

The Indian Buddhist Mahādeva in Tibetan Sources

Jonathan A. Silk

For E. Gene Smith

The story of the schismatic monk Mahādeva is relatively well known.¹ It is the tale of the author of the Five Theses which caused the originally unitary monastic community to split into the Mahāsāṃghika and Sthavira orders, something like a century after the death of the Buddha. Mention of this story occurs in a great many texts including a number of Tibetan compositions. Some of these sources frame their references in a “historical” manner, while others treat the story less contextually, making it do other work, for instance as a morality play. In the following, I explore some of the available Tibetan materials, beginning with those which refer to the story in the context of the schism narrative.

While many traditional sources attribute to Mahādeva the basic schism between the Mahāsāṃghika and Sthavira, there is good evidence suggesting that originally he was taxed only with causing a schism internal to the Mahāsāṃghika order itself. Among the earliest relevant Indian sources known in Tibet is Vasumitra’s *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* (Wheel of the Formation of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Assemblies). There we read simply:²

When two hundred years had passed [since the Buddha’s death] a wandering ascetic (**parivrājaka*) named *Mahādeva renounced the world (**pravrajya*) and dwelt at *Caityaśāila; he taught the Five Theses of the Mahāsāṃghikas, and having publicized them thoroughly, he created the division into three sects called *Caityaka, *Aparaśāila and *Uttaraśāila.

Here Mahādeva is credited with an internal division in the Mahāsāṃghika order itself, that into three sub-sects named *Caityaka, *Aparaśāila and *Uttaraśāila. Likewise in the closely related *Nikāyabhedavibhaṅgavyākhyāna* (Commentary on the Classification of the Divisions of Buddhist Monastic Communities), which is in fact part of the fourth chapter of the *Tarkajvālā* (Blaze of Reasoning) of Bhāviveka (or Bhavya),³ we find the following:⁴

¹ For a detailed investigation of the relevant materials, see my forthcoming *Riven By Lust: Incest and Schism in Indian Buddhist Legend and Historiography* (University of Hawaii Press).

² The Tibetan is edited by Miyasaka in Takai 1928/1978: 2.15-20 (and see Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 3.1-5): *lo nyis brgya pa la gnas pa'i tshé kun tu rgyu lha chen po zhes bya ba rab tu byung ste mchod rten gyi ri la gnas pas dge 'dun phal chen po'i lugs lnga po de dag yang dag par rjes su brjod cing | yang dag par rjes su bsgrags nas mchod rten pa'i sde dang | nub kyi ri bo'i sde dang | byang gi ri bo'i sde zhes bya ba sde pa gsum nam par bkod do ||*. The Tibetan was already translated by Vassilief in 1863: 229.

³ On the difficult question of the identity and date (sixth/seventh/eighth century?) of the author of the *Tarkajvālā*, see Ruegg 1990. The name of this author may properly be Bhavya or, as seems increasingly likely, Bhāviveka, with the commonly cited Bhāviveka going back to a copiest’s error. Whether all these forms indeed refer to the same individual is a question we need not address here.

Again, as a division of the *Gokulikas there are the Sthaviras called *Caityaka. A wandering ascetic named Mahādeva renounced the world and dwelt at *Caityāsaila. Again, when he proclaimed the Theses of the Mahāsāmghikas, the *Caityaka order was created.

Slightly earlier in the same text, however, we also find the following:⁵

Again, others say that 137 years after the parinirvāṇa of the Blessed One, King Nanda and Mahāpadma⁶ convened an assembly of the Āryas in the city of Pāṭaliputra, and when they had attained the state of calm emancipation free from clinging, Ārya Mahākāśyapa, Ārya Mahāloma, Mahātyāga, Uttara, Revata and so on constituted a monastic community of arhats who had obtained perfect knowledge. When they were thus gathered, Māra the evil one [as] *Bhadra opposed them all.⁷ Taking up the guise of a monk,⁸ he performed

⁴ Miyasaka in Takai 1928/1978: 21.4–8 (Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 25.18–26.3 = *Tarkajvālā* in Derge Tanjur 3856, *dbu ma, dza* 150b7-151a1): *yang ba lang gnas pa nmams kyi¹ bye brag las gnas britan mchod rten pa zhes bya ba ste | de ni lha chen po zhes bya ba'i kun du rgyu zhig rab tu byung nas mchod rten can gyi ri la gnas pa yin te | yang de ni dge 'dun phal chen pa'i gzhi 'don par gyur pa na² mchod rten pa zhes bya ba'i sde par nram par bzhaq te³ |.*

1) T/H: *kyis* 2) *Tarkajvālā: ni* 3) *Tarkajvālā: gzhag ste.*

Translated in Rockhill 1907: 189; Bareau 1956: 176–177; Walleser 1927: 84.

⁵ Textual Materials 1. *Tarkajvālā* IV.8 and following constitutes the *Nikāyabhedavibhaṅgavyākhyāna*. Kanakura 1962: 285 recognizes that the content of the *Nikāyabhedā*^o and the *Tarkajvālā* is identical, but seems unaware that the former is in fact an extract from the latter, a fact which also seems to have been unknown to Bareau 1954: 232, who says that it is “possible” that the great sixth century Madhyamaka master Bhā[va]viveka is also the author of the *Nikāyabhedā*^o. (Bareau clearly assumes that it is the sixth century Bhā[va]viveka who wrote the *Madhyamakahr̥dayakārikā* and its commentary the *Tarkajvālā*.)

The passage has been translated in Rockhill 1907: 186–187, Walleser 1927: 81–82, Bareau 1956: 172–173, and Kanakura 1962: 286–287.

⁶ There is good reason to believe that there were not two kings, one named Nanda and another Mahāpadma, but that Mahāpadma was the ruler of the Nanda dynasty. If so, we might emend our text by removing a *dang*, and read **rgyal po dga' bo pa dma chen po zhes bya ba*. The problem was noted already by Rockhill 1907: 186, n. 2, and La Vallée Poussin 1909: 183, n. 3, and later for instance by Bareau 1955: 91. Needless to say, the wider chronological problems of dynasties and reigns have also attracted the attention of scholars (see e.g., the detailed studies of Tsukamoto 1980, esp. 62ff.); as they are, nevertheless, not directly relevant to our inquiries here, we are able to leave them aside. See the Additional Note, below.

⁷ The sentence *de ltar bzhuqs pa na bdud sdig can bzang po thams cad kyi mi mthun pa'i phyogs su gyur pa* is difficult to construe, and may be corrupt. It has been understood differently by Bareau (1956: 172: “Pendant qu’ils demeuraient ainsi, Māra, le vicieux, se transforma de façon à être semblable à un homme ayant toutes les qualités (*bhadra*)”), and Kanakura (1962: 286, and 289-290, n. 6: このように彼等が住した時、悪魔パドラがすべてに反対する者となった). Kanakura understands *mi mthun pa'i (ba'i) phyogs* as *vipakṣa* or *pratipakṣa*, while Bareau takes this *mi* as “person.” The fact remains that, as Ulrike Roesler has emphasized to me, this is a very uncomfortable way to read *mi mthun pa'i phyogs*, and something may be wrong here. It is also possible that *bzang po thams cad* should be taken as a unit, in which case may the expression may mean that Māra “set himself in opposition to all the good”? But other sources attest to the existence of the name *Bhadra, and I do think that *Bhadra is a proper name here. Although I cannot resolve the problem, I received helpful suggestions from Ulrike Roesler and Akira Saito.

⁸ The expression *dge slong gi cha byad (du)* may be restored with almost total confidence as

various feats of magic, and with five propositions caused a great schism in the monastic community. Sthavira *Nāga and *Sthiramati,⁹ both of whom were very learned, praised these five propositions, and taught in accord with them, namely: ...¹⁰ This, they claimed, is the teaching of the Buddha. Then, the two sects (**nikāya*) split, the Sthavira and the Mahāsāṅghika. Thus for a period of sixty-three years was the monastic community split by a quarrel.

Here we have an account of the fundamental schism in the early Buddhist community, with the cause for this schism identified as five contentious points. The author of those points is indicated not as Mahādeva but rather as a certain *Bhadra. We will see that this connection between the two names becomes important in Tibetan sources. And in fact, the same name, apparently associated with precisely the same events, appears in a fundamental work, the *Chos 'byung* (History of Buddhism) of Bu ston (1290-1364). Bu ston says:¹¹

According to some, 137 years after the Teacher had passed away, at the time when King Nanda and Mahāpadma were reigning, and when the elders Mahākāśyapa, Uttara and others were residing at Pāṭaliputra, Māra the evil one, in the guise of a monk named *Bhadra, performed various feats of magic, sowed disunion among the clergy and brought confusion into the Teaching. At that time, in the time of the Sthavira *Nāgasena and *Manojña¹² sixty-three years after the sects had been split, Sthavira Vātsīputra recited (**saṃ√gai*) the teaching.

A later Tibetan history, the influential fifteenth century *Deb ther sngon po* (Blue Annals) of 'Gos Gzhon nu dpal (1329-1481), transmits once again an account almost identical to Bhāviveka's, in which, however, while the five propositions do occur, the name *Bhadra does not:¹³

**bhikṣuṣeṣeṇa*. It occurs for instance in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (Wogihara 1932–1935: 513.22 [Mitra 242], 679.20 [331], 775.10 [388], 776.14 [389]), where it appears in an expression identical to what we find here: *māraḥ pāpīyān bhikṣuṣeṣeṇa*.

⁹ For reasons I do not fully understand, and which are never stated, Lamotte consistently reconstructs this name as Sāramati (1956; 1958: 308). Tsukamoto 1980: 237 offers Sthitamati or Sthiramati.

¹⁰ As there is considerable difficulty over the exact way to take these five items, the *pañca-vastūni* (*gzhi lnga*), I omit a translation here.

¹¹ Lokesh Chandra 1971, folio 88b3–5 (808): *kha cig ston pa 'das nas lo brygad dang sum cu rtsa bdun lon pa na rgyal po dga' bo dang padma chen po zhes bya ba byung bas grong khyer skya bo'i bur gnas brtan 'od srung chen po dang bla ma la sogs pa bzhugs pa'i dus su bdud sdig can bzang po zhes bya ba dge slong gi cha byad du byas nas rdzu 'phrul sna tshogs bstan te | dge 'dun rnams phye nas bstan pa dkrugs te de'i tshe gnas brtan klu'i sde dang yid 'ong gi dus su sde pa so sor gyes nas lo drug cu rtsa gsum na gnas brtan gnas ma'i bus bstan pa bsdu so zhes zer ro ||*

The identification of the apparent basis of the passage, and the translation, slightly modified, are those of Obermiller 1931–1932: II.96, and n. 618. See also the rendering of Vogel 1985: 104.

¹² Obermiller suggests Manojña and Vogel Valguka for Yid 'ong.

¹³ 'Gos Gzhon nu dpal 1985: 52.1-10, translated in Roerich 1949: 28–29, which I have modified significantly: *yang lugs gsum pa ni | sangs rgyas mya ngan las 'das nas lo bryga dang sum cu rtsa bdun na | rgyal po dga' bo dang pad ma chen po'i dus | grong khyer pa tra bi bu tar [sic] 'od srungs chen po la*

Again, according to a third tradition: after 137 years had elapsed since the nirvāṇa of the Buddha, in the time of King Nanda and Mahāpadma, when Mahākāśyapa and others, who had attained perfect knowledge, were staying in the town of Pāṭaliputra, partisans of Māra, the Sthavira *Nāgasena and *Sthiramati, both of whom were very learned, praised the five propositions . . . which caused [the community] to split into two sects, the Sthaviras and the Mahāsāṃghikas. In this manner, for sixty years the monastic community was divided by quarrel.

