

Caitikas shared the caves at Nāsik (No. 48) with the Bhadrāyanīyas, and those at Junnar (No. 49) with the Dharmottarīyas.

Some Mahāsāmghika religious occupied the wooded mountains near Dhānyakaṭaka and took the name of Śailas (No. 50) or of Mahāvanaśailas (Nos. 51-52). Hsüan tsang (T 2087, ch. 10, p. 930c) relates that, on a mountain situated to the east of Dhānyakaṭaka, there was the monastery of the Pūrvaśaila «Eastern Mountain», while, to the west of the city, stood the monastery of the Aparāśaila «Western Mountain». In fact, the inscriptions carefully distinguish the Purvaśailas of Dharanikota (No. 53) — also represented at Allūru, district of Kistna (No. 54) — from the Aparāśailas known in Nāgārjunikoṇḍa by the name of Aparamahāvinaseliya (Nos. 55-57). The latter also occupied, in the district of Kistna, the site of Ukhasirivadhamaṇa, at the location of the present-day village of Ghaṇṭaśālā, thirteen miles west of Masulipatam (No. 58). Moreover, they migrated to Kānheri (No. 59) on the western coast, where they were neighbours to the Bhadrāyanīyas; their remoteness did not prevent their compatriots, the laity of Dhenukākata or Dhānyakaṭaka, from continuing to support them financially.

The Amarāvātī inscriptions also mention the Sidhatas (No. 62) and Rājagirinivāsikas (Nos. 60-61), known to the Pāli sources by the names of Siddhatthakas (*Dpv.*, V, 54; *Mhv.*, V, 12) and Rājagiriya (*ibid.*). They formed part of the Andhaka sect.

The religious donations recorded by the inscriptions came not only from individuals, but also from clans (*kula*), groups (*gaṇa*) and associations (*sahaya*). Among the latter, some could have been Buddhist sects not mentioned in literature : Saphineyakas (= Savinayakas) and Tāpaśīyas from Ujjayinī (LÜDERS, 198, 229, 219, 220, 228, 307, 409), Aparājitās and Apaguriyas from Junnar (1158, 1163, 1152), Laṃkuḍīyas from Bharukaccha (1169) and āira (*ārya*) Utayipabhāhis from Amarāvātī (1276). This seems to indicate that the fragmentation of the Saṃgha went much further than the traditional lists lead us to suppose.

THE FILIATION OF THE SECTS. — The sects already had a long history behind them when certain chroniclers, both Chinese and Indian, conceived the idea of compiling their genealogical tree, drafting their history, or rather legend, and listing their doctrines. As they had insufficient material to do this, they supplemented the lack of information with treasures of the imagination, ceaselessly returning to the work in order to bring it up to date and adapt it, after a fashion, to the situation of the moment. The compilation continued for centuries, it could even be said that it is still going on if we consider the efforts of modern historians to

draw up a table of the filiation of the sects⁷. Here, we would like, without further complicating a matter which is already sufficiently confused, merely to set out the state of the sources.

«The number of sects», wrote Kern, «is fixed by convention at eighteen; just as in theory, there are eighteen *Purāṇa*, and eighteen castes are sometimes accepted. The facts are, in all three cases, contrary to theory. If we add up the names in the different lists, of which no two agree, the total is higher than the official figure. In one of those lists (*Dpv.*, V, 51), the oldest of all, it is expressly said that there are eighteen sects and, at the same time, it is asserted that there are twenty-four of them»⁸.

However, if the chroniclers maintained the figure of eighteen, it is because of its traditional value and because the first official list, or that considered to be such, stopped at that number. Subsequently, new sects were to be added to the old ones.

The interest of the early chroniclers was above all focused on the subdivisions to be established between the sects, whether they were eighteen in number or twenty-four. Thus we see successively appearing, in chronological order, lists with two, three, five, then four subdivisions.
585 They present, roughly, the internal situation of the Saṃgha at different centuries in its history.

1. — LISTS WITH TWO SUBDIVISIONS

I. LIST BY THE STHAVIRAS. — In his *History of Indian Buddhism* (pp. 270-1), which appeared in 1608, the Tibetan compiler Tāranātha reproduces a list of eighteen sects with two subdivisions which he attributes to the Sthaviras or Elders :

- I. Mahāsāṃghikas : 1. Mūlamahāsāṃghikas, 2. Vyavahārikas, 3. Lokottaravādins, 4. Bahuśrūtiyas, 5. Prajñaptivādins, 6. Caitikas, 7. Pūrvaśailas, 8. Aparāśailas.
- II. Sthaviras : 1. Mūlasthaviras, 2. Sarvāstivādins, 3. Vātsīputriyas, 4. Dharmotariyas, 5. Bhadrāyanīyas, 6. Saṃmatīyas, 7. Mahīśāsakas, 8. Dharmaguptakas, 9. Suvarṣakas, 10. Uttariyas.

Tāranātha does not cite his source, but several early lists adopted the same subdivision.

2. LIST BY VASUMITRA. — A certain Vasumitra who lived in the fourth century after the Nirvāṇa (first or second century A.D.?); and

⁷ See, in A. BAREAU, *Les Sectes bouddhiques*, p. 30, a table "which should represent with near certainty the real filiation of the sects".

⁸ After H. KERN, *Histoire du bouddhisme dans l'Inde*, II, Paris, 1903, p. 481.

who, rightly or wrongly, has been identified with the great Sarvāstivādin master of the *Vibhāṣā* and the *Kośa* (V, p. 53), wrote a *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* which was translated three times into Chinese and once into Tibetan :

a. *Shih pa pu lun*, T 2032, p. 17b-c; tr. in the fifth cent., attributed to Kumārajīva (cf. P. DEMÉVILLE, *Versions chin. du Milinda*, p. 48, n.1.).

b. *Pu chih i lun*, T 2033, p. 20a-b, tr. by Paramārtha between 557 and 569. Paramārtha's version and commentary have been translated into French by P. DEMÉVILLE, *Origine des sectes*, MCB, I, 1931, pp. 15-64.

c. *I pu chung lun lun*, T 2031, p. 15a-b, tr. by Hsüan tsang in 602. This version has been translated into English by J. MASUDA, *Origin and Doctrines of Buddhist Schools*, Asia Major, II, 1925, pp. 1-78; into French by A. BAREAU, *Trois traités sur les Sectes bouddhiques* JA, 1954, pp. 235-66.

d. *Gzün lugs-kyi bye-brag bkod-paḥi hkhor-lo*, Tanjur, *Mdo* XC, 11 (CORDIER, III, p. 414; LALOU, p. 117b). The colophon gives the author as Vasubandhu or Vasumitra, the translator as Dharmākara. This version has been translated into German by M. VASSILIEV, *Der Buddhismus*, Berlin, 1860, p. 224 sq.

586 e. *I pu chung lun shi chi*, TKS, A, LXXXII, 3, 217a sq. : Chinese commentary by K'uei chi on Hsüan tsang's version «according to instructions received from the latter, as the translation proceeded».

