

正觉学报

Journal of True Enlightenment

第 三 期

2011

正觉教育基金会 主办

True Enlightenment Education Foundation

正觉学报

Journal of True Enlightenment

第 三 期

2011

编 审 委 员

佛教正觉同修会亲教师团

曲立全 周子全

周焕铭 范锦明

张火庆 张志成

陈永宝

(按笔划顺序排列)

财团法人正觉教育基金会

True Enlightenment Education Foundation

ISBN 978-986-83966-9-2

正觉学报 — Issue 3

Journal of True Enlightenment

Editorial Board

The Teaching Group of True Enlightenment Practitioners Association

Chu Lichuan	Chou Tzuchuan
Chou Huannming	Fahn Jjinming
Chang Hwoching	Chang Chihcheng
Chen Yungpao	

Founder : Xiao Pings

Chief Editor : Pai Chihwei

Authors : Tsai Lichen, Pai Chihwei, Kao Heilin, Lin Weizen

Publisher : True Enlightenment Education Foundation

Address : 10th Fl., No. 267, Sec. 3, Chengde Rd., Datong
District, Taipei 103, Taiwan, R.O.C.

Telephone : 886-2-2595 6092

Fax : 886-2-2595 4493

Website : <http://scholar.enlighten.org.tw>

Version and Date : 1st ver., first print, 2011/12/31, 2000 volumes

Domestic Price : NT\$300/issue

Overseas Price : US\$ 15/issue

國家圖書館出版品預行編目(CIP)資料

正覺學報. 第三期 / 蔡禮政等作 ; 白志偉總編輯.
-- 初版. -- 臺北市 : 正覺教育基金會, 2011.12
面 ; 公分
年刊
部分內容為英文
簡體字版
ISBN 978-986-83966-9-2(平裝)

1. 佛教 2. 史學 3. 期刊

220.5

100027748

正觉学报 — 第三期

Journal of True Enlightenment

创 办 人 : 萧平实
总 编 辑 : 白志伟
作 者 : 蔡礼政、白志伟、高惠龄、林伟仁
出 版 者 : 财团法人正觉教育基金会
地 址 : 103 台北市承德路三段 267 号 10 楼
电 话 : 886-2-2595 6092
传 真 : 886-2-2595 4493
学 报 网 址 : <http://scholar.enlighten.org.tw>
版 次、日 期 : 初版首刷 2011/12/31 二千册
国 内 定 价 : 每期新台币 300 元
国 外 定 价 : 每期 15 美元

宗 旨

正觉学报的宗旨，在于弘扬释迦牟尼佛实证第八识如来藏而成就佛道的佛法义学，秉持学术界客观求真的科学精神，以合乎三量——至教量、现量、比量——的辩证方法，公平客观的引证态度，以及真修实证的立场，引导佛学界回归以实证为目标的佛法义学。

Mission Statement

The mission of the *Journal of True Enlightenment* is to spread **Buddha Sakyamuni's** doctrine of attaining Buddhahood through the personal realization of the eighth consciousness, Tathagatagarbha, and to guide the Buddhist academia back to the correct understanding of Buddhist sutras based on the scientific spirit of objectively pursuing the truth, the methodology of the three-ways-of-knowing—knowing by ultimate teachings, personal experience and logical inference, the fair attitude of citation, and the standpoint of both real practice and personal realization.

编辑序言

学术界经常使用西方史学的方法进行佛学研究，然而研究的结论经常不能令佛教界心悦诚服，乃至产生许多的冲突。这种采用西方史学方法进行佛学研究始自清末民初，研究者对于西方史学研究方法的采用，产生对中国史学的全面性冲击。于是史学界便有所谓的「疑古派」史学家不断地出现，成为近代史学研究的主要流派。疑古派的研究态度对于史学研究虽有所贡献，但是也经常产生荒谬不经的结论而贻笑大方，例如顾颉刚就是代表性人物。顾颉刚提出中国古代史是「层累地」造成，震撼中国古代史的研究；但是，他认为「禹是一条虫」，则又沦为史学研究的笑柄。为什么一位精于运用史学方法的学者，竟然会有评价这么极端的结果？答案是，疑古派以「不知为不有」作为研究的思想前提，导致凡是「不知的」就一定「不存在」的误谬。¹ 除此之外，东西方史学研究方法过于重视文字文献而缺乏实地证实的方法，其不足与错误也是导致误谬的重要因素。综合而言，对于西方史学思想与方法的全面采用，而没有反思其前提是否正确的能力，也就没有发现其谬误而加以批判的智慧，这样的研究必然导致研究成果品质的不稳定，乃至全盘皆错的境地。

