

## The Role of *Prātimokṣa* Expansion in the Rise of Indian Buddhist Sectarianism

Charles S. Prebish

Utah State University

IN CURRENT BUDDHOLOGY, there are two primary but opposing hypotheses to explain the beginnings of Indian Buddhist sectarianism. The first, advocated by Andre Bareau, presumes the schism that separated the Mahāsāṃghikas and Sthaviras to have resulted from disciplinary laxity on the part of the future Mahāsāṃghikas, coupled with concerns over five theses predicated by the monk Mahādeva. The second hypothesis, more recently promulgated by Janice Nattier and myself, suggests that the initial schism resulted not from disciplinary laxity but solely from unwarranted expansion of the root *vinaya* text by the future Sthaviras.

One of the major features of the second thesis revolves around the degree to which it can be demonstrated that the Sthaviras may have expanded the root *vinaya* text. A comparison of two very early *vinayas*, the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin's (in Sanskrit) and the Theravādin's (in Pāli), amply shows that the two texts bear remarkable coincidence in all but one category: the *śaikṣa-dharmas* (simple faults or misdeeds, the least serious category of precepts). In that category, the Mahāsāṃghika text posits sixty-seven items, while the Theravāda text posits seventy-five. To date, no scholars have addressed this circumstance with specificity. Consequently, this paper examines the *śaikṣa-dharmas* of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* of each *nikāya*, isolating the divergent rules and relating them to the significant, major concerns expressed at the second council of Vaiśālī, an arguably historical event that predated the actual sectarian split in early Indian Buddhism by no more than a few decades. The paper argues that the divergent rules in the two *nikāyas* demonstrate an attempt on the part of the future Sthaviras to circumvent a potential *saṃghabheda*, or schism within the order, by

making more explicit the general areas of disagreement that precipitated the second council. In so doing, they inadvertently provoked the split they were so diligently trying to avoid.

Prior to Marcel Hofinger's *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī* (published in 1946), it was rather ordinary to assign the beginnings of Buddhist sectarianism to the events surrounding the council of Vaiśālī and conclude that the initial schism that separated the Mahāsāṃghikas from the Sthaviras in early Indian Buddhism resulted from the dual problematic of disciplinary laxity on the part of the future Mahāsāṃghikas and the famous five theses of the monk Mahādeva focusing on the nature of the *arhant*. This council has received a substantial amount of consideration in the scholarly literature,<sup>1</sup> and the bulk of it does not need to be rehearsed here. Nor is it necessary to consider new information regarding the date of the historical Buddha that casts fresh light on the specific date of the Vaiśālī council.<sup>2</sup> What does need to be considered is a review of the most recent general conclusions regarding the Vaiśālī council.

With the possible exception of R. O. Franke and Paul Demiéville,<sup>3</sup> virtually all scholars agree that the Vaiśālī council was an historical event. While Hofinger states it quite directly: "The council of Vaiśālī is not a fiction," Bareau is indirect: "We see, therefore, that the hypothesis of the historicity of the council of Vaiśālī appears as much more defensible than the contrary hypothesis."<sup>4</sup> Several *vinayas* (namely, the Mahāsāṃghika, Sarvāstivādin, Theravādin, and Dharmaguptaka) even identify the site of the council as the Vālukārāma, although this may be a later addition. Further, all sources agree that the primary focus of the event was the now well-known issue of the ten illicit practices of the Vṛjiputraka *bhikṣus* of Vaiśālī. Nonetheless, there is serious disagreement on the interpretation of the council proceedings. While Hofinger has admirably traced the rejection of all ten points in the Pāli *pātimokkha*,<sup>5</sup> Demiéville aggressively pursues the thesis of Mahāsāṃghika laxity on the basis of the mention of only one of the ten points (i.e., the possession of gold and silver) in their council record. He writes, "Consequently, even on the single point of discipline which the Mahāsāṃghikas mention in their recitation of the council of Vaiśālī, their Vinaya turns out to be infinitely more lax than the Pāli Vinaya."<sup>6</sup> However, even a cursory study of the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya* reveals that all ten points are included therein, and Bareau documents

this carefully using the Chinese version of the text (*Taishō* 1425). He concludes about the Mahāsāṃghikas:

