shisong lü* records: Devadatta, having approached the four people, made this statement: "You should join me in splitting *śramaṇa* Gautama's harmonious monastic community and imparing his [community of] the Dharma wheel (提婆達多到是四人邊已， 作是言："汝當共破沙門瞿曇和合僧、壞轉法輪。" T. 1435 (XXIII) 24b22–c23).

The Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayas also narrate that Devadatta and his four companions intend to split both the monastic community and the Dharma wheel: T. 1450 (XXIV) 170b28: [我等五人]同意破大眾及破法輪; Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 79: *tiṣṭhate eva śramaṇasya gautamasya samagraṃ śrāvakasaṃghaṃ bhetsyāmaḥ; cakrabhedaṃ kariṣyāmaḥ*; T. 1442 (XXIII) 702b22 – 27 ("破和合僧伽" & "破法輪"); D. 2, *'dul ba*, *cha*, 4a5–7 ("*nyan thos kyi dge 'dun mthun pa dbye bar bya"* & "'*khor lo yang dbye bar bya"*).

Buddhist studies: an anthropological or sociological approach may throw new light on the function of these accusations in post-schism Buddhist societies.

As I have stated, the process of schism is deeply intertwined with the expansion of Buddhism in terms of geography, chronology, and doctrinal complexity. We can say that schism is the past, present, and inevitable future of Buddhist societies. However, due to the strict systematization of the five *ānantarya-karma*s in Buddhist scholastic traditions, inciting a schism has been labeled as the gravest transgression, sending perpetrators to hell, even if schism is not necessarily a condemnable and immoral offense in Vinaya texts. In this sense, schism becomes a taboo, a prohibition, a transgression around which everyone wants to draw a clear line of demarcation. Nevertheless, nobody can say that he or she is entirely innocent—even if they do not directly participate in schismatic activities, they live in diversified communities that are the products of schismatic activities. When Buddhists from diversified Buddhist communities accuse Devadatta of schism, they are also directly or indirectly guilty of schism. In this part, I turn to the scapegoat theory proposed by the French philosopher René Girard in his famous book *The Scapegoat* (1986) to make sense of the condemnation of Devadatta.

The scapegoat mechanism is a crucial component of Girard's broad-ranging theory, bridging diverse fields ranging from anthropology, literary criticism, and religious studies, to sociology. The fundamental assumption of Girard's theory is that human beings are mimetic creatures with a natural tendency to imitate others and desire what others desire (i.e., mimetic desire). On the individual level, mimetic desire creates the situation that each member of a community is theoretically another's mimetic rival, as they tend to desire the same objects. If a community wishes to operate harmoniously and solidify its sense of collective identity, they must rely on a sacrificial mechanism to dissolve mutual blame and internal conflict. By virtue of seeking, blaming, and even eliminating a "marginalized" or "external" victim (i.e., a scapegoat), the scapegoat becomes the victim of ritualized violence for the whole community, and it alone shoulders all the violence within the community. The victimization of the scapegoat, prevalent in religion, mythology, and literature, "symbolizes the change from reciprocal violence and destruction to unanimous accord and construction" (1977: 86). Due to the transformation of all-against-all violence into all-against-one persecution, the mechanism of scapegoating serves as an effective way to bring harmony to communities consisting of competitive individuals.

If we use the scapegoat theory to reconsider the Devadatta narrative, we find that the stories of Devadatta are not just literary, religious, or mythological texts, but "persecution texts," in Girard's terminology (1986: 36). Through a formal acceptance of Devadatta's sin, by making Devadatta's transgression indisputable and exceptionally reprehensible, Buddhists seek a cure for their or their ancestors' sins in the sectarian, schismatic history of Buddhism. The following analyses reveal that the Devadatta narrative possesses all of the most stereotypical traits of a scapegoat story as set forth by Girard.

(1) According to Girard, the first characteristic of a persecution text is the existence of a crisis, natural or social. A crisis usually results in a loss of social distinction, the firewall enforced to maintain the stability of a community against random outbreaks of mimetic rivalry. In the Devadatta narrative, only the MSV version presents the crisis as a natural disaster: Devadatta's schismatic activities take place during a famine in Rājagṛha.[353] The famine functions as the trigger of crisis: because of the deficiency in food, the community comes close to losing its principles of obeying the correct Dharma, and its members are bribed by Devadatta who offers them abundant food. In this sense, this natural disaster can be interpreted as the catalyst for the dissolving differentiation between the correct Dharma and incorrect Dharma. In addition to the famine, the schismatic reality of Buddhist communities poses a predicament, an ideological crisis that incessantly puts pressure on the Buddhists themselves because the diversified Buddhist communities clearly deviate from the blueprint of a unified community drawn by Śākyamuni Buddha. It is easy to imagine that in the process of disintegrating into numerous small communities, now and then these Buddhists must have compromised the monastic codes that prohibit schism, which certainly embodies itself as a dissolution of rules, limits, or "differentiation", in Girard's term. Schism—together with Devadatta's other crimes, such as imitating and attempting to murder the Buddha—signifies the abolishment of "differences" between the Buddha and Devadatta in the same way that the crime of patricide destroys the distinction between father and son.

(2) As Girard observes (1986: 17), the first characteristic is closely intertwined with the second, namely, the reinforcement of a crime that eliminates differences. Because every Buddhist group is equally vulnerable to being cast as the guilty party by other communities, they need to find a common enemy, a chief offender to blame. To this end, Buddhists

[353] Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 204–205, D. 1, *'dul ba*, *nya*, 250b4-251a1, T. 1450 (XXIV) 202c5-21; Borgland 2018: 98.

continuously reinforce the thought that the chosen scapegoat (i.e., Devadatta) is the source of trouble, and attempt to destroy that scapegoat to end the trouble. By means of establishing Devadatta as the common target, diverse and disconnected Buddhist groups avoid the fate of mutual accusation, and they "mobilize"—the verb Girard chooses, in the same sense as when speaking of mobilizing the military (1986: 113)—the violence toward a single victim. In this way, the mutual antagonism between any two separate communities gives way to the unified hatred toward Devadatta, and the collective responsibility for the schismatic reality is successfully transferred to Devadatta himself.

(3) Regarding the third characteristic, Girard believes that "the victims are chosen not for the crimes they are accused of but for the victim's signs that they bear, for everything that suggests their guilty relationship with the crisis" (1986: 24). Usually, the most common, banal signs that identify a scapegoat include a physical disorder, status as an outsider, or status of marginalization. In the case of Devadatta, since he is a proponent of radical asceticism, he definitely belongs to the group marginalized by the settled monks. This point is easy to understand because ascetic Buddhists are geographically removed from the settled communities, and seclude themselves from daily institutional operations. Their independent lives are uncontrollable by monastic institutions and therefore pose a potential, unpredictable threat (see more discussions in §3.3.3). Ascetic monks can even become social and economic competitors with domesticated monks, as the ascetic lifestyle may contrast with the relatively easy life of monastic monks, and consequently produce a negative effect on the material and social support for monasteries. Therefore, Devadatta can be regarded as a marginalized insider who is an easy target of criticism.

(4) Regarding the fourth characteristic of a persecution text—that is, violence—Girard (1986: 24) states that "the import of the operation is to lay the responsibility for the crisis on the victims and to exert an influence on it by destroying these victims or at least by banishing them from the community they pollute." The fate of Devadatta reflects exactly this sort of ritualized violence: Devadatta is expelled from the Buddhist community and dies from being swallowed by the earth (cf. Horner 1966). In both cases, Devadatta's punishment functions as a sign that the monastic community has successfully met the challenge and resolved the crisis. As Girard further states, there is also a process of the divinization of scapegoat, which mainly occurs after the crisis has been completely resolved, the most famous example of which is Christ. Speaking of Devadatta, he is of course not sacralized in the texts of so-called mainstream Buddhism. However, as I shall discuss below, the image of Devadatta indeed

becomes more and more favorable in Mahāyāna Buddhism, in which he is no longer a scapegoat but transformed into Śākyamuni's aide, who strategically commits evil with a pedagogical end. In this respect, Devadatta has also shaken off his identity as a scapegoat.