Here the actual author of the problematic Five Theses goes unmentioned. The name *Bhadra, associated with the exposition of five contentious theses, reappears in a yet later but very important and influential compendium of doctrines and history, the *Grub mtha' chen mo* (Great Doxology) of 'Jam dbyangs bzhad pa'i rdo rje Ngag dbang brton 'grus (1648–1721):¹⁴

According to one tradition of the Sammatīya,¹⁵ 137 years after the Buddha's death, in the time of King Nanda and Mahāpadma, in the city Pāṭaliputra, the evil one, calling [him-

sogs pa so so yang dag par rig pa thob pa rnams bzhugs pa na | bdud kyi phyogs su gyur pa'i dge slong gnas brtan klu'i sde zhes bya ba dang | yid brtan pa zhes bya ba mang du thos pa dag gis gzhan la lan gdab pa mi shes pa | yid gnyis | yongs su brtag pa | bdag nyid gso bar byed pa ste | gzhi lnga bsngags par byed pas rkyen byas nas sde pa gnyis su gyes te | gnas brtan pa dang | dge 'dun phal chen pa'o || de ltar lo drug cu rtsa gsum gyi bar du dge 'dun bye zhing 'khrug long gis gnas pa las . . .

¹⁴ Gelek 1973: 133b2–5 (298): *mang bkur ba'i 'dod bar grags pa yang lugs gcig la | sangs rgyas 'das nas lo brgya dang so bdun na | rgyal po dga' bo dang padma chen po'i dus grong khyer pa tra li pu trar bdud sdig can bzang po zhes pas dge slong gi cha byad kyis rdzu 'phrul sna tshogs bstan te | gzhi lngas dge 'dun gyi dbyen chen po bskyed pas sngar ltar rtsa ba'i sde gnyis su gyes nas | lo drug cu re gsum du 'khrugs kyis gnas ba las | de rjes lo gnyis brgya 'das par gnas brtan gnas ma'i bus yang dag bar bsdu pa las rim gyis gyes te | phal chen pa la tha snyad gcig pa dang | ba lang gnas gnyis gyes bsam bu gsum | ba lang gnas la'ang mang thos | brtag smra mchod rten pa ste gsum gyes pas drug ste | egs ldan gyis | de dag ni dge 'dun phal chen pa'i dpya ba drug yin no || zhes so ||*

The passage was given an abridged translation by La Vallée Poussin 1910: 414–415 (who gives the author the Sanskrit name Mañjuḥoṣāhāsavajra). On the work, see Mimaki 1982: XLIV–XLV. As Mimaki 1982: 1 notes, this text was of great use to Vassilief 1863.

¹⁵ Compare Kanakura 1962: 287, Lamotte 1958: 307, and Bareau 1956: 172, n. 1. Bareau refers to Tāranātha for his suggestion of a Sammatīya origin for the story, but as far as I can see, and as Kanakura says explicitly, their argument for the Sammatīya source of this tradition appears to be based on the coincidence of Tāranātha's attribution to the Sammatīya tradition of a certain pattern of school affiliation, and the same apparent pattern found following Bhāviveka's discussion of Mahādeva quoted here. See Schiefner 1868: 206.19ff., translated at Chimpa and Chattopadhyaya 1980: 340. The attribution in modern scholarship of this tradition to the Sammatīyas seems to go back to La Vallée Poussin 1910: 414, who refers to this very passage from 'Jam dbyangs bzhad pa, but it is thereafter almost universally repeated by other scholars as a fact, without as far as I can tell any recourse to evidence. Perhaps further investigation into Tibetan historical works will help clarify earlier origins of the attribution.

Available information on Sammatīya tradition may not confirm this attribution. In the *Samṣkṛtāsamṣkṛtaviniścaya* of Daśabalaśrīmitra, the councils are considered to be the first, immediately after the Buddha's death, the second one hundred years later, and then a third, "four hundred years after the *parinirvāṇa* of the Tathāgata, when the community of the Ascetic had become divided into different groups, each adhering to its own school, [and] Vātsīputra recited and compiled the Dharma of one of these schools." See Skilling 1982: 40–41. There is no reference here to the account attributed by 'Jam dbyangs bzhad pa to the Sammatīya.

self] *Bhadra, clothed as a monk, displayed various wonders. By creating a great schism in the monastic community through the Five Points, he split what had previously been the Root Community (**mūlanikāya*) into two,¹⁶ and [the monastic community] quarrelled for sixty three years. Following that after two hundred years the Sthavira Vātsīputra recited [the teaching; **saṃ√gai*], and successively split [the community]...

As if such fluctuations were not evidence enough of some confusion or conflation in the historical and doxological tradition, already somewhat earlier the great Tibetan historian Tāranātha (1575-1635) recorded two interesting accounts in his seminal work, *Rgya gar chos 'byung* (History of Buddhism in India),¹⁷ perhaps the most important history of Indian Buddhism ever written. One is a variation of the version we have just noticed, although one gets the impression that in Tāranātha's recounting it has become slightly garbled:¹⁸

When the Ārya Mahātyāga was upholding the teaching in Madhyadeśa, King Nanda's son Mahāpadma did honor to the entire monastic community in the town of Kusumapura [= Pāṭāliputra]. The monk *Sthiramati, who was a follower of the Sthavira *Nāga, proclaimed five propositions, and by provoking a great argument the four sects gradually began to be divided into eighteen.

Here it appears that the author of the five propositions is stated to be the monk *Sthiramati who, according to Bhāviveka and those who follow him most closely, is an adherent of these theses, but not their author. In addition, the schism being alluded to appears not to be the initial one into two sects, the Mahāsāṃghika and the Sthavira, but another which led to the development of the (legendary) eighteen sects of mature Indian sectarian Buddhism. On the other hand, Tāranātha also reports, just a few pages earlier in the very same text, the following tradition:¹⁹

¹⁶ La Vallée Poussin 1910: 415 continues his presentation as follows (the ellipses are his): "...[These Points are part of the doctrine of the Mahāsāṃghikas. For later,] from a branch of the Gokulikas, the elder named Caitika. This man, an ascetic named Mahādeva, became a monk, resided on the mountain 'where is a caitya,' and professing the [Five] Points of the Mahāsāṃghikas, created the sect named Caitika." If such a passage is actually found in 'Jam dbyangs bzhad pa's text anywhere near the preceding passage, I have missed it in my search.

¹⁷ The full title is *Dam pa'i chos rin po che 'phags pa'i yul du ji ltar dar ba'i tshul gsal bar ston pa dgos 'dod kun 'byung*.

¹⁸ Dorji 1974: 27a3-4 (53), Schiefner 1868: 43.22-44.4, Tāranātha 1985: 40b5-41a2. The translation is modified from that found in Chimpa and Chattopadhyaya 1980: 85: *yul dbus su ni 'phags pa gtong ba chen po zhes bya bas bstan pa skyong bar mdzad cing | grong khyer me tog tu rgyal po dga' bo'i bu pa dma chen po zhes bya bas dge 'dun thams cad mchod par byed pa las | gnas brtan klu'i rjes su zhugs pa dge slong yid brtan pa zhes bya bas | gzhi lnga yongs su bsgrags te rtsod pa rgya cher spel bas | sde pa bzhi yang rim gyis bco bryad du gyes pa'i mgo brtsams | ...*

¹⁹ Dorji 1974: 25b1-2, 5 (50), Schiefner 1868: 41,6-11, 18-20, Tāranātha 1985: 38a4-b1, 5-6. The translation is that of Chimpa and Chattopadhyaya 1980: 79-80: *de'i tshes yul ma ru da'i¹ phyogs gcig na | tshong dpon gyi bu lha chen po zhes bya ba | pha ma dgra bcom bsad pa ste mtshams med gsum byas pa cig rang gi sdig pas yid 'byung nas kha cher song ste | rang gi spyod tshul yongs su gsang nas dge slong byas shing | blo rno bas sde snod gsum po yang shin tu byang bar shes nas yid shin tu 'gyod*

In Mathurā²⁰ there lived the son of a merchant called Mahādeva. He committed the three deadly sins namely killing his father, killing his mother and killing an *arhat*. Depressed in mind, he left for Kashmir where, carefully concealing his misdeeds, he became a monk. As he had a keen intellect, he acquired mastery of the three Piṭaka-s, felt remorse for his sins and strove by himself after meditation in a monastery. Being blessed by the power of Māra, he was taken by all for an *arhat*, and thus his prestige grew more and more....

A few lines below, Tāranātha’s text continues:²¹

After his death, another monk called *Bhadra, who is considered to have been an incarnation of the evil Māra himself, raised many objections and doubts to the sayings [of the Buddha].

This *Bhadra is then said to have propagated five theses (*gzhi lnga = *pañca-vastūni*). Tāranātha’s recounting here effectively merges into a single account the Mahādeva and *Bhadra stories. Elsewhere, however, Tāranātha explicitly indicates his belief that there were two distinct individuals, Mahādeva and Bhadra, whose influence brought about the degeneration of the monastic community:²²

In the period before Mahādeva and Bhadra appeared, there were many who attained the fruit [of the spiritual path], but after the two of them disrupted the teaching and stirred up disputes, monks did not devote themselves to yogic cultivation but instead thought only of disputes, and as a result very few attained the fruit [of the spiritual path]. Therefore, at the time of the Third Council there were few saints.

It is evident in light of this passage that for Tāranātha, the variant versions of what must once have been a single story of a disruptive monk, alternatively named Mahādeva and

pas dgon par ting nge 'dzin la brtson par byed do || de la bdud kyis byin gyis brlabs te thams cad kyis dgra bcom par bzung nas rnyed bkur yang cher 'phel | ...

de shi ba na de'i rjes su dge slong bzang po zhes bya ba de² bdud sdig can nyid kyi sprul pa yin nam yang zer | des kyang bka'i don rnams la brgal brtag dang the tshom gyi gnas mang po bskyed cing |

1) Schiefner *ta'i* 2) Tāranātha omits *de*.

²⁰ The text has *ma ru ḍa/ṭa*, which seems a simple inversion of *ma ḍu/ṭu ra*, the latter quite understandable for Mathurā, in agreement with our other sources. So also Bareau 1955: 97. Chimpa and Chattopadhyaya 1980: 79 have written “*Maruda.” That the form is not an innovation of Tāranātha, nor a corruption in the transmission of his work, is proved by its appearance almost a century earlier in the work of Shākya mchog ldan, for which see below note 46 and Textual Materials 5.

²¹ Translated at Chimpa and Chattopadhyaya 1980: 80 (slightly modified).

²² Schiefner 1868: 48.11–16; Tāranātha 1985: 45a4–6: *de yang lha chen po dang bzang po ma byung ba yan chad du 'bras bu thob pa nyid¹ rer yang shin tu mang po 'byung ba las | de gnyis kyis bstan pa bkrugs² te rtsod pa byung ba nas dge slong rnams rnal 'byor la mi brtson par rtsod pa'i don sems pa³ nyid kyis 'bras bu thob pa'ang shin tu nyung bar gyur la | de'i phyir bsdu ba gsum pa'i dus 'di tsam na dgra bcom pa nyung ngo ||* 1) T nyin 2) T dkrugs 3) S omits *pa*. See the translation in Chimpa and Chattopadhyaya 1980: 94.

Bhadra, have become so distinct that he could only conclude that in historical fact there were indeed two separate, though similar, individuals, both of whom he then blames for the decline of the monastic community in the period leading up to the Third Council. In sum, if we survey the multiple versions of such apparently related stories in Tāranātha's text, we are forced to conclude that we meet here a confused collection of what was, originally, one basic story.²³

In parallel with such “historical” or at least historically contextualized versions of the basic story, Tibetan sources also preserve versions of the same tale removed from its “historical” context. These begin to appear at least as early as the thirteenth century. The first is found in the **Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* (Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels), a popular collection of moralistic sayings composed between 1215 and 1225 by the patriarch of the Sa skya school, and one of the greatest scholars in the history of Tibetan Buddhism, Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1182–1251).²⁴ In this work, popular both in the sense of being aimed at a lay audience and of being widely circulated, we find the following verse:²⁵

Fully realizing their error,
The crafty will [nevertheless] entice others with words.
When Mahādeva uttered a wail,
He said that he [merely] declared the Truth of Suffering.

