

Aśoka's "Schism" Edict.

K. R. NORMAN

(Faculty of Oriental Studies, Cambridge)

1. Introduction.

Of the three extant versions of Aśoka's so-called Schism Edict, the one at Sāñcī has been known since 1838, when J. Prinsep made an attempt to decipher it, but concluded (1838, 565) that it was in too mutilated a state to be restored completely. It was studied by Cunningham (1854, 261), and subsequently included by him in his *Inscriptions of Asoka* (1877, 42, 116, 141). It was also studied by Bühler, who noted (1894A, 87) that it seemed to be "a second version of Aśoka's so-called Kosambī edict on the Allāhābād pillar".

The version on the pillar at Allāhābād was discovered by Cunningham in 1870 and included in his *Inscriptions of Asoka* (1877, 38, 116, 141). He called it the Kosambī edict, because he recognised in it the word Kosambī, although the pillar upon which it was found stands some 50 kilometres from Kauśāmbī. It was published by Senart (1886, 103) in the form in which it had been published by Cunningham, "for the sake of completeness" (1889, 309=1886, 103). Bühler (1890, 124) expressed his belief that this and the Sāñcī edict were the same.

As V. A. Smith pointed out (1924, 178), the historical interest of these two inscriptions (which were both so fragmentary that scholars had to guess at their contents and therefore their purpose) was not recognised until after the discovery of the Sārnāth inscription in 1905, "when it appeared that the Sāñcī and Kauśāmbī edicts which had been known for many years, were merely variants of the better preserved Sārnāth text". On its discovery the Sārnāth version was discussed by Vogel

(1905-6) and by the discoverer Oertel (1908).

After the discovery of the Sarnāth version comparative studies of all three versions became possible, and they were the subject of articles by Venis (1907), Boyer (1907) and Hultzsck (1911 and 1912). This comparative work enabled improvements to be made in the reading of the two earlier versions, but progress was impeded by the fact that the first syllable of the word *samage* which occurred in the second line of the versions at both Sāñcī and Allāhābād was damaged, and all early interpretations hinged upon a belief that the inscription dealt with *mage*, the word being taken literally by some editors and in a religious sense by others. The true significance of the edict was not realised until Hultzsck (1911, 168) recognised that the reading in line 8 at Sāñcī was not *samghasa mage*, which supported the belief that the word in the earlier line was *mage*, but *samghe samage*. Cunningham had, in fact, read *samgham samage* in line 8 many years before (1854, [repr.] 167), and had translated it, “[and prays that the...] community may always be united”. He had subsequently read *samghasamage* (1877, 116), without translating, but his reading seems to have been ignored by later editors.

Despite his suggestion for line 8, Hultzsck did not recognise the same word *samage* where it occurred earlier in its damaged form in line 2, although he had come to this conclusion by the time he re-edited all three inscriptions for the revised edition of Volume I of *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*. Printing of this was stopped in 1914 by the outbreak of war. It started again in 1920, but was held up once more by the need to incorporate the superior facsimiles of the Kharoṣṭhī versions of the Rock Edicts which had become available. The volume finally appeared in 1925.

The various improvements made in the readings from 1905 onwards enabled the content and therefore the purpose of the edict, now called by some the “Schism Edict” because it clearly dealt with schism in

the Order, to be surmised. It was pointed out by H. C. Norman (1908), that the edict was dealing with *saṅghabheda* and the punishment to be meted out for this—the imposition of white robes and the enforcement of dwelling in *anāvāsa*. He pointed out that the Saddhammasaṅgha and Buddhaghosa's Samantapāsādikā stated that Aśoka made the heretics wear white robes and expelled them from the Order, and while the Mahāvamsa made no mention of this, the Dipavamsa (VII 53) stated: *theyyasamvāsabhikkhuno nāseti līnganāsanam*; “The king destroyed the Bhikkhu emblems of those who had furtively attached themselves (to the Saṅgha)”. This phrase, said Norman (1908, 100) “is much the same as stripping off yellow robes and making them wear white”. Boyer (1907, 130), Venis (1907, 3) and Hultsch (1925, 161 n. 8 and 162 n. 8) pointed out other parallel terminology in various Pāli texts. The inclusion of the word *saṅghabheda* was taken to refer to the schism in the Buddhist church which, according to the Pāli chronicles, led to the third council which was held in the reign of Aśoka. The suggestion that there was a connection between the edict and the third council was widely accepted. Smith (1924, 178-79) commented that “inasmuch as all the three documents deal with the penalties for schism in the church, it is reasonable to assume that they report the decision of the Council convened to suppress schism”.

Majumdar (1939) made suggestions for the improvement and interpretation of the text of the version at Sāñcī, and commented upon the possible relationship between Aśoka and the Buddhist Order. He was of the opinion (1939, 286-87) that “it is not unlikely...that the issue of the three Edicts was connected with the traditional Third Council of Pāṭaliputra”. The belief that there was a connection between the Aśokan inscription and the schism and council referred to in the Pāli chronicles was also held by Bloch (1950, 152 n. 1) and Bareau (1955, 129 foll.). There were, however, others who were not slow to point out that, despite such parallelism of details, the edict included no

reference whatsoever to the third council. Eggermont stated, "There is not a single Asoka inscription that can confirm or deny the historicity of this Council" (1956, 118) and concluded (ibid. 119), "The data of the Asoka-inscriptions sufficiently illustrate the circumstances, which according to the tradition of the Pali-sources led to the third Buddhist Council of Pāṭaliputra, but fail to prove the historicity of the Council itself".

In 1959, two articles appeared, almost simultaneously but quite independently, one from Alsdorf, who made a number of suggestions for restoring the text of all three versions, and the other from Jayawickrama, both giving further support to the idea of a connection between the edict and the Third Council. Jayawickrama discussed at length the accounts given in the Pāli chronicles, and Aśoka's connection with Buddhism. He wrote of "fresh evidence...available from the edicts", and maintained that there was a reference in them to the Third Council which "has so far escaped the notice of Aśokan scholars" (1959, 66), although this claim is hard to substantiate in view of the articles already mentioned. He was of the opinion that the Third Council was held long before the Schism edict was published, but Aśoka's part in the former was still fresh in his memory when he promulgated the latter. He concluded that "to this extent it may be said that the edicts refer to the Council" (1959, 72). Alsdorf, on the other hand, believed that the Third Council was held after the *saṅgha* had been purified.

These articles were followed by one from Bechert (1961). He followed up the references to the Vinaya-piṭaka and other texts¹⁾ which earlier scholars had noted, and in a detailed survey he pointed out the precise meaning of the words *saṅghabheda* and *samagga* in the Pāli Vinaya. He repeated his views in a subsequent article (1982). He drew attention to the statement that the Buddha prescribed the *uposathakamma* for *bhikkhus* who were *samagga*, and defined the state of being *samagga*

(*sāmaggī*) as applying to a single residence (*ekāvāsa*) which was limited by means of a boundary (*sīmā*)². In both articles Bechert made it clear that *bheda* in the Vinaya sense did not mean a “schism” in the Buddhist order as a whole, but must have been restricted to a *nikāya* of the church. He pointed out that Aśoka was only the first of a long line of kings to interfere in the affairs of the Saṅgha.

Despite all the work which has been done on this edict, it seems to me that no-one has considered in detail all the accounts of the event in the early Pāli chronicles, and compared them with the three versions of the edict. Even Jayawickrama, who refers to all of the early accounts, adopts, perhaps understandably in view of his particular interest in that text, the account given by Buddhaghosa in the *Samantapāsādikā* as the basis for his discussion. It also seems to me that there is more to be deduced from the actual inscription than has been done in the past, and in this paper I would wish to examine the precise wording of the chronicles and the three versions of the edict more carefully, in the light of some of the suggestions which have been made.