同样的，既然学术界使用史学方法进行大众所熟悉之世俗世界的历史研究，尚且产生极大的错谬；若要对于本质上超越世俗世界，追求法界实相智慧的佛教来进行学术研究，如果研究者本身没有认识清楚生命与法界的本质与事实真相，也不相信佛教中有真实修行与实证实相智慧的事实时，有可能不犯下错误吗？对于这样的命题，我们并不学习疑古派所主张「怀疑一切」的错误前提与态度；相反的，本会一些研究人员以实事求是的研究精神，从符合传统佛教实证精神的三量原则，强调「实证佛教、实践佛学」的重要性，² 进行史学命题的专题研究，以论文的形式提出研究成果，并且通过审查。兹胪列本期采用的三篇论文如下：

- 1、真史学与新史学——以《阿含经》略论佛教的史学地位（蔡礼政）
- 2、史权、史责与史家（白志伟、蔡礼政）
- 3、佛学研究与历史想象——以阿含部经典略评吕凯文〈从两类《央掘魔罗经》探讨声闻经大乘化的诠释学策略〉（高惠龄、蔡礼政）

¹ 请参考杜正胜著，《新史学之路》，三民书局（台北），2004，页 98-101。

² 请参考《正觉学报》创刊号〈创刊词〉、〈编者序言〉，正觉教育基金会（台北），2007。

蔡礼政著作的〈真史学与新史学——以《阿含经》略论佛教的史学地位〉，系针对史学史的发展脉络中，近代梁启超以「新史学」之名，对于旧史学展开一系列有关于历史的定义、主体范围等等进行批判。而东西方史学界皆不约而同地以「新史学」之名，提出各种历史理论与哲学观念著作史籍，挑战前人的理论与哲学观点，乃至引发后现代主义对于传统历史主义的种种挑战；于是基于文献、文字、实物等等历史遗迹作为史学基础的传统史学几近于崩解，形成史学界「历史之死」的恐惧。因此，「新史学」的蓬勃发展，反而导致「历史之死」的危机。

该文认为不论新旧史学皆将历史寄托于文字、实物等等历史遗迹上，是对于历史的错误定义，正确的历史定义应以所有事实作为范围，而不以历史遗迹为限，并以此展开对于历史的性质、主体范围、功能等等的探讨。该文认为历史的性质具有过去性、现在性与未来性，并不仅止于传统史学所认为的过去性，或极少数史学家认为的现在性而已；而历史主体并不是仅有人类而已，历史主体范围应该要包括与人类共同生存的畜生道有情，乃至完整的历史主体则是十法界的一切有情。

该文认为新旧史学将历史寄托于文字、实物等等，必然导致后现代主义所质疑历史的断裂、不连续、想象、不实等不可避免的问题；若历史主体唯有人类，也必然导致人类眼光的狭隘与短视，最后危害人类本身的生存。因此，不论新旧史学所建立的史学皆是充满不实、想象，是对众生没有利益的假史学，也是自身矛盾而导致「历史之死」的假史学。真史学则以十法界有情各自皆有第八识如来藏作为判断历史主体的标准，如来藏的本体真实存在而能记录一切业行，并且显示名法（七识心）与色法（物质）之间的规律。依于第八识如来藏的真实存在所建立的真史学，才是符合法界事实真相的真正史学，才是有利益于一切有情的真史学。

由于该文厘清历史的基本定义、性质、主体范围与功能，并且针对新旧史学皆以名色作为内部逻辑的起点与终点，必然导致历史产生断裂、不连续的矛盾与不一致提出批判。该文提出以第八识如来藏作为史学内部逻辑的起点与终点，能使历史不再产生断裂、不连续的矛盾与不一致，重建史学的坚实基础与架构，足令史学起死回生。因此，本篇论文不但具有学术创见，而且深具开创性，未来将对史学产生根本性的影响，使历史学从危害有情的假史学时代，迈向利益一切有情的真史学时代。