According to the version by Hsüan tsang, which differs only a little from those by Kumārajīva and Paramārtha, Vasumitra divided the sects in the following way :

I. Mahāsāṃghikas : 1. Ekavyavahārikas, 2. Lokottaravādins, 3. Kaukkūṭikas (or Kaukūlikas), 4. Bahuśrutīyas, 5. Prajñaptivādins, 6. Caityaśailas, 7. Aparāśailas, 8. Uttaraśailas.

II. Sthaviravāda :

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Sarvāstivāda or Hetuvāda | | | |
| { | { | 2. Vātsīputrīyas | 3. Dharmottarīyas |
| | | | 4. Bhadrāyanīyas |
| | | | 5. Saṃmatīyas |
| | | | 6. Channagirikas (or Śaṇṇagarikas) |
| | | | 8. Dharmaguptakas |
| { | 7. Mahīśāsakas | : | |
| | 9. Kāśyapīyas or Sauvarśakas | | |
| | 10. Sautrāntikas or Saṃkrāntivādins | | |
| 11. Mūlasarvāstivāda or Haimavatas | | | |

Still according to Vasumitra, it was the heresy provoked by Mahādeva I, in the year 116 of the Nirvāṇa, which led to the final scission of the Saṃgha into Mahāsāṃghikas and Sthaviras⁹.

⁹ See above, pp. 275-276, 288.

In the second century after the Nirvāṇa, the Mahāsāṃghikas, who had withdrawn north of Rājagṛha, split into four schools : Ekavyavahārikas, Lokottaravādins, Kaukkuṭikas and Bahuśrutīyas, the latter having as their master a certain Yajñavalkya, who was versed in the profound meaning of the writings. — In the third century after the Nirvāṇa, the controversies aroused over the subject of ordination by Mahādeva II led to further dissension : the partisans of the heresiarch made for the mountainous regions (of Andhra country?) where they formed the Caityāśaila sect which soon divided into Easterners (Pūrvaśailas) and Westerners (Uttaraśailas).

587 During the two centuries which followed the Nirvāṇa, the Sthavira school preserved its homogeneity under the authority of famous masters who transmitted the holy word : Kāśyapa, Ānanda, Madhyāntika, Śāṇavāsin, Upagupta, Pūrṇa, Mecaka and Kātyāyanīputra. After the death of the latter, at the beginning of the third century after the Nirvāṇa, the Sthaviravāda split into two : 1. the traditionalist Sthaviras, who remained faithful to the teaching of the sūtras and who, having withdrawn to the Snowy Mountains, took the name of Haimavatas; 2. the Sarvāstivādins, adherents of Kātyāyanīputra whose research in the field of Abhidharma appeared as ominous innovations.

During the third century after the Nirvāṇa, and at the beginning of the fourth, the Sarvāstivādins engendered four schools : Vātsīputrīyas, Mahīśāsakas, Kāśyapīyas and Sautrāntikas.

The founder of the Vātsīputrīyas was the brahmin Vātsīputra whose master Rāhula had taught him the *Śāriputrābhidharma* in nine parts, or *Dharmalakṣaṇābhidharma*. His disciples attempted to complete its meaning by means of sūtras, and this enrichment of the doctrine caused the blossoming of four new schools : Dharmottarīyas, Bhadrāyanīyas, Saṃmatīyas (founded by the Arhat Saṃmita) and Channagirikas.

The Mahīśāsakas were started by a brahmin who, before taking up the religious life, «rectified the earth» as a district governor; having become an Arhat, he made use of the Vedas and Sanskrit grammar in order to adorn the sūtras of the Buddha. Springing from the Mahīśāsakas, the Dharmaguptakas compiled a «Basket of the Bodhisattvas» and justified this innovation by invoking the authority of Maudgalyāyana.

The Kāśyapīyas or Sauvarṣakas owe their origin to the Arhat Suvarṣaka Kāśyapa, purportedly a contemporary of the Buddha and author of a both apologetic and moralizing collection of texts.

The Sautrāntikas or Saṃkrāntivādins, as their names indicate, acknowledged no authority except that of the sūtras and taught the passage of the *skandha* through existences.

We have already pointed out the factitious nature of the information supplied by Vasumitra.

3. LIST IN THE *ŚĀRIPUTRAPARIṢCCHĀ*. — The twofold subdivision also appears in a *Mahāsāṃghika* compilation, a mediocre Chinese translation of which was made by an unknown hand between the years 317 and 420 A.D. : the *Śāriputrāpariṣcchā*, T 1465, p. 900c.

588

I. Mahāsāṃghikas	1. Vyavahāras 2. Lokottaras 3. Kukkulikas 4. Bahuśrutakas 5. Prajñaptivādins 6. Mahādevas	}	2nd cent. p. Nirv.
	7. Caitras (Caitikas) 8. Mataras (Uttaraśailas)	}	3rd cent. p. Nirv.
II. Sthaviras	1. Sarvāstivādins 5. Vātsīputrīyas 10. Kāśyapīyas 11. Sūtravādins 12. Saṃkrāntikas	{	2. Mahīśāsakas 3. Dharmaguptakas 4. Suvarṣas 6. Dhamottarikas 7. Bhadrāyanīyas 8. Saṃmatīyas 9. Śaṇṇagarikas
			3rd cent. p. Nirv.
			4th cent. p. Nirv.

4. PĀLI LIST. — The Pāli and Sinhalese sources, *Dīpavaṃsa* (V, 39-54); *Mahāvāṃsa* (V, 1-13), *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā* (pp. 2-3, 5 and passim) which date from about the fifth century; the *Mahābodhivaṃsa* (pp. 96-97) from the end of the tenth century, the *Nikāyasamgraha* (pp. 6-9) from the fourteenth century; finally, the *Sāsanavaṃsa* (pp. 14, 24-5) from the end of the nineteenth century, set out the genealogy of the sects in an identical fashion :

I. Mahāsāṃghikas	{	1. Gokulikas 5. Ekavyohārikas	{	2. Paṇṇattis 3. Bahussutakas or Bahulikas 4. Cetiyas
II. Theravāda	{	1. Mahīmsāsakas 7. Vajjiputtakas	{	2. Sabbatthivāda → 3. Kassapiyas
				↓
				4. Saṃkantikas
				↓
				5. Suttavādas
	{		{	6. Dhammaguttikas
				8. Dhammuttariyas
				9. Bhadrāyanīkas
				10. Chandāgārikas
				11. Saṃmitīyas

589 With regard to the date of the formation of the sects, the chronicle (*Mhv.*, V, 2, 11-13) supplies the following facts :

1. During the first hundred years after the Nirvāṇa (486-386 B.C.), the school of the Theras was «one and united».

2. During the second century, between the second council (100 p. Nirv. = 386 B.C.) and the third (236 p. Nirv. = 250 B.C.), the eighteen (var. seventeen) sects listed above were formed.