2. The recipients.

The version at Allāhābād is the shortest, but in many ways it is the most useful of the three versions because, although it is badly damaged as a result of a later inscription being carved over it, nevertheless the extent of the inscription can be made out. We can, therefore, be certain of the number of lines, and consequently can calculate fairly accurately the number of missing akṣaras, and can in fact conjecture them with a fair degree of certainty. We can assume that it includes what the scribe considered to be the very gist of the edict, i. e. it does not contain anything which he thought was extraneous. The name of the recipients occurs in the first line. It is addressed to the ministers at Kosambī, and I have dealt elsewhere (1983, 284) with this fact, and its implications

for the original position of the pillar which is now at Allāhābād. It seems very likely that Alsdorf was correct in conjecturing (1959, 163) the words <*vataviyā saṃghe*> to fill the gap at the beginning of the second line.

The Sārnāth version begins with the akṣaras *deva*, which we can confidently assume are the beginning of the word *devānaṃṭpiye*, which occurs as the first word at Allāhābād. It also includes the syllables *pāṭa* at the beginning of the third line. These are probably the beginning of the place name Pāṭaliputra, as Hultsch (1925, 162 n. 2) suggested. Since the syllables are not at the beginning of the inscription, it is not certain whether they refer to the ministers at that place, although Alsdorf, calculating that there was room for 15–16 akṣaras, restored the text of the third line of the inscription as *Paṭa<liputasi mahāmātā vataviyā na lahi>ye kena pi saṃghe bhetave e cum kho* on that assumption (1959, 165), and Bechert accepted his restoration (1961, 20) without, it would seem, considering whether it would be appropriate in that position in the inscription. Alsdorf pointed out (1959, 165 n. 4) the problem which arises from assuming that the edict is addressed to the ministers at Pāṭaliputra, since it is not obvious why something addressed to Pāṭaliputra should be at Sārnāth. The solution I proposed for the mention of the name Kosambī in the edict at Allāhābād is perhaps less appropriate for the Sārnāth pillar, since it is unlikely that Sārnāth would come under the jurisdiction of the mahāmāttas at far-distant Pāṭaliputra.

No-one, to my knowledge, has suggested an adequate explanation for the akṣaras *e la* which are legible at the beginning of the second line. I have suggested elsewhere (1983, 291 n. 73) that these might be part of a place name, perhaps the place where other mahāmāttas had their headquarters. If this were so, then we could deduce that the address of the recipients continued into the second line of the inscription.

The version at Sāñcī is damaged at the beginning. Most editors are

agreed that one line has been lost, in which case there is room for an address there. Since the damaged inscription is found at the top of the stump of the column, as can be seen from the photograph of the pillar in J. Irwin's paper (1983, pl. 17), I do not know how editors can be certain how many lines are missing. It is probable that this statement was first made before the Sārnāth version was known, when it was believed that the introduction to the Sāñcī version was of the same length as the Allāhābād version. Nevertheless, long after the discovery of the Sārnāth version, Majumdar (1939, 283) stated that the text originally consisted of eight lines, of which the first is entirely lost. It would seem that he and other editors overlooked the fact that Bühler (1894, 366) stated that "this is sufficient to prove that line 7 [counting from the bottom] does not contain the beginning of the edict, but that a probably not inconsiderable piece has been lost at the top". I can see nothing to stop us believing that the introduction might have been as long as the Sārnāth version. We can be certain that when the exemplar was received it originally had an address upon it, although we cannot tell whether the scribe actually wrote the address when he inscribed it. Majumdar, believing that only one line was missing, suggested (1939, 284) that there was no address, but the edict probably began with the words: *Devānaṃpiye Piyadasi ānaṇayati*. He accepted as very probable (1939, 285) the suggestion that the akṣara yā was the remnant of the word *mayā* "by me", to be taken with *kaṭe*.

Alsdorf rejected these suggestions (1959, 164 n. 3), and restored the beginning of the first legible line as <lahi>yā, before which he conjectured the words <Vidīsāyaṃ mahāmātā vataviyā saṃghe na kenapi>, in the belief that the mahāmātras at Vidisā were the probable recipients. If this is correct, and of course we have no evidence whatsoever for the place name, then we might conjecture that the inscription began with the words *devānaṃpiye ānaṇayati*. This gives a total of 28 syllables. Alsdorf pointed out (1959, 164) that there were 13 syllables in every

line except the last one, which had 14. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to believe that the first two (missing) lines of the inscription could have had 14 syllables in each of them.

3. The text of the Edict.

It is noteworthy that there are differences in the word order in the various versions. In the Allāhābād version the words <saṃghe> *sama-ge kaṭe* come first, immediately after the address. In the Sāñcī version they come after the words <saṃghe na kenapi lahi> *yā bhetave*, if Alsdorf's conjecture is correct. There are other verbal differences between the versions, as we shall see, so this is perhaps not significant. There is no reference to the *saṃghe* being *samaghe* in the Sārnāth version, which has the words <na lahi> *ye kenapi saṃghe bhetave* immediately after the address, if Alsdorf is correct. It cannot, however, be ruled out that the phrase was in the missing portion at the beginning of the inscription. Alsdorf stated (1959, 165) that there was no evidence that *pāṭa* should come at the beginning of the line which ends with *e cum kho*, and it was possible that the line beginning with *pāṭa* should go a line or two higher. If this were so, then there would be room for the words Alsdorf suggests and also the statement that the *saṃgha* had been made *samagga*, which might be thought to be an essential part of the edict since it appears in the other two versions. Vogel, however, pointed out (1905-6, 167) that the mark under the first line on the right (which probably indicates the level of the earth at some stage of the pillar's history) must line up with the mark under the third line at the left (which is barely visible on Hultzsch's plate unless looked for, but is reasonably clear on Vogel's plate), and also with the line on the fragment. This proves that the akṣaras *pāṭa* come at the beginning of the line which ends in *e cum kho*, and it is certain that only about 15 akṣaras are missing between *pāṭa* and *ye*. If the words *saṃghe samage kaṭe* were in the inscription, then they must have occurred earlier than

the word *Pāṭalīputa*, if Alsdorf was correct in his conjecture.

I have pointed out elsewhere (1983, 291 n. 73) that since the akṣaras *pāṭa* are not at the beginning of the inscription it is possible that they are part of the edict proper rather than belonging to the address. We might then assume that the words *saṃghe samage kaṭe* occurred between *Pāṭa*<*līputasi*> and <*na lahi*>*ye*, but since *Pāṭalīputasi* would then be the last word in the preceding clause, which seems unlikely on stylistic grounds, it would seem to be necessary to construe *Pāṭalīputasi* with *saṃghe* etc. We could postulate some such statement as “(At a council held OR in the Asokārāma) in Pāṭaliputra the *saṃgha* was made *samagga*”. The absence of any such words in the other versions makes this suggestion less probable, but their absence there is not necessarily decisive, since the Sāñci version also includes words not found in the other versions.

If the word *Pāṭa*<*līputa*> in the third line is not part of the address, then my suggestion that the akṣaras *e la* in the second line are the beginning of another place name is less likely to be correct. As an alternative suggestion we might note that the form of the akṣara *e* is that of the vowel in initial position. This could be the relative pronoun, in support of which it can be pointed out that that pronoun has the form *e* in line 3 in the same inscription. If it is the relative pronoun, then the akṣara *la* would be the beginning of another word, perhaps some form of the word *lājā*. We could guess that the missing sentence had a meaning on the lines of “(what is) the *saṃgha* in the *ārāma* of the king at Pāṭaliputra has been made *samagga*”.