Of course, Devadatta has never been the only scapegoat in the schismatic history of Buddhism. We are also well-informed about schismatic monks such as Mahādeva and Yaśas of the Vātsīputrīyas, who are purportedly also convincing schismatics. Accusations against these schismatics who were active in the post-*parinirvāṇa* societies reflect a form of a scapegoat mechanism, intended to transfer responsibility for the schismatic history of Buddhism to certain individuals. The above "scapegoat" interpretation of Devadatta is just a preliminary interpretation. A further investigation in the future in this direction would bring more new insights to our reading of the Devadatta narrative.

3.2.4 Summary

The previous section 3.1 sheds light on the core, and probably the earliest layer, of Devadatta's image, namely, his image as the schismatic monk during the Buddha's lifetime. In this section, I continue to develop the reading of the Devadatta stories as a schismatic narrative and situate the Devadatta stories against their schismatic background. I demonstrate that many accounts of Devadatta are modeled on definitions of a schismatic monk as found in the Vinaya codes: the success in Devadatta's early religious career is plausibly a literary device to make Devadatta meet the requirement for being a schismatic in the Vinayas; the details of his four or seven major supporters are intentionally created to fulfill the minimum number of participants in a schism required by each Vinaya; his schismatic activities—ranging from the composition of a discrepant teaching and *Prātimokṣasūtra*, the proposition of five ascetic practices, initiating a vote, to the performance of separate monastic ceremonies such as *poṣadha*, *pravāraṇa*, and *karman*—are also composed in accordance to the definition of a schism in each Vinaya. All these discussions illustrate how much we can make sense of these seemingly loosely-bound and even contradictory stories in the context of the legal discussions of schism.

Moreover, I also investigate the different understandings of the schismatic sins of Devadatta in two Buddhist contexts, namely, the Vinaya context and the scholastic traditions. In the Vinayas' legal discussions, schisms are divided into justifiable and unjustifiable ones. While justifiable schismatics will not descend into hell for punishment, those who incite

unjustifiable schisms are also left with abundant opportunities to expiate the offense. Depending on how far a schism proceeds, the Vinayas regulate that its schismatic commits the transgression ranging from a *duṣkṛta,* to a *sthūlātyaya*, and finally to a *saṅghāvaśeṣa*—all sins are not as grave as a *pārājikā* which incurs the penalty of immediate excommunication. In comparison, the Abhidharmas define a schism as the gravest sin among the five *ānantarya-karma*s, which must lead to a rebirth in hell immediately and necessarily in the next life. In this scholastic understanding of schisms, splitting a *saṅgha* is not merely a legal issue; instead, it becomes a morally reprehensible act subject to intensive polemics. It is this scholastic approach to the schism that has long been dominant among Buddhists, and it is in this context that Devadatta was subject to forceful resentments. The realization of a dichotomy between the Vinaya approach and the scholastic approach to schism can also shed light on a historical understanding of the separate creation of Devadatta and Mahādeva: while Devadatta stories must be contextualized in Vinaya texts as illustrations of a sinful schism, the image of Mahādeva is more shaped in Abhidharma literature to associate with the five *ānantarya-karma*s.

The third focus of this section is to understand the fact that Devadatta's schism constitutes the most condemned case of schism. I start from the theory of the twofold schism (i.e., *cakrabheda* and *karmabheda*) developed in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma tradition(s) and elaborate on how Devadatta's schism distinguishes itself from the other schisms that occurred after the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha: according to the dichotomy of the *cakrabheda* and *karmabheda*, Devadatta's schism constitutes the sole instance of a *cakrabheda* that incurs the inevitable punishment in hell. In addition, the scapegoat theory can also illuminate the function of the Devadatta stories in the Buddhist schismatic history—by setting Devadatta as the common enemy, diversified Buddhist communities transfer the collective responsibility for the schismatic reality to Devadatta himself. In this sense, the Devadatta stories become a persecution narrative, through which Buddhists attempt to seek a cure for their or their ancestors' sins in the sectarian, schismatic history of Buddhism.

If we fail to understand the ideological background of how Buddhists define and discuss the issue of schism, we will not be able to grasp the rich historical and theological information contained in the creation of the Devadatta stories.

3.3 Devadatta as a proponent of asceticism

As a crucial element in the Devadatta narrative, Devadatta's ascetic propositions and their religious significance have been briefly touched upon several times in the above discussion: I mention that in the Sthavira-derived Vinayas, the five ascetic practices are the central propaganda with which Devadatta attracts his followers and achieves his success in the voting ceremony; in addition, these ascetic propositions, as Devadatta's major dogmas that contradict the Dharma of the Buddha, account for the fact that Devadatta's schism is regarded as an illegal one, the punishment for which is to descend into hell. Moreover, as a schismatic proponent, Devadatta is subjected to the tendency of being marginalized, a mark that a scapegoat usually bears. Without the detail of his ascetic propositions, Devadatta's schism would never appear as a logically coherent and pedagogically convincing narrative. However, some related questions arise: Why did Buddhist narrators choose to associate Devadatta with ascetic propaganda in the narrative? Why did asceticism, a sort of practice frequently acknowledged as a correct path to awakening, become a condemnable matter in the Devadatta narrative? What is the underlying motivation to compose a narrative of a failed ascetic, and what messages can we read here concerning asceticism in Buddhism?[354]

3.3.1 Devadatta's five ascetic practices

In popular versions of Devadatta's legends, Devadatta is endowed with an ascetic nature, for he proposes the five ascetic practices to split the *saṅgha*, with the presumption that Śākyamuni would not permit this proposal.[355] The fivefold ascetic proposition, as a polemic intentionally crafted to arouses dissenting views within the monastic community, successfully instigates the split of a considerable number of monks with ascetic tendencies. However, when we inquire ourselves about which five items on earth are proposed by

[354] Before proceeding to the main body of my investigation, I must briefly state my suspicion about the historicity of the accounts of Devadatta's five ascetic propositions. Of course, this story is widely attested in different Vinayas of the Sthavira offshoots, but no such account can be found in the Mahāsāṅghika texts. This is the basic reason why I tend to believe it is the creation of Sthavira monks, rather than part of the original core that perhaps belonged to an ancient and once-unified group of Buddhists. In addition, the accounts of Devadatta's ascetic followers on the part of several famous Chinese pilgrims should be viewed as no more than a meta-narrative full of bias and predisposition. Therefore, I would regard the account of his five ascetic propositions as a narrative by means of which the Buddhist composers embodied certain ideologies.

[355] Vin. ii. 196–198; T. 1462 (XXIV) 768c11–12; T. 1421 (XXII) 164a26–164b1; T. 1428 (XXII) 594b14–15; T. 1463 (XXIV) 823a17–26; T. 1435 (XXIII) 264 b28–c4; T. 212 (IV) 696b4–14. Cf. Ray 1994: 162–178.

Devadatta, we are confronted with a rather awkward situation: details of Devadatta's five ascetic practices diverge significantly in different Vinayas.