If they do not speak of the 9 other customs, this is not because they approved of them, since they implicitly condemn them elsewhere. . . . The 9 customs of the monks of Vaiśālī, therefore, could not have been one of the causes of the schism which separated the Mahāsāṃghikas from the Sthaviras, as the Sinhalese chronicles affirm and, following them, certain historians of Buddhism. In fact, the two sects were in accord on this point, as M. Hofinger has well shown.<sup>7</sup>

A study of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin texts preserved in Sanskrit yields a similar result.<sup>8</sup> Additionally, the Mahāsāṃghikas could not be considered as easterners (i.e., the Prācīnaka, or the same title as the Vṛjiputrakas), as Hofinger would like to maintain (by adjusting the geographical tension theory of Przyluski<sup>9</sup> so as to categorize the Sthavira, Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, and Sarvāstivādin *nikāyas* as westerners). On this point, Bareau asserts, “It is without doubt imprudent to draw conclusions on the primitive geographical redress of the sects from indications as fragmentary as those furnished by our recitations.”<sup>10</sup> Although Demiéville has serious doubts about the historicity of the Vaiśālī council, he does suggest:

For my part, I cannot refrain from seeing in the tradition relative to the council of Vaiśālī, above all, a reflection of this conflict between rigorism and laxism, between monasticism and laicism, between “sacred” and “profane,” which traverses all the history of Buddhism and which, after having provoked the schism between the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas, is expressed later by the opposition between Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna.<sup>11</sup>

Despite Demiéville’s aggressive claim to the contrary, there is nothing in any of the *vinaya* council accounts of the various *nikāyas* that attests to the separation of Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas at this point. Bareau confirms the absence of sectarianism at this point in Indian Buddhist history quite assertively when he proclaims: “The primitive version is, as M. Hofinger has well shown, anterior to the first schism which separated the Mahāsāṃghikas from the Sthaviras.”<sup>12</sup>

Although the famous *daśa-vastūni* and the council of Vaiśālī seem effectively eliminated from the historical actuality of the initial schism in Indian Buddhist history, the notorious five theses of Mahādeva remained a primary causal factor in scholarly arguments. Convinced that the first *saṃghabheda* was historically removed from the Vaiśālī coun-

cil, Andre Bareau developed a new theory, one that turned on two notions: (1) laxity on the part of the future Mahāsāṃghikas developed after the Vaiśālī council (although it is not precisely clear just how this laxity develops) and (2) the five theses of Mahādeva. Moreover, it postulated a non-canonical council held at Pāṭaliputra 137 years after the Buddha's enlightenment, from which the schism emerged. Until fairly recently Bareau's theory was rather widely accepted as a brilliant and ingenious solution to a knotty Buddhological problem.<sup>13</sup> In 1977, Janice J. Nattier and I criticized Bareau's theory, suggesting in its place that

Mahādeva has nothing to do with the primary schism between the Mahāsāṃghikas and Sthaviras, emerging in a historical period considerably later than previously supposed, and taking his place in the sectarian movement by instigating an internal schism within the already existing Mahāsāṃghika school. Second, that the sole cause of the initial schism in Buddhist history pertained to matters of Vinaya, but rather than representing a reaction of orthodox Buddhists to Mahāsāṃghika laxity, as maintained by both Demiéville and Bareau, represents a reaction on the part of the future Mahāsāṃghikas to unwarranted expansion of the root Vinaya text on the part of the future Sthaviras. . . .<sup>14</sup>

The argument concerning Mahādeva's five theses is complex,<sup>15</sup> and until quite recently it has not received much additional attention. Lance Cousins, however, has published a fresh, new discussion of the five points, dividing their historical development into three phases<sup>16</sup> and confirming the Prebish-Nattier hypothesis that the five points of Mahādeva were not involved in the first schism. Cousins' article additionally utilizes important material on the Pudgalavādins, published by Thich Thien Chau<sup>17</sup> and Peter Skilling,<sup>18</sup> not available to earlier researchers.