The versions at Sāñci and Sārnāth state that the *saṃgha* is not to be broken (if Alsdorf’s conjectures are correct), while the version at Allāhābād states that breaking (if we accept Alsdorf’s conjecture of <*bhede* (y)*e*>³⁹ at the beginning of the third line) in the *saṃgha* is not to be accepted. All three versions then go on to say that anyone who shall break (the verb is *bhañj-* not *bhind-*, and as Barua (1946, II, 337)

points out it is in the future tense) the Order shall be made to dwell (future passive participle) in a non-dwelling (*anāvāsa*)⁴⁾, i. e. outside the *āvāsa* (which is the usual dwelling place for bhikkhus), having been made to wear white clothes⁵⁾.

Allāhābād and Sārṇāth agree in reading *āvāsaiye* in this sentence. This is unexpected as a future passive participle form⁶⁾, and it is possible that two akṣaras have been omitted in this word, which should perhaps be restored as *āvāsai<tavi>ye*. If this is so, then the scribe's eye must have jumped from one *i*-mātrā to the next *i*-mātrā. This suggestion is perhaps supported by the form *vāsāpetaviye* which occurs in the Sāñcī version. The fact that the Sārṇāth and Allāhābād versions agree here might seem to suggest that there was some special relationship between these two versions, but in fact there seems to be no consistent relationship between the three versions. It is to be noted that Allāhābād agrees with Sāñcī in having the words *bhikhu vā bhikhuni vā* after the words *saṃghaṃ bhakhati* instead of before, as at Sārṇāth; Sārṇāth agrees with Sāñcī in having *saṃghe bhetaṃ*, where Allāhābād has *saṃhasi bhede*; Allāhābād and Sāñcī agree in having *saṃmaḍhāpayitu* where Sārṇāth has *saṃmaḍhāpayiya*; Sārṇāth and Allāhābād have *lahiye* where Sāñcī has *lahiyā*.

The Sāñcī version includes two extra phrases or sentences in the body of the inscription. The first consists of the words *bhikhūnaṃ ca bhikhunīnaṃ cā ti putapaṇḍitike caṃdamasūriyike*. This phrase is without any verb, and makes no obvious sense as it stands. Since, however, the particle *ti* might imply a quotation or the reason for some thought or action, most translators understand the imperative or optative of the verb "to be" and translate: "(Thinking) that the Order of bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs is samagga, (may it last) for as long as my descendants and the sun and moon shall last". The words *bhikhūnaṃ* and *bhikhunīnaṃ* are in the genitive plural case, but rather removed from the word *saṃghe*, with which they would most easily be construed.

The particle *ti* also seems to be misplaced. It might have been expected to occur after the word *caṃdamasūriyike* or, even more likely, after a verb following that word. It was probably these considerations which led Hultsch to give two different interpretations at different times: "...path is prescribed both for the monks and the nuns. As long as (my) sons and great-grandsons (shall reign, and) as long as the moon and sun (shall shine), the monk or nun who shall cause division in the Saṃgha should be caused to put on white robes and to reside in a non-residence" (1911, 168) and: "The Saṃgha both of monks and nuns is made united as long as (my) sons and great-grandsons (shall reign, and) as long as the moon and sun (shall shine)" (1925, 161). It is not clear why Majumdar (285) preferred the first of these.

The second additional sentence states that Aśoka's wish is that the *saṃgha*, being *samagga*, should exist for a long time. Hultsch translates: "For what is my desire? That the saṃgha may be united (and) of long duration" (1911, 168). It seems somewhat strange that Aśoka should have inserted two sentences saying almost exactly the same thing. Where the phrase *putaḥapotike caṃdamasūriyike* occurs elsewhere (PE 7 (OO)) it is found in conjunction with *hotu*, and we might have expected it to occur with *hotu* or *siyā* here, with an introductory word, e. g. *(y)ena* or *etāye athāye*. The absence of any such word suggests that the phrase has been misplaced, and it is possible that it was at one time together with the second phrase. If this was so, then it is possible that the (originally one) sentence occurred at the end of the edict, and gave Aśoka's wish when he promulgated the edict: that the *saṃgha* of bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs should be longlasting, lasting as long as his descendants and as the sun and moon, i. e. *saṃghe samage bhikkhūnaṃ ca bhikkhunīnaṃ ca putaḥapotike caṃdamasūriyike cīlathitike siyā ti*. It seems possible that the scribe's eye jumped from the words *saṃghe samage kaṭe* at the beginning of the edict to *saṃghe samage* at the end of the edict, and he began to copy part of the final

sentence. He stopped when he realised his mistake, and continued with the sentence beginning *ye samgham*. As already noted, these sentences or phrases are not found in the other two versions. Although it is perhaps more likely that one version should have added phrases, rather than that two versions should have omitted them, in view of the uncertainty which, as will be seen in the next section, was clearly felt about the covering letter, it is not impossible that all the scribes (as is usual in my writings about the Aśokan inscriptions, by scribe I mean anyone employed in the train of transmission of the edicts) received them in their exemplars, but handled them differently, as seems to have happened in the case of the Minor Rock Edicts (Norman, 1983, 282).

4. The covering letter.

The Sārnāth version contains an additional portion at the end, of a type which I have elsewhere (1984, 314) called the "covering letter". It was recognised by Hultzsch (1912, 1057) that the long passage from "Then this edict..." to the end "adds nothing new to the king's order... but provides merely for the proper circulation of the edict among the parties concerned". He was able to compare the parallel phrase in the Rūpnāth version of Minor Rock Edict I. As Alsdorf suggests (1959, 161) with reference to this passage, and as I have suggested (1984, 314) with reference to comparable covering letters in other inscriptions, it is probable that the covering letter should not have been inscribed, and the reason for the non-appearance of this portion of the edict at the other sites is that the other scribes realised this, and consequently did not inscribe it.

The covering letter starts by saying that the ordinance (*sāsana*) is to be made known to the *samgha* of bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs, i. e. the local *samgha* in each area to which a copy of the edict had been sent. It goes on to say that a similar writing (*lipi*) should be (*huvāti* is

subjunctive) deposited (or written, since Venis (1907, 3) has shown that the related Sanskrit word *nikṣip-* can mean “inscribe”) in the *samsalana* (which we can translate as “meeting place” or “office”, on the basis of Sanskrit *samsarana* “resting place for passengers near the gates of a city”) in their own presence, and the ministers are to deposit a similar writing among the layfollowers. We can assume that the copies which we now possess must have been placed in one or other of these three places at each of the three sites.

The covering letter goes on to say that layfollowers are to go on every *uṣoṣatha* day (*anuṣoṣatham*) to do something (*visvaṃsayitave* is an infinitive of purpose) to the ordinance. In this sentence the word *yāvu* is an optative, and Bechert (1961, 26 n. 22) would seem to be making an error in assuming it is the equivalent of the word *yāvat*. It seems to me very unlikely that any construction consisting of the accusative adverb phrase *anuṣoṣatham* with *yāvat* could exist. Bechert compounds this error by suggesting that the words *ṣoṣathāye yanti* have fallen out by haplography. By inserting these words he destroys a distinction made in the edict between the conduct of the layfollowers and that of the ministers.

Each individual minister is also to go (*yāti* is subjunctive) every *uṣoṣatha* day, regularly (*dhuvāye*) on the *uṣoṣatha* day (*uṣoṣathāye*) in order to *visvaṃsayitave* the ordinance and also to *ājānitave* (“to understand”) [it]. Vogel, the first translator, translated *uṣoṣathāye* as “go to the sabbath (service)”, and this interpretation of the dative has been followed by succeeding editors. Hultsch (1925, 163) translated *uṣoṣathāye* as “(come) to the fast-day (service)”, but I see no reason to doubt that it is a dative of time (like *dhuvāye*) rather than a dative of place, or even purpose. I therefore translate it accordingly. The words *etaṃ sāsanam* are in the accusative case, and must be the object of *visvaṃsayitave* (and *ājānitave*). I do not understand Bechert’s comment (1961, 26) that it is only possible to connect *etaṃ eva sāsanam*

with the two infinitives if they are taken as passives. An infinitive can, of course, be passive, as *bhetave* is earlier in the inscription (as Alsdorf (1959, 164) notes)— but it makes no sense to try to fit an accusative together with two passive infinitives here, since there is nothing for the word in the accusative to depend upon. Bechert's way of taking them would be an accusative and (passive) infinitive construction which would be unparalleled in my experience. We must remember that Bechert published his article over 25 years ago. I am sure he would not interpret the Prakrit in that way now, although he did repeat his "findings" more recently (1982, 67).