The Pāli Vinaya and its commentary present the list as follows: (1). *āraññikā* ("dwelling in the forest"); (2). *piṇḍapātikā* ("living on alms"); (3). *paṃsukūlikā* ("wearing robes of rags"); (4). *rukkhamūlikā* ("living at the foot of the tree"); (5). *macchamaṃsaṃ na* [assu] ("eating neither fish nor meat").[356]

In a way different from the Pāli list, the Mahīśāsaka version comprises: (1). 不食鹽 ("abstention from salt"); (2). 不食酥乳 ("abstention from buttermilk"); 3. 不食魚肉 ("abstention from fish and meat"); (4). 乞食 & 不受他請 ("begging for alms" & "not accepting invitations"); and (5). 春夏八月日露坐，冬四月日住於草菴 ("staying in the open air during the eight months of spring and summer, while living in thatched cottages during the four months of winter").[357] This version does not contain practices that expose the practitioner to nature much: the practice of forest-dwelling as mentioned in the Pāli Vinaya has been deleted from this list, and the item "living in the open air" is replaced with "living in the open air during spring and summer." It is plausible that this Mahīśāsaka list was written in a place with a much colder climate, probably an adaptation to the new natural environment amid the dissemination of Buddhism northwards. In addition, the Mahīśāsaka version adds abstention from salt, butter, and milk, while excluding the rule of wearing three ragged robes. In total, the Mahīśāsaka tradition only shares two practices in common with the Pāli tradition, namely, begging for alms and abstaining from meat and fish.

The Dharmaguptaka list seems to be intermediate between the Theravaṃsa and Mahīśāsaka traditions. It shares three items with the Pāli list, that is, *paṃsukūlikā*/著糞掃衣, *piṇḍapātikā*/乞食, and *macchamaṃsaṃ na* [assu]/不食魚及肉. The Dharmaguptaka Vinaya additionally includes *luzuo* 露坐 (Pāli *abbhokāsika*), whose nuance is slightly different from that of *rukkhamūlikā* ("those living at the foot of the tree") in the Pāli version. According to the **Vimuttimagga*, the text of which is preserved in its Chinese translation *Jietuo dao lun* 解脫道論 (T. 1648), *abbhokāsika* is to eschew places with any form of shelter, while

[356] Vin. ii. 196-197, iii. 171–172; T. 1462 (XXIV) 768c11–12.

[357] T. 1421 (XXII) 164a26–164b1: 一不食鹽；二不食酥乳；三不食魚肉，若食善法不生；四乞食，若受他請善法不生；五春夏八月日露坐，冬四月日住於草菴，若受人屋舍善法不生.

rukkhamūlikā means to abandon one's abode.[358] In this sense, the *abbhokāsika* rule is stricter, as it not only prohibits one from houses but also trees and so forth since a tree can still provide shelter for the ascetic.[359] The Dharmaguptaka list also contains the abandoning of eating salt or butter, which is agreed by the Mahīśāsaka school. Interestingly, another Vinaya in Chinese, the *Pinimu jing* 毗尼母經 (T. 1463 [XXIV] 82a17–26), contains precisely the same list of the five ascetic practices—乞食 ("begging"), 糞掃衣 ("wearing rag-robe"), 不食酥鹽 ("abstention from butter and salt"), 不食肉魚 ("abstention from meat and fish"), and 露坐 ("sitting in the open air") —which possibly hints at its school affiliation.[360]

The Sarvāstivāda traditions contain quite different lists. In the Chinese *Shisong lü*, a new practice—*yishi* 一食 (**ekāsanika*, "one eating") [361]—is added to the list; another four items consist of wearing ragged robes, begging for alms, living in the open air, and abstaining from meat and fish (T. 1435 [XXIII] 264b28–c4). The *Chuyao jing* 出曜經 (T. 212 [IV] 696b4–14) contains a rather odd list, as it is not meat and fish that are prohibited, but flesh and blood (不食肉飲血). It is puzzling why the composers thought Buddhists would drink blood. In addition, the *Chuyao jing* adds the rule that monks should not possess gold, silver, or other treasures (不獲持金銀寶物), apart from three more common items, namely, 常守三衣 ("always wearing three robes"), 乞食 ("living on alms"), and 樹下露宿 ("staying overnight at the foot of a tree").

---

[358] T. 1648 (XXXII) 404c9–10 = Eng. Ehara et al. 1961: 28: 云何樹下坐？斷屋舍住。云何露地坐？斷眾覆處。

[359] This point is clearly expressed in a later part of this text: 若住覆處及在樹下，則失露住 (If one lives in a place with a shelter or under a tree, he disobeys the practice of living in open air. T. 1648 (XXXII) 405c18 = Eng. Ehara et al. 1961: 33–34. Cf. Dantinne 1991: 17.

[360] According to Clarke (2004: 9), who offers an overview of previous investigations into the school affiliation of this text, modern scholars generally attribute it to the school of Dharmaguptaka or Haimavata. Sasaki (2000b: 368–370) states that the Dharmaguptaka affiliation is more credible.

[361] The meaning of "one eating" (*ekāsanika*) is in fact a bit ambiguous. Whether it should be interpreted as *eka-asana* ("one meal") or *eka-āsana* ("one seat") is still controversial (cf. CPD s.v. *ekāsanika* for a thorough discussion of the scholarship on this term; see also Ray 1994: 300). This ambiguity is also reflected in its Chinese translation, which is sometimes *yizuo shi* 一坐食 ("eating in one place"), other times *yi shi* 一食 ("eating one meal"). Nevertheless, their implications are similar: one should confine their eating to only one time in one seat, and not eat again on the same day after cleaning their bowl, or even after standing up during eating (Dantinne 1991: 14: "S'il doit se lever accidentellement alors qu'il est en train de manger, il ne se rassied plus ensuite pour achever son repas." Cf. Vm.160).

The lists appearing in the *Saṅghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya are more divergent. We possess a version of the list that reveals a clear ascetic tendency on the part of Devadatta (MSV Version I: *āraṇyakatva* ["dwelling in the forest"], *paiṇḍapātikatva* [living on alms], *pāṃsukūlikatva* [wearing rag-robes], *traicīvarikatva* [wearing three robes], and *vṛkṣamūlikatva* [living at the foot of the tree]. Gnoli 1977–1978: II. 271, D. 1, *'dul ba*, *nya*, 298a1–4, T. 1450 [XXIV] 153b15–24). However, elsewhere, Devadatta also champions less austere practices, such as living indoors and wearing long robes (MSV Version II: T. 1450 [XXIV] 149b9–20; *Genben sapoduobu lü she* 根本薩婆多部律攝 [**Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya-saṃgraha*] T. 1458 [XXIV] 546b29–c3). Noteworthy is that the MSV *Saṅghabhedavastu* additionally provides a dramatically reversed story (MSV Version III) in which Devadatta propagandizes against the five points of ascetic practice proposed by the Buddha: 1. *piṇḍapāti-katvena na rocante* ["are not pleased with collecting alms"], 2. *pāṃsukūlikatvena na rocante* [are not pleased with wearing rag-robes], 3. *traicīvarikatvena na rocante* ["are not pleased with wearing three robes'], and 4. *ābhyavakāśikatvena na rocante* [are not pleased with living in uncovered places], with the fifth item missing from the text. (Gnoli 1977-1978: II. 204–205, D. 1, *'dul ba*, *nya*, 250b4–251a1, T. 1450 [XXIV] 202c13–14). He provokes monks who are not desirous of ascetic practices to split from the *saṅgha*. In this case, Devadatta no longer espouses ascetic practices, but precisely the opposite. The typical Mūlasarvāstivāda tarnishing of Devadatta's reputation is evident here.

