

DID THE BUDDHA INSULT DEVADATTA ?

Étienne Lamotte

I

The Buddhist tradition has justifiably shown itself to be severe in connection with Devadatta, the Buddha Śākyamuni's cousin who, having entered the Order of bhikṣus, attempted to supplant the Master as head of the Community in which he was blameworthy of three grave offences: he provoked a schism, threw a rock from a mountain top in order to crush the Buddha and inflicted a mortal wound on a nun. Finally, the ground opened under his feet and he was cast alive into the great hell.

The Buddha himself was unable to contain his indignation when Devadatta proposed he retire and leave the Community to his care. These are the terms in which the Vinaya¹ reports the event:

'At that time the Lord, surrounded by a large assembly in which a king was present, was expounding the Dhamma, while remaining seated. Then Devadatta, having risen from his seat and adjusted his outer robe on one shoulder, bowed with joined hands before the Lord and said to him, "Lord, the Lord is now worn out, aged, grown old; he has had his time and is at the end of his life; Lord, may the Lord now be content with devoting himself to dwelling happily in the present life and may he entrust the Community of monks to me. It is I who shall lead the Community of monks".

"Enough, Devadatta, renounce the desire to lead the Community of monks". And a second time . . . And a third

¹ Vin II, 188-9 (Pāli texts are cited according to the Pali Text Society editions).

time Devadatta said to the Lord, "Lord, the Lord is now worn out, aged, grown old. . . It is I who shall lead the Community of monks".

"Devadatta, it is not even to Sāriputta and Moggallāna that I would entrust the Community of monks. Why, then, should I entrust it to you, corpse (*chava*), lickspittle (*kheḷāpaka*)?"

Then Devadatta said to himself, "In an assembly in which a king is present, the Lord treats me as a 'lickspittle' while he upholds Sāriputta and Moggallāna". Irritated and dissatisfied, he greeted the Lord and, having circumambulated him keeping him to his right, he went away.

Such was Devadatta's first piece of maliciousness towards the Lord.

The word *kheḷāpaka* which attracts our attention here has many variants: *kheḷāsika* and *kheḷopaka* in the Vinaya manuscripts², *kheḷāsaka* in the Samantapāsādikā³, *kheḷāsika* in the Dhammapada Commentary⁴. *Kheḷāpaka* and *kheḷāsika* are listed in the Pali Text Society's *Pali-English Dictionary* which defines them as: 'An abusive term "eating phlegm" (?)'.

However, to take this term in its strongest sense is to not follow the exegetical tradition initiated by Buddhaghosa who opts for a figurative sense. Indeed, in the Samantapāsādikā we read⁵:

Kheḷāsako 'ti ettha micchājīvena uppannapaccayā ariyehi vantabbā kheḷasadisā, tathārūpe paccaye ayam ajjhoaratī 'ti katvā kheḷāsako 'ti bhagavatā vutto.

"The means of subsistence resulting from wrong livelihood

2 Vin II, 323.
3 VinA VI, 1275.
4 Dhpa, new ed., PLI, 118.
5 VinA VI, 1275.

should be vomited by the Noble Ones like spittle. That is why the Lord says *kheḷāsaka*, "should be vomited like spittle", in order to explain that Devadatta consumes means of subsistence of that type'.

Buddhaghosa's authority cannot be questioned and it is in recommending his interpretation that modern exegetes have in their translations somewhat mitigated the strictness of the terms *chava* and *kheḷāpaka* (*kheḷāsaka*, *kheḷāsika*) addressed by the Buddha to Devadatta.

Rhys Davids and Oldenberg⁶: I would not give over the Bhikkhu-saṃgha, Devadatta, even to Sāriputta and Moggallāna. How much less, then, to so vile (*chava*) and evil-living (*kheḷāpaka*) a person as you'.

Malalasekera⁷: 'Not even to Sāriputta and Moggallāna would I hand over the Order, and would I then to thee, vile one, to be vomited like spittle?'

E.J. Thomas⁸: same translation.

Miss I.B. Horner⁹: 'I would not hand over the Order of monks even to Sāriputta and Moggallāna. How then could I to you, a wretched one to be vomited like spittle?'