If *uṣosathāye* is taken as a dative of time, rather than place or purpose, then it is to be noted that there is no information about the place where the ministers and the layfollowers are to go to do these actions⁷⁾. The most likely location would seem to be where the copies of the edict have been deposited, since in the case of the layfollowers the deposition has been mentioned immediately before. There is no reference whatsoever to the *saṃgha*, and any idea of the ministers and layfollowers going anywhere to ensure that the *saṃgha* carry out the *uṣosatha* proceedings correctly seems to me to be mere imagination. Bechert's translation "damit dieser Verordnung (des Königs) Vertrauen und Beachtung geschenkt wird" (1961, 27) is presumably based upon the way in which he interprets the infinitives. His translation does, of course, give the possibility that the ministers and laymen could make the trust be given by a third party, e. g. the *saṃgha*.

The word *visvamsayitave* causes difficulties, because, if it is assumed to be the Middle Indo-Aryan equivalent of Sanskrit *viśvās-*, with *-ams-* instead of *-ās-*, as Vogel (1905-6, 170) suggested, whether as a mistake based upon the *-am-/-ā-* error, or a genuine phonetic development of *-ās->-ams-*, there is no attested meaning of the causative form which makes good sense here⁸⁾. The meanings given for the Sanskrit word are: "to cause to trust, inspire with confidence, console, comfort,

encourage". It is for this reason that the meaning "to make oneself familiar with" was suggested by Vogel (170), although Senart (1907, 33) thought this was rather implausible, and suggested "donner confiance", or "donner autorité", or "pratiquer, se conformer à". Bloch (1950, 153 n. 12) says that the verb *viśvās-* is normally constructed with the locative case and points out that we should expect a word meaning "prendre connaissance", although in his translation he leaves a blank. According to Monier-Williams (1899, s. v.), however, *viśvās-* is also found with the accusative and the genitive.

At present I cannot make any convincing suggestion for the interpretation and translation of this word, although I agree with Bloch as to the general sense which is required. If *visvaṃsayitave* is not to be derived from the verb *viśvās-*, the only proposal I can put forward, and that very tentatively, is that we have here the word *visvaṃ* "all" followed by the verb *sayitave*. Vogel (1905-6, 170) considered this possibility, but rejected it on the grounds that, from the way in which the words are connected together, it is evident that *visvaṃsayitave* is to be regarded as one word. This objection does not seem to be valid. In his edition Vogel prints the words as they occur in the inscription, with no spaces between the words which are written together. It becomes clear that, as in the case of certain other Aśokan inscriptions, words which form a linguistic unit are written in groups⁹. I see no reason why the verb and an adjective agreeing with the object should not go together, so it is not unreasonable to suggest that we could be dealing with two words. A stronger objection is that derivatives of the word *viśva* "all" do not seem to be widely attested in Middle Indo-Aryan, and it is perhaps rather unlikely that Aśoka should have used it.

If, however, we can accept that *visvaṃ* might have been used, then we could suggest that *sayitave* was the Middle Indo-Aryan equivalent of *śrayitavai*, from the root *śri-*. This would give a meaning "depend

on”, which does not seem very likely in the context. In his discussion of this word, Vogel (170) in fact included the form *savitave*, probably by mistake (just as Woolner’s form *visvamsavitave* (1924, Part II, 135), which is followed by R.L. Turner (1966, § 11967), must be an error). It does, however, suggest an explanation. If Áśoka had *savitave* in the original form of the edict, it is possible that a scribe who did not recognise the word believed that the *-v-* was a glide *-v-* (as in *yāvu*), and replaced it by a glide *-y-*. We might assume that *savitave* was the infinitive of *savati*, from **śravati* “to hear”, which is attested in Pāli¹⁰. The sentence would then mean “in order to hear this whole inscription”¹¹.

The covering letter concludes with the order to promulgate the inscription widely. I have already dealt with this portion elsewhere (1983, 283) when dealing with the similar passage in the Rūpnāth version of Minor Rock Edict I.

If we assume that the covering letter was sent to all sites with the edict, then we can surmise that the scribe at Allāhābād omitted the whole of the covering letter. The scribe at Sārnāth perhaps realised too late that the covering letter should not have been included, and omitted the final sentence, in which Áśoka expressed his wish. He recognised that this was neither a part of the edict proper, nor any part of the instructions about the way in which the edict was to be promulgated. The scribe at Sāncī realised that the covering letter should not be inscribed, and omitted it, but misunderstood the final sentence as belonging to the edict proper, and therefore inscribed it at the end of the edict. By error some words were inserted earlier by the stonemason in the actual process of inscribing, as I have already suggested.

5. Mentions of schism in Pāli texts.

We have five accounts of the third council and the events leading

up to it given in the early Pāli chronicles: two in Dip, two by Buddhaghosa in his Sp and Kv-a, and one in Mhv. The accounts they give are not identical, but differ in various details.

(1) Dip VII (35-41) states that the schismatics and heretics had lost gain and honour, and consequently infiltrated the Order. For seven years the *uposatha* ceremony was carried out by incomplete groups (*vagguṣosatha*)¹² since the noble ones did not attend the ceremonies. By 236 BE, 60,000 bhikkhus lived in the Asokārāma. The various sectarians ruined the doctrine, wearing yellow robes. Moggaliputta convened a council, and having destroyed the different doctrines and expelled these shameless intruders, he recited the Kathāvatthu.

(2) Dip VII (44-54) says there was a dreadful schism among the Theravādins in BE 236. The heretics (who are numbered at 60,000) seeing the honour being given to the Saṅgha, furtively attach themselves to it. The Pātimokkha ceremonies in the Asokārāmahāra are interrupted. A minister, who ordered the Pātimokkha ceremony to be performed, killed some of the bhikkhus, which led to the king consulting the elders about the killings. Moggaliputta presided over a gathering of 60,000 Buddhists, assembled to destroy the sectarians. Aśoka learned the doctrine from the thera, and is said (VII 53) to have destroyed the (bhikkhu-) emblems of the intruders (*rājā...theyyasaṃvāsabhikkhuno*¹³)...*nāseti liṅga-nāsaṇaṃ*). The heretics, performing the *pabbajjā* rite according to their own doctrine, injured the Buddha's utterances. To annihilate them Moggaliputta recited the Kathāvatthu. After that recitation he held the Third Council.

(3) Sp (53, 1-61, 25), in a passage dealing with the ninth year after Aśoka's consecration, says that the heretics whose gain and honour had dwindled gained admission to the Order for gain. Each claimed his own doctrine to be the true Dhamma and Vinaya. Those who could not gain entry into the Order put on yellow robes and intruded into the vihāras, disrupting the *uposatha* and *pavāraṇā* ceremonies. The

true monks refused to perform the *uposatha* ceremony in their presence, and were unable to make the heretics conform to the true principles of Dhamma and Vinaya. Some of the heretics continued to perform their old sacrifices, etc. The *uposatha* at the Asokārāmahavihāra was interrupted for seven years. Aśoka tried to force the bhikkhus to hold the *uposatha*, but his intervention led to the death of a number of bhikkhus. The king himself then listened to the views of the sectarians and realised they were heretical. He gave them white robes and expelled them from the Order. They numbered 60,000. The *saṅgha* is then said to be *samagga*, and they assembled and held the *uposatha*. The account in Kv-a (6, 8-7, 28) is almost exactly the same, although it gives no date.

