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Abstract

Buddhist monastic law usually divides infractions of precepts into either five or seven groups—the most serious offence of which is known as a pārājika. These are offences of non-celibacy, murder, theft and lying about spiritual attainments. It is generally accepted in the West, where the focus lies on Mainstream or Theravāda Buddhism, that these offences entail permanent expulsion from the monastic order.

The present thesis sets out to show that not only do pārājika offences not necessarily entail expulsion, but a monk or nun who transgresses against a pārājika dharma may in fact remain within the saṃgha if his/her transgression was not concealed and if he/she was truly repentant. This procedure is known as pārājika penance.

Evidence for this is provided by means of a systematic survey of texts ascribed to five Vinaya traditions, viz. Mahāśāsaka, Sarvāstivāda, Mahāsāṃghika, Dharmaguptaka and Mūlasarvāstivāda. The Vinaya of each of these traditions has been examined and the results produced here in order to shed light on their respective stance with regard to pārājika penance.
Technical note

The present thesis was written on a Macintosh Performa with Nisus Writer. The diacritics of transliterated Sanskrit, Tibetan and Pāli (as well as those for French and German) have been reproduced with the Norman font. The reproduction of Chinese texts has been at times problematic due to the fact that all of the necessary characters do not appear in a single font or font set. In most cases I have used Japanese input methods (and fonts) to reproduce the texts as the Japanese language kit/OS is far more efficient and user-friendly than the Chinese language kit. Although the JIS 1 and 2 font sets have only 6349 characters, an additional 5801 characters are to be found in the JIS X character set. A high degree of overlap is to be found in the Chinese language kit font set which offers 13501 characters (or so I believe). This, however, is nowhere near enough as the character one needs will always be the one they decided not to add to any font set (Murphy’s Law). In addition, the IRIZ (International Research Institute for Zen Buddhism) Gaiji Set offers some 700 characters—a number of which have been from time to time utilized. When, however, all else has failed I have resorted to using Enfour’s Gaiji Edit Kit & Designer (those who have used this software will realise why I use the term ‘resorted’). This software has enabled me to create the following characters which do not seem to appear in any of the above font sets:-prefixes followed by various suffixes. As there is no Taishō font as such—none that maps on to the characters exactly, that is—I have used characters predominantly from the JIS character sets even though they sometimes differ slightly from the Taishō form, e.g., I have used 德 in place of the form encountered in the Taishō 徳. This has also been done to a certain extent for aesthetic reasons; I have tried not to mix JIS fonts with Chinese language fonts as the forms are somewhat different again. In short, I have only gone to the trouble of generating characters/fonts where no readily recognizable form of that character exists in the limited number of fonts available to me.
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Chapter One
Introduction

Buddhist monastic life is regulated, at least in theory, by the Vinaya. In practice, however, it would appear that the Vinaya does not regulate every aspect of monastic life. Gregory Schopen's work on the Vinaya, for example, has highlighted the lack of regulations in the Theravādin Vinaya\(^1\) governing the behaviour of monks and nuns in regard to stūpas.\(^2\) Furthermore, by the term Vinaya we must understand that there is no one Vinaya. Indeed, each school had its own Vinaya and although these Vinayas each claim to be Buddhavacana\(^3\) or 'the word of the Buddha' they are perhaps as diverse as they are complex. Notwithstanding this diversity, the codes of practice for followers of the monastic life seem to be, at least in terms of their purport, of one voice.

This voice regulates nearly every aspect of monastic life—from minor breaches of monastic etiquette such as covering up curries and sauces with rice in one's alms bowl with the intention of procuring more condiments,\(^4\) to

---

\(^1\) Throughout the present work I have italicized ‘Vinaya’ when I am referring to a specific text; in this case, the Theravādin Vinaya. Where I have not italicized this term it is to be taken as a generic term referring to the collections of literature of various traditions within Buddhism that deal with monastic discipline. Similarly, other words such as prātimokṣa and vibhaṅga, etc., have also been italicized when they have been used following the name of a particular tradition to refer to specific texts as opposed to generic terms.


\(^3\) On interpretations of this term, see _inter alia_, Steven Collins, "On the very idea of the Pali canon," _JPTS_ , vol. 15, pp. 93-94.