3. During the third century p. Nirv. (286-186 B.C.), six new sects developed on the Indian subcontinent : Hemavatas, Rājagiriya, Siddhatthikas, Pubbaseliyas, Aparaseliyas and Vājiriyas. Some of these, as we saw, are mentioned on the Amarāvātī inscriptions. According to the *Nikāyasamgraha* (tr. C.M. FERNANDO, Colombo, 1908, p. 9), these were six Mahāsāṃghika subsects which emerged from the main body in the year 255 p. Nirv. (231 B.C.) and which later led to three further sects : Vetulyas, Andhakas and Anya-Mahāsāṃghikas¹⁰.

4. In 236 p. Nirv. (250 B.C.), the Theravāda migrated to Ceylon, under the leadership of Mahinda. It was represented on the island by monks from the Mahāvihāra who occupied, to the south of Anurādhapura, the Mahāmeghavana which had been placed at their disposal by King Devānampiyatissa. The holy enclosure contained the Thūpārāma Dāgaba built by Devānampiyatissa (cf. p. 269), the Bodhi tree, a branch of which had been brought from Gayā by Saṃghamittā (cf. pp. 269-270), the uposatha hall of the Lohapāsāda constructed by Duṭṭhagāmaṇi and the greatly renowned Mahāthūpa, or Ruvanveli Dāgaba, erected by the same sovereign (pp. 363-364). Nowadays the monks of the Mahāvihāra still consider themselves to be the most authorized holders of the Buddhist doctrine and discipline. It would be wronging them to confuse them with the other schools : «The Theravāda», they say, «like a giant fig-tree, contains, without omissions or additions, the integral teaching of the Victorious One; the other schools grew (on it) like thorns on a tree» (*Dpv.*, V, 52).

However, internal dissensions destroyed the unity of the Theravāda even in Ceylon.

590 1. In the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi, in the year 454 p. Nirv. (32 B.C.) exactly, in circumstances recorded above (pp. 370-371), some laxist monks separated from their colleagues at the Mahāvihāra and went to occupy, to the north of Anurādhapura, the newly established monastery of the Abhayagiri where they formed the Dhammarucika sect (*Mhv.*, XXXIII, 97).

¹⁰ See above, pp. 288-289.

2. In the reign of Vohārikatissa (746-768 p. Nirv. = 260-282 A.D.), the Mahāyānist heresy, known in Ceylon by the name of Vetullavāda, made its appearance on the island. Contested by the minister Kapila (*Dpv.*, XXII, 43-4; *Mhv.*, XXXVI, 41), it retained some more or less overt adherents among the Dhammarucikas.

3. In the reign of Goṭhakābhaya (785-798 p. Nirv. = 299-312 A.D.), a Dhammarucika faction formed itself into a separate body, at the monastery of the Dakkhiṇavihāra, where it took the name of Sāgaliya (*Mhv.*, V, 13). According to the *Nikāyasamgraha*, the scission, provoked by the Thera Sāgala, occurred in the year 795 p. Nirv. (309 A.D.).

4. In the reign of Mahāsena (808-835 p. Nirv. = 322-349 A.D.), these Sāgaliyas went to occupy the new Jetavana monastery founded in Anurādhapura on the instigation of the monk Tissa of the Dakkhiṇārāma (*Mhv.*, XXXVII, 32-3). From then on, they took the name of Jetavanīyas.

5. LIST IN THE MAÑJUŚRĪPARIPṚCCHĀ. — This work (T 468, p. 501a-c), translated into Chinese by Saṃghabhara in 518, contains a list of eighteen sects arranged into two groups and presented as each emerging from one another at a century's interval.

- I. Mahāsāṃghikas : 1. Ekavyavahārikas → 2. Lokottaravādins → 3. Kaukullikas → 4. Bahuśrutīyas → 5. Caitikas → 6. Pūrvaśailas → 7. Uttaraśailas.
 II. Sthaviras : 1. Sarvāstivādins → 2. Haimavatas → 3. Vātsīputrīyas → 4. Dharmottarīyas → 5. Bhadrāyanīyas → 6. Saṃmatīyas → 7. Śaṇḍagairikas → 8. Mahīśāsakas → 9. Dharmaguptakas → 10. Kāśyapīyas → 11. Sautrāntikas.

6. LIST I OF BHAVYA. — There exists in the Tanjur, *Mdo* XC, 12 (Cordier, III, p. 414) a *Nikāyabhedavibhaṅgavyākhyāna*, translated into Tibetan by Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna <Atīśa> (981-1054 A.D.) with the title of *Sde pa tha dad par ḥbyed pa dan rnam par bśad pa*. Its author was a certain Bhavya, possibly the same as the great writer Bhāviveka or Bhāvaviveka, who lived in the second half of the sixth century A.D. and was the founder of the Svāntantrika-Sautrāntika branch of the Madhyamaka.

591 The *Nikāyabheda* has been translated by W.W. ROCKHILL, *Life of Buddha*, London, 1884, pp. 181-96, by M. WALLESER, *Die Sekten des alten Buddhismus*, Heidelberg, 1927, pp. 78-93 and by A. BAREAU, *Trois traités...*, JA, 1956, pp. 167-91. The work contains no less than three lists of sects : the first and third in two subdivisions, the second in three.

List I (ROCKHILL, p. 182; WALLESER, pp. 78-9; BAREAU, p. 168), which reproduces the traditional Sthavirian scheme, begins with the following

information : «one hundred and sixty years after the Parinirvāṇa of the Bhagavat Buddha, when King Dharmāsoka was ruling in Kusumapura (= Pāṭaliputra), a great schism broke out in the Saṃgha, consequent to some controversies, and at first the community divided into two schools, the Mahāsāṃghikas and the Sthaviras».

I. Mahāsāṃghikas : 1. Mūlamahāsāṃghikas, 2. Ekavyavahārikas, 3. Lokottaravādins, 4. Bahuśrutīyas, 5. Prajñaptivādins, 6. Caitikas, 7. Pūrvaśailas, 8. Aparāśailas.

II. Sthaviras : 1. Mūlasthaviras or Haimavatas, 2. Sarvāstivādins or Vibhajjavādins, Hetuvādins, Muṇḍakās, 3. Vātsīputrīyas, 4. Dharmottarīyas, 5. Bhadrāyanīyas, 6. Saṃmatīyas also called Avantakas and Kurukullas, 7. Mahīśāsakas, 8. Dharmaguptakas, 9. Suvarśakas or Kāśyapīyas, 10. Uttarīyas or Saṃkrāntivādins.

7. THE SAMMATĪYA LIST (= List III of Bhavya, list III of Tāranātha). — The Saṃmatīyas' concept of the origin and filiation of the sects is known from the concordant information supplied by Bhavya's list III (ROCKHILL, p. 186; WALLESER, p. 81, BAREAU, *JA*, 1956, pp. 172-3) and Tāranātha's list III (pp. 271-2).

The genealogical tree of the schools is preceded by the famous passage regarding the Mahāsāṃghika schism in 137 after the Nirvāṇa, and which has been examined above (pp. 281-282, 288).

