

A PARADIGM FOR SCHISM IN THE VINAYAS:
THE DEVADATTA NARRATIVE COMPLEX
IN ITS HISTORICAL CONTEXT¹

CHANNA LI

ABSTRACT

In this paper, I argue that the core, and probably also the earliest layer, of Devadatta's image depicts him not as an evildoer, but as the first schismatic monk to appear during the Buddha's lifetime. Many elements of his schismatic narrative, some of which appear disjointed or contradictory, reflect particular Vinaya discussions of schism. Particularly, the narrative of Devadatta's early monastic life should be understood as a literary device that shows him as fulfilling the prerequisites for being a schismatic. Other details of the Devadatta narrative, such as the number of Devadatta's supporters, the actual activities that Devadatta engaged in to create a division, and locations associated with these activities, align with and reflect the different interpretations and emphases placed on the criteria for schism within each Vinaya tradition.

KEYWORDS

Devadatta, Vinaya, *saṅghabheda*, *saṅgharāja*, *nānāsaṃvāsa*, Buddhist Sects, *Mohe sengqi li*

¹ This paper has evolved from my doctoral dissertation titled "Challenging the Buddha's Authority: A Narrative Perspective of Power Dynamics between the Buddha and His Disciples." I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude once again to my supervisor, Prof. Jonathan Silk, and my second adviser, Prof. John Strong, for their invaluable guidance throughout the research process. I would also like to acknowledge the contributions of the two peer reviewers whose insightful comments and suggestions have shed new light on the direction of my work. I am truly grateful for their feedback, which has significantly enhanced my previous studies. Lastly, I extend my heartfelt appreciation to Prof. Shayne Clarke for providing me with incredibly useful advice and meticulous revisions during the process of revising this paper into its current format. I take responsibility for any errors that may have occurred in this paper.

1. Introduction

Devadatta, a cousin of Śākyamuni Buddha, is branded as perhaps the most controversial figure in Buddhist literature: driven by the desire for fame and reward, he is said to have plotted to split the *saṅgha* by propounding five practices of austerity; suborned Ajātaśatru to commit patricide; attempted to murder Śākyamuni on more than one occasion; murdered an arhat nun; and ended up being swallowed by the earth and descending to hell. However, the reading of Devadatta as an ignorant, ineffectual, and depraved villain, although widely present and accepted in Buddhist texts, impedes us from establishing a more comprehensive and contextualized understanding of this figure. In fact, the life stories of Devadatta have rarely been studied in their broader ideological context: there are indeed several – though not many – academic works devoted to Devadatta’s life stories, but these works are aimed mainly at unveiling a “historical” Devadatta or combing relevant literature and sorting it into different historical layers.² Whether a “historical” Devadatta may be

² Studies of Devadatta’s full biography have been undertaken by Mukherjee (1966), Bareau (1991), and Mori and Motozawa (2006). In addition, Ray (1994) argues that Devadatta is representative of the forest monks, who are hated and thus vilified by settled monks. The *Buddhist Studies Review* has published a special issue (1997, vol. 14, issue 1) on the theme of Devadatta, collecting three papers (Lamotte 1997, Bareau 1997, Tinti 1997) that each focus on different aspects of the Devadatta legends. Moreover, Deeg (1999) has investigated the Chinese records of Devadatta’s followers as witnessed by Chinese pilgrims, reconstructing the formation of Devadatta’s *saṅgha* through information collected from Buddhist texts. More recently, Borgland (2018) has examined the stories in the MSV in which Devadatta tries to persuade other monks not by means of five ascetic practices, but by taking an anti-ascetic position.

According to Mukherjee (1966) and Bareau (1991; 1997), who have independently conducted the most exhaustive studies on the topic so far, Devadatta’s image comprises different historical layers. Here I briefly summarize their discoveries, adding my own comments. They divide the stories of Devadatta into several chronological layers: (1) The earliest core of Devadatta’s image, as their studies reveal, portrays him as no more than an active separatist who advocates dissenting ideas in the *saṅgha*. This conclusion is based on the fact that only the accounts of Devadatta’s schismatic activities are commonly shared by all six Vinayas. (2) In the second layer are stories that are shared by all five of the Sthavira-derived Vinayas, but absent from the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya; these include Devadatta’s ascetic propositions, his attempts to murder the Buddha, his connection with Ajātaśatru, etc. (cf. “Betrachtungsstufe A” in Mukherjee 1966; Bareau 1991: 101–102, 1997: 21). This layer, although not the earliest part of his image, was nonetheless formed at an early period, as it is widely preserved in Buddhist texts, including both the mainstream *āgamas/nikāyas* and many early Mahāyāna *sūtras* (e.g., the *Mahāyānamahāpari-*

restored in this way or not, proposing different layers of narrative elements contributes significantly to a more historical reading of Devadatta's stories.³ However, studies of Devadatta should not be confined to the task of merely collating data; in fact, these vibrant, striking, and multifaceted stories can offer a medium for illuminating otherwise unseen facts, discerning the intertextuality the various tales and their latent ideologies, and highlighting the religious significance of ostensibly tangled stories.

In the course of establishing a deeper understanding of how Devadatta's multifaceted image came into being, and apprehending the ideological messages conveyed by the stories related to him, many questions still await answers. The most foundational of these is how we should approach the fundamental image of Devadatta. To answer this crucial question, we should first clarify the major elements comprising Devadatta's core image, and which of these elements supply an overarching theme upon which subsequent stories were produced. In this process, we inevitably also hypothesize the relative chronological order of the major elements underlying Devadatta's image, which contributes to our understanding of how Devadatta's different stories came together and what kinds of ideologies played a role in the formation of Devadatta's complex biography.

2. Basic sources

The name "Devadatta" was common in Indian grammatical examples (*devadattaḥ pacati* etc.) from Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* onward.⁴ Whether

nirvāṇamahāśūtra). (3) The third layer contains stories only adopted by some of the five Śthavira offshoots: for instance, his kinship with the Buddha of the Śākya family (Bureau 1997: 32); his murder of the nun Utpalavarṇā; his activities in his youth, etc. (cf. "Nebenüberlieferung B" in Mukherjee 1966). (4) The most recent layer contains stories that are accepted by only one of the five schools, for instance, those unique to the Mūlarsāvāstivāda school(s) (cf. "Einzelberichte C" in Mukherjee 1966).

³ In the following discussion, I sometimes use the expression "the Devadatta narrative" to denote the life stories that are commonly attributed to the figure of Devadatta in non-Mahāyāna Buddhist literature. In doing so, I temporarily ignore the sectarian school, language, and geographic distribution of each story.

⁴ There is almost a whole page of references to Devadatta in Pathak and Chitrao's index of the *Mahābhāṣya* (1927: 614). Other common names in the Sanskrit grammatical traditions include Yajñadatta and Brahmadata. Combined with what I will argue in the

the appearance of the name of Devadatta in Buddhist literature predated the grammatical tradition is unknown. In Buddhist traditions, Devadatta's life stories are mainly found in the six complete Vinayas⁵ belonging to the schools of Theravāda-Mahāvihāra (hereafter, Theravāda),⁶ Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, Sarvāstivāda, Mūlasarvāstivāda, and Mahāsāṅghika. Texts of other genres do sometimes contain elements of the biographical stories of Devadatta, but usually in fragmentary or over-embellished ways.⁷ The Chinese *Zengyi ahan jing* 增一阿含經, an *āgama*

following part of this paper, the name Devadatta was likely used as a generic name for someone who incurred a schismatic transgression in ancient Buddhist discussions of schismatic issues.

⁵ Cf. Clarke 2015 for an in-depth discussion of Vinaya literature as a genre. This encyclopedia entry is particularly useful because it offers a detailed analysis of the textual structure of each of the six Vinayas, as well as a comprehensive scope of texts affiliated to each of these schools in different languages.

⁶ The more popular convention to name this school is “Theravāda.” However, the historical validity of terming the ancient Buddhist tradition in question as “Theravāda” has been subject to scrutiny, particularly in the book *How Theravāda Is Theravāda?* (Skilling et al. 2012). In the introduction to this publication, Skilling observes that Buddhists in premodern South and Southeast Asia did not use the term *theravāda* to identify themselves. In a likewise manner, the article by R. Gethin (2012: 11–12) in this book has highlighted the fact that the term *theravāda* was not used to refer to a particular school of Buddhism in Pāli *aṭṭhakathās*, save for the *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā*, in which the usage of *theravāda* was borrowed from the *Dīpavaṃsa* as a synonym for *theriyavāda* (“the tradition belonging to the elders”). Even in the *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā* or the *Dīpavaṃsa*, the *vāda* part of *theravāda* seems not to have been part of the proper name (*thera* alone is the complete proper name), but simply means “tradition” or “school” of views (Gethin 2012: 11).

As an alternative, Skilling prefers another term *theravaṃsa*, which semantically expresses that this is a lineage of *Theras*. To lend credence to his proposal, Skilling refers to Buddhaghosa who uses this term to refer to the monk Saṅghathera Dāthānāga, describing him as “a follower of the lineage of the *Theras*” (*theravaṃsanvayena*) in the *Sumaṅglavilāsinī* (Gethin 2012: 16). However, if we question that the term “Theravāda” was a modern construction due to the fact that it was not attested in premodern sources, the term *theravaṃsa* is likewise subject to the same question due to the same reasoning: its historical pedigree could not be dated before the 5th century, and it was nevertheless a retrospective invention but in ancient times.

⁷ Mukherjee (1966), Bareau (1991), and Mori and Motozawa (2006) survey how Devadatta stories are distributed across primary sources. Devadatta stories are also spread throughout the *āgamas/nikāyas*, *jātakas*, *avadānas*, and *sūtras*. However, among the *āgama/nikāya* texts, detailed biographical accounts are only found in the Chinese *Zengyi ahan jing*. In addition, some *jātakas* and *avadānas* (e.g., DhP-A 133ff., Ja nos. 113, 139, 150, 445, 466, 533) also contain biographies of Devadatta, but perhaps in more developed form. For a brief introduction of Devadatta in the *jātakas*, see Appleton 2019.

text, also contains an extended version of his biography (Bareau 1992); however, considering that the other texts of the *āgama/nikāya* genre rarely include long stories about Devadatta, in addition to the fact that the *Zengyi ahan jing* was “an open-ended repository for a long time [in northwest India],”⁸ it is unlikely that the stories of Devadatta were first created in the *āgama* genre; rather, the Chinese *Zengyi ahan jing* must have borrowed his biography from other textual sources. Overall, regarding the textual distribution of Devadatta’s stories, we can say that the Devadatta narrative is closely associated with the Vinaya genre.

The aforementioned six Vinayas can be classified into two groups: five Vinayas descend from the ancient Sthaviras, each containing two versions of Devadatta’s biography, in the *vibhaṅga* section and in the *vastu/khandhaka* section (Table 1). These five Vinayas are the Theravāda Vinaya in Pāli, the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya in Chinese (*Mishase bu hexi wufen lü* 彌沙塞部和醯五分律, T. 1421), the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya in Chinese (*Sifen lü* 四分律, T. 1428), the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya in Chinese (*Shisong lü* 十誦律, T. 1435), and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya in Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese.⁹ The second group includes the *Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (T. 1425) of the Mahāsāṅghika lineage. Devadatta stories

⁸ Palumbo 2013: 154. Nota bene that both Mukherjee (1966: 141ff.) and Bareau (1997: 32), based on the problematic idea that the *Zenyi ahan jing* is attributed to the Mahāsāṅghika school (cf. Palumbo 2013: 4, n. 10), conclude that Devadatta’s ascetic tendencies are shared by the Mahāsāṅghika school. However, although the school affiliation of the *Zengyi ahan jing* remains unclear, the hypothesis that associates it with the Mahāsāṅghika has been discarded by recent scholarship. Hiraoka (2007a, 2008a) argues that the *Zengyi ahan jing* is a “patchwork,” stitching together elements of different schools upon a Sarvāstivāda foundation. Palumbo has expressed the similar idea that the *Zengyi ahan jing* is possibly not a direct translation of a mature, fixed Indic text, but remained a body of developing text for a long time before the compilation was complete (Palumbo 2013: 5, 154). In this light, we find no records of Devadatta’s ascetic tendencies in the Mahāsāṅghika texts. Therefore, I dismiss asceticism as one of the earliest elements of the Devadatta narrative, and place it in the second layer.

⁹ Tokiya (1988: 42–47) provides a brief comparison of the Devadatta stories presented in the Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese versions of the MSV *Saṅghabhedavastu*. To be specific, the main organizational difference between the Sanskrit-Tibetan and Chinese versions lies in that the Chinese places the latter part of the Sanskrit/Tibetan versions into its middle part: from the episode “The Buddha converses with Ajātaśatru, who grows more and more attached to him” up to “The questions of Upāli” (episode names follow Gnoli 1977–1978: II.308) are found in the tenth and eleventh fascicles of the Chinese version.

can be found in the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* (*sengcan fa* 僧殘法) section of the *vibhaṅga* and the **bhikṣuprakīrṇakavarga* (*zasong baqu fa* 雜誦跋渠法) of the *Mohe sengqi lü*.

Table 1. Location of the Devadatta Narrative in the Six Vinayas

	<i>Vinaya</i>	<i>Vibhaṅga</i>	<i>Vastu/Khandhaka</i>
1	Mahīśāsaka	T. 1421 (22) 16c–21b (僧殘法)	T. 1421 (22) 164a–166b
2	Dharmaguptaka	T. 1428 (22) 590b13–596c16 (僧殘法)	T. 1428 (22) 909b–913c * <i>Saṅghabheda-khandhaka</i> (破僧捷度)
3	Pāli	iii. 171–176 (<i>saṅghādisesa</i>)	ii. 180–206 (<i>cullavagga</i>)
4	Sarvāstivāda	T. 1435 (23) 24b22–26b8 (僧殘法)	T. 1435 (23) 257a–267a
5	Mūlasarvāstivāda	T. 1442 (23) 700a29–705a8 (破僧違諫學處); D. 3, ' <i>dul ba, ca, 286a2–cha, 13b6</i>	T. 1450 (24) 99a21–206a14; D. 1, ' <i>dul ba, ga, 255b1–nga, 302a6; Gnoli 1977–1978</i>
6	Mahāsāṅghika	T. 1425 (22) 281c12–284c21 (明僧殘戒)	T. 1425 (22) 489c9–25 (a part of <i>varga</i>) ¹⁰

2.1 *Devadatta in the Vinayas of the Sthavira offshoots*

The Sthavira-derived Vinayas present the Devadatta stories in a repetitive manner. As mentioned above, each of these Vinayas reports Devadatta's stories twice, in the *vibhaṅga* and in the *vastu/khandhaka*, but the content of these two sections overlaps considerably.¹¹ Moreover, episodes seem

¹⁰ The Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya differs in structure from the Vinayas of the Sthavira offshoots. As Clarke 2004 demonstrates, the Mahāsāṅghika equivalent of the *vastu/khandhaka* section is the *varga* section.

¹¹ Frauwallner (1956: 117–118) also observes the repetition of the Devadatta story in both the *vibhaṅgas* and the *vastu/khandhakas*. According to him, Devadatta was first associated with the tenth *saṅghāvaśeṣa* of the *Prātimokṣa* (*vibhaṅga*) possibly before the time of Aśoka. The earliest version mainly recounts about Devadatta's schism based on five ascetic points. Subsequently, the *vastu/khandhaka* section further expands on the Devadatta narrative by including additional aspects such as his ordination, initial success as a monk, the division within the *saṅgha*, and the eventual defeat of Devadatta by Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana. As Frauwallner observes, the Devadatta narrative gradually

to be distributed arbitrarily between the *vibhaṅga* and the *vastu/khandhaka* sections: many episodes that occur in the *vibhaṅga* section of one school appear in the *vastu/khandhaka* section of another school. As a result, the *vastus/khandhakas* of the Theravāda, Sarvāstivāda, and Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayas share more episodes with the *vibhaṅgas* of the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka schools than the *vastus/khandhakas* of latter two schools. It seems the editors of these Vinayas each developed their own way of storytelling and showed no agreement on the “proper” distribution of episodes between the *vastu/khandhaka* and *vibhaṅga*.

In my previous publication on Devadatta in *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*,¹² I have created two tables to facilitate a clear understanding of how Devadatta stories are told in different Vinayas sections: Table 2 presents twenty-three frequently shared episodes in two storylines (A and B); and Table 3 shows the distribution of these episodes between each Vinaya’s *vibhaṅga* and *vastu* section. In this paper, I find it necessary to provide the two tables again, for the following considerations: these two tables provide the basic content of the Devadatta narrative, which is convenient for readers to comprehend and grasp the story’s context in my following discussion; on the other hand, I have reversed the sequence of the two storylines for a clearer presentation (i.e., episodes 1 to 17 as “Storyline A,” while episodes 18 to 23 are “Storyline B” as seen in the new version below).

Overall, Devadatta’s activities as contained in these two storylines can operate independently of each other. Storyline A – seen, for example, in the Mahīśāsaka and the Dharmaguptaka *vibhaṅgas* – ends with the

evolved by incorporating more episodes, resulting in a “composite” narrative. However, this expansion also led to certain inconsistencies and variations among different Vinaya records regarding the Devadatta narrative. Nevertheless, Frauwallner does not attempt to explain the different functions of these records in *vibhaṅgas* and *vastu/khandhakas*. In a detailed list of the different records of Devadatta in the *vibhaṅgas* and the *vastu/khandhakas*, Bareau (1991: 89–90) notices that the *vastu/khandhaka* versions always end with Upāli’s questions (Bareau 1991: 91), while the *vibhaṅga* versions end with Devadatta’s schism (Bareau 1991: 105). As I will demonstrate, these endings can shed light on the functions of Devadatta stories in the *vibhaṅgas* and the *vastu/khandhakas*.

¹² Li 2019a: 142–143, Tables 2 and 3. In my dissertation (Li 2019b), I reverse the sequence of the two storylines for a clearer presentation (i.e., episodes 1 to 17 as “Storyline A,” while episodes 18 to 23 are “Storyline B”). Here, I follow the new labels in Li 2019b.

Buddha's directive on the actions to prevent a schism, that is, enacting a specific *saṅghāvaśeṣa* rule against the potential schismatic, and therefore does not treat Devadatta's schism as an actual occurrence. In comparison, in storyline B – adopted, for instance, in the Mahīśāsaka and the Dharmaguptaka *vastus* – Devadatta indeed splits the *saṅgha* for a short while, but Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana successfully reunite it. However, there is yet another way to understand the narrative logic behind the two storylines. In the Theravāda, Sarvāstivāda, and Mūlasarvāstivāda *vastus/khandhakas*, storylines A and B are taken as two continuous stages of the same narrative: the tales of storyline A occur first, narrating how Devadatta becomes a schismatic and how the Buddha (temporarily) quells his schismatic intentions; then storyline B continues to tell how Devadatta finally manages to instigate a schism and falls to hell as punishment.

By closely examining how these episodes are distributed across the *vastus/khandhakas* and *vibhaṅgas*, it is also possible to shed light on why the Vinayas feature two separate versions of Devadatta's stories between the *vibhaṅga* and *vastu/khandhaka*. Regardless of whether or not the first fourteen episodes of storyline A are incorporated into the *vibhaṅgas*, all *vibhaṅga* sections possess a formulaic ending: Devadatta intends to split the monastic community (episode 15: “Devadatta hatches a plan to split the *saṅgha* by proposing five points (*pañcavratapada*) to guarantee his future reputation”); the Buddha, having learned of the deeds of Devadatta and his group, instructs the community on how to cope with this situation, and issues rulings against *saṅghabheda* (episode 16 against the schismatic; episode 17 against those abetting a schism). That is to say, these three episodes stabilize the basic structure of the Devadatta narrative in the *vibhaṅgas*, and thereby construct a core narrative in which Devadatta intends to split the *saṅgha*, and the Buddha establishes rules to prevent and even suspend the schismatic, in order to prevent the *saṅgha* from being divided. The preceding episodes expand on this core narrative, adding more details on how Devadatta grows into a corrupt schismatic. Based on these three episodes (15, 16, 17), which constitute the essential part of the *vibhaṅga* narration, we can see that the primary function of the *vibhaṅga* section is to enact rules to prevent schismatic actions.

On the other hand, all the *vastu/khandhaka* versions end with another fixed series of stories: Devadatta proposes the five ascetic points (*pañcavratapada*) (episode 18), and calls a vote on the five points in Rājagṛha and successfully splits the *saṅgha* (episode 19); Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana win his followers back (episode 20); Devadatta dies (episode 21); Devadatta's followers commit the offense of *sthūlātyaya* (Pāli *thullaccaya*, Chin. *touluoze* 偷羅遮) (episode 22); and Upāli questions the Buddha on how to define the crime of splitting the *saṅgha* (episode 23). In this regard, the essential content of the *vastu/khandhaka* version comprises episodes 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23. Judging from the dialogue between Upāli and the Buddha, the focus of the *vastu/khandhakas* is quite different from that of the *vibhaṅga* section: the primary function of these episodes is to define what kinds of deeds are categorized as *saṅghabheda*, instead of proposing countermeasures as narrated in the *vibhaṅgas*. Therefore, we can see that the primary function of the *vibhaṅga* version of the Devadatta narrative is distinguished from that of the *vastu/khandhaka* version; thus, the differing compositions of the Devadatta stories in the Vinayas are not meaningless repetitions, but serve different ends.

Having said this, we can also draw some tentative conclusions regarding the relative chronology of the twenty-three episodes in Vinaya literature. On this point, Mukherjee (1966: 75) argues that the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* rulings of the *vibhaṅgas* (namely, episodes 16 and 17) form the original core of the Devadatta narrative, because they are found in every Vinaya and serve as the central elements around which the other stories developed.¹³ To follow up on Mukherjee's argument, I find that the core episodes of the *vibhaṅga* groups (i.e., episodes 15 to 17) and those of the *vastu/khandhaka* group (i.e., episodes 18, 22, 23) are in actuality quite

¹³ One possible counterargument is that the so-called "core episodes" were included in the Vinayas primarily due to their technical content, while other episodes were excluded because they were deemed less relevant to legal discussions. Therefore, the absence of other episodes does not necessarily indicate a younger origin. Be that as it may, there must have been a core of Devadatta around which all other episodes gradually came about. No element, other than the role of schismatic, was more stable to serve as such a core. While the other episodes were possibly also created in a quite ancient time, they might not have been originally associated with Devadatta (for instance, his role as a proponent for asceticism).

similar. In each case, a charge is issued against Devadatta and his supporters, and monastic regulations are proposed to deal with Devadatta's transgression (cf. Mukherjee 1966: 74–86; a similar framework is also found in the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinayavibhaṅga*, T. 1425 [22] 281c12–282b8, as seen below). In this regard, the *vibhaṅga* and *vastu/khandhaka* versions of the Devadatta stories can be further reduced to the same set of core episodes (i.e., episodes 15, 16, 17 = 18, 22, 23) from a narrative perspective.

According to these central episodes, Devadatta is a separatist, who – possibly driven by a desire to impose stricter monastic rules according to the Sthavira offshoots – intends to cause a schism in the early *saṅgha*, which motivates the Buddha to lay down a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* ruling against schismatic actions. In these episodes that set out the basic structure of the Devadatta narrative in the Vinayas, we find only a legal discussion of how to stop or define schismatic activities. In contrast, further episodes in the *vibhaṅgas* and *vastus/khandhakas* provoke a polemic against an increasingly evil Devadatta, a heinous character who is corrupted by material benefits, commits myriad evil deeds, and is destined to go to hell. This expanded part includes stories such as Devadatta instigating Ajātaśatru to commit patricide and his attempts to murder Śākyamuni, which highlight Devadatta's intensified depravity and capacity for evil. The divide – and even conflicts, which I will discuss later – between the two images heavily suggests an extensive historical development. Among his other image aspects, that as a schismatic with an ascetic tendency was likely created earlier, as it encompasses the core of the Devadatta narrative that is consistent across the Vinayas of the Sthavira offshoots.

In conclusion, in this section we have examined the seemingly repetitive records of Devadatta in the two sections of the five Sthavira-derived Vinayas, namely, the *vibhaṅgas* and *vastus/khandhakas*. Based on previous scholarship, I list twenty-three commonly shared episodes of the Devadatta narrative in these Vinayas. On the grounds of the content and function of these episodes, this investigation sheds light on the possible rationale behind the differing compositions of the Devadatta narrative in the Vinayas: Devadatta stories in the *vibhaṅgas* aim to demonstrate how to prevent a schism, whereas the narrative in the *vastus/khandhakas* defines a schism. This observation, however, is not unexpected since the

vibhaṅgas and the *vastus/khandhakas* are of different textual nature: the *vibhaṅgas* are an expansion of the core of the *Prātimokṣas*, which focus on individual actions, while the *vastus* provide regulations for Buddhist communal life and ceremonies (Borgland 2014: 9; von Hinüber 1996: 9; Frauwallner 1956: 46).

The two versions of the Devadatta story can be reduced to a similar core narrative (episodes 15, 16, 17, or 18, 22, 23) in which Devadatta is accused of committing *saṅghabheda* and the monastic community takes collective measures to prevent this transgression. It is noteworthy that these central episodes are situated in a legal context, discussing how to identify and punish such a schismatic. The other episodes, expanding the core narrative, add more evil deeds to Devadatta's biography. Consequently, the image of Devadatta develops into that of an evildoer, encompassing many other facets besides his being a schismatic. However, these further Devadatta episodes do not fully harmonize with the legal discussion of schismatics in the Vinayas. The most obvious contradiction is that in the legal discussion, Devadatta merely incurs the transgression of *saṅghāvaśeṣa*, rather than a *pārājika*, even if he murdered an arhat-nun. In addition, Devadatta's actions such as causing a schism, attempting to murder the Buddha, murdering an arhat-nun and drawing blood from the Buddha's feet also fall under the category of *ānantaryakarmas* ("sins of immediate retribution"), which can be understood as the gravest transgressions a monk could ever commit. In this regard, there is little doubt that Devadatta's current image resulted from extensive historical developments, the earliest layer of which, as reflected in Devadatta's core narrative, paints him merely as a schismatic in a legal context. As further elaborated in section 3, we see more evidence that the Devadatta stories were deliberately constructed to augment the basic narrative of a schismatic, and the Devadatta narrative should be read fundamentally as a schismatic narrative.