(4) Mhv (V 229-270) states that the heretics who had lost honour put on the yellow robe and joined the bhikkhus. They proclaimed their own doctrines and performed their old practices. The bhikkhus could not restrain them, and for seven years the bhikkhus in Jambudipa held no *uposatha* ceremony nor the ceremony of *pavāraṇā* in all the ārāmas. When Aśoka tried to make the bhikkhus in the Asokārāmahavihāra perform the *uposatha*, his minister killed several bhikkhus. The king listened to all the bhikkhus' doctrines, and he caused all the adherents of false doctrines to be expelled from the Order. They numbered 60,000. The Order, now in perfect harmony, assembled and performed the *uposatha*. Mhv V 270 says 60,000 heretics were expelled by the king, and V 274 says the *saṅgha* was *samagga*. The end of the Third Council is dated to the 17th year after Aśoka's consecration.

6. Conclusions.

We should note the points which are common to all, or nearly all, the versions. Most of them give a date for the event, although they do not entirely agree¹³⁾; they all say that the problem was caused by sectarians who had lost prestige as a result of the growing gain of the Buddhists; they all mention the Asokārāma in their accounts,

although the first Dīpavaṃsa account does not specifically state that the event took place in the Asokārāma; they all refer to various ceremonies being interrupted, and all except for the second Dīpavaṃsa account specify that the interruption lasted for seven years; they all state that when the matter of the *uposatha* had been settled the Third Council was held; they all state that Moggaliputta recited the Kathāvatthu.

If we examine all these versions, we can probably trace the way in which additions were made to the basic version of the story. It is likely that the first account in the Dīpavaṃsa is the earliest version. It dates the occurrence, and states that sectarians whose honour and gain had been reduced because of the growing prestige of the Buddhist Order infiltrated the order and wore the yellow robe. For seven years the true Buddhists would not perform the *uposatha* in their presence. Moggaliputta destroyed the various doctrines and removed the shameless ones. There is no mention of Aśoka, nor of the giving of white robes. The second version in Dīp adds the statement that there was a *bheda* in the Theravāda. It does not specifically mention the *uposatha*, but states that the Pātimokkha ceremony in the Asokārāmavihāra was interrupted, although it does not say for how long. A minister tried to settle the matter, but his intervention caused bloodshed. The king asked about the bloodshed, received religious instruction, and destroyed the sectarians' (bhikkhu-) emblems.

The two versions by Buddhaghosa, which are identical for our purposes, add the information that the sectarians continued to perform their previous practices. They also introduce the story of Aśoka becoming so involved that he sends a minister who tries to settle the matter by force, killing a number of bhikkhus in the process. Because of his training in the doctrine Aśoka was able to discern that the intruders had heretical views, and he consequently made them wear white robes and expelled them from the Order. The Order is then said

to be *samagga*. The Mahāvamsa version adds the detail that no *uposatha* ceremony was held in Jambudīpa for seven years, nor the *paṅvāraṇā* ceremony in all the ārāmas.

We can probably reconstruct the matter in the following way. Sectarrians (probably those who had fallen out of favour when Aśoka began to show a preference for Buddhism) infiltrated the Asokārāma, and the true bhikkhus refused to celebrate the *uposatha* ceremony while they were there. There was therefore *bheda* in the Asokārāma saṅgha. Majumdar refers to the fact that bhikkhus are forbidden to wear the householder's garb, which is what the white robe would be, and he suggests that this *saṅghabheda* must have been a very serious event, which carried a heavier penalty than that laid down for *saṅghabheda* in the Vinaya-piṭaka¹⁵. I suggest, however, that it was not a question of bhikkhus being forced to wear the householder's white robes, but of infiltrators being forced to give up the emblems to which they were not entitled, and being made to depart from the vihāra, where they had no right to be. The Vinaya penalties would not be appropriate for those who were not genuine bhikkhus.

I see no reason to believe that Aśoka himself carried out the expulsion. The earlier version in the Dipavamsa states that Moggaliputta removed the heretics, and makes no mention of Aśoka. It is, however, not unlikely that, as the chronicles say that the bhikkhus were unable to restrain the sectarians by the rules of discipline, Moggaliputta was unable to enforce the order of expulsion from the vihāra. In this case, recourse to the civil power was perhaps inevitable, and a minister had to deal with the matter. This action would not be a case of one of the king's ministers intruding into a religious matter, since those to be evicted were not true bhikkhus.

There is no need to doubt that this part of the story is historically true. The next version, however, has Aśoka himself becoming involved, doubtless because it was "his" ārāma. According to this version, he

personally sent his minister, and became further involved after the bloodshed which was caused. Aśoka's commitment to the Theravāda cause is emphasised by the story that he personally decided who held the heretical views, and expelled them from the Order. When the sectarians had been removed, the saṅgha in the Asokārāmahāyāna became *samagga*. The final expansion of the story adds the detail that no *uposatha* ceremony was held in Jambudīpa for seven years, nor any *ḍaḍḍarāṇā* ceremony in all the ārāmas. These additional details presumably represent an attempt to make the matter appear far more widespread than it really was.

We can probably disregard the figure of 60,000, which occurs several times in the story. We read that Aśoka's father fed 60,000 brahmins, and Aśoka did the same. He then fed 60,000 Buddhists in their place. We then read that there were 60,000 heretics involved in the dispute, presumably the same group who had been deprived of their food. There were 60,000 true bhikkhus, presumably those who had replaced them as recipients of food. What is of importance is that these were the ones who were fed by Aśoka, implying that they were fed in Pāṭaliputra, which in turn implies that the whole occurrence took place in Pāṭaliputra, and probably in the Asokārāma. It was, therefore, a very limited operation, concerning only the one saṅgha, that of the Asokārāma.

The precise details about the relationship between the recitation of the Kathāvatthu and the Third Council vary slightly, in the different versions. The first Dipavaṃsa account is somewhat disjointed and several details are mentioned twice, but it seems to say that Moggaliputta held the Third Council, and then subdued the sectarians, and recited the Kathāvatthu. The second Dipavaṃsa account states that Moggaliputta recited the Kathāvatthu to annihilate the sectarians' doctrines, and after that held the Third Council. Both of Buddhaghosa's accounts and the Mahāvaṃsa state that Moggaliputta recited the

Kathāvatthu at the Third Council.

It is, however, clear that there is an inconsistency in the story. All the versions state that Moggaliputta recited the Kathāvatthu to refute the sectarians' views. We are told that the sectarians included nigaṇṭhas and acelakas, and we are told that among the practices they followed were the *agnihotra* and the five fires. The Kathāvatthu, however, is not concerned with any such sects or practices. It is concerned with refuting views held by various sects of Buddhism. We can deduce that two events have been put together: the infiltration of the Buddhist order by sectarians, whose presence and differing views on *pabbajjā*, etc., led to the suspension of Buddhist ceremonies for a considerable length of time, and the arising of different doctrines in the Buddhist church, as a result of which the Kathāvatthu (or at least the early core of it) was recited to refute them. It is therefore quite possible that the *saṅghabheda* in the Asokārāmahāyāna and the Third Council were quite unconnected, and occurred at two quite different times, but were somehow linked together in the historical tradition inherited by the Mahāvihāra.

Asoka's Schism Edict states that the *saṅgha* had been made *samagga*, and that monks and nuns who caused schism in the future should be made to live outside the *āvāsa*, and to wear white robes. As we have seen, the removal of the (bhikkhu-) emblems or the wearing of white robes, the expulsion and the *saṅgha* being made *samagga* are mentioned in the Pāli chronicles. I believe that it is too much of a coincidence for there to be no connection whatsoever between the edict and the chronicles. I conclude that the references in the Pāli texts must go back to a much earlier tradition, brought from India and preserved in the Mahāvihāra, that Asoka did, or at least wrote of doing, these things. It is interesting to note that the references to white robes and the *saṅgha* being *samagga* do not occur before Buddhaghosa's account of the matter, which implies either that these details were not available

to the author of the Dipavaṃsa, or else that he chose to omit them for some reason.