As for the sects this is how the Saṃmatīyas understood their filiation :

I. Mahāsāṃghika trunk

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|--------------------|
| { | 1. Ekavyavahārikas | { | 3. Bahuśrutīyas |
| | 2. Gokulikas | | 4. Prajñaptivādins |
| | | | 5. Caitikas |

592 II. Sthavira trunk

- | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---|-------------------|---|--------------------|---|-------------------|
| { | { | 1. Mūlasthaviras | { | 2. Sarvāstivādins | { | 3. Vibhajjavādins | { | 4. Mahīśāsakas |
| | | | | | | 8. Saṃkrāntivādins | | 5. Dharmaguptakas |
| | | | | | | | | 6. Tāmraśāṭīyas |
| | | | | | | | | 7. Kāśyapīyas |
| { | { | 9. Vātsīputrīyas | { | 10. Mahāgiriya | { | 11. Dharmottarīyas | | |
| | | | | 14. Saṃmatīyas | | 12. Bhadrāyanīyas | | |
| { | { | 15. Haimavatas | { | | { | 13. Śaṇṇagarīkas | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

2. — LISTS WITH THREE SUBDIVISIONS

While the lists with two groupings were still in circulation, a list with

three subdivisions was issued which accepted as the forerunners not only the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas, but also the Vibhajyavādins, supporters of some distinctions introduced by certain schools into the philosophical debate.

1. MAHĀSĀMĠHIKA LIST. — Tāranātha (p. 271) presents a list with three subdivisions as being of Mahāsāṃghika origin.

- | | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| I. Sthaviras | { | 1. Sarvāstivādins { 2. Mūlasarvāstivādins
3. Sautrāntikas

4. Vātsīputrīyas { 5. Saṃmatīyas
6. Dharmottarīyas
7. Bhadrāyaniyas
8. Śaṇṇagarikas |
|--------------|---|--|
- II. Mahāsāṃghikas : 1. Mūlamahāsāṃghikas, 2. Pūrvaśailas, 3. Aparāśailas, 4. Rājagirikas, 5. Haimavatas, 6. Caitikas, 7. Siddhārthikas, 8. Gokulikas.
- III. Vibhajyavādins : 1. Mahīśāsakas, 2. Kāśyapīyas, 3. Dharmaguptakas, 4. Tāmraśāṭīyas.

The somewhat late nature of this listing is evident from the mention of the Rājagirikas and Haimavatas recorded in the *Mahāvamsa* (V, 13) as sects of the third century after the Nirvāṇa. The Tāmraśāṭīyas, also called Tāmrāparīyas, are the religious of Taprobane (Ceylon); they
 593 included in their ranks famous scholars whose theories were to be discussed by Vasubandhu and Asaṅga.

LIST II OF BHAVYA. — Bhavya's list II (ROCKHILL, p. 186; WALLESER, p. 81; BAREAU, JA, 1956, p. 171) reproduces the foregoing, word for word.

3. — LISTS WITH FIVE SUBDIVISIONS

1. THE FIVE SCHOOLS. — From the fourth century of the Christian era onwards, we find in the Indian and particularly the Chinese texts many allusions to five schools, always the same, as though they were, if not the only ones, at least the most important :

1. T 1470, ch. 2, p. 925c 29 : *Ta pi ch'iu san ch'ien wei i*, a translation of which, attributed to An Shih kao (148-170 A.D.), probably dates from the fourth or fifth century. This passage deals with the colour of the monastic robe : red for the Sarvāstivādins, black for the Dharmaguptakas, magnolia for the Kāśyapīyas, blue for the Mahīśāsakas, yellow for the Mahāsāṃghikas (cf. LIN, *AM*, pp. 80-1).

2. T 1465, p. 900c : *Śāriputrapariṣecchā*, translated into Chinese by an anonymous scholar between 317 and 420. It deals with the same colours : yellow

for the Mahāsāṃghikas, dark red for the Dharmaguptakas, black for the Sarvāstivādins, magnolia for the Kāśyapīyas, blue for the Mahīśāsakas (cf. LIN, *AM*, pp. 81-2).

3. T 397, ch. 22, p. 159 : *Mahāsaṃnipātasūtra*, translated into Chinese between 414 and 421. It contains a prediction by the Buddha regarding various classes of disciples : Dharmaguptakas, Sarvāstivādins, Kāśyapīyas, Mahīśāsakas, Vātsīputrīyas and Mahāsāṃghikas. However, even while differentiating six groups, the passage concludes with a general remark on the five schools (cf. LIN, *AM*, pp. 299-300).

4. T 1425, ch. 40, p. 548b : Postscripts by Fa hsien to his translation of the *Mo ho sēng ch'i lū* made, in collaboration with Buddhābhaddra, from 416 to 418. The passage lists five schools : Dharmaguptakas, Mahīśāsakas, Kāśyapīyas, Sarvāstivādins and Mahāsāṃghikas.

5. T 2145, ch. 3, pp. 20-1 : *Ch'u san tsang chi chi* by Sēng 'yu (444-518), in which the Chinese scholar compiled the history of five Vinayas : 1. Sarvāstivādin Vin. or *Shih sung lū* (T 1435), 2. Dharmaguptaka Vin. or *Ssū fēn lū* (T 1428), 3. Mahīśāsaka Vin. or *Wu fēn lū* (T 1421), 4. Mahāsāṃghika Vin. or *Mo ho sēng ch'i lū* (T 1425) which he identifies with that of the Vātsīputrīyas, 5. Kāśyapīya Vin. which has not been translated into Chinese (cf. LIN, *AM*, pp. 297-8).

594 6. T 2059, ch. 11, p. 403a : *Kao sēng chūan* by Hui chiao (519-544) who speaks of five Arhats, disciples of Upagupta and founders of five Vinaya schools : Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahāsāṃghika, Mahīśāsaka and Kāśyapīya.

7. T 190, ch. 60, p. 932a 17 : *Abhinīskramanasūtra* translated into Chinese by Jñānagupta in 597. The colophon lists five parallel but separate biographies of the Buddha, belonging to five different schools : Mahāsāṃghika, Sarvāstivādin, Kāśyapīya, Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka.

8. T 1852, p. 10a : *San lun hsūan i* by Chi tsang, a Chinese of Parthian origin who lived from 549 to 623. He speaks of five contemporary Masters who, at the time of Upagupta, separated and founded five schools : Dharmaguptaka, Mahāsāṃghika, Mahīśāsaka, Kāśyapīya and Vātsīputrīya.

9. T 2087, ch. 3, p. 882b : *Hsi yü chi*. On his arrival in India in about 630, Hsüang tsang found five versions of the Vinaya in Uḍḍiyāna : Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, Kāśyapīya, Sarvāstivādin and Mahāsāṃghika.

10. T 2131, ch. 4, p. 1113 : *Fan i ming i chi*, a kind of *Mahāvvyutpatti* compiled by the Chinese Fa yün (1088-1158). It refers to the five disciples of Upagupta who divided a single great Vinayapīṭaka into five classes : Dharmaguptaka, Sarvāstivādin, Kāśyapīya, Mahīśāsaka and Vātsīputrīya.