These four short lines quite unambiguously allude to one element of the story of Mahādeva, which recounts that although he claimed to be an Arhat, he had in fact not

²³ Kanakura 1962: 291, n. 15 has opined that the various versions recorded in later Tibetan sources are based on Kashmiri (by which he means Sarvāstivādin) and Sammatīya sources, with some authors such as Tāranātha conflating the traditions.

In addition to the sources cited above, there are of course other, later sources as well. In the eighteenth century, for instance, Sum pa mkhan po (1704–1788) records a version of the story which informs us concisely that a merchant from Southern India named Mahādeva killed his own teacher, father and mother, committing the three sins of immediate retribution, and then corrupted the teaching; for the relevant passage, see Das 1908: 43.6–11: *gsum pa ni | 'dul ba lung na mi gsal pas mi mthun pa mang la | de'i rtsa ba ni nyan thos sde bco brgyad du gyes pa nas sbyor pa phal cher mthun kyang lta ba mi mthun pa'i dbang gis te | de'i rgyu yang ston pa'i sku tshe snga ma zhig tu bram ze'i 'khor phye ba'i las lhag gi tshul dang rkyen ni rgya gar lho phyogs su ded dpon zhig gi bu lha chen po zhes pa rang gi slob dpon dgra bcom pha ma bsad de mtshams med gsum byas pa zhig gis chos log dar bar byas shing rtsa ba'i sde bzhir gyes pa physis su sde bco brgyad du gyes shing de la des slad pa cung zad yod de mdo sde tshangs pa dang lung nyams sogs byung ba bka' bsdu nyams pa'i dbang gyis te | . . .* (Note that as in the story to be cited from Dmar ston's commentary, Sum pa mkhan po has Mahādeva hailing from Southern India.)

²⁴ van der Kuijp 1996: 398.

²⁵ The Sanskritist Sa skya Paṇḍita gave his text an Indic title; its Tibetan title is *Legs par bshad pa rin po che'i gter*, usually called *Sa skya legs bshad*, or simply *Legs bshad*. The cited verse is numbered 151 in the edition of Bosson 1969, but I believe the version he established is faulty. The following is the verse as cited in the commentary:

| nyes pa mngon sum byed bzhin du || g.yo* can tshig gis pha rol bslu |
| lha chen smre sngags shor ba la || sdug bsnal bden pa bsgrags so lo |

* v.l. g.yon

transcended the limits of human fallability. Therefore, he experienced psychological pain and confusion. When deep at night he cried out in anguish, his disciples heard him and were concerned. He however rationalized his cries of pain as instead a verbal affirmation of the first of the Four Noble Truths, that of Suffering. Although to one familiar with the story the verse's reference is clear, an extended version of the story is provided by Sa skya Paṇḍita himself in one of his major works, the *Sdom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba* (A Clear Differentiation of the Three Codes), in which the account is, moreover, indeed explicitly connected with its “historical moment” as the instigation for the Third Council.²⁶

After the completion of the First Council [during which was compiled] the Buddha's stainless preaching, while his teaching remained pure, the monks of Vaiśālī created ten incorrect points in contradiction to the Buddha's teaching. Then, in order to refute that inverted teaching seven hundred nobles convened the Second Council, it is said. After [the teaching] was thus purified, there appeared a monk named Mahādeva, a thief in this teaching. He killed his own mother and father, murdered a saint who was his teacher, and became a monk without preceptor or monastic sponsor.²⁷ Later, he dwelt in a monastery, and consumed the offerings made in faith by lay devotees. He served as preceptor and sponsor for fools [who ordained and trained under him], and the food and wealth given to him by rich fools fell like rain. He was surrounded by a monastic community of many hundreds of thousands gathered from the unfortunate devout. Then that great liar claimed that he was a saint. When his retinue requested a display of magical powers, he said “My magical powers became impaired this morning at dawn.” Because he was mindful of his own [previous] sins, when he uttered a great wail, he declared “I was proclaiming the Truth of Suffering.” With such lies he made the heads of his followers spin, and even those gifts of faith that ought to have been given to the nobles went to him. A great number of the foolish renunciants forsook the Saints and gathered around him. It is said that after the nirvāṇa of the Buddha, there was no assembly gathered by an ordinary person greater than his. Since students followed his instruction of the inverted teaching, there arose many competing doxographical systems. It is said that after that fool Mahādeva died, he fell into hell. I have heard that the Saints refuted those inverted teachings of his, and convened a Third Council.

Very close to this version both in the time of its composition and in terms of its content is the account in the *Rgya bod kyi chos 'byung rgyas pa* (Extensive History of Buddhism in India and Tibet) of the Rnying ma pa author Mkhas pa lde'u, dated in its present form to

²⁶ Textual Materials 2. My translation is indebted that in Rhoton 2002: 172-174, I owe my knowledge of this passage to the kindness of my friend David Jackson.

²⁷ That is, he is (or claims to be) a monk, but since he lacks both an *upādhyāya* and an *ācārya*, he cannot legally be a real monk.

“later than 1261” by Dan Martin,²⁸ although much of this work undoubtedly belongs to a somewhat earlier period. The account in this text reads as follows:²⁹

Then, 110 years after the passing of the Teacher, there was a Venerable Mahādeva who was born in a merchant family. While his father was gone on trade, he slept with his mother. When his father returned, having deliberated with his mother, he killed his father. Concerned about their bad reputation, they fled to another country. There was an arhat-monk whom they had earlier patronized. When they met him there, out of concern that he might have spread their bad reputation, through a stratagem they offered him an invitation and killed him by giving him poison. Then after the mother slept with another, [Mahādeva] became jealous, and killed his mother as well. Thus did he commit three of the sins of immediate retribution. Still, his outlook was not inverted.

Having removed the impediments to his serious religious practice, going to another country he then requested initiation in the monastic communities, and this being given he was initiated and ordained [as a monk]. Since his intelligence and drive were great, he applied himself to religion, and thus he grew full of wisdom, such that the king of the land and all of the people honored him greatly.

He then became lustful, and pridefully he lied, saying: “I have obtained the fruit of arhatship.” His merit increased, and the king offered him an invitation [to attend him]. There [at court] he became enamored of the king’s consort. Since [she] saw him ejaculate, [she] asked: “If one is a saint, one has cut off the defilements, and thus does not produce semen, yet how is it that you produce semen?”

“I am tormented by Māra. Even though I have become an arhat (**aśaikṣa*), Deva-putramāra places obstacles in the way of my goodness.” Because his disciples were given to idle chatter, he said to several of them: “You have obtained the status of Stream Winner, or Arhat, Lone Buddha or Renunciant.”

Since he said that, his retinue asked: “We don’t know anything at all, so how are we able to obtain these great fruits?”

[He replied] “Sure you have obtained them!” and said many such things.

On another occasion, having repented since he had lied in giving inverted teachings to his disciples, at night he was afflicted, and called out “Alas, alack, the great suffering!”

The assembly heard this, and said “What is the trouble?”

“There is no trouble at all.”

“Then why did you say ‘alas, alack’ they asked.

He said: “I was thinking of the Noble Path. If one does not call out, it will not be clear to one.” Then he summarized his inverted teaching in verse for his disciples:

[Arhats] are gods beguiled by ignorance,

²⁸ See Martin 1997: 43–44 (§ 54).

²⁹ Textual Materials 3.

Possess doubt, are manipulated by others.
[For them] the path emerges out of verbal flow.
This is the teaching of the Buddha.

When Mahādeva said this on the occasion of expounding the meaning of the Prātimokṣa [core monastic rules] at the time of the Uposatha [bimonthly confession] rite, there were a few who were listening at that spot near to obtaining wisdom and the fruit [of the path], and they inquired into that expression [in the verse] saying: “This expression contravenes the [Buddha’s] word. What you say does not put his intention in a good light. Mahādeva, don’t say things like this! This is not the teaching³⁰ preached by the Buddha.” Engaging in discussion about the wording in that [verse], they argued the whole night long. After the king, his ministers and others [tried] in turns to reconcile them, but were unable to, they said: “Didn’t the Buddha formerly say anything about the means to solve a dispute?” Someone said: “Yes, he did.” So, [the king] said “Please, those who did not agree with the Elders go to one side, and those who did not agree with Mahādeva go to the other.”

At that time, the side of the great Elders was left with a small number of the senior [monks], while on Mahādeva’s side the monastic community swelled in numbers with young, arrogant [monks]. [Thus the monastic community] split into two, the Sthavira and the Mahāsāṃghika.

Both this version and the version related by Sa skya Paṇḍita himself, relying at least in part on the same tradition, present a number of interesting features. Before we explore these, however, we must also notice an even more detailed version found in the oldest known commentary to Sa skya Paṇḍita’s *Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels*, that composed, sometime before 1245,³¹ by his disciple Dmar ston Chos kyi rgyal po (ca. 1197 – ca. 1258).³² There we find the following rendition of our story:³³

³⁰ Literally “dharma and vinaya.”

³¹ According to Roesler 2002a: 432.

³² The best discussion I know of this figure is found in Stearns 2001: 69–78, whose book is dedicated to the study of one particularly important text by this author. Regarding our text, as noted by Roesler 2002a: 433 (and by Stearns 2001: 197, n. 298), according to the colophon of the transmitted text, the commentary was originally composed by another disciple of Sa skya Paṇḍita, Lho pa kun mkhyen Rin chen dpal. Since this version was unclear and in part mistaken, Dmar ston corrected and rewrote the work under the direction of Sa skya Paṇḍita. Whatever may be the reality of this account, the commentary, without doubt, came from the atelier of Sa skya Paṇḍita.

³³ Textual Materials 4. Almost precisely the same story is recounted in a number of similar later commentaries on the same text, all obviously dependent on Dmar ston’s work. One may thus see the translation in Davenport 2000: 115–117 of the *Legs bshad pa rin po che’i gter gyi don ’grel blo gsal bung ba ’du ba’i bsti gnas* of Sa skya mkhan po Sangs rgyas bstan ’dzin (1904–1990), for a version with only minimal differences from that translated here. I am grateful for the help I have gained from this translation in making my own of Dmar ston’s text.

Previously in southern India there was a great city called Varuṇa.³⁴ A certain rich householder had no son, and hence he fell to entreating the gods. So after ten months, a son was born to his wife, and they gave him the name Mahādeva. In order to provide for a great celebration of his birth, his father went to sea in search of wealth, and he was gone on his journey for twelve years.

During that time the boy thoroughly grew up, and turned into a young man. He developed an unnatural desire for his mother, and then his mother bid him: “Son, if you want me to have sex with you and join up with you, after your father comes back from sea when he is about to arrive, lie in wait on the road and kill your father.” The son did as he was told, and concealing himself he killed his father on the road. A little while later, his mother got together with some other man, and so Mahādeva got upset, and killed his mother too. Later, there was an arhat who was his teacher, and while he was listening to some teachings from him he feared that due to his profound insight [the arhat] would make known to others [Mahādeva’s] earlier sins, so he murdered him too.

Then he became weary of the things he should not have done, and not wishing to stay in his hometown, he gave his household goods to someone who wanted them and went to a place near to Madhyadeśa. At that time, there had arisen a great famine in that land, and being unable to obtain a livelihood as a layman and seeing that monks were venerated and had their needs fully met, he found a rag robe in a charnel ground. Independent of any masters, he ordained himself, and adopting the guise of a monk, he settled in an outlying region.