Bechert is quite right to point out that the terms *samagga* and *saṅghabheda* have precise meanings in the Vinaya, and if they have those meanings in this edict, then it is clear that those who have seen a reference here to an actual schism in the Buddhist church over matters of doctrine were wrong to do so. What Bechert has not, however, shown beyond any shadow of doubt is that Aśoka was in fact using the words in their true Vinaya sense here. It is not impossible that he was using them in a more general, less legalistic, sense.

There is no reference to the Third Council in the extant portions of the Schism Edict. There are various explanations possible for this: (1) It might have been mentioned in the missing portions of the Sāñcī and Sārnāth inscriptions; (2) The Third Council might not yet have taken place, i. e. the edict was promulgated between the expulsion of the sectarians and the holding of the Council; (3) The Council might have taken place, unknown to the king, i. e. the king's involvement with Buddhism was not as great as we might assume from the Pāli texts, and he was really unacquainted with the Order's activities; (4) The schism which led to the promulgation of Aśoka's edict might have been another schism, not the one which led up to the Third Council; (5) The connection between the schism and the Third Council is based upon a misunderstanding by the Pāli chroniclers, and has no historical basis.

Nor is there any specific reference in the edict to a schism having taken place. We have to deduce it from the fact that the *saṅgha* is said to have been made *samagga*¹⁶⁾, and from the penalty which is announced for those causing schism in the future. We are not told which *saṅgha*, if it was a local *saṅgha*, has been made *samagga*. Such details may have been included in the missing portions of the Sāñcī and Sārnāth versions, but they do not occur in the Allāhābād version.

It would be interesting to know what interpretation a reader at Allāhābād would have put upon the edict. Since no place is mentioned, he would presumably have assumed that it referred either to the local saṅgha or to the Buddhist saṅgha as a whole, as appears to be the case when Aśoka refers to the saṅgha in the Calcutta-Bairāṭ inscription¹⁷). If it did refer to a schism in Pāṭaliputra, there is no way in which such a reader could have been aware of that fact.

The edict makes no mention of the way in which the *saṅgha* was made *samagga*, or by whom. Aśoka would surely have included "by me" if he had been responsible. We are not told whether the penalty announced for future schismatics had applied to the schism which was now settled, nor is there mention of the time when the schism occurred. It may have been very recent, or it may have happened years before.

The edict does not specify the person(s) responsible for enforcing the newly announced penalty. The covering letter at Sārnāth deals with the propagation of the edict, but not its implementation. We do not know by what authority such a penalty was fixed. It is more serious than the penalties for *saṅgha-bheda* laid down in the Vinaya-piṭaka, which perhaps means that those penalties had been fixed at some date before the time of Aśoka, and had proved to be inadequate, but there was no way in which the Vinaya-piṭaka could be changed. The edict therefore perhaps reflects a decision by some authority that the penalty should be increased. It seems unlikely that it was Aśoka's own decision. It is more likely that he was merely using his secretariat to have the information known more widely, more quickly. The covering letter says how the propagation is to take place. The edict is to be made known to the saṅghas of monks and nuns (presumably in the administrative areas of the mahāmāttas to whom the edict is addressed). A copy is to be kept by the ministers themselves, and another is to be given to the laymen. The ministers and the laymen are to listen (?) to the edict every *uposatha* day, and the ministers are to understand it,

which doubtless means understand its implications. I can see nothing in the edict to support Bechert's conclusion that the mahāmāttas and laymen are to go to the *uposatha* ceremony every *uposatha* day to control the observance of the edict by the monks. If Aśoka had really ordered a minister and (all?) the laymen throughout India, or at least in those areas to which the edict had been sent, to attend every *uposatha* ceremony to ensure that schismatics were expelled, then we should be forced to conclude that schism was widespread in the whole Buddhist Saṅgha, for no specific saṅgha is mentioned.

The absence of any reference in the edict to the person(s) responsible for the expulsions in the future suggests that it is for the saṅghas of monks and nuns, to whom a copy of the edict must be given, to carry out the expulsions themselves. The retention of a copy by the ministers, and the sending of a copy to the laymen, were doubtless "for information only", so that everyone would know the situation and would have full knowledge of the penalty to be imposed, if the civil authorities became involved in the enforcement of the penalty.

An interesting example of such an intervention can be seen in the Chinese translation of the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṅghikas¹⁸⁾, where in the chapter dealing with the seven *adhikarāṇa-samathas* (Taishō, Vol. 23, 328b) it is said that if a bhikṣu does not obey the orders of the Saṅgha, then members of the Saṅgha should tell him that, if he does not accept the Saṅgha's instructions, they will have to vote (*śalākā grah-*) and expel him from the Order. If he still does not obey their instructions, then an upāsaka or upāsakas should be sent to ask the bhikṣu why he does not follow the Saṅgha's instructions, and to inform him that if he does not follow them then the layman's way of life (*avadāta-vasana-dharma*?) will be imposed upon him, and he will be evicted from towns and cities (*nigama* and *nagara* or *grāma*?), i.e. made to live outside them¹⁹⁾.

Although the precise Sanskrit equivalents of these terms must remain

uncertain as long as we have only the Chinese translation of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, it seems quite possible that these two punishments are the parallels of the enforced wearing of white garments and the banishment to an *anāvāsa* which are specified in the Aśokan edict. It appears from the context that these penalties are not imposed by the Vinaya rules for any particular offence (not even for causing *bheda* in the Saṅgha), but are the final resort, to be enforced when the Saṅgha finds it impossible to make a bhikṣu obey their instructions, even after they have voted to evict him from the Order. The situation is therefore comparable with that described in the earliest form of the story in the Pāli chronicles, where Moggaliputta expelled the sectarians who had infiltrated the saṅgha but, as we surmised above, was perhaps unable to make the intruders leave the Asokārāmahavihāra and therefore had to have recourse to the civil authority.

In the later accounts of the matter, however, the Theravādins, presumably in an attempt to improve their standing vis-à-vis the other schools of Buddhism, increased the role which Aśoka had played in the settling of the schism, by saying that he personally had sent the minister to settle the matter, and had taken part in the identification and expulsion of the sectarians. The scope of the schism was widened, extending it all over India.

The edict suggests that after a schism (not necessarily the one mentioned in the Pāli chronicles) a more severe penalty than that laid down in the Vinaya-piṭaka was announced by Aśoka, not necessarily on his own authority. Aśoka made this known to the saṅgha, his ministers and the laymen. It seems possible that information about Aśoka's edict was subsequently taken to Ceylon together with the stories of the schisms and councils which had taken place in the early years of Buddhism. The earliest version of the story in the Dīpavaṃsa shows no knowledge of the wording of the edict, but the direct parallelism between the details of the schism in the later chronicles and

the wording of the edict suggests that some of the latter was actually incorporated into the chronicle story. The fact that Aśoka specified a penalty for schism was interpreted as meaning that he had personally enforced that penalty. The fact that his edict had been sent to at least three places, and probably more, was taken to indicate that the schism had been more widespread than at first reported.

That conflation has taken place in the story, as told in the Pāli chronicles, is shown by the fact that three originally quite separate events can be identified in it: there had been a schism; there had been a dispute over doctrine which had led to a Theravādin refutation, now incorporated in the Kathāvatthu; and the Theravādins had held their third *saṅgīti* at which their canon was recited. The third *saṅgīti* was not, in fact, connected in any way with the schism, but it is possible that it was held in the aftermath of the doctrinal dispute, when there was a need for the Theravādins to re-affirm their beliefs.

The “Schism” Edict proves nothing more than it says: that the *saṅgha* was made *samagga*, presumably after a schism, and those causing schism in the future were to be punished. There is no evidence that this schism was the one described in the chronicles, although it is possible that the details of the edict were the direct cause of the story in the chronicles that Aśoka played a part in settling the schism and personally punished the offenders. There is nothing whatsoever in the edict to suggest that Aśoka knew of the Third Council.