Table 2. Basic Episodes in the five Vinayas

Storyline A

1	Devadatta joins the <i>saṅgha</i> together with other Śākya princes.
2	Devadatta gains magical power.
3	Devadatta wins the favor of Ajātaśatru.
4	The Buddha is informed of Devadatta's evil intentions by the god Kakudha.
5	The Buddha explains what the five kinds of teachers are.
6	The Buddha warns monks of the danger of excessive honors and gifts.
7	Devadatta demands that the Buddha retire and transfer leadership to him.
8	The Buddha refuses and insults Devadatta.
9	The Buddha sends Śāriputra (or Ānanda in the [Mūla]Sarvāstivāda <i>Vinayavastu</i>) to Rājagṛha to announce that Devadatta's actions do not represent the Buddha, the <i>saṅgha</i> and the Dharma (i.e., ecclesiastic act of information, Pāli <i>pākasaniyakamma</i>). ¹⁴
10	Devadatta provokes Ajātaśatru to kill his father, Bimbisāra.
11	Devadatta attempts to kill the Buddha by sending assassins after him.
12	Devadatta attempts to kill the Buddha by hurling a stone at him, thereby drawing blood.
13	The disciples of the Buddha attempt to protect the Buddha.
14	Devadatta attempts to kill the Buddha by letting loose an intoxicated elephant.
15	Devadatta hatches a plan to split the <i>saṅgha</i> by proposing five points (<i>pañcavratapada</i>) to guarantee his future reputation.
16	Śākyamuni instructs the <i>saṅgha</i> on how to deal with the crime of <i>saṅghabheda</i> ; a <i>saṅghāvaśeṣa</i> ruling against inciting a schism is released.
17	The same measures are taken toward abetting a schism when Devadatta's supporters attempt to assist him.

Storyline B

18	Devadatta proposes the five points (<i>pañcavratapada</i>).
19	Devadatta calls a vote on the five points at a venue in Rājagṛha and splits the <i>saṅgha</i> .

¹⁴ Cf. Borgland 2018: 91 for the explanation of *pākasaniyakamma*.

20	Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana successfully lure back the followers of Devadatta.
21	Devadatta dies.
22	Followers of Devadatta commit the offense of <i>sthūlātyaya</i> (Pāli <i>thullaccaya</i> , Chin. <i>touluo zhe</i> 偷羅遮).
23	Upāli asks the Buddha how to define the offense of <i>saṅghabheda</i> .

Table 3. How Episodes are Distributed
in Each of the Vinayas of Five Sthavira Offshoots¹⁵

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

¹⁵ Bold highlights the stable, fixed episodes found in the *Vibhaṅga* and *Vastu/Khandhaka*, respectively. Episodes marked with * are found only in the Chinese version, but not in the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the MSV.

2.2 *Devadatta in the Mahāsāṅghika literature*

Our present understanding of the image of Devadatta in the Mahāsāṅghika context relies on two texts, namely, the *Mohe sengqi lü* in Chinese and the *Mahāvastu* in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. These are the only two available Mahāsāṅghika texts that contain details of Devadatta's activities.¹⁶

The *Mohe sengqi lü* contains stories about Devadatta in two main parts: one in the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* (*sengcan fa* 僧殘法) section of the *vibhaṅga*,¹⁷ the other in the **Bhikṣuprakīrṇakavarga* (*zasong baqu fa* 雜誦跋渠法) section.¹⁸ I offer an English translation of both sections in the appendix of this paper. According to the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* section, Devadatta's activities mainly consist of composing divergent monastic codes and new scriptures: he reverses the monastic rules of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* and applies his new regulations to both monastic and lay Buddhists; moreover, he revises the content of the whole canon, redefines the meanings conveyed by the scriptures, and also teaches other Buddhists.¹⁹ This differs from the Sthavira accusation that he proposed five controversial points of ascetic practice, although one can still argue that asceticism may also reflect a doctrinal or legal divergence. In response, Śākyamuni issues a ruling stating that a *jñāpticaturthakarman* procedure (“an ecclesiastical act consisting a motion [*jñāpti*] followed by three proclamations [*karmavācanā/anuśrāvāṇā*]”)²⁰ must be conducted to suspend the schismatic. Monks are supposed first to pressure and admonish (in Chinese simply *jian* 諫, while in Sanskrit two terms

¹⁶ Several Sanskrit fragments of the *Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka* have been identified so far (Clarke 2015: 65). Moreover, the Mahāsāṅghika Lokottaravādin *Bhikṣuṇivāyaya* (Roth 1970: 328–329) preserves a keyword summary of the *Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka* (*prakīrṇakod-dāna*). However, none of these Sanskrit texts mention any Devadatta episodes.

¹⁷ T. 1425 (22) 281c12–282c23, 284a26–b13. The text and its translation are found in the appendix of this paper.

¹⁸ T. 1425 (22) 442c29–443a26. The text and its translation are found in the appendix of this paper.

¹⁹ T. 1425 (22) 281c12–28. 提婆達多欲破和合僧故勤方便，執持破僧事，於十二修多羅 ... 不制者制，已制者便開，乃至在家出家共行法 ... 於此九部經，更作異句、異字、異味、異義，各各異文辭說，自誦習持，亦教他誦持。For an English translation, see the appendix to this paper.

²⁰ Cf. Borgland 2014: 127 for a more detailed explanation of the definition of the *jñāpticaturthakarman*. Cf. also Heirman 2002: II.422–423 for the *jñāpticaturthakarman* in the *Sifen lü*.

sam-anu-√grah, *sam-anu-√bhāṣ* are attested)²¹ the separatist three times in private (*pingchu* 屏處) and three times in a group (*duorenzhong* 多人中).²² If such admonishment fails, monks in good standing can ask for a “*karman* for requesting permission” (*qiuting jiemo* 求聽羯磨),²³ which petitions the *saṅgha* to conduct the legal procedure against Devadatta. Here, the “*karman* for requesting permission” (Chin. *qiuting jiemo* 求聽羯磨) actually functions as the motion (*jñapti*) in the *jñapticaturthakarman* procedure. The petition, or the motion, is followed by the *saṅgha*’s admonishment of Devadatta up to three times, and those admonishments operate in a manner akin to the three proclamations [*karmavācānā/ anuśrāvaṇā*].

²¹ These two Sanskrit terms are attested in the Mahāsāṅghika *Bhikṣuṇīvinaya* (Roth 1970: 149): *sā bhikṣuṇī bhikṣuṇibhir yāvat tṛtīyakāṁ samanugrāhitavyā samanubhāṣitavyā tasya vastusya pratiniḥsargāya* (“That nun should be questioned and admonished by nuns up to three times for abandoning the [schismatic] issue”).

²² Across various Vinaya traditions, it is widely prescribed that the first step for dealing with a schismatic is to conduct an informal admonishment, usually in a private setting. The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya demonstrates the closest resemblance to the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṅghikas. Specifically, the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya also mandates the process by which a schismatic monk must be admonished by fellow monks in private, in a group, and in front of the *saṅgha* before the *saṅgha*’s decision to proceed to *jñapticaturthakarman* (T. 1421 [22] 20c7–12): a monk who has a close relationship [with the accused monk] (*qinhou biqiu* 親厚比丘) should be sent to admonish the schismatic monk. If the schismatic monk does not stop, a group of monks should be sent to admonish him. If he persists in taking schismatic actions, the *saṅgha* must admonish him. However, it should be noted that the exact number of admonishments is not specified in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya.

In other Vinayas, these informal admonitions are referred to as *vattabba* (Vin iii. 172), *jian* 諫 (“to admonish”; T. 1428 [22] 595a21), *biejian* 別諫/ *bzhams te bsgo* (T. 1442 [23] 702c20; D3, ‘*dul ba, cha, 5a3*), or *ruanyu yuechi* 軟語約勅 (“to constrain and pressure with soft words”; T. 1435 [23] 25b19). Tokiya (1987: 21) identifies several more occurrences of the *biejian* rule in MSV Vinaya texts. Cf. also Hüskén 1997: 322 for a brief mention of informal admonition in the Pāli Vinaya.

²³ The Pāli term *apalokanakamma* (“an ecclesiastical act for granting permission”), which may bear a similar connotation, is attested in the *Pācittiya* (no. 79) of the *Vinayavibhāṅga* (Vin iv. 152). In this story, the group of six [troublesome] monks gave their permission and sent one representative to attend the *karman*. The *saṅgha* took this opportunity to successfully initiate a legal process against this representative, because the group of six had already granted permission for the *karman* and all the other members of the *saṅgha* also agreed with the act.

In the MSV tradition, when a monk attempts to make an accusation (*codana*) of another monk, the accusing monk (*codaka*) must seek permission (*avakāśa*) from the accused monk (*codita*) to accuse him. A detailed discussion of the procedure of accusations (*codana*) and granting permission (*avakāśadāna*) is found in Borgland 2014: 46–51.

In the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* section of the Pāli Vinaya, Dharmaguptaka *Sifen lü*, Sarvāstivāda *Shisong lü*, and Tibetan and Chinese translations of the MSV Vinayas,²⁴ if the guilty monk still persists in his wrong action after the *saṅgha* finishes the three proclamations, he is committing an offense entailing suspension (Skt. *saṅghāvaśeṣa*, Chin. *sengjiaposhisha* 僧伽婆尸沙), as the previous petition and proclamations constitute a complete *jñāpticaturthakarman*.²⁵ However, the Chinese Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya (as well as the Mahīśāsaka as discussed in the previous footnote) adds another *jñāpticaturthakarman* procedure for enacting the ecclesiastical act of suspension (Skt. *utkṣepañīyaṃ karman*). As the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya continues to narrate, Devadatta persistently continues his schismatic activities despite the three admonishments from the *saṅgha*. Therefore, when the *saṅgha* reports the issue to the Buddha, the Buddha orders the *saṅgha* to issue an ecclesiastical act of suspension (*utkṣepañīyaṃ karman*, Chin. *ju jiemo* 舉羯磨), and the guilty monk who does not abandon his schismatic activities after three proclamations is committing a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* offense (*sengjiaposhisha* 僧伽婆尸沙). In the next part of the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* section, on rulings on monks who support a schismatic, we are told that the act of suspension does not come into effect because Devadatta's followers, conventionally termed "the group of six monks" (六群比丘) – a phrase almost synonymous with troublemaking monks – raise an objection in the third round of the proclamations (有多人遮, 羯磨不成, "Because many people raised objections, this *karman* was not [carried out] successfully"). In response to the objections of Devadatta's followers, the Buddha establishes another procedure to

²⁴ Vin iii. 171–172; *Sifen lü* T. 1428 (22) 595a20–b11; *Shisong lü* T. 1435 (23) 25b19–29; T. 1442 (23) 702c20–26, D3, 'dul ba, cha, 5a3–5.

²⁵ The eleventh-century Vinaya monk Yuanzhao 元照 (1048–1116), in his subcommentary on Daoxuan's (道宣, 598–667) *Sifen lü biqiu hanzhu jieben* 四分律比丘含注戒本 (a *Sifen lü* commentary), lists ten differences between the *saṅgha*'s admonishment (*sengjian* 僧諫) and private admonishment (*pingjian* 屏諫). Here, it states that at least four monks are needed to conduct a *sengjian*, while any members, including Buddhist monks, nuns, laypeople, and so forth can conduct a *biejian*. A *sengjian* follows the specific procedure of the *jñāpticaturthakarman*, while a *biejian* can use any (other) convenient methods (*Sifen lü hanzhu jieben shuxing zongji* 四分律含注戒本疏行宗記 X. 714 [39] 893b20–c16). This demonstrates that in the Dharmaguptaka system, when the *saṅgha* admonishes the accused monk, it is regarded as part of the *jñāpticaturthakarman*, which differs from the Mahāsāṅghika and Mahīśāsaka Vinayas.

punish monks who assist in causing a schism. In the event that the assisting monks still refuse to stop after three proclamations by the *saṅgha*, the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* ruling against abetting a schism will be implemented.

Not being suspended, Devadatta later holds an independent *poṣadha* with the group of six monks in Gayā, where the Buddha is also going to hold a *poṣadha* with his own community.²⁶ In this way, Devadatta splits the Buddha's monastic community.

The basic structure of the core narrative here is quite similar to that of the central episodes (15/16/17 or 18/22/23) of the Sthavira offshoots. However, some of their details nonetheless differ. The Mahāsāṅghika tradition reports that, in Rājagṛha, Devadatta composed different monastic rulings and new teachings in order to split the *saṅgha* with the help of the group of six monks. In comparison, the Vinayas of the five Sthavira offshoots state that Devadatta plotted to split the *saṅgha* by proposing five ascetic practices.

The *Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka* does not mention Devadatta's schismatic activities in its tenth *varga*, where the issue of *saṅghabheda* is discussed.²⁷ Instead, the relevant stories are included in the second *varga*, and more specifically, in its brief discussion of who is a *nānāsaṃvāsavarta* (Chin. *yizhu* 異住, "a [suspended] monk or nun who must reside in another community").²⁸ The story takes place in Gayā. When a *poṣadha* assembly

²⁶ As I will discuss later in detail, the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya stipulates that if two monastic communities conduct separate *karmans* or ceremonies within the same residence (Skt. *āvāsa*) or boundaries (Skt. *sīmā*), it is considered a *saṅghabheda*. Kieffer-Pülz 1992 provides a comprehensive discussion of *sīmā* in the Pāli tradition that is definitely worth reading. Cf. nn. 65–66 for more detailed discussions of *āvāsa* and *sīmā*.

²⁷ Bareau's study on the origin of the Devadatta legends clearly ignores this account, perhaps because this story is not contained in the tenth *varga*, the section focusing specifically on *saṅghabheda*. I discuss the tenth *varga* of the *Mohe seng qi lü* in n. 113 below (T. 1425 [22] 489c9–17).

²⁸ The Sanskrit *nānāsaṃvāsavarta* appears in the keyword summary of the *Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka* (*prakīrṇaka-uddāna*) attached to the Mahāsāṅghika Lokottaravādin *Bhikṣuṣūvīnaya* (cf. Roth 1970: 328, write as *nānāsaṃvāsavarta*). The Pāli term is *nānāsaṃvāsaka*, as noted by Roth (1970: 329, n. 9). BHS s.v. *nānāsaṃvāsika*: "one who lives apart (from the generality of monks or nuns), under restrictions which bar him or her from certain rights of association." For a more comprehensive explanation of the term *nānāsaṃvāsaka*, refer to n. 67 below.

It is perhaps important to notice that *nānāsaṃvāsavarta*, *niṣṭavarta*, *sthalasthavarta*, and *dinnavarta*, which are all from the second *uddāna* of the *Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka*, are

is supposed to be held, Śākyamuni sends Ānanda to summon Devadatta. However, Devadatta refuses to join the assembly and declares that he will no longer venerate the same Three Jewels, no longer share the same *poṣadha*, *pravāraṇa*, or other *karmans*, and will choose whether or not to obey the monastic codes. Conspiring with his supporters, Devadatta manages to split from Śākyamuni Buddha's *saṅgha* by performing a separate *poṣadha* ceremony in the city of Gayā, where the Buddha's *saṅgha* will also hold a *poṣadha* ceremony.

One significant point is noteworthy here: Devadatta's story is recounted within the context of the category of *nānāsaṃvāsavarta* rather than *saṅghabheda*. What does the concept *nānāsaṃvāsavarta* signify for the Devadatta narrative in the Mahāsāṅghika tradition? To address this question, it is essential to comprehend the meaning of *nānāsaṃvāsavarta* as defined in the *Mohe sengqi lü*. It may be noted that in this Vinaya, *yizhu/nānāsaṃvāsavarta* is explained twice, and in both cases it is connected with the community of supporters of a schismatic (*poseng bandang* 破僧伴黨 “the allied party that is assisting a schismatic”).²⁹

In the first occurrence, disputes between two groups of monks cause Sudatta, a householder, and other laypeople to question the worthiness of their offerings to both groups. The Buddha advises Sudatta to continue offering to both groups and teaches that when there are no schismatic monks, the two conflicting groups of monks should reside together (*saṃvāsa/samānasaṃvāsa*).³⁰ Then, disciples of the Buddha ask him to explain what constitutes *saṅghabheda*. After answering them with the definition of a *saṅghabheda* and the procedure for preventing it, the Buddha proceeds to the definition of *nānāsaṃvāsavarta*:

allied monks who assist a schismatic are *nānāsaṃvāsavarta*. They are not allowed to talk, reside, or eat together (with other monks). They do not

suffixed with the term *varta*. As studied by Chung (2006: 183, n. 42), the *Vinayamāṭṛka*, a Sarvāstivāda Vinaya text paralleled to the *Bhikṣuprakīrṇakoddāna*, contains a *vyṛta* section, which should correspond to *varga* section in the Mahāsāṅghika Lokottaravādin *Bhikṣuprakīrṇakoddāna*. Clarke 2004: 97 conducts a similar discussion of *pratisaṃyukta*, another section shared by the *Vinayamāṭṛkā* and *Bhikṣuprakīrṇakoddāna*.

²⁹ Waldschmidt (1926: 34) uses the Sanskrit *tadānuvartakā*, which is followed by Roth (1970: 150). In the *Uddāna* of the *Samghātīṣeṣa* of the Mahāsāṅghika Lokottaravādin *Prātimokṣasūtra*, *tasya cānuvartakā* is recorded (Tatia 1976: 12).

³⁰ T. 1425 (22) 440c11–12: 無有方便破僧人，應與共住。

acknowledge the authority of the same body of the buddha, dharma, and *saṅgha*. They must hold separate *poṣadha*, *varṣāvāsa*, and *pravāraṇa* ceremonies, and must perform ecclesiastical acts separately. While it is permissible to say to renunciates of other non-Buddhist schools “There are available beddings and seats. Take as you wish,” it is not permitted to say this to *nānāsaṃvāsavartakas*.³¹

The second occurrence is found at the end of the Devadatta stories discussed here: “At that time, Devadatta split the *saṅgha*. The group of six monks was the allied party assisting the schismatic. This is called *nānāsaṃvāsavarta*.”³²

These discussions demonstrate that the Mahāsāṅghika understanding of *nānāsaṃvāsavarta* is not identical to that of the Pāli Vinaya: while *nānāsaṃvāsaka* in the Pāli Vinaya refers to those who, usually due to a different interpretation of monastic codes, were suspended and thus had to perform separate ceremonies or ecclesiastical acts (not necessarily schismatic groups), the *nānāsaṃvāsavarta* in this Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya applies to the allied party of a schismatic and is the result of *saṅghabheda*. In other words, *nānāsaṃvāsavarta* is a synonym for the divided community of the schismatic. Devadatta’s story is presented as a background narrative to help define the status of the community of his supporters as being *nānāsaṃvāsavarta*.

The *Mahāvastu*³³ preserves two episodes from Devadatta’s present life. One story narrates that, after the going forth of the Buddha, Devadatta goes to woo Yaśodharā but is refused.³⁴ The text then states that this is not the first time that Yaśodharā has rejected Devadatta’s marriage proposal. In a past life, Yaśodharā, as a tigress, also refused both Devadatta’s and Sundarananda’s courtship because she yearned for the Buddha.³⁵ Even in this life, before Yaśodharā gets married, the Buddha, Devadatta,

³¹ T. 1425 (22) 441a23–27: 是破僧伴黨，盡壽不應共語、共住、共食，不共佛法僧，不共布薩安居自恣，不共羯磨。得語餘外道出家人：有床座，欲坐便坐。不得語彼坐。是名異住。 This passage has also been partially translated into English by Sasaki 1989: 193–194, in a discussion of *saṅghabheda* in the *Mohe sengqi li*.

³² T. 1425 (22) 443a25–26: 爾時提婆達多破僧，六群比丘破僧伴黨。是名異住。

³³ On the nature of this text and its date of compilation (the composition was finalized by around the sixth century), see Tournier 2012: 95.

³⁴ Marciniak ii 95–96; Senart ii 68–69 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: II.66–67.

³⁵ Marciniak ii 97–100; Senart ii 69–72 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: II.67–69.

and Sundarananda all participate in a tournament to win her hand. When Devadatta goes to the venue of the tournament, he finds a stray elephant running toward him. Devadatta strikes the elephant dead but cannot drag its body away, leaving the giant corpse blocking the passage to the city of Kapilavastu. Sundarananda, the Buddha's younger brother, comes to drag it out of the gateway, but cannot move it. In contrast, the Buddha effortlessly hurls the dead elephant over the seven walls and out of the city.³⁶ In the tournament, which consists of shooting an arrow clear through palm trees, Devadatta's arrow only advances as far as the third palm tree, while Sundarananda's arrow pierces three trees and then falls to the ground before the fourth. Śākyamuni, with his grandfather's bow that only he can string, shoots the arrow through all seven palm trees and even the drum at the far end of the trees, after which the arrow finally strikes the earth. In this way, the Buddha triumphs over Devadatta and the other Śākya princes.³⁷

The second episode from Devadatta's current life is when the young Śākya princes go forth. As Devadatta leaves home, he is riding a well-adorned elephant, but his crown is knocked off when his head hits the gate.³⁸ This portends the futility of his future religious pursuits. Based on this episode alone, though we have no other records of Devadatta's religious career in his present life elsewhere in the *Mahāvastu*, we can easily conjecture that his religious journey must have been a failed one.

Apart from the descriptions of Devadatta as the Buddha's rival in marriage, several past-life stories are also preserved in the *Mahāvastu*, on the basis of which more pieces can be added to the puzzle of Devadatta's image. Specifically, in the first story,³⁹ Devadatta had coveted the wife of the Buddha in a past life, for which he incurred severe punishment. This recalls his competition with the Buddha for Yaśodharā in his present

³⁶ Marciniak ii 103–104; Senart ii 74–75 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: II.71–72.

³⁷ Marciniak ii 104–105; Senart ii 75–77 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: II.72–74.

³⁸ Marciniak iii 227; Senart iii 178 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: III.174.

³⁹ Senart i 128–131 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: I.101–103. In this Jātaka (although not specifically termed as *jātaka* in the text), Devadatta appears as an evil king named Jāthara. He desires Apratimā, the wife of a merciful king named Kuśa; Queen Apratimā, Yaśodharā's past incarnation, physically punishes Jāthara. However, at the request of the compassionate king Kuśa, she spares him.

life. Based on the accounts in the second⁴⁰ and third⁴¹ stories, in which Devadatta vainly conspired to murder the Buddha, we can deduce that the composers of the *Mahāvastu* must have been familiar with Devadatta's aborted murder plans. From the fourth story,⁴² in which Devadatta's leadership was particularly condemned, we can surmise that the *Mahāvastu*'s composers must have been familiar with the Devadatta who acted as the leader of the schismatic community. Generally speaking, each of these Jātakas contrasts the evilness of Devadatta with the Buddha's compassion, agreeing with the Sthavira accounts that the mercy of the Buddha is frequently contrasted with Devadatta's ingratitude.⁴³

In sum, in the *Mohe sengqi lü*, the core of the Devadatta narrative is still his schismatic activities, which consist of at least two aspects: composing new Vinaya rules and canonical scriptures, and conducting a *poṣadha* ceremony separately from the Buddha's *saṅgha* within the same residence (*āvāsa*) or boundaries (*sīmā*). There is no evidence associating Devadatta with ascetic tendencies or transgressions⁴⁴ as usually narrated in the Sthavira-derived Vinayas. The stories contained in the *Mahāvastu* display a more developed narrative tradition. As we read in the other five Vinayas, Devadatta always possesses ill intentions toward

⁴⁰ Senart i 132 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: I.103. In the second Jātaka, Devadatta, being a wretched hunter, manages to shoot a lion that is a former existence of the Buddha. However, the lion expresses no intention of revenge, even though it has the capability to kill the hunter.

⁴¹ Senart i 132 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: I.104. The third Jātaka relates that Devadatta was a treacherous navigator who conspired with a group of bandits to kill a caravan leader, a former existence of the Buddha. However, after Devadatta's conspiracy fails, the caravan leader grants Devadatta pardon out of compassion.

⁴² Senart i 359–366 = Eng. Jones 1949–1956: I.305–311. In the fourth Jātaka, the Buddha and Devadatta are reincarnated as the deer Nyagrodha and Viśākha, two brothers each leading their own herd. When a pregnant doe from Viśākha's herd is ordered to go to the king's kitchen and offer her own life, she pleads with Viśākha to let her survive until she delivers her fawn. Viśākha does not absolve her because no other deer agree to offer themselves in her place; in the end, Nyagrodha decides to take her place in order to save her baby. Having figured out what has happened, all the people applaud Nyagrodha for being a good leader and condemn Viśākha's evil leadership.

⁴³ Cf. *Dubhiyamakkaṭajātaka* (no. 174, Ja ii. 71); T. 202 (4) 366b3–9; T. 1450 (24) 180a22–c10.

⁴⁴ For instance, the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya knows the story of Ajātaśatru murdering his father (T. 1425 [22] 329b15–c15; 370a28–b1). However, there is no explicit association between Devadatta and Ajātaśatru's patricide.

the Buddha, habitually competing with him not only in this life but also in past lives. Many stories, such as Devadatta's various attempts to murder the Buddha and his attempted wooing of Yaśodharā, may have been known among Mahāsāṅghika monks.

2.3 Summary: *The Devadatta narrative in historical development*

Insofar as the available information is concerned, both the ancient Sthaviras and Mahāsāṅghikas reached a consensus regarding Devadatta's central image as a schismatic in the Vinaya literature. To briefly summarize what we have discussed above, in both the Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika offshoots, the core image of Devadatta is no doubt that of a schismatic who attempted to split the monastic community of Śākyamuni Buddha. It is noteworthy that Devadatta's ascetic tendencies are not mentioned in the available Mahāsāṅghika texts. The Devadatta narrative, as shared in both the Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika traditions, can thus be reduced to the same basic skeleton: when Devadatta intended to split the *saṅgha*, the Buddha legalized a procedure to prevent and punish schismatics; furthermore, the Buddha also legalized a procedure to suspend the supporters of the schism after Devadatta's followers assisted with his schismatic activities (episodes 15, 16, 17 or 18, 22, 23). Within this narrative skeleton, we find the earliest and most fundamental image of Devadatta as a schismatic.