\(^4\) _Theravādin sekhiya_, no. 36.
slightly more serious offences which entail expiation such as the upholstering of chairs with cotton\(^5\) or making threatening gestures to other monks,\(^6\) to serious offences which entail a formal meeting of the saṅgha such as lustfully holding the hand of a woman,\(^7\) and the most serious of all offences—offences such as murder\(^8\)—which are usually said to entail expulsion from the monastic order. The number of rules governing monastic life differs between the various traditions, ranging from as few\(^9\) as 218 in the Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣu prātimokṣa and 290 in the corresponding Bhikṣunī prātimokṣa to as many as 263 in the Sarvāstivādin Bhikṣu prātimokṣa and 380 in the Mahīśāsaka Bhikṣunī prātimokṣa.\(^{10}\) Not all of the rules recited as the prātimokṣa, however, are strictly speaking precepts to be upheld by individual monks or nuns.

The prātimokṣa recitation consists of eight categories of rules for monks and seven for nuns. These categories consist of pārājika, saṃghāvaśeṣa, aniyata,\(^{11}\) niḥsargika pācattika, pācattika, pratideśanika, śaikṣā and adhikaraṇaśamatha.\(^{12}\) These should not all be viewed as precepts as some are

---

\(^{5}\) Theravādin bhikkhu pācittiya, no. 88; bhikkhunī pācittiya, no. 164.

\(^{6}\) Theravādin bhikkhu pācittiya, no. 75. Cf. Theravādin bhikkhunī pācittiya, no. 153.

\(^{7}\) Theravādin bhikkhu saṃghādisesa, no. 2.

\(^{8}\) Theravādin pārājika, no. 3.

\(^{9}\) The Upāli pariprccā sūtra (Taishō (T.) 1466) only contains 215 rules (Hirakawa Akira, Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns (MDBN), 1982, p. 39; Hirakawa Akira, Ritsuö no kenkyū 亀澤の研究 (RK), 1960, p. 434).


\(^{11}\) The aniyata rules do not exist for nuns.

\(^{12}\) Note that many of these terms have multiple forms even in Sanskrit. Pācattika, for example, is found in Sanskrit as, \textit{inter alia}, pátayantika, pāyattika, and pācittiya in Pāli.
merely rules governing procedural matters for the Order such as the *aniyata*.

*Aniyata* are undetermined offences of which there are two. These are basically provisions under which the *samgha* may use the testimony of a lay female devotee eyewitness to bring charges of a *pārājika*, *samghāvaśeṣa* or *pācattika* against a *bhikṣu* under the conditions of the first *aniyata*, viz. if a *bhikṣu* is seen sitting together with a woman in a place convenient for sexual intercourse and the lay devotee makes accusations against him of one of these three types of offences, and he acknowledges that he was indeed sitting there. Similarly, the second *aniyata* relates to sitting down together with a woman in a place convenient for lewd talk. In this case the *bhikṣu* is only liable to charges of *samghāvaśeṣa* or *pācattika* depending on the testimony of the lay female devotee. Thus, these are not preceptual rules *per se*; they are rules for the *samgha* as opposed to those for the individual members who comprise the *samgha*.

Similarly, the *adhikaraṇaśamatha* which are common to both the *bhikṣu* and *bhikṣunī* *samghas* are rules for settling disputes within the Orders. Thus, if we exclude these rules from the present discussion of precepts, we find ourselves left with six classes of precepts, viz. *pārājika*, *samghāvaśeṣa*, *niḥsargika* *pācattika*, *pācattika*, *pratideśanika* and *śaikṣā*. It is these five classes of precepts that constitute the individual precepts for members of the two *samghas*, viz. *bhikṣu* and *bhikṣunī*. Although the Vinaya traditions thus categorize precepts into five categories, preceptual infractions are usually divided into either five or seven classes.

*Pārājika*, *samghāvaśeṣa* and *pratideśanika* precepts are relatively straightforward in that violation of them entails either a *pārājika*, *samghāvaśeṣa* or *pratideśanika* offence. It is the other precepts in which confusion is more often found. The violation of *niḥsargika* *pācattika* and *pācattika* precepts
both entail pācattika offences or "offences of expiation,"\(^{13}\) the only difference being that nihsargika pācattikas also involve forfeiture. In contrast to the aforementioned five preceptual classes, śaiksā—or sekhiyā dhammā as they are known in Pāli—entail a duṣkṛta (Pāli dukkata) offence. The above six preceptual classes thus correlate to five classes of offences.