Notes.

- 1) Abbreviations: PED=Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary; CPD=Critical Pāli Dictionary; BE=Buddhist Era, i. e. after the death of the Buddha; SepE=Separate Edict. The abbreviations of the titles of Pali texts are those given in the Epilegomena to Vol. I of CPD.
- 2) *bhagavatā paññattaṃ samaggānaṃ uposathakammaṃ ti. kittāvatā nu kho sāmaggī hoti, yāvata ekāvāso udāhu sabbā paṭhavi ti. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave ettāvatā sāmaggī yāvata ekāvāso*, Vin I 105, 4-6.

- 3) We cannot tell whether the form would be *e* or *ye* in the Allāhābād version.
- 4) CPD (s. v.) defines *anāvāsa* as: “a place not fit for residence”. This presumably means “residence for a bhikkhu”, although it is clear that bhikkhus were sometimes found in an *anāvāsa*, e. g. *na...sabhikkhukā āvāsā vā anāvāsā vā abhikkhuko āvāso vā anāvāso vā gantabbo*, Vin II 32, 29–30 (*anāvāso nāma cetiyagharaṃ bodhigharaṃ sammajjani-attako dāru-attako pānīyamālo vacca-kuṭṭi dvāra-kotṭhako ti evam ādi*, Sp 1167, 8–10). Cf. *anāvāso ti navakammasālādiko yo koci padeso*, Sp 1066, 11–12. If *āvāsa* means *vihāra* (*āvāso ti vihāro vuccati*, Sp 613, 28 (ad Vin I 134, 26)), then presumably an *anāvāsa* is anywhere outside a *vihāra*. During the discussion which followed the reading of an earlier version of this paper at Kyoto University on 19 November 1986, Professor Yutaka Ojihara suggested that *anāvāsa* might mean “an uninhabitable place” as well as an “uninhabited place”.
- 5) The wearing of white clothes is a synonym for returning to the lay life, for such clothes signify a householder or layman. Cf. *gihidhajo...odātavathāni*, Sp 1159, 8. Although it is convenient to translate “having been made to wear white garments”, the absolutive is in fact active and is to be taken with an unexpressed instrumental “[by them], having made him wear...”.
- 6) Senart (1907, 28) suggested that *āvāsaiye* is the opt. pass. of *āvāsati*, but in view of *vāsāpetaviye* in the Sāñci version it is more likely to be a future passive participle. Woolner (1924, II s. v.) suggested that *āvāsaiye* was formed from *āvāsai-ati* on the analogy of *dekkh-iye* from *dekkh-ati*, but such a form based on the causative stem would seem to be very unusual.
- 7) It might be suggested that *sāsanaṃ* is the accusative of goal of motion, and we should translate “go to this ordinance”. I assume, however, that *sāsana* is the verbal ordinance, not the written form of it. Had Aśoka meant to say they were to go to the place where the proclamation was inscribed, then I think he would have said *yāvu etam eva lipiṃ*.
- 8) Where the verb *svās-* occurs elsewhere in the Aśokan inscriptions (in SepE II (see Hultzsch, 1925, Index s. vv.)) the strong grade is *svās-* with long *-ā-*. The optative *asvāseyu / asvāsevu* means “they may have confidence (in me)”, the noun *asvāsanāya* (in the sense of a dative infinitive) “to inspire confidence”, and the future passive participle *asvāsaniyā* “must be inspired with confidence”. It is possible that *visvāmsayitave* is an error for *visvāsayitave*, with *-am-* written for *-ā-*. If so, then the meaning is “to cause to trust” = “to cause to be trusted”. Woolner quotes “to make oneself familiar with” (suggested by Kern, T. Bloch and Vogel) and “to be inspired with confidence in” (following Venis 1907). The latter translation is followed by Hultzsch (1925, 163).

- 9) For the writing of words together in groups see Janert (1972, 25-57).
- 10) Cf. *savam*, the present participle of *savati*, at Ja III 244, 22* (ct. : = *sutvā*).
- 11) During the discussion mentioned in n. 4 above, Professor Ojihara suggested that *visvaṃsayitave* was a mistake for the causative of *visvan*. This would presumably give the meaning “cause to recite, cause to be recited”.
- 12) At Dip VII 36 *vagga* is opp. to *samagga*, according to the PED (s. v.). Oldenberg (1879, 157) translated *vagguṇosatha* correctly, and it is not clear why Law (1959, 183) departed from him and, by dividing the compound *vaggu* (<Skt *valgu*) + *ṇosatha* (instead of *vagga*+*ṇosatha*), translated “pleasant uposatha”, although this is highly inappropriate in the context.
- 13) Dip VII 53. It would appear that *bhikkhuno* is a genitive plural form (= *bhikkhūnam*). For genitive plural forms in -o, see Norman (1976, 124).
- 14) It would seem that the Theravādin tradition was not entirely certain about the date of the Third Council. As H. C. Norman pointed out (1908, 9), the Saddhamma-saṅgaha gives 228 BE as the date for the beginning of the trouble, and states that the *uposatha* was not celebrated for 6 years. It quotes the *porāṇa*, however, as saying that the Third Council was held 228 BE.
- 15) Causing schism is dealt with in the tenth *saṅghādisesa* rule. Anyone attempting to cause schism should be told to desist. If after three admonitions he still persists, then it is a breach of the rule. The penalty for this is laid down at Vin III 185, 37-38: *saṃgho va tassā āpattiyaṃ parivāsaṃ deti mūlāya paṭikkassati mānattaṃ deti abbheti*; “placing on probation, sending back to the beginning, inflicting the *mānatta* discipline, rehabilitation”. It appears that the Kosambī bhikkhus needed to be re-ordained (*bhedānuvattakā bhikkhūṇa upasampajjeyyūṃ*, Vin II 201, 1-2).
- 16) Can *saṃgha samage kaṭe* mean “The Order was made united (when it was founded)”?
- 17) Bechert raises the question of the meaning of the word *saṃgha*. In the Calcutta-Bairāṭ edict we find that Priyadasi greets the Saṃgha, and wishes it well. He goes on to say that it is known how great is his faith in the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Saṃgha. In these circumstances, I do not believe it likely that, when it occurs at the beginning of that edict, the word *saṃgha* refers only to the saṅgha at Bairāṭ. The edict was presumably sent to a number of places, and the address was to the *saṃgha* as a whole. As Schopen states (1984, 16), “Aśoka, in spite of the fact that there appears to have been some kind of internal problem within the Saṃgha, always speaks of it as “the Saṃgha”, and “the Bhikkhu-Saṃgha”.
- 18) My thanks are due to Professor Keisho Tsukamoto of Tohoku University for drawing my attention to this reference, to Mr S. Karashima for translating

the relevant passage for me and providing possible Sanskrit equivalents, and to Dr Mark Lewis of the University of Cambridge for help with the interpretation of various Chinese terms.

- 19) If this punishment is the equivalent of Aśoka's *anāvāsa*, then it suggests that the word means "an uninhabited place", rather than merely "outside the vihāra".