白志伟与蔡礼政合著的〈史权、史责与史家〉，探讨新旧史学家著作史籍系从种

种事实中挑选部分事实而记述之；此种挑选事实的权利，即是史权。该文认为史学家应该为史权的实践负起史责，而史权与史责亦是因果对应关系的一种；新旧史学家著作史籍，多是错误地建立欲界爱中我所的价值与意义，导致人类彼此不择手段地争夺世间名闻利养而征战不已的情形加剧，这是史学家所必须负起教唆人类征战的责任，而且不能逃脱于法界因果律则之外；不管他们信不信有因果律则存在，法界的事实就是这样如实的呈现与纪录。在此也提醒史学家面对法界的实相，使真正的历史可以真实呈现而增上其利益有情的功能，达成以古鉴今而利益有情的功能，亦是真史学的一部分。因此史学家在行使史权的同时，必须对于应负的史责具有正确的认知。该文认为过去的史学家实践史权，研究历史事实、发现历史规律时，眼光乃是极为狭隘而短视，仅以极短暂的数千年人类历史，却想推演整个法界的历史规则，于是经常产生错误的结论。因此，一切史学家皆应该学习并宣扬真史学，以实证的方法扩大自己与一切有情的眼界，提升有情在法界中的功德，才是史学家应尽的史责。

该文依于史学家挑选历史事实的史权概念，扩充史家的范围以吻合十法界有情的真实相，才能究竟成就真史学。换个层面来说，如同记载过去历史的史学家一般，现代新闻从业人员与传播从业人员，皆在每日发生的种种事实中选择部分事实作为新闻而传播之，因此也都是实行史权的史学家，也都应该遵守史学家的道德伦理规范，同样也必须负起相对应的史责。从史权的概念再扩大之，则人人皆在生存的过程中，选择部分事实而对其认知，并且依此认知而造作种种事业，所以人人皆是史学家，也都应该为自己选择认知的事实，负起史责。该文探讨史权、史责与史家的范围，皆是史学界以往所忽略的领域，因此该文亦深具创见与开创性，是史学界难得一见的佳作。

高惠龄与蔡礼政合著的〈佛学研究 with 历史想象——以阿含部经典略评吕凯文〈从两类《央掘魔罗经》探讨声闻经大乘化的诠释学策略〉〉，探讨佛学研究应该以佛教的教理为核心，不应该以历史想象及错会文字后的判断作为核心，并以吕凯文的系列论文作为举例与评论的对象，显示史学研究方法若以历史想象、法义想象为核心，必然产生种种的谬误。该文认为吕凯文主张「声闻乘与声闻经是大乘与大乘经的宿主」，预设小乘声闻的历史先于大乘菩萨的历史，是预设立场而作先判的「大乘非佛说」的错误历史想象，并不符合历史事实。因为《阿含经》所记载的历史事实是：佛陀先成佛之后，才宣说小乘声闻法，不是先宣说《阿含经》小乘声闻法以后才成佛；而佛陀本身是世世修习菩萨道而成佛者，不是世世修习声闻解脱道而成佛者，

所以佛陀本身就是大乘菩萨法道最高的果证者，当然不该如吕凯文所说的只懂《阿含经》解脱道的阿罗汉，而是真实已成之佛；而且佛陀的继位者并不是声闻阿罗汉，而是弥勒菩萨。这些都是三乘共许的历史事实，由此便足以证明「大乘非佛说」之主张只是历史想象，而非历史事实。《阿含经》既已记载弥勒菩萨将于未来世成佛，是释迦佛陀的继位者，则已显示声闻阿罗汉的修证远远不如弥勒菩萨；此亦显示三乘贤圣同闻大乘经典的事实，证明小乘声闻亦是大乘经的听闻者，只是因为没有实证大乘法而听不懂大乘菩萨法，故不能成就念心所，无法详记大乘经的内容，所结集出来的大乘经典必然非常简略而唯有名相。因此，只有在「大乘法与大乘经是声闻乘与声闻经的宿主」的历史事实作为前提下，历史事实与佛教教理才能达到一致性而没有任何矛盾存在，这样才是完备而且符合事实的佛学研究，才能符合佛法弘传的真实历史。