However, the Pāli Vinaya is not alone in assigning insulting words to the Buddha. They are also found in other disciplinary collections which have come down to us in Chinese translation. Some of them follow the Pāli Vinaya in interpreting the insults in question in a figurative sense by comparing Devadatta to spittle

6 *Vinaya Texts* III (SBE xx), Oxford 1885, 238-9.
7 *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* I, London 1937, 1108.
8 *The Life of Buddha as Legend and History*, London 1931, 132-3.
9 *The Book of the Discipline* V (SBB xx), London 1952, 264.

that should be vomited. This is the case for the Vinayas of the Mahīśāsakas and Dharmaguptakas, the closest to the Pāli Vinaya and translated at the beginning of the fifth century, the first by a monk from Kaśmīr, Buddhajīva (in 424-6), the second by another Kaśmīrian monk, Buddhayaśas (in 408).

According to the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya¹⁰, the Buddha treated Devadatta as a 'fool' (*yü chih* 愚癡), and according to the ancient editions of the Sui (581-617) and Sung (1104-48), as 'like spittle' (*ju hsien t'o* 如涎唾). Similarly, the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya¹¹ claims that he called him 'foolish man' (*ch'ih jen* 癡人), 'body of tears and spittle' (*t'i t'o chih shen* 涕唾之身).

Other later Vinayas take the insults in their proper meaning and in particular claim that Devadatta had really swallowed spittle. According to the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya¹², the Buddha said to his rival, 'You are a "lickspittle" (*tan t'o* 噉唾), a "fool" (*ch'ih jen* 癡人), a "corpse" (*szü jen* 死人). According to the Mūla-sarvāstivādin Vinaya¹³, his terms were: 'You are an "ignoramus" (*wu chih* 無智), a "fool" (*ch'ih jen* 癡人), an "eater of spittle" (*shih t'o che* 食唾者). Similarly, the Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa¹⁴ which uses the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya as its book of discipline puts these words on the Buddha's lips: 'You are a "maniac" (*k'uang jen* 狂人), a "corpse" (*szü jen* 死人), a "cougher of spittle" (*sou t'o jen* 嗽唾人).

In brief, we find ourselves faced by a dual tradition: one,

10 T 1421, ch.3, 18b20. (Chinese texts are cited according to the *Taishō Issaikyō* edition by Takakusu and Watanabe, 1924-9.)

11 T 1428, ch.4 592b13-14.

12 T 1435, ch.36, 258b7.

13 T 1450, ch.13, 169b25-6.

14 T 1509, ch.26, 251b11-12; 252b15-16.

represented especially by the Pāli sources, for which Devadatta was a vile person 'to vomit such as spittle', the other, more realistic and probably Sarvāstivādin in origin, in the terms of which Devadatta had really swallowed spittle.

II

This divergence can be explained by another passage in the canonical texts narrating how Devadatta, in possession of supernatural powers of a worldly nature (*pothujjanika iddhi*), resorted to various transformations in order to beguile the crown prince Ajātasattu and thus ensure advantages, respect and renown for himself. Chronologically, this episode took place before his insolent request during which the malign disciple called upon the Buddha to entrust the Community to him.

Here again the texts are classed in two groups: in the first, Devadatta limits himself to infantile games aimed at frightening the prince; in the second, he pushes impropriety so far as to swallow Ajātasattu's saliva.

First group of texts

The Pāli Vinaya¹⁵ records the facts in the following way:

'While Devadatta, having retired into solitude, was plunged in meditation, this reflection came to his mind, "Who can I charm so that, due to his good disposition towards me, many advantages and honours will accrue to me?" Then Devadatta said to himself, "Prince Ajātasattu is young and has a fine future. What if I were now to charm Prince Ajātasattu? When he is well-disposed towards me, many advantages and honours will accrue to me".

15 Vin II, 184-5.

Then Devadatta, having adjusted his bedding and taken up his alms bowl and robe, set out for Rājagaha and, in due time, reached Rājagaha. There, having disposed of his own form and transformed himself into that of a young boy wearing a girdle of snakes, he appeared on the lap of Prince Ajātasattu. Then Prince Ajātasattu was terrified, anguished, anxious and trembling. Thereupon Devadatta spoke thus to Prince Ajātasattu: "Prince, are you frightened of me?"

"Yes, I am frightened. Who are you?"

"I am Devadatta."

"Lord, if you are truly Venerable Devadatta, appear in your proper form."