When he went into the city to beg for his needs, owing to his previous circumstances he was not happy, and he dwelt with a displeased countenance. Over time, herdsmen who kept buffalo, goats and sheep saw him, and approached him. Mahādeva taught the Teachings to the herdsmen, making them profound and easy to listen to. When he told them that his appearance was due to his disgust with transmigration, they said: “This great meditator is cultivating his awareness of the impurity of the world. He is one who is a sincere true aspirant after the Teaching.” And they had faith in him, and honored him.

Through his renown based on his false front, he came to the notice of the townspeople, and at first the women and children made offerings to him, but gradually throngs of people gathered and offered great alms to him. At that time Mahādeva accepted things from those who had and stored them up, then donating them to those who had not, and [even] to those who already had enough, and so on.³⁵

Since he flattered the people, curried their favor, and abundantly agreed with their way

³⁴ I am not certain how to identify this place.

³⁵ The end of the sentence *de'i tshe lha chen gyis kyang yod pa las blangs shing sog 'jog byas te med pa la byin zhing gang ba len la sogs pa dang* | is difficult to construe, and I am not sure I have it right (and of course, the text may be corrupt). I thank Samten Karmay for his suggestions which agree with my tentative understanding.

of doing things, the people said: “The teacher is a person endowed with both religious and mundane knowledge, and truly compassionate—he is far greater than even a saintly arhat.” And so saying, they zealously and wholeheartedly made offerings to him of all the wealth they had. Even the rich opened their storehouses filled with the possessions accumulated by their ancestors, and gave them to him. He in turn gave them what they needed in the way of food, vegetables and clothing.

Although he had not obtained those qualities, he said: “I am an arhat. I have eliminated all defilements, done what needs doing.” And he seduced everyone with the deception that he had thoroughly surpassed the mundane state, and everyone thought: “He is truly perfect.” Some people motivated by faith, and a majority in order to procure a livelihood, requested ordination, and he consented. A crowd of people ordained, and gathered around him. Monks from elsewhere who had gathered for the sake of their livelihood vowed themselves to him, and he came to be surrounded by a retinue of some many hundreds of thousands of monks.

At that time, when he was there preaching the Teachings to his followers, in the early pre-dawn hours, he thought to himself: “Previously I had illicit sexual relations with my mother; because of that I killed my father; later I killed my mother; I killed an arhat, and I ordained myself, wasted gifts of faith,³⁶ and lied about having surpassed the mundane state.” Mindful of the sufferings he would endure in hell as punishment for taking advantage of many ignorant people, he thought about it and said three time: “Oh, how painful it is [oh, suffering]! How painful it is!”

Some of the students in the huts [in his monastery] heard him speaking like this, and the next morning they asked him: “Master, if an arhat is free of suffering, why did you loudly complain this morning at daybreak?”

The master said: “What are you talking about?”

They said: “You spoke in such-and-such a manner.”

The master said: “Didn’t you hear the rest?”

They said: “No, we did not hear.”

The master said: “I was naming the truths; I proclaimed: ‘Oh, its arisal! Oh, its cessation! Oh, the path!’ You did not hear the others.”

Even though the students were ignorant, they had some doubt because of all his different facial expressions, and one said: “Well then, master, if you are an arhat, why didn’t you know the answer to our question about the Teachings?”

He was worried, and said: “There are those like Śāriputra too, disciples who are messengers of the Teacher who are like this. The teacher alone has passed beyond doubt.”³⁷

³⁶ That is, by being a dishonest receiver of alms, he renders the charity of the givers void of the religious merit they would have gained by donating to a worthy recipient.

³⁷ An interesting idea! The allusion appears to be to the fact that certain disciples of the Buddha, while transmitting his ideas, did not understand them. This claim is commonly made about Ānanda (who is a

Everyone gathered there asked the master to show them a display of his magical powers.

“My arhatship was destroyed early this morning; I don’t have any magical powers.”

“Can they be destroyed?”

“Certainly. It is said that ‘Destruction is a quality of an arhat.’³⁸ In the same way, an arhat has the quality of ignorance mentioned earlier. He has the quality of looking after others. He has the quality of admonishing people.”

And although he carried favor with them in this way, to the dissatisfied assembly he said: “Nevertheless, I do have magical powers. There are mistaken interpolations and omissions in the scriptures preached by the Blessed One.”

It is said that after he died, he fell into hell.

Dmar ston’s version of this story clearly belongs to the same tradition as that recorded by his teacher Sa skya Paṇḍita and by Mkhas pa lde’u; probably the elaborations Dmar ston records are elements he heard from Sa skya Paṇḍita, or obtained from some source parallel to Sa skya Paṇḍita’s own. While the precise ultimate source(s) of this version of the story of Mahādeva are not yet clear, commentators belonging to the Sa skya school several centuries later specify that Sa skya Paṇḍita did not have a written source for his story, but rather relied on oral accounts. And indeed studies of other tales transmitted by Dmar ston also indicate that he relied very heavily on oral traditions, something which is suggested not only by the content of his tales but by the very language in which he recorded them, which is on the whole more akin to the colloquial than to the formulaic “translationese” characteristic especially of works rendered from Sanskrit.³⁹ On the other hand, Sa skya Paṇḍita’s own version, perhaps at least in part because of the constraints of its metrical form, is less flowery, and considerably less detailed. Concerning Sa skya Paṇḍita’s source of this tale, the Sa skya scholar Gser mdog paṅ chen Shākya mchog ldan (1428–1507) wrote:⁴⁰

perfect transmitter of the Buddha’s preaching, because not understanding the content he is compelled to recite it word for word, and not paraphrase, for instance—see Silk 2002), but it is an unusual suggestion to make about Śāriputra.

³⁸ Again, Mahādeva is being disingenuous: the destruction which is a quality of arhats is the destruction of their ignorance and other impediments to their awakening, not destruction in general, and certainly not the destruction of the very powers characteristic of the arhat.

³⁹ See the remarks of Roesler 2002b: 161, and 2002a: 435, as well as these two papers of hers *passim*. I am grateful to Dr. Roesler for her kind suggestions and assistance with this material, and for sharing with me the pages of Ęndon 1989: 129–130 relevant to our story. I regret that my ignorance of Russian prevents me from making full use of the contribution of this Mongolian scholar (now, I learn from Gene Smith, deceased). I am, however, very grateful for the kindness Andrey Fesyun (Moscow) showed me in obtaining a copy of this book (from Siberia!) and translating for me into English several relevant passages.

⁴⁰ In his *Sdom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye pa’i bstan bcos ’bel gnam mnam par nges pa legs bshad Gser gyi thur ma* (The Golden Scalpel of Elegant Explanations, being a Definitive Discussion of the Treatise [named] Detailed Analysis of the Three Codes), Tobgey 1975: 103a4–5: *mnam par dpyod pa gsum pa’i lan ni ldon dka’ ba yin te | lha btsun bsam yas pa’i bshad las | gnam ’di yang bod kyi slob dpon mams*

It is difficult to answer the third reflection: According to the commentary of Lha btsun Bsam yas pa:⁴¹ “This story is merely well known to Tibetan masters, but otherwise I have not seen it expounded in [any] Indian [source].”

In response to a number of issues raised by Shākya mchog ldan, but in particular discussing the origins of Sa skya Paṇḍita’s account, his contemporary and rival Go rams pa Bsod nams seng ge (1429-1489)⁴² displays his awareness of two traditions of a Third Council, one of which places it in Kusumapura (Pāṭaliputra) 160 years after the nirvāṇa under Aśoka, with the arhats and wise common monks ending up in Jālendhara (= Jālandhara) in the extreme Northwest. A second tradition, which concerns Mahādeva, dated 137 years after the nirvāṇa, involves the evil *Bhadra; 63 years after that time the Sthavira Vātsīputra again recited the teachings.⁴³ Then Go rams pa reports that Sa skya Paṇḍita (“the author of the treatise”) states that he heard from the report of his teacher that the Third Council was convened to refute the perverted teachings of Mahādeva. According to Go rams pa, since Sa skya Paṇḍita says that he heard an oral tradition, there is no need to adduce a source since the oral nature of the tradition is known from the literal meaning of the term “tradition.”⁴⁴

The conclusion to be drawn from these passages is that, at least according to a tradition current in the Sa skya school some two centuries after the time of Sa skya Paṇḍita, his recounting of the story of Mahādeva relied upon an oral tradition transmitted within Tibet, and not directly upon any written source of Indian origin.

In this light, it is of interest here that both Shākya mchog ldan and Go rams pa offer abbreviated versions of the story of Mahādeva, individually different however in a number of particulars from the versions cited by their Sa skya pa predecessors, Sa skya Paṇḍita and Dmar ston, and the Rnying ma pa Mkhas pa lde’u. Shākya mchog ldan’s version reads as follows:⁴⁵

la grags pa tsaṃ ma gtogs | rgya gar pa’i gzhung las bshad pa ma mthong zhing |. On this author, see Jackson 1983: 16–18. The work quoted here consists of the author’s own answers to a number of questions he had earlier posed to other Sa skya scholars concerning Sa skya Paṇḍita’s Three Codes. In addition to all his other help, I thank David Jackson for his correction of my translation of the title of this work. See also the note in Rhoton 2002: 34, n. 67.

⁴¹ Lha btsun Bsam yas pa’s commentary on the Three Codes of Sa skya Paṇḍita was counted by Shākya mchog ldan as one of the four best available commentaries. According to Leonard van der Kuijp, some years ago he saw a copy in Beijing, and there is some hope that it may be published eventually.

⁴² On this author, see Sobisch 2002: 26–28.

⁴³ The passage appears in his *Sdom pa gsum gyi bstan bcos la dris shing rtsod pa’i lan sdom gsum ’khrul spong* (Removing Errors Concerning the Three Codes Treatise: A Reply to the Questions [of Shākya mchog ldan]), found in *Sa skya pa’i bka’ ’bum* (Collected Works of the Sakya Founding Masters) (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1968-1969): 14.271.2.1–3.3 = ta 307a1–b3 = 62a1–b3.

⁴⁴ *bstan bcos rtsom pa po ’dis bla ma’i gsung sgros las lha chen gyi chos log sun phyung ba la bka’ bsdu gsum par thos zhes gsungs so || gtaṃ rgyud dang grags go ces dang | thos so zhes pa thams cad la lung khungs ston dgos pa’i nges pa med de | gtaṃ rgyud ces pa’i sgra don nyid kyis shes so ||*

⁴⁵ Textual Materials 5. I have translated the story, which is in some places extremely terse, in light of parallel accounts.

The following story is told: In the town of *Mathurā⁴⁶ there was a merchant's son named Mahādeva. He committed three sins of immediate retribution, and having repented, wondered if there was not some means by which he could expiate this sin. Then he heard a monk saying:

Even if someone has committed a serious crime,
He can eradicate it by cultivating goodness;
He could then illuminate the world,
Like the sun free of clouds.

And he renounced the world, gaining mastery over the Tripitaka. [Once] when it fell to him to recite the [Prātimokṣa-] sūtra in the assembly of many arhats, at the end of the sūtra he recited:

[Arhats] are gods beguiled by ignorance,
[For them] the path emerges out of verbal flow.
They possess doubt, are manipulated by others.
This is the teaching of the Buddha.

When the arhats disputed with him, saying “This is not the word of the Buddha!” a large group of young monks took their place to one side, and on account of this revolt in the monastic community, the division into eighteen [sects] came about. —So the traditional commentators explain.

