

Sri Lanka International Journal of Buddhist Studies (SIJBS)
Volume IV (2015), ISSN- 20128878

The First *Saṅgīti* and Theravāda Monasticism

Bhikkhu Anālayo

Chief Editor: Dr. Iromi Ariyaratne



Sri Lanka International Buddhist Academy (SIBA)
Pallekele, Kundasale

The First *Saṅgīti* and Theravāda Monasticism

Bhikkhu Anālayo

Concord in the monastic community
is [a source of] happiness¹

Introduction

In this paper I explore the significance of the account of the first *saṅgīti* in the different *Vinayas* and their report that the assembled monks decided not to abolish the minor rules. In the final part of my study I turn in particular to the impact of this decision on the formation of the Theravāda sense of monastic identity.

The Convocation of the First *Saṅgīti* and the Minor Rules

According to the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* and its parallels, at the time of the Buddha's decease Mahākassapa was travelling together with a group of monks. On hearing the news that the Buddha had just passed away, a monk in this company reportedly expressed his satisfaction to be now free to do as he likes. According to the *Dīrgha-āgama* parallel to the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* his statement was as follows:

Do not grieve that the Blessed One has attained final extinction! We gain independence. That old man kept on telling us: 'It is proper that you should act like this, you should not act like this.' From now on that is behind us and we can do as we like.²

This episode also comes up at the first *saṅgīti*, a term perhaps best translated "communal recitation" (instead of "council").³ Accounts of this episode have been preserved in a range of different *Vinayas*, as follows:

- the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya* extant in Chinese translation,⁴
- the **Vinayamāṭṭkā* extant in Chinese translation, presumably representing the Haimavata tradition,⁵
- the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya* extant in Chinese translation,⁶
- the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* extant in Chinese translation,⁷
- the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* extant in Chinese and Tibetan translation,⁸
- the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* extant in Chinese translation,⁹
- the Theravāda *Vinaya* extant in Pāli.¹⁰

According to these canonical accounts, Mahākassapa conceived of the need to convene a *saṅgīti* in response to this episode.¹¹ In other words, the event of the first *saṅgīti* is presented in the canonical sources as being from the outset related to the perceived need to ensure adherence to *Vinaya* rules and regulations.¹²

The topic of adherence to *Vinaya* rules then takes central stage in the account of the actual proceedings in relation to a permission given by the Buddha, according to the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* and its *Dīrgha-āgama* parallel, that the minor rules can be abolished after his passing away.¹³

According to the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*, the Buddha had even asked Ānanda to remind him of the need to abolish the minor rules himself before passing away. At the first *saṅgīti* Ānanda then has to face criticism for not having reminded the Buddha to do this.¹⁴ The other *Vinayas*, however, agree with the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* and its *Dīrgha-āgama* parallel that the Buddha had only given permission to abolish these rules, without suggesting that he had intended to do so himself.

The Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* reports Mahākassapa censuring Ānanda for not having ascertained which of the different rules fall into the category of those that can be abolished,¹⁵ as this raises the problem of different opinions about the categories of rules to which this permission can be applied. In the Mahīśāsaka and Sarvāstivāda *Vinayas* Mahākassapa similarly depicts different opinions monks might have on what the expression “minor rules” refers to.¹⁶ In the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, the (Haimavata?) **Vinayamāṭṭkā*, and the Theravāda *Vinaya*, once Ānanda has mentioned the Buddha’s permission to abolish the minor rules,¹⁷ this leads to an actual discussion among the assembled monks who propose different interpretations of the scope of the expression “minor rules”.¹⁸

The Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya* reports such a discussion regarding the scope of the minor rules to be abolished taking place after the completion of the first *saṅgīti*. This discussion involves a group of a thousand monks who had not participated in the gathering. After recording a range of different opinions on which rules should be abolished, comparable to the differences reported in the other *Vinayas*, the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya* continues with a radical suggestion voiced by the infamous group of six monks. This group of six monks is a recurrent trope in *Vinaya* literature, responsible for all kinds of mischief. According to the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*, the group of six made the following suggestion:

Elders, if the Blessed One were alive he would abolish all [rules] completely.¹⁹

The group of six come up in the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya* again in relation to the same minor rules. Still during the lifetime of the Buddha they reportedly objected against the inclusion of these minor rules in the recitation of the monastic code of rules.²⁰ A similar objection by the group of six against the recitation of the minor rules is reported in a range of other *Vinayas*.²¹ Perhaps this incident led to an association of the group of six with the motif of the minor rules in the first *saṅgīti* account as found in the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*.

Even leaving aside this blatant suggestion found in the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya* only, a lack of agreement among the monks concerning the scope of the minor rules to be abolished is not a light matter. It involves different conceptions of the scope of the code of monastic rules, *pātimokkha/prātimokṣa*, that is to serve as the foundation for the monastic community.

The Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, the (Haimavata?) **Vinayamāṭṭkā*, and the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* continue after their report of the successful completion of the first *saṅgīti* with a discussion between Mahākassapa and the monk Purāṇa, who had not participated in the gathering. Purāṇa also features in the Theravāda *Vinaya*, which reports that, on being asked to adopt the first *saṅgīti*’s recital, he replies that he

prefers to remember the *Dhamma* and *Vinaya* in the way he has heard it himself.²² The Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, the (Haimavata?) **Vinayamāṭṭkā*, and the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* report that Purāṇa is not aware of, or even refuses to accept, that the Buddha had withdrawn certain special allowances made during a period of famine.²³ Thus here the problem, which the *saṅgīti* is meant to avoid, actually manifests, namely discord regarding the rules to be followed after the Buddha's demise, thereby endangering the harmonious continuity of the Buddhist monastic tradition.²⁴

***Saṅgīti* and Communal Harmony**

According to different *Vinayas*, at the suggestion of Mahākassapa the decision was taken by the assembled participants of the first *saṅgīti* that no rules should be abolished and no new rules be promulgated. When evaluated in its narrative context, this decision is only natural. A central concern behind the performance of a *saṅgīti* is to affirm communal harmony.²⁵ The same concern finds explicit expression in the concluding section of the different codes of the monastic rules, *pātimokkha*, which enjoins that all of the assembled monastics should train in concord in these rules, without dispute.²⁶ Thus a disagreement about the scope of the code of the monastic rules, to be recited every observance day (*uposatha*) by the members of a monastic community in affirmation of their agreement to train in these rules, needs to be avoided at all cost. How could monastics be expected to recite in harmony if they did not first of all agree on the scope of what is to be recited? Discord in this respect carries with it the potential of *saṅghabheda*, a schism in the monastic community. This is the exact opposite of what the first *saṅgīti* set out to achieve.