除此之外，该文认为吕凯文预设佛教的小乘声闻与大乘菩萨二者间只存在着不可共量性，也是无知于历史事实与佛教教理的错误观念。因为佛教教理存在着至少四种位阶的共量与不共量，但是只有一种大乘典范存在，小乘只是大乘入门的初阶而非典范。四种位阶从最下阶到最上阶为：六凡业道众生、小乘声闻（含摄缘觉）、大乘菩萨与佛陀。其中最下阶六凡业道众生的境界，是四种位阶皆可共量的境界，小乘声闻的境界是小乘声闻、大乘菩萨与佛陀等三种法道有情皆可共量的境界，如此依序类推；反之，佛陀的境界具有其余下三阶所不可共量的性质，菩萨的境界具有余下二阶所不可共量的性质，如此依序类推。而小乘声闻、大乘菩萨与佛陀三个位阶，是三种并立的阶梯，是适应于五浊恶世众生根器，可以循序渐进往上修行的阶梯，而以佛陀为唯一的典范，并没有典范转移或消灭的问题。

该文对于吕凯文论文所采用史学研究方法的错误前提，以及方法运用上专业不足的现象，提出种种精彩的评论，不但具体可见现代西方史学方法的不足与错误的前提假设，亦可一睹真正不掉入历史想象的佛学研究所应具备佛法知见的专业性。该文对于佛教教理的阐述，以及对于史学研究方法的评论极富创见，亦是值得肯定的作品。

根据上述三篇论文的简介可知，新旧史学对于历史本身的定义、性质、主体范围与功能等等最基本的内涵，不但不能正确认知与建立，而且所采用的史学理论与方法也无助于反思史学的困境，而寻得解决之道。由此可见，历史学是目前人类发展过程中，仍然只是一门粗具雏型而尚未成熟的学科，因为人类可知的历史只是极

为短暂的数千年而已。这样一门粗具雏型而尚未成熟的学科，其采用的研究方法也是极为幼稚而令人啼笑皆非。因为法界的事实真相中最关键而且是史学中最切身的事实与命题是：是否存在第八识如来藏作为一切生命的基础？而这样关于存在与否的命题，绝非只以极为幼稚的史学研究方法——「对比」古今中外的文献——所能解决，特别要指出的是绝非取材于古时凡夫所写下的文献所能解决，也不是分析语源发展、语意逻辑等等解读文字的史学方法所能解决。

实证佛教所宣说的声闻解脱法门，或者菩萨实相智慧法门，乃至佛地的福德智慧双具的境界，皆是以第八识如来藏真实存在，作为亲证声闻解脱、亲证菩萨实相智慧，或者成就究竟佛道的基础。因此，只有实证的方法，才能补足佛教史学乃至世间史学的研究方法；凡是不采用实证方法，仅以实证方法以外的史学方法——特别是以文字训诂的方法——进行的佛学研究、历史研究或者哲学研究，皆不能真正完整的解决问题。本期学报三篇关于历史学的论文所申论者，正好显示这样的事实。祈请佛教界与学术界的贤达人士，共同思考其中的道理，并齐步迈向亲证解脱与智慧的真史学境界。