There are also noticeable differences between the Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika versions of the Devadatta stories. The five Sthavira-derived Vinayas associate Devadatta's schism with his ascetic tendencies, an aspect that cannot be found in the extant Mahāsāṅghika tradition(s). Devadatta's supporters are also not represented consistently: on the Sthavira side, there are usually four major followers, while the *Mohe sengqi lü* refers to the group of six monks. Of course, the exact degree of depravity exhibited in the Mahāsāṅghika account is still unknown due to the lack of records. Nevertheless, the composers of the *Mahāvastu* seemed to share some stories with the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition, which was quite enthusiastic in ascribing more evil qualities and actions to Devadatta.

In the next section, I will demonstrate how the popular version of Devadatta's biography is effectively modeled on the definition of a schismatic in the Vinayas. I will reveal that the true significance of the figure

of Devadatta must first and foremost be understood in the Buddhist schismatic context. By examining the gap between Devadatta's portrayal as a schismatic and a villain, we can better understand the evolution of his narrative from a legal debate to a depiction of him as a morally repugnant character.

3. Main Discussion: Devadatta's biography in the context of *Saṅghabheda*

Analyzing the content and distribution of the Devadatta episodes in the Vinayas leads us to conclude that the core image of Devadatta is that of the first schismatic who dares to challenge the Buddha. Such a core image, even on its own, would largely account for the forceful resentment of generations of Buddhists toward Devadatta.

However, surrounding Devadatta's core image as a schismatic are also some records about his achievement in his early monkhood, which seem irrelevant to, or even conflict with, his unfavorable image as a schismatic. Why do Buddhist traditions, despite endeavoring to portray him as heinous as possible, relate the successes of his early life? Why do most of the Vinayas not choose to omit this favorable detail of Devadatta's biography? Do these mutually conflicting aspects⁴⁵ of Devadatta's image consequently prevent the Devadatta narrative from being a classic schismatic story? Or can these diverse aspects combine to form a coherent and harmonious whole, collectively serving the polemical rhetoric against schism?

To venture a basic answer, I will demonstrate that this positive portrait is crucial to the process of making Devadatta the paradigm of a schismatic. I will analyze several elements of Devadatta's biography against the ideological background of schism, and discuss the meaning these stories produce in the Buddhist schismatic context. As we shall see, his biography is modeled on Buddhist understandings of the definition of a schismatic; many elements of his schismatic stories, some appearing to

⁴⁵ Another conflicting aspect of Devadatta's image is that of a monk advocating asceticism. Generally speaking, advocating a more self-disciplined lifestyle would seem to warrant a favorable reception in the Buddhist context, but Devadatta's ascetic propositions are condemned as incorrect. I will devote a separate paper to discussing this issue.

be disjointed or contradictory, indeed reflect particular discussions of schism. Investigating the Devadatta narrative in a schismatic context also contributes to our awareness that Buddhists have possessed complicated attitudes toward the issue of schism.

3.1 *Defining a schismatic: Starting from Devadatta's early monkhood*

Over the past few decades, modern Buddhist scholars have taken note of the accounts of Devadatta's prosperous early life found in Buddhist texts from various traditions. Especially in the Sarvāstivāda tradition, the success of his early religious pursuits is portrayed with great exaggeration, highlighting his majesty in his early monkhood. The success of Devadatta's early monastic life has already been noticed by scholars such as A. Bareau and R. Ray.

These scholars have attempted to explore the historical significance of this aspect of the Devadatta story in various ways, which arrive at more or less the same answer. One example is found in the works of Bareau. Based on the hypothesis that the figure's ascetic tendencies are included in the original layer of the Devadatta narrative (with which I disagree; see above, n. 8), Bareau argues for reading Devadatta originally as a schismatic who sincerely wished to return to a more austere life. Since the harsh condemnation of Devadatta seems to have arisen only later in his history, Bareau believes that these positive accounts should be read as a relic of the historical Devadatta, a portrait of the "real" Devadatta that later Buddhist editors could not eliminate. Bareau's positive reading of Devadatta is then fully adopted by Ray (1994: 162–178), who argues that Devadatta was a forest saint who was maligned by the later, settled monastic community because Devadatta's promotion of austere practices and the forest lifestyle would have jeopardized the interests of the settled monks who controlled the writing of scriptures. Consequently, in their hatred toward Devadatta, the settled Buddhists fabricated stories of his evil deeds. In Ray's argument, the demonization of Devadatta reflects the opposition between the two Buddhist lifestyles: forest-dwelling and settled monasticism.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Ray 1994: 171–172: "It seems clear that the core of the Devadatta legend, and particularly the vitriolic nature of the condemnation of this saint, is best understood as the

The above interpretation, however, cannot be supported by the Devadatta narrative itself, since in the core narrative (episodes 15/16/17 and 18/22/23), Devadatta already appears as a schismatic who deserves reprimand. After all, transmitted Buddhist texts are religious – not historical⁴⁷ – in nature, and the existence of a naive, saintly Devadatta probably shares the same degree of fiction as that of an evil Devadatta.

In fact, there is no need to resurrect a “historical” Devadatta in order to understand the significance of his early achievements. Since the Devadatta stories are closely associated with the Vinaya discourse on schismatic issues, we should make an effort to read and comprehend the Devadatta narrative, which encompasses his early life as a monk, within the context of legal discussions on schism. I argue that the episodes about Devadatta’s early monkhood precisely serve to establish Devadatta’s legitimacy as a schismatic monk. As we delve into a close analysis, it becomes clear that the precise details of Devadatta’s early achievements differ among various sources, yet they uniformly adhere to the specific Vinaya regulations regarding schismatics within their respective traditions.

We may commence our investigation with the Sarvāstivāda Vinayas, the tradition that uses the most embellishments to highlight Devadatta’s early religious endeavors. The *Shisong lü*, for instance, stresses that Devadatta once assiduously pursued the correct path and enjoyed great fame in his first twelve years of monkhood:⁴⁸

expression of a controversy between a proponent (and his tradition) of forest Buddhism and proponents of settled monasticism, a controversy that in the sources is seen from the viewpoint of the monastic side.”

⁴⁷ Although scholars have discovered many images depicting the figure of Devadatta (e.g., Zin 2006a: 69–95; 2006b: 332–337), beyond the testimony of legends, we have no evidence to claim that a historical Devadatta ever existed. I only find the name Devadatta discovered in archaeological findings one time. The name Devadatta appears in a first-century Kharoṣṭhī inscription carved on a volute bracket excavated in Sirkap (Konow 1929: 99–100). However, we have little idea whether or not this name has any connection with our Devadatta.

⁴⁸ T. 1435 (23) 257a7–12: 佛在王舍城。爾時調達，於佛法中信敬心清淨，著三十萬金錢直莊嚴具出家，乘調善象直十萬金錢，是象以金網等莊嚴，亦直十萬金錢。調達所著衣服，復直十萬金錢。是調達出家作比丘，十二年中善心修行，讀經、誦經、問疑、受法、*坐禪，爾時佛所說法皆悉讀誦。(I use asterisk [*] to indicate terms that I will further explain).

The Buddha dwelled in the city of Rājagṛha. At that time, Devadatta entertained a pure, faithful mind toward Buddhist teachings. He went forth into homeless life with ornaments that were worth three hundred thousand gold coins. He rode a magnificent elephant worth one hundred thousand gold coins. The elephant was ornamented with golden nets and other things, which were worth another one hundred thousand gold coins. The clothes which Devadatta wore were again worth ten hundred thousand gold coins. Devadatta went forth and became a monk, and for twelve years he cultivated the path with wholesome thoughts. He read *sūtras*, chanted *sūtras*, asked about his doubts, received the Dharma, and sat in meditation. At that time, he read and recited all the teachings preached by the Buddha.

A similar portrait is also painted in the *Chuyao jing* 出曜經 (T. 212),⁴⁹ a version of the *Udānavarga* with prose explanations and narratives added, possibly also affiliated with the early Sarvāstivāda tradition:⁵⁰

The Buddha once dwelled in Kalanda's abode, in the Bamboo Grove in Rājagṛha. At that time, there was a monk named Devadatta. He was intelligent and extensively learned. For twelve years, he sat in meditation entering *samādhi*. His mind never wandered. In the beginning, he never dismissed any of the twelve austerity practices. He roused himself to the contemplation of impurity and the mindfulness of inhalation and

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

⁴⁹ According to Hiraoka 2007b, the stories in the *Chuyao jing* mostly conform to the Sarvāstivāda *Shisong lü*, but with one story closer to the *Āṅguttaranikāya* and the *Zengyi ahan jing*. Cf. also Tomomatsu 1970: 98–102. Mitsuno (1981: 12–15) argues that the *Udānavarga* was the (or a) version of the *Dharmapada* that was popular in the Sarvāstivāda schools. The *Chuyao jing*'s textual relationship with the *Udānavarga* is explained in Mitsuno (1981: 58, 62).

⁵⁰ T. 212 (4) 687b7–11: 昔佛在羅閱城竹園加蘭陀所。爾時有比丘名曰調達，聰明廣學，十二年中坐禪入定，心不移易，十二頭陀初不缺減，起不淨觀 (**aśubha-bhavānā*)，了出入息 (**ānāpāna-smṛti*)，*世間第一法 (**agra-dharma*)，乃至頂法 (**mūrdhana*) 一一分別，所誦佛經六萬，象載不勝。

The above description of Devadatta's religious cultivation resembles the cultivation process advanced in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, in which *aśubha-bhavānā* and *ānāpāna-smṛti* are regarded as two paths to enter into meditation for those who are dominated by desire (*rāga*) and doubt (*vitarka*). Practitioners at different stages of the four roots of wholesome karma (*si shan'gen* 四善根; these are, in ascending order of superiority, *uṣmagata*, *mūrdhana*, *kṣānti*, and *agra-dharma*) will go through varying situations to attain deliverance. *Abhidh-k-bh* 337–348; *Abhidh-k-k* verses 6.9–6.23; T. 1558 (29) 117b6–120c15; Fr. La Vallée Poussin 1923–1931: IV.148–176 = Eng. Pruden 1988–1990: III.916–941.

exhalation. He distinguished each dharma, from the “foremost worldly dharmas” to the “peak dharmas.” The Buddhist *sūtras* that he recited amount to sixty thousand, which even an elephant was incapable of carrying.

Apart from some additional details about his dedicated practice of meditation and austerity, the depiction of Devadatta as a diligent monk is reiterated in a similar way to what we read in the *Shisong lü*. The accounts of his early accomplishments reflect a widespread narrative about Devadatta in the Sarvāstivāda schools, which is further attested to in the *Binaïye*, another Vinaya text affiliated with the Sarvāstivāda tradition.⁵¹ The famous Chinese pilgrim Xuanzang also heard that Devadatta had maintained a proper religious life in his first twelve years of monkhood,⁵² an account which seems to draw on Sarvāstivāda texts as the source.

The widespread Sarvāstivāda records regarding Devadatta’s early accomplishments serve as a reflection of how this particular school

⁵¹ *Binaïye* 鼻奈耶 T. 1464 (24) 857c11–15. According to Clarke (2015: 72), the *Binaïye* is an incomplete Vinaya, only containing a *vibhaṅga* section.

⁵² *Datang xiyu ji* 大唐西域記 T. 2087 (51) 900a1–3: 提婆達多(唐言天授), 斛飯王之子也。精勤十二年, 已誦持八萬法藏。(“Tipodaduo [Devadatta] – the meaning of which is ‘given by the Heaven’ in Chinese translation – a prince of King Droṇodana. [He] practiced diligently for twelve years, and had already recited and retained eighty thousand collections of the Dharma.”) It seems to draw from the *Da zhidu lun* T. 1509 (29) 164c1–9: 是時, 斛飯王子提婆達多, 出家學道, 誦六萬法聚, 精進修行, 滿十二年。(“At that time, Devadatta, a prince of King Droṇodana, went forth to pursue the religious path. He recited sixty thousand collections of Buddhist teachings and practiced in an earnest way for twelve entire years.”)

The *Da zhidu lun*, allegedly authored by the famous Nāgārjuna, is completely preserved only in its Chinese translation by Kumārajīva (ca. 344–413). For a more detailed study and translation of this work, Lamotte’s masterpiece (1944–1980) is always an indispensable source of knowledge and inspiration. According to Lamotte, the author, possibly not Nāgārjuna, must have been a Mahāyāna Buddhist who was quite familiar with Sarvāstivāda works. As Lamotte (1944–1980: I.88, n. 1; 106, n. 1, etc.) points out repeatedly in his translation of the *Da zhidu lun*, when the *Da zhidu lun* cites a Vinaya without further specifying its school affiliation, it is generally referring to the *Shisong lü*. Furthermore, some stories from the *Da zhidu lun* resemble the versions in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya: for instance, Yaśodharā’s pregnancy (cf. Lamotte 1944–1980: II.1001ff., Strong 1997; cp. T. 1509 [29] 182b15–c20; T. 1450 [24] 158c16–159b11, 162b1–c22). However, the more recent research by Zacchetti (2021: 110–116) has suggested that a clear affiliation with a particular Buddhist school may not be meaningful for the *Da zhidu lun*, which is a collective compendium in genre, despite the clear influence from the Sarvāstivāda *Vibhāṣā* compendia.

defines the attributes of a schismatic. In the *Shisong lü*, the Buddha defines a schismatic as follows:⁵³

The Buddha spoke to Upāli: “A single monk is incapable of splitting a united *bhikṣusaṅgha*. Neither can two monks, or three, or four, or five, or six, or seven, or eight monks split a united *bhikṣusaṅgha*. It takes a minimum of nine **purified** monks with shared views [on monastic disciplines] to split a united *bhikṣusaṅgha*. Upāli! A single nun cannot split a united *saṅgha*. Nor can two, or three, or four, or five, or six, or seven, or eight, or nine purified nuns with shared views split a united *saṅgha*. Upāli! Not a single probationer (*śikṣamānā*), nor a single male or a female novice, nor a single male or female [non-Buddhist] renunciate (**pravrajita*) can split a united *saṅgha*. Even two, or three, or four, or five, or six, or seven, or eight, or nine of them, who are purified and shares the same view, are still unable to split a united *saṅgha*.”

In light of the above discussion, the first condition for being a schismatic is to be a monk, not a nun or other monastic members. Moreover, one must be a “purified” (*qingjing* 清淨) monk. According to one of its commentaries, *qingjing* 清淨 means that a monk does not violate the legal rules, and therefore remains pure in terms of conduct and actions

⁵³ T. 1435 (23) 267a4–12: 佛語優波離: *一比丘不能破和合僧, 若二、若三、四、五、六、七、八, 亦不能破和合比丘僧。極少乃至九清淨同見比丘, 能破和合比丘僧。優波離! 一比丘尼不能破和合僧, 若二、若三、四、五、六、七、八、九清淨同見比丘尼, 亦不能破和合僧。優波離! 非一式叉摩尼、非一沙彌沙彌尼、非一出家出家尼*能破和合僧, 若二、若三、四、五、六、七、八、九清淨同見, 亦不能破和合僧。

*一比丘不能破和合僧, 若二、若三...亦不能破和合: The same account appears more than once in the *Shisong lü*. Note that T. 1435 (23) 372a20–21 seems to be partially corrupted, as it states that two to nine proper *bhikṣus* can [should be corrected to “cannot”] cause a schism (一比丘不能破僧, 二、三、四乃至九比丘清淨同見者能破)。

*出家出家尼 (“male or female renunciates”): Conventionally, the Buddhist monastic community consists of seven groups (i.e., *bhikṣu*, *bhikṣuṇī*, *śikṣamānā*, *śrāmaṇera*, *śrāmaṇerī*, *upāsaka*, *upāsikā*), with these two additional groups (出家, 出家尼) not included in the listing. In my understanding, the two groups refer to non-Buddhist renunciates. This understanding is supported by parallel readings among different Vinaya texts. For instance, in the *Wufen biqiuni jieben* (T. 1437 [23] 483b6–7) and *Mohe sengqi lü* (T. 1425 [22] 373c22–23), where a *pācattika* ruling is issued against some Buddhist monks or nuns who give food to 出家/出家尼 (or 出家男/出家女) with their hands, the parallel readings in the Vinayas such as the *Sifen lü* and *Shifen lü* qualify them as groups of heretics (外道男, 外道女; e.g., T. 1428 [22] 664c20–21; T. 1435 [23] 100c20–21).

(similar to the Pāli term *pakatatta* as we will elaborate later).⁵⁴ *Tongjian* 同見 (“shared views”) literally means sharing the same views, and according to Bechert (1961: 32; 1982: 67–68), the term “view” (*dr̥ṣṭi/diṭṭhi*) in Vinaya context specifically refers to those on monastic discipline, rather than on doctrines. In this sense, *tongjian* expresses something similar to the Pāli term *samānasaṃvāsaka*, since they both refer to those belonging to the same community who hold the same understanding with regard to monastic discipline.⁵⁵

Elsewhere, the *Shisong lü* further emphasizes that the *binbiqiu* (擯比丘, **utksipta*),⁵⁶ those who are suspended and consequently not allowed to participate in monastic ceremonies and ecclesiastical acts, cannot split the *saṅgha*. This again confirms that proper monkhood is a necessary precondition for being a schismatic in the Sarvāstivāda school(s). Indeed, according to the *Shisong lü*, Devadatta was not suspended even though he was about to be charged with a *jñāpticaturthakarman*, as “he ceased his schismatic actions after being instructed by the Buddha.”⁵⁷

The requirement for being a purified monk prescribed by Vinayas is also accepted and further elaborated by the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharmas. For instance, in the **Abhidharmasamayapradīpika* (阿毘達磨藏顯宗論, T. 1563), it is stressed that a schismatic must possess majesty to cause a schism, and only a great monk (*da biqiu* 大苾芻) is endowed with such majesty:⁵⁸

⁵⁴ In the Chinese Vinaya commentary 四分律刪補隨機羯磨疏正源記 (X726), 清淨同見 is explained as referring to those who “do not violate any of the essence of the precepts and share the same correct view” (X726 [40] 888c6: 戒體無違, 同一正見也).

⁵⁵ The term *samānasaṃvāsa* (see n. 64) implies collective performance of ecclesiastical ceremonies or acts within the same monastic boundaries. It is unclear whether *Tongjian* carries the same connotation.

⁵⁶ T. 1435 (23) 267a20–21: 一切比丘皆能破僧, 唯除擯人不能破僧 (“All categories of monks have the potential to cause a schism. Only the suspended cannot cause a schism”).

⁵⁷ T. 1435 (23) 25b1–2: 爾時, 提婆達多聞佛口教, 暫捨是事。

⁵⁸ This passage is contained in two texts, **Abhidharmasamayapradīpika* (阿毘達磨藏顯宗論, T. 1563 [29] 886b27–c3) and **Abhidharmayāyānusāra* (阿毘達磨順正理論, T. 1562 [29] 587c19–24): 論曰: 能破僧者, 要大苾芻, 必非在家、苾芻尼等, 以彼依止無威德故。唯*見行人, 非*愛行者, 以惡意樂極堅深故, 於染淨品俱躁動故。要住淨行, 方能破僧, 以犯戒人, 無威德故。即由此證, 造餘逆後不能破僧, 以造餘逆, 及受彼果, *處無定故。

Commentary: The one who can cause a schism must be a great *bhikṣu*, definitely not a layperson, a *bhikṣuṇī*, or so forth, because (the latter categories) are not majestic objects to rely on. He must be one whose activities are based on [correct] views (*drṣṭicarita*), not on emotion (*trṣṇācarita*), because evil inclinations can be extremely solid and deep, and also can be agitated by both defilement and purity. Only one abiding in purity can split the *saṅgha*, because violators of monastic codes possess no majesty (*prabhāva*). In view of the above argument, it can be deduced that one who has already committed other sins of immediate retribution (*ānantaryakarma*, *nizui* 逆罪) has no opportunity to cause a schism. This is because the perpetrator of other sins of immediate retribution would receive subsequent retributions and be reborn in an unfixated location (**avyasthāna*, Tib. *rnam par mi gnas pa*).

This Abhidharma discussion can effectively be interpreted as an elucidation or an annotation of the Vinaya rule regarding the necessary condition for causing a schism. Although the discourse is prompted by the inquiry of whether a perpetrator of other *ānantaryakarmas* (“sins of immediate retribution”)⁵⁹ could cause a schism, the primary objective is to highlight the required majesty of a potential schismatic. The discourse stresses that only monks possess enough majesty to divide a monastic community; it asserts that only monks whose actions are based upon correct views, rather than personal preferences, may divide the monastic community, as they could then avoid sinking into the depths of evil inclinations; and only monks who maintain pure conduct and morality may cause a split in a monastic community, as they would otherwise lose their majesty.

*見行 and 愛行: e.g., T. 1559 (29) 247c14: 是比丘多見行, 非貪愛行 = Abhidh-k-bh 261.10: *sa ca drṣṭicarita eva na trṣṇācaritaḥ*. Lamotte (1944–1980: III.1292) translates *drṣṭicarita* as “les rationalistes” and *trṣṇācarita* as “les sensuels.”

*處無定: Index Abhidh-k-bh s.v. 處無定 and *avyasthāna*. For a detailed discussion of *avyasthāna*, see Abhidh-k-bh 227.21–228.1; T. 1559 (29) 237b2–9.

⁵⁹ The standard list includes killing one’s father, mother, or an arhat, drawing the blood of a *tathāgata*, and inciting a schism (Silk 2007: 253). At Sāñcī, the order of the five transgressions is slightly different: killing one’s mother, father, or an arhat, drawing the blood of a buddha, and inciting a schism (Marshall et al. 1901: 341). The *ānantaryakarma* perspective on Devadatta’s sin will be discussed in a separate paper. While my dissertation (Li 2019b: 170–174) offers an initial investigation into this subject, it undoubtedly contains errors that require revision and reevaluation. In any case, Devadatta’s association with other *ānantaryakarmas* was possibly developed relatively later than his schismatic image. Hiraoka (1993: 296–298) already notices that drawing blood from the Buddha’s foot was initially a story independent from Devadatta.

The glowing portrayal of Devadatta's early monastic life may reflect the requirement that high esteem is a prerequisite for instigating a schism, both as outlined in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya and as expounded in the Abhidharma commentaries on such a requirement. It is worth noting, however, that other schools' Vinayas do not require that a schismatic monk be an eminent monk, as I will discuss briefly below. Therefore, the emphasis on the majesty of a schismatic monk is likely a unique interpretation within the Sarvāstivāda tradition.

The agreement between Devadatta's portrayal and the characteristics of a schismatic monk can also be observed in the Pāli Vinaya. In the Pāli Vinaya, Devadatta attains an immediate albeit ordinary achievement after ordination: while Bhaddiya, Anuruddha, and even Ānanda all attain supernatural achievements, what Devadatta masters is only mundane magical power (*pothujjanikaṃ iddhiṃ*, Vin ii.183), or elsewhere, [eight] meditative attainments (*aṭṭha samāpatti*, Mp i.191; *jhānalābhī jāto*, *Sukhavihārijātaka* [no. 10, Ja i. 141]).⁶⁰ Correspondingly, the Pāli Vinaya actually also requires that a schismatic monk have the status of regular monkhood, without necessarily requiring a majestic status:⁶¹

⁶⁰ Vin ii.183: *Atha kho āyasmā Bhaddiyo teneva antaravassena tisso vijjā sacchākāsi. Āyasmā Anuruddho dibbacakkhuṃ uppādesi. Āyasmā Ānando sotāpattiphalaṃ sacchākāsi. Devadatto pothujjanikaṃ iddhiṃ abhinipphādesi.* Cf. DhP-A i.138.

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

According to the *Manorathapūraṇī* (Mp i.191), Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Ānguttaranikāya*, Devadatta gained eight meditative attainments (*aṭṭha samāpatti*) while the achievements of Bhaddiya and Anuruddha were higher: *evaṃ Anupiyambavanam gantvā pabbajitesu pana tesu tasmīṃyeva antovasse Bhaddiyathero arahattaṃ pāpuṇi, Anuruddhatthero dibbacakkhuṃ nibbattesī, Devadatto aṭṭha samāpattiyō nibbattesī, Ānandatthero sotāpattiphale patiṭṭhāsī, Bhagutthero ca Kimbilatthero ca pacchā arahattaṃ pāpuṇiṃsu* (“Thus, [they] went to the mango grove in Anupiya. Among those who have gone forth, the elder Bhaddiya attained arhatship during the very same rainy season, the elder Anuruddha developed divine eyes, Devadatta gained the eight meditative attainments, the elder Ānanda was established in the fruit of stream entry, and elder Bhagu and Kimbila later attained arhatship”).

⁶¹ Vin ii.204: *Na kho, Upāli, bhikkhunī saṅghaṃ bhindati, api ca bhedāya parakkamati, na sikkhamānā saṅghaṃ bhindati ... na sāmaṇero ... na sāmaṇerī ... na upāsako ... na upāsikā saṅghaṃ bhindati, api ca bhedāya parakkamati. Bhikkhu kho, Upāli, pakatatto, samānasaṃvāsako, samānasimāyaṃ ṭhito, saṅghaṃ bhindati.*

Upāli, a nun cannot split a monastic community, even if she strives for a schism ... A probationer ... a novice ... a woman novice ... a lay follower ... a female lay follower cannot split a monastic community, even if she strives for a schism. Only a **regular** monk, Upāli – living in the same community (*samānasamvāsako*), staying within the same boundaries (*samānasīmāyaṃ thito*)⁶² – can split a monastic community.