The *Sāmagāma-sutta* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel report that, after the leader of the Jains had passed away, his monks began to quarrel among each other. The loss of communal harmony then caused the lay followers to become dissatisfied. The relevant passage in the *Madhyama-āgama* parallel to the *Sāmagāma-sutta* proceeds as follows:

Not long after his death the disciples of the Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta had broken up into factions and there was no communal harmony ... the white-clothed disciples of Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta who were living the household life were all dissatisfied with these [monastic] disciples of the Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta.²⁷

Quarrel among the monastic community leading to dissatisfaction among the lay followers is a dire prospect for Jain as well as Buddhist monastics. Their mendicant lifestyle makes both monastic traditions rather sensitive to dissatisfaction among their respective lay followers and the potential loss of their support.²⁸

In order to prevent communal disharmony and its dire repercussions, the assembled participants of the first *saṅgīti* would have found themselves forced to find a solution enabling them to establish communal concord on the basis of common adherence to the same set of rules. In fact the decision not to abolish any existing rule and not to allow for new rules to be promulgated just follows a precedent set according to the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* by the Buddha himself. The passage in question reports that one of several principles preventing decline set forth by him was precisely that existing rules should not be abolished and new rules should not be established.²⁹ The

Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* account of the first *saṅgīti* explicitly draws attention to this parallelism. According to its report, when Mahākassapa proposed that it would be best not to abolish any of the rules and not to promulgate new rules, he explicitly referred to the Buddha's teaching of such a way of procedure as one of seven principles that will prevent the decline of the monastic community.³⁰

The Liberating Teachings vis-à-vis the Rules

The *Sāmagāma-sutta* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel not only provide a background for the decision taken according to the different *Vinayas* at the first *saṅgīti* with their depiction of the quarrelling Jains; they also present a contrast to this decision. This contrast emerges with the Buddha's reaction to the report of the quarrel among the Jains. This reaction emphasizes the *bodhipakkhiyā dhammā* as the core of the teaching, concord in which will prevent the arising of quarrel in the Buddhist community.³¹ These are:

- the four establishments of mindfulness (*satipaṭṭhāna*),
- the four right efforts (*sammappadhāna*),
- the four bases for supernormal ability (*iddhipāda*),
- the five faculties (*indriya*),
- the five powers (*bala*),
- the seven factors of awakening (*bojjhaṅga*),
- the noble eightfold path (*ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo*).

The *Pāsādika-sutta* and its *Dīrgha-āgama* parallel similarly recommend concord on this set of mental qualities and practices conducive to awakening as what will prevent a loss of communal harmony after the Buddha's demise.³² The same concern to maintain communal harmony in contrast to the quarrelling Jains informs the *Saṅgīti-sutta* and its parallels.³³ The exposition given in this discourse concerns predominantly aspects of the teaching, the Dharma; matters of monastic rule and conduct only play a minor role.

In this way the *Sāmagāma-sutta*, the *Pāsādika-sutta*, and the *Saṅgīti-sutta*, together with their parallels, present a broader vision of the foundation for concord, which covers various practices that purify the mind. Although these of course require establishing a basis in morality, they are not concerned with adherence to moral conduct alone.³⁴

A discourse in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* and its *Samyukta-āgama* parallel report that a monk in front of the Buddha declared his inability to train in the whole set of regulations covered in the monastic code of rules.³⁵ The Buddha in reply suggests that the monk should just dedicate himself to the three trainings in higher virtue, the higher mind, and higher wisdom. This pragmatic reply is significant for appreciating the importance given to the rules in early Buddhist thought. The importance of virtue, *sīla*, has its proper place as the first of the three trainings, building a foundation for the higher mind and higher wisdom. Nevertheless, observance of the rules is clearly

seen as subordinate to the overarching aim of cultivating the higher mind and higher wisdom, that is, tranquillity and insight.³⁶

A set of three discourses in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* and their parallels in the *Samyukta-āgama* go so far as to indicate that someone who has fulfilled the higher training in virtue could still incur breaches of the minor rules, in fact the same holds even for someone who has fulfilled the training in the higher mind.³⁷

The danger of mistaking the means of moral conduct for being the goal comes up for explicit comment in the *Mahāsāropama-sutta* and its *Ekottarika-āgama* parallel. According to both versions, to mistake accomplishment in virtue, *sīla*, as the goal would be comparable to a person who mistakes the bark or else the leaves of a tree for being its heartwood.³⁸ Having taken only the bark or the leaves from the tree, this person will be unable to carry out the task to be accomplished with the help of heartwood. Needless to say, the main task to be accomplished from the normative viewpoint of early Buddhist thought is awakening. For progress to awakening a discourse in the *Udāna* then recommends avoiding the two extremes of either taking rules and observances to be the essence of the holy life or else seeing no fault in sensuality.³⁹ Reaching the first level of awakening in turn entails precisely the overcoming of the fetter of dogmatic adherence to rules and observances.⁴⁰

Mahākassapa and Ānanda at the First Saṅgīti

Whereas the emphasis in the above discourses is on concord regarding the liberating teachings as a whole, with the first *saṅgīti* an increasing emphasis on firm adherence to the rules sets in. This exemplifies a theme that runs through the entire *saṅgīti* account, particularly evident in the contrast set between Mahākassapa and Ānanda. In the early discourses the former Brahmin Mahākassapa stands out in particular as a devoted adherent to ascetic practices and thus naturally functions as an emblem of an attitude that gives particular importance to aspects of moral conduct.⁴¹

A discourse in the *Samyutta-nikāya* and its parallels showcase Mahākassapa as being so devoted to his ascetic conduct that he is unwilling to give it up even on being explicitly invited by the Buddha to do so.⁴² This stands in a telling contrast to the *Mahāsakuludāyī-sutta* and its parallel, which report the Buddha making the explicit point that he was considerably less ascetic in his conduct than some of his disciples.⁴³