This evidence, which could easily be added to, shows the vogue the theory of the Five schools enjoyed in India and especially China.

2. LIST BY SĒNG YU. — The Chinese Sēng 'yu (444-518), in his *Ch'u san tsang chi chi* (T 2145, ch. 3, p. 20a), made use of this tradition which was universally accepted in his time in order to attempt a new classification of the sects by taking the five schools as the forerunners.

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| I. 1. Sarvāstivādins | 2. Vātsīputrīyas | { | 3. Dharmottarīyas |
| | | | 4. Bhadrāyanīyas |
| | | | 5. Śaṇṇagarīkas |
| II. 6. Mahīśāsakas | | | |
| III. 7. Kāśyapīyas | { | 8. Saṃkrāntikas | |
| | | 9. Saṃmatīyas | |
| IV. 10. Mahāsāṃghikas | { | 11. Ekavyavahārikas | |
| | | 12. Bahuśrutīyas | |
| | | 13. Prajñaptivādins | |
| | | 14. Caitikas | |
| | | 15. Aparāśailas | |
| V. 17. Dharmaguptakas | | 16. Uttaraśailas | |

4. — LISTS WITH FOUR SUBDIVISIONS

1. DISAPPEARANCE OF THE DHARMAGUPTAKAS. — In the list of the five schools drawn up in China, it was the Dharmaguptakas who most frequently occupied the place of honour. There is nothing surprising in this considering the rôle played by that school in the diffusion of the Vinaya in China. The first formularies (*karmavācanā*) such as the *T'an wu tê lü pu tsa chieh mo* (T 1432), translated in 252 by the foreign monk Saṃghavarman, and the *Chieh mo* (T 1433), translated in 254 by the Parthian Dharmasatya, pertained to that school. According to I ching, China followed mainly the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya and, from the evidence of J. de Groot, the *Prātimokṣa* of that school was considered to be the paramount code of Hīnayānist Buddhism until the final years of the Empire¹¹.

An apocryphal tradition recorded by Tao shih in his *Fa yüan chu lin* (T 2122, ch. 89, p. 944c) which he compiled in 668, claims that, under the Han, in the first *chien ning* year (168 A.D.), five śramaṇas from North India, three Yüeh chih — including Fa ling — and two Indians, had translated the *Prātimokṣa* and *Karmavācanā* of the Dharmaguptakas at Ch'ang an¹². However, as Fa ling lived at the end of the fourth century, he could not have played the part attributed to him by this tradition¹³; however the legend is true in that the disciplinary works of

¹¹ J. J. M. DE GROOT, *Le code du Mahāyāna en Chine*, Amsterdam, 1893, p. 3.

¹² Cf. S. LÉVI, *Les seize Arhat protecteurs de la Loi*, JA, 1916, pp. 40-1 of the off-print.

¹³ Cf. P. PELLIOU, *Meou-tseu ou les doutes levés*, TP, 1920, No. 5, pp. 344-6. The first authenticated translation of the *Prātimokṣa* is that made by Dharmakāla in 250 A.D., but the work is lost. We do, however, possess a *Tsa chieh mo* (T 1432) and a *Chieh mo* (T 1433) of the Dharmaguptakas, translated, the former by Saṃghavarman in 252, the latter by T'an ti in 254.

the Dharmaguptakas reached China through the intermediary of monks from the North-West.

With the exception of that last region, the Dharmaguptakas played only an unobtrusive rôle on the Indian subcontinent. Buddhist inscriptions in Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī make no mention of them.

The Hinayānists who, at the time of Fa hsien (beginning of the fifth cent.), had 500 saṃghārāmas in Uḍḍiyāna, were supplanted during the next two centuries by the Mahāyānists. In approximately 630, Hsüan tsang in his *Hsi yü chi* (T 2087, ch. 3, p. 882b), notes their disappearance :
 596 «On both banks of the Śubhavastu river, there were formerly 1,400 saṃghārāmas, most of which are already deserted. In the past, the monks in that land numbered 18,000; now they have gradually diminished. They all study the Mahāyāna and are engaged in the practice of meditation on quietude. They are skilful at reciting the texts, but do not seek to understand their profound meaning. Their disciplinary conduct is pure, and they are especially versed in magical formulae». The Master of the Law adds that those religious read the five Vinayas, particularly that of the Dharmaguptakas : this is the only allusion to that school in the *Hsi yü chi*.

Half a century later, when I ching arrived in about 671, the situation had not improved : the town of Kučā in Central Asia, Khotan and Uḍḍiyāna contained no more than a few Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka and Kāśyapīya monks, lost in the mass of Sarvāstivādins and Mūlasarvāstivādins.

Hence, from the sixth century A.D., the Dharmaguptakas had ceased to count as an Indian sect and, great though their influence had formerly been in China, they could no longer be retained in the lists as leaders. Hsüan tsang and I ching therefore forebore from mentioning them again, and replaced the old list of five groups with a new one which counted no more than four.

2. THE FOURFOLD CENSUS BY HSÜAN TSANG. — The *Hsi yü chi* contains abundant information on Buddhist India of the seventh century. Without attempting to establish the filiation of the schools, Hsüan tsang merely records, wherever he passed, the number of monasteries and monastics, occasionally indicating the qualities of the latter.

Employing a purely descriptive method, he distinguishes eight categories of religious in India :

1. Mere bhikṣus, not belonging to any definite school and scattered in small groups in lands more or less hostile to the Good Law; they generally had no precise doctrine and observed the precepts of their order only very imperfectly.

2. Hīnayānist bhikṣus whose school is not specified.

3. Mahāsāṃghikas and Lokottaravādins.

4. Sarvāstivādins.

5. Sthaviras proper and Mahāyānasthaviras, the latter influenced to a certain degree by Mahāyanist theories.

597 6. Saṃmatīyas, whose influence proved to be increasing.

7. Mahāyānists en masse occupying certain regions such as Uḍḍiyāna (18,000), the Ghazni area (10,000), Magadha (10,000), Orissa (10,000), and Southern Kośala (10,000).

8. Bhikṣus «studying both the Hīna- and Mahāyāna»: these were probably Mahāyānists living in former Hīnayānist monasteries, whose rules they continued to observe.

According to this census, we note that during Hsüan tsang's time only four Hīnayānist schools were still represented: 1. Sthaviras and Mahāyānasthaviras, 2. Mahāsāṃghikas and Lokottaravādins; 3. Sarvāstivādins; 4. Saṃmatīyas. There were a further several thousand Hīnayānists whose sect or school could not be specified.