The version cited by Go rams pa runs as follows:⁴⁷

In the south there was a merchant whose wife gave birth to a son. They named him Mahādeva, and his father went to sea in search of treasure. At that time, the son grew up and joined together with his mother. Hearing the news that his father was returning, he waylaid and killed him. Learning that his mother had slept with another man, he got angry and killed her too. An arhat, spiritual guide to the family, informed him of the fruits which result from evil, and thinking to himself “He knows the things I’ve done,” he killed him. Having committed three sins of immediate retribution, he subsequently went to dwell in a monastery. He taught many perverted teachings, and early one morning while he recollected the evil he had done, since he cried out “Alas, the suffering!” the assembly asked him the cause [of his exclamation]. He claimed “Since I was contemplating the Four Noble Truths, having directly perceived the truth of suffering I exclaimed it.” At that time, the assembly questioned him about the Three Jewels, the Factors of Awakening (**bodhyaṅga*) and so on, in response to which he deceived the group with lies saying: “I

⁴⁶ See note 20, above. The existence of the form *ma ru ta* for Mathurā here in the early fifteenth century shows that this is not an innovation of the late sixteenth–early seventeenth century Tāranātha.

⁴⁷ Textual Materials 6. I was able to locate this passage easily thanks to the detailed analytic outline of the text in Sobisch 2002: 461–479.

admit to arhatship, but I do not claim to be a Teacher. Those who teach tradition say: ‘Only the Buddha has passed beyond doubt and uncertainty.’” Having lived a life corrupt in so many ways, he died and was reborn in hell, it is said. The arhats refuted those perverted teachings, and held the Third Council—[so] I have heard.

Dmar ston’s story is entirely decontextualized, or we might perhaps say re-contextualized, since Sa skya Paṇḍita both provides an environment for his pithy single verse version by placing it in a section of his collection of aphorisms devoted to “bad conduct,”⁴⁸ and a context for his more extended version in the “A Clear Differentiation of the Three Codes” within which it fits into an overall “historical” argument for the necessity of his own work.⁴⁹ In these Tibetan retellings, however, there no explicit or even implicit connection to the Mahāsāṃghika-Sthavira schism, in marked contrast to the version in the *History* of Mkhas pa lde’u, which fits the story precisely into this context, namely as the background instigation for the sectarian split into the two primary monastic lineages. Nevertheless, in several of these versions including the decontextualized ones, the name Mahādeva is either explicitly or by implication connected with the utterance of the exclamation “Oh, how painful it is!” Moreover, in the versions directly associated with Sa skya Paṇḍita, his own and that of his disciple Dmar ston, and only slightly less explicitly in the version of Mkhas pa lde’u, Mahādeva is made to take advantage of the ambiguity of the expression, since he claims that the words his students took (and as we the audience know, took rightly) to mean “Oh, how painful it is!” should have been understood as “Oh, suffering!” as a proclamation of the first of the Four Noble Truths. Since Mahādeva is not really an arhat, but only pretending to be, he must make excuses for his inability to behave as an arhat should, demonstrating precisely the pattern of deception at the heart of his story, in which the Five Theses were generated as a result of Mahādeva’s attempts to explain away those of his actions which deviated from what was expected of an arhat.

In the core Indian versions of the Mahādeva story, the two having fled and living together as husband and wife, his mother encourages Mahādeva to kill an arhat who might reveal their true relationship.⁵⁰ In both Sa skya Paṇḍita’s and Dmar ston’s texts, the murder of the arhat takes place after the murder of the mother, and the revised motive for this third murder is the same. The source of this variant is unknown, but it is interesting to observe that that same variation is found in some Japanese sources, including the eleventh century *Konjaku monogatari* 今昔物語集 (Tales of Long Ago). There we read as follows:⁵¹

At a time now long ago, in India, four hundred years after the Buddha entered Nirvāṇa,

⁴⁸ I am not sure whether the explicit distinction into thematic sections is to be attributed to the author or to his commentators, but the internal structure is, in any case, quite clear.

⁴⁹ This understanding follows the outline of Go rams pa; see Rhoton 2002: 276.

⁵⁰ See my forthcoming *Riven By Lust*.

⁵¹ Yamada Yoshio et al. 1959: I.306, *kan* IV.33, “Tenjiku no Daiten no koto” 天竺ノ大天ノ語, translated by Mair 1986: 26–27 (which I have modified).

there was a man named Mahādeva in the land called Mathurā. His father had gone off across the ocean to another land on a commercial venture. In the interim, Mahādeva thought: “I will take for my wife the woman who is the fairest of face and most surpassingly beautiful in the world,” and though he sought her, he could not find her. He returned home, and seeing there his mother, fair of face and surpassingly beautiful, he thought: “There is no woman in the world finer than she.” And he took his mother to be his wife.

When they had lived together for several months, his father returned after having spent many months overseas, and was about to land. It occurred to Mahādeva: “Since I have taken my mother as my wife, should my father return he will certainly not think well of me.” And so Mahādeva went forth and meeting him even before he had stepped on shore, killed his father.

After this, while they were living together without concern, Mahādeva went away for a short time, and it happened that his mother went over to a neighbor’s for a spell. Mahādeva returned, and thinking: “She’s gone to the neighbor’s secretly and had intercourse with another man!” he flew into a great rage and, seizing his mother, beat her to death. And so it was that he murdered both his father and his mother.

Fearful of the ignominy which such conduct would bring him, Mahādeva left his native home and journeyed to a distant place where he took up residence. At that time it so happened that there was [at that place] an arhat-monk from his native land. When that arhat came to the place where Mahādeva was presently dwelling, Mahādeva looked at him and thought: “When I was in my native home, I killed my father and mother. Fearing the ignominy which such conduct would bring me, I came and dwelled here. Here I stealthily concealed the matter of the murder of my father and mother. However, this arhat has come around and he will certainly make it known to people. The best thing for me to do would be to get rid of this arhat.” And so he killed the arhat, and thus he committed his third sin of immediate retribution. After that, Mahādeva . . .⁵²

There is ample scope for the speculation that these two traditions, the Tibetan and the Japanese, might ultimately share a common inspiration, perhaps in a version of the tale that circulated in China but which itself is lost to us (or simply undiscovered or unnoticed so far). The near complete Japanese reliance on China for its Buddhism, including its Buddhist lore, either directly or through Korean intermediaries, is too well known to require recital here. In contrast, we must remember that it is only wholesale adoption of the thoroughly polemical claim that all the vital sources of Tibetan Buddhism stem from India that allows one to overlook the profound influences flowing, from the earliest periods, into Tibet from the east. Contrary to what the usual Indophilic Tibetan self-understanding would suggest, there is nothing whatsoever unusual or problematic in imagining possible proximate Chinese origins for narratives or doctrines found in Tibetan Buddhist sources, even in cases in which

⁵² The text breaks off at this point.

we can be quite sure that the ultimate origins of the stories or ideas in question do indeed lie in India. In other words, there is no *prima facie* reason to doubt that originally Indian Buddhist materials might have reached Tibet by means of China, and in fact we have voluminous evidence that precisely this did happen in any number of cases. This, of course, does not in turn suggest, much less prove, that this particular story transmitted by Sa skya Paṇḍita, Mkhas pa lde'u and Dmar ston came from or through China, but it does remind us of this possibility.

Although perhaps not one of the core legends through which Tibetans understood their Indian Buddhist heritage, the story of Mahādeva nonetheless is well known to influential Tibetan writers, at least from the early Phyi dar period onwards, and continues to be repeated, perhaps especially in Sa skya sources, down to the present day. It is not unlikely that further investigations will uncover yet more evidence of its influence, either as a historical trope or as a cautionary moral tale. Such research might also contribute to a clarification of the ultimate sources of the story in Tibet, and possibly to a greater appreciation of early influences on Tibetan narrative and legendary traditions from the east.

Additional Note

With the exception of Tāranātha, who refers to Mahāpadma as the son of Nanda, our sources appear to assume the existence of two kings, Nanda and Mahāpadma. This does not agree at least with what the Purāṇas tell us of dynastic history.⁵³ These vast and generally amorphous collections of Hindu lore and legend, which often pretend to be mere objective accounts of history, record Mahāpadma as the first king of the Nanda dynasty, and even specify that Nanda *is* Mahāpadma. These sources thus suggest that there were not two kings, one named Nanda and another Mahāpadma, but that Mahāpadma was “the Nanda,” which is to say the founding ruler of the Nanda dynasty.⁵⁴ If correct, and not due to transmissional error, this argues against any direct knowledge of these historical “facts” by the Buddhist author of the original account upon which all the others are based, whether that be Bhāviveka himself or, equally likely, some so far unknown predecessor. It is a further matter of considerable interest that these same Purāṇic sources see Mahāpadma as a degenerate monarch, son of a low-caste śūdra woman, and his reign as marking the end of the age of kṣatriya kings and the start of śūdra rule. Moreover, it is even suggested in this literature that Mahāpadma killed his father

⁵³ The best study of all relevant sources is that in Tsukamoto 1980; see his index s.v. Mahāpadma and Nanda. An attempt to chart some possibilities is found on p. 150.

⁵⁴ See for example *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* 4.24.20–21, translated in Wilson 1840: 183–184, and *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* 12.1.8, additionally referred to by Wilson. The verse in the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* reads: *mahāpadmapatiḥ kaścīn nandaḥ kṣatraravināśakṛt | tato nṛpā bhaviṣyanti śūdra-prāyās tv adharmikāḥ ||*. Śrīdhara Svāmin’s commentary *Bhāvārthadīpikā* explains: *nando nāma kaścīn mahāpadmasaikhyāyāḥ*, an explanation followed by other commentaries as well. The relevant texts are collected in Pargiter 1913: 25, translated p. 69 (with the main rendering being that of the *Matsya-*, *Vāyu-* and *Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇas*, with differences from the *Viṣṇu* and *Bhāgavata* in the notes.)

Mahānandin, last king of the preceding Śiśunāga dynasty. It is tempting to speculate about whether, despite some apparent ignorance of historical facts at least as they are presented in the Purāṇas, such unfavorable ideas about the character of Mahāpadma—transmitted to us in these same sources—may have been known to the authors of our histories, or rather to the author of the account(s) upon which they are based, and an association somehow forged, consciously or not, between a bad, degenerate and destructive monk and a degenerate and patricidal monarch. The negative portrayal of King Nanda in the (admittedly rather late) Buddhist *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* certainly does not contradict this hypothesis.⁵⁵ At the same time, we must confess that it may indeed potentially be contradicted by the fact that for the Purāṇas, one of the hallmarks of the degeneracy of the Nanda kings is precisely their support for heresies, namely Buddhism and Jainism.⁵⁶

Textual Materials 1

Tarkajvālā: Derge Tanjur 3856, *dbu ma, dza*, 149b5-150a2, corresponding to *Nikāyabhedavibhaṅgavyākhyāna* (Teramoto and Hiramatsu 1935: 22.9-23.10; Miyasaka Yūshō in Takai 1928/1978: 18.17-19.8):

yang gzhan dag ni 'di skad smra ste | bcom ldan 'das yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa nas¹
 bzung nas² lo brgya sum cu rtsa bdun lon pa na |³ rgyal po dga' bo dang |³ pa dma⁴ chen po
 zhes bya bas grong khyer pā ṭa la⁵ pu tra'i nang du sdud⁶ pa la sogs pa'i 'phags pa la⁷ ni yang
 len pa med pa na⁸ bsil ba'i dngos po thob par gyur ba na |³ 'phags pa 'od srungs chen po dang
 | 'phags pa spu chen po dang | gtong ba chen po dang | bla ma dang | re ba ta la sogs pa so so⁹
 yang dag par rig pa thob pa'i dgra bcom pa'i dge 'dun¹⁰ de ltar bzhugs pa na bdud sdig¹¹ can
 bzang po thams cad kyī mi mthun pa'i phyogs su gyur pa² dge slong gi cha byad¹² 'dzin pas
 dzu¹³ 'phrul sna tshogs bstan nas | gzhi lngas dge 'dun gyi dbyed chen po bskyed de² gnas
 brtan klu zhes bya ba dang | yid brtan pa zhes bya ba mang du thos pa dag gis¹⁴ gzhi lnga
 bsngags par byed | rjes su ston par¹⁵ byed cing de¹⁶ gzhan la lan gdab pa dang | mi shes pa
 dang | yid gnyis pa dang | yongs su brtags pa dang | bdag nyid gso bar byed pa ni lam yin te |
 'di ni sangs rgyas kyī bstan pa yin¹⁷ zhes zer ro || des na¹⁸ sde pa gnyis su chad nas gnas te |
 gnas brtan pa dang | dge 'dun phal chen sde zhes bya'o || de ltar lo drug cu rtsa gsum gyi bar
 du¹⁹ dge 'dun bye²⁰ nas 'khrug long gis gnas so ||

1) Teramoto/Hiramatsu (T/H): *omits* nas 2) T/H & Takai (T): *add* | 3) T/H & T: *omit* | 4) T/H & T: padma 5) T/H & T: pa ta li 6) T/H & T: *add*: par byed 7) T/H & T: phal for la 8) T/H & T: par for pa na 9) T/H: sor for so 10) T/H: adds yin no 11) T: adds to 12) T/H: byed for byad, *an incorrect emendation of the editors* 13) T: rdzu 14) T gi, with NP reading gis 15) T/H: *omits* par 16) T/H: *adds* | 17) T/H & T: *add* no | 18) T/H: de nas for des na 19)

⁵⁵ See Sāstrī 1925: 611.17, 21, again Sāṅkṛtyāyana in Jayaswal 1934: 31.3, 7, vv. 422, 424, and the speculations in Jayaswal 1934: 14–16, in which King Nanda is called the first among the vile, *nīcamukhya*. Jayaswal 1915: 75-9-2 is interesting for the lengths to which the author is willing to go to have history come out his way.