In the accounts of the first *saṅgīti* Mahākassapa and the attitude he embodies take precedence over Ānanda who, in spite of being the Buddha's personal attendant who had memorized the teachings, finds himself being demoted and criticized in various ways. The *Vinaya* accounts of the first *saṅgīti* report that Mahākassapa at first did not even include Ānanda in the gathering. According to one of the parallels to the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta*, Mahākassapa explained:

Ānanda is [like] a lay person. I am afraid that, being with covetousness in his mind, he will not recite the discourses completely.⁴⁴

By comparing Ānanda to a lay person, he is implicitly presented as not living up to the ideal of a real monk as conceived by the participants of the first *saṅgīti*, and this in turn puts into question his potential contribution to the first *saṅgīti* by reciting the

discourses. According to the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*, in reply to the suggestion by other monks to let Ānanda be part of the assembly, Mahākassapa refused:

No! A person in training like him entering among the community of those powerful and virtuous ones who are beyond training is like letting a jackal enter among a pride of lions.⁴⁵

Although not necessarily in such stark terms, the different *Vinaya* accounts of the first *saṅgīti* agree in drawing a pronounced contrast between these two disciples. This contrast may well reflect an actual conflict between two contending factions in the monastic community after the Buddha's decease, with the more ascetically inclined faction emerging as the winning party in the accounts of the first *saṅgīti*.⁴⁶

The shift in attitude that emerges out of this contrast concords with the agenda of the first *saṅgīti*, reportedly convened by Mahākassapa to ensure adherence to *Vinaya* rules and regulations. This in turn forms part of an attempt to shore up institutional authority and achieve maximum acceptability in the eyes of public opinion, in order to safeguard the continuity of support for the monastic community.

The Legacy of the First *Saṅgīti* and Theravāda Monasticism

The decision to curtail the possibility of any adaptation of the rules reflects not only a shift of perspective by foregrounding monastic discipline over other aspects of the Buddha's teaching, it also involves to some degree a shift of perspective in relation to these very rules. According to a basic pattern evident in the different *Vinayas*, the Buddha is on record for promulgating rules only in reply to a particular problem that had arisen.⁴⁷ Often enough rules given in order to address a particular issue then turn out to be insufficient to settle the matter at hand, whereupon the Buddha is shown to amend them by changing their formulation or making additional stipulations. In short, the *Vinaya* narratives on the promulgation of rules present these as *ad hoc* regulations taken in response to specific situations, always open to amendments if the situation should require this.

The in itself natural decision taken at the first *saṅgīti* to consider these *ad hoc* regulations to be unalterable law that admits no longer of any change moves Buddhist law closer to ancient Indian brahminical attitudes towards law as something invested with a timeless status.⁴⁸ In this way the first *saṅgīti* marks the onset of an attitude that has its basis in ritualistic tendencies prevalent in the ancient Indian setting, whereby rules originally meant to support the monastic life acquire such importance that they become the timeless essence of the monastic life.

The decision reportedly taken at the first *saṅgīti* has had considerable impact on the implementation of *Vinaya* rules and their observance in the Theravāda tradition in particular, where strict adherence to the rules in the way these are found in the Pāli *Vinaya* has become a core element of normative monastic identity.⁴⁹

The *Dīpavaṃsa* (4.6) defines the expression *theravāda* as a referent to the sayings that were collected by the elders at the first *saṅgīti*:

The collection of the teaching and the discipline [was made] by the five hundred elders, this collection made by the elders is called *theravāda*.⁵⁰

A similar definition can be found in the *Mahāvamsa* (3.40).⁵¹ In other words, for Theravāda monastics the Pāli *Vinaya*, held to have been recited in this form at the first *saṅgīti*, forms the core of their monastic identity, and this often to such an extent that it can overshadow the other component of the definition of *theravāda* in the *Dīpavamsa*: the Dhamma. Unsurprisingly this sense of monastic identity by foregrounding the *Vinaya* comes in close association with the decision enshrined in the first *saṅgīti*'s account to keep the rules unaltered and not permit any change or amendment.⁵² The resultant attitude in traditional Theravāda monastic circles finds a succinct summarisation in a statement reportedly made by the venerable Ajāhn Buddhadāsa at the sixth *saṅgīti* in Burma in 1956. He explains that Theravāda monastics are

against the revoking, changing or altering of the original even in its least form ... we have no warrant of addition in such a manner that would make Buddhism develop according to [the] influence of the ... locality, or to any other circumstances ... we are afraid of doing such a thing ... by means of this very cowardice, Theravada is still remaining in its pristine form of the original doctrine. May we be in cowardice in this way forever.⁵³

Conclusion

The convening of the first *saṅgīti* takes its motivation from the perceived need to ensure strict adherence to the rules promulgated by the Buddha. Faced by the permission to abrogate the minor rules, the monks assembled at the first *saṅgīti* reportedly find themselves unable to determine which rules this permission refers to. In view of the central purpose of the first *saṅgīti* to ensure communal harmony and avoid discord in the monastic community, it seems almost inevitable that the decision taken in this situation was to avoid any change and pledge adherence to the code of rules as received without allowing any alteration.

Although in itself a natural development, this decision involves a change of attitude towards what at the outset were *ad hoc* regulations to deal with specific situations, amenable to adjustment and modification if this should be required. The resultant legal conservatism particularly evident in traditional monastic Theravāda circles needs to be understood in the light of its historical roots as the final result of what originally appears to have been mainly an attempt to maintain communal harmony after the demise of the Buddha.