Then Devadatta cast off the form of a young boy and, wearing his cloak and other robes and holding his alms bowl, stood before Prince Ajātasattu.

Thereupon Prince Ajātasattu, wholly charmed by that marvellous wonder on the part of Devadatta, placed himself at his service, day and night, with five hundred chariots; and five hundred portions of cooked rice were supplied to Devadatta as a gift of food.

Some supplementary details are added by the Dhammapada Commentary¹⁶. Having transformed himself into a young boy, Devadatta put four poisonous snakes at his hands and feet, placed a snake round his neck, rolled a snake round his head like a pillow, put a snake on one shoulder and, in this guise, appeared on Ajātasattu's lap.

16 DhP A 1, Pt.1, 118.

Mahīśāsaka Vinaya¹⁷:

'Having descended in a net, Devadatta appeared above the prince's bed, in the form of a young boy, sucking his finger and lying down in a well-behaved way. Having seen him, the prince was very frightened and asked him, "Are you a god or a demon?"

He answered, "I am Devadatta; do not be frightened, do not be scared". The prince said to him, "If you are Devadatta, resume your original form". Thereupon Devadatta transformed himself and resumed his former bodily attitudes.'

Dharmaguptaka Vinaya¹⁸:

'Devadatta went to Prince Ajātasattu and, making use of his supernormal power (*rddhibala*), rose in the air. Sometimes he expounded the Dharma while showing his body, sometimes he expounded the Dharma while hiding his body, sometimes he expounded the Dharma while showing half his body, sometimes he expounded the Dharma while not showing [even] half his body. Sometimes his body emitted smoke, sometimes it emitted fire. Finally, he changed into a child, his body adorned with a necklet of precious stones; he held onto the prince's arm and, turning round, sucked a finger.

When the prince saw that transformation, he was frightened and his body hairs stood on end. Devadatta, knowing that the prince was frightened of him, said, "Do not be frightened! Do not be frightened!"

The prince asked him, "Who are you?"

He answered, "I am Devadatta".

The prince went on, "If you are truly Devadatta, resume

17 T 1421, ch.3, 17c21-5.

18 T 1428, ch.4, 592a9-18.

your own form".

He resumed his body as it had been previously.'

Ekottarāgama¹⁹:

'Devadatta, hiding his proper form, assumed the body of a young boy and appeared on the prince's knees. Then the courtesans each reflected as follows, "Who is that man? Is he a demon or is he a god?" They had not finished speaking when Devadatta once more transformed his body and again became as before.'

In all these sources, the account is still relatively simple. Devadatta transforms himself only into a little boy, whether or not encircled by snakes. He only wants to frighten Ajātasattu and, on the latter's request, immediately resumes his original form. He takes no action that could earn him the epithet of 'lickspittle'.

Second group of texts

This marks a turn and an evolution in the legend. Devadatta's intention is no longer to frighten, but to beguile the crown prince. To this end he multiplies transformations and changes successively into an elephant, a horse, an ox, which reach Ajātasattu by passing through a wall and going out by a door, or vice versa. He also changes into a monk and even into a veil and a cap, which Ajātasattu makes into a turban for himself. Finally, he takes the form of a child, adorned with a necklet of precious stones. Not the least frightened, the crown prince takes him in his arms, plays with him and ends by putting spittle in his mouth. Through love of gain and honours, Devadatta agrees to swallow it.

This new version of the facts appears first in the Chinese

19 T 125, ch.47, 802c21-4.

Udānavarga²⁰ and a Vinaya²¹ of unknown origin, both translated into Chinese in the years 382 and 383 CE by Chu Fo-nien. It also appears in the Saṃyuktāgama²² of the Kāśyapīya school translated in about the year 400 by a translator whose name has not been preserved. Finally, it is repeated and developed in the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya²³, translated between 404 and 405 by Kumārajīva, and the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya²⁴, an incomplete translation of which was made by I-ching between the years 700 and 712.

Furthermore, it is to this Sarvāstivādin recension that the great exegetes of the fourth century turned: the five arhats of Kaśmīr who compiled the Mahāvibhāṣā²⁵ and the or several Mādhyamika(s) who elaborated the Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa²⁶.