We are forced to accept the fact that no standard version of Devadatta's five ascetic practices exists in Buddhist history, and each school has developed its own discrepant version. In total, ten practices have appeared in Devadatta's list of five ascetic points (see Table 3.3.1): three points on how to live—namely, (1). forest-dwelling, (2). living in the open air, and (3). living at the foot of a tree; two on how to dress—that is, (4). wearing rag-robes and (5). wearing three garments; four items on how to eat—i.e., (6). begging for alms, (7). abstaining from fish or meat, (8). abstaining from butter or salt, and (9). one eating; in addition to one Vinaya rule of (10). possessing no treasure. It seems that Devadatta's five practices constituted an undefined and open-ended category that Buddhists were still able to revise at a relatively late date.

Table 3.3.1 Devadatta's five practices listed in various texts with their respective numerations

	Forest-dwelling	Living on alms	Wearing rag-robes	Wearing three garments	Living in the open air/ at the foot of a tree	No fish or meat	No curdled milk or salt	Others
Wufen lü		4.乞食			5. 春夏露坐,冬住於草菴 Spring and summer in the open air; winter in thatched cottages	3.不食魚肉	1. 不食鹽 No salt 2. 不食酥乳 No butter or milk	
Sifen lü		2.乞食	1.著糞掃衣		3.露坐	5.不食魚及肉	4.不食酥鹽 No butter or salt	
Pinimu jing T.1463		1.乞食	2. 糞掃衣		5.露坐	4.不食肉魚	3.不食酥鹽 No milk or salt	
Pāli Vinaya & *Shanjian lü piposha*	1. *Āraññikā*	2. *Piṇḍa-pātikā*	3. *Paṃsu-kūlikā*		4. *Rukkha-mūlikā*	5. *Maccha-maṃsaṃ na* assu		
Shisong lü		2.乞食	1.著納衣		4.露地住	5.斷肉魚		3. 一食 One eating
Chuyao jing T.212		2.乞食		1.常守三衣	4.樹下露宿	3.不食肉飲血 Neither flesh nor blood		5. 不獲持金銀寶物 No gold/silver/ treasure
MSV Version I	1.*Āraṇya-katva*	3. *Paiṇḍa-pātikatva*	5. *Pāṃsu-kūlikatva*	4. *Traicīvari-katva*	2. *Vṛkṣamūlikatva*			
MSV Version II			4.留長縷績 Long robes		5.住村舍內 Living in the villages	2.不食魚肉	1. 不食乳酪 3. 不鹽	
MSV Version III		1. *Piṇḍapāti-katvena na rocante*	2. *Pāṃsukūlikatvena na rocante*	3.*Traicīvarikatvena na rocante*	4. *Ābhyavakāśikatvena na rocante*			

3.3.2 *Dhutaguṇa*s and their relation to Devadatta's ascetic proposals

As a religion advocating renunciation, Buddhism is innately a form of ascetic movement, albeit in a critical and moderate way. Termed *dhutaguṇa* or *dhutaṅga* (or other variant forms; cf. BHSD s.v. *dhuta*), the ascetic practices indeed appear as virtuous actions as commonly as—if not more frequently than—their appearance as the target of criticism in Buddhist literature.[362] The concept of legitimized ascetic practices is found in an early incarnation in the *Dīghanikāya* where it is known as *cattāro ariyavaṃsā* ("four noble lineages"), which contain three common ascetic practices (*cīvara*, *piṇḍapāta*, and *senāsana*; DN. iii. 224–225; cf. also Ray 1994: 294). We further find a list of nine practices in the *Sappurisasutta* of the *Majjhimanikāya*, which consists of *āraññika* ("one dwelling in the forest"), *paṃsukūlika* ("one wearing rag-robes"), *piṇḍapātika* ("one living on alms"), *rukkhamūlika* ("one living at the foot of a tree"), *sosānika* ("one living on cemetery grounds"), *abbhokāsika* ("one living in the uncovered place"), *nesajjika* ("one remaining in a sitting posture"), *yathāsanthatika* ("one accepting any seat offered to him"), and *ekāsaniko* ("one eating"). Furthermore, the Vinayas generally prescribe that during the ordination procedure, monks should be informed of several ascetic practices that fall under the category of the "four requisites (*niśraya*s)", namely, living at the foot of trees (*vṛkṣamūla*), living on alms (*piṇḍapāta*), wearing only rag-robes (*pāṃśukūla*) and using only cow urine as medicine (*pūtimuktabhaiṣajya*; Ray 1994: 26–27, 294).

Later, two well-systematized lists of *dhutaguṇa*s come into being and become the source of our popular understanding of Buddhist ascetic activities (Table 3.3.2).[363] The first list contains 13 items that can be found in Pāli texts such as the **Vimuttimagga* (解脫道論, T. 1648) and *Visuddhimagga*; and the other list consists of 12 practices mostly found in the Mahāyāna texts represented by the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñā-pāramitā-sūtra.*

---

[362] Several famous criticisms of asceticism are summarized in Dantinne (1991: 1–3). However, as he later points out (ibid. 3), "Si l'adhésion excessive aux règles éthiques et aux voeux religieux est, certes, une passion qui contrecarre la réalisation du Nirvāṇa, elle n'est par pour autant foncièrement mauvaise." He cites the *Cūḷa-assapura-sutta* (MN. i. 281ff.) as an example to demonstrate that ascetic practices can also promote one's spiritual achievement.

[363] Cf. Boucher 2008: 43–44, Ray 1994: 297–298, and Dantinne 1991: 5ff. (esp. 5–10 for various other lists of *dhutaguṇa*s in Buddhist texts). The reason I choose the above two *dhutaguṇa* lists, among many other lists from different Buddhist groups, is not because they are most authentic (different Buddhist groups would have diverging ideas about authenticity), but because these two lists are more systematically organized and fixed.

Table 3.3.2. Two popular *dhutaguṇa* lists

(Practitioners of) *dhutaguṇa* items	The Theravaṃsa list	The Mahāyāna list
1. one wearing the rag-robe	*paṃsukūlika*	*pāṃśukūlika*
2. one wearing the three robes	*tecīvarika*	*traicīvarika*
3. one wearing garments of felt or wool	ø	*nāma(n)tika*
4. one begging for alms	*piṇḍapātika*	*piṇḍapātika*
5. one begging for alms (from house to house) in turns	*sapadānacārika*	ø
6. one observing "one eating"	*ekāsanika*	*aikāsanika (ekāsanika)*
7. one eating only one bowl of food	*pattapiṇḍika*	ø
8. one taking no food after mealtime	*khalupacchābhatika*	*khalupaścādbhaktika*
9. one dwelling in the forest	*āraññaka*	*āraṇyaka (aranyaka)*
10. one living at the foot of a tree	*rukkhamūlika*	*vṛkṣamūlika*
11. one living in the uncovered place	*abbhokāsika*	*ā(a)bhyavakāśika*
12. one living on cremation grounds	*sosānika*	*śmā(a)śānika*
13. one accepting any seat offered to him	*yathāsanthatika*	*yāthāsaṃstarika*
14. one who remains in a sitting posture	*nesajjika*	*naiṣadika/naisadyika*

In contrast to the common assumption that Devadatta's proposal addresses the *dhutaguṇa*s, we find items in Devadatta's list that do not precisely overlap with those of the *dhutaguṇa* lists.[364] In comparing the above two *dhutaguṇa* traditions with the ten practices purported to

[364] Cf. Dantinne 1991: 10–20 for a detailed explanation of each *dhutaguṇa* practice. Here, I just briefly discuss some technical terms whose meanings are not straightforward. *Sapadānacārika* means the practice that the monk begs from house to house without paying attention to the donors' social caste (ibid. 13); *Khalupaścādbhaktika* means the ascetic "qui refuse de manger par après" (ibid. 14), including not partaking brew made from fruits, honey, and so forth after the midday meal.