Abbreviations

AN	<i>Aṅguttara-nikāya</i>
D	Derge edition
DĀ	<i>Dīrgha-āgama</i> (T 1)
Dhp	<i>Dhammapada</i>
DN	<i>Dīrgha-nikāya</i>

EĀ	<i>Ekottarika-āgama</i> (T 125)
It	<i>Itivuttaka</i>
MĀ	<i>Madhyama-āgama</i> (T 26)
Mil	<i>Milindapañha</i>
MN	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>
Mp	<i>Manorathapūraṇī</i>
Q	Peking edition
SĀ	<i>Saṃyukta-āgama</i> (T 99)
SĀ ²	<i>Saṃyukta-āgama</i> (T 100)
SN	<i>Saṃyutta-nikāya</i>
Sn	<i>Sutta-nipāta</i>
T	Taishō edition
Ud	<i>Udāna</i>
Vin	<i>Vinayaṭṭhaka</i>
Vism	<i>Visuddhimagga</i>

References

- Anālayo (2003) *Satipaṭṭhāna, The Direct Path to Realization*. Birmingham: Windhorse.
- Anālayo (2011a) *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Anālayo (2011b) Mahāpajāpatī's Going Forth in the Madhyama-āgama. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, 18: 268–317.
- Anālayo (2012) The Case of Sudinna: On the Function of Vinaya Narrative, Based on a Comparative Study of the Background Narration to the First Pārājika Rule. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, 19: 396–438.
- Anālayo (2013) A Note on the Term Theravāda. *Buddhist Studies Review*, 30.2: 216–235.
- Anālayo (2014) *The Dawn of Abhidharma*. Hamburg: Hamburg University Press.
- Anuruddha, Kākkāpalliye et al. (2008) *The First and Second Buddhist Councils, Five Versions, English Translations from Pāli and Chinese*. Hong Kong: Chi Lin Nunnery.
- Banerjee, Anukul Chandra (1977) *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit, Prātimokṣa Sūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākya*. Calcutta: World Press.
- Bareau, André (1955) *Les premiers conciles bouddhiques*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

- Bureau, André (1971) *Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtrapīṭaka et le Vinayapīṭaka anciens: II, Les derniers mois, le Parinirvāṇa et les funérailles*. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, vol. 2.
- Beckh, Hermann (1911) *Udānavarga, Eine Sammlung Buddhistischer Sprüche in Tibetischer Sprache, Nach dem Kanjur und Tanjur mit Anmerkungen Herausgegeben*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Bernhard, Franz (1965) *Udānavarga*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bhagvat, Durga N. (1939) *Early Buddhist Jurisprudence (Theravāda Vinaya-Laws)*. Delhi: Cosmo Publications (undated reprint).
- Bond, George D. (1982) *The Word of the Buddha, The Tipiṭaka and its Interpretation in Theravada Buddhism*. Colombo: Gunasena.
- Chakravarti, Uma (1987/1996) *The Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Collins, Steven (1998) *Nirvana and Other Buddhist Felicities, Utopias of the Pali Imaginaire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cone, Margaret (1989) Patna Dharmapada. *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 13: 101–217.
- Cousins, L.S. (1991) The 'Five Points' and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools. *The Buddhist Forum*, 2: 27–60.
- Cowell, E.B. and R.A. Neil (1886) *The Divyāvadāna, A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends, Now First Edited from the Nepalese Sanskrit Mss. in Cambridge and Paris*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de La Vallée Poussin, Louis (1976) *The Buddhist Councils*. Calcutta: Bagchi.
- Deo, Shantaram Bhalchandra (1956) *History of Jaina Monachism, From Inscriptions and Literature*. Poona: Deccan College, Postgraduate and Research Institute.
- Dhirasekera, Jotiya (1982/2007) *Buddhist Monastic Discipline, A Study of its Origin and Development in Relation to the Sutta and Vinaya Piṭakas*. Dehiwala: Buddhist Cultural Centre.
- Durt, Hubert (1980) Mahalla/mahallaka et la crise de la communauté après le Parinirvāṇa du Buddha. In *Indianisme et Bouddhisme, Mélanges offerts à Mgr. Etienne Lamotte*, 79–99. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste.
- Dutt, Sukumar (1924/1996) *Early Buddhist Monachism*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Findly, Ellison Banks (2002) The Housemistress at the Door, Vedic and Buddhist Perspectives on the Mendicant Encounter. In L.L. Patton (ed.). *Jewels of Authority, Women and Textual Tradition in Hindu India*, 13–31. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Findly, Ellison Banks (2003) *Dāna, Giving and Getting in Pali Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

- Franke, Otto (1908) The Buddhist Councils at Rājagaha and Vesālī, As Alleged in Cullavagga XI., XII. *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 6: 1–80.
- Frauwallner, Erich (1956) *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Freiberger, Oliver (2000) *Der Orden in der Lehre, Zur religiösen Deutung des Saṅgha im frühen Buddhismus*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Geiger, Wilhelm (1958) *The Mahāvamsa*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Gethin, Rupert (1992) *The Buddhist Path to Awakening: A Study of the Bodhi-Pakkhiyā Dhammā*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Gnanarama, Pategama (1997) *The Mission Accomplished, A Historical Analysis of the Mahāparinibbana Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya of the Pali Canon*. Singapore: Ti-Sarana Buddhist Association.
- Gombrich, Richard F. (1988) *Theravāda Buddhism, A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gombrich, Richard F. (1990) How the Mahāyāna Began. *The Buddhist Forum*, 1: 21–30.
- Guruge, Ananda W.P. (1970) Some Problems in Buddhist Ethics. In J. Tilakasiri (ed.). *Añjali, Papers on Indology and Buddhism, A Felicitation Volume Presented to Oliver Hector de Alwis Wijesekera on his Sixtieth Birthday*, 4–19. Colombo: University of Ceylon.
- Huxley, Andrew (1996) The Vinaya: Legal System or Performance-Enhancing Drug? In T. Skorupski (ed.). *The Buddhist Forum, Volume IV, Seminar Papers 1994–1996*, 141–163. London: University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. (1980) The Disappearance of Buddhism and the Survival of Jainism: A Study in Contrast. In A.K. Narain (ed.). *Studies in the History of Buddhism, Papers Presented at the International Conference on the History of Buddhism at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, WIS, USA, August 19–21, 1976*, 81–91. Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation.
- Keith, Berriedale (1932) Mahāvīra and the Buddha. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, 9: 859–866.
- Kumar, Ujjwal (2010) Truth of the Devil Statement. In S. Nanayakkara et al. (ed.). *Buddhism, Contemporary Studies, Selected Papers from the 3rd International Conference, Sri Lanka Association of Buddhist Studies (SLABS)*, 112–127. Pannipitiya: K Line Printing Services.
- Lariviere, Richard W. (1997/2004) Dharmaśāstra, Custom, ‘Real Law’, and ‘Apocryphal’ smṛtis. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 32: 611–627.
- Law, Bimala Churn (1933). *A History of Pāli Literature*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, vol. 1.
- Lubin, Timothy (2007) Punishment and Expiation: Overlapping Domains in