The Prebish-Nattier hypothesis for the rise of Buddhist sectarianism relies heavily on the *Śāriputrapariṣcchā-sūtra*, translated into Chinese between 317 and 420 CE, but which, according to Bareau,<sup>19</sup> was likely to have been composed by around 300, thus representing the oldest of all the sectarian treatises. This text relates an episode in which an old monk rearranges and augments the traditional *vīnaya*, said to have been codified by Kāśyapa at the alleged first council of Rājagṛha, consequently causing dissension among the monks, which required the king's arbitration and eventually precipitated the first schism.<sup>20</sup> The relevant passage makes it clear that, from the Mahāsāṃghika perspective, the real issue culminating in the schism

was *vinaya* expansion. The Mahāsāṃghikas are designated in the passage as those who study the “ancient *vinaya*,” and this tallies extremely well with the conclusions of Andre Bareau, W. Pachow, Marcel Hofinger, Erich Frauwallner, and Gustav Roth that the Mahāsāṃghika (and Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin) *vinaya* represents the most ancient of all the *vinaya* traditions. Further, each of the above cited scholars reaches his conclusion by applying a separate critical technique (Bareau utilizing text length of the *śaikṣa* section of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, Pachow utilizing comparative *prātimokṣa* study, Hofinger utilizing all second council materials in the various *vinayas*, Frauwallner utilizing an analysis of the *skandhikas* of the various *vinayas*, and Roth utilizing an examination of the language and grammar of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin texts preserved in Sanskrit). It also tallies well with the conclusion of the Chinese pilgrim Fa-hien, who regarded the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya* as the original.<sup>21</sup> Cousins agrees with the above conclusion heartily and comments on the *Śāriputrapariṣcchā-sūtra*: “Rather it sees the Mahāsāṃghikas as the conservative party which has preserved the original Vinaya unchanged against the reformist efforts to create a reorganized and stricter version.” He goes on: “Clearly the Mahāsāṃghikas are in fact a school claiming to follow the Vinaya of the original, undivided sangha, i.e. the mahāsāṃgha.”<sup>22</sup> As to why the future Sthaviras would choose to enlarge the *vinaya*, Nattier and I conclude:

It is not unlikely that the council of Vaiśālī, in representing the first real threat of division in the quasi-unified Buddhist saṃgha, made all Buddhists aware of the problem of concord now that the Buddha was long dead. In seeking to insure the continued unity that all Buddhists must have desired, they simply began to expand the disciplinary code in the seemingly appropriate direction. Just as the respect for orthodoxy inhibited the participants at the alleged first council of Rājagṛha from excluding the “lesser and minor points” which the Buddha had noted to be expendable, the same respect for orthodoxy inhibited the future Mahāsāṃghikas from tolerating this new endeavor, however well intentioned it was.<sup>23</sup>

This latter conclusion also gains support from Cousins:

What is important is that the picture which now emerges is one in which the earliest division of the saṃgha was primarily a matter of monastic discipline. The Mahāsāṃghikas were essentially a conservative party resisting a reformist attempt to tighten discipline. The likelihood is that they were initially the larger body, representing

the mass of the community, the *mahāsāṅgha*. Subsequently, doctrinal disputes arose among the reformists as they grew in numbers and gathered support. Eventually these led to divisions on the basis of doctrine. For a very long time, however, there must have been many fraternities (*nikāyas*) based only on minor *vinaya* differences.<sup>24</sup>

If we acknowledge, in light of the above materials, that the Prebish-Nattier hypothesis offers the most fruitful potential for identifying the causal basis of the first sectarian division in Buddhism, it becomes necessary to further explore the earliest *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* texts extant in hopes of isolating precisely which rules appear to be those appended to the root *vinaya* text by the future Sthaviras. It has been argued elsewhere<sup>25</sup> that comparative *prātimokṣa* study involves considerably more investigation than simply creating concordance tables of correlation between the texts of the various schools preserved in Pāli, Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan. I maintain that “A more sensible approach would be the developmental, concentrating more on the contents of the various rules than their numbers.”<sup>26</sup> In examining the *śaikṣa-dharma* section of the Sanskrit Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin text and the Theravādin text in Pāli, numbering respectively sixty-seven and seventy-five rules, one finds this approach quite instructive, despite the fact, now acknowledged by most scholars, that the Theravādins can in no way be historically identified as the Sthaviras of the first schism.