These five classes are known in Pāli as pañca āpatti "five offences" or pañca āpattikkhandhā "five classes of offences" and are listed as pārājika, samghādisesa, pācittiya, pāṭidesanīya and dukkata.\(^{14}\) Likewise, in Chinese they are collectively referred to as wupian 五篇 "the five sections," and individually as boluoyi 波羅夷, sengqieposhisha 僧伽婆尸沙, boyiti 波逸提, boluotitisheni 波羅提提舍尼 and tujiluo 突吉羅.\(^{15}\)

There are two other main classes of offences which, when added to the above five, comprise the seven classes of offences known in Pāli as satta āpatti "seven offences" or satta āpattikkhandhā "seven classes of offences."\(^{16}\) They are known in Chinese as qiju 七聚 "the seven collections."\(^{17}\) The two classes of offences which are added are sthūlātyaya (Pāli thullaccaya), Chinese toulanzhe 偌蘭遮 and durbhāṣita (Pāli duabhāṣita), Chinese eshuo 惡說 "wrong speech."\(^{18}\)

---


\(^{15}\) Here, for reasons of convenience, the terminology I have given for these five is that as found in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya (T. 1428, p. 1004c8-9 ff). A detailed discussion of the differences in Vinaya terminology between different nikāyas is not germane to the present study and has accordingly not been undertaken here.

\(^{16}\) *VP*, vol. 5, p. 91, lines 22-24: tattha katamā satta āpattiyo. pārājikāpatti samghādisesāpatti thullaccayāpatti pācittiyāpatti pāṭidesanīyāpatti dukkaṭāpatti dukbhāṣitāpatti, imā satta āpattiyo.
The first of these two offences is rather obscure. Horner translates Pāli thullaccaya as “grave offence.” It would appear that intention plays an important part in this offence. There is, for instance, the story in the Theravādin Vinaya about a monk who unknowingly brought back poison in his alms food. When he gave this to the other monks to try they all died. As he was unaware of the poison there was no offence. Another monk, however, knowingly gave poison to another in order to test it. This resulted in a sthūlātaya or grave offence. Presumably, if the monk had deliberately murdered another monk it would have been a pārajika. However, as the monk’s intention was only to test the poison it was not deemed to be a pārajika. Similarly, if a monk approaches a boat with the intention of stealing it he commits an offence of wrong doing (duṣkṛta); in loosening the moorings it is also a duṣkṛta; if he moves the boat in the slightest, it is a grave offence (sthūlātaya); if he moves the boat across the river he commits a pārajika.

Offences of the second kind, durbhāṣita (Pāli dubbhāsita) or offences

17 It appears that although not all the traditions preserved in Chinese translations strictly classify offences into seven categories, these seven categories appear to be, at least in practice, common to the five major traditions extant in the Chinese literature (Hirakawa Akira, Hirakawa Akira chosakushū 平川彰著作集 (HC), vol. 14, p. 117, notes that although the Mahāsāṃghika and Sarvāstivādin traditions strictly classify offences into only five categories the other two categories are mentioned in these Vinayas). It should be noted that there is a degree of variation in the terminology used in the different Chinese recensions.

18 Again, for reasons of convenience, I have given Dharmaguptaka Chinese terms (T. 1428, p. 599c25-27). For a stimulating discussion on these two terms, see Vinaya Texts, Sacred Books of the East (SBE), vol. 13, pp. xxv-xxvi.

19 Horner, BD, vol. 6, p. 133, passim.


21 See BD, vol. 1, p. 81; VP, vol. 3, p. 49. These offences are exceedingly interesting; there seem to be cases of monks deliberately causing the death of others in which their actions only entail grave offences and not pārajikas (see the stories about the monks of Āḷavī who deliberately dropped bricks on others’ heads with the intention of killing them!).
of wrong speech seem to be much rarer and much less serious than sthūlātyaya
offences. It appears that if a monk maliciously insults another by, for example,
calling him a refuse-scavenger or referring to him as a member of other
despised classes then he incurs an offence of wrong doing (duṣkṛta). If,
however, without any intention of shaming the other party he jokingly refers
to one as such it is only an offence of wrong speech (durbhāṣita). Thus,
these two offences sthūlātyaya and durbhāṣita seem to be offences with which
one can be charged when one’s actions are not tantamount to a prescribed
Vinaya offence, but are nevertheless in violation of the essence of a specific
precept.

Although precepts may vary within the different Vinaya traditions in
terms of the number of precepts, the order in which they appear and phraseology,
throughout this diverse body of literature the one thing that remains absolute
and unchallenged is the position of the pārājikas as the gravest of all offences.