总编辑

白志伟 谨识

公元 二〇〇九年十二月十六日

Editorial Note

The academia usually applies the Western historiographical methodology to Buddhist studies. However, most of the research conclusions cannot convince the Buddhist society and even cause a lot of conflicts. The application of Western historiographical methodology to Buddhist research started from the late Ching and early Republican era. Due to the adoption of this methodology, it makes a great impact on the Chinese historiography, and thus the historians of so-called the Yigupai (the Doubting Antiquity School) continuously appear in the academia of historiography and become the main stream of the research in modern historiography. Although the research attitude of the Doubting Antiquity School contributes something to historiography, this attitude often makes some ridiculous conclusions and becomes a joke. For example, Gu Jiagang is a case in point; he proposed the theory that the history of ancient China was created “layer upon layer,” which shocked the researchers of the Chinese ancient history study; however, his viewpoint that “Yu is a worm” also became a joke. Why does a scholar who masters the methodology of historiography surprisingly have such extremely different evaluation results? The answer is that the Doubting Antiquity School uses the assumption that “those unknown must be nonexistent” as the logic premise of its research, and therefore it results in the false belief that anything “unknown” must be “nonexistent.” In addition, both Eastern and Western research methods on historiography overemphasize the method of documental study rather than actual realization; the insufficiency and errors of the method are the important factors in making wrong conclusions too. In sum, the completely adoption of the thought and method of Western historiography, yet without the capability to examine if the premise is correct or not, will make one lack of the wisdom to discover and criticize the errors. This way of research will definitely lead to the unreliable research results or even to a complete mistake.

With the application of historiographical method, the academia has made severe mistakes even in the historical research of the mundane world, which the public are familiar with; with the same methodology, if the academic research is about Buddhism, which is in essence beyond the mundane world and pursues the ultimate-reality wisdom of the dharma-realm, and if the researchers do not clearly understand the essence and true reality of both life and dharma-realm or believe the truth that there are real practice and actual realization of the ultimate-reality wisdom in Buddhism, how could it be possible not to make mistakes? For such a kind of proposition, we do not follow the wrong premise and attitude of “doubting everything” which is claimed by the Doubting Antiquity School; on the contrary, some researchers of our Association undergo the research of the proposition of historiography with the attitudes of finding the truth, conforming to the principle of three-valid-cognition-ways that is consistent with the traditional Buddhist positivism, and emphasizing the importance of “Positivist Buddhism and Practical Buddhist Study.” They submitted their research results with the format of thesis and have passed our review

process. The following three papers have been accepted in this issue:

1. True Historiography versus New Historiography—A Brief Discussion on the Position of Buddhism in Historiography Based on *The Agama Suttas* (Tsai Lichen)
2. Historical Right, Historical Responsibility and Historians (Pai Chihwei and Tsai Lichen)
3. Buddhist Research versus Historical Imagination—A Brief Comment on Kevin Lu's "How Did Mahayana Buddhism Reform Savaka Sutta?: On Mahayana's Hermeneutical Strategies by Two Kinds of Buddhist Paradigms of *Arigulimāla Sutta*" Based on *The Agama Suttas* (Kao Huiling and Tsai Lichen)

Tsai Lichen's article "True Historiography versus New Historiography—A Brief Discussion on the Position of Buddhism in Historiography Based on *The Agama Suttas*" criticizes, from the development history of historiography, the modern scholar Liang Qichao who challenged the viewpoints of old historiography about the definition of history, the scope of subject, etc. in the name of "new historiography"; at the same time, both Eastern and Western historiographical societies proposed various historical theories and philosophical concepts in their articles in the name of "new historiography" to challenge the former scholars' theories and philosophical concepts, and it even provoked the challenges from postmodernism to the traditional Historicism. As a result, the traditional historiography, which is based on the historical remains such as documents, texts, actual materials, etc., almost collapsed, and the fear of the "death of history" was raised in the historiographical society. Therefore, the flourishing of "new historiography" reversely results in the crisis of the "death of history."

Tsai thinks it is a wrong definition of history that both new and old historiographies all study the history based on the historical remains such as texts, actual materials, etc. The correct definition of history should be based on all facts, rather than the historical remains, to explore the natures, scope of subject, functions, etc. of history. This article thinks the natures of history possesses the characters of past, present and future rather than the character of past thought by the traditional historiography or the character of present thought by very few historians. In addition, the subject of history includes not only human beings; its scope should also include the animals that coexist with human beings. The complete subject of history should even include all sentient beings of the ten dharma-realms.