While many scholars downplay the significance of the *śaikṣa-dharmas* in the overall scheme of the *prātimokṣa*, John Holt takes the opposite approach in concluding, “These rules are much more than mere social etiquette. . . . The motive which generated their inclusion into the disciplinary code was simply this: perfect control of inward demeanor leads to perfect control and awareness of outward expression, even the most minute public expressions.”<sup>27</sup> As such, they are critical to an understanding of early Buddhist sectarian history. I. B. Horner, in her classic translation of the Pāli *Vinaya-piṭaka*, arranges these rules into three sections: (1) rules 1–56, focusing on etiquette and behavior on the daily alms-tour; (2) rules 57–72, focusing on teaching the dharma with propriety; and (3) rules 73–75, focusing on inappropriate ways of urinating and spitting.<sup>28</sup> Seeking more specific definition, I suggested another classification, addressing the functionality of the entire section: (1) the robe section, (2) the section on village visiting, (3) the section on dharma instruction, and (4) the section on eating.<sup>29</sup> Irrespective of which classification is preferred, a comparison of the

two texts in question involves considerably more than a facile location of eight rules, primarily because the rules do not correspond directly by number.

After careful comparative cross-referencing between the two texts, four rules in the Sanskrit Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin text are found to have no counterpart in the Pāli text—numbers 20, 23, 27, and 56.<sup>30</sup>

Rule 20 reads:

*na osaktikāya<sup>31</sup> antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti sikṣākaraṇīyā |*

“I will not sit down amongst the houses in the *utsaktikā* posture,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 23 reads:

*na antaragrhe niṣaṅṅo hastṃ kokṛtyam vā pādakaukṛtyamvā kariṣyāmīti sikṣākaraṇīyā |*

“Having sat down amongst the houses, I will not do evil with the feet or do evil with the hands,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 27 reads:

*nāvakīrṇṇakāraṇaṃ piṇḍapātram paribhūṃjīṣyāmīti sikṣākaraṇīyā |*

“I will not eat alms food [while] making confused [speech],” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 56 reads:

*na osaktikāya<sup>32</sup> niṣaṅṅsyāgilānasya dharmandeśayīṣyamīti sikṣākaraṇīyā |*

“In the *utsaktikā* posture, I will not teach dharma to one seated who is not ill,” is a precept that should be observed.

It is extremely significant that two of the four Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin rules (nos. 23 and 27) cited above have no counterpart in the various texts of the other schools. The remaining two (nos. 20 and 56) seem to involve a posture cited in no other text with the Mūlasarvāstivādin version possibly being excepted (and then, only if the term *osaktikā* is a direct correspondent to *utsaktikā* as found in the latter text). Further, the grammatical variants of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin were once considered to be extremely corrupt Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit forms. Franklin Edgerton, commenting on Senart’s edition of the Sanskrit text of the Mahāvastu, said: “Perhaps the most difficult and corrupt, as also probably the oldest and most important, of all BHS works is the Mahāvastu. . . . It was edited by Émile Senart

in three stout volumes, 1882–1897. Senart’s extensive notes often let the reader perceive the despair which constantly threatened to overwhelm him.”<sup>33</sup> More recent scholarship has presented an entirely different picture of the language of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin texts, one that is clearly consistent with the original hypothesis of this paper. Gustav Roth’s extensive work with the texts of this *nikāya* leads him to conclude (in 1966):

I would call this language the Prakrit-cum-quasi-Sanskrit of the Ārya Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. . . . The regular recurrence of Prakrit forms shows that they cannot be taken for grammatical mistakes. They belong to the stock of the language. . . . This coexistence of Prakrit and Sanskrit forms side by side has to be acknowledged as the new type of a language through and through composite in its nature.<sup>34</sup>