As the gravity of the offence may suggest, pārājikas entail the most
severe of punishments. The punishment for a pārājika is one of
excommunication from the monastic order (asaṁvāsa). An excommunicated

---


25 Mircea Eliade et al. eds., The Encyclopedia of Religion, 1987, s.v., defines
‘excommunicate’ as “to cut off from communion” or “to exclude from fellowship in a
community.” I am using the term here and throughout in a similar sense and not in any
specific Christian sense. I would, however, define it more as an exclusion from participation
in communal activities, affairs and the privileges or benefits thereof. As the interpretation
of asaṁvāsa varies among the different traditions it is difficult to come up with one term
which encompasses this divergence.

26 It is often assumed that one is expelled for committing a pārājika. Although in
practice this may be true, the wording of the pārājikas suggests a translation more in line
with excommunication. For a more detailed discussion of this, see chapter two.
bhikṣu forfeits the rights of association (saṃvāsa) normally granted to other members of the saṃgha. To all intents and purposes he may be deemed to be expelled.

There is, however, one very important yet often overlooked exception to this rule. In all of the Vinayas except the Theravādin, there exist provisions which may be invoked under special circumstances which allow a bhikṣu who has committed a pārājika offence to remain within the saṃgha without being excommunicated. The bhikṣu is granted “pārājika penance” and is thereinafter referred to as a śikṣādattaka or “one who has been granted the training.” Although the śikṣādattaka forfeits many of the privileges he previously enjoyed as a bhikṣu, he is neither expelled nor excommunicated and is allowed to continue to receive many of the benefits offered to general members of the saṃgha. The details of this provision, however, vary between the different Vinaya traditions.

Much of Western Buddhological literature has tended to overlook the existence of these provisions and seems to insist that either the term pārājika means an offence for which one is to be expelled or that the violation of a pārājika leads to permanent and irrevocable expulsion. This train of thought, however, is simply on the wrong track. Nevertheless, as a train of thought that traces its origin back for more than a century it has proved very difficult to derail.\(^\text{27}\)

Robert Cæsar Childers’ monumental and pioneering Pāli dictionary of 1875 defines pārājika as “meriting expulsion” and goes on to state that “pārājikā dhammā” are “sins involving expulsion from the priesthood.”\(^\text{28}\) T. W. Rhys

\(^\text{27}\) The following is a brief but by no means authoritative survey of the literature surrounding what I call “the myth of permanent and irrevocable expulsion,” pārājika confession, pārājika penance and the śikṣādattaka.
Davids and William Stede’s *Pali-English Dictionary*, published between the years 1921-25, renders the term *pārājika* along similar lines: “One who has committed a grave transgression of the rules for bhikkhus; one who merits expulsion.”  

Edward J. Thomas, in 1933, stated that the violation of any of the *pārājika* rules results in “permanent expulsion.”  

In 1938, I. B. Horner in her introduction to the first volume of *The Book of the Discipline* stated, “It is beyond all doubt that the punishment for breach of the Pārājika rules indeed involves expulsion.”  

Such statements, however, are by no means unique to scholars of the Theravādin tradition. In 1937 William Edward Soothill and Lewis Hodous, in their dictionary of Chinese Buddhist terms, defined *pārājika* as, “...rules of expulsion from the order, for unpardonable sin,” and within a definition of *wupian* as, “sins demanding expulsion from the order....”  

In 1975, Charles Prebish stated that violation of “any one of the pārājika dharmas results in permanent expulsion from the samgha.”  

Nearly a decade later, in 1984, Chatsumarn Kabilsingh gave the following comments on the impetus surrounding the formation of the *pārājika* rules: “The *Pārājikas* were formed to govern those offences, the most serious of all, which involve ‘defeat’ and whose penalty is expulsion from the Order.”  

---


31 *BD*, vol. 1, p. xxvii.


33 Ibid., p. 440a, s.v. *pian* 範.

34 Charles Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, p. 11.
noted that “a transgression of any of the first four rules leads to the irrevocable expulsion from the order. This is why these rules are called pārājika ‘relating to expulsion.’” In 1996, Karma Lekshe Tsomo described pārājika dharmas as “…transgressions requiring dismissal from the monastic life.”

More recently, in 1997, Ann Heirman remarked that “a pārājika is an offense that leads to a permanent, lifetime exclusion from the order.” Similarly, in the same journal Ute Hüsken stated that, “The transgression of one of the pārājika rules leads to the monk’s or nun’s permanent and irreversible loss of status as a fully ordained member of the order.” Furthermore, in 1998 Bernard Faure wrote on the “four cases leading to pārājika, ‘defeat,’ that is, expulsion from the community….”