The article thinks both new and old historiographical researches based on texts, actual materials, etc. will definitely lead to the inevitable problems of breakage, discontinuity, imagination, untruth, etc. of history, which are questioned by postmodernism. If the subject of history only includes human beings, it will definite lead to the narrow and short vision of human beings, and endanger the survival of human beings finally. Therefore, both the new and old historiographies are full of untruth and imagination, and are the false historiographies which cannot benefit the sentient beings. They are also the false historiographies that conflict with each other and result in the "death of history." The

true historiography uses the eighth consciousness Tathagatagarbha, which each sentient being in the ten dharma-realms has, as the criteria to judge the subject of history. The original entity of Tathagatagarbha really exists and can record all karmic deeds; it also can manifest the rules between the name dharma (the seven consciousnesses) and the form dharma (the materials). The true historiography based on the real existence of Tathagatagarbha is the real one that conforms to the true reality of the dharma-realm and can benefit all sentient beings.

The article clarifies the basic definition, properties, scope of subject and functions of history, and criticizes both new and old historiographies for their using the name-and-form as the starting and ending points of internal logic, which will surely lead to the conflict and inconsistency of breakage and discontinuation in history. The article proposes that Tathagatagarbha acts as the starting and ending points of internal logic in historiography, and it can avoid the conflict and inconsistency of breakage and discontinuation in history. This viewpoint rebuilds a firm, solid base and structure for historiography and makes it become alive again. In summary, this article is not only innovative in the academic field but also pioneering; it will produce a fundamental influence on the historiography in the future and let the historiography progress from the age of the false one that endangers sentient beings to the age of the true one that can benefit all sentient beings.

“Historical Right, Historical Responsibility and Historians,” coauthored by Pai Chihwei and Tsai Lichen, explores the behavior that both the new and old historians write about history based on partial facts selected from all facts; this kind of right to select the facts is the historical right. This article thinks the historians should take the responsibility for the implementation of historical right; the historical right and historical responsibility are a kind of relation between cause and effect. While writing about history, most of the new and old historians wrongly build the value and significance based on the self-belongings of desire-realm, which lead to more and more fights for the worldly fame and wealth among human beings. These historians should be responsible for inciting people to fight; they also cannot be free from the rules of cause-and-effect in the dharma-realm; no matter they believe the existence of cause-and-effect rules or not, the facts of the dharma-realm are manifested and recorded truthfully. The article also reminds the historians to face the true reality of the dharma-realm so that the real history can be truly manifested and enhance its function of correcting current behavior through history to benefit sentient beings. This is a part of the true historiography too. Therefore, while performing the historical right, the historians should precisely understand the historical responsibility which they should take at the same time. The article thinks, when implementing the historical right to study the facts of history and find its rules, the past historians’ vision is very narrow and short; only based on the extremely short human history of several thousand years, they try to deduce the historical rules of the whole dharma-realm, and thus often come to the wrong conclusions. Therefore, all historians should learn and propagate the true historiography, broaden both their and all sentient beings’ outlook with the method of actual realization, and enhance all sentient beings’ merits and virtues of the

dharma-realm; these are the responsibility which the historians should take.

Based on the concept of historical right that historians choose the historical facts, this article broaden the job scope of historians to conform to the true fact of the ten dharma-realm sentient beings, and therefore ultimately achieves the practice of the true historiography. From another aspect, the same as the historians who record the history, all modern staff of news and media select parts of the facts from various facts happened every day as the news and disseminate them; they are all the historians who perform their historical rights; therefore, they should comply with the historians' ethic regulations and take the corresponding historical responsibility as well. From an extended concept of historical right, everyone, when living, selects parts of the facts, recognizes them and performs various karmic deeds according to the recognition; therefore everyone is the historian too and should take the responsibility of historical right for his selected recognition of the facts. The article researches the scope of historical right, historical responsibility and historians, which have been neglected by the historiographical society before. It is also a highly innovative and pioneering article which is an excellent work seldom found in the historiographical field.