By 1970, when Roth’s edition of the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins appeared, his position on the language and grammar of this *nikāya* remained fundamentally consistent with his earlier conclusions.<sup>35</sup> My own grammatical notes in *Buddhist Monastic Discipline* tend to confirm Roth’s judgment.<sup>36</sup> That the language of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin text appears to be distinct unto itself, coupled with a number of *śaikṣa-dharmas* that appear in no other *prātimokṣa* texts of the various *nikāyas*, lends credence to the supposition, noted above, that this text was extremely ancient. In light of the other materials presented, it is not unreasonable to assume that this may well have been the root *vinaya* text expanded upon by the future Sthaviras. Since the Mahāsāṃghika trunk schools developed in a separate lineage than that of the Sthavira *nikāyas*, it is imperative to see how, if at all, the Sthavira *nikāyas* may have expanded the root *vinaya* text. While the Theravādins are certainly less ancient historically than the Mahāsāṃghikas, their complete *vinaya* is no doubt the earliest of all the preserved versions of the Sthavira schools. As such, its additional *sekhiya-dhammas* (Skt. *śaikṣa-dharmas*) are exceedingly important.

No less than twelve rules in the Pāli *pātimokkha* have no counterpart in the Sanskrit Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin text. These include numbers 3, 4, 16, 18, 20, 30, 31, 33, 40, 42, 54, and 68.<sup>37</sup>

Rule 3 reads:

*supaṭicchanno antaraghare gamissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā |*



“I shall go well covered amongst the houses,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 4 reads:

*supaṭicchanno antaraghare nisīdissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā |*

“I shall sit down well covered amongst the houses,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 16 reads:

*na kayappacālakam antaraghare nisīdissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā |*

“I will not sit down amongst the houses shaking the body,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 18 reads:

*na bāhuppacālakam antaraghare nisīdissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā |*

“I will not sit down amongst the houses shaking the arms,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 20 reads:

*na sīsappacālakam antaraghare nisīdissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā |*

“I will not sit down amongst the houses shaking the head,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 30 reads:

*samatittikam piṇḍapātam paṭiggahessāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā*

“I shall accept alms food up to the brim [of the bowl],” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 31 reads:

*sakkaccam piṇḍapātam bhuñjissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā |*

“I shall eat alms food respectfully,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 33 reads:

*sapadānam piṇḍapātam bhuñjissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā |*

“I shall eat alms food uninterruptedly,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 40 reads:

*parimaṇḍalam ālopaṃ karissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā |*

“I shall separate the morsels into [little] balls,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 42 reads:

*na bhuñjamāno sabbaṃ hatthaṃ mukhe pakkipissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā |*

“I shall not put the whole hand in the mouth when eating,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 54 reads:

*na oṭṭhanillehakaṃ bhuñjissāmiti sikkhā karaṇīyā |*

“I shall not lick the lips when eating,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 68 reads:

*na chamāyaṃ nisīditvā āsane nisinnassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmiti sikkhā karaṇīyā |*

“I shall not teach dharma while sitting on the ground to one sitting on a seat who is not ill,” is a precept that should be observed.

A summary of the twelve Pāli rules reveals that, according to Horner’s classification, eleven fall into her category of etiquette and behavior on the daily alms-tour, while the twelfth falls into her category described as teaching the dharma with propriety. Utilizing my categorization, six rules are concerned with eating, three with village visiting, two with robes, and one with dharma instruction. Nevertheless, a composite of the two approaches demonstrates that all twelve rules focus on two general areas of conduct: behavior in the village and various aspects of eating. And precisely because respect for the individual monks and nuns was a necessary requisite for successful maintenance of the entire monastic saṃgha by the laity, this emphasis is not at all surprising. Holt proclaims this rather dramatically:

We must also point out that one’s outward appearance was symbolic in at least two ways. In the first case, bhikkhus were considered to be “sons of the Buddha” and objects of veneration for the laity. To appear in public in a dishevelled fashion was insulting not only to the Buddha, but to the laity who considered bhikkhus as examples of high Buddhist spirituality and worthy receptors of meritorious acts of lay piety. In the second case, bhikkhus were bearers of the Dhamma and the chief source of learning for the laity. Casual attention to one’s public habits would reflect a similar casual regard for the teaching of the Dhamma.<sup>38</sup>

Nor is it surprising to evaluate these apparently expanded rules with respect to the fact that five of the ten *daśa-vastūni* of the Vaiśālī council concerned matters of food and drink. Equally, the other five points of the council, in the most general sense, address matters of individual and communal respect. In other words, if the Buddhist community was plagued by the genuine threat of *saṃghabheda* in the aftermath of the

council of Vaiśālī, and specifically with regard to matters of personal and institutional integrity and ethical conduct, it might well be both logical and reasonable to tighten the monastic code by the addition of a number of rules designed to make the required conduct more explicit. Of course, *vinaya* expansion is precisely what the *Śāriputrapariṣcchā-sūtra* records as the cause of Buddhism's initial schism, commenting as well that it was respect for the orthodoxy of the "ancient *vinaya*" that prohibited the future Mahāsāṃghikas from accepting the addition, irrespective of motive.

Andre Bareau, in *Les premiers conciles Bouddhiques*, comes to almost the same conclusion as presented above when he says, "One may justly think that the cause of the quarrel resided in the composition of the code of the monks and, more specifically, in the list of the śikṣākaraṇīyā,"<sup>39</sup> but he dismisses the conclusion immediately: "It is improbable that such a serious conflict could have been provoked by dissension on such a trivial subject."<sup>40</sup> Yet Bareau also concedes that the majority of points for which the Vṛjiputraka *bhikṣus* were reprovved were no more important than the ones cited here. We think that it is here that Bareau and others have missed an enormously valuable opportunity for understanding the growth of early Indian Buddhist sectarianism. We may never know with absolute certainty whether the rules cited above were precisely the rules to which the *Śāriputrapariṣcchā-sūtra* alludes. Nonetheless, a comparison of the Pāli precepts in question with the extant *vinaya* texts of other early Buddhist *nikāyas* suggests a high degree of correlation.<sup>41</sup> This is especially significant since these non-Mahāsāṃghika *nikāyas* all emerged from a common basis in the original Sthavira trunk group. It also correlates almost identically with the Chinese version of the *Upālipariṣcchā-sūtra*.<sup>42</sup> Further, as the Sthavira trunk subdivided internally over the next several centuries into many other *nikāyas*, each sect sought to underscore its own position with regard to personal and institutional conduct (and especially with regard to the geographic, communal circumstance in which it found itself) by appending additional rules in the *śaikṣa-dharma* section of its *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*. As a result, we find ninety-six rules in the Chinese version of the Kāśyapīya text, one hundred rules in the Chinese version of the Mahīśāsaka text, one hundred rules in the Chinese Dharmaguptaka text, one hundred eight rules in the Sanskrit and Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin texts, and one hundred thirteen rules in the Sanskrit and Chinese Sarvāstivādin texts. In so doing the *nikāyas* became distinct not only by the doctrines

they espoused, but by their rules for communal dwelling and behavior. In some cases, these differences are of monumental importance. The Dharmaguptaka text, for example, advances twenty-six rules in this section to delegate appropriate conduct at a *stūpa*. Apart from what this tells us, historically, about the Dharmaguptaka school, it offers significant insight into the ritual applications of Dharmaguptaka doctrinal affinities. In the light of the work by Hiraakawa, Schopen, and Williams on the role of *stūpa* worship in the rise of Mahayana, this *vinaya* material is critically important.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, it has long been acknowledged that the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* was the most widely accepted *vinaya* in China.<sup>44</sup> Consequently, one must ponder whether its incorporation of these twenty-six rules for *stūpa* worship, more extensively delineated than in any other *vinaya*, was the primary basis for the high status of its *vinaya* in the development of Chinese Buddhism. No doubt, other, similar, insights might well emerge from a renewed interest in this category of *vinaya* rules, long overlooked, but still overwhelmingly fertile. At the very least, the specifics of the first great *saṃghabheda* in Buddhism are less mysterious.