- Brahmanical Law. *Indologica Taurinensia* 33: 93–122.
- Migot, André (1952) Un grand disciple du Buddha, Śāriputra, son rôle dans l'histoire du Bouddhisme et dans le développement de l'Abhidharma. *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 46: 405–554.
- Misra, G.S.P. (1972) *The Age of Vinaya*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Ñāṇatusita, Bhikkhu (2014) *Analysis of the bhikkhu pātimokkha*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.
- Oberlies, Thomas (1997) Neuer Wein in alten Schläuchen? Zur Geschichte der buddhistischen Ordensregeln. *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes*, 15: 171–204.
- Oldenberg, Hermann (1879) *The Dīpavaṃsa, An Ancient Buddhist Historical Record, Edited and Translated*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Pachow, W. (1955) *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa, on the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pali Versions*. Santiniketan: Sino-Indian Cultural Society.
- Peoples, Dion Oliver (2012) *Chanting the Saṅgīti Sutta*. Bangkok: Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University.
- Pischel, Richard (1904) Neue Bruchstücke des Sanskritkanons der Buddhisten aus Idyuktšari, Chinesisch-Turkestan. *Sitzungsbericht der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin*, 25: 1138–1145.
- Pruitt, William and K.R. Norman (2001) *The Pātimokkha*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Przyluski, Jean (1926) *Le concile de Rājagrha, introduction a l'histoire des canons et des sectes bouddhiques*, Paris: Paul Geuthner.
- Rockhill, W.Woodville (1883/1907) *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of His Order, Derived from Tibetan Works in the Bkah-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur, Followed by Notices on the Early History of Tibet and Khoten*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner.
- Schmidt, Klaus T. (1989) *Der Schlussteil des Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins, Text in Sanskrit und Tocharisch A verglichen mit den Parallelversionen anderer Schulen, Auf Grund von Turfan-Handschriften herausgegeben und bearbeitet*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Seeger, Martin (2006/2008) The bhikkhunī Ordination Controversy in Thailand. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 29.1: 155–183.
- Senart, Émile (1882). *Le Mahāvastu, texte sanscrit publié pour la première fois et accompagné d'introductions et d'un commentaire*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, vol. 1.
- Shravak, Lalji (2012) Saṅgīti Sutta, Recitation of Dhammas at the First Abhidhamma Saṅgīti. In L. Shravak and C. Willemen (ed.). *Dharmapracicaya, Aspects of Buddhist Studies, Essays in Honour of N.H. Samtani*, 233–241. Delhi: Buddhist World Press.

- Sobisch, Jan-Ulrich (2010) Bhikṣuṇī Ordination: Lineages and Procedures as Instruments of Power. In T. Mohr and J. Tsedroen (ed.). *Dignity & Discipline, Reviving Full Ordination for Buddhist Nuns*, 239–252. Boston: Wisdom.
- Stache-Rosen, Valentina (1968) *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus II; Das Saṅgītisūtra und sein Kommentar Saṅgītiparyāya*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Suzuki, Teitaro (1904) The First Buddhist Council. *The Monist*, 14.2: 253–282.
- Tatia, N. (1975) *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādimahāsāṅghika School*. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Tilakaratne, Asaṅga (2000) Saṅgīti and Sāmaggī: Communal Recitation and the Unity of the Saṅgha. *Buddhist Studies Review*, 17.2: 175–197.
- Tilakaratne, Asaṅga (2005) Personality Differences of Arahants and the Origins of Theravāda, A Study of Two Great Elders of the Theravāda Tradition: Mahā Kassapa and Ānanda. In A. Tilakaratne et al. (ed.). *Dhamma-Vinaya, Essays in Honour of Venerable Professor Dhammavihari (Jotiya Dhirasekera)*, 229–257. Colombo: Sri Lanka Association for Buddhist Studies.
- Verardi, Giovanni (1996) Religions, Rituals, and the Heaviness of Indian History. *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, 56.2: 215–253.
- von Glasenapp, Helmuth (1925/1999) *Jainism, An Indian Religion of Salvation*. S.B. Shrotri (trsl.). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- von Hinüber, Oskar (1995) Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya. A Survey of Theory and Practice. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 18.1: 7–45.
- von Hinüber, Oskar (1996/1997) *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- von Hinüber, Oskar (1997). Old Age and Old Monks in Pāli Buddhism. In S. Formanek (ed.). *Aging, Asian Concepts and Experiences Past and Present*, 65–78. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- von Hinüber, Oskar (2008) The Foundation of the Bhikkhunīsaṅgha – A Contribution to the Earliest History of Buddhism. *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*, 11: 3–29.
- von Simson, Georg (2000) *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, vol. 2.
- Voyce, Malcolm (2007) The Vinaya and the Dharmasāstra: Monastic Law and Legal Pluralism in Ancient India. *Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 39.56: 33–65.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst (1951) *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, vol. 2.

Waldschmidt, Ernst (1954/1967) *Zum Ersten Buddhistischen Konzil in Rājagrha*. In *Von Ceylon bis Turfan, Schriften zur Geschichte, Literatur, Religion und Kunst des indischen Kulturraums, Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag am 15. Juli 1967 von Ernst Waldschmidt*, 226–237. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Zongtse, Champa Thupten (1990) *Udānavarga, Band III: Der tibetische Text, unter Mitarbeit von Siglinde Dietz herausgegeben von Champa Thupten Zongtse*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

* I am indebted to *bhikkhunī* Dhammadinnā for commenting on a draft version of this paper.