An examination of our texts enables us to specify the conclusions which we reached earlier. According to the oldest exegesis, represented by the Pāli-using Theravādins, the Mahīśāsakas and Dharmaguptakas, the qualification *kheḷāpaka* or *kheḷāsika* addressed by the Buddha to Devadatta was merely a 'rude word', an insult without any objective meaning. Later on, other exegetes within the Sarvāstivādin-Vaibhāṣika school wished to see in it a reproach concerning a real deed and, in order to justify their interpretation, modified the texts in consequence by claiming that Devadatta had 'accepted spittle' from Ajātasattu.

20 T 212, ch.14, 687c23-8.

21 T 1464, ch.2, 859b22-9.

22 T 100, ch.1, 374b13-19.

23 T 1435, ch. 36, 257c4-12.

24 T 1450, ch.13, 168c7-16.

25 T 1545, ch.85, 442a1-8.

26 T 1509, ch.14, 164c21-3; ch.26, 252b22-6.

III

Transposed onto this level, the words addressed by the Buddha to his malign cousin or other disciples are not based on semantics and even less so on history, but enter the field of doctrinal controversy.

'From the night of his Enlightenment until the night of his Nirvāna, everything that the Buddha stated and taught is true and not false'²⁷. 'His good word is distinguished by four characteristics: it is well-spoken, agreeable and pleasant, favourable to deliverance, and truthful'²⁸. Among the eighteen exclusive attributes (*aveṇikadharmā*) of the Buddha, it is accepted that all actions of body, speech and mind of the Tathāgata are preceded by knowledge (*jñānapūrvamgama*) and accompanied by knowledge (*jñānānuparivartin*)²⁹.

Therefore, if Śākyamuni treated Devadatta as a *kheḷāpaka*, it was because the latter had really swallowed spittle, and if that word seems harsh, it was nonetheless uttered for the good of the guilty one.

What remains is that such a term seems shocking on the lips of Śākyamuni who during his lifetime was, according to the happy expression of Alfred Foucher [tr.], 'the accomplished type of gentleman-monk'. On reading and rereading the early sūtras, one is struck by his natural distinction, care for seemliness and constant concern for propriety and proportion. Thus, whatever the baseness of Devadatta, one wonders if the Buddha did not give

27 D III, 135; A II, 24; It, 121, *Madhyamāgama*, T 26, ch.34, 645b18-21. This canonical passage was later modified: *Laṅkāvatāra*, 142-3; *Prasannapāda*, 366, 539; *Pañjikā*, 419.

28 Sn, 78.

29 *Pāncaviṃśatisāhasrikā*, 211-12; *Śatasāhasrikā*, 1450; *Mahāvuyutpatti*, Nos 135-53.

way to a gesture of impatience towards him.

At the instigation of the Jaina monk Nātaputta, Prince Abhaya, the son of King Bimbisāra, one day went to the Buddha in order to ask him a question, the gist of which was as follows: 'You have said and repeated that Devadatta was destined to misery, condemned to hell for a kalpa and absolutely incurable. Is it permissible for the Buddha to use such unpleasant and disagreeable terms concerning others? If so, in what way do you differ from ordinary men? If not, why are you so harsh?'

This was a double-edged question, but the Buddha replied without hesitation, 'If a word is false, the Tathāgata never utters it, be it pleasant or disagreeable. But if a word is true, justified and useful, be it unpleasant and disagreeable for others, the Tathāgata reserves the right to utter it at the appropriate time. And why? Because the Tathāgata has compassion for beings'³⁰.

It could not have been better put. Whether gentle or severe, every word of the Buddha conforms to the truth and has no other aim than the welfare of creatures.

His adversaries were not disarmed for all that, and continued to reproach the Buddha for the harshness of perfectly justified words.

Apart from the occasional criticism, at least two serious actions were brought against the Buddha.

30 Cf. *Abhayarājakumārasutta*, M I, 392-6 (tr. I.B. Horner, *Middle Length Sayings* II, London 1957, 60-4). This sutta has no parallel in the *Madhyama*, but was known by a Northern source: it is cited in the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* by Nāgārjuna, T 1521, ch.11, 79b4.