## NOTES

1. See especially Marcel Hofinger, *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī* (Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon, 1946); Andre Bareau, *Les premiers conciles Bouddhiques* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955); Paul Demiéville, “À propos du concile de Vaiśālī,” *T’oung Pao* 40 (1951): 239–296; and Charles S. Prebish, “A Review of Scholarship on the Buddhist Councils,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 33, no. 2 (February 1974): 239–254.
2. A summary of the basic argument regarding the new approach to Buddha’s historical dating is best revealed by Richard Gombrich’s article “Dating the Buddha: A Red Herring Revealed,” in Heinz Bechert, ed., *Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*, vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 239–259, in which Gombrich dates the death of the Buddha to around 405 BCE (actually between 411 and 399). A concise statement of the position on the Vaiśālī council, dating the council to 70–80 years after Buddha’s death, is Lance S. Cousins’s “The ‘Five Points’ and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools,” in *The Buddhist Forum*, ed. Tadeusz Skorupski, vol. 2 (New Delhi: Heritage Publishers, 1992), 27–31 and 54–60.
3. Refer to R. O. Franke, “The Buddhist Councils at Rājagaha and Vesālī as Alleged in Cullavagga XI, XII,” *Journal of the Pālī Text Society* (1908): 70; and Paul Demiéville, “À propos du concile de Vaiśālī,” 258.
4. See Hofinger, *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī*, 249; and Bareau, *Les premiers conciles Bouddhiques*, 87.
5. Hofinger, *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī*, 216 (and nn. 1–3) and 217 (and nn. 1–7).
6. Demiéville, “À propos du concile de Vaiśālī,” 275.
7. Bareau, *Les premiers conciles Bouddhiques*, 78.
8. See Charles S. Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: The Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtras of the Mahāsāṃghikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1975), 70, 80, 88, and 90.
9. See Jean Przyluski, *Le concile de Rājagṛha* (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1926–1928), 309–314.
10. Bareau, *Les premiers conciles Bouddhiques*, 82–83.
11. Demiéville, “À propos du concile de Vaiśālī,” 259–260.
12. Bareau, *Les premiers conciles Bouddhiques*, 86.
13. See *ibid.*, 88–111.
14. Charles S. Prebish and Janice J. Nattier, “Mahāsāṃghika Origins: The Beginnings of Buddhist Sectarianism,” *History of Religions* 16, no. 3 (February

1977): 238–239.

15. See *ibid.*, 250–265 for a full exegesis of the argument.

16. Cousins, “The ‘Five Points’ and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools,” 27–60.

17. Thich Thien Chau, “The Literature of the Pudgalavādins,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 7, no. 1 (1984): 7–16; and “Les réponses des Pudgalavādin aux critiques des écoles Bouddhiques,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 10, no. 1 (1987): 33–53.

18. Peter Skilling, “The Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛta-Viniścaya of Daśabalaśrīmitra,” *Buddhist Studies Review* 4, no. 1 (1987): 3–23.

19. Andre Bareau, *Les sectes Bouddhiques du petit véhicule* (Saigon: École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1955), 17, 21.

20. The relevant passage of the text (*Taishō* 1465, p. 900b) is translated on p. 189 of Étienne Lamotte’s *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien* (Université de Louvain, 1958).

21. James Legge, trans., *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms: Being an Account by the Chinese Monk Fa-hsien of His Travels in India and Ceylon (A.D. 399–414) in Search of the Buddhist Books of Discipline* (repr.; New York: Paragon, Dover, 1965), 98. One may also refer to Fa-hien’s Chinese translation of the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* (*Taishō* 1425, 1426, 1427), carried out with the assistance of Buddhahadra between 416–418 CE, where he offers the same conclusion.