Similar to the requirement stated in the *Shisong lü*, the first condition for being a schismatic in the Pāli Vinaya is also being a monk, not a nun, nor a novice, nor a lay follower. Moreover, one must also be a *pakatatta* monk, who is “a regular (monk),” one not presently subject to any monastic punishment.⁶³ When we read the Devadatta narrative, when the

It is worth noting that some Pāli texts also include stories about Devadatta’s prestige. However, these stories do not appear to be connected with the context of the Vinaya regulations, so I have chosen not to include them in the main discussion. One example of such a story is found in the Dhammapada commentary *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā* (Dhp-A i. 79–80 = Eng. Burlingame 1921: I.190–191). It narrates an interesting story in which Devadatta is promoted to the rank of one of Śākyamuni’s top two disciples (Pāli *dvinnam aggasāvakanam*), alongside Śāriputra. As the legend goes, a householder donated a robe to the community and the monks had to choose between Devadatta and Śāriputra, Śākyamuni’s two chief disciples, to be the recipient of the robe. After a lengthy debate, the majority of the monastic community agrees that Devadatta, rather than Śāriputra, should receive the robe. Although Devadatta is not treated in a favorable light in the story’s later events (as it turns out, the robe does not fit Devadatta at all, and the Buddha also steps in and criticizes Devadatta for habitually wearing robes not made for him), a remarkably high prestige is still credited to him: he once possessed enough charisma to overshadow Śāriputra. As another example, in the PTS edition of the *Udāna* (Ud 3), Devadatta is regarded as one of the eleven Buddhist sages whom Śākyamuni praises. However, Devadatta’s name is not attested in all available Pāli editions, as in the Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti (Be) and Siamese (Se) editions the name Devadatta is omitted and there are only ten saints. Cf. Masfield 1994: 14, n. 31 and Ray 1994: 162; 176, n. 32. Since the Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti edition often changes readings, it seems more likely that Devadatta’s name was deleted from the list by later editorial intervention. Additionally, the fact that different editions contain many variations of the list of elders suggests that this list was not a particularly stable tradition.

⁶² Kieffer-Pülz (1992: 54) translates the phrase *samānasīmāyaṃ thito* as “in derselben Sīmā aufhält” (“residing in the same *sīmā*”). Cf. n. 65 for the discussion of *sīmā*.

In the *Saṅghādisesa* section of the *Vibhaṅga* of the Pāli Vinaya (and in many other places as well), the phrase *samānasamvāsako samānasīmāyaṃ thito* is used to explain the term *samaggo*: *samaggo nāma saṅgho samānasamvāsako samānasīmāyaṃ thito* (“a united *saṅgha* means those living in the same community, staying within the same monastery boundaries”). Cf. Bechert 1961: 22–23.

⁶³ The term *pakatatta* typically refers to a monk who is in good standing, particularly with regard to his eligibility for participating in religious ceremonies and other ecclesiastical acts. Kieffer-Pülz (1992: 126, n. 198): “*Pakatatta*, hier mit ‘regulär ordiniert’

Buddha's *saṅgha* initiates a *jñāpticaturthakarman* procedure to suspend Devadatta for his schismatic actions, Devadatta's supporters stand up to defend him, assisting him in evading suspension. Therefore, in actuality he still maintains the status of a regular monk at the moment when he splits the Buddha's *saṅgha*. There is no requirement for depicting Devadatta as a great monk in terms of Vinaya regulations, and in fact, Devadatta is not regarded as esteemed as in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya.

Moreover, in the Pāli Vinaya, additional criteria for being considered a schismatic are suggested, and it is noteworthy that the story of Devadatta satisfies all of these criteria. For instance, the schismatic must belong to the same community (*saṃvāsa*)⁶⁴ that adheres to the same set of *Prātimokṣa* rules and performs monastic ceremonies and formal acts collectively within the same monastic boundaries (Pāli *sīmā*).⁶⁵ In other

übersetzt, wird auch durch 'integer' wiedergegeben (PTSD s.v. *pakatatta*). Damit sind Mönche gemeint, die ein Kamma durchführen können, d.h. bei denen alle Voraussetzungen für das jeweilige Kamma gegeben sind." Nolot 1996: 122, n. 18, "a regular monk;" Silk 2009: 238, n. 18: "[*pakatatta*] indicates a monk who is not subject to any disciplinary restrictions on his monastic status and is thus not only a monk but in good standing *vis-à-vis* the rules of monastic conduct."

⁶⁴ According to Kieffer-Pülz (1992: 63), the term *saṃvāsa* "umfaßt demnach über das bloße Zusammenleben hinaus die gemeinsame Durchführung von 'Rechtshandlungen' (*kamma*), die gemeinsame Pātimokkha-Rezitation (*ekuddeso*) und die 'gleiche Schulung' (*samasikkhātā*), was sich vermutlich auf die Befolgung derselben Pātimokkha-Regeln bezieht. Es kann daher im übertragenen Sinn mit 'Gemeinschaft' übersetzt werden." Cf. also Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 52–53. In other words, *saṃvāsa* ("community") encompasses not only communal living, but also adherence to the same set of *Prātimokṣa* rules and the collective performance of monastic ceremonies and formal acts. This term is closely related to the other term *āvāsa* ("residence"), which indicates the area where monks and nuns spend the rainy season together. (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 43–45: "Āvāsa wird ... in der vorliegenden Arbeit mit 'Wohnbezirk' wiedergegeben. Der 'Wohnbezirk' ist das Gebiet, in dem die buddhistischen Mönche und Nonnen die drei Monate der 'Regenzeit' [*vassa*] verbringen und den sie in diesem Zeitraum nur in Ausnahmefällen verlassen dürfen. Er wird daher gelegentlich 'Regenzeit-Wohnbezirk' [*vassavasa*] genannt.")

⁶⁵ A residence (*āvāsa*) needs to have boundaries (*sīmā*). Jurisdictional boundaries (Skt. *sīmā*) indicate the territory within which monastic ceremonies and formal acts have to be carried out. (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 55: "Im Rahmen der buddhistischen Rechtsvorschriften ist *Sīmā* f bzw. *Sīma terminus technicus* für die 'Grenze [eines Gemeindebezirks].' Ursprünglich ist eine *Sīmā* in diesem Sinn die konkrete Grenze 'eines Wohnbezirks' [*ekāvāsa*]. Später wird der *Terminus Sīmā* eigenständig gebraucht, unabhängig von der Ausdehnung eines Wohnbezirks und unabhängig davon, ob es sich um eine 'festgelegte' [*sammata*] oder 'nicht-festgelegte' [*asammata*] *Sīma* handelt.")

words, if the schismatic monk does not reside together with the *saṅgha* that he intends to divide, and more importantly, if he does not participate in ceremonies or other ecclesiastical acts together with the members of that *saṅgha*, he is not regarded as a *saṅghabhedaka*, but more accurately as a *nānāsaṃvāsaka* (“a monk or nun who must reside in another community”).⁶⁶ In the Pāli Vinaya, Devadatta’s initiation of a vote for schism

Elsewhere, Chung and Kieffer-Pülz (1997: 14) comment on the relationship between *āvāsa* and *śīmā*, including their evolutionary relationship, as follows: “the residence’ (*āvāsa*) in which Buddhist monks had their dwelling-places delimits the space within which the monks had to assemble as a ‘complete community’ (Skt. *saṃgha samagga*, Pāli *samagga saṅgha*) for ‘ecclesiastical acts’ (Skt. *karma*, Pāli *kamma*), as for example the ‘ordination ceremony’ (*upasampadā*), the ‘observance day’ (Skt. *poṣatha*, Pāli *uposatha*). This area was later defined more precisely by determining a ‘boundary’ (*śīmā*) with marks (*nimitta*) which indicated the border of the *āvāsa*. Still later the *śīmā* gained a life of its own and was determined irrespective of the extension of a residence. By this time the term *āvāsa*, which had been used nearly exclusively for this residence of the monks in the time of the Pāli Vinaya, had become generalized and could be used in other meanings, for instance as a designation for the dwelling place of a single monk.”

As Heirman (2002: II.964) explains, “the territory occupied by an *āvāsa*, however, was not precisely determined. Consequently, since formal acts had to be carried out in the presence of all the monks/nuns of the *āvāsa*, i.e., in a harmonious order, problems could easily arise because one could not exactly determine what was ‘harmonious’ within an *āvāsa*. Therefore, one started to exactly define the borders of the *āvāsas*.”

⁶⁶ The current understanding of the term *nānāsaṃvāsaka* is by and large based on the Pāli Vinaya. Kieffer-Pülz (1992: 53) explains, “Dagegen werden ein Mönch bzw. Eine Nonne, die wegen bestimmter Vergehen zeitweilig aus dem Orden ‘ausgeschlossen sind’ (*ukkhitta*), von dem ausschließenden Orden als *nānāsaṃvāsaka*, ‘Angehörige(r) einer anderen (wörtlich: einer verschiedenen) Gemeinschaft,’ d.h. Angehörige(r) einer Gemeinschaft, die von dem Saṅgha, der den Mönch (die Nonne) suspendiert hat (*ukkhipati*), ‘verschieden’ (*nānā*) ist, bezeichnet.” They are called “residents of a different community,” as the monks on probation (*parivāsika*) are prohibited from residing “under one roof” (*ekacchāne āvāse*) with monks who are not under probation or residing “under one roof” (*ekacchāne anāvāse*) (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 43). Elsewhere (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 63, n. 103; 123, n. 190), she further explains that a suspended monk (*ukkhitta*) is a *nānāsaṃvāsaka* who is not allowed to participate in any ecclesiastical acts of the very monastic community that suspended him.

Furthermore, as noted by Hüsken (1997: 323), in the Pāli Vinaya, if more than three dissenting monks join together, they would not be subject to suspension, “as they can form a *saṅgha* of their own and thereby put themselves out of the reach of the jurisdiction of the affected *saṅgha*.” In other words, *nānāsaṃvāsa* is a relative term (“relativen Begriff” in the words of Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 53): monks will regard the members of other Buddhist communities as *nānāsaṃvāsakas*.

The separation between *nānāsaṃvāsakas*, as Hüsken continues to comment, does not lead to a *saṅghabheda*. This is because a *saṅghabheda* is “two equal factions within one

took place in Rājagṛha during the *uposatha* ceremony of the Buddha's *saṅgha*.⁶⁷ In this way, Devadatta belonged to the same community as the Buddha's *saṅgha* (*samānasaṃvāsa*) before he split the community.

The Dharmaguptaka *Sifen lü* and Mahīśāsaka *Wufen lü* preserve accounts of Devadatta's early monkhood, which, however, depict him as a proper monk without notable distinctions. To be specific, in the Dharmaguptaka *Sifen lü*, Devadatta's achievement is portrayed as relatively inferior to those of the other Śākya princes:⁶⁸ while other Śākya princes have achieved "superior states," Devadatta has attained only *shenzu* 神足 (**rddhipāda*, "magical powers"), a lesser attainment.⁶⁹ The

order which are not able to reach an agreement on a certain question." Bechert 1961: 31 also notes that *saṅghabheda* is the consequence of the situation in which the decision made by the majority is not recognized by a minority from the same *saṅgha*.

Nolot (1999: 34, n. 102) notes two ways of becoming a *nānāsaṃvāsaka*, namely, by one's own will (to interpret legal teachings differently) and by the suspension procedure that was carried out against one, on the basis the Sp's relevant discussion (Sp i.149).

Discussions of the MSV Vinaya definition of *nānāsaṃvāsaka* are found in Borgland (2014: 254; 387, n. 505; 440, n. 840). According to him (2014: 440), a monk becomes a *nānāsaṃvāsika* "either by intentionally joining the non-virtuous faction in a dispute, or by being suspended (*utkṣipta*)."

⁶⁷ Vin ii.199: *Atha kho Devadatto tadahuposathe utthāyāsanaṃ salākaṃ gāhesi* ("Then, on the day of the Upasatha, Devadatta got up from his seat and distributed voting sticks").

⁶⁸ T. 1428 (22) 591b22–24: 爾時諸釋子受世尊及諸上座教授已，往詣彼國，各自思惟，*證增上地。提婆達得神足證。

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

*證增上地: The Chinese Vinaya commentaries explain this term as the *chuguo* 初果 ("first realization," i.e. *srotāpanna*), and argue that this attainment was only shared by the Śākya princes other than Devadatta. See 四分律疏飾宗義記 X. 733 (42) 122a12–13; 四分律含注戒本疏行宗記 X. 714 (34) 891b6.

⁶⁹ Magical powers as an achievement bear varying connotations in different contexts. Hiraoka (2008b) provides a comprehensive overview of the positive and negative manifestations of magical power as documented in Buddhist literature. Theoretically, magical powers may be regarded as positive, as they would help the Buddha convert common believers (Granoff 1996: 80–82). However, such an attainment is not unique to the Buddha and is often shared by gods as well as other religious masters, both Buddhist and non-Buddhist. The Vinayas even contain some forceful diatribes against wielding magical powers, such as the Buddha's criticism of Piṇḍola for displaying his magical powers for the sake of a sandalwood bowl (Fiordalis 2010: 384ff.). Especially since this narrative separates Devadatta's achievement from that of the other princes, there are good grounds to believe that magical powers are not regarded as a superior attainment in this context.

Mahīśāsaka *Wufen lü* relates that only six of the eight Śākya princes achieve arhatship after ordination, the exceptions being Ānanda and Devadatta. While Ānanda does not immediately achieve arhatship because he needs to serve as the Buddha's attendant, there is no obvious reason why Devadatta achieves nothing. Later, Devadatta has to rely on the private instruction of the Buddha to attain magical powers.⁷⁰

The neglect of Devadatta's majestic traits in the two Vinayas actually serves as evidence for the strong association between the Devadatta story and the Vinaya regulation on schismatic issues. Both Vinayas confirm that a schismatic must be a monk, not any of the other categories of Buddhist followers.⁷¹ However, they do not explicitly say that the schismatic must be a monk in good standing, nor that he must be a prestigious monk.⁷² Neither Vinaya, therefore, has rules that would imply that

⁷⁰ T. 1421 (22) 17b14–c21: 說是法時，六人漏盡，得阿羅漢。阿難侍佛，不盡諸漏。調達一人，空無所獲... 於是，世尊與諸大德聲聞，受阿耨達龍王請。調達未得神通，不能得去，羞恥益深，便作是念：我今當問修神通道。便往白佛：願佛為我說修通法。佛即為說，調達受學，安居之中，便獲神通。獲神通已，作是思惟：誰應先化？復作是念：瓶沙王太子名曰眾樂，先化導之，然後餘人乃從我教。

“When the Buddha preached the Dharma, the six [princes] exhausted their *āsravas* and realized arhatship. Ananda needed to attend to the Buddha and did not extinguish his *āsravas*. Only one person, Devadatta, achieved nothing ... At that moment, the Blessed One and many venerable *śrāvakas* received the invitation from the dragon king of the Anavatapta Lake. Devadatta was not able to go because he had not acquired magical powers. He felt more and more ashamed, whereupon he had the following thought: ‘Now, I should inquire about the path to practicing magical powers.’ After that, he approached the Buddha and spoke: ‘May the Buddha instruct me on the path to [obtaining] magical powers.’ The Buddha thus instructed him. Having received the teaching, Devadatta acquired his magical powers during the summer retreat. After attaining magical powers, he had the ensuing thought: ‘Whom should I convert first?’ He then thought: ‘King Bimbisāra has a prince named *Zhongle* 眾樂 (**Vāraruci*; the alias of Ajātaśatru). If I convert him first, then other people will come to follow my instruction.’”

⁷¹ T. 1428 (22) 913b7–10: 優波離！一比丘不能破僧，雖求方便亦不能破僧，亦非比丘尼，非式叉摩那、沙彌、沙彌尼破僧，雖求方便破僧亦不能破僧。

“Upāli! One *bhikṣu* cannot split a *saṅgha*. Even if he tried in every way, he could not split a *saṅgha*. Furthermore, neither *bhikṣuṇīs*, *śikṣamāṇās*, *śrāmaṇeras*, nor *śrāmaṇerikās* can split a *saṅgha*. Even if they were to try every means, they could not split a *saṅgha*.”

T. 1421 (22) 166a17–20: 若王助破僧，令僧不和合，而非破。若大臣、優婆塞、優婆夷、比丘尼、式叉摩那、沙彌、沙彌尼、一比丘乃至七比丘助破僧，亦如是。See n. 98 for an English translation.

⁷² The lack of requirement of proper monkhood as a prerequisite for a schismatic in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya may be due to its regulation that schismatic monks should still be punished even if they cease their schismatic actions before the *jñapticaturthakarman*

a schismatic monk should be portrayed as extraordinary. The records of Devadatta's magical attainments, rather than representing a superior achievement, serve to enable the logical progression of the narrative, particularly in establishing Devadatta's ability to gain the patronage of Ajātaśatru. In addition, these records can be seen as a narrative device to be effectively contrasted with Devadatta's eventual downfall.

In the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, Devadatta's inherently corrupted nature is consistently depicted. Devadatta's motivation for joining the Buddhist community is not rooted in genuine intent; rather, his primary goal is to become the next Śākya king. The other Śākya princes, perceiving the potential harm his kingship could cause, devise a plan to entrap him into renouncing worldly pursuits.⁷³ After ordination, Devadatta achieves nothing at first.⁷⁴ Later, driven by yearning for material profit, Devadatta manages to persuade Daśabalakāśyapa – who is naive and does not realize Devadatta's true intentions – to teach him magical powers. With these magical powers, Devadatta gains a reputation as a great monk and wins Ajātaśatru's patronage.⁷⁵ It is notable that the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya makes no effort to describe Devadatta's early monkhood as respectful or laudable, as it constantly highlights the connection between Devadatta's magical powers and his evil nature. This reflects an agenda of thoroughly defaming Devadatta, which may be peculiar to the

(T. 1428 [22] 595b13–15: 若一切未白, 方便欲破和合僧, 受破和合僧法堅持不捨, 一切突吉羅). Additionally, there is a clear statement that Devadatta incurred a *jñapti-caturthakarman* even after he [temporarily] stopped his schismatic actions, after being admonished by the Buddha (T. 1428 [22] 594c14–595a3: 時世尊以無數方便, 令提婆達破僧心暫息。以無數方便, 呵責提婆達已, 告諸比丘: 聽僧與提婆達呵諫, 捨此事故, 白四羯磨 ... 僧為提婆達作如是呵諫白四羯磨). This implies that his proper monkhood had already been damaged before he finally brought the five ascetic points to a vote in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya.

⁷³ T. 1450 (24) 145a6–20. Gnoli 1977–1978: I.203; D. 1, 'dul ba, nga, 104a1–b1.

⁷⁴ This statement is clearly indicated in the Chinese version: T. 1450 (24) 167c27–28: 唯提婆達多未得聖果 (“Only Devadatta has not yet attained any fruits of sainthood [**ārya-phala*]”). Although not explicitly stated, a similar situation can be inferred from both the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions, as they indicate that Devadatta approached the Buddha and each of the five hundred elders solely to request instruction in acquiring magical powers. Cf. Gnoli 1977–1978: II.68–70 and D. 1, 'dul ba, nga, 157a5–160a1.

⁷⁵ T. 1450 (24) 167c26–168b28. See Li 2019b: 211–216 for an English translation. Cf. also Gnoli 1977–1978: II.68–70 and D. 1, 'dul ba, nga, 170b4–171a4.

Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition.⁷⁶ When we check the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, this Vinaya indeed does not stipulate that a schismatic has to be a spiritually great monk. It only states that a monk on probation (被捨置人, *utkṣiptaka*) cannot split the *saṅgha*.⁷⁷ In this sense, the Devadatta narrative also corresponds to the Vinaya regulations of this tradition.

The regulations regarding the legitimacy of a schismatic monk are not limited solely to the Vinayas of Sthavira offshoots. The Mahāsāṅghika *Mohe sengqi lü* acknowledges that a potential separatist is expected to be an esteemed monk who is adept at comprehending profound Buddhist teachings.⁷⁸ Such a requirement aligns with that of the Sarvāstivāda tradition, in which schismatic monks are expected to exemplify majesty. This principle that only one with good comprehension of the Dharma and Vinaya may be deemed a schismatic monk may be echoed in Devadatta's schismatic activities of composing a separate set of scriptures⁷⁹ and altering the Vinaya rules in the *Mohe sengqi lü*.

It is now easier to understand why the Vinayas incorporate episodes about the early achievements of Devadatta. The Vinayas establish distinct prerequisites regarding the type of monk who can legitimately initiate a division within a *saṅgha*. Especially in the Sarvāstivāda tradition, only

⁷⁶ One famous relevant example is Devadatta swallowing Ajātaśatru's saliva for the sake of patronage. T. 1442 (23) 701a1–12, D. 3, 'dul ba, ca, 289a4–b4. Cf. Habata 2018 for an analysis of the original meaning of the term *kheḷāpaka/kheḷāsika/kheḷāsaka* ("the eater of saliva").

⁷⁷ MSV *Saṅghabhedavastu*: Gnoli 1977–1978: II.272–273, D. 1, 'dul ba, nya, 298a4–299a1, T. 1450 (24) 153c10–154a14.

⁷⁸ T. 1425 (22) 489c11–13: 如, 大德比丘, *如法, 如律, 善解深理, 是比丘應禮拜、恭敬、隨順法教。如法, 如律, 善解深理。

*The Pāli parallel reads *dharmo ayaṃ vinayo idaṃ satthu sāsanaṃ*, which is translated by Bechert (1961: 32–33) as "dies ist das Gesetz [Buddhas], dies ist die [vom Buddha verkündete] Ordenszucht, dies ist die Anweisung des Meisters." He comments that *dharma/dhamma* means legal teaching, not doctrinal teaching. However, this may not necessarily reflect the idea of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya composers, at least not those who composed the Devadatta stories. In the Mahāsāṅghika version of the Devadatta stories, it is indeed mentioned that Devadatta composed not only different Vinaya rules but also different scriptures. The term *dharma* in this context could be possibly understood as referring to doctrinal teachings.

⁷⁹ Thus, the Vinaya composers here seem to understand *dharma* from 如法、如律, 善解深理 as the scriptural teaching of the Buddha, not quite the same as what Bechert understands.

those who are venerable and respectable can cause a schism. That is to say, in order to make Devadatta a potential schismatic, the Sarvāstivāda monks have to admit that Devadatta was once – if not always – a saintly monk. The Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya also defines a schismatic as a monk in good standing who possesses proficiency in both Dharma and Vinaya. This provides an explanation for why the Vinaya recounts Devadatta as composing a distinct set of Dharma and Vinaya teachings. From a practical standpoint, the requirement that a schismatic monk must be highly respected can be understood from various perspectives. After all, from a logical perspective, it is hard to imagine that a monk with a bad reputation could make a convincing appeal to the monastic community, much less persuade the majority of monks to vote for him. It is more feasible that a charismatic and respectable monk would encourage and convince other Buddhists to separate from the preexisting authoritative unit.⁸⁰ On the other hand, the stipulation of a schismatic’s majesty can serve as a precautionary measure.⁸¹ It allows a certain leeway for schisms to take place within the monastic community, but with the aim of controlling and preventing any unnecessary, illegal, or unjustified schisms that may occur. The setting of a high threshold is to minimize the likelihood of a schism occurring.

Therefore, I interpret the early, successful religious career of Devadatta not as a reflection of a more historical Devadatta, but as a literary composition, an ideological imperative with the aim of making Devadatta a “proper” schismatic. This interpretation is supported by the Vinayas, which are hesitant to acknowledge Devadatta’s early success. In their

⁸⁰ For instance, the *Wufen lü* (T. 1421 [22] 164b7–8): 時五百比丘皆取籌，唯除阿難及一須陀洹比丘 (“At that moment, all five hundred monks took voting sticks, with the sole exception of Ānanda and a monk of the *śrotāpanna* attainment”). In the *Sifen lü* (T. 1428 [22] 909b14–15), it is only Ānanda and sixty other elders who vote against Devadatta.

⁸¹ In his book about another famous schismatic, Mahādeva, Silk (2009: 24) discusses the possible logic of such an arrangement in historical context: “Buddhist technical literature acknowledges the possibility that schism may occur within a monastic community. In fact, it seems to accept this as an inevitability. It insists, however, that any action to instigate such a schism must be brought about by a legitimate, indeed a respected and honorable, member of the community in question, and only upon reflection, never impulsively.”

discussions about the qualifications of a schismatic, the Theravāda, Dharmaguptaka, and Mahīśāsaka Vinayas do not highlight the grandeur of a schismatic. Correspondingly, Devadatta is portrayed as a monk of lesser attainment in their respective accounts. In the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, Devadatta is further downplayed as a monk with an inherently corrupt nature. In all these Vinayas, Devadatta achieves only a mediocre level of magical attainment, despite his arduous efforts. It is important to note that his acquisition of magical powers primarily serves as an explanation for his capacity to win the support of Ajātaśatru, rather than being a significant accomplishment in itself.

Having demonstrated the correlation between the accounts of Devadatta's early monkhood in each Vinaya and the regulations concerning the qualities of a legitimate schismatic, it appears evident that the details of Devadatta's early monkhood were deliberately modeled after a schismatic in the legal context. Indeed, it is worth noting that not only does Devadatta align with the criteria outlined for a legitimate schismatic in the Vinayas, but his schism also closely corresponds to the discussions of a legal schism within those texts. In the following section, we will delve into a thorough examination of how Devadatta's schism aligns with the definitions of *saṅghabheda* as depicted in the Vinayas of various Buddhist schools.