This is the record established by Hsüan tsang:

I. Sthaviras

Regions	Number of monasteries	Number of religious	References to T 2087
1. Sataṭata	30 +	2,000 +	ch. 10, p. 927 c 23
2. Drāviḍa	100 +	10,000 +	ch. 10, p. 931 c 4
I*. Mahāyāna-sthaviras			
3. Bodh-Gayā	Mahābodhisamghā-rāma	1,000	ch. 8, p. 918 b 14
4. Kalinga	10 +	500 +	ch. 10, p. 929 a 3
5. Ceylon	200 +	20,000 +	ch. 11, p. 934 a 14-15
6. Bharukaccha	10 +	300 +	ch. 11, p. 935 c 1-2
7. Surāṣṭra	50 +	3,000 +	ch. 11, p. 936 c 15
Total	401 +	36,800 +	

II. Mahāsāṃghikas

Regions	Number of monasteries	Number of religious	References to T 2087
1. Andar-āb (Hindūkush)	3	some tens	ch. 12, p. 940a2
2. Kaśmīra	1	100 +	ch. 4, p. 888a7-8
3. Dhānyakāṭaka	20 +	1,000 +	ch. 10, p. 930c14
Total	24 +	1,100 +	
II*. Lokottaravādins			
4. Bāmyān	several tens	several thousands	ch. 1, p. 873b12

598

III. Sarvāstivādins

Regions	Number of monasteries	Number of religious	References to T 2087
1. Agni (Qarašahr)	10 +	2,000 +	ch. 1, p. 870a11
2. Kučā	100 +	5,000 +	ch. 1, p. 870a24
3. Bharuka (Aqsu)	some tens	1,000 +	ch. 1, p. 870c18
4. Chieh-chih (Gaz Valley)	10 +	300 +	ch. 1, p. 873a27-28
5. Kabhanda (Taš Kurgān)	10 +	500 +	ch. 12, p. 941c9
6. Wu-sa	10 +	1,000 +	ch. 12, p. 942b16-17
7. Ch'ia-sha (Kašgar)	some hundreds	10,000 +	ch. 12, p. 942c19-20
8. Tamasāvana (S. Kaśmīr)	1	300 +	ch. 4, p. 889b29
9. Matipur (Bijnōr District)	10 +	800 +	ch. 4, p. 891b25
10. Navadevakula (S-E of Kanyākubja)	3	500 +	ch. 5, p. 896a19-20
11. In Magadha	Kapotavihāra	200 +	ch. 9, p. 925b17
12. Īraṇaparvata (Monghyr)	2	2,000	ch. 10, p. 926a18
13. Gūrjarātra (Gujarāt)	1	100 +	ch. 11, p. 936c25
Total	158 +	23,700 +	

IV. Saṃmatīyas

Regions	Number of monasteries	Number of religious	References to T 2087
1. Ahicchatra	10 +	1,000 +	ch. 4, p. 892c29
2. Kapitha (Sāmkāśya)	4	1,000 +	ch. 4, p. 893a19
3. Ayamukha (in Oudh)	5	1,000 +	ch. 5, p. 897a10-11
4. Viśoka (in Oudh)	20 +	3,000 +	ch. 5, p. 898c12-13
5. Śrāvastī	some h. in ruins	very small number	ch. 6, p. 899a9
6. Kapilavastu	1,000 in ruins	3,000 (var., 30)	ch. 6, p. 900c26-28
7. Vārāṇasī ¹⁴	30 +	3,000 +	ch. 7, p. 905b 4-5
8. Mṛgadāva (Sārnāth)	1	1,500	ch. 7, p. 905b17
9. Vaiśālī	1	very small number	ch. 7, p. 908b5
10. Īraṇaparvata (Monghyr)	10 +	4,000 +	ch. 10, p. 926a15-16
11. Kārṇasuvarṇa	10 +	2,000 +	ch. 10, p. 928a20-21
12. Mālava (Baroda)	some hundreds	20,000 +	ch. 11, p. 935c11
13. Valabhī (in Kāthiāwār)	100 +	6,000 +	ch. 11, p. 936b19-20
14. Ānandapura	10 +	1,000 -	ch. 11, p. 936c8
15. Sindh	some hundreds	10,000 +	ch. 11, p. 937a28
16. A-tien-p'o- ch'ih-lo (Indus delta)	80 +	5,000 +	ch. 11, p. 937c22
17. Pi-to-chih-lo (delta area)	50 +	3,000 +	ch. 11, p. 938b4
18. A-fan-t'u (Middle Sindh)	20 +	2,000 +	ch. 11, p. 938b17
Total	1,351 +	66,500 +	

¹⁴ According to the *Life of Hsüan tsang* (T 2053, ch. 3, p. 235c 3), Vārāṇasī contained more than 30 monasteries inhabited by over 2,000 Sarvāstivādin religious. However, we know from an inscription at Sārnāth (LÜDERS, 923) dating from the Gupta period that in Vārāṇasī the Saṃmatīyas had taken over from the Sarvāstivādins.

Hīnayānists (unspecified)

Regions	Number of monasteries	Number of religious	References to T 2087
1. Bactra	100 +	3,000 +	ch. 1, p. 872c 4-5
2. Puṣkarāvātī	1 (in ruins)	a few religious	ch. 2, p. 881a17-18
3. Po-lu-sha (Sāhbāz-Garhī)	1	50 +	ch. 2, p. 881b10-11
4. Śākala	1	100 +	ch. 4, p. 889b 4-5
5. Kulūtā		small number	ch. 4, p. 890a3
6. Pāryātra (Bairāṭi)	8 (in ruins)	very small number	ch. 4, p. 890a25-26
7. Sthāneśvara	3	700 +	ch. 4, p. 890c14
8. Śrughna	5	1,000 +	ch. 4, p. 891a21
10. Matipur	1	200 +	ch. 4, p. 891c17-18
11. Govīṣana	2	100 +	ch. 4, p. 892c19-20
12. Prayāga	2	very small number	ch. 5, p. 897a24-25
13. Kauśāmbī	10 +	300 +	ch. 5, p. 898a 3-4
14. Chan-chu (Ghāzīpur?)	10 +	1,000 -	ch. 7, p. 907c1
15. Magadha	1	50 +	ch. 9, p. 925c13-14
16. Campā	some tens	200 +	ch. 10, p. 926c20-21
Total	145 +	6,700 +	

It ensues from this that, at the beginning of the seventh century, the adherents of the Hīnayāna were distributed as follows :

Sthaviras	401 monasteries	36,800 religious
Mahāsāṃghikas	24 monasteries	1,100 religious
Sarvāstivādins	158 monasteries	23,700 religious
Sammatīyas	1,351 monasteries	66,500 religious
Unspecified	145 monasteries	6,700 religious
	2,079	134,800

Incomplete though these statistics are, they nevertheless enable us to draw some interesting conclusions.

1. Of the eighteen-plus traditional schools which are regularly mentioned by the disputations, four played the part of forerunners to such an extent that they overshadowed all the others. The most important one was unquestionably that of the Sammatīyas who alone totalled half the Hīnayānist Saṃgha. On the Indian subcontinent, the other three schools were clearly declining. Of the 36,800 Sthaviras, 20,000 were to be found in Ceylon and 10,000 in the Deccan. The Mahāsāṃghikas were in the

process of disappearing, except in the Hindūkush, where the imposing site of Bāmyān still sheltered several thousand Lokottaravādins. The Sarvāstivādins, formerly so powerful in the North-West, held their own there only with difficulty : of the 23,700 of them recorded, 19,800 were scattered in the oases of Central Asia : Kašgar, Taš Kurgān, Aqsu, Kučā and Qarašahr.