⁵⁶ See Hazra 1975: 206.

T/H: *omits du 20*) T/H: *phye for bye*

Textual Materials 2

Sdom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba of Sa skya Paṇḍita. The text is that printed in Rhoton 2002: 325-326 (with the passages numbered, somewhat arbitrarily, §§586-597). According to p. 28 of Rhoton's book (prepared for the most part by David Jackson), this text follows that in *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum (Collected Works of the Sakya Founding Masters)* (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1968-1969): 5:297.1.1-320.4.5 (*na* 1a–48b5):

sangs rgyas gsum rab dri med		bsdu ba dang po byas pa'i rjes
bstan pa dag par gnas pa na		yangs pa can gyi dge slong gis
sangs rgyas bstan dang 'gal ba yin		mi rung pa yi gzhi bcu byas
de la 'phags pa bdun bryga yis		chos log legs sun dbyung phyir
bsdu ba gnyis pa mdzad ces grag		de ltar dag par byas pa'i rjes
lha chen zhes bya'i dge slong zhig		bstan pa 'di yi chom rkun byung
de yis rang gi pha ma bsad		slob dpon yin pa'i dgra bcom bkrongs
mkhan slob med pa'i dge slong byas		phyi nas dgon par bsdad nas ni
sbyin bdag rnams kyi dad rdzas zos		blun po rnams kyi mkhan slob byas
blun po longs spyod can rnams kyis		phul ba'i zas nor char bzhin bab
skal med dad can 'dus pa yi		dge 'dun 'bum phrag du mas bskor
de nas brdzun rlabs chen po de		dgra bcom yin par khas blangs so
'khor gyis rdzu 'phrul zhus pa na		rdzu 'phrul tho rangs nyams zhes zer
rang gi sdig pa dran pa yis		smre sngags chen po bton pa la
sdug bsngal bden pa bos zhes bsgrags		de la sogs pa'i brdzun tshig gis
tshogs pa rnams kyi mgo bo bskor		'phags pa rnams la 'bul rgyu yi
dad rdzas rnams kyang de la 'gyur		rab byung blun po phas cher gyis
dgra bcom bor nas de la 'dus		sangs rgyas mya ngan 'das 'og tu
so so skye bos 'khor bsdu pa		de las mang ba med ces grags
de yi chos log bshad pa yi		rjes su slob ma rnams 'brangs nas
'khrul pa'i grub mtha' du ma byung		lha chen blun po de shi nas
sems can dmyal bar gyur ces grag		de yi log pa'i chos de dag
dgra bcom rnams kyis sun phyung nas		bsdu ba gsum pa byas zhes thos

Textual Materials 3

Rgya bod kyi chos 'byung rgyas pa of Mkhas pa lde'u. Chab spel tshe brtan phun tshogs 1987: 98.20–101.3:

de nas ston pa 'das nas lo brgya rtsa bcu lon pa'i tshe | btsun pa lha chen po zhes bya
 ba zhig tshong dpon gyi rigs las skyes pa zhig byung ngo | des pha tshong la song gi bar
 du ma dang nyal te | de nas pha log pa dang ma dang gros byas nas pha yang bsad do |
 der gtam ngan pa grags kyi dvogs nas yul gzhan zhig tu bros pa dang | de na sngar mchod

gnas byas pa'i dge slong dgra bcom pa gcig yod pa dang der 'phrad de des gtam ngan pa
bsgrags kyi dvogs nas sgyu thabs kyi sphyan drangs dug btang nas bsad | de nas ma yang
gzhan zhig dang nyal ba las phrag dog skyes te ma yang bsad do | de ltar mtshams med
gsum byas kyang de ltar lta ba ni ma log ste |

dge sbyor la bar chad med par byas nas | yul gzhan zhig tu phyin pa dang de nas dge
'dun nams la rab tu byung bar zhus pas gnang ste rab tu byung bsnyen par rdzogs par byas
so | de blo dang brtson 'grus che bas chos la nan tan byas pas | mkhas pa'i tshad du gyur
nas | yul de'i rgyal po dang yul mi kun gyis kyang bkur sti cher byas pas |

de la chags sems skyes te dregs pas brgyal nas rdzun du smras so | bdag gis ni dgra
bcom pa'i 'bras bu thob bo | zhes brjod pas | bsod nams skyes te rgyal pos sphyan drangs pas
| der rgyal po'i btsun mo la chags pa skyes pas khu ba thig pa 'khor gyis mthong nas | der
'phags pa yin na zag pa zad pas khu ba mi 'byung ba yin pa la | khu ba 'byung ba ci zhig
yin zhus pas |

de ni bdud kyi gtses pa yin te lha'i bu'i bdud bya ba mi slob pa'i sar phyin yang dge
ba la bar chad byed do zhes smras nas | slob ma nams spros pa la zhugs pa'i phyir na kha
cig la ni khyod kyi rgyun du zhugs pa thob byas | de bzhin du dgra bcom pa dang rang
sangs rgyas dang kun tu rgyu thob byas pas 'khor nams kyi gsol pa |

bdag cag ci yang mi shes na 'bras bu thob ches ci la bgyi lags zhes zhus pas |

ci kyang thob pa yin gyi zhes tshig mang du smras pas |

duz gzhan zhig na slob ma nams la chos log brdzun du smras pas 'gyod nas | mtshan
mo zhig gdungs te | kye ma kye hud sdug bsngal chen po'o | zhes bos pa las |

'khor nams kyi thos nas | ci nyes zhes smras pas |

ci yang ma nyes zer |

'o na kye ma kye hud ces pa ci ltar yin zhes zhus pas |

de ni ngas 'phags pa'i lam la dmigs te ma bos na mngon du mi 'gyur zhes smras so |
de nas 'khor nams la chos log smras pa nams tshigs bcad du bsdu te |

lha nams ma rig pa yis bslus |

the tshom can nams gzhan gyis 'jug |

lam ni sgra'i rgyun las 'byung ||

'di ni sangs rgyas bstan pa yin ||

zhes pa zhig lha chen po la gso sbyong gi res mos so sor thar pa don dus su brjod pas |
gnas de na thos pa shes rab dang 'bras bu thob tu nye ba bag re yod pa nams kyi tshig de
la dang brtags pas tshig 'di ni bka' las kyang 'gal | don las kyang mdzes par mi snang nas
smras pa | lha chen po tshig 'di lta bu ni ma smros shig [] 'di ni sang rgyas kyi bstan pa'i
'dul ba'i chos ma yin no | zhes smras pas | der tshig de las gleng langs te mtshan thog thag
rtsod par gyur | rgyal po dang blon po la sogs pas res mos kyi sdum yang ma bsdums nas |
sngon sangs rgyas kyi rtsod pa zhi ba'i chos 'ga' yang ma gsungs sam zer bas | kha cig na
re de ni gsungs so zer nas | 'o na gnas brtan pa ltar med ces gsungs pa nams phyogs gcig
tu byas | lha chen po ltar med ces zer ba nams kyang phyogs gcig tu bzhugs su gsol zhes

pas | de ltar gyi tshe na gnas brtan chen po'i phyogs ni rgan rim nyung shas chung ba zhig
 lus | lha chen po'i phyogs su ni gzhon rim dregs pa can dang dge 'dun grangs kyis mang
 bar gyur te | gnas brtan pa'i sde pa dang | dge 'dun phal chen pa'i sde pa gnyis su gyes par
 gyur to |

Textual Materials 4

Dmar ston's commentary is available in a number of editions; later commentaries are, at least in regard to the present story, heavily indebted to this version, and in fact repeat it with very little alteration.⁵⁷ The most commonly cited printed edition of Dmar ston's commentary is *Legs par bśad pa rin po che'i gter dan de'i grel pa: The Subhāṣitaratnanidhi of Sa-skya Paṇḍita with its commentary by Dmar-ston Chos-rgyal* (Gangtok: Sherab Gyaltzen, 1983—The title page states “Reproduced from the 1982 Lhasa Tibetan People's Publishing House edition”): 149–153. Another printed edition is that due to Tenzin Chhagdor (Delhi: Ladakh Institute of Higher Studies, 1968): 118–126, bound as a codex but handwritten. (This book, which lacks a title page and prints the publication information on the back cover only, contains separately the complete text of Sapaṅ's poem and Dmar ston's commentary. In the notes I call it D) Thanks to the kindness of Dr. Ulrike Roesler, I have also been able to see two blockprint editions of Dmar ston's commentary. According to Roesler 2002a: 431, n. 2, “one is from the Dar 'bag gzim khang/Lhasa, presently in the possession of the British Library (no. 19999.e.39 ...) and one ... filmed by the NGMPP [Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project—JAS] (running no. L5010, reel no. L474/9 ... vol. *kha* given in the margin ...). In the first blockprint (B) our story is found on folios 50a2–53b3, in the second (N) 27b7–29b6. With these sources, and having collated only our one story, it is impossible for me to produce a critical edition. What follows therefore is a reasonable approximation of the transmitted text, with only the most major variants noted. (N is a particularly erratic text.)

sngon rgya gar lho phyogs kyi rgyud grong khyer chen po wa ru na zhes bya ba na |
 khyim bdag phyug po zhig la bu med nas lha la gsol ba gtab pas | zla ba bcu nas khyim thab
 la bu zhig btsas te | de'i ming lha chen po zhes bya bar btags so || de'i btsas ston rgyas par
 bya ba'i phyir pha de rgya mtshor nor bu len du song ba las lam du lo bcu gnyis thogs so ||
 de'i skabs su bu de shin tu skye drag pas lang tshor smin nas rang gi ma la 'dod log
 spyod la zhugs te | de'i tshe mas bu la smras pa | bu khyod dang lhan cig tu dga' zhing 'du
 bar 'dod na | khyod kyi pha rgya mtho las slar log nas sleb tu nye bas lam du sgugs la pha