¹ Uv 30.22, Bernhard 1965: 397: *sukham saṃghasya sāmāgrī* (with its Tibetan counterpart in Uv 30.23, Beckh 1911: 116, or Uv 30.24, Zongtse 1990: 336: *dge 'dun rnams ni mthun pa bde*). Similarly worded counterparts can be found in DhP 194: *sukhā saṃghassa sāmaggī* (cf. also AN 10.40 at AN V 77,1, It 19 at It 12,8, and Vin II 205,7), and the Patna *Dharmapada* 68, Cone 1989: 121: *sukhā saṃghassa sāmaggī*; cf. also T 212 at T IV 755b29 and T 213 at T IV 794c8.

² DĀ 2 at T I 28c14 (the translation is based on adopting a variant). Parallels to this type of statement can be found in DN 16 at DN II 162,29, a Sanskrit fragment version, Waldschmidt 1951: 422,6 (§48.10), T 5 at T 173c27, T 6 at T I 189b25, and T 7 at T I 206c20 (in this version a group of monks have such thoughts); cf. also Durt 1980. On the lack of significance of the circumstance that the *Mahāparinibbāna* narrative does not explicitly refer to the first *saṅgīti* cf. Anālayo 2011a: 863f note 43.

³ By adopting this rendering I follow the example of Gombrich 1990: 25, Cousins 1991: 27, and the detailed discussion in Tilakaratne 2000.

⁴ T 1428 at T XXII 966b18.

⁵ T 1463 at T XXIV 817c17; for a discussion of the school affiliation cf. Anālayo 2011b: 270f note 11.

⁶ T 1425 at T XXII 490a25.

⁷ T 1421 at T XXII 190b24.

⁸ T 1451 at T XXIV 401a19 and its Tibetan parallel in Waldschmidt 1951: 423,7 (§48.10).

⁹ T 1435 at T XXIII 445c29.

¹⁰ Vin II 284,26; for a comparative survey of several of these versions cf. Kumar 2010. In what follows my study focuses on these *Vinaya* accounts; a study with translations of a range of different accounts of the first *saṅgīti* can be found in Przyłuski 1926; for English translations of several *Vinaya* versions cf. Anuruddha et al. 2008, for a translation from the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* cf. Rockhill 1883/1907: 148–161; and for a comparative study cf. also, e.g., Suzuki 1904, Bareau 1955: 1–30, and de La Vallée Poussin 1976: 2–29.

¹¹ As already pointed out by von Hinüber 1997: 73 in relation to the Theravāda version, “this remark is actually the reason why Mahākassapa decides to convoke the first council.”

¹² Bareau 1955: 4 comments that, even if this episode should be purely fictive, “il n’en est pas moins certain qu’il reflète une situation et des préoccupations très réelles”, namely that “l’unité de la Communauté était menacée par certaines tendances laxistes.”

¹³ DN 16 at DN II 154,16 and its parallel DĀ 2 at T I 26a28. Gnanarama 1997: 114 comments that “the Buddha’s intention was to hand over the controlling power ... to the Saṅgha themselves. He wanted to create an atmosphere amicable for free administration and growth of the dispensation.”

¹⁴ T 1425 at T XXII 492b4.

¹⁵ T 1451 at T XXIV 405b3 and D 6 *da* 307b6 or Q 1035 *ne* 291a5.

¹⁶ The Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 191c8, and the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1435 at T XXIII 449c26; cf. also the Sanskrit fragment version in Waldschmidt 1954/1967: 234f.

¹⁷ The Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 967b12, the (Haimavata?) **Vinayamātrkā*, T 1463 at T XXIV 818b3, and the Theravāda *Vinaya*, Vin II 287,30. Franke 1908: 13 notes that DN 16 at DN II 154,24 continues by reporting that the Buddha, about to pass away, asked the assembled monks if they had any doubt or uncertainty about the Buddha, the Dhamma, the Saṅgha, or the path, encouraging them to have it clarified now while he was still alive. Franke notes that this would presumably have been an occasion for Ānanda to have the scope of the expression “minor rules” clarified. A similar invitation to get any doubts clarified can be found in the Sanskrit fragment parallel, Waldschmidt 1951: 390,21 (§42.2), as well as in DĀ 2 at T I 26b1, T 5 at T I 172c7 (here the