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

What is at stake here is not a discussion of the historicity of schisms that occurred in early Indian Buddhism.⁸² Instead, our focus is on how

⁸² Bechert 1961 distinguishes *nikāyabheda* (the formation of various schools or sects) from *saṅghabheda*. He (1961: 34) insightfully notes that the formation of *nikāyas* occurred at a time when the corpus of Vinaya regulations was essentially already completed. Therefore, *saṅghabheda* in Vinayas does not actually refer to *nikāyabheda*. He interprets *nikāyabheda* as the doctrine-based division between large communities (each encompassing many *saṅghas*), *saṅghabheda* as the splitting of a particular *saṅgha* into two factions by disputes over legal rules and their application. Mori 1994 examines schism-related records across various Buddhist texts, albeit without the necessary distinctions between related yet nuanced concepts such as *saṅghabheda*, *saṅgīti*, *nānāsaṃvāsa*, etc. Satō (1963: 793) takes Devadatta's ascetic tendency as a manifestation of a movement for idealism in the early

Buddhist traditions define and understand schism, including such questions as: how does a Vinaya determine a monastic schism? What is legally required for a schism, besides being initiated by a monk in good standing? Does Devadatta's schism fulfill all these conditions? As I shall demonstrate, the Devadatta narrative does reflect Buddhist discussions of schism. In the process of reading the Devadatta narrative alongside Buddhist discussions of schism, we can see how many elements of the Devadatta narrative make full sense in the Buddhist schismatic context.⁸³

As a first step, I shall investigate how schism (*saṅghabheda*) is defined in various Vinaya texts and what realizing a schism entails, which has been studied by Hüsken 1997 and earlier by Bechert 1961. Usually, the relevant discussions are found in the inquiries of Upāli concerning *saṅghabheda*, the final section of the *Saṅghabhedavastu* (or *khandhaka*). After Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana foil Devadatta's schismatic attempts, Upāli asks the Buddha about the definition of schism. In the Pāli Vinaya, a schism must involve deeds such as the proposition of eighteen [unjustified] activities (*aṭṭhārasahi vatthūhi*)⁸⁴ and separate *uposatha*,

Buddhist community that later developed into the first split between the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṅghikas. However, as I have discussed above (n. 8) and elsewhere in my dissertation (2019b: 197–202), I have reservations about considering ascetic tendencies as an accurate historical representation of Devadatta's doctrinal or monastic standpoint.

⁸³ Sasaki's 1992 analysis explores Devadatta's schism as a *saṅghabheda* in the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāsāṅghika Vinayas. Sasaki 1993b then focuses on how to read Devadatta's schism in the context of *saṅghabheda* in other Vinaya traditions. However, he inadvertently conflates these Vinaya discussions with the concepts of *cakrabheda* and *karmabheda*, a pair of contrasting categories that emerged later than the main discussion of *saṅghabheda* in Vinayas. This conflation consequently leads to erroneous conclusions. For some critical comments on his theories, see Borgland 2014: 438, n. 836, Li 2019b: 124, n. 240, and Fujimoto 2021: 53. Nevertheless, his series of related publications still provide valuable insights on the understanding of Devadatta's schism in the broader context of *saṅghabheda* discussions. For instance, Sasaki 1993a insightfully notes the significance of the number of Devadatta's schismatic assistants in legitimizing a schism.

⁸⁴ Here, the eighteen include (Vin ii.204 = Eng. Horner 1938–1952: V.286–287): claiming (1) Dharma as non-Dharma; (2) non-Dharma as Dharma; (3) Vinaya as non-Vinaya; (4) non-Vinaya as Vinaya; (5) what is not uttered and declared by the Tathāgata as uttered and declared by the Tathāgata; (6) what is uttered and declared by the Tathāgata as not uttered and declared by the Tathāgata; (7) what is not practiced by the Tathāgata as practiced by him; (8) what is practiced by the Tathāgata as not practiced by him; (9) what is not regulated (*apaññatta*) by the Tathāgata as regulated (*paññatta*) by him; (10) what is

pavāraṇa, and *kamma* ceremonies (*āveṇi-uposathaṃ karonti*, *āveṇi-pavāraṇaṃ karonti*, *āveṇi-saṅghakammaṃ karonti*, Vin ii.204). Here, the performance of separate monastic ceremonies means specifically that two divided groups hold separate *uposathas* or *karmans* within the same residence (*āvāsa*), or in other words, within the common boundaries (*simā*),⁸⁵ as already discussed. In addition, the required minimum number of monks in a schism is specified as nine⁸⁶ – four monks on one side,

regulated by the Tathāgata as not regulated by him; (11) a non-offense as an offense; (12) an offense as a non-offense; (13) a light offense as heavy; (14) a heavy offense as light; (15) an offense with remainder (*sāvasesā āpatti*; i.e., non-*pārājika*) as without remainder (*anavasesā āpatti*; i.e., *pārājika*); (16) an offense without remainder as with remainder; (17) a grave offense (*duṭṭhullā āpatti*; i.e., *pārājika* or *saṅghādisesa*) as a minor offense (*aduṭṭhullā āpatti*); (18) a minor offense as grave.

As Borgland (2014: 253–254, 438, n. 835) notes, the same eighteen matters resurface in the *Samathakkhandhaka* of the *Cullavagga* of the Pāli Vinaya, which lists eighteen cases of “dispute [which has its basis in] controversy” (*vivādādhikaraṇa*) as explained by the Buddha when he attempted to resolve the disputes among the Kosambī monks. Nolot (1996: 96) also notices that the eighteen points of controversy are identical with those leading to a split in a *saṅgha*.

According to Bechert (1961: 32–33; 1982: 64–65), all eighteen points are about falsification or misinterpretation of the Vinaya regulations, not about doctrinal teachings.

⁸⁵ As Bechert (2001: 12) comments, “a split within the monks of a particular residential area does not result in *saṅghabheda*, as long as the partisans do not use a common *simā* which was established before, but define separate *simās* for each group.” To clarify, if two groups of monks engage in separate *karmans* in different *simās*, it does not automatically lead to a schism, as there are alternative scenarios, such as the presence of two *nānāsaṃvāsas*.

⁸⁶ Vin ii.203 = German tr. Bechert 1961: 30 = Eng. tr. Sasaki 1993b: 181–183: *Ekato, Upāli, eko hoti, ekato dve, catuttho anussāveti, salākaṃ gāheti ‘ayaṃ dhammo, ayaṃ vinayo, idaṃ satthusāsaṇaṃ, imaṃ gaṇhatha, imaṃ rocethā’ti. Evaṃ pi kho, Upāli, saṅgharāji hoti, no ca saṅghabhedo. Ekato, Upāli, dve honti, ekato dve, pañcama anussāveti ... Ekato, Upāli, dve honti, ekato tayo, chaṭṭho anussāveti ... Ekato, Upāli, tayo honti, ekato tayo, sattamo anussāveti ... Ekato, Upāli, tayo honti, ekato cattāro, aṭṭhamo anussāveti ... Ekato, Upāli, cattāro honti, ekato cattāro, navamo anussāveti, salākaṃ gāheti ‘ayaṃ dhammo, ayaṃ vinayo, idaṃ satthusāsaṇaṃ, imaṃ gaṇhatha, imaṃ rocethā’ti. Evaṃ kho, Upāli, saṅgharāji ceva hoti saṅghabhedo ca. Navannaṃ vā, Upāli, atirekanavannaṃ vā saṅgharāji ceva hoti saṅghabhedo ca.*

“On the one side, Upāli, there is one monk, while on the other side, there are two. A fourth monk speaks out and takes a voting stick, saying: ‘This is the [legal] Teaching. This is the Vinaya. This is the Master’s teaching. Take it, approve of it.’ This, Upāli, is thus monastic dissension, but not a schism ... On the one side, Upāli, there are two monks, while on the other side, there are two. A fifth monk ... On the one side, Upāli, there are two monks, while on the other side, there are three. A sixth monk ... On the one side, Upāli, there are three monks, while on the other side, there are three. A seventh monk ...

four on the other, and a ninth who may choose which side to align with,⁸⁷ which is a scheme to avoid a draw when voting. If there were fewer than nine monks, it would constitute a *saṅgharāji* instead of a *saṅghabheda*.⁸⁸

When we check the Pāli version of Devadatta's schism, his activities in this Vinaya are narrated in full compliance with the legal discussion of schism:⁸⁹ Devadatta advocates the implementation of the five ascetic practices, which by nature indicates a falsified understanding of Vinaya regulations; he confronts Ānanda and openly declares, "from now on, Venerable Ānanda, I will conduct *uposatha* and monastic *kamma* separate from the Buddha and the monastic community of monks."⁹⁰ Later, in an *uposatha* held in Rājagaha ("within the same boundaries" as the Buddha's *saṅgha*), Devadatta distributes and collects voting sticks, and five hundred Vajjan monks vote for the five ascetic propositions (Vin ii. 199). Later, Devadatta leads his own community to Gayā and settles there. It is worth noting that the number of Devadatta's main companions is said to be four (i.e., Kokālika, Khaṇḍadeviyāputta, Kaṭamorakatissaka, and Samuddadatta). This arrangement possibly served as a deliberate design to ensure that, together with Devadatta, they would fulfill the minimum requirement of having five monks from the majority side to initiate a schism.

On the one side, Upāli, there are three monks, while on the other side, there are four. An eighth monk ... On the one side, Upāli, there are four monks; on the other side, there are four. A ninth monk speaks out and takes a voting stick, saying: 'This is the [legal] teaching. This is the Vinaya. This is the Master's teaching. Take it and approve of it.' This, Upāli, is thus monastic dissension and also a schism. There must be nine monks, Upāli, or more than nine, to constitute monastic dissension as well as a schism."

⁸⁷ Hüskén (1997: 321) analyzes the role and function of the ninth person in inducing a *saṅghabheda*. She stresses that the person entrusted with carrying out the vote always belongs to the majority part, as his personal opinion ultimately determines which side constitutes the majority. In other words, the voting outcome is influenced by the perspective of the monk overseeing the process. She adds that this very monk must be formally appointed by the complete order (Vin ii.84).

⁸⁸ Also see Bechert 1961: 30–31. Hüskén 1997: 320.

⁸⁹ Vin ii.195–198 = Eng. Horner 1938–1952: V.276–279.

⁹⁰ Vin ii.198: *ajjatagge dānāhaṃ, āvuso ānanda, aññatreva bhagavatā, aññatreva bhikkhusaṅghā, uposathaṃ karissāmi saṅghakammaṃ karissāmi*.

In the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, the definition of schism is expressed as follows:⁹¹

(Upāli asked:) “How is *saṅghabheda* defined? How many people are needed to be considered a *saṅghabheda*? Who is splitting the harmonious *saṅgha*?”

The Buddha spoke: “Upāli! Two factors can [induce] schism, namely, false speech and similar speech. A monastic community can be split by these two factors. Upāli, there are two other factors that can result in a schism: holding a *karman* and taking voting sticks (*śalākā*).⁹² Upāli, one

⁹¹ T.1428 (22) 913b2–14: (優波離): 云何破僧? 齊幾人名為破僧? 誰破和合僧? 佛言: 優波離! 有二事破僧: *妄語、相似語, 以此二事故破僧。優波離! 復有二事破僧: 作羯磨、取舍羅。優波離! 一比丘不能破僧, 雖求方便亦不能破僧, 亦非比丘尼, 非式叉摩那、沙彌、沙彌尼破僧, 雖求方便破僧亦不能破僧。優波離! 此眾一比丘、彼眾一比丘, 彼行破僧舍羅、作羯磨, 如是不能破僧, 但令僧塵垢。二人、三人亦如是。優波離! 若此眾四人若過、彼眾四人若過, 行破僧舍羅、作羯磨, 優波離, 齊是名為破僧, 是為破和合僧。See also Sasaki (1993b: 178–179) for an English translation of a portion of the above passage.

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

*令僧塵垢: should be reconstructed as **saṅgharajas*, which corresponds to *saṅgharāji* in Pāli. Since the Sanskrit form of the Pāli *saṅgharāji* is not yet attested, it is not absolutely sure whether the Dharmaguptaka form *saṅgharajas* was a correct Sanskrit form or a misreading of *saṅgharāji* (or *saṅgharāja*).

Here, 妄語 and 相似語 seem to refer to the eighteen matters that cause the separation of a monastic community. However, the Dharmaguptaka list is not entirely identical with the list given in the Pāli version as given above: 破, 有十八事: 法、非法、律、非律、犯、不犯、若輕、若重、有殘、無殘、麤惡、非麤惡、常所行、非常所行、制、非制、說、非說, 是為十八 (T. 1428 [22] 595a16–19). (“There are eighteen matters [that cause] a schism: [claiming] (1) [a matter is] in accord with the legal teaching; (2) [a matter is] not in accord with the legal teaching; (3) [a matter is] in accord with the Vinaya; (4) [a matter is] not in accord with the Vinaya; (5) [a matter is] an offense; (6) [a matter is] not an offense; (7) [a matter is] a light [offense]; (8) [a matter is] a grave [offense]; (9) [a matter is an offense] with remainder (*sāvaśeṣa*; i.e., non-*pārājika*); (10) [a matter is an offense] without remainder (*niravaśeṣa*; i.e., *pārājika*); (11) [a matter is] a grave offense (*duṣṭhula*); (12) [a matter is] not a grave offense (*aduṣṭhula*); (13) [non-obligation] as obligation (*kṛtya*); (14) [obligation] as non-obligation; (15) [a matter] is regulated [by the Buddha]; (16) [a matter] is not regulated; (17) [a matter] is declared [by the Tathāgata]; (18) [a matter] is not declared [by the Tathāgata].”)

It is noteworthy that, similar to the Pāli tradition as demonstrated earlier, the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya also regards the same list of eighteen matters as points of controversy in discussing *vivādādhikaraṇa* in the **Kauśāmbīkhandhaka* (拘睺彌捷度) and the **Adhikarāṅkhandhaka* (滅淨捷度) (T. 1428 [22] 883a17–19; 916a6–7).

⁹² On the diverse usages of *śalākā* (*chou* 籌) in Buddhist as well as other Indian societies, see Durt 1974 and his contribution to the entry *chū* 籌 in the *Hōbōgirin* (volume 5); see also Borgland 2014: 412–416. The Vinayas stipulate two fixed cases in which monks

bhikṣu could not split a *saṅgha*. Even if he tried in every way, he could not split a *saṅgha*. Furthermore, neither *bhikṣuṇīs*, *śikṣamāṇās*, *śrāmaṇeras*, nor *śrāmaṇerikās* could split a *saṅgha*. Even if they were to try every means, they could not split a *saṅgha*. Upāli! If one *bhikṣu* from this group and one *bhikṣu* from another group pass out voting sticks for a schism and arrange a *karman*, they could not split the *saṅgha*, but merely raise dust within the *saṅgha* (**saṅgharajas*). The same situation applies to the case of two or three *bhikṣus* [on each side]. Upāli! If this group contains four or more members (**catvāro vā atirekacatvāraḥ*) and the other group includes four or more members, and they pass out voting sticks for a schism and arrange a *karman*, Upāli, such a situation is called a *saṅghabheda*, a division of a complete *saṅgha* (**samagrasaṅgha*)."⁹³

As demonstrated by the above dialogues, there are several prerequisites for inducing a legitimate schism: As we have previously discussed, only a proper monk can split the monastic community, not other monastic community members. The second condition concerns schismatic activities, which include false speech, similar (but misleading) words, initiating a vote for schism, and a separate performance of *karmans*, which are largely in line with the Pāli rules. Another crucial prerequisite is the minimum number of monks involved. The Dharmaguptaka Vinaya stipulates that there must be at least four monks on each side to legally constitute a schism. That is to say, any separation must involve a minimum number of eight monks in total, which means a minimum of four on each side. Otherwise, it is regarded as a dissension (Pāli *saṅgharāji*), not a legal schism. However, it is worth considering how a group of eight can consistently form both a majority party and a minority party during the voting process. The Pāli Vinaya addresses this issue by introducing the role of a ninth member who is entrusted with the task of overseeing the voting process and deciding which side to support. I tend to interpret the Dharmaguptaka's requirement of four members on each side not as a combined total of eight monks from both sides, but rather

should use sticks, namely, at ceremonies like *poṣadha*, *varṣā*, and *pravāraṇa*, as ration cards in the distribution of food or clothing, and at meetings to express different opinions and solve disputes (i.e., *adhikaraṇaśamatha*).

⁹³ Bechert (2001: 11; 1961: 22) explains that *samagga* means a *saṅgha* that is "complete" within a particular *sīmā*, which has been frequently mistranslated as "living in harmony."

as eight members not including the chief schismatic, who would be the ninth member. In actuality, the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya expounds upon in a subsequent passage that assisting monks (*bandang* 伴黨, Skt. *anuvartaka*) must be comprised of four or more members.⁹⁴ This means the presence of the chief schismatic as a ninth member is implied to ensure the formation of a majority party between the two factions.

If we turn to the Devadatta story in this Vinaya, we find that Devadatta's schism in fact meets all the above prerequisites:⁹⁵

At that time, the Blessed One dwelled in the city of Rājagṛha. A certain circumstance occasioned an assembly of the monastic community. Then, Devadatta rose from his seat and passed out voting sticks, [saying]: “Elders who accept these five points [of ascetic practice] as [being in accordance with] the [legal] Teaching, the Vinaya, the teachings taught by the Buddha should take a voting stick.” Then, five hundred newly trained (*navaka*) monks lacking in intelligence took voting sticks. At that time, Ānanda rose from his seat, draped his *uttarāsaṅga* robe over one side [of his body], and spoke thus: “Elders who admit these five matters as not [being in

⁹⁴ T. 1428 (22) 596b11–12: 伴黨者，若四、若過四人。The requirement of four members or more on each side seems to serve the purpose of ensuring that both parties are sufficiently large to be recognized as legitimate *saṅghas*. The Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, similar to the Pāli Vinaya, establishes the principle that a *saṅgha* must consist of a minimum of four monks (T. 1428 [22] 595a15–16: 僧者，四比丘，若五，若十，乃至無數。“A *saṅgha* consists of four monks, or five, or [up to] ten, or [up to] an incalculable number”). In the case of the Pāli tradition, Bechert (1982: 64) states: “Consequently, *saṅghabheda* can take place only if a particular *saṅgha* is large enough to be broken into two *saṅghas*. The smallest *saṅgha* consists of four monks.”

⁹⁵ T. 1428 (22) 909b8–18: 爾時世尊在王舍城。有因緣眾僧集會。時提婆達多從坐起行舍羅：誰諸長老，忍此五事是法、是毘尼、是佛所教者，便捉籌。時有*五百新學無智比丘捉籌。爾時阿難從坐起，以*鬱多羅僧著一面，作如是言：誰諸長老，忍此五事非法、非毘尼、非佛教者，以鬱多羅僧著一面。是中，有六十長老比丘，以鬱多羅僧著一面。時提婆達多語諸比丘言：長老！我曹不須佛及眾僧，自共作羯磨說戒。即往至伽耶山中。爾時提婆達多至伽耶山中，離佛及僧，自作羯磨說戒。Cf. Sasaki 1993b: 179.

*五百新學無智比丘: The parallel in the Pāli Vinaya reads *pañcamattāni bhikkhusatāni navakā ceva honti appakataññuno ca* (“five hundred monks [from Vesālī], who were newly ordained and had little insight, were present”).

*鬱多羅僧 (*uttarāsaṅga*): Heirman 2002: II.801–802 explains different types of monastic robes. The *uttarāsaṅga* is the upper robe; *antaravāsaka* is the inner robe; and the *saṅghāṭī* 僧伽梨 is the outer cloak. Buddhist nuns have two more robes, namely, and the *udakaśāṭikā* (Pāli *udakasāṭikā*, a bathing garment) and *saṃkacchikā* (Pāli *saṃkacchika*), which is a band to support the breasts. See von Hinüber and Anālayo 2016 for more discussions regarding Buddhist monastic robes, especially the *saṃkacchika*.

accordance with] the [legal] Teaching, the Vinaya, the Buddha’s teachings – drape your *uttarāsaṅga* robe over one side [of your body].” Sixty elder monks from the assembly draped their *uttarāsaṅga* robe over one side [of their body]. Then, Devadatta spoke to the monks: “Elders! We no longer need the Buddha and his monastic community. We will perform *karman* and recitation of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* on our own.” [They] immediately went to Mount Gayā. At that time, Devadatta went to Mount Gayā, detached from the Buddha and the monastic community, and performed *karman* and recitation of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* on [their] own.

First of all, Devadatta advanced the teaching of the five ascetic propositions, constituting at least one of the first two factors that induce a schism as stipulated by the same Vinaya: 妄語 (“false speech”) and/or 相似語 (“similar [but misleading] speech”).⁹⁶ Moreover, his schismatic activities expand to organizing a vote. Although Ānanda led sixty senior monks to oppose Devadatta’s five ascetic propositions, five hundred new monks cast their votes in Devadatta’s favor and Devadatta won the majority of the votes. After the voting ceremony, Devadatta performed a separate *karman* assembly and independently recited the *Prātimokṣasūtra* in Gayā, which marks his official split from the Buddha’s monastic community. In this regard, Devadatta’s schism indeed includes all necessary steps that are formalized in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya.

In addition, as I have analyzed above, the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya stipulates that for a schism to be legal, minimally four monks must be present on each side, and on the schismatic side there must be four monks who are assisting the schismatic. In the above description of Devadatta’s schism, there are five hundred monks on Devadatta’s side, sixty-one monks on the other, which no doubt makes this schism a legal one. In the stories where the exact number of Devadatta’s followers is not mentioned, the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya frequently narrates that Devadatta recruits four members: Kokālika, Khaṇḍadravya, Kaṣamarakatiṣya, and

⁹⁶ Although the content of the five ascetic practices varies from one source to another (Li 2019b: 187–191), the Chinese Vinaya commentaries commonly state that, among Devadatta’s five ascetic practices, abstention from buttermilk/salt and from fish fall under the category of “false speech,” while the other three are “similar speech” (e.g., T. 2792 [85] 665b19–23; X. 726 [40] 816a2–5; X. 728 [40] 275c12–19).

Samudradatta.⁹⁷ It seems that this detail about Devadatta's supporters was created in accordance with the above legal discussion of minimum participants. To sum it up, the Dharmaguptaka version of Devadatta's schism fits quite well with the definition of a legitimate schism as stipulated by the Vinaya of the same school.

The high degree of conformity between the legal definition of a schism and the account of Devadatta's schismatic deeds is also found in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya. This Vinaya defines a schism in a slightly different way than the previous two Vinayas, and we indeed observe that the presentation of Devadatta's schism varies correspondingly. The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya's definition of a schism reads as follows:⁹⁸

⁹⁷ T. 1428 (22) 594a3–5: 一名三聞達多, 二名鶩荼達婆, 三名拘婆離, 四名迦留羅提舍, 及其身為五。

⁹⁸ T. 1421 (22) 166a15–23: 佛言: 有四事名破僧: 說五法、自行籌、捉籌、於界內別行僧事。又問: 云何名僧*不和合, 而非破? 佛言: 若王助破僧, 令僧不和合, 而非破。若大臣、優婆塞、優婆夷、比丘尼、式叉摩那、沙彌、沙彌尼、*一比丘乃至七比丘助破僧, 亦如是。若*不問上座而行僧事, 是即不和, 亦非僧破; *若不共同食, 於食時異坐, 鬪諍罵詈, 亦如是。要於界內八比丘分作二部, 別行僧事, 乃名為破。 Cf. Sasaki 1993b: 180.

*不和合 (“dissonance”) seems to be literarily reconstructed as *asamagra*. However, it is more plausible that the connotation of *saṅgharāja* is conveyed in this context.

*一比丘乃至七比丘助破僧: Mori (1994: 11) understands the phrase as involving one up to seven monks who are involved in both sides. This interpretation aligns more closely with the requirement indicated later in the same passage that at least eight monks must be involved in a schism (known as 界內八比丘分作二部). It is indeed plausible that the original version of this sentence intended to convey such a meaning. However, the ambiguity in the expression 助破僧 (literarily, “[monks] aiding a schism”) can lead to a variant understanding of the presence of eight monks on the schismatic side. This variant understanding is reflected in the Devadatta narrative, which I will discuss further below.

*不問上座而行僧事: this may imply the rule of “procedure in the presence” (*saṃmukhavinaya*), which means the accused monk (*codita*) must be present and questioned several times when the accuser (*codaka*) initiates a settlement procedure such as a *karman*. Cf. Borgland 2014: 46–51. Here, the Mahīśāsaka emphasizes that without the process of inquiry of the accused monk, disagreements among different groups from one original *saṅgha* can only lead to *saṅgharāja*, but not to a *saṅghabheda*.

*若不共同食, 於食時異坐: the connotation of *nānāsaṃvāsaka* is implied here. As I mentioned earlier (n. 67), a *nānāsaṃvāsaka*, who is suspended due to holding different views on monastic rules, is prohibited from participating in monastic ceremonies. According to *Pācittiya* 69 of the Pāli Vinaya, the monastic members are also forbidden from eating and sleeping together with the *nānāsaṃvāsaka* (cf. Lee 2008: 238). Therefore, the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya here asserts that when a monk is suspended and adopts the status of a *nānāsaṃvāsaka*, it does not necessarily lead to a *saṅghabheda* taking place.

The Buddha spoke: “Four activities split the *saṅgha*, namely, preaching the five practices, privately passing out voting sticks, taking a voting stick, and separately conducting monastic ceremonies in the [same] district (*sīmā*).” Again, he (Upāli) asked: “What constitutes a monastic dissonance rather than a schism?”

The Buddha responded: “If a king assists in creating a split, it causes dissonance in the *saṅgha*, but not a split. The same applies if ministers, *upāsakas*, or *upāsikās*, or *bhikṣuṇīs*, or *śikṣamānās*, or *śrāmaṇeras*, or *śrāmaṇerikās*, or from one to seven *bhikṣus* assist in creating a split. If one conducts monastic activities without consulting the elder, it thereby [gives rise to] monastic dissonance, not a split. The same applies to cases in which [monks] do not eat together, sit in separate places during mealtime, or engage in quarrels or resentment. Only when eight *bhikṣus* in the same boundaries split off into two groups and separately conduct their monastic ceremonies is it called a schism.”