The *Shi'er toutuo jing* 十二頭陀經 (T. 783 [XVII] 720c6–10) lists 12 practices: (9). 在阿蘭若處; (4). 常行乞食; (5). 次第乞食; (6). 受一食法; (7?). 節量食 (Dantinne [ibid. 9] reconstructs it as **bhojanamātrajña*); (8). 中後不得飲漿; (1). 著弊納衣; (2). 但三衣; (12). 塚間住; (10). 樹下止; (11). 露地坐; (14). 但坐不臥. (The numeration system follows Table 3.3.2).

The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya (T. 1421 [XXII] 26a18–20) contains 12 practices, which are more similar to the Theravaṃsa list: (9). 作阿練若; (4). 乞食; (6). 一坐食; (?). 一種食、(?). 一受食、(5). 次第乞食; (12). 塚間; (1). 糞掃衣; (2).三衣; (13). 隨敷坐; (10). 樹下坐; (11). 露坐.

The Dharmaguptaka *Fo benxing ji jing* contains *caṅkramana* (*jingxing* 經行, "wandering around to prevent sleep") besides 11 common items (T. 190 [III] 869a11–b8): (9). 阿蘭若; (4). 乞食; (1). 著糞掃衣; (8). 不非時食; (6). 一坐食; (7). 受一摶食; (12). 塚間法; (11). 露地法; (10). 在樹下法; (?). 經行法; (13). 常坐不

be Devadatta's propositions, we note that only seven practices—i.e., forest-dwelling, begging for alms, wearing rag-robes, wearing three garments, living in the open air, living at the foot of a tree, and "one eating"—are shared between them.

Are the three practices that appear in Devadatta's list but not in *dhutaguṇa* lists (i.e., possessing no gold, silver, or treasure; no fish or meat; and no butter or salt) regarded as legitimate ascetic actions? Among the items that have appeared in Devadatta's list, the practice of possessing no money given in the *Chuyao jing* seems to be unexpected, as it does not advance a more radical practice—this practice itself is a common Vinaya rule.[365] Moreover, this practice is also connected to another Buddhist polemic against schism, namely, the ten illegal propositions advanced by the Vaiśālī monks (Skt. *daśa-vastūni,* Chn. *shishi feifa* 十事非法).[366] Note that these ten illegal propositions only appear in the Sthavira-derived Vinayas with considerable discrepancies among different schools. The corresponding account in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya omits all but one, namely, the tenth proposition that monks are allowed to accept money. Although both Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika sides clearly declare the practice of accepting money as illegally proposed by

---

臥; (2). 畜三衣法. Compared to the Theravaṃsa list, it omits going alms-begging [from house to house] in turns (*sapadānacārika*) and accepting any seat that is offered (*yathāsanthatika*).

The *Pinimu jing* (T. 1463 [XXIV] 804c24–29) provides a different list of (9). 行空閑靜處; (4). 乞食; (1). 糞掃衣; (?). 有瞋心止不食; (6). 一時受取; (12). 常塚間行; (11). 露地坐; (10). 樹下坐; (13). 常坐不臥; (13). 隨得敷具; (2). 齊三衣; It omits going alms-begging [from house to house] in turns turns (*sapadānacārika*) and eating only a handful of food (Pāli *pattapiṇḍika,* Chn.受一摶食), compared to the Theravaṃsa list.

The Sarvāstivāda school(s) also accepts most of the items listed in the Theravaṃsa tradition, with the exception of the thirteenth *yathāsanthatika* (T. 1509 [XXV] 537a19–23): 十二頭陀: (9). 作阿蘭若; (4). 常乞食; (1). 納衣; (6). 一坐食; (7). 節量食; (8). 中後不飲漿; (12). 塚間住; (10). 樹下住; (11). 露地住; (13). 常坐不臥; (5). 次第乞食; (2). 但三衣.

[365] For the discussions of this rule in the Vinayas, see Chiu 2014: 12–13 and Heirman 1997: 44–50.

[366] The content of the ten propositions (*Shishi feifa* 十事非法) in Pāli is given in Nattier & Prebish 1977: 242–244: "preserving salt in a horn" (鹽淨; Pāli *siṅgiloṇakappa*), "taking food when the shadow is beyond two fingers wide" (i.e., eating after the noon hour 二指淨; *dvaṅgulakappa*); "after finishing one meal, going to another town for another meal" (近聚落間淨; Pāli *gāmantarakappa*); "holding several confession ceremonies within the same monastic boundary [*sīmā*]" (住處淨, 如是淨; Pāli *āvāsakappa*); "confirming a monastic act in an incomplete assembly" (隨意淨; Pāli *ānumatikappa)*; "carrying out an act improperly and justifying it by its habitual performance in this way" (所習淨, 久住淨; Pāli *āciṇṇakappa*); after eating, drinking unchurned milk that is somewhere between the states of milk and curd" (生和合淨; Pāli *amathitakappa*); "drinking unfermented wine" (飲闍樓羅, 水淨; Pāli *jalogim*); using a mat without a border (隨意淨, 不益縷尼師壇淨; Pāli *adasakaṃ nisīdanam*); and accepting gold and silver (金銀淨; Pāli *jatarūparajatam*)." Cf. other versions of the ten propositions in T. 1421 (XXII) 192a27ff.; T. 1425 (XXII) 493a28ff.; T. 1428 (XXII) 968c18ff.; T. 1435 (XXIII) 414a21ff.; T. 1441 (XXIII) 597b17ff.; T.1462 (XXIV) 677c16ff.

the unauthorized side (namely, the monks from Vaiśālī 毘舍離), they have different historical interpretations of this event: According to the traditional Sthavira-derived history *Dīpavaṃsa*, the ten polemical propositions resulted in the second Buddhist council held at Vaiśālī and led to the first schism between the ancient Sthaviras and Mahāsāṅghikas;[367] on the other hand, the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya states that this debate brought about the composition of a new Vinaya Canon containing stricter monastic codes. We may surmise how this item from the ten illegal propositions ended up in the list of Devadatta's ascetic points—the composers of the *Chuyao jing*, who were Sarvāstivāda monks inheriting the tradition that the Mahāsāṅghikas' ten illegal propositions led to the first split, subconsciously or intentionally connected Devadatta to the Mahāsāṅghika side, and therefore attributed the "presumed" Mahāsāṅghika proposal of not accepting money to Devadatta.[368]

Now, I shall focus primarily on the other two items, i.e., no fish or meat and no butter or salt). The remaining two items from Devadatta's list, i.e., no fish or meat and no butter or salt, seem to be absent from any *dhutaguṇa* list (including those minor traditions as seen in n. 364). However, these two practices are in fact mentioned in the Chinese translation of the **Vimuttimagga*, in its discussion of the practice of living on cremation grounds (*śmāśānika*, Pāli *sosānika*):[369]

> If a monk lives on cremation grounds, he should not build a house; nor should he build either a bed or a seat. He should neither sit downwind nor stay upwind. He should not fall into a deep sleep. He should not eat food with the taste of fish. He should not drink curdled milk or eat sesame oil. He should not touch meat dishes.

---

[367] In the Pāli traditions, the ten polemical propositions are regarded as the cause for the split between the Sthaviras and the Mahāsāṅghikas, as the Sthaviras were opposed to them, while the Mahāsāṅghikas accepted them (for an overview of the past important scholarship on the second council, see Nattier & Prebish 1977: 237–238; also cf. Sasaki 2015). However, Nattier & Prebish (1977: 241–244), with the reference to the Sanskrit version of the Mahāsāṅghika *Bhikṣuprātimokṣasūtra*, have proven that the ancient Sthaviras and Mahāsāṅghikas entirely agreed with each other on the objection to the ten issues.