“Buddhist Research versus Historical Imagination—A Brief Comment on Kevin Lu’s ‘How Did Mahayana Buddhism Reform Savaka Sutta?: On Mahayana’s Hermeneutical Strategies by Two Kinds of Buddhist Paradigms of *Arigulimāla Sutta*’ Based on *The Agama Sutras*,” coauthored by Kao Huiling and Tsai Lichen, explores the concept that Buddhist studies should use the doctrines of Buddhism as the kernel rather than the historical imagination and wrong judgment from the misunderstanding of texts. By citing Kevin Lu’s series papers as examples and commenting on them, this article shows that the research method of historiography will make various mistakes if using the historical imagination and doctrinal imagination as the kernel. The article thinks Kevin Lu’s claim about “Sravakayana and the Sravakayana sutras being the host of Mahayana and the Mahayana sutras” and his presupposition about the Sravakayana history preceding the Mahayana history are a wrong historical imagination of “Mahayana being not the Buddha’s teaching” posited by him, and do not conform to the historical facts. The facts recorded in *The Agama Sutras* are: After the Buddha had attained the Buddhahood, He expounded the Sravakayana dharma of Hinayana; it is not that the Buddha became a Buddha after He preached the Sravakayana dharma; the Buddha’s achievement of Buddhahood resulted from practicing the dharma of Mahayana Bodhisattva-Way in His past lives rather than practicing the dharma of Sravakayana Liberation-Way; therefore the Buddha is the realizer of the highest achievement of Mahayana Bodhisattva-Way. The Buddha is a real Buddha who had attained the Buddhahood at that time, but not an *arhat* who only know the Liberation-Way of *The Agama Sutras*, as claimed by Kevin Lu. In addition, the successor of the Buddha is not an *arhat* of Sravakayana but is Bodhisattva Maitreya. All these are the historical facts admitted by the three-vehicle practitioners. The above evidence can prove that “Mahayana being not the Buddha’s teaching” is only historical imagination but not a historical fact. Because *The Agama Sutras* record that Bodhisattva Maitreya

will become a Buddha in the future and is the successor of the Buddha, it manifests the fact that the realization level of the *arhats* is far below that of Bodhisattva Maitreya. It also shows the fact that all the sages and saints of the three-vehicles heard the Mahayana teachings at the same time, and proves that the Hinayana sound-hearers had heard the Mahayana teachings too. Due to not having actually realized the Mahayana dharma, these sound-hearers could not understand the dharma of Mahayana Bodhisattva-Way so as to be unable to fulfill the mental function of mindfulness; because they could not memorize the contents of Mahayana teachings, the Mahayana sutras which they collected are very rough and include the Buddhist terms only. Therefore, only under the premise of the historical fact that “Mahayana and the Mahayana sutras are the host of Sravakayana and the Sravakayana sutras,” the historical facts and the Buddhist doctrines can be consistent with each other. Only this way will the Buddhist studies be complete and in conformity with the facts, and can be consistent with the true history of the propagation of the Buddha dharma.

In addition, the article thinks Kevin Lu’s presupposition about only incommensurability between Hinayana Sravakayana and Mahayana Bodhisattva in Buddhism is also a wrong concept which results from the ignorance of the historical facts and Buddhist doctrines. In fact, in Buddhist doctrines, both commensurability and incommensurability exist in at least four stages: but there exists only one model of Mahayana and Hinayana is merely the elementary stage for entering Mahayana rather than a model. The four stages are, in order from the lowest to the highest, the sentient beings of the six ordinary karmic paths, Hinayana Sravakayana (including Pratyekabuddha), Mahayana Bodhisattva, and Buddha. Among them, the state of the lowest stage of the six ordinary karmic paths is a state that can be measured by all sentient beings of the four stages; the state of Hinayana Sravakayana is a state that can be measured by all sentient beings of Hinayana Sravakayana, Mahayana Bodhisattva and Buddha. The same scenario can be applied to the higher stages. On the other hand, the state of Buddha possesses the characters that cannot be measured by the sentient beings of the lower three stages; the state of Bodhisattva possesses the characters that cannot be measured by the sentient beings of the lower two stages, and so on. The three stages, Hinayana Sravakayana, Mahayana Bodhisattva and Buddha, are the three stages existing at the same time for the sentient beings of the evil world of five turbidities; they can progress toward the higher stages through gradual practice step by step in sequence, with the Buddha stage as the only model, and there does not exist the problem about paradigm shift or extinction.

The article brings up various excellent comments on Kevin Lu’s papers about the wrong premise of research method in historiography and the phenomenon of professional insufficiency in applying the methods. It provides an actual example for us to see the insufficiency and wrong premise or assumption in the research method of modern Western historiography, and also to see that a professional Buddhist researcher should possess sufficient Buddhist knowledge so as not to fall into