The requirement of a minimum number of monks in a legal schism in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya appears not to be straightforward. At first, it states that “monks aiding schism” (助破僧) must number at least eight, which is different from the Dharmaguptaka and Pāli versions of at least four (excluding the chief schismatic). However, later in the same passage, it reformulates the condition as “eight monks dividing into two groups,” suggesting that a schism involves a total of eight monks from both sides, rather than solely from the schismatic side. This latter understanding, involving eight monks from both sides (excluding the chief schismatic), aligns more closely with other Vinaya traditions and may have been what was implied by the original regulation. Intriguingly, however, the details of the Devadatta narrative correspond better to the first understanding, where there are at least eight aiding monks from the schismatic party. In the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, eight followers of Devadatta are listed: the well-known supporters Kokālika, Khaṇḍadravya, Kaṭamorakatiṣya, and Samudradatta, along with four additional monks Ebi 頽鞞 (*Aśvajit), Fenna-posou 分那婆藪 (*Punarvasu), Banna 般那 (*Pāṇḍu), and Luxi 盧醯 (*Lohitaka).⁹⁹ Here, the schismatic party of Devadatta reaches the exact number of eight. Therefore, the Mahīśāsaka version of eight sympathetic

⁹⁹ T. 1421 (22) 164a22–24. Among the six, 頽鞞 (Skt. Aśvajit, Pāli Assaji) and 分那婆藪 (Skt. Punarvasu, Pāli Punabbasuka) are usually mentioned together as two troublesome monks (cf. T. 1421 [22] 21c11–13; MN i.473), while 般那 (Skt. Pāṇḍu, Pāli Paṇḍu)

monks or the Dharmaguptaka record of four companions should not be dismissed as a mere arbitrary alterations. Rather, the specific inclusion of Devadatta's supporters in each Vinaya tradition is likely a deliberate decision made to align with their respective definitions of a schism.

In the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, the activities leading to a schism include preaching the five ascetic practices, organizing a vote, and casting voting sticks, which correspond to the wrong speech and voting ceremony as stipulated in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya. However, a divergence between the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka schools is found in the fourth item, namely, 於界內別行僧事 (“separately conducting monastic ceremonies in the same boundaries”). The corresponding item in the Dharmaguptaka version is simply that of conducting [different] *karmans* (作羯磨), with no requirement for the venue of the ceremonies. Consequently, in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, Devadatta chooses to perform the *karman* in Gayā, which is a different locality than that of Śākyamuni's monastic community (who were in Rājagṛha) and likely in a different *sīma*. In contrast, the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya narrates that Devadatta performed a separate ceremony for *poṣadha* immediately after the voting, signifying that Devadatta's followers reside in the same region as Śākyamuni's monastic community.¹⁰⁰

and 盧醯 (Skt./Pāli Lohitaka) frequently appear together (cf. T. 1421 [22] 163a3; Vin ii. 1).

¹⁰⁰ T. 1421 (22) 164b5–10: 於是調達十五日布薩時，於僧中說上五事，自行籌，唱言：若忍樂此五法者，可捉此籌。時五百比丘皆取籌，唯除阿難及一須陀洹比丘。時舍利弗、目連、諸大羅漢皆不在彼布薩會中。調達行籌畢，即與五百比丘*和合布薩。

“Therefore, on the fifteenth day [of that month], which was the scheduled time for a *poṣadha*, Devadatta declared the above five points [of ascetic practices] in the monastic community and passed out voting sticks on [his] own, proclaiming thus: ‘If [you] accept these five teachings, [you] ought to take this voting stick.’ Then, five hundred monks all took voting stick, with the exception of Ānanda and one monk who had attained *srotāpanna*. Then, neither Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, nor any of the other great arhats were present at that *poṣadha* assembly. Having passed out the voting sticks, Devadatta immediately performed a *poṣadha* altogether with five hundred monks.” Cf. also Sasaki 1993b: 180–181.

*和合布薩 (Pāli *sāmaggī-uposatha*): The technical term 和合布薩, when wielded in its proper sense in the Pāli Vinaya, means a *poṣadha* that is held to reunify the *saṅgha*. Cf. Sasaki 1993a. In the above passage, however, 和合布薩 is possibly not used in such a technical sense but more literally means “to perform a *poṣadha* together with [...]”

In all respects, then, Devadatta's schism is depicted as a legal schism in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya as well.¹⁰¹

The Sarvāstivāda *Shisong lü* agrees with the Theravāda tradition that a minimum of nine pure monks must be involved in a schism.¹⁰² However, unlike the slightly variant lists of eighteen schismatic matters found in the Pāli, Dharmaguptaka, and Mahīśāsaka traditions, the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya specifically identifies fourteen matters as contributing factors to schism.¹⁰³ In addition, the *Shisong lü* states that conducting a *karman* and organizing a vote would lead to a schism. However, the *Shisong lü* uses the expression “proclamations” (Chin. 唱說; Skt. **karmavācanā*?) as a synonym for *karman*, and places the [first-round] proclamation prior to the voting:¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ Here, I see that the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya emphasizes the significance of performing ceremonies or ecclesiastical acts as a contributing factor to division. Out of the four activities, only the advocacy for the five ascetic practices stands out as representing a variant interpretation of the legal teachings. The other three activities are all specifically associated with ecclesiastical acts or the subsequent ceremonies. This emphasis is also reflected in the Mahīśāsaka's list of the eighteen points leading to “dispute [which has its basis in] controversy” (*vivādādhikaraṇa*) (T. 1421 [22] 154a15–19). Compared to the Pāli and Dharmaguptaka versions, the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya includes two variant items, namely, “confession *karman* is to be performed” (用羯磨出罪) and “confession *karman* is not to be performed” (不用羯磨出罪). In comparison, the Pāli version mentions “practiced (*āciṇṇa*) by the Tathāgata” or “not practiced by the Tathāgata,” while the Dharmaguptaka version indicate “obligation” or “non-obligation” (although obligation/*kṛtya* could be specified as ecclesiastical obligation according to Borgland 2014: 244–245; and the same understanding may be applied to the Pāli term *āciṇṇa*).

¹⁰² T. 1435 (23) 267a7–12. Refer to n. 5 for the original text and its English translation.

¹⁰³ T. 1435 (23) 266b18–22: 十四者，非法說法、法說非法、非善說善、善說非善、犯說非犯、非犯說犯、輕說重、重說輕、有殘說無殘、無殘說有殘、常所行法說非常所行法、非常所行法說常所行法、非說言說、說言非說。“The fourteen are: claiming (1) non-Dharma as Dharma; (2) Dharma as non-Dharma; (3) unwholesome as wholesome; (4) wholesome as unwholesome; (5) offense as non-offense; (6) non-offense as offense; (7) light [offense] as heavy; (8) heavy as light; (9) offense with remainder as without remainder; (10) offense without remainder as with remainder; (11) obligation [lit. activity to always be practised] as non-obligation; (12) non-obligation as obligation; (13) not declared as declared; (14) declared as not declared.” In the *Shisong lü*, these fourteen matters are regarded as [part of] the basis for *vivādādhikaraṇa* (T. 1435 [23] 251b18–19: 有十四破僧因緣及六鬪諍本，是名鬪諍事本。).

¹⁰⁴ T. 1435 (23) 267a12–15: 優波離! 有二因緣，名破僧：一唱說、二取籌。唱說者，如調達於僧中乃至第二、第三唱言：我調達作是語。取籌者，如調達初唱竟，共四伴取籌。

Upāli! There are two factors to bring about a schism: one is proclamations (**karmavācanā*), the other collecting voting sticks. As for proclamations, the example is that Devadatta proclaimed to the monks, (text repeats, down to) for a second and third time, saying: “I, Devadatta, make this statement.” As for collecting voting sticks, the example is that Devadatta, having made the first proclamation, collected voting sticks together with his four companions.

Correspondingly, the story of Devadatta’s schismatic activities in the same Vinaya includes these two activities, that is, repeated proclamations of the five ascetic propositions and collecting voting sticks:¹⁰⁵

At that time, Devadatta made this statement: “I, Devadatta, proclaim in the monastic community: ‘A monk should wear rag robes throughout their entire lives, should beg for alms throughout their entire lives, should [partake only] one meal [daily] throughout their entire lives, should live in the open air throughout their entire lives, and should not eat meat and fish throughout their entire lives.’ Any monk who delights in these five practices then rise up and take a voting stick.” Having proclaimed thus, Devadatta and his four companions rose up and took voting sticks right away. Devadatta made this statement a second time ... [Devadatta] having made the second proclamation, two hundred and fifty monks rose from their seats and took voting sticks. Devadatta then made this statement a third time ... Devadatta having made the third proclamation, another two hundred and fifty monks rose from their seats and took voting sticks. At that time, Devadatta right away led this crowd back to the place where he lived and changed the set of legal regulations.

It is worth noting that in this Devadatta narrative, Devadatta’s proclamation and voting are performed in an alternating pattern, with proclamation followed by voting, and this sequence repeats two more times. This design indicates that the story is intentionally structured to align with the

¹⁰⁵ T. 1435 (23) 265a12–26: 爾時調達作是言：我調達僧中唱言：比丘應盡形著納衣、應盡形乞食、應盡形一食、應盡形露地住、應盡形不噉肉魚。*隨何比丘喜樂是五法者，便起捉籌。唱已，調達及四伴，即起捉籌。調達第二復作是言：我調達僧中唱言：比丘應盡形著納衣、應盡形乞食、應盡形一食、應盡形露地住、應盡形不噉肉魚。隨何比丘喜樂是五法者，便起捉籌。唱第二語已，有二百五十比丘，從坐起捉籌。調達第三復作是言：我調達僧中唱言：比丘應盡形著納衣、應盡形乞食、應盡形一食、應盡形露地住、應盡形不噉肉魚。隨何比丘喜樂是五法者，便起捉籌。第三唱，復有二百五十比丘，從坐起捉籌。爾時調達，即將是眾，還自住處，更立法制。

*隨何: Possibly Skt. **kenacit* in the instrumental case.

requirements of schismatic activities outlined in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya. In addition, while the Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka Vinayas provide specific information about the location where Devadatta performed the *karman* with his community (in Gayā or Rājagṛha), the *Shisong lü* does not include such detailed accounts. This could be attributed to the absence of specific regulations regarding the venue for performing *karmans* in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya when discussing the prerequisites for a valid schism.

The Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya largely agrees with the regulations of the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya regarding the prerequisites for a valid schism. Accordingly, a schism must involve at least nine monks on two opposing sides, and they must perform *karmans* and hold a vote:¹⁰⁶

Where there is one monk, there *saṅgha* is not divided; where there are two, or where there are three, or up to eight monks, there the *saṅgha* is not divided. Where there are nine monks or more, there the *saṅgha* is divided due to two factors, namely, by means of *jñaptikarman* and by means of taking voting sticks.

In this discussion, the Mūlasarvāstivāda version employs the term *jñaptikarman* (Tib. *gsol ba'i las*) for the term *changshuo* 唱說 used in the *Shisong lü*, and aligns closely with the Sarvāstivāda discussion. Nevertheless, the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya possesses some idiosyncratic views on *saṅghabheda*. In the beginning of Upāli's question, the Buddha explains the definitions of a *bheda* and *sāmagrī* ("concord"), stating that "Upāli, when monks who consider a legal teaching illegal, an illegal teaching legal, or discord as accord, perform *karmans*, this is called *saṅghabheda*."¹⁰⁷ By providing such definitions, the Mūlasarvāstivāda

¹⁰⁶ Gnoli 1977–1978: II.271, line 8–11: *yatraiko bhikṣur na tatra saṅgho bhidyate; yatra dvau yatra trayo yāvad aṣṭau na tatra saṅgho bhidyate; yatra nava bhikṣavo uttare vā tatra dvābhyāṃ kāraṇābhyāṃ saṅgho bhidyate; jñaptikarmaṇā śalākāgrahaṇena ca*. D. 1, 'dul ba, nga, 297b1–2: *gang na dge slong dgu 'am lhag par yod pa de na rgyu gnyis kyis dge 'dun gyi dbyen du 'gyur te / gsol ba'i las dang tshul shing len pas so*. T. 1442 (23) 153b13–14: 如其至九或復過斯, 有兩僧伽, 方名破眾, 作其羯磨, 并復行籌。

¹⁰⁷ Gnoli 1977–1978: II.271, line 3–5: *yataś copālin bhikṣavaḥ <dharme 'dharmaśamjñīnaḥ> adharme dharmasamjñīno vyagre avyagrasamjñīnaḥ karmāṇi kurvanti; ayam ucyate saṅghabhedaḥ*. D. 1, 'dul ba, nga, 297a7: *dge slong rnam chos kyis chos ma yin pa'i 'du shes dang / chos ma yin pas chos kyi 'du shes dang / mi mthun pa la mthun pa'i 'du shes kyis las rnam byed na 'di ni dge 'dun gyi dbyen zhes bya'o*. T. 1442 (23) 153b8–9: 於其非法作非法想, 現有別住作別住心, 作羯磨者, 齊此名為破壞羯磨僧

Vinaya emphasizes the erroneous views held by *saṅghabhedakas*. When we turn to Devadatta's schismatic activities, such actions precisely illustrate the definition of schism in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, including the performance of a *karman* in which he proclaims the approval of the five practices¹⁰⁸ and organizing a vote for a schism.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that Devadatta is not depicted as an advocate of the five ascetic practices, but rather as someone who opposes such practices (Borgland 2018: 97–98; Li 2019b: 190). If the Buddhist attitude toward asceticism is equivocal (cf. Li 2019b: 199–202), its attitude toward sensualism is resolutely unfavorable. By presenting a contrasting narrative in which Devadatta is depicted as advocating for a more comfortable lifestyle to garner support from the monks, the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya not only aims to discredit Devadatta's personality, but also potentially aligns with its regulations concerning the erroneous beliefs held by the *saṅghabhedakas*.

In the case of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, the *Mohe sengqi lü* defines schism and schismatics as follows:¹¹⁰

伽也。The Chinese version alone identifies the schism as *karmabheda*, which is not attested in the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions. The Chinese seems to have been influenced by the classification of *cakrabheda* and *karmabheda* that emerged in a later historical phase.

As one may discern, *dharme 'dharmaśaṃjñīnaḥ* is the initial pair among the fourteen matters that lead to a schism as well dispute. Note that the list(s) of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya differs from the version given in the *Shisong lü*. Moreover, as Borgland (2014: Appendix, p. 14) observes, the various Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya traditions present different versions of the list.

¹⁰⁸ It is explicitly confirmed by the MSV Vinaya that Devadatta's proclamation of the five ascetic practices is part of the *jñāptikarman*. Gnoli 1977–1978: II.271: *katham jñāptikarmanā? yathāpīdat devadatto bhikṣūṇāṃ jñāpayati śaṃjñāpayati śikṣayati grāhayati: paṃcabhīr āyusmanto vratapadair bhikṣuḥ śudhyati vimucyati niryāti sukhaduḥkham vya-tikrāmati; sukhaduḥkhavyatikramam cānuprāpnoti*; D. 1, 'dul ba, nga, 297b2ff.; T. 1450 (24) 153b14–24.

¹⁰⁹ Gnoli 1977–1978: II.204, D. 1, 'dul ba, nya, 250b4–251a1, T. 1450 (I) 202c10–17. Borgland 2018: 98 offers an English translation based on the Sanskrit and then (p. 99) an English translation based on the Chinese version.

¹¹⁰ T. 1425 (22) 489c9–15. 破僧者。佛住舍衛城，時尊者優波離往至佛所，頭面禮足，却住一面，白佛言：世尊說破僧，云何名破僧？佛告優波離：如，大德比丘，如法，如律，善解深理，是比丘應禮拜、恭敬、隨順法教。若比丘謂彼比丘所說非法、不隨順行，僧諍，非破僧，乃至一*界一*住，同說戒，共作羯磨。我已制一界一住中別作布薩自恣羯磨，是名破僧。

Regarding the definition of *saṅghabheda*, [it is said thus]: the Buddha dwelled in the city of Śrāvastī. At [that] time, the venerable Upāli came to the Buddha's place. He bowed his head and face to the Buddha's feet, sat to one side, and spoke to the Buddha, saying: "The Blessed One speaks of *saṅghabheda*. What is *saṅghabheda*?"

The Buddha spoke to Upāli: "For instance, a venerable *bhikṣu* behaves in accordance with the Dharma and Vinaya, and is adept at comprehending the profound meanings. This *bhikṣu* should venerate, respect, and conform to the teaching of the [legal] Dharma. If [another] *bhikṣu* says what this *bhikṣu* states is the wrong Dharma and he does not behave in accordance [with the Dharma], [this is a case of] dissension (*saṅgharāja*), not *saṅghabheda*, so long as they live in the same boundaries (*sīmā*) and in the same residence (*āvāsa*), recite the *Prātimokṣasūtra* jointly, and perform *karmans* together. I previously established [the definition of] *saṅghabheda* as the situation in which monks from the same boundaries and the same residence separately performing *poṣadha*, *pravāraṇa*, [or other] *karmans*."

Two conditions for constituting a valid schism are stipulated here: a schism must involve disagreements in understanding the Dharma and Vinaya, in addition to the requirement that the schismatic party must hold a separate *poṣadha*, *pravāraṇa*, or *karman* in the same residence.¹¹¹ Additionally, the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya makes a clear distinction between *saṅghabheda* from *saṅgharāja*: only when a dissenting monk from the same boundary and residence (in other words, he must be a *samānasamvāsa*) conducts ecclesiastic ceremonies or acts separately, is he a *saṅghabhedaka*. Otherwise, even if he disagrees with other monks in teachings, he is just a *saṅgharājaka* as long as they live within the same boundary (*sīmā*) and the same residence (*āvāsa*) and hold ecclesiastic ceremonies jointly.

In the case of Devadatta, he first composed new scriptures and divergent monastic codes (see section 2.2 and Appendix I), which fulfills the

**Jie* 界, *zhu* 住: *zhu* 住 (Skt. *āvāsa*; "residence"). *Jie* 界 (Skt. *sīmā*; "boundary").

¹¹¹ Based on a reevaluation of Sasaki's previous publication on the same topic, Fujimoto 2021 reaffirms that the two conditions are necessary to constitute a valid schism in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya: 1. 法や律について異見を主張し他の比丘に唱導して破僧を企てる ("One asserts divergent views regarding the Dharma or Vinaya, and promotes them to other monks and plans to cause a division"); 2. 唱導者と随伴者がサンガと別に羯磨(サンガの行事)を行う ("The proposer and his followers perform *karman* [ceremonies of the *saṅgha*] separately from the *saṅgha*").

first condition. Later, in Gayā where both Śākyamuni and Devadatta resided, Devadatta performed his separate *poṣadha* despite three invitations from Śākyamuni to perform a joint *poṣadha*. Instead, Devadatta quickly held a separate *poṣadha* with the group of six monks in the same location (see Appendix III). He further declared that “from now on, I will no longer [follow] the same buddha, dharma, and *saṅgha*, I will no longer perform *poṣadha*, *pravāraṇa*, or other *karman* jointly. From now on, whether I wish to train in or not train in the [Buddha’s] *prātimokṣa* [and] *vinaya*, [I will do so] on account of my own will – we have just finished the performance of [our own] *poṣadha*.”¹¹² We find that Devadatta’s schism here also fits well with the legal discussion of schism in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya.

Having investigated how Devadatta’s initiatives fit into each school’s definition of schism, we arrive at the conclusion that the Devadatta narrative is a self-contained schismatic story. Despite appearing chaotic and sometimes even logically flawed, key elements of the Devadatta narrative in the Vinayas retain their underlying ideological aim: they agree with the definitions of schism in the Vinayas, serving to make Devadatta’s schism the paradigm of what a legal schism should be. Of course, whether these Devadatta stories were composed under the sway of the Vinaya regulations or the other way around – namely, that the Vinaya regulations were made to accommodate these Devadatta stories – remains an open question. Although I tend to regard them as a unity (or a symbiotic process: these Devadatta stories, as illustrations of what constitutes a schism, are already an integral part of the Vinaya rules), it seems more plausible that Devadatta was first created to serve the Vinaya discussions: on the one hand, the name Devadatta does indeed sound like a common name, and it seems likely that the Vinaya compilers just chose a common name when attempting to further illustrate the nature of schism; on the other

¹¹² T. 1425 (22) 443a17–19: 自今日後，不共佛法僧、不共*布薩自恣羯磨。從今日後波羅提木叉毘尼，欲學、不學自從我意，但我等已作布薩竟。

*布薩自恣羯磨: In my translation, I read this compound as a *dvandva* consisting of three separate items, which can be supported by the reading *āvenim uposathaṃ karonti, āvenim pavāraṇaṃ karonti, āvenim saṅghakammaṃ karonti* in the Pāli Vinaya when discussing the definition of *saṅghabheda* (Vin ii.204). However, as n. 136 shows, it is also possible to read the compound as “*karmans* for *poṣadha* and *pravāraṇa*.”

hand, it is worth noting that historical records of *saṅghabheda* predates the appearance of the schismatic Devadatta. References to *saṅghabheda* have already been found in several Aśoka edicts (Bechert 1961), whereas there is a lack of supporting evidence regarding Devadatta's antiquity beyond the canonical texts.

4. Concluding remarks

As scholars agree, the portrait of Devadatta as a rebellious, but foolish and impotent evildoer is the end product of a long history of development, throughout which increasingly lurid stories were composed to attribute crimes to him. Amid the elaboration of his various evil deeds, Devadatta's image became a mix of heterogeneous components, containing multiple conflicting elements. To grasp the multilayered significance of the Devadatta narrative, we must first investigate how the stories of Devadatta developed over a long time span.

This paper begins with an investigation into Devadatta's core image in the Vinayas of both the Sthavira and Mahāsāṅghika traditions, thereby shedding light on the core of the Devadatta narrative in its historical development. By situating these Devadatta stories against their schismatic background, it demonstrates that the core of the Devadatta narrative is modeled on definitions of a schismatic monk as found in the Vinaya codes. First of all, it is widely accepted by the Vinayas that not just anybody is qualified to become a schismatic. A schismatic must be a prestigious monk; more importantly, he must be a monk in good standing (that is, not presently in breach of the monastic rules or subject to any monastic punishment). This background knowledge can explain the tradition, shared by different schools, in which Devadatta starts out as a successful monk. I argue that we should read Devadatta's early religious achievement as a literary device to allow Devadatta to meet the requirements for being a schismatic in the Vinayas. Secondly, a legitimate schism requires that many conditions be fulfilled. The essential prerequisites call for a minimum number of participants, require that the main schismatic be a monk, and stipulate specific schismatic activities that must take place. All of this is reflected in Devadatta's case: the details of his four or eight major supporters and his schismatic activities

– ranging from composing new teachings and a divergent *Prātimokṣasūtra* (according to the *Mohe sengqi lü*), propounding five ascetic practices, and initiating a vote, to the performance of separate monastic ceremonies, such as *poṣadha* and *pravāraṇa* – are all composed in accordance with the definition of a schism in each Vinaya. Therefore, Vinaya literature is not just the main vessel for these stories, but the incubator in which the Devadatta narrative was initially developed: the stories of Devadatta must have been initially composed to illustrate the Vinaya rules on *saṅghabheda*. All these discussions illustrate how much these seemingly loosely bound or even contradictory stories could bear significance in the context of legal discussions of schism.

In considering Devadatta’s image as a schismatic the concept of *adhikaraṇa* (“dispute”) has frequently arisen. This is quite understandable, as schism (*bheda*) and dispute (*adhikaraṇa*) are intricately intertwined. A *saṅghabheda* arising from different interpretations of legal teachings can be seen as a form of “dispute which has its basis in controversy” (*vivādādhikaraṇa*). As Borgland (2014: 217) has observed, disputes can threaten the overall unity (*sāmagrī*) of the monastic community, and one of the most crucial functions of the settlement procedures (*adhikaraṇaśamatha*) is “to prevent the division of the monastic community (*saṅghabheda*).”¹¹³ On the other hand, however, when procedures to resolve disputes fail, they may become factors that contribute to schism. The voting for a schism is, for instance, a form of *yadbhūyaisīka* (“majority decision”) procedure, aimed at ensuring the victory of the righteous side (non-schismatic) and preventing the occurrence of schism.¹¹⁴ However, in reality, there may be situations where the schismatic faction forms the majority in the voting (such as Devadatta’s party), leading to the formalization of the schism.

In addition, it is important to distinguish Devadatta’s schism from the conflict among the Kauśāmbī monks, although the latter is also closely associated with the theme of schism within the monastic community. The

¹¹³ As Nolot (1996: 103) has demonstrated, in the story of the *Saṅgīti* in Vesālī, the dispute settlement procedure known as *saṃmukhavinaya* (“hearing”) is employed to resolve the dispute between monks from Vesālī and the visiting monk Yasa, which, however, still results in *saṅghabheda*.

¹¹⁴ Borgland 2014: 221: “The point of the vote is therefore not to determine what is ‘right,’ but for the ‘right’ side to win.”

conflict among Kauśāmbī monks emerges from disagreements regarding the interpretation of legal rules, with one faction questioning the validity of the suspension *karman* imposed by the opposing side. These conflicts result in the separate performance of ceremonies and ecclesiastical acts by the two factions, which compromises the unity of the original *saṅgha*. It is important to note that this separation is **not** brought about through a formal voting for schism, but rather through the separate performance of rituals such as *poṣadha* and *pravāraṇa*, in two monastic residences or boundaries (*sīmā*). Therefore, in a technical sense, this separation is classified as *nānāsaṃvāsa* rather than *saṅghabheda*, and the two factions are considered as two separate *nānāsaṃvāsakas*. Furthermore, in a *saṅghabheda* (schism), there is typically a primary or original party and a separate party involved. However, this dynamic does not precisely apply to the situation in Kauśāmbī.

As previously highlighted by Bechert, the term *saṅghabheda* in Vinaya literature refers to the division or split of a specific local Buddhist community into two factions. It is not identical to *nikāyabheda*, which refers to the division of Buddhist schools or sects that took place after the time of the Vinaya's composition. However, over time, the term *saṅghabheda* evolved, expanding its connotation from local community splits to encompassing Buddhist sectarian history, and became intricately entwined with another popular concept of *ānantaryakarma*, thereby complicating the distinction between schism as a legal issue and as a spiritually reprehensible act. These shifts, embedded within distinct ideological and historical contexts, have engendered the complex tapestry of Devadatta narratives.

