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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 Vaiśāli, 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 arhat. This council has received a substantial amount of consideration in the scholarly literature, 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. 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, 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.” 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*, 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.” 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. 7

A study of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin texts preserved in Sanskrit yields a similar result. 8 Additionally, the Mahāsāṃghikas could not be considered as easterners (i.e., the Prācīnaka, or the same title as the Vṛjiputraṇakas), as Hofinger would like to maintain (by adjusting the geographical tension theory of Przyluski 9 so as to categorize the Sthavira, Mahiśāsaka, 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.” 10 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 Hinayāna and Mahāyāna. 11

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.” 12

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 Vaiśāli council (although it is not precisely clear just how this laxity develops) and (2) the five theses of Mahādeva. Moreover, it pos-
tulated 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. 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 con-
siderably later than previously supposed, and taking his place in the
sectarian movement by instigating an internal schism within the al-
ready 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... The argument concerning Mahādeva’s five theses is complex, 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 and confirming the Prebish-Nattier hypothesis that the five points of
Mahādeva were not involved in the first schism. Cousins’ article additional-
tly utilizes important material on the Pudgalavādins, published
by Thich Thien Chau and Peter Skilling, not available to earlier
researchers.

The Prebish-Nattier hypothesis for the rise of Buddhist sectari-
anism relies heavily on the Śāriputraparipṛcchā-sūtra, translated into
Chinese between 317 and 420 CE, but which, according to Bareau, 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 vin-
aya, said to have been codified by Kāśyapa at the alleged first coun-
cil of Rājagrha, consequently causing dissension among the monks,
which required the king’s arbitration and eventually precipitated
the first schism. The relevant passage makes it clear that, from the
Mahāsāṃghika perspective, the real issue culminating in the schism
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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 skandhakas 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. 21 Cousins agrees with the above conclusion heartily and comments on the Śāriputraparipṛcchā-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.” 22 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 saṅgha, 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 Rājagrha 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. 23

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 saṅgha 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.

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 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.”

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.” 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. 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. 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 56.30

Rule 20 reads:

\begin{quote}
na osaktikāya\textsuperscript{11} antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti sikṣākaranīyā |

“I will not sit down amongst the houses in the utsaktikā posture,” is a precept that should be observed.
\end{quote}

Rule 23 reads:

\begin{quote}
na antaragrhe niṣāṇṇo hastṃ kokṛtyam vā pādakaukṛtyamvā karisyāmīti sikṣākaranīyā |

“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.
\end{quote}

Rule 27 reads:

\begin{quote}
nāvakīrṇṇakārakaṃ pindapātram paribhuṃjiṣyāmīti sikṣākaranīyā |

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

Rule 56 reads:

\begin{quote}
na osaktikāya\textsuperscript{12} niṣāṇṇyāgilānasya dharmandeśayamīti sikṣākaranīyā |

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

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.” 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.

By 1970, when Roth’s edition of the Bhikṣunī-Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins appeared, his position on the language and grammar of this nikāya remained fundamentally consistent with his earlier conclusions. My own grammatical notes in Buddhist Monastic Discipline tend to confirm Roth’s judgment. 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.

Rule 3 reads:

\[
\text{supaṭicchanno antaraghare gamissāmiti sikkhā karaṇīyā} | \]
“I shall go well covered amongst the houses,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 4 reads:

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

Rule 16 reads:

na kayappacālakaṃ 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 bāhuppacālakaṃ 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 sīsappacālakaṃ 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:

samatīttikaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ 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 piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā  
“I shall eat alms food respectfully,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 33 reads:

sapadānam piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā  
“I shall eat alms food uninterruptedly,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 40 reads:

parimaṇḍalaṃ 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 pakkhipissāmīti 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 bhuñjissāmīti sikkhā karaṇiyā
to not lick the lips when eating,” is a precept that should be observed.

Rule 68 reads:

na chamāyaṃ nisīditvā āsane nisinnassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmīti
“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 saṅgha 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. Nor is it surprising to evaluate these apparently expanded rules with respect to the fact that five of the ten daśa-vastūni of the Vaiśāli 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 saṅghabheda in the aftermath of the
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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 Śāriputraparipṛcchā-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 Béarou, 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,” 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.” Yet Béarou also concedes that the majority of points for which the Vṛjiputra bhikṣus were reproved were no more important than the ones cited here. We think that it is here that Béarou 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 Śāriputraparipṛcchā-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. 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 Upāliparipṛcchā-sūtra. 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 Hirakawa, Schopen, and Williams on the role of stūpa worship in the rise of Mahayana, this vinaya material is critically important. Moreover, it has long been acknowledged that the Dharmaguptaka vinaya was the most widely accepted vinaya in China. 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 saṅghabheda in Buddhism are less mysterious.
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