[368] There is much information to be investigated between the diversified records of the second council (including the Mahādeva stories and his five propositions) and the Devadatta narrative, which, unfortunately, I have to skip in my dissertation due to the limitation of time and space.

[369] T. 1648 (XXXII) 405c27–29: 若比丘止於塚間，不當作房及安床座，不從風坐不逆風住，臥時不熟，無食魚味，不飲乳酪不食麻粹，不觸肴肉。Cf. also Ehara et al. 1961: 34; Ray 1994: 302; Dantinne (1991: 19) explains that eating fish meat and so forth would attract nonhumans ("Il évitera de consommer de la viande du poisson et d'autres aliments qui attirent les nonhumains").

We see that the rulings concerning the prohibition of fish, meat, and dairy products are all part of the legal practice of *śmāśānika*, and therefore, Devadatta's proposals for abstaining from the above food are entirely legitimate in the Buddhist *dhutaguṇa* context. Why do Buddhists impose such strict eating rules on cemetery-dwellers? One story that Schopen adduces may offer some hints.[370] The *vibhaṅga* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya narrates a story of the monk Mahākāla (Chn. 大哥羅苾芻, Tib. nag po chen po), who practiced *śmāśānika*. Usually, he fed himself on the lumps of food (*piṇḍaka*) that people offered to their dead relatives on the cremation ground, and therefore people noticed that Mahākāla would get fatter during epidemics but emaciated when no epidemics occurred. This change led villagers to suspect that the cemetery monk fed himself on the flesh of corpses. There were even some young boys who pretended to be dead to test whether Mahākāla was a corpse-eater. However, they became extremely terrified at the sight of the monk and gave up on the test. Therefore, nobody could verify whether Mahākāla ate people's flesh or not. Despite the Buddha's defense of him, the rumor was widely disseminated, even among members of the Buddhist community. In the end, the Buddha had to issue a rule that monks should only eat the food they receive as a gift (*apratigrāhita-bhukti*; *byin len byed du bcug ste bza' ba*; 受取方食).

While postponing an interpretation of the Mahākāla story to the next section, I must restate that I by no means mean to suggest that the list of Devadatta's ascetic propositions was inspired by or connected with the *śmāśānika* practices. Instead, I surmise that such food abstinence perhaps took more influence from another Buddhist ascetic movement, namely, the ascetic practices that arose under the sway of the bodhisattva spirit of compassion. In fact, there are many early Mahāyāna texts that strongly urge abstention from meat or fish out of the bodhisattva spirit.[371] One famous example is the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*, in which, after the Buddha orders monks not to consume meat, the Bodhisattva Kāśyapa, by the same token, urges abstention from butter, milk, sesame extraction, and so forth.[372]

[370] T. 1442 (XXV) 825a26–c27, D. 3, *'dul*, *ja*, 154b2–156b7. Eng. Schopen 2007: 76–80.

[371] Kawasaki 1985.

[372] T. 374 (XII) 386a11–28; T. 375 (XII) 626a3–23; T. 376 (XII) 868c19–869a7; D. 119, *mdo sde*, *nya*, 57a5–b7; D. 120, *mdo sde*, *tha*, 54a7–b4.

Regarding the reason why butter and milk should be treated in the same way as meat, Bhāviveka in the *Madhyamaka-hṛdayakārikā* explains:[373]

> Precisely because [they are] produced from semen and the like, fish and meat must be prohibited. For this reason, butter, milk, and the like must be (prohibited) in the same way. These (actions) are all transgressions.

As a Mahāyānist upholding the bodhisattva ideal, Bhāviveka argues for regarding fish, meat, butter and curdled milk as substances produced from "living creatures" in the same fashion, and therefore, abandoning the habit of consuming them to maintain a compassionate mind. Possibly in the same spirit, the precept of abstaining from meat is officially enacted by the *Fanwang jing* 梵網經 (T. 1484, specifically its second fascicle), a text that was fundamentally important to the formation of the bodhisattva precept tradition in East Asia, which later evolved into outright vegetarianism in Chinese Buddhism.[374]

Based on the accounts in the **Vimuttimagga* and Mahāyāna texts, we may safely conclude that abstention from fish, meat, butter, and other dairy products are legalized practices among certain Buddhist groups, despite not being accepted as major components of the standard *dhutaguṇa* traditions.[375] But how can we understand the correlation between

---

[373] Lindtner 2001: 107: *śukrādi sambhavādeva matsyamāṃsaṃ vigarhitam, taṃ ghṛtakṣīrādi hetoḥ syādevaṃ vyabhicāritā* (IX, 135).

For the Japanese translation, with which I am not in complete agreement, see Kawasaki 1985: 177. 精液等から生じたるものであるが故に，魚肉等〔を食すること〕は誹謗されるべきであるというのであれば，これ〔魚肉〕は酥•乳糜等のごとぐ〔食せられてよいともいえる〕。かくのごとくして，因が不確定ということになる。

[374] T. 1484 (XXIV) 1005b10–13. On the abstention from meat in Chinese Buddhism, see Michihata 1966: 49–62.

[375] There is one text that lists abandoning fish, meat and dairy products as the twelfth practice of the 12 *dhutaguṇa*s. It is the Chinese *Da biqiu sanqian weiyi* 大比丘三千威儀 (T. 1470), dubiously attributed to the second-century translator 安世高 An Shigao. However, this would have been composed no earlier than the Jin dynasty, perhaps in China, having a strong Mahāyāna tendency (Wang Yili 2011; Lü 1980: 64). T. 1470 (24) 919b6–18: 十二頭陀者, 一者不受人請，日行乞食，亦不受比丘僧一飯食分錢財。二者止宿山上，不宿人舍郡縣聚落。三者不得從人乞衣被，人與衣被亦不受，但取丘塚間死人所棄衣補治衣之。四者止宿野田中樹下。五者一日一食，一名僧迦僧泥。六者晝夜不臥但坐，睡來起經行，一名僧泥沙者偃。七者有三領衣，無有餘衣，亦不臥被中。八者在塚間，不在佛寺中，亦不在人間，目視死人骸骨，坐禪求道。九者但欲獨處不欲見人，亦不欲與人共臥。十者先食菓蔵却食飯，食已不得復食菓。十一者但欲露臥，不在樹下屋宿。十二者不食肉，亦不食醍醐，麻油不塗身。

Interestingly, the earliest Buddhist references to the prohibition of consuming fish, meat and dairy products are all connected with heretical asceticism, and these prohibitions are listed together with nakedness and the other typically heretical practices, especially Jain ones. This reference is found in a story in which a

Devadatta's five ascetic points and the standard *dhutaguṇa* practices, especially with regard to the disagreement between the two ascetic traditions?