Let me offer additional clarification on how the expansion of the connotation of *saṅghabheda* influenced the development of a schismatic narrative. To begin with, the connotation of *saṅghabheda* as a local community split should have been the context for the formation of the core episodes of the Devadatta narrative, which is actually the main argument of my present paper. While the Vinayas do treat *saṅghabheda* as a rather unfavorable matter and make various efforts to prevent it,¹¹⁵ they do not

¹¹⁵ Hüskén 1997: 320 and Borgland 2014: 220 both acknowledge the undesirability of schism in the Vinaya, prompting the Vinayas to employ various strategies to prevent such divisions.

excessively vilify or stigmatize it. The offense of *saṅghabheda* is, in these sources, still classified under the category of *saṅghāvaśeṣa*, rather than *pārājika*, and the Vinayas set out a detailed procedure for assessing the severity of a schismatic's offense and offer the potential schismatic ample opportunity to repent. In this sense, the Vinayas adopt a more rational attitude toward schism, and even allow certain (justifiable) schisms.¹¹⁶ In Devadatta's case, his schism is no doubt an evil one, as even though Devadatta knows that his five ascetic points violate the teachings legalized by the Buddha he persists in propounding them with the deliberate intention of causing a schism. Despite not being formally suspended through the *jñapticaturthakarman* procedure due to the support he received from his followers, Devadatta could not escape the spiritual consequences of his schismatic actions, leading to his descent into hell.

On the other hand, *saṅghabheda* gradually came to encompass the notion of *nikāyabheda*. Possibly, the gradual realization of the potential harm of schism¹¹⁷ and dissatisfaction with Buddhist sectarian history contributed to the strong aversion of many Buddhists toward *saṅghabheda*. Schism, as one of the five *ānantarya-karmas* that lead to rebirth in hell immediately in the next life, became the predominant perspective through which Buddhists in general perceive *saṅghabheda*. In the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma texts, schism is even considered the gravest transgression among the five *ānantarya-karmas*. It is precisely against this ideological background that the story of Mahādeva was created. Exhibiting similarities to Devadatta in his traits and transgressions, Mahādeva is prominently portrayed as the perpetrator of the five *ānantarya-karmas* in the Sarvāstivāda scholastic tradition.¹¹⁸ The aversion to Mahādeva may have

¹¹⁶ In my dissertation (Li 2019b: 162ff.), I have included a comprehensive discussion on various types of schism, distinguishing between justified and unjustified schisms, as well as examining the corresponding retribution that schismatics may incur. A more comprehensive elaboration on this subject (as well as the *cakrabheda* and *karmabheda*) will be reserved for a separate paper.

¹¹⁷ Bechert 2001: 12 comments, "It seems that later on the monks learned to carefully avoid *saṅghabheda*, which would be a most serious transgression of the rules and could be noticed by the lay followers."

¹¹⁸ Mahādeva is well known for committing four *ānantarya-karmas*, namely, matricide, patricide, murdering an arhat, and causing a schism. As for the fifth *ānantarya-karma*,

been rooted in the belief that he was responsible for the schism between the Sthaviras and the Mahāsāṅghikas. It would be a natural assumption that such a heinous person would have been involved in other formidable criminal activities. In contrast, Devadatta was initially conceived as a Vinaya figure, to be employed in the Vinaya discussion of schismatic issues and serve as an object lesson on unjustified schismatics. Although the concept of *ānantarya-karma* originated quite early in Buddhist history, the core and original part of the Devadatta stories does not delve deeply into the ramifications of this concept; if it exists, the influence of *ānantarya-karma* within the original part of the Devadatta narratives may have been limited to the specific item of schism.

Although Devadatta and Mahādeva may initially have been created in two separate traditions and borne different ideological or religious functions, the reverberation of the *ānantarya-karmas* also influenced the development of Devadatta's image. Consequently, as the gravity of schismatic sins and the prevalence of narratives regarding *ānantarya-karma* escalated, the life stories of these two figures came to include more and more reprehensible details.

As I have discussed, amid the transition from viewing *saṅghabheda* primarily as a legal offense to understanding it within the framework of *ānantarya-karma*, the portrayal of Devadatta as a schismatic became just one aspect of his broader image as an evildoer, and his role swiftly expanded to that of embodying the very essence of evil. However, since Devadatta's various other evil deeds were most likely created in contexts different from that of his schismatic sin, his other crimes are not completely compatible with his schismatic image. Devadatta's multifaceted

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

According to Silk's studies (2009: 64), the primary reason why Mahādeva could not realize all five *ānantarya-karmas* is that these stories are originally fictional accounts from the *Dharmarucyavadāna*, not belonging to the semihistorical figure Mahādeva. Buddhists repurposed the narratives of Dharmaruci, who committed the five *ānantarya-karmas* in the time of a past buddha, into the biographical stories of Mahādeva.

notoriety therefore ended up creating tensions within the depictions of Devadatta's personality, and moreover, resulted in clashes between the different Buddhist ideologies underlying the composition of his stories. I will delve into these aspects in my next paper on Devadatta.

Appendix: The Devadatta stories in the *Mohe sengqi lü*

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

Appendix I. The *Saṅghāvaśeṣa* ruling concerning the chief schismatic (T. 1425 [22] 281c12–282c23)

¹¹⁹ The Buddha dwelled in the city of Rājagṛha, as recorded extensively in the preceding part. At that time, Devadatta diligently sought expedient means with the intention of splitting the harmonious *saṅgha*, and persisted in upholding schismatic activities. Regarding the twelvefold [*corrected to tenfold*]¹²⁰ [*Prātimokṣa*]*sūtra*, namely, the introduction to the precepts, the four *pārājikas*, the thirteen *saṅghāvaśeṣas*, the two

¹¹⁹ 佛住王舍城，廣說如上。是時，提婆達多欲破和合僧，故勤方便，執持破僧事，於十二修多羅，戒序、四波羅夷、十三僧伽婆尸沙、二不定法、三十尼薩耆波夜提、九十二波夜提、四波羅提提舍尼、眾學法、七滅諍法、隨順法，不制者制，已制者便開，乃至在家出家共行法。所謂九部經，修多羅、祇夜、授記、伽陀、優陀那、如是語經、本生經、方廣、未曾有法，於此九部經，更作異句、異字、異味、異義。各各異文辭說，自誦習持，亦教他誦持。

¹²⁰ Literally, *Shi'er xiuduoluo* 十二修多羅 means “the twelve *sūtras*.” However, here it refers to the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, as explained elsewhere in the *Mohe sengqi lü* (波羅提木叉者，十修多羅也。T. 1425 [22] 338c20). The number *Shi'er* 十二 (“twelve”) seems to be an error for ten, because there are only ten divisions indicated in this context, as also observed by Yinshun (1994: 115, n. 19, 21). Elsewhere in the *Mohe sengqi lü*, it is indeed stated that there nine *vinaya* sections in addition to the introduction [that is, ten sections in total]. (時尊者優波離作是言：諸長老！是九法序。何等九？一、波羅夷；二、僧伽婆尸沙；三、二不定法；四、三十尼薩耆；五、九十二波夜提；六、四波羅提提舍尼；七、眾學法；八、七滅諍法；九、法隨順法。 “At that time, the venerable Upāli spoke thus: ‘Elders! There are nine dharmas and the introduction. What are the nine? (1) *pārājikas*, (2) *saṅghāvaśeṣas*, (3) the two *aniyatats*, (4) the thirty *naiḥsargi-*

aniyatadharmas, the thirty *naiḥsargika-pāyantikās*, the ninety-two *pāyantikās*, the four *pratideśanīyas*, the *śāikṣadharmas*, the seven *adhikaraṇaśamathadharmas*, and the *anudharmas*,¹²¹ he forbade what was not forbidden, but allowed what was forbidden ... [repeating the previous text down to] [he applied this to] the precepts shared by lay practitioners and renunciants. As for the ninefold scriptures, they are, namely, *sūtras*, *geyas*, *vyākaraṇas*, *gāthās*, *udānas*, *itivṛttakas*, *jātakas*, *vaipulyas*, and *adbhutadharmas*. With regard to these ninefold scriptures, he again invented disparate sentences, disparate words, disparate interpretations, and disparate meanings. As for each of these disparate texts and sayings, he recited them on his own and practiced and retained them, and further instructed others to recite and retain them.

¹²² At that time, the monks spoke: “Devadatta! You must not seek expedient means to break the harmonious *saṅgha*! Do not persist in

ka-pāyantikās, (5) the ninety-two *pāyantikās*, (6) the four *pratideśanīyas*, (7) the *śāikṣa*, (8) the seven *adhikaraṇaśamathas*, and (9) the *anudharma*.” T. 1425 [22] 492b14–18.

¹²¹ The *anudharma* (elsewhere found as *fa suishun fa* 法隨順法, *dharma anudharma*, or *fa sui shun* 法隨順; “abiding by the *dharma*”), as the last section of the *Prātimokṣa*, is attested in the Sanskrit version of the Mahāsāṅghika *Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa Vibhaṅga* (Roth 1970: 300). As noted by Roth (1970), this section is not shared by the Vinayas of the Sthavira side.

The content of the *anudharma* is not immediately clear, as both the Sanskrit and Chinese versions of the *Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa Vibhaṅga* only mention that the content of this part “conforms to that of the *Bhikṣu Vibhaṅga*” (*dharmaś cānudharmaś ca yathā bhikṣūnām*, Roth 1970: 300; 法隨順法，如上比丘中廣說。T. 1425 [22] 544c9). In the *Bhikṣu Prātimokṣa Vibhaṅga*, however, the *anudharma* is only explained as follows: 法隨順：法者，如二部毘尼；隨順者，順行此法也。“*Anudharma: dharma* refers, for instance, to Vinayas of two communities [i.e., *bhikṣus* and *bhikṣuṇī*]; *anu* refers to the action of following or abiding by such *dharmaś*” (T. 1425 [22] 412b14–15).

A clearer explanation of the *anudharma* is finally found in two Chinese translations of the Mahāsāṅghika *Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa: Mohe sengqi lü da biqiuni jieben* 摩訶僧祇律大比丘戒本 T. 1426 (22) 555b10–21 and *Mohe sengqi biqiuni jieben* 摩訶僧祇比丘尼戒本 T. 1427 (22) 566b26–c6. To be brief, the *anudharma* is associated with the introspection and self-evaluation of one’s behavior in the *poṣadha* ceremony. After reciting the *Prātimokṣa* rules, monks and nuns are questioned about their adherence to certain Vinaya rules to determine whether they have maintained pure conduct. If their behavior is pure, they remain silent. When they comply with the Vinaya rules, they are called “abiding by the *dharma*.”

¹²² 時諸比丘語：提婆達多！*汝莫作方便壞和合僧！莫執持破僧事！汝莫為破和合僧故勤方便！莫受破僧事故共諍長老！當與僧同事！何以故？*僧和合歡喜不諍，共一學，如水乳合，如法說法照明，安樂住。

upholding schismatic activities! Do not diligently seek expedient means to split the harmonious *saṅgha*! Do not dispute with elders by accepting schismatic activities! Perform monastic activities in accordance with the *saṅgha*! Why? The *saṅgha* should be harmonious, remain joyful [and] without disputes, share the same training, remain as united as the mixture of water and milk, illuminate the teaching according to the teaching [of the teacher], and dwell in comfort and delight.”

¹²³ In this way, [however], the first admonishment could not halt [his action], nor could the second and third admonishments halt him. Monks, due to this situation, came to report to the Buddha: “Blessed One! Devadatta is seeking expedient means with the intention of splitting the harmonious *saṅgha*, and persists in upholding schismatic activities. Regarding the introduction to the precepts down to the nine-fold dharma [scriptures], he invented disparate sentences, disparate words, disparate interpretations, and disparate meanings. As for each of these disparate texts and sayings, he only recited and practiced them on his own, but also instructed others [to do so]. Then, monks admonished him for a first time, but could not halt [his action]. [We] admonished him for a second and a third time, yet still could not halt [him].”

¹²⁴ The Buddha spoke to the monks: “If this Devadatta, the foolish one, seeks expedient means with the intention of splitting the harmonious

*汝莫作方便, ... 故共諍長老: The Pāli parallel reads (Vin iii.172): *māyasmā samaḡ-gassa saṅghassa bhedaḡya parakkami bhedanasaḡvattanikaḡm vā adhikaraṇaḡm samādāya paggaḡya aṭṭhāsi, samaḡ āyasmā saṅghena samaggo*.

*僧和合歡喜不諍 ... 安樂住: The Sanskrit *Abhisamācārika* of the Mahāsāṅghika school contains a parallel expression: *kasya tvaḡ bhikṡūṇāḡ samagrāṇāḡ sahitānāḡ saḡmodamānānāḡ avivadamānānāḡ ekoddeśakānāḡ kṡīrodakibhūtānāḡ sāstuḡ śāsanāḡ dīpayamānānāḡ suhaṇ ca phāsuṇ ca viharantānāḡ* (Karashima 2012: 289, §38.6.30B1; cf. Heirman 2002: II.424–425).

¹²³ 如是一諫不止, 第二、第三諫亦復不止。諸比丘以是因緣, 往白佛言: 世尊! 提婆達多欲破和合僧故勤方便, 執持破僧事。從戒序乃至九部法, 異句、異字、異味、異義, 各各異文辭說, 自誦習, 亦教他。時諸比丘一諫不止, 二諫、三諫猶故不止。

¹²⁴ 佛告諸比丘: 若是提婆達多愚癡人, 欲破和合僧故勤方便, 執持破僧事, 乃至九部法, 作異句、異字、異味、異義, 各各異文辭說, 三諫不止者, 汝去應當屏處三諫, 多人中三諫, 僧中三諫, 令捨是事。比丘屏處諫者, 應作是說: 汝, 提婆達多, 實欲破和合僧, 執持破僧事, 乃至九部法, 異句、異字、異味、異義, 異文辭說, 自誦習, 亦復教他不? 答言: 實爾。復應語提婆達多: 汝莫破和合僧故勤方便! 莫執持破僧事! 長老提婆達多! 破和合僧最大惡重罪, 當墮惡道, 入泥犁

saṅgha and persists in upholding schismatic activities ... [repeating down to] regarding the ninefold dharma [scriptures], he invents disparage sentences, disparate words, disparate interpretations, and disparate meanings. [He recites] each of these disparate texts and sayings. If three times admonishments could not halt him, you should go admonish him three times in private, three times in front of many people, and three times in the monastic community in order to dissuade him from these activities. Monks who admonish him in private should speak thus: ‘You, Devadatta! Is it true that you intend to split the harmonious *saṅgha*; persist in upholding schismatic activities ... [repeating down to] regarding the ninefold dharma [scriptures], [you] have invented disparage sentences, disparage words, disparate interpretations, and disparate meanings; and recite and practice each of the different texts and sayings, not only on your own, but also instruct others?’ He will answer: ‘Yes, it is true.’ Again, [you] should say to Devadatta: ‘You should not diligently seek expedient means to split the harmonious *saṅgha*! Do not persist in upholding schismatic activities! Elder Devadatta! To split the harmonious *saṅgha* is the utmost heinous evil and grave offense. You would fall into the unfortunate destinies and end up in hell. You would endure sufferings for the duration of a *kalpa*. Devadatta! We now possess a compassionate mind. For the sake of benefits, you should heed our words. The first admonishment has been made, but the second admonishment remains pending. Will you abandon such actions?’ If he does not abandon them, issue the second and third admonishments in the same way. Again, in front of many people, issue the three admonishments in the same way.

¹²⁵ If he still refuses to halt, go to the *saṅgha*. [You] should request permission for a *karman* (求聽羯磨). The one who [petitions for]

中，經劫受罪。提婆達多！我今慈心，饒益故，當受我語。一諫已過，二諫在。捨此事不？不捨者，第二、第三諫亦如是。復於多人中，三諫亦如是。

¹²⁵ 猶不止者，將詣僧中，應作求聽羯磨。羯磨者作如是說：大德僧聽！是長老提婆達多，欲破和合僧故勤方便，執持破僧事住。於十二事，乃至九部經，異句、異字、異味、異義，異文辭說，自誦亦教他。已屏處三諫，多人中三諫，猶故不止。若僧時到，僧今於僧中，當三諫令止。僧中應問：提婆達多！汝實於十二法，乃至九部經，異句、異字、異味、異義，異文辭說，自誦復持教他，諸比丘已屏處三諫，多人中三諫，猶故不止耶？答言：實爾。僧中應諫言：汝，提婆達多，莫為破和合僧故勤方便，莫執持破僧事，乃至於九部經中，異句、異字、異味、異義，

performing the *karman* speaks thus: ‘Venerable Monks, please let the *saṅgha* listen to me! This Elder Devadatta is diligently seeking expedient means for the intention of splitting the harmonious *saṅgha*, and persists in upholding schismatic activities. Regarding the twelvefold [corrected to tenfold] [*Prātimokṣa*]*sūtra*... [repeating down to] As for the ninefold scriptures, [he has invented] disparate sentences, disparate words, disparate interpretations, disparate meanings. As for the disparate texts and sayings, he has not only recited them on his own, but also instructed others. We have already admonished him three times in private and three times in front of many people, yet still could not halt his actions. If the proper time has come for the *saṅgha* (Skt. *sacet saṅghasya prāptakālah*; Pāli *yadi saṅghassa pattakallam*), may the monks in the *saṅgha* now admonish him three times to make him halt.’ [He should be] questioned in front of the *saṅgha*: ‘Devadatta! Is it true that regarding the twelvefold [legal] dharma ... down to the ninefold scriptures, you have invented disparate sentences, disparate words, disparate interpretations, and disparate meanings; As for the disparate texts and sayings, you have not only recited them on your own, but also retained and instructed others; after monks have admonished you three times on private occasions and three times in front of many people, yet you still do not halt [your actions]?’ He will answer: ‘It is true.’ [He should be] admonished in front of the *saṅgha*, saying: ‘Devadatta, you should not diligently seek expedient means to split the harmonious *saṅgha*! Do not persist in upholding schismatic activities! [Repeating the text down to] regarding the ninefold scriptures, do not invent disparate sentences, disparate words, disparate interpretations, disparate meanings, and disparate texts and expressions. You do not split the harmonious *saṅgha*! To split the harmonious *saṅgha* is an utmost heinous factor, a grave offense. You will fall into the unfortunate destinies and end up in hell. You will endure sufferings for the duration of one *kalpa*. Today, the monastic community is admonishing you out of a compassionate mind. For the sake of benefit, [you should] heed the words of the *saṅgha*. The first admonishment has

異文辭說。汝莫破和合僧！破和合僧者，是大惡事，是重罪，墮惡道，入泥犁中，經劫受罪。今日眾僧中慈心諫汝，欲饒益故，當受僧語。一諫已過，二諫在，當捨此事。若不捨，如是第二、第三諫。

been made, but the second admonishment remains pending. You should abandon these actions.’ If he does not abandon them, issue the second admonishment and the third in the same way.”

¹²⁶ Still, [Devadatta] refused to abandon [his actions]. The monks again came to the Buddha to report the issue: “This Devadatta has already been admonished three times in private, three times in front of many monks, and three times in front of the *saṅgha*. But he still does not abandon them.” The Buddha told these monks: “This Devadatta is a stupid person who is diligently seeking expedient means to split the harmonious *saṅgha* and persists in upholding schismatic activities, who has already been admonished three times in private, three times in front of many monks, and three times in front of the *saṅgha*, but still refuses to abandon [his activities]. The *saṅgha* should perform an act of suspension (**utkṣepaṇīyaṃ karma*.)” [...]

¹²⁷ The Buddha said to the monks: “Summon all the monks who are based in the city of Śrāvastī. We are going to issue precepts on behalf of the monks for the sake of ten benefits ... [repeating down to] monks who have already heard them should hear again. If a monk diligently seeks expedient means with the intention of splitting the harmonious *saṅgha*, and has disputes with [other monks] due to persisting in upholding schismatic activities, the monks should say to this [disruptive] monk: ‘Elder, do not diligently seek expedient means to split the harmonious *saṅgha*, [nor] dispute with [other monks] due to persisting in upholding schismatic activities. Perform monastic activities in accordance with the *saṅgha*! Why? The harmonious *saṅgha* should remain joyful [and] without disputes, share the same training, remain as united as the mixture of water and milk, illuminate the teaching according to the teaching [of the

¹²⁶ 猶故不止，諸比丘復以是事，往白世尊：是提婆達多，已於屏處三諫，多人中三諫，僧中三諫，此事猶故不捨。佛語諸比丘：是提婆達多癡人，破和合僧勤方便，執持破僧事，已屏處三諫，多人中三諫，僧中三諫，此事猶故不捨者，僧應與作舉羯磨。..... [a Jātaka is omitted in my translation here].

¹²⁷ 佛告諸比丘：依止舍衛城比丘皆悉令集，以十利故為諸比丘制戒，乃至已聞者當重聞。若比丘欲破和合僧故勤方便，執持破僧事故共諍，諸比丘語是比丘言：長老！莫破和合僧故勤方便，執持破僧事故共諍。當與僧同事。何以故？和合僧歡喜不諍，共一學，如水乳合，如法說法照明，安樂住。長老捨此破僧因緣事。是比丘諸比丘如是諫時，堅持是事不捨者，諸比丘應第二、第三諫，為捨是事故。第二、第三諫時，捨是事好。若不捨者，僧伽婆尸沙。

teacher], and dwell in comfort and delight. Elder, you should abandon these actions relating to schism.’ If this monk, when admonished by other monks, remains committed to [such] activities and refuses to abandon them, the other monks should admonish him a second and third time in order to stop such schismatic activities. During the second or third admonishment, it is acceptable if he abandons such activities. If he does not abandon them, he is committing a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* offense.”

Appendix II. The *Saṅghāvaśeṣa* ruling on those who assist the chief schismatic (T. 1425 [22] 284a26–b13)

¹²⁸ The Buddha was dwelling in the city of Śrāvastī, as extensively illustrated above. At that time, the monks were going to perform an act of suspension (**utkṣepañīyaṃ karma*, 舉羯磨) for Devadatta. On that occasion, no objection was raised during the first round of [proclamation of] the *karman*. When the second round of [proclamation of] the *karman* was finished, still nobody objected. When the third round of [proclamation of] the *karman* was conducted, Devadatta gazed upon the face of the group of six monks and spoke: “Group of six monks! You have been obedient to me for a long time and cooperated with me in doing things. Today, the monastic community is holding an act of suspension against me. It has proceeded to the second round of proclamation, but [you] remain silent. Today, you place me at the disposal of those people, just as feeding a bird curds mixed with crumbed grain; a mongoose (**nakula*, 那俱羅), cakes spread with butter; a jackal, rice blended with oil. The one who is cultivating pure practices is now trapped by others, but you just sit and watch!”

¹²⁹ Then, the group of six stood up and spoke thus: “Such-and-such elder is a monk preaching the Dharma, a monk explaining the Vinaya.

¹²⁸ 佛住舍衛城，廣說如上。爾時諸比丘為提婆達多作舉羯磨。時，初羯磨竟，無有遮者。第二羯磨竟，亦無有遮者。第三羯磨時，提婆達多看六群比丘面，而作是言：六群比丘，汝等長夜承事我，共我從事。今眾僧為我作舉羯磨，已至再說，而皆默然。汝等今日持我任於眾人，如酪塗麩與鳥，如酥塗餅與那俱羅，如油和飯與野干。修梵行者，為人所困，而坐觀之。

¹²⁹ 六群比丘即起作是言：如是如是長老，是法語比丘 (*dhammavādī*)，律語比丘 (*vinayavādī*)。是比丘所說，皆是我等欲忍可事。是比丘所見欲忍可事，我等亦欲忍

The matters stated by this monk is all what we wish to agree upon. The activities that this monk intends to endorse is what we also intend to endorse. This monk speaks [for us] while knowing about us; not that he speaks without knowing about us.” At that time, due to the objection of many people, the *karman* was not carried out.

¹³⁰ Then, the [other] monks spoke to the group of six: “Elders! Do not assist Devadatta’s actions to split the harmonious *saṅgha* and make the same statement and agreeable view [with him]. You should perform activities in accordance to the *saṅgha*. The complete *saṅgha* should be harmonious, stay joyful and without disputes, share the same training, remain as united as the mixture of water and milk, illuminate the teachings according to the teachings [of the teacher], and dwell in comfort and delight.” In this way, the first admonishment was filed, but they did not stop. After the second and third admonishments, they still did not halt.

¹³¹ The monks reported this situation to the Blessed One. The Buddha spoke to the monks: “This group of six monks shares the same statement and view with that foolish Devadatta who desires to split the harmonious *saṅgha*. If you have admonished them for the first, second, and third time, yet still could not stop them, you should go to a private place to admonish them three times, in front of many people to admonish them three times, and in front of the monastic community to admonish them three times, to force them to stop.” The monks obeyed the teaching of the Buddha ...

可。是比丘*知說，非不知說。是時，有多人遮，羯磨不成。

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

¹³⁰ 時諸比丘語六群比丘: 長老! 莫助提婆達多作破和合僧同語同見。當與僧同事。一切僧和合歡喜不諍, 共一學如水乳合, 如法說法照明, 安樂住。作如是一諫不止, 第二、第三諫猶故不止。

¹³¹ 諸比丘以是因緣具白世尊。佛告諸比丘: 是六群比丘, 與愚癡提婆達多欲破和合僧, 同語同見, 已一諫、二諫、三諫不止者, 汝去屏處三諫, 多人中三諫, 應僧中三諫, 令捨是事。比丘受教。

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

¹³² The Buddha said to the monks: “Summon all the monks who are based in the city of Rājagṛha. We shall issue precepts on behalf of the monks for the sake of ten benefits. [Repeating down to] monks who have already heard them should hear them again. Suppose there are monks who are sympathetic and assisting – one, or two, or many in number – who share the same statements and views with the monk intending to split the harmonious *saṅgha*. When the other monks admonish the [schismatic] monk, if those sympathetic monks say: ‘Elder! Please Do not speak of the virtues or vices of the monks! Why? He is the monk preaching the Dharma, the monk explaining the Vinaya. The matters stated by this monk is what we all wish to agree upon. The activities that this monk intends to endorse is what we also intend to endorse. This monk speaks [for us] while knowing about us; it is not the case that he speaks without knowing about us,’ then other monks should admonish such sympathetic monks: ‘Elders! Please do not say “he is a monk preaching the Dharma, a monk explaining the Vinaya.” Why? He is not a monk preaching the Dharma, nor a monk explaining the Vinayas. [You] elders should not assist with schismatic activities, but ought to take delight in supporting the harmonious *saṅgha*. Why? The *saṅgha* that is harmonious stays joyful [and] without disputes, shares the same training, remains as united as the mixture of water and milk, illuminates the teachings according to the teachings [of the teacher], and dwells in comfort and delight. Elders, you ought to abandon these schismatic activities!’ If these sympathetic monks, when admonished by other monks, remain committed to [such] activities and refuse to abandon them, the other monks should admonish them a second and third time in order to make them abandon such [schismatic] activities. During the second or third admonishment, it is

¹³² 佛告諸比丘：依止王舍城比丘皆悉令集。以十利故為諸比丘制戒，乃至已聞者當重聞。若比丘同意相助，若一、若二、若眾多，同語同見欲破和合僧是比丘，諸比丘諫時，是同意比丘言：長老！莫說是比丘好惡事。何以故？是法語比丘，律語比丘。是比丘所說，皆是我等欲忍可事。是比丘所見欲忍可事，我等亦欲忍可。是比丘知說，非不知說。諸比丘諫是同意比丘：長老！莫作是語—是法語比丘，律語比丘。何以故？是非法語比丘，非律語比丘。諸長老莫助破僧事，當樂助和合僧。何以故？僧和合歡喜不諍，共一學如水乳合，如法說法照明，安樂住。諸長老！當捨此破僧事。是同意比丘，諸比丘如是諫時，堅持不捨者，諸比丘應第二、第三諫，捨此事故。第二、第三諫時，捨是事好，若不捨者，僧伽婆尸沙。

acceptable if they abandon such activities. If they do not abandon them, they are committing a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* offense.”