The pretext for the first³¹ were the torments and illnesses endured by the Buddha in his last existence: heretics accused him of having assassinated the young Sundarī; Ciñcā claimed she was pregnant by him; a rock thrown by Devadatta crushed one of his toes; he was injured by an acacia thorn; he suffered from migraine when King Virūdhaka massacred his compatriots, the Śākya; invited by the brahmin Agnidatta, then rejected, he was forced to eat barley; following a cold draught, he developed backache; for ten years he thought he should devote himself to austerities; seeking alms-food in a brahmin village, he received nothing and had to return with his bowl empty.

How can it be explained that such a holy person had to undergo those nine torments?

This provoked a fine controversy between scholars. For some of them, the Buddha was, like the average mortal, subject to the fruition of actions required to expiate faults in his former lives; for others, those torments and illnesses resulted solely from ineluctable physical conditions; for yet others (in this case, the Mahāyānists), the Buddha's indispositions were simulated, mere skilful means (*upāya*) aimed at winning over beings.

Another action of which the Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa³² has preserved the record was also brought against the Buddha by exegetes and scholars. It is based, no longer on the torments endured by the Lord, but on supposed faults for which he became blameworthy after his enlightenment.

Here again, there are nine counts of indictment:

31 On this accusation, see my *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse* I, Louvain 1944, 507-11.

32 T 1509, ch.26, 251b6-254b29 (cf. *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse* III, Louvain 1970, 1661-89).

1. The Buddha expounded the Dharma to an assembly of heretics³³ without doubting he was believed: this was a sign of thoughtlessness.
2. He displayed his body to the Jaina master Saccaka Nigaṇṭhaputta³⁴.
3. He displayed his tongue and cryptorchis to Ambaṭṭha, Brahmāyu and Sela³⁵.
4. He treated his disciples as fools.
5. He insulted Devadatta by treating him as a fool, a corpse and a lickspittle.
6. He used a stone bowl whereas he had forbidden such a usage to his monks³⁶.
7. He abstained from adjudging certain difficult problems and declared them to be 'reserved or undefined points' (*avyākṛtavastu*)³⁷.
8. He sometimes taught the doctrine of Self and sometimes the

33 Samaṇasaccasutta in which the Buddha taught the 'Four Brahmin Truths' to various wandering ascetics, Antabhāra, etc.: A II, 176-7; Saṃyukta in T 99, ch.35, 251a20-b19; T 100, ch.11, 450c5-451a10; Ekottara in T 125, ch.18, 639a1-11.

34 M I, 233; Saṃyukta, T 99, ch.5, 36b22-3; Ekottara, T 125, ch.30, 716b4-5.

35 D I, 106; M II, 143; Sn, 107-8; T I, ch.13, 87c14-17; T 20, 263b24-6; T 26, ch.41, 688b27-8; T 76, 885b4-7.

36 The Buddha used a stone bowl which had been given to him by the Four Great Kings of the gods (*caturmahārājikadeva*). In contrast he only allowed his monks bowls made of iron or earthenware, cf. Pāli Vin II, 112; Mahīśāsaka Vin, T 1421, ch.26, 170a2-3; Mahāsāṃghika Vin, T 1425, ch.29, 462a11; Sarvāstivādin Vin, T 1435, ch.37, 269b8.

37 Problems on the infinity of the world, etc., which number ten in the Pāli texts, but fourteen in the Sanskrit writings. The Buddha judged them to be useless to deliverance and refused to express an opinion on them; cf. D I, 187-8; M I, 431; S IV, 395; A V, 193-4.

doctrine of Non-Self³⁸.

9. He in turn affirmed and denied the existence of dharmas³⁹.

By means of arguments based on the texts and on reason, the defence refuted the various counts of indictment one after the other. However, its address is so long and subtle that it cannot be reproduced in entirety here. I shall merely translate the passage concerning Devadatta⁴⁰:

'The Buddha said to Devadatta, "You are a fool (*mūḍha*), a corpse (*śava*), a lickspittle (*kheḷāsika*)".

A "fool" because, due to the gravity of his offences, Devadatta was to fall into the Avīci hell: hence this threefold insult.

A "corpse" because, under the appearance of a living man, Devadatta did not accumulate good roots. With his shaven head and monk's robe, it could have been said he was a holy man (*āryapudgala*), but inwardly he possessed no wisdom: he was therefore a corpse.