Bibliography

- | | | |
|---------------------|-------|---|
| Alsdorf, L. | 1959 | "Aśokas Schismen-Edikt und das dritte Konzil", <i>IJJ</i> III, 161-74. |
| Bareau, A. | 1955 | <i>Les Premiers Conciles Bouddhiques</i> , Paris. |
| Barua, B. M. | 1946 | <i>Asoka and his inscriptions</i> , 2 volumes, Calcutta. |
| Bechert, H. | 1961 | "Aśokas 'Schismenedikt' und der Begriff sangha-bheda", <i>WZKSO</i> V, 18-52. |
| | 1982 | "The importance of Aśoka's so-called Schism edict", <i>Indological and Buddhist Studies (in honour of Professor J. W. de Jong)</i> , Canberra, 61-68. |
| Bloch, J. | 1950 | <i>Les Inscriptions d'Asoka</i> , Paris. |
| Boyer, A. M. | 1907 | "L'inscription de Sārnāth et ses parallèles d'Allahābād et de Sānchi", <i>JA</i> (10) X, 119-42. |
| Bühler, G. | 1890 | "Texts of the Asoka edicts on the Delhi Mirat pillar and of the separate edicts on the Allahabad pillar", <i>IA</i> XIX, 122-26. |
| | 1894A | "Votive inscriptions from the Sānchi stūpas", <i>Ep. Ind.</i> II, 87-116. |
| | 1894B | "Further inscriptions from Sānchi", <i>Ep. Ind.</i> II, 366-408. |
| Cunningham, A. | 1854 | <i>Bhilsa Topes</i> , London (repr. Varanasi, 1966). |
| | 1877 | <i>Inscriptions of Asoka</i> , Calcutta. |
| Eggermont, P. H. L. | 1956 | <i>The chronology of the reign of Asoka Maurya</i> , Leiden. |
| Hultzsch, E. | 1911 | "The Sanchi edict of Asoka", <i>JRAS</i> , 167-69. |
| | 1912 | "The Rupnath and Sarnath edicts of Asoka", <i>JRAS</i> , 1053-59. |
| | 1925 | <i>Inscriptions of Asoka</i> , Oxford. |
| Irwin, J. | 1983 | "The true chronology of Aśokan pillars", <i>Artibus Asiae</i> XLIV, 4, 247-65. |
| Janert, K. L. | 1972 | <i>Abstände und Schlussvokalverzeichnungen in Aśoka-</i> |

- Inschriften*, Wiesbaden.
- Jayawickrama, N. A. 1959 "A reference to the Third Council in Asoka's Edicts?", *UCR* XVII, 61-72.
- Law, B. C. 1957-58 The Dipavamsa, Ceylon Historical Journal, VII, 1-266.
- Majumdar, N. G. 1939 "Inscription on the Aśoka pillar", in Marshall and Foucher, 1939, I, 283-87 (and plate CVII).
- Marshall, Sir John and Alfred Foucher 1939 *The monuments of Sāñchī*, 3 volumes, Calcutta.
- Monier-Williams, M. 1899 *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford.
- Norman, H. C. 1908 "Sinhalese Historical Documents and the Maurya Inscription of Sārnāth", *JASB* VIII (New Series), 7-10.
- Norman, K. R. 1976 "Pāli and the language of the heretics", *AO*, 37, 117-26.
- 1983 "Notes on the Ahraurā version of Aśoka's First Minor Rock Edict", *IJ* XXVI, 277-92.
- 1984 "Aśokan *silā-thambha-s* and *dhamma-thambha-s*", *Ācārya-vandanā (D. R. Bhandarkar Birthday Centenary Volume)*, Calcutta, 311-18.
- Oertel, F. O. 1908 "Excavations at Sārnāth", *ASI Annual Report 1904-5*, 59-104.
- Oldenberg, H. 1879 *The Dipavamsa*, London.
- Prinsep, J. 1838 "Translation of inscriptions in the Society's museum", *JASB* VII (Old series), 557-67 (and plate XXIII).
- Schopen, G. 1984 "Two problems in the history of Indian Buddhism", *StII*, 10, 1-39.
- Senart, É. 1881 *Les inscriptions de Piyadasi*, Vol. I, Paris.
- 1886 *Les inscriptions de Piyadasi*, Vol. II, Paris.
- 1889 "The inscriptions of Piyadasi", *IA* XVIII, 300-9.
- 1907 "Une nouvelle inscription d'Aśoka", *Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, Paris, 25-36.
- Smith, V. S. 1924 *Early History of India*, 4th ed., Oxford.
- Thomas, F. W. 1915 "Notes on the edicts of Asoka", *JRAS*, 97-112.
- Turner, R. L. 1966 *Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London.
- Venis, A. 1907 "Some notes on the Maurya Inscription at

- Sarnath", *JASB* (New Series), III, 1-7.
- Vogel, J. Ph. 1905-6 "Epigraphical discoveries at Sarnath", *Ep. Ind.* VIII, 166-79.
- Woolner, A. C. 1924 *Asoka Text and Glossary*, 2 parts, Calcutta.

Appendix : Aśoka's "Schism" Edict.

I. *Allāhābād*

1. [devānam]piye ānapayati kosaṃbiyaṃ mahāmātā
2.(sa)ma(ge ka)ṭe sa(m)gh(a)si no l(a)hiye
3.(saṃghaṃ bhā)khati bhikh(u) v(ā) bhikh(u)ni vā (se pi) cā
4. [o]dāt(ā)ni dusāni (sa)naṃdhāpayitu a(nāvā)sas(i ā)v(ā)saiy(e)

II. *Sāñci*

1.
2. ... (y)ā bhe(ta)...(gh)e...mage kaṭe
3. [bhi]khūna(m) ca bhi(khun)inaṃ c(ā) ti (p)utapa
4. [po]tike caṃ(da)m(asū)ri(yi)ke ye saṃghaṃ
5. bh(ā)khati bhikhu vā bhikhuni vā odātā
6. ni dus(ān)i sanaṃ(dhāpay)itu anā(vā)
7. sasi vā(sā)petaviy(e) ichā hi me kiṃ
8. ti saṃghe samage cilathitike siyā ti

III. *Sārṇāth*

1. devā.....
2. el
3. pāṭa..... ye-kena-pi saṃghe-bhetave-e-cuṃ-kho
4. (bhikh)ū-(vā-bhikh)uni-vā saṃghaṃ-bh(ākha)t(i) s(e)-odātāni-dus(ān)i
(sa)ṃnaṃdhāpayiyā-ānāvāsasi
5. āvāsaiye hevaṃ-iyam-sāsane bhikhusaṃghasi-ca bhikhunisamghasi-ca
viṃnapayitaviye
6. hevaṃ-devānaṃpiye-āhā hedisā-ca-ikā-lipi tuphākamtikaṃ-huvāti
saṃsalanasi-nikhitā
7. ikaṃ-ca-lipiṃ-hedisam=eva upāsakānaṃtikaṃ-nikhipātha te-pi-ca-upāsakā
anuposathaṃ-yāvu
8. etam=eva-sāsanaṃ visvaṃsayitave anuposathaṃ-ca-dhuvāye ikike-mahā-
māte-posathāye
9. yāti etam=eva-sāsanaṃ visvaṃsayitave ājānitave-ca āvatake-ca-tuphākam-

āhāle

- 10. savata-vivāsayātha-tuphe etena-viyamjanena hem-eva-savesu-koṭavisavesu etena
- 11. viyamjanena vivāsāpayātha

Alsdorf's emendations: (<<.....>>)

KRN's emendations: = ([.....])

I. *Allāhābād*

- 2. <vataviyā saṃghe>
- 3. <bhede ye>

II. *Sāñci*

- 0. [devānampiye ānapayati] <Vidisāyaṃ
- 1. mahāmātā vataviyā saṃghe na kenapi
- 2. lahi>yā bheta<ve saṃ>ghe <sa>mage kaṭe

III. *Sārāth*

- 1. devā[nampiye ānapayati]
- 2. ela
- 3. Pāṭa<liputasi mahāmātā vataviyā na lahi>ye kenapi saṃghe bhetave e cuṃ kho
- (or) Pāṭa[liputasi saṃghe samage kaṭe na lahi]ye.....

(本稿は、昭和61年11月19日京大会館において行われたパーリ学仏教文化学会、大谷大学仏教会、仏教大学学会、京都大学インド・仏教会共催による公開講演会のペーパーを先生に加筆して頂いたものである。編集部記)