22. Cousins, “The ‘Five Points’ and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools,” 33–34.

23. Prebish and Nattier, “Mahāsāṃghika Origins,” 270.

24. Cousins, “The ‘Five Points’ and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools,” 48.

25. See Charles S. Prebish, “The Prātimokṣa Puzzle: Fact Versus Fantasy,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94, no. 2 (April–June 1974): 168–176; and Charles S. Prebish, “Vinaya and Prātimokṣa: The Foundation of Buddhist Ethics,” in *Studies in the History of Buddhism*, ed. A. K. Narain (Delhi: B. R. Publishing Corp., 1980), 223–264.

26. Prebish, “The Prātimokṣa Puzzle,” 174.

27. John Holt, *Discipline: The Canonical Buddhism of the Vinayapīṭaka* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981), 102–103.

28. I. B. Horner, trans., *The Book of the Discipline*, Part 3 (repr.; London: Luzac & Company Ltd., 1957), xxviii.

29. Prebish, “Vinaya and Prātimokṣa,” 251.

30. The Sanskrit text for each of the rules is taken from W. Pachow and

Ramakanta Mishra, eds., “The Prātimokṣa Sūtra of the Mahāsāṃghikas,” *Journal of the Gaṅgānāth Jhā Research Institute* X, nos. 1–4 (1952–1953): appendix 1–48. For another edition of the text, see Nathmal Tatia, ed., *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādi-Mahāsāṃghika School*, vol. 16 of the Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1976). The English translations are taken from Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*.

31. There is no Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit or Pāli equivalent for *osaktikā*. The nuns’ text records the same form, but Gustav Roth offers no explanation in his edition of the text, other than to indicate that it could not be traced in any dictionary. See Gustav Roth, ed., *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya: Including the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, vol. 12 of the Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1970), 297 and 349. The closest parallel is *utsaktikā*, listed in both the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (no. 8542) and Franklin Edgerton’s *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (although the latter cites the former as its source). Its only possible correspondent in the various *Prātimokṣa-sūtras* is in that of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *nikāya* (*śaikṣa-dharma* no. 18).

32. Again, the term *osaktikā* is found in the nuns’ text of this *nikāya*, and is listed in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (no. 8608), corresponding to its counterpart in the Mūlasarvāstivādin text (*śaikṣa-dharma* no. 86).

33. Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), 1:10 (¶1.73).

34. Gustav Roth, “Bhikṣuṇīvinaya and Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka and Notes on the Language,” *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 52, nos. 1–4 (January–December 1966), 38–39.

35. Roth, *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, lv–lxi.

36. Charles Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*.

37. The Pāli text is adapted from Venerable Ñāṇamoli Thera, ed. and trans., *The Pātimokkha: 227 Fundamental Rules of a Bhikkhu* (Bangkok: The Social Science Association of Thailand, 1966). The translations are mine.

38. Holt, *Discipline: The Canonical Buddhism of the Vinayaṭṭaka*, 102–103.

39. Bareaux, *Les premiers conciles Bouddhiques*, 94.

40. *Ibid.*

41. Here one should refer to the Sanskrit and Chinese texts of the Sarvāstivādin *nikāya*; the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the Mūlasarvāstivādin text; the Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, and Kāśyapīya texts preserved in Chinese; as well as the Chinese version of the *Upālipariṣcchā-sūtra* (Taishō 1466), and the *Mahāvvyutpatti*.

42. Taishō 1466 (*Yu-po-li wen-fu-ching*). This text appears in Valentina Stache-

Rosen, trans., *Upālipariprcchāsūtra: Ein Text zur buddhistischen Ordendisziplin*, no. 140 of *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

43. See Akira Hirakawa, “The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relationship to the Worship of Stūpas,” *Memoirs of the Toyō Bunkyo Research Department* 22 (1963): 57–106; Gregory Schopen, “The Phrase ‘sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet’ in the Vajracchedikā: Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 17 (1975): 147–181; Gregory Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 21 (1979): 1–19; Gregory Schopen, “Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit,” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10 (1985): 9–47; and Paul Williams, *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations* (London: Routledge, 1989), 20–33.

44. For a full description of the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, see Charles S. Prebish, *A Survey of Vinaya Literature* (London: Routledge Curzon, 1994).