⁵⁷ Compare for instance *Legs bshad 'dod dgu 'byung ba'i gter mdzod ces bya ba bzhugs so / Wishing treasure of Elegent [sic] Sayings with Commentary by Sakya Paṇḍit Kun dGa rGyal mTshen* (Kalimpong: Sakya Khenpo Ven. Sangey Tenzin / Tibet Mirror Press, 1974): 134–137, and *Bsod nams rgyal mstha, Sa skya legs bshad kyi 'grel pa gsar bu'i dga' ston zhes bya ba bzhugs so* (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1999): 187–191. Leonard van der Kuijp also kindly sent me the few relevant pages from 'Phrin las don grub, *Sa skya'i legs bshad kyi trsa 'grel* (Qinghai: Qinghai People's Publishing House [mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang]/ distributed by Qinghai Xinhua Bookstore [mtsho sngon zhing hva dpe khang], 1995): 280–285.

gsod cig ces bsgo'o || bus kyang de bzhin du byas te gsang nas lam du pha bsad do || de nas re zhig nas ma des skyes pa gzhan zhig dang 'grogs pas | lha chen 'khrugs nas ma yang bsad do || de nas rang gi mchod gnas dgra bcom pa zhig yod pa de la chos ci rigs pa nyan cing yod pa la | de'i mngon shes kyis sngar gyi nyes pa gzhan la sgrog pas 'jigs te de'ang bkrongs so ||

de nas rang yang bya ba ma yin pa de rnams la yid sun te | gzhis der sdod snying ma 'dod nas | yo byad rnams su 'dod pa la byin te | yul dbus dang nye ba'i phyogs gzhan zhig tu phyin pa dang | de'i tshe yul phyogs der mu ge chen po byung bas khyim pa'i rten gyi 'tsho ba ma rnyed nas | btsun pa'i rten la dad cing 'tsho ba mod par mthong nas | dur khrod la sogs pa nas gos ngur smrig btsal te | mkhan slob la sogs par ma ltos par rang rtags rang gis khas blangs te | btsun gzugs su bcos nas yul de'i bas mtha' zhig tu gnas mal bcas te |

'tsho ba grong khyer du bsod snyoms byed cing de'i tshe yang sngar gyi rgyu mtshan la brten nas snying mi dga' ste | bzhin ldog nas bsdad pa dang | rim gyis ma he dang ra lug la sogs pa'i rdzi bo rnams kyis mthong nas | de'i drung du phyin pas | lha chen gyis ba lang rdzi la sogs pa rnams la chos bshad zab cing rna bar snyan pa dag gis gdams | 'khor ba la skyug log pa'i nram 'gyur bstan pa na | de rnams na re sgom chen 'di ni yul la mi sdug pa sgom zhing | snying nas chos byed pa'i skyes bu dam pa zhig 'dug zer te | dad cing¹ mos par gyur nas

sgro btags pa'i snyan grags kyis grong khyer gyi mi rnams la sbran pas | thog mar bud med dang byis pa la sogs pas bsnyen bkur byas | de nas rim gyis skye bo phal mo che 'dus te bsod snyoms chen po byung ngo || de'i tshe lha chen gyis kyang yod pa las blangs shing sog 'jog byas te med pa la byin zhing gang ba len la sogs pa dang |

kha gsag dang ngo bsrung la sogs pa'i mi'i chos lugs ches cher bstun pas | skye bo de rnams na re lha chos dang mi chos gnyis kar 'dzom zhing thugs rje che ba 'di lta bu'i gang zag ni | 'phags pa dgra bcom pa bas kyang ches khyad par du 'phags so zhes zer zhing mos nas 'dun pa thams cad kyis ci 'byor pa'i yon gyis mchod cing | phyug po rnams kyis kyang pha mes rnams kyis bsags pa'i bang mdzod kha phye ste | khong la phul bas khong gyis kyang gzhan tshul dang | tshod tshul dang gos zas la sogs pa'i mthun rkyen byin zhing |

kho bo ni dgra bcom pa'o || zag pa zad pa'o ||² bya ba byas pa'o || zhes de ma thob bzhin du mi'i chos las bla mar gyur pa'i brdzun gyis kyang thams cad bslus shing mgo bskor bas | thams cad kyi bsam pa la de bden yang dag snyam nas 'ga' zhig ni dad pa skye ba'i sgo nas phal cher ni 'tsho ba'i phyir rab tu byung bar zhus te gnang nas | skye bo phal mo che rab tu byung ste 'dus pa dang | dge slong gzhan yang 'tsho ba'i phyir 'dus pa rnams sdoms pas dge slong 'bum phrag mang po zhig 'khor gyi dkyil 'khor du 'tshogs |

de'i tshe rang gi 'khor rnams la chos ston cing yod pa'i tshe | nam tho rangs kyi dus su rang la bsam mno btang pas | sngar gyi ma la 'dod log spyad pa dang | de'i phyir pha bsad pa dang | phyis ma bsad pa dang | dgra bcom pa bsad pa dang | rang rtags rang gis blangs te | dad zas chud gsan pa dang | mi chos bla ma'i brdzun smras pa dang | sems can du ma'i mgo rmongs pa la sogs pa'i ngo bo dang nyes dmigs dmyal ba'i sdug bsngal rnams dran

nas | blo rdol du kye ma ho sdug bsngal lo || sdug bsngal lo zhes pa lan gsum smras so ||
de lta bu'i sgra de spyil po na yod pa'i slob ma 'ga' zhig gis thos te | nang par phyag
'tshal ba'i dus su | mkhan po dgra bcom pa sdug bsngal las brgal ba lags na | da nang tho
rangs sdug skad chen po smra ba'i rgyu ci lags zhus pas |

mkhan po na re ci zer cing 'dug |
de rnams kyis smras pa | 'di skad do ||
mkhan pos smras pa khyod kyis gzhan ma thos sam |
smras pa | ma thos so ||

mkhan pos smras pa kho bos ni bden pa bos pa yin te | kye ma kun 'byung | kye ma
'gog pa | kye ma lam | zhes bsgrags pa yin te | khyod kyis gzhan tsho ma thos par byas pas |
slob ma de rnams mgo rmongs kyang rnam 'gyur gzhan dang gzhan thams cad the
tshom du gyur pas | gcig na re | kwa ye mkhan po dgra bcom pa lags na chos dris pa la mi
shes pa ci byung byas pas |

de nga bas shā ri'i bu lta bu la'ang yod de | nyan thos rnams ni ston pa'i 'phrin bskyel
ba dang 'dra la | som nyi las brgal ba ston pa nyag gcig go ces so ||

der tshogs pa thams cad 'dus te | mkhan pos bdag cag la rdzu 'phrul bstan par zhu byas
pas |

nga'i dgra bcom pa da nang snga dro zhig pas bdag la rdzu 'phrul med do lo ||
de la 'jigs pa yod dam byas pas

shin tu'ang yod de | dgra bcom pa yongs su nyams pa'i chos can bya ba yin | zhe'o ||
de bzhin du snga ma de dgra bcom pa mi shes pa'i chos can bya ba yin | gzhan yang rjes su
bsrung ba'i chos can | bdag gsod par 'gyur ba'i chos can | rtogs pa'i skul ba dang ldan pa'i
chos can | mi g.yo ba'i chos can bya ba yod do ||

zhes ngo bstod de smras kyang de la 'khor rnams ma rangs par | 'on kyang kho bo'i
rdzu 'phrul te | bcom ldan 'das kyis mdo'i gseb tu lhad shor ro ||

kho yang tshe'i dus byas nas dmyal par lhung ngo || zhes grag go ||

1) B, D: da ni nga *for* dad cing 2) B, N *add*: bya ba zad pa'o ||

Textual Materials 5

Sdom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye pa'i bstan bcos 'bel gtam rnam par nges pa legs bshad Gser gyi thur ma of Shākya mchog ldan. Tobgey 1975: 102a7-b5:

'di skad thos te | ma ru ṭa zhes bya ba'i grong khyer du | tshong dpon zhig gi bu ma
hā de ba zhes bya ba'i ming can | mtshams med pa gsum byas pa zhig 'gyod pa skyes nas |
sdig pa de gshags pa'i skabs yod dam med snyam pa la | dge slong zhig na re |

gang gis sdig chen byas pa yang |
| dge ba byas pas 'byang bar 'gyur |
| de ni 'jig rten snang ba ste |
| nyi ma sprin dang bral ba bzhin ||

The Indian Buddhist Mahādeva in Tibetan Sources

zhes zer ba thos nas | rab tu byung ste | sde snod gsum la mkhas par byas so || des dgra
bcom pa mang po'i bdu su mdo 'don pa'i res la bab pa na | mdo'i mjug tu |

lha rnam ma rig pa yis bsul |
| lam ni sgra yi rgyun las byung |
| the tshom can rnam gzhan gyis 'jug |
| 'di ni sangs rgyas bstan pa yin ||

zhes bton pas | dgra bcom pa rnam kyis sangs rgyas kyi bka' ma yin par rtsad pa na
| dge slong gzhan pa phal cher gyis kho'i phyogs bzung bas | dge 'dun gyi sde 'khrugs pa
la brten nas | gyes pa bcwa brgyad kyi bar du song ba yin no || zhes lung gi 'grel byed dag
'chad do ||

Textual Materials 6

Sdom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba'i rnam bshad rgyal ba'i gsung rab kyi dgongs pa gsal ba
of Go rams pa Bsod nams seng ge. In *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum (Collected Works of the Sakya*
Founding Masters) (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1968–1969): 14.195.2.3–3.2 = ta 152b2–153a2 =
154b2–155a2:

de yang lho phyogs na ded dpon zhig yod pa'i chung ma la bu btsas pa dang | lha chen
po ming btags nas pha de rgya mtshor rin po che len du song | de'i tshe bu cher skyes te ma
dang lhan cig 'dus pha 'ongs pa'i gtam thos te | lam gol bar song ste pha bsad | ma yang
skyes ba gzhan dang nyal po byed par shes nas khros te bsad | rang gi slob dpon dgra bcom
pa zhig gis sdig pa'i rnam smin bshad pas | 'dis kho bo'i bya ba de dag shes so snyam nas
bkrongs te | mtshams med kyi las gsum byas nas phyis dgon par bsad de | chos log mang
du bstan | tho rangs rang sdig dran te | kye ma sdug bsngal lo | zhes bsgrags pas 'khor gyi[s]
rgyu mtshan zhus pas | 'phags pa'i bden pa bzhi bsgoms pas sdug bsngal bden pa mngon
sum du mthong nas bos ba yin no zhes zer ro || de'i tshe 'khor rnam kyis dkon mchog
gsum dang | byang chub kyi phyogs kyi chos la sogs pa dris pas | kho bos dgra bcom par
khas blang kyi ston pa yin par ma smras so || de dag lung ston pa ni | the tshom dang | som
nyi las brgal ba'i sangs rgyas 'ba' zhig go || zhes pa la sogs pa'i brdzun tshig gis tshogs ba
rnam kyi mgo bo bskor nas | log 'tsho mang du zos pas shi nas sems can dmyal bar 'gyur
zhes grag go || chos log de dag dgra bcom rnam kyis sun phyung nas | bka' bsdu gsum pa
byas zhes thos so ||