Corpses are adorned in many ways, but they gradually decompose and it is impossible to revive them. So it was with Devadatta. Each day the Buddha instructed him in various ways, but his bad disposition (*duṣṭacitta*) increased, his malign and wrong tendencies (*pāpakākuśaladharmā*) grew from day to day, and he eventually committed three offences of immediate fruition (*ānantarya*); he was therefore a corpse.

38 The Buddha explained himself on this subject in the Ānandasutta, S IV, 409-1; T 99, ch.34, 245b9-25; T 100, ch.10, 444c.

39 In principle, the Buddha affirmed the existence of dharmas in the Hinayāna and denied their existence in the Mahāyāna.

40 Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa, T 1509, ch.26, 252b15-c15 (cf. *Traité III, op. cit.*, 1671-4).

He was also a "lickspittle". Devadatta, coveting gain (*lābha*) and honours (*satkāra*), changed into a young boy (*kumāraka*) with a heavenly body and manifested himself in the arms of Prince Ajātaśatru. The prince blew in his mouth and gave him spittle to swallow. That is why Devadatta was a lickspittle.

Objection — Devadatta, who possessed the concentrations (*samādhi*), had renounced sense-desires (*vītarāga*). How could he still swallow another's spittle?

Answer — In that person, bad dispositions (*duṣṭacitta*) were profound, but his faculties were sharp (*tīkṣṇendriya*). Having renounced sense-desires (*vītarāga*), he could transform himself. When he swallowed the spittle, he lost his sharp faculties but, after a time⁴¹, recovered them. That is why he was called "lickspittle".

Moreover, Devadatta had said to the Buddha, "The Buddha is worn out (*jīrṇa*). Since he has always cherished solitude (*viveka*), may he enter the forest and devote himself to the joys of absorption (*dhyāna*) and may he entrust the Community to me". The Buddha answered him, "Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana possess great wisdom, they are good men, gentle and pure, and yet I would not entrust the Community to them. How, then, could I entrust it to you who are a fool, a corpse, a lickspittle".

It is for such reasons that the Buddha, although he has no attachment to things, (on occasion) utters harsh words, but only with the aim of winning over beings.

The texts do not tell us the outcome of the action, but if there was a verdict, we can surmise that the Buddha emerged as

41 *Note by translator:* in *Traité II, op. cit.*, 1673, the author translates this phrase as 'but when he so wished'; the rest is unchanged.

white as snow from all accusations made against him and that it was solemnly acknowledged that 'all actions of body, speech and mind of the Tathāgata are preceded by knowledge and accompanied by knowledge'.

* * *

[This article originally appeared under the title 'Le Buddha insulta-t-il Devadatta ?' in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (University of London), XXXIII, Part 1, 1970, pp.108-115. Translated by Sara Boin-Webb and published with grateful acknowledgements to the original editor.]

Ed. See also Biswadeb Mukherjee, *Die Überlieferung von Devadatta, dem Widersacher des Buddha, in den kanonischen Schriften* (Dr. diss. Göttingen Univ. 1966, publ. in Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft series, 1966).

DEVADATTA AND THE FIRST BUDDHIST SCHISM

André Bareaux

The Buddhist tradition, mainly represented by the Pāli canonical texts of the Theravādins, attributes to Devadatta the first attempt at a schism (*saṃghabheda*) in the monastic Community founded by the Buddha. This was said to have taken place in the very lifetime of the latter, who succeeded in dissipating the serious threat which hung over the company of his disciples and who naturally seized the opportunity to give his monks useful instructions with a view to averting any danger of schism in the future.

Apart from secondary details probably added to an earlier version, the Theravādin account is credible on the whole. A first glance, therefore, hardly excites any scepticism, especially if, like the majority of those who study early Buddhism, one has confidence in the Pāli texts and considers them to be the most faithful to the early tradition, as well as being the most orthodox and the most authentic.

Is this really so? In an attempt to find out, the Theravādin sources need to be compared with those of other early schools (*nikāya*), at least with the documents that have come down to us, usually in their Chinese translations. Since a schism was a very serious attack on monastic discipline, it is dealt with in the vast collections devoted to such, the Vinaya Piṭakas. In fact, apart from that of the Theravādins transmitted in its original Pāli, we possess complete Chinese translations of those of the Mahā-sāṃghikas, Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas, Sarvāstivādins and Mūlasarvāstivādins. The last has also reached us in a Tibetan translation and large sections of its Sanskrit text have been discovered since the beginning of this century.