- doubts are only about the scriptures), T 6 at T I 188b4, and T 7 at T I 204c7 (which just mentions doubt in general, without further specifications). Another point worth noting is that in the Theravāda *Vinaya* Ānanda's mentioning of this permission by the Buddha is preceded by his recitation of the discourses where, had he recited DN 16 in full, the monks would already have been informed of the Buddha's injunction; a narrative inconsistency already noted by de La Vallée Poussin 1976: 14. This problem does not hold for the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, as in its account Ānanda's recitation of the discourses takes place only afterwards. The **Vinayamātrkā* has the same temporal sequence as the Theravāda *Vinaya*, in that here the recitation of the discourses takes place before Ānanda mentions the Buddha's permission to abolish the minor rules. This does not result in the same degree of inner inconsistency as in the Theravāda *Vinaya*, however, since in the **Vinayamātrkā* the recitation of the discourses is not done by Ānanda, but rather involves the whole assembly of monks and Ānanda's role is only to be interrogated in case something has been forgotten; cf. T 1463 at T XXIV 818a12. Since his mentioning of the Buddha's permission occurs right after the recitation of the texts has been completed, it falls naturally within the role assigned to him in the account of the first *saṅgīti* in the **Vinayamātrkā* to mention what has not been recalled by the other assembled monks.
- ¹⁸ Different views on the scope of the minor rules can also be found in later texts of the Pāli tradition: Mil 144,4 takes the expression to refer just to the *dukkata* type of offence, whereas Mp II 348,14 considers all rules except for the four *pārājikas* to be minor rules. Vism 11,34 correlates the minor rules with the rules of behaviour, *ābhisamācārika sīla*, followed by indicating that the rules of behaviour correspond to regulations found in the *Khandhakas* of the *Vinaya*.
- ¹⁹ T 1425 at T XXII 492c12; on the group of six cf. Anālayo 2012: 417f.
- ²⁰ T 1425 at T XXII 338c7 (no. 10).
- ²¹ The Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 685c11 (*pācittiya/pātayantika* no. 72), the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 41b9 (no. 10), the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1442 at T XXIII 775a27 (no. 10) and D 3 *cha* 276b4 or Q 1032 *je* 255b7, and the Theravāda *Vinaya*, Vin IV 143,6 (no. 72). An exception is the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1435 at T XXIII 74b25 (no. 10), where according to the narrative introduction such an objection had been voiced just by a single monk who according to the Sarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhāṣā*, T 1440 at T XXVIII 526a1, was one of the group of six. The objection itself in all versions seems to reflect, as already pointed out by Dhirasekera 1982/2007: 312, "one of the first attempts to get rid of some of the monastic regulations which had found a place in the code of the Pātimokkha."
- ²² Vin II 290,6.
- ²³ The Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 968c4, the (Haimavata?) **Vinayamātrkā*, T 1463 at T XXIV 819a10, and the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 191c25.
- ²⁴ Tilakaratne 2000: 196 explains that "we need to view these acts of communal recitals as determined, first and foremost, by a very important communal requirement, namely, the assurance of the solidarity of the Saṅgha, as a group, to one way of behaviour (the *Vinaya*)." As noted by Ñānatusita 2014: xxxviii, "the most important purpose of the fortnightly Pātimokkha recitation is assuring the unity of the Saṅgha."
- ²⁵ Tilakaratne 2000: 175 points out that "the fundamental purpose of ... events described as *saṅgīti* is the assurance of the unity of the Buddhist monastic organization ... the key activity was to recite together the Dhamma and the *Vinaya* ... [which], first and foremost, was meant to be a public expression of one's allegiance to the organisation which was represented by the Dhamma and the *Vinaya*." Collins 1998: 447 summarizes the general spirit of early Buddhist monastic administration and law in the following way: "a community organizing its affairs by uncoerced vote rather than authoritarian fiat, and achieving (in aspiration, at least) a state of unanimous harmony."
- ²⁶ Dharmaguptaka, T 1429 at T XXII 1022b11, Kāśyapīya, T 1460 at T XXIV 665a19, Mahāsāṅghika, Tatia 1975: 36,2, Mahīśāsaka, T 1422 at T XXII 199c19, Mūlasarvāstivāda, Schmidt 1989: 92,9 (fol. 37R, this part has been omitted by Banerjee 1977), Sarvāstivāda, von Simson 2000: 258,9, and Theravāda, Pruitt and Norman 2001: 110,9; cf. also Pachow 1955: 214 and Schmidt 1989: 34f. In the words of Gombrich 1988: 110, "the *pātimokkha* ritual's communal function ... was the one thing which held the Saṅgha together."
- ²⁷ MĀ 196 at T I 752c14; with a parallel in MN 104 at MN II 243,18 (cf. also T 85 at T I 904c6). The same problem recurs in DN 29 at DN III 118,11 and its parallel DĀ 17 at T I 72c17. Quarrels appear to have broken out in the Jain community already during the lifetime of Mahāvīra; cf. Keith 1932: 864, Deo 1956: 78ff, and von Glasenapp 1925/1999: 383ff. According to Jaini 1980: 84, during

- subsequent periods of Indian history “the divisiveness associated with sectarianism was much more severe among Jains than among the Buddhists.”
- ²⁸ Chakravarti 1987/1996: 62 explains that “since the laity provided for the *saṅgha*, they ... often exercised their influence upon the *saṅgha*”, as a result of which “the conduct of the *bhikkhu* was ultimately shaped and moulded by the very society he had opted out of.” The ability of the laity to assert their influence results in particular, in the words of Findly 2002: 13, from “the renunciant being normally prohibited from using the cooking fire and from storing edibles, and being thus dependent on a daily round of door-to-door petitioning to procure his serving of cooked food.” Findly 2002: 18 adds that “this dependence on resources by the Buddhist renunciant is, in this way, curious: in spite of the fact that they are enjoined to live as islands unto themselves, as refuges unto themselves ... they do indeed need others; they need donors to give them, on a continual basis, the material means” they require, resulting in “the need for the petitioner to consider and maintain the goodwill of the donor”; cf. also, e.g., Freiberger 2000: 187ff and Findly 2003: 214ff and 337ff.
- ²⁹ DN 16 at DN II 77,3 (= AN 7.21 at AN IV 21,18), with similarly formulated counterparts in Sanskrit fragments, Waldschmidt 1951: 120,20 (§2.8), and in DĀ 2 at T I 11b29 and MĀ 142 at T I 649b16, all of which precede this injunction with another such principle that throws into relief the importance of communal harmony for preventing decline. The principle not to abolish any rule and not to promulgate new rules comes up again with positive connotations in the Theravāda *Vinaya* in the narrative introduction to *nissaggiya pācittiya* no. 15, according to which the Buddha praised Upasena for having precisely this attitude; cf. Vin III 231,14.
- ³⁰ T 1435 at T XXIII 450a22.
- ³¹ MN 104 at MN II 245,7 and MĀ 196 at T I 753c5; cf. also Gethin 1992: 233f.
- ³² DN 29 at DN III 127,15 and DĀ 17 at T I 74a14.
- ³³ DN 33 at DN III 210,19 and its parallels in Sanskrit fragments, Stache-Rosen 1968: 44 (v to x), DĀ 9 at T I 49c6, and T 12 at T I 227a23. The similarity in purpose between the *Saṅgīti-sutta* and the first *saṅgīti* has already been noted by von Hinüber 1996/1997: 32; cf. also Peoples: 2012: 27–33, Shrivak 2012: 240f, and Anālayo 2014: 15–49.
- ³⁴ Dhirasekera 1982/2007: 227 highlights “the relatively secondary importance which the Buddha attached to discipline in its mere outward form in contrast to the more fundamental teachings of the doctrine and their practice in the religious life”; cf. also Guruge 1970: 11.
- ³⁵ Whereas AN 3.83 at AN I 230,17 speaks of over hundred and fifty rules, perhaps reflecting an early count of the Theravāda *pātimokkha* still in evolution, its parallel SĀ 829 at T II 212c11 instead mentions two hundred and fifty rules; cf. also, e.g., Dutt 1924/1996: 75f, Law 1933: 21, Bhagvat 1939: 64, Pachow 1955: 8f, Misra 1972: 33, and Dhirasekera 1982/2007: 145. A reference to a version of this discourse preserved in a Sanskrit fragment *uddāna* can be found in Pischel 1904: 1139 (IIIa.1).
- ³⁶ In this context it may also be worthwhile to note a recurrent pattern emerging from a comparative study of the *Majjhima-nikāya* in the light of its parallels, where the Pāli discourses have an apparent predilection for commending seeing fear in even the slightest fault when training in the precepts, *aṇumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī, samādāya sikkhassu sikkhāpadesu*, whereas their *Madhyama-āgama* parallels rather place emphasis on bodily, verbal, and mental purity; cf. Anālayo 2011a: 718.
- ³⁷ SĀ 820 at T II 210c2, SĀ 821 at T II 210c28, and SĀ 822 at T II 211a24 envisage a breach of the minor rules possible for someone who has fulfilled the training in higher virtue, and for someone who has fulfilled the training in higher virtue as well as in the higher mind. The parallels AN 3.85 at AN I 232,22, AN 3.86 at AN I 233,38, and AN 3.87 at AN I 234,19 go a step further, since according to them a breach of the minor rules would be possible even for someone who has fulfilled the training in the higher virtue, the higher mind, and higher wisdom, i.e., for an arahant.
- ³⁸ MN 29 at MN I 193,21 compares this to the bark of the tree; its parallel EĀ 43.4 at T II 759b11 compares the same to the tree’s leaves (adopting a variant reading without an additional reference to twigs. In MN 28 the taking of the leaves of the tree rather illustrates mistaking gains and renown for being the goal.
- ³⁹ Ud 6.8 at Ud 71,29; the parallel T 212 at T IV 737c17 seems to be based on a similarly worded Indic original not entirely understood by the Chinese translator.
- ⁴⁰ Cf., e.g., Sn 231 and its counterpart in the *Mahāvastu*, Senart 1882: 292,3; on the problem posed by this fetter being quite relevant for Buddhist practitioners (and not only for non-Buddhists) cf. Anālayo 2003: 220 note 12.