In this regard, Ray (1994: 314) argues that Devadatta's ascetic practices represent a "rigorist interpretation of the *dhutaguṇa*s". However, since Devadatta's list largely overlaps with the standard *dhutaguṇa* lists, how can we claim that the practices of abstaining from fish, meat, dairy products, and salt and no keeping of treasure are stricter and more radical than other varieties of *dhutaguṇa* practices? Therefore, I would rather suggest that the discrepancy between Devadatta's list and the systematized *dhutaguṇa* lists was the outcome of the independent development of the two ascetic traditions in Buddhist literature. To be more specific, Devadatta's practices, although having a clear ascetic tendency, were probably produced independently of the systematized *dhutaguṇa* traditions. That is to say, Devadatta's list may have evolved from common, preexisting ascetic practices that at the same time possibly also gave rise to the systematized *dhutaguṇa*s. Therefore, we may surmise that Devadatta's ascetic propositions were not formed under the direct sway of the standardized *dhutaguṇa* traditions. One observation that further strengthens this hypothesis is that Devadatta's practices, with their clearly ascetic nature, are seldom termed *dhutaguṇa* or its variant forms in the Vinayas. The Vinayas usually refer to Devadatta's practices as the "five matters" or "five practices": The Pāli Vinaya calls them *pañcavatthu* (Vin iii. 171). The Chinese *Wufen lü* and *Shisong lü* refer to them as *wufa* 五法. The Sanskrit MSV *Saṅghabhedavastu* uses the word *pañcavratapada* ("five matters of observation"; Gnoli 1977-1978: II. 27). The Tibetan translation is *brtul zhugs kyi gzhi lnga,* the exact rendering of the Sanskrit term, while the Chinese MSV *Saṅghabhedavastu* labels them *wu jinfa* 五禁法 ("five practices of self-discipline"). Only the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya explicitly states that Devadatta's five practices are *dhutaguṇa*s (頭陀勝法, T. 1428 [XXII] 594a28–b9).

In sum, Devadatta's ascetic propositions, including the three additional prohibitions that do not appear in standard *dhutaguṇa* lists, represent a normal, if not the most popular, form of Buddhist asceticism. Then, how do we understand the fact that Devadatta's ascetic

---

parivrājaka master named Nigrodha (sometimes Nigaṇṭha) makes a false accusation of Buddhist teaching. He is defeated by the Buddha, who denies the soteriological usefulness of this heretical asceticism. This story is widely found in the *āgama*/*nikāya* texts; it is sometimes called **Nyagrodha-brāhmaṇa-sūtra* (尼拘陀梵志經 T. 11 [I] 223b6–19), other times **(Udumbarika-) Sīhanāda-sūtra* (DN. iii. 41; 散陀那經 T. 1[I] 47c14–26; 師子經 T. 26 [I] 441c17–24; 優曇婆邏經 T. 16 [I] 592b6–19). Does this imply that Buddhists did not accept abstention from these foods at first, but regarded them as heretical practices? On abstention from certain foods in Jainism, see Cort 2002: 723; Williams 1983: 110–113.

propositions are generally condemned, while the *dhutaguṇa*s are not? Why it is acceptable for Buddhists to make asceticism the core of Devadatta's schismatic notions? In the following section, I shall investigate what the Devadatta narrative tells us about asceticism in Buddhism.

3.3.3 The ambiguity of asceticism in Buddhism

Let us return now to the Mahākāla story. While there are multiple ways to interpret this narrative, the first message I read here is that it is easy for a Buddhist ascetic to embroil himself and the whole *saṅgha* in an unforeseen predicament. As revealed in the story, it is the isolated lifestyle of cemetery monks that largely accounts for the rumors about Mahākāla. Villagers attempt to spy on him, but their efforts end in failure; even the appearance of the Buddha cannot stop the gossip and clarify the truth. These situations mainly arise from the fact that the ascetic lifestyle can neither be regulated nor supervised by either secular or monastic society. In this sense, the high level of autonomy possessed by ascetic monks is transformed into a potential threat, and ascetic monks, as represented by Mahākāla, become potential troublemakers within the monastic community. The promulgation of the Vinaya rule on how to obtain food, which concludes the narrative, should thus be read as an attempt to place śmāśānika monks under regulation. That is to say, the underlying mentality behind the composition of the Mahākāla narrative is that of anxiety over the untoward side effects of asceticism; it is an appeal to place radically austere lifestyles under control.

With this interpretation in mind, it becomes easier to understand the depiction of the first rebellious schismatic Devadatta as a proponent of asceticism. On the one hand, Buddhist texts praise the virtues of austerity as a correct path to awakening on numerous occasions—especially in the case of Mahākāśyapa. But on the other hand, as Dantinne (1991: 3) notes, "selon les traités de scolastique du Sarvāstivāda, elle appartient à la catégorie des passions 'voilées et indéterminées' (*nivṛtāvyākṛta*), couvertes (*ācchādita*) par la passion (*kleśa*) et dépourvues de méchanceté (*vyāpāda*) envers autrui." That is to say, asceticism itself is value-neutral, and the practitioners themselves play the key role in determining whether asceticism improves or impairs their spiritual cultivation.[376]

[376] Dantinne 1991: 3: "Elle est, en fait, une compulsion (*anuśaya*) indéterminée, neutre (*avyākṛta*), dont l'effet n'est ni inévitablement mauvais, ni inévitablement bon. Il n'est par sans intérêt de noter à cet égard que les interprétations des Sarvàstivàdin ne font que reformuler et préciser des conceptions identiques déjà exposées dans les sources canoniques."

The controversy over asceticism, as Freiberger (2007) comments, takes several directions in Buddhist texts: namely, whether it deviates from the principles of the Middle Way, whether it is soteriologically useful, and whether it brings potential threat to the settled monastic community.

To start with, one major criticism of asceticism comes from the central doctrine of the Middle Way, whose dogma intrinsically denies both indulgences in pleasure and in extreme asceticism. According to the doctrine of the Middle Way, although asceticism is sometimes instrumental to the pursuit of one's awakening, it still does not represent an ultimate and genuine understanding of the Buddha's teaching. Regarding this point, Freiberger (2007: 250) even argues that "the concept of the Middle Way was a rhetorical tool against severe asceticism; its polemical power was more important than as its (varying) contents."

In addition, extreme ascetic practices are sometimes claimed to be soteriologically useless and even disastrous. Śākyamuni's own awakening is the most potent illustration: extreme austerity could not even lead the Bodhisattva to liberation.[377] Moreover, Buddhist texts further contend that asceticism could be misused by hypocritical or dishonest persons, resulting in grave retribution. As revealed in the **Nyagrodhabrāhmaṇasūtra,*[378] the ascetics represented by Nigrodha are spurred by the corrupt motivation to perform asceticism for the sake of winning more donations. As this text further adds, those ascetics tended to possess arrogant and overbearing minds and treated other *śramaṇa*s with contempt. They were easily provoked and always jealous of other *śramaṇa*s. In other words, ascetic practitioners are easily subject to afflictions (e.g. "汝所修行, 煩惱隨增"; "*tapassino upakkileso*").

On the sociopolitical level, the existence of ascetics could put monastic monks in an unfavorable social and economic position: asceticism could place undue pressure on monastic monks because society would question the religious earnestness of monastic monks, who lead relatively more comfortable lives, and compel them to adopt a more self-restrained lifestyle. It is also easier for ascetics to impress potential patrons, which leaves monastic

---

[377] In many other texts, the same point is emphasized again and again. For instance, the *Cūḷadhammasamādānasutta* of the *Majjhimanikāya* accuses heretical austerity of "undertaking dharmas that induce suffering and result in future affliction" (*dhammasamādānaṃ paccuppannadukkhañceva āyatiñca dukkhavipākaṃ*), which means asceticism not only causes suffering in the present life, but also leads people to hell in the future.

[378] T. 1 (I) 224a29–b22; DN. iii. 42–45. As Freiberger (2006: 239, 253n.15) argues, such criticism of asceticism can also be found in many other texts, such as the *Nivāpasutta* and *Mahāsaccakasutta* of the *Majjhimanikāya.*

monks in a disadvantageous position with regard to the distribution of donations. Consequently, ascetics could severely compromise material support for monasteries. Moreover, ascetics are hard to control and supervise—as the case of Mahākāla illustrates—and therefore cause unforeseen problems for Buddhist communities.