2. Of the 134,800 Hīnayānist monks counted, 6,700 did not belong to any definite school. Had it been otherwise Hsüan tsang, with his characteristic concern for exactitude and precision, would not have failed to mention it.

3. Both in India and Central Asia, the respective importance of the Small and Great Vehicle was palpably the same. According to the information supplied by Hsüan tsang (cf. É. LAMOTTE, *Sur la formation du Mahāyāna*, Asiatica, Festschrift Weller, Leipzig, 1954, pp. 394-5), the pure Mahāyānists and the mixed Mahāyānists (studying both the Small and Great Vehicle) together totalled 2,521 monasteries and 119,430 religious. These figures are quite close to those which could be produced by the Hīnayānists with their 2,079 monasteries and 134,800 religious.

3. THE FOURFOLD CENSUS BY I CHING. — Less than a century after Hsüan tsang, the Chinese pilgrim I ching, who visited India and the South Seas from 671 to 695 of the Christian era, records in his *Nan hai chi kuei nei fa chuan* (T 2125, ch. 1, p. 205a-b) the following precise details :

As for the division into various Nikāyas (schools), according to the Western (Indian) tradition, there are only four great systems. With regard to their appearance and disappearance, and the diversity of their names, there is no agreement on such matters... Thus it is that in the five parts of India and in the islands in the South Seas, four Nikāyas are spoken of everywhere. Nevertheless, the number of their adherents varies according to the locality...

1. The Ārya Mahāsāṃghikanikāya is subdivided into seven sects. Each of the 3 Piṭakas contains 100,000 stanzas [i.e. $3 \times 100,000 = 300,000$ stanzas], which, in the Chinese tradition, makes nearly a thousand scrolls.

602 2. The Ārya Sthaviranikāya is subdivided into 3 sects, and its Tripiṭaka is the same size as that of the preceding school.

3. The Ārya Mūlasarvāstivādanikāya is subdivided into 4 sects [but on p. 206c 1-2, I ching mentions only three : 1. Dharmaguptakas, 2. Mahīśāsakas, 3. Kāśyapīyas]. Its Tripiṭaka is also of the same size.

4. The Ārya Saṃmatīyanikāya is subdivided into 4 sects and its Tripiṭaka is subdivided into 200,000 stanzas, 30,000 of which are Vinaya Stanzas.

There are, however, many divergences with regard to the doctrinal traditions of these schools : it is in accordance with the present state of affairs that 18 sects are spoken of. As to the division into five main schools, I have heard nothing of that in the West¹⁵.

¹⁵ Translation after Lin.

In connection with the geographical expansion of the four schools, I ching adds a few precise details : The Mahāsamgha is followed in Magadha (Central India), a little in Lāṭa and Sindhu (Western India), a little to the N. and S. of India; it coexists with other schools in eastern India, but is rejected in Ceylon. — The Sthavira predominates in the South, especially in Ceylon; it is followed in Magadha and, to some extent, in Lāṭa and Sindhu; it coexists with other schools in Eastern India. — The Mūlasarvāstivāda flourishes in Magadha and has asserted itself throughout the North; it has a few adherents in Lāṭa and Sindhu and coexists with other schools in Eastern India. — The Saṃmatīya is above all represented in Lāṭa and Sindhu; it is practised in Magadha and, a little, in the South of India; it coexists with other schools in eastern India.

4. THE SARVĀSTIVĀDIN LIST BY VINĪTADEVA. — The Sarvāstivādin and Vinīta-deva in particular recorded the state of affairs noted by Hsüan tsang and I ching by establishing a fourfold division of the Saṃgha in which they inserted the eighteen traditional sects while replacing some of them with other later ones. This list with four groupings appears :

a. in a passage in the *Samayabhedoparacanacakraṇikāyabhedopadarśanasamgraha* by Vinīta-deva, an author who lived between the end of the eighth century and the first part of the ninth. The work, the Sanskrit original of which is lost, exists in a Tibetan version in the Tanjur, *Mdo* XC, 13 (CORDIER, III, p. 414; LALOU, p. 117b). It has been translated, in whole or in part, by ROCKHILL, *Life*, pp. 181-93; LIN, *AM*, p. 185, note; BAREAU, *JA*, pp. 192-200.

603 b. in the *Mahāvayutpatti* (Nos. 9077-98), from approximately 800 A.D.

c. in the *Histories of Buddhism* by Bu-ston (II, p. 99) and Tāranātha (p. 272), the latter attributing a Sarvāstivādin origin to the list.

I. Mahāsāmghikas : 1. Pūrvaśailas, 2. Aparāśailas, 3. Haimavatas, 4. Lokottaravādins, 5. Prajñaptivādins.

II. Sarvāstivādins : 1. Mūlasarvāstivādins, 2. Kāśyapīyas, 3. Mahīśāsakas, 4. Dharmaguptakas, 5. Bahuśrutīyas, 6. Tāmraśāṭīyas, 7. Vibhajyavādins.

III. Sthaviras : 1. Jetavanīyas, 2. Abhayagirivāsins, 3. Mahāvihāravāsins.

IV. Saṃmatīyas : 1. Kaurukullakas, 2. Avantakas, 3. Vātsīputrīyas.

The mention of Jetavanīyas proves that this list postdates the fourth century. In fact, it was only in the reign of Mahāsenā (322-349 A.D.) that the Sāgaliyas, who were installed at the monastery of the Jetavana-vihāra, took the name of Jetavanīyas.

5. THE LIST IN THE TWO *ṚCCHĀS*. — A somewhat similar list appears in a passage common to both the *Bhikṣuvarṣāgraprṇchā* and the *Śrāmaṇavarṣāgraprṇchā*, translated into Tibetan between the end of the tenth century and the beginning of the eleventh (*Mdo* XC, 21, and *Mdo* XC, 6; cf. CORDIER, III, pp. 416 and 412). This list, to which Bu-ston (II, p. 98) alludes, has been translated into French by LIN, *AM*, pp. 182-3.

- I. Sarvāstivādins : 1. Kāśyapīyas, 2. Mahīśāsakas, 3. Dharmaguptakas, 4. Mūlasarvāstivādins.
- II. Mahāsāṃghikas : 1. Pūrvaśailas, 2. Aparāśailas, 3. Haimavatas, 4. Vibhajyavādins, 5. Prajñaptivādins, 6. Lokottaravādins.
- III. Saṃmatīyas : 1. Tāmraśāṭīyas, 2. Avantakas, 3. Kaurukullakas, 4. Bahuśrutīyas, 5. Vātsīputrīyas.
- IV. Sthaviras : 1. Jetavanīyas, 2. Abhayagirivāsins, 3. Mahāvihāravāsins.