Appendix III. The account in the second *Varga* (T. 1425 [22] 442c29–443a26)

¹³³ The Buddha was dwelling in the city of Rājagṛha. Just as fully narrated in the stories of Devadatta, [text omitted down to] Devadatta goes to the city of Gayā.¹³⁴ The Buddha went to the city of Gayā afterward. On that day, a *poṣadha* assembly was supposed to be held. The Buddha spoke to Ānanda: “Come to summon Devadatta. Today, the *saṅgha* is going to perform the formal act of *poṣadha*.” Then, Ānanda came to Devadatta and spoke thus: “Elder! Today, the *saṅgha* is going to perform a *poṣadha* ceremony. The Blessed One summons you, Devadatta.” (Devadatta) responded: “I will not go. From now on, I will no longer [follow] the same buddha, dharma, and *saṅgha*, I will no longer perform *poṣadha*, *pravāraṇa*, or *karman* jointly. From now on, whether I wish to

¹³³ 佛住王舍城。如提婆達多因緣中廣說，乃至提婆達多走向伽耶城。佛於後向伽耶城。其日應布薩。佛語阿難：汝去語提婆達多來，今日僧作*布薩羯磨事。阿難即往作是言：長老！今日僧作布薩羯磨，世尊喚提婆達多。答言：我不去。從今日後，不共佛法僧，不共布薩自恣羯磨。從今日後，波羅提木叉欲學不學自從我意。

*布薩羯磨：In the *Mohe sengqi lü*, *busa* 布薩 and *jiemo* 羯磨 are frequently combined to refer to the ceremony held for *poṣadha* affairs (e.g., T. 1425 [22] 447c22–448a9, a11, 449a22, 541b8). Therefore, I translate the phrase as a compound, “the *poṣadha* ceremony.”

¹³⁴ We have no further clue as to which narrative the “stories of Devadatta” (提婆達多因緣) refers to. No extant stories of Devadatta contain the detail in which Devadatta goes to the city of Gayā. It may have been a different story that the Mahāsāṅghika monks once knew, but is no longer accessible to us. According to the other Vinayas, after performing a separate *karman*, Devadatta and his community went to Gāya. The same scenario should also fit here. Fujimoto (2021: 49), on the other hand, argues that based on the two conditions (1. Variant teachings; 2. Separate performance of *karman*) required for a schism in the Mahāsāṅghika tradition, the “stories of Devadatta” (提婆達多因緣) mentioned here refer to the narrative found in the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* section, in which Devadatta composed a different set of Vinayas and Sūtras. However, I respectfully disagree with this interpretation. The fact that there are two conditions for a schism to be considered valid does not necessarily imply that both conditions have to be mentioned together in this part of the *Varga*. Therefore, it is not necessary to connect the “stories of Devadatta” (提婆達多因緣) with what is narrated in the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* section. The conditions for a schism can be addressed separately in different contexts or sections in the *Mohe sengqi lü*.

train in or not train in the [Buddha's] *prātimokṣa* [and] vinaya, [I will do so] on account of my own will.”

¹³⁵ Having heard those words, Ānanda made the thought: “It is indeed uncommon! He utters such evil voices. Won't he harm the *saṅgha*?” Having returned, Ānanda reported the above matter to the Blessed One. The Buddha spoke to Ānanda: “You should go to Devadatta's place again.” [The story repeats until the part where] Ānanda made the thought: “It is uncommon! He utters such evil voices. Won't he harm the *saṅgha*?”

¹³⁶ After Ānanda returned, the group of six monks spoke to each other: “Śramaṇa Gautama must send messengers three times! [Since] we all possess true intentions [to split the *saṅgha*], let us conduct *poṣadha* affairs in advance. We shall earn great fame in the future.” While the Buddha was still alive, Devadatta and the group of six monks split the *saṅgha* and immediately completed the *poṣadha*.

¹³⁷ Ānanda reported that situation to the Blessed One. The Buddha spoke: “You should go again to summon Devadatta for the third time. Today, the *saṅgha* is going to perform a *poṣadha* ceremony.” Ānanda immediately departed and made the statement [to Devadatta]: “The Blessed One summons you. Today the *saṅgha* is going to perform a *poṣadha* ceremony.” Devadatta answered: “I will not go. From now on, I will no longer [follow] the same buddha, dharma, and *saṅgha*, I will no longer perform *poṣadha*, *pravāraṇa*, or other *karman* jointly. From now on, whether I wish to train in or not train in the [Buddha's] *prātimokṣa* [and] vinaya, [I will do so] on account of my own will – we have just finished the performance of [our own] *poṣadha*.”

¹³⁵ 阿難聞是語已，作是念：此是奇事。出是惡聲，將無壞僧耶？阿難還，以上事具白世尊。佛語阿難：汝更往提婆達多所。乃至阿難作是念：奇事，出是惡聲，將無壞僧？

¹³⁶ 阿難還後，六群比丘自相謂言：沙門瞿曇必當三遣使來。我等各各正意，先作布薩事。我等作後世名譽。佛在世時，提婆達多、六群比丘共破僧，即布薩竟。

¹³⁷ 阿難以是因緣具白世尊。佛言：汝更第三往語提婆達多來，今日僧作布薩羯磨。阿難即往，作是言：世尊喚。今日僧作布薩羯磨。答言：我不去。自今日後，不共佛法僧，不共布薩自恣羯磨。從今日後，波羅提木叉毘尼，欲學不學自從我意。但我等已作布薩竟。

¹³⁸ Having heard thus, Ānanda make the thought: “It is uncommon! He has already harmed the *saṅgha*.” He immediately returned and reported the above situation to the Blessed One. Having heard thus, the Blessed One pronounced this verse: “Pure and clear as the moon reaching its fullness, [in such a] pure and clear [state] should a *poṣadha* be engaged. With pure and clear physical and verbal actions, in this way should the *poṣadha* be performed.” The Buddha declared to Ānanda: “Those unfaithful to the Dharma have already completed the *poṣadha*. We who are faithful to the Dharma should perform the *poṣadha*.” At that moment, Devadatta split the *saṅgha*, and the group of six monks were his schismatic companions. They were called “monks who must reside in another community” (Skt. *nānāsaṃvāsavarta*).

Abbreviations

Abhidh-k-bh	<i>Abhidharmakośabhāṣya</i> of Vasubandhu. See Pradhan 1975.
Abhidh-k-k	<i>Abhidharmakośakārikā</i> of Vasubandhu. See Pradhan 1975.
BHS	<i>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary</i> . See Edgerton 1953.
Chin.	Chinese
D.	Derge Kanjur
Dhp-A	<i>Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā</i> . See H. C. Norman 1906.
DN	<i>Dīghanikāya</i> . See T. W. Rhys-Davids and Carpenter 1890–1911.
Index Abhidh-k-bh	Index to the <i>Abhidharmakośabhāṣya</i> , 3 vols. See Hirakawa 1973–1978.
IBK	<i>Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū</i> 印度學佛教學研究 [<i>Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies</i>]
Ja	<i>Jātaka</i> stories from the <i>Jātakatthavaṇṇanā</i> . See Fausbøll 1877–1896.
Marciniak ii	<i>The Mahāvastu</i> . Vol. II. See Marciniak 2020.
Marciniak iii	<i>The Mahāvastu</i> . Vol. III. See Marciniak 2019.
MN	<i>Majjhimanikāya</i> . See Trenckner et al. 1888–1925.

¹³⁸ 阿難聞已，作是念：奇哉！已壞僧竟。即還，以上因緣，具白世尊。世尊聞已，即說此偈：清淨如月滿，清淨得布薩。身口業清淨，是乃應布薩。佛告阿難：非法人已作布薩竟，如法人應作布薩。爾時提婆達多破僧，六群比丘破僧伴黨，是名異住。

Mp	<i>Manorathapūraṇī</i> , the commentary on the <i>Aṅguttarani-kāya</i> . See Walleser and Kopp 1924–1956.
MSV	Mūlasarvāstivāda (Vinaya)
PTS	Pāli Text Society
Senart i	<i>Le Mahāvastu</i> . Vol. I. See Senart 1882–1897.
Senart ii	<i>Le Mahāvastu</i> . Vol. II. See Senart 1882–1897.
Senart iii	<i>Le Mahāvastu</i> . Vol. III. See Senart 1882–1897.
Sp	<i>Samantapāsādikā</i> . Buddhaghosa’s commentary on the <i>Vinaya-Piṭaka</i> . See Takakusu and Makoto 1924–1947.
T.	<i>Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō</i> . Cited from CBETA (http://www.cbeta.org/cbreader).
Ud	<i>Udāna</i> . See Steinthal [1885] 1982.
Vin	Pāli <i>Vinaya-piṭaka</i> . See Oldenberg 1879–1883.

Bibliography

- Appleton, Naomi. 2019. “What Does It Mean to Be a Badly Behaved Animal? An Answer from the Devadatta Stories of the Pāli Jātakas.” *Religions* 10 (4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel10040288>.
- Bureau, André. 1991. “Les agissements de Devadatta selon les chapitres relatifs au schisme dans les divers Vinayapitaka.” *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient* 78: 87–132.
- Bureau, André. 1992. “L’histoire de Devadatta selon l’Ekottara-agama.” *Eurasie: Cahiers de la Société des Études euro-asiatiques* 2: 68–79.
- Bureau, André. 1997. “Devadatta and the First Buddhist Council.” *Buddhist Studies Review* 14 (1): 19–37.
- Bechert, Heinz. 1961. “Aśoka’s ‘Schismenedikt’ und der Begriff *Saṅghabheda*.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5: 18–52.
- Bechert, Heinz. 1982. “The Importance of Aśoka’s So-called Schism Edict.” In L.A. Hercus et al., eds., *Indological and Buddhist Studies in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on His Sixtieth Birthday*. Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies: 61–68.
- Bechert, Heinz. 2001. “*Saṅghabheda* and *Nikāyabheda* in Buddhist Law.” *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 2: 9–14.
- Borgland, Jens Wilhelm. 2014. *A Study of the Adhikaraṇavastu: Legal Settlement Procedures of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. Ph.D. dissertation, Oslo University.
- Borgland, Jens Wilhelm. 2018. “Devadatta and the Extracurricular Ascetic Practices: Some Highlights from the Story of the First Buddhist Schism as Told in the *Saṅghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.” In Lutz Edzard, Jens W. Borgland, and Ute Hüsken, eds., *Reading Slowly: A Festschrift for Jens E. Braarvig*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag: 89–114.

- Burlingame, Eugene Watson. 1921. *Buddhist Legends: Translated from the Original Pāli Text of the Dhammapada Commentary*. 3 vols. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Chung, Jin-Il. 2006. "More Fragments of Karmavācānā Texts." In J. Braarvig et al., eds, *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. III. Oslo: Hermes Publishing: 177–188.
- Chung, Jin-il and Petra Kieffer-Pülz. 1997. "The *Karmavācānās* for the Determination of *Simā* and *Ticivarena avippavāsa*." In Bhikkhu T. Dhammaratana and Bhikkhu Pāsādika, eds., *Dharmadūta: Mélanges offerts au Vénérable Thich Huyen-Vi à l'occasion des son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Paris: Éd. You-Feng: 13–56.
- Clarke, Shayne. 2004. "Vinaya Māṭṛkā – Mother of the Monastic Codes, or Just Another Set of Lists? A Response to Frauwallner's Handling of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47 (2): 77–120.
- Clarke, Shayne. 2015. "Vinayas." In J. A. Silk et al., eds., *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Vol. I. Leiden and Boston: Brill: 60–87.
- Deeg, Max. 1999. "The Saṅgha of Devadatta: Fiction and History of a Heresy in the Buddhist Tradition." *Journal of the International College for Post-graduate Buddhist Studies* 2: 183–218.
- Durt, Hubert. 1974. "The Counting Stick (*Śalākā*) and the Majority/Minority Rule in the Buddhist Community." *IBK* 23 (1): 470–464.
- Edgerton, F. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Vol. 2. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fausbøll, Viggo, ed. 1877–1896. *The Jātaka: Together with its Commentary, Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha*. 6 vols. London: Trübner & Co.
- Fiordalis, David V. 2010. "Miracles in Indian Buddhist Narratives and Doctrine." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 33 (1–2): 381–408.
- Frauwallner, E. 1956. *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*. Rome: IsMEO.
- Fujimoto Akira 藤本晃. 2021. "Makasōgiritsu no hasō teigi 『摩訶僧祇律』の破僧定義" [The Definition of *Samghabheda* in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya]. *IBK* 70 (1): 47–54.
- Gethin, Rupert. 2012. "Was Buddhaghosa a Theravādin? Buddhist Identity in the Pali Commentaries and Chronicles." In Peter Skilling et al., eds., *How Theravāda is Theravāda? Exploring Buddhist Identities*. Chiang Mai: Silk-worm Books: 1–66.
- Gnoli, Raniero, ed. 1977–1978. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu, Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. 2 vols. Rome: IsMEO.
- Granoff, Phyllis. 1996. "The Ambiguity of Miracles: Buddhist Understandings of Supernatural Power." *East and West* 46 (1–2): 79–96.

- Habata, Hiromi. 2018. “Zum Wort *khelāpaka-*, *khelāsika-*, *khetaśaka-* in der Devadatta- Episode.” In O. von Criegern et al., eds., *Saddharmāmṛtam: Festschrift für Jens-Uwe Hartmann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien: 149–156.
- Heirman, A. 2002. *The Discipline in Four Parts. Rules for Nuns according to the Dharmaguptakavinaya*. 3 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Hinüber, Oskar von. 1996. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin etc.: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hinüber, Oskar von and Anālayo. 2016. “The Robes of a *Bhikkhuni*.” *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 13: 79–90
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1973–1978. *Abidatsuma kusharon sakuin* 阿毘達磨俱舍論索引 [Index to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*]. 3 vols. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.
- Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 1993. “*Akushin shutsubusshi ketsu’ setsuwa no den-shō* 「悪心出仏身血」説話の伝承” [The Narrative tradition of Drawing Blood of the Buddha with An Evil Mind]. In Maeda Egaku 前田恵學, ed., *Genshi bukyō to daijō bukyō: Watanabe Fumimaro hakase tsuitō kinen ronshū* 原始仏教と大乘仏教: 渡辺文磨博士追悼記念論集 [Studies in Early Buddhism and Mahāyāna Buddhism in Commemoration of the Late Professor Dr. Fumimaro Watanabe]. Vol. I. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō: 285–302.
- Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 2007a. “*Zōitsu agonkyō no seiritsu kaimei ni mukete* 『増一阿含経』の成立解明に向けて (1)” [The Sectarian Affiliation of the *Zengyi ahan jing* 1]. *IBK* 56 (1): 212–219.
- Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 2007b. “*Shutsuyōkyō no seiritsu ni kansuru mondai* 『出曜経』の成立に関する問題” [The Sectarian Affiliation of the *Chuyao jing*]. *IBK* 55 (2): 181–187.
- Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 2008a. “*Zōitsu agonkyō no seiritsu kaimei ni mukete* 『増一阿含経』の成立解明に向けて (2)” [School Affiliation of the *Zengyi ahan jing* 2]. *IBK* 57 (1): 254–261.
- Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 2008b. “*Jinzū/ shinpen no kōnō to shiyōjō no chūi* 神通／神変の効能と使用上の注意” [The Effect of the *Abhijñā* Power and Warning of its Use as Seen in Buddhist Narrative Literature]. *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 仏教研究 *Buddhist Studies* 36: 209–230.
- Hōbōgin* 法寶義林. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d’après les sources chinoises et japonaises*. Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise, 1929–.
- Horner, I. B., trans. 1938–1952. *The Book of the Discipline: (Vinaya-Piṭaka)*. 5 vols. London: PTS.
- Hüsken, Ute. 1997. “*Samghabheda* as Depicted in the Vinaya of the *Mahāvihāra* School.” In Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, eds., *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica: 319–331.
- Jones, J. J., trans. 1949–1956. *The Mahāvastu*. 3 vols. London: Luzac.

- Karashima, Seishi. 2012. *Die Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins*. Vol. XIII. 2. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 1992. *Die Sīmā: Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Konow, Sten. 1929. *Kharoshthī Inscriptions, with the Exception of Those of Aśoka*. Calcutta: Central Publication Branch.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1923–1931. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*. 6 vols. Paris: Paul Geuthner.
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1944–1980. *Le Traité de la grande Vertu de Sagesse*. 5 vols. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste de l'Université catholique de Louvain.
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1997. “Did the Buddha Insult Devadatta?” *Buddhist Studies Review* 14 (1): 3–18. Originally published in 1970 as “Le Buddha insulta-t-il Devadatta?” in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 33: 108–115.
- Lee, Ja-rang. 2008. “Sanga no wagō o megutte サンガの「和合」をめぐって: SamanasamvāsakaとNānāsamvāsaka の検討” [On the Unity of the Buddhist Saṅgha: A Consideration on Samanasamvāsaka and Nānāsamvāsaka]. *Bukkyō ken'yū 仏教研究 Buddhist Studies* 36: 231–253.
- Li, Channa. 2019a. “Devadatta.” In J. A. Silk et al., eds., *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Vol. II. Leiden and Boston: Brill: 141–155.
- Li, Channa. 2019b. “Challenging the Buddha's Authority: A Narrative Perspective of Power Dynamics Between the Buddha and His Disciples.” Ph.D. dissertation, Leiden University.
- Marciniak, Katarzyna. 2019. *The Mahāvastu*. Volume III. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology.
- Marciniak, Katarzyna. 2020. *The Mahāvastu*. Volume II. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology.
- Marshall, S. J., Alfred Foucher, and Nani Gopal Majumdar. 1901. *The Monuments of Sāñchī*. Vol. 1. London: Probsthain.
- Masefield, Peter. 1994. *The Udāna Translated from the Pāli*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Mitsuno Hiromoto 水野弘元. 1981. *Hokkukyō no kenkyū 法句經の研究* [Studies on the Dharmapāda]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Mori Shōji 森章司. 1994. “Hasō kō 「破僧」考” [A Study on Saṃghabheda]. *Ōkurayama ronshū 大倉山論集 Bulletin of the Okurayama Institute* 38: 1–39.
- Mori Shōji 森章司 and Motozawa Tsunao 本澤綱夫. 2006. “Daibadatta no kenkyū 提婆達多 (Devadatta) の研究” [Studies on Devadatta's Biography]. *Genshi bukkyō seiten shiryō ni yoru shakuson-den no kenkyū 原始仏教聖典資料による釈尊伝の研究* [A Study of the Biography of Śākyamuni Based on Early Buddhist Scriptural Sources] 11: 1–114.

- Mukherjee, Biswadeb. 1966. *Die Überlieferung von Devadatta, dem Widersacher des Buddha, in den kanonischen Schriften*. Munich: Kitzinger.
- Nolot, Édith. 1996. "Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms I–III." *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 22: 73–150.
- Nolot, Édith. 1999. "Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms IV–X." *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 25: 1–111.
- Norman, H. C. 1906. *The Commentary on the Dhammapada*. 4 vols. London: PTS.
- Oldenberg, Hermann, ed. 1879–1883. *The Vinaya Piṭakaṃ: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*. 5 vols. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.
- Palumbo, Antonello. 2013. *An Early Chinese Commentary on the Ekottari-ka-āgama: The Fenbie Gongde Lun 分別功德論 and the History of the Translation of the Zengyi Ahan Jing 增一阿含經*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corp.
- Pathak, Shridharshastri and Siddheshvarshastri Chitrao. 1927. *Word index to Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Mahābhāṣyaśabdakoṣaḥ*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Pradhan, P., ed. 1975. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Center.
- Pruden, L. M. 1988–1990. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.
- Ray, Reginald A. 1994. *Buddhist Saints in India: A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rhys-Davids, T. W. and J. E. Carpenter, eds. 1890–1911. *The Dīgha-Nikāya*. 3 vols. London: PTS.
- Roth, Gustav. 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya Including Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑. 1989. "Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period (1): The meaning of the Schism Edict." *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 18: 181–202.
- Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑. 1992. "Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period (2): Saṅghabheda (1)." *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 21: 157–176.
- Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑. 1993a. "Hasō suru no ni hitsuyō na biku no ninzū 破僧するのに必要な比丘の人数" [The Minimum Number of Bhikṣus to Commit a Saṅghabheda]. In Maeda Egaku 前田惠學, ed., *Genshi bukkyō to daijō bukkyō: Watanabe Fumimaro hakase tsuitō kinen ronshū 原始仏教と大乘仏教: 渡辺文磨博士追悼記念論集* [Studies in Early Buddhism and Mahāyāna Buddhism in Commemoration of the Late Professor Dr. Fumimaro Watanabe]. Vol. I. Kyoto: Nagatabunshōdō: 153–172.
- Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑. 1993b. "Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period (3): Saṅghabheda (2)." *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 22: 167–199.

- Satō Mitsuo 佐藤密雄. 1963. *Genshi bukkyō kyōdan no kenkyū* 原始仏教教団の研究 [A Study of the Early Buddhist Order in the Vinaya Piṭaka]. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- Senart, É. 1882–1897. *Le Mahāvastu*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2007. “Good and Evil in Indian Buddhism: The Five Sins of Immediate Retribution.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 35: 253–286.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2009. *Riven by Lust: Incest and Schism in Indian Buddhist Legend and Historiography*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Silk, Jonathan A., Oskar von Hinüber, and Vincent Eltschinger, eds. 2015. *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Vol. I. *Literature and Languages*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Silk, Jonathan A. Richard Bowring, Vincent Eltschinger, and Michael Radich, eds. 2019. *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Vol. II. *Lives*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Skilling, Peter, Jason A. Carbine, Claudio Cicuzza, and Santi Pakdeekham, eds. 2012. *How Theravāda is Theravāda? Exploring Buddhist Identities*. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.
- Steinthal, Paul. [1885] 1982. *Udāna*. London: PTS.
- Strong, John S. 1997. “A Family Quest: The Buddha, Yaśodharā, and Rāhula in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.” In Juliane Schober, ed., *Sacred Biography in the Buddhist Traditions of South and Southeast Asia*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press: 113–128.
- Takakusu, Junjirō and Makoto Nagai, eds. 1924–1947. *Samantapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa’s Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka*. 7 vols. London: PTS.
- Tatia, Nathmal, ed. 1976. *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādimahāsāṅghika School*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Tinti, Paola. 1997. “Did Hsuan-tsang Meet the Followers of Devadatta?” *Buddhist Studies Review* 14 (1): 38–47.
- Tokiya Kōki 釋舎幸紀. 1987. “破僧伽における二、三の問題 – デーヴァダッタに関する記述を中心として [Explorations of the Saṅghabhedavastu of the Sarvāstivādavīnaya: Focusing on the Devadatta Records].” *IBK* 36 (1): 17–24.
- Tokiya, Yukinori 釈舎幸紀. 1988. “Hasōga kendo ni arawareru devadatta zō 破僧伽犍度にあらわれるデーヴァダッタ像” [The Image of Devadatta in the Saṅghabhedavastu].” *Takada Tanki Daigaku Kiyō* 6: 41–79.
- Tomomatsu Entai 松友圓諦. 1970. *Bukkyō Keizai shisō ken'yū: Bukkyō ni okeru Buppai no Riron no Jissai (chū)* 仏教経済思想研究: 佛教に於ける分配の理論と実際 (中) [Theory and Practices of Distribution in Buddhism]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Tournier, Vincent. 2012. “The Mahāvastu and the Vinayapiṭaka of the Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādins.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 15: 87–104.

- Trenckner, V., Robert Chalmers, and C. A. F. Rhys-Davids, eds. 1888–1925. *The Majjhima-Nikāya*. 4 vols. London: PTS.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1926. *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins*. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft.
- Walleser, M. and H. Kopp, eds. 1924–1956. *Manorathapūraṇī, Commentary on the Aṅguttara Nikāya*. 5 vols. London: PTS.
- Yinshun 印順. 1994. *Yuanshi fojiao shengdian zhi jicheng* 原始佛教聖典之集成 [The Establishment of Sacred Texts of Ancient Buddhism]. Taipei: Zhengwen Publishing House.
- Zacchetti, Stefano. 2021. *The Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 (**Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*) and the History of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā: Patterns of Textual Variation in Mahāyāna Sūtra Literature. Edited for publication by Michael Radich and Jonathan Silk. Hamburg Buddhist Studies, 14. Hamburg: Projekt Verlag.
- Zin, Monika. 2006a. *Mitleid und Wunderkraft. Schwierige Bekehrungen und ihre Ikonographie im indischen Buddhismus*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Zin, Monika. 2006b. “About Two Rocks in the Buddha’s Life Story.” *East and West* 56 (4): 329–358.