As Freiberger (2007: 250–251) summarizes in his study on criticisms of asceticism: "the criticism has thus two directions: outward and inward. Its proponents regard severe ascetic practices as a sinful lifestyle, which, in principle, does not lead to liberation, regardless of the religious affiliation of the practitioner. Apart from this religious motivation, there may also have been sociopolitical and economic motives for the criticism of Buddhist ascetics in particular. Individual Buddhists living an ascetic and independent life were certainly a threat to the flourishing monastic institution. Uncontrollable, they frequently called into question the alleged ongoing 'secularizing' tendency of Buddhist monasticism. Moreover, despite—or because of—the monastery's close connection to 'the world,' ascetic Buddhists enjoyed great veneration from the laity, a fact that may have had a negative effect on material support for the monastery."[379]

Such criticism is not merely confined to Buddhism. Cultural theory studies show asceticism to have a wide application across human cultures. In a general sense, asceticism is "a universal and innate human predisposition," and human cultures are all ethical cultures, "inescapably ascetical."[380] Therefore, it is not surprising to find similar condemnations of asceticism in other religions, such as Christianity. In Newman's research on Cistercian authors' criticism of the strict practices of the "heretical" Cathars, the practitioners of

---

[379] Indeed, divergent attitudes towards asceticism also exist between schools. Schopen (2007: 74) has made some interesting comments on the contradictory views of asceticism between Mahāyāna monks and Mūlasarvāstivāda monks: "At least two things, however, seem to be relatively sure: the authors of a strong, seemingly early strand of Mahāyāna sūtra literature advocated their undertaking or appear to have been 'attempting to reinvent, revitalize or resurrect these extreme ascetic practices'; and the compilers of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya seem to have been intent on doing everything they could do to demonize and discourage their practice; to poke fun at them; and to erect legal, economic, and social barriers to their undertaking."

Nowadays, many Buddhist reformers still draw on the rebellious aspect of asceticism in their revolutionary campaigns. In the book *The Forest Monks of Sri Lanka* (1983), Carrithers discusses a new Buddhist movement in modem Sri Lanka that is based on the revival of traditional asceticism. According to him (1983: 104), "asceticism and reform are merely an idiom through which dissent and segmentation are expressed in the *saṅgha*".

[380] See Freiberger 2006: 3–4, in which he cites Bronkhorst (2001: 402). Throughout my discussion, asceticism implies what P. Olivelle terms "elite asceticism", by which means extraordinary forms of self-control and self-restraint, as opposed the more general "cultural asceticism" (Olivelle 2011: 31–32).

asceticism are also regarded by Cistercian Christians as proud, willful, hypocritical people who are described metaphorically as "the foxes who spoil the vine."[381]

Now we may be able to understand the mentality underlying Devadatta's association with asceticism. Buddhist traditions all ascribe five ascetic practices to Devadatta, a fact that certainly reveals equivocal attitudes toward asceticism in Buddhism: on the one hand, ascetics, as represented by Mahākāśyapa, are glorified as pure and genuine Buddhists who can masterfully control their sensory desires; on the other hand, ascetics are sometimes criticized as deceptive monks who practice asceticism with an arrogant, hypocritical, dishonest mind. The story of Devadatta's ascetic practices must be connected with the latter view.

3.4 Summary

To grasp the significance of the Devadatta narrative, we must first investigate how stories of Devadatta have developed over a long time span. This chapter began with an investigation into the core image of Devadatta in the Vinayas of both the Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika traditions, thereby shedding light on the Devadatta narrative in its historical development. Consistently with previous scholarship, I accept that the original and core image of Devadatta is that of the first schismatic monk.

In the next part, I attempted to make sense of the Devadatta narrative in the Buddhist schismatic context. The investigation into Buddhist discourses on the issue of schism sheds light on several key points that prepare us to read more deeply into the Devadatta narrative. First of all, it is widely accepted by the Vinayas that not just anybody is qualified to become a schismatic. A schismatic must be a prestigious monk; more importantly, he must be free from monastic punishment and maintain a proper monastic life. I argue that this background knowledge can explain the tradition, shared by different schools, that Devadatta starts out as a respectful monk. Secondly, many conditions must be fulfilled for a legitimate schism. The essential prerequisites require a minimum number of participants that the main schismatic is a monk, specific schismatic activities, and so forth, all of which are reflected in Devadatta's case. Therefore, I argue that Vinaya literature is not just the main vessel for Devadatta stories, but the incubator in which the Devadatta narrative was initially developed: the stories of Devadatta would have initially been composed to illustrate the Vinaya rules on *saṅghabheda*.

[381] Newman 2007: 91–115.

Moreover, schismatics are divided into several categories in the Vinayas, some of which are justified and do not necessarily lead the perpetrators into the Avīci hell. That is to say, Buddhist Vinaya traditions never held the close-minded attitude of condemning all schismatic activities; instead, they allow for a certain latitude—after all, schism is an inevitable historical process. When one group of monks split from another group, their animosity does not necessarily prove that one side is more corrupt than the other side. Devadatta's schism is no doubt an evil one, as Devadatta clearly knows that his five ascetic points violate the Dharma legalized by the Buddha, but he insists on propounding them. Moreover, regarding the seriousness of the transgression of a schism, the Vinayas adopt an analytical attitude and prescribe a gradually intensifying punishment over the different stages of a schism. Regarding Devadatta's schism, the Vinayas ambiguously place it somewhere between the transgressions of *saṅghāvaśeṣa* and *sthūlātyaya,* differently from the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharmas, which regard schism as the gravest of the five *ānantarya-karma*s, definitively leading to a descent into the Avīci hell. Further, I argue that the separate schismatic stories of Devadatta and Mahādeva may have initially been produced in two different textual traditions (i.e., the Vinayas and Abhidharmas), and reflect two distinct understandings of the sin of schism.

Furthermore, I also make an effort to answer the question of why Devadatta's schism is the most severely condemned among many other schisms, if schism is, in fact, a neutral phenomenon in the Vinayas. I answer this first on the basis of the twofold category of schism in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharmas. While a *karmabheda* is less harmful and irreversible, a *cakrabheda* would jeopardize the Buddhist community in a more heinous way and therefore be unredeemable. Devadatta's schism fulfills all of these prerequisites and constitutes a unique example of *cakrabheda*, which means that it is also the sole schism that would doom the perpetrator to descent into the Avīci hell, according to the Sarvāstivāda twofold-schism theory. Moreover, using the scapegoat theory proposed by Girard, I attempt to investigate the mentality underlying the criticism of Devadatta within the schismatic history of Buddhism. I interpret the condemnation of Devadatta as an embodiment of the scapegoat mechanism that would transfer and absolve the guilt of monks who were living in already-split communities.

In the last section, I attempt to further investigate Devadatta's association with asceticism. Devadatta's five points do not constitute a coherent and fixed tradition since lists of the five points vary among different Vinayas. Its polemical intent to cast Devadatta as a controversial figure is much more important than its actual content. Moreover, his five

ascetic practices do not entirely overlap with the Buddhist *dhutaguṇa* traditions, which reveals the possibility that Devadatta's ascetic propositions arose independently of the formalized Buddhist *dhutaguṇa* traditions. Furthermore, Devadatta's close association with ascetic tendencies reflects the equivocality of asceticism in Buddhism: although self-discipline is valued in Buddhist ethics to a certain extent, extreme asceticism goes against the principles of the Middle Way. It is therefore soteriologically useless and may pose a sociopolitical threat to settled monastic Buddhists.