Literature

- Bareau, André. 1954–1956. “Trois Traités sur les Sectes Bouddhiques attribués à Vasumitra, Bhavya et Vinītadeva.” *Journal Asiatique* 242/2: 229-266, 244 / 2: 167–200.
- . 1955. *Les Premiers Conciles Bouddhiques*. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d’Études 60 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France).
- Black, Deborah. 1997. *Leaves of the Heaven Tree: The Great Compassion of the Buddha* (Berkeley: Dharma Publishing).
- Bosson, James E. 1969. *A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels: The Subhāṣitaratnanidhi of Sa Skya Paṇḍita in Tibetan and Mongolian*. Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 92 (Bloomington: Indiana University).
- Chab spel tshen brtan phun tshogs. 1987. *Mkhas pa lde’us mdzad pa’i Rgya bod kyi chos ’byung rgyas pa* (Lhasa: Bod ljong mi dmangs dpe skrun khang).
- Chimpa, Lama and Alaka Chattopadhyaya. 1980. *Tāranātha’s History of Buddhism in India* (Calcutta: K P Bagchi & Company).
- Dagyab, Loden Sherap [Brag g.yab Blo ldan shes rab]. 1989. *Bod brda’i tshig mdzod* (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives).
- Das, Sarat Chandra. 1908. *Pag Sam Jon Zang. Part I. History of the Rise, Progress and Downfall of Buddhism in India, by Sumpa Khan-po Yeçe Pal Jor* (Calcutta: Presidency Jail Press).
- Davenport, John T., with Sallie D. Davenport and Losang Thoden. 2000. *Ordinary Wisdom: Sakya Pandita’s Treasury of Good Advice. With a commentary entitled A Hive Where Gather Bees of Clear Understanding by Sakya Khenpo Sangyay Tenzin* (Boston: Wisdom Publications).
- Dorji, Tseten. 1974. *Five Historical Works of Tāranātha (Rgya gar chos ’byuñ, Kahna pa’i rnam thar, Bka’ babs bdun gyi rnam thar, O rgyan rnam thar Rgya gar ma, and Sgrol ma’i rnam thar)*. Reproduced from impressions of 19th century Sde-dge blocks from the library of Ri-bo-che Rje-druñ of Padma-bkod (Lohit, Arunachal Pradesh: Tibetan Nyingmapa Monastery).
- Ėndon, D[andaryn]. 1989. *Skazochnye Syuzhety v Pamyatnikakh Tibetskoï i Mongol’skoï Literatur* (Moscow: Nauka).
- Gelek Demo, Ngawang. 1973. *The Collected Works of ’Jam-dbyans-bzad-pa’i-rdo-rje, Reproduced from prints from the Bkra-sis-’khyil blocks*. Volume 14. Gedan Sungrab Minyam Gyunphel series 53 (New Delhi: New Statesman Press).
- ’Gos Gzhon nu dpal. 1985. *Deb ther sngon po* (Chengdu: Sichuan Minzu Chubanshe 四川民族出版社). [The author’s name is given in Chinese as Guo Xunnubai 郭循努白.]
- Hazra, R. C. 1975. *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*. Second edition (Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987).
- Jackson, David P[aul]. 1983. “Commentaries on the Writings of Sa-skya Pandita: A Bibliographical Sketch.” *The Tibet Journal* 8/3: 3-23.
- Jayaswal, K[ashi] P[rasad]. 1915. “The Saisunaka and Mauryan Chronology and the Date of the Buddha’s Nirvana.” *The Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 1/1: 67-116.
- . 1934. *An Imperial History of India, in a Sanskrit Text [c. 700 B.C. – c. 770 A.D], with a Special Commentary on Later Gupta Period* (Lahore: Motilal Banarsi Dass).
- Kanakura Enshō 金倉圓照. 1962. *Indo Chūsei Seishi-shi 印度中世精神史* (Reprint: Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1983).

- van der Kuijp, Leonard W[illem] J[ohannes]. 1996. “Tibetan Belles-Lettres: The Influence of Daṇḍin and Kṣemendra.” In José Ignacio Cabezón and Roger R. Jackson, eds. *Tibetan Literature: Studies in Genre* (Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion): 393–410.
- Lamotte, Étienne Paul Marie. 1956. “Buddhist Controversy over the Five Propositions.” *Indian Historical Quarterly* 32/2-3: 148-162.
- . 1958. *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien, des Origines à l’ère Śāka*. Bibliothèque du Muséon 43; Reprint Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 14 (Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1976.). An English translation is available: *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śāka Era*. Translated by Sara Webb-Boin. Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 36 (Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain Institut Orientaliste, 1988). My references are to the French original.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1909. “Councils and Synods (Buddhist).” In James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons): IV.179–185.
- . 1910. “The ‘Five Points’ of Mahādeva and the Kathāvattu.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1910: 413–423.
- Lokesh Chandra. 1971. *The Collected Works of Bu-ston*, Part 24 (YA). Śata-Piṭaka 64 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture).
- Mair, Victor. 1986. “An Asian Story of the Oedipus Type.” *Asian Folklore Studies* 45/1: 19–32.
- Martin, Dan, with Yael Bentor. 1997. *Tibetan Histories: A Bibliography of Tibetan-Language Historical Works* (London: Serindia Publications).
- Mimaki, Katsumi. 1982. *Blo Gsal Grub Mtha’* (Kyoto: Zinbun kagaku Kenkyusyo).
- Obermiller, Eugene [Evgenni Eugen’evich]. 1931–1932. *History of Buddhism (Chos ’byung) by Bu-ston*: I. Part: The Jewelry of Scripture. II. Part: The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet. Materialien zur Kunde des Buddhismus 18, 19 (Heidelberg: O. Harrassowitz; Reprint, Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1964).
- Pargiter, F[rederick] E[den]. 1913. *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age* (London: Oxford University Press; Reprint: Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1962 [Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 19]).
- Rhoton, Jared Douglas. 2002. *A Clear Differentiation of the Three Codes : Essential Distinctions among the Individual Liberation, Great Vehicle, and Tantric Systems. The sDom gsum rab dbye and Six Letters* (Albany: State University of New York Press).
- Rockhill, William Woodville. 1907. *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of His Order* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trübner & Co.).
- Roerich, George N[ikolayevich]. 1949. *The Blue Annals* (Calcutta; Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Barnarsidass, 1976).
- Roesler, Ulrike. 2002a. “The Great Indian Epics in the Version of Dmar ston Chos kyi rgyal po.” In Henk Blezer, with the assistance of Abel Zadoks, ed., *Religion and Secular Culture in Tibet*. Tibetan Studies II: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000 (Leiden: Brill): 431–450.
- . 2002b. “Not a Mere Imitation: Indian Narratives in a Tibetan Context.” In Alfredo Cadonna and Ester Bianchi, eds., *Faces of Tibetan Religious Tradition and Contacts with Neighbouring Cultural Areas* (Firenze: Leo S. Olschki): 153–177.
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1990. “On the authorship of some works ascribed to Bhāvaviveka/Bhavya.” In David Seyfort Ruegg and Lambert Schmithausen, eds., *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*. Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference: Kern Institute, Leiden: August

- 23-29, 1987. Vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill): 59–71.
- Sāstrī, T. Gaṇapati. 1925. *The Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (Trivandrum; Reprint: Delhi: Sri Satguru, 1989).
- Schiefner, Antonius [Franz Anton von]. 1868. *Tāranāthae de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione. Narratio. Contextum Tibeticum* (Petrograd: Imp. Academiae Scientiarum Petropolitanae).
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2002. “Possible Indian Sources for the Term *Tshad ma'i skyes bu as Pramāṇapurūṣa*.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30/2: 111–160.
- Skilling, Peter. 1982. “History and Tenets of the Sāmmaṭiya School.” *Linh-So'n—Publication d'études bouddhiques* 19: 38–52.
- Sobisch, Jan-Ulrich. 2002. *Three-Vow Theories in Tibetan Buddhism: A Comparative Study of Major Traditions from the Twelfth through Nineteenth Centuries*. Contributions to Tibetan Studies 1 (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag).
- Stearns, Cyrus. 2001. *Luminous Lives: The Story of the Early Masters of the Lam 'bras Tradition in Tibet* (Boston: Wisdom Publications).
- Takai Kankai 高井観海. 1928/1978. *Shōjō Bukkyō Gairon* 小乘仏教概論. Expanded reprint edition with supplements by Miyasaka Yūshō 宮坂宥勝 (Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房佛書林).
- Tāranātha. 1985. *The Collected Works of Jo-nañ Rje-btsun Tāranātha. Reproduced from a set of prints from the Rtag-brtan Phun tshogs-glin blocks preserved in the library of the Stog Palace in Ladak*. Smanrtsis shesrig dpemzod 16 (Leh, Ladakh: C. Namgyal & Tsewang Taru). The *Dam pa'i chos ring po che 'Phags pa'i yul du ji ltar dar ba'i tshul gsal bar ston pa dgos 'dod kun 'byung* reproduced here is an independently paginated handwritten copy, and does not belong to the xylographed sTog palace set reproduced otherwise in these collected works.
- Teramoto Enga 寺本婉雅 and Hiramatsu Tomotsugu 平松友嗣. 1935. *Zōkanwa sanyaku taikō Ibushūrinron, Ibushūseishaku, Ibusesshū* 藏漢和三譯對校・異部宗論・異部宗精釋・異部説集 (Kyoto: Mokudōsha 黙働社).
- Tobgey, Kunzang. 1975. *The Complete Works (Gsuñ 'bum) of Gser-mdog Pañ-chen Śākya-mchog-ldan*. Reproduced from the unique manuscript prepared in the 18th century at the order of Rje Śākya-rin-chen, the 9th Rje Mkhan-po Bhutan preserved at the Monastery of Pha-jo-sdins 'og-min-gnis-pa. Vol. 7 (Thimpu: Kunzang Tobgey).
- Tsukamoto Keishō 塚本啓祥. 1980. *Shoki Bukkyō Kyōdanshi no Kenkyū* 初期仏教教団史の研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林).
- Vassilief [Vasil'ev], V[asilii] P[avlovich]. 1863. *Le Bouddhisme: Ses dogmes, son histoire et sa littérature. Première partie, aperçu général*. Trans. G. A. La Comme (Paris: Auguste Durand / Benj. Duprat). Original Russian edition 1857.
- Vogel, Claus. 1985. “Bu-ston on the Schism of the Buddhist Church and on the Doctrinal Tendencies of Buddhist Scriptures.” In Heinz Bechert, ed., *Zu Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur I*. (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III,1). Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge 149 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 104–110.
- Walleser, Max. 1927. *Die Sekten des alten Buddhismus*. Die buddhistische Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung 4 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung).
- Wilson, Horace Hayman. 1840. *The Vishṇu Purāna, a System of Hindu Mythology and Tradition*,

The Indian Buddhist Mahādeva in Tibetan Sources

Translated from the Original Sanscrit, and Illustrated by Notes Derived chiefly from Other Purāṇas (London: Oriental Translation Fund Committee; reprint in vol. 9 of *Works of the Late Horace Hayman Wilson*, Fitzedward Hall, ed. London: Trübner Co., 1868; reprinted from the latter in vol. 4 of: New York: Garland Publishing, 1981).

Wogihara Unrai. 1932–1935. *Abhisamayālamkāraloka Prajñāpāramitāvyaḥyā*. Tōyō Bunko Publications Series D, 2 (Tokyo: The Tōyō Bunko. Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 1973).

Yamada Yoshio 山田孝雄, et al. 1959. *Konjaku Monogatari-shū* 今昔物語集 I. Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei 日本古典文学大系 22 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店).

2008.1.16

Instituut Kern / Universiteit Leiden

チベット語諸資料に現れる大天 (Mahādeva) の説話

Jonathan A. Silk

本論文はチベット語諸資料に現れる大天 (Mahādeva) の説話を論ずるものである。『大毘婆沙論』などのインド仏教文献では、根本分裂の原因は大天の五事だったとされている。これに関する説話は、チベット語で現存するテキストにも見受けられる。直接サンスクリット語原典から翻訳された仏典や論書の中だけでなく、チベット固有の文献にも同じ説話が語られている。Bu ston, 'Gos Gzhon nu dpal, Tāranātha 等の『仏教史』に言及される大天の説話の文脈は、第三結集 (Pāṭaliputra の結集) に関連して描かれているが、Sa skya Paṇḍita の *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi や *Sdom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba* と、それを詳述する後の、特に Sa skya 派のテキストに見られる大天の説話は全く第三結集と関係なく、「断章取義」的に挙げられている。本論文ではこのチベット語文献中の大天説話の有り方と、東アジアに見受けられる『今昔物語集』の大天説話との関係にも触れる。