- ⁴¹ The listings of outstanding disciples, AN 1.14 at AN I 23,18 and EĀ 4.2 at T II 557b8, reckon Mahākassapa as foremost in the undertaking of ascetic practices. His eminence in this respect is also recorded in the *Divyāvadāna*, Cowell and Neill 1886: 395,23, and in the *Mahāvastu*, Senart 1882: 64,14.
- ⁴² SN 16.5 at SN II 202,16, SĀ 1141 at T II 301c13, SĀ² 116 at T II 416b15, EĀ 12.6 at T II 570b6, and EĀ 41.5 at T II 746a24. Tilakaratne 2005: 236 comments that his behaviour “in this context is not typical of a disciple of the Buddha. Usually ... the disciple would abide by the request of the Master.”
- ⁴³ MN 77 at MN II 6,31 and its parallel MĀ 207 at T I 782c20.
- ⁴⁴ T 5 at T I 175b11.
- ⁴⁵ T 1425 at T XXII 491a22; my translation is based on an emendation of the term for “jackal”.
- ⁴⁶ Cf., e.g., Przyluski 1926: 296ff, Migot 1952: 539f, Frauwallner 1956: 161f, Bareau 1971: 140, Tilakaratne 2005: 239, and von Hinüber 2008: 26.
- ⁴⁷ Cf., e.g., MN 65 at MN I 445,7 and MĀ 194 at T I 749a13, or else Vin III 9,28 and T 1425 at T XXII 227c2; cf. also T 2121 at T LIII 70a11. In the words of von Hinüber 1995: 7, “rules are prescribed only after an offence has been committed. Thus rules are derived from experience and based on the practical need to avoid certain forms of behavior in future. This means at the same time that the cause for a rule is always due to the wrong behavior of a certain person, and consequently there is no [pre]existent system of Buddhist law.”
- ⁴⁸ Verardi 1996: 216 sums up that “the Veda has been considered as a holy text, (self)-revealed and ... perceived as eternal and *apauruṣeya*, i.e. not composed by any human author.” Lariviere 1997/2004: 612 explains that, however much it may reflect current customs and be influenced by them, “the idiom of all the dharma literature is one of eternity and timelessness ... dharma literature clings to the claim that all of its provision can be traced directly or indirectly to the Veda, the very root of dharma”; cf. also Lubin 2007: 95: “the Dharmasāstra has been consciously constructed in such a way as to subsume everything within an overarching system unified (at least theoretically) by dependence on the Veda.” On the general influence of the brahminical heritage on early Buddhist monasticism cf. also Oberlies 1997 and on the relationship between Dharmasāstra and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* Voyce 2007.
- ⁴⁹ Tilakaratne 2005: 245 sees the first *saṅgīti*’s decision to disallow any change of the rules as expressing attitudes that “seem to have had tremendous influence in determining the subsequent history”, representing “the formal beginning of the tradition that subsequently came to be known as” Theravāda. Tilakaratne 2005: 252f notes that for the Theravāda monastic tradition “strict adherence to Vinaya has been seen as its hallmark ... [the] decision not to abolish any of the rules prescribed by the Buddha and not to formulate any new rules crystallizes this attitude.” Tilakaratne 2005: 254 concludes that “the end result of this emphasis was a monastic organization which lay more emphasis on the letter than on the spirit of the Vinaya.”
- ⁵⁰ Oldenberg 1879: 31,2: *pañcasatehi therehi dhammavinayasamgaho, therehi katasamgaho theravādo ’ti vuccati*.
- ⁵¹ Geiger 1958: 19,20. Bond 1982: ix explains that “Theravada Buddhism is a ‘religion of the book.’ It has at its center a body of authoritative scripture, the *Tipiṭaka*. This ... scripture constitutes the foundation and source of the Theravada tradition.” Gombrich 1988: 3 similarly points out that the “hallmarks of Theravāda Buddhism are the use of Pali as its main sacred language and dependence on the Pali version of the Buddhist Canon as its sacred scripture.” On the significance of the term *theravāda* cf. in more detail Anālayo 2013.
- ⁵² Pace Sobisch 2010: 243, who assumes that in legal matters “the fact that the saṅgha has autonomy and the authority to decide the matter is probably unchallenged”; cf. also Huxley 1996: 157.
- ⁵³ Quoted in Seeger 2006/2008: 158 note 11.