This list is shoddy work : the Vibhajyavādins are Sthaviras and not Mahāsāṃghikas; the Bahuśrutīyas, Mahāsāṃghikas and not Saṃmatīyas, and so on. At quite a late date, the only concern of the compilers was to arrange the eighteen sects in four different classes, but the distribution was done at random and seemingly without the slightest criticism. In fact, the eighteen sects no longer existed except in theory.

5. — APOCRYPHAL TRADITIONS

604 Towards the end of the eighth century, when Indian Buddhism was showing clear signs of disintegration, Indo-Tibetan exegetes conceived the idea of attributing to each of the four great schools a given master, a special language, a particular cloak and characteristic religious names.

These facts appear in some later Indian works, such as the *Bhikṣuvarṣāgraprṇchā*, referred to above, and the *Prabhāvatī* (*Mdo* LXXXIX, 3; cf. CORDIER, III, p. 410), a commentary by a certain Śākyaprabha from the eighth century on the *Śrāmaṇeratriśatakārikā*. They were taken up and completed by the Tibetan historians Bu-ston (II, pp. 99-100) and Jam-yan bśad-pa (end of eighteenth cent.) in his *Grub-mthaḥ*. The early indologists seem to have taken them seriously : A. CSOMA DE KÖRÖS (*Tibetan-English Dictionary*, 1834, p. 276; *Notices on the different Systems of Buddhism*, J.As.Soc. Bengal, VII, p. 142 sq.), V. VASSILIEV (*Bouddhisme*, tr. La Comme, 1865, pp. 270-1), E. BURNOUF (*Introduction à l'histoire du bouddhisme indien*, 2nd ed., 1876, p. 397). More recently, the late lamented LIN LI-KOUANG (*AM*, pp. 176-87) still referred to them in the remarkable chapter he devoted to the original language of Buddhism. This is what they amount to :

1. The Sarvāstivādins had as their master the kṣatriya Rāhulabhadra; they

spoke Sanskrit, wore a cloak made from 25 to 29 strips of material, used the lotus as their emblem, and their names in religion ended in *mati*, *śrī*, *prabha*, *kīrti* and *bhadra*. — 2. The Mahāsāmghikas had the brahmin Mahākāśyapa as their master; they spoke Prākṛit, wore a cloak made of 23 to 27 strips, and used a shell as their emblem, their names ended in *mitra*, *jñāna*, *gupta* or *garbha*. — 3. The Saṃmatīyas had as their preceptor the śūdra Upāli; they spoke Aprabhraṃśa, wore a cloak made of 21 to 25 strips, and took an areca-leaf as their emblem; their names ended in *dāsa* or *senā*. — 4. The Sthaviras vested their authority in the vaiśya Kātyāyana, spoke Paisācī; their strips and emblems were like those of the Saṃmatīyas; their religious names ended in *deva*, *ākara*, *varman*, *senā*, *jīva* or *bala*.

Nothing is worth retaining from these systems of classification.

6. — CONCLUSIONS

In all this mass of pseudo-historical elucubrations, a few true facts are revealed here and there. The inscriptions in Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī show that, in the first two centuries of the Christian era, most of the Hīnayānist sects were disseminated throughout India. Several of them
 605 had already split up, and the Mahāsāmghikas, for example, occupied points on the map as far apart as Wardak, to the west of Kābul, and Kārli in the District of Bombay. Others, after a game of 'general post', ended by merging and living together peacefully in the same establishments : there were Dharmottariyas and Caitikas in Junnar; Bha-drāyanīyas and Caitikas at Kārli; Sarvāstivādins and Mahāsāmghikas in Mathurā and Wardak; Sarvāstivādins and Saṃmatīyas at Śrāvastī; Mahāsāmghikas, Bahuśrutīyas, Aparāśailas, Mahīśāsakas and Tāmraparṇīyas in Nāgārjunikoṇḍa. From then on, the interweaving of the sects becomes so complicated that all hope of unravelling it is lost.

However, it was at this time that the Sthavirian list with two subdivisions appeared; it was out of date on publication. Vasubandhu's name was attached to it, but was taken up again, with a few variants, by the anonymous authors of the *Śāriputra*- and *Mañjuśrī-Paripṛcchā*, by the Sinhalese chroniclers and, also in the seventh century, by the compiler Bhavya. It is wholly dominated by the memory of the great schism, which, at the time of Aśoka, divided the community into two sections which were never to come together again : the Sthaviras and Mahāsāmghikas.

The latter soon replaced it with a list with three subdivisions which gave the most important place to the Vibhajjavāda in general and, more particularly, to the Sinhalese Tāmraśāṭīyas with whom they were in regular communication by the direct maritime route linking the Mahāsāmghika fief in Andhra country to Cape Andrasimoundou on the west coast of Ceylon (Ptolemy, VII, 4, 3).

In the fourth century, the Chinese saw the Saṃgha from another angle; they were in regular contact with the North-West where the five Hīnayānist schools which specialized in the study of the Vinaya and the biography of the Buddha predominated. In their eyes, the most illustrious was that of the Dharmaguptakas whose set of rules (*prātimokṣa*) and rituals (*karmavācanā*) they had adopted in the middle of the third century A.D. Hence, when the learned Sêng yu, in all good faith, undertook to inform his compatriots about the genealogy of the Indian sects, he chose a scheme with five subdivisions in which the five schools of the North-West acted as forerunners, the place of honour being reserved for the Dharmaguptakas.

606 In the seventh century, during their prolonged stays in India, first Hsüan tsang, and then I ching noted, with great astonishment, that the famous Dharmaguptakas of whom they had heard in China had practically disappeared from the map of India and consisted of no more than a few adherents in Kučā, Khotan and Uḍḍiyāna. The influence over the subcontinent was shared by four great Hīnayānist schools, overshadowing all the others : Sthaviras, Mahāsāṃghikas, Sarvāstivādins and Saṃmatīyas, the last being by far the most numerous. The fact had to be accepted and a new situation recorded. Being objective and realistic, the Chinese masters therefore erased the Dharmaguptakas from their records and only retained the four great schools. Thus, a fourfold classification replaced the list with five subdivisions which had formerly been compiled by Sêng yu.

This new distribution was adapted to Indian traditions and customs by the Sarvāstivādin Vinītadeva (ninth century) and other anonymous chroniclers. To each of the four great schools was reserved the role of head of the list; then, in those four lists were classed somewhat haphazardly — because they were no longer of importance — the eighteen sects, the number of which had been hallowed by tradition.

Finally, this scheme fell into the hands of Indo-Tibetan exegetes who, in a spirit of systematization, but without the least criticism, endeavoured to attribute to each of the four great schools a characteristic robe, their own emblems, special religious names and even a particular dialect.

But, since we are in India where all traditions, however outdated they may be, are piously preserved, the various lists with two, three, five and four subdivisions, instead of being withdrawn one by one as the next was published, were kept side by side and continued to be regularly reproduced. This is what makes the problem of the filiation of the sects so complicated and, it must be admitted, futile.