There are, however, a number of scholars who appear to be cognisant of the fact that pārājikas do not necessarily entail permanent and irrevocable expulsion from the Buddhist Order. Sylvain Lévi was perhaps one of the first European scholars to comment on the śikṣādattaka in his translation of the Mahāyāna-sūtrālankāra. Soon after Léon Weiger translated a passage in his Bouddhisme chinois which deals with a bhikṣu who has not concealed his

35 Chatsumarn Kabilsingh, A Comparative Study of Bhikkhuni Pātimokkhā, p. 51.


37 Karma Lekshe Tsomo, Sisters in Solitude, p. 5.


40 Sylvain Lévi, Mahāyāna-sūtrālankāra, ed. and transl., Bibliothèque de l’École des Hautes Études, vols. 159 and 190 (1907 and 1911), pp. 54-55 and pp. 100-102 respectively.
offence and is accordingly granted pārājika penance. Louis de La Vallée Poussin mentions the śikṣādattaka in his monumental work L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu. Franklin Edgerton in his dictionary of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit has a short entry devoted to the śikṣādattaka. E. Frauwallner, in his work on the earliest Vinaya makes passing mention of a passage which contains regulations concerning the fate of a bhikṣu who does not want to leave the Order although he has committed a pārājika. More recently, Gregory Schopen has devoted nearly a whole page to the śikṣādattaka in an article in a Festschrift in honour of Yuyama Akira 湯山明. This one page is, perhaps, the most detailed and full account of the śikṣādattaka yet to be published in English.

In contrast to Western scholarship, in China and Japan the existence of the śikṣādattaka seems to be accepted as commonplace. In Japan, it is mentioned by, amongst others, Tsuchihashi Shūkō 土橋秀高, Satō Tatsugen


43 Franklin Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary (BHSD), s.v. śikṣādattaka. Edgerton, however, lists it as masculine and thus fails to recognize the fact that this term also has a feminine counterpart.

44 Erich Frauwallner, The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature, p. 205.


46 See, inter alia, Oda Tokunō's Bukkyō daijiten 佛教大辞典 (OBD), s.v. gakke 學悔; Wogihara Unrai's Bonwa daijiten 梵和大辞典 (BWD), s.v. śikṣā-dattaka; Nakamura Hajime's Bukkyōgo daijiten 佛教語大辞典 (NBD), s.v. yogaku shami 般學沙彌; Sakaki Ryōzaburō ed., Mahāvyutpatti, entry no. 8723.

佐藤達玄, Yamagiwa Nobuyuki 山極伸之 and Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木関. In Taiwan, Shi Shengyan 釋聖嚴 in his work on Vinaya precepts entitled *Jieliuxue gangyao* 戒律學綱要 has briefly explained the concept. Furthermore, there are a couple of paragraphs in French by Kuo Li-ying on the topic of confession of pārājika offences.

Hirakawa Akira 平川彰, however, has dealt with the subject in a number of his works and although he dedicates only a couple of pages to it, this is perhaps the fullest treatment of the topic in any modern language. Hirakawa’s work on this topic, and the rest of the Vinaya for that matter, is considered to be authoritative and is usually taken without question. In short, Hirakawa states that a bhikṣu who has committed a pārājika without concealing the matter, may be granted a special penance and although he is demoted to the status of a novice he is, nevertheless, not expelled. Hirakawa points out that this special provision is only available to bhikṣus who have violated the first pārājika and that no such provisions are made for bhikṣunīs.

Accordingly, in light of the apparent lack of any in-depth study of...
parājika confession, penance and the resulting status of śikṣādattaka, I, on advice from Gregory Schopen and Paul Harrison, decided to undertake such a study. My aim is simple and my focus narrow. Firstly, through a detailed study of the textual evidence, I will attempt to bring to the foreground the role of the śikṣādattaka which has been sorely overlooked in much of Western Buddhology. Secondly, I will re-examine Hirakawa’s theories that the path of the śikṣādattaka is only open to bhikṣus and that it is only applicable in the event of a transgression against the first parājika, viz. abrahmacarya, by offering evidence in support of the existence of the śikṣādattā śramaṇeri, in addition to evidence suggesting that the special provision of parājika penance may also be invoked in cases involving violations of other parājika offences.

As far as methodology is concerned I will primarily be focusing on Chinese Vinaya materials as these are the most abundant, extensive and accessible materials available to us at the present time. My methodology is one of simple textual exegesis. I will systematically survey the literature of the five schools, viz. Mahiśasaka, Sarvāstivāda, Mahāsāṃghika, Dharmaguptaka, and Mūlasarvāstivāda as preserved in their respective Chinese translations. Furthermore, where Sanskrit, Pāli or Tibetan materials are available, these too will be investigated where practicable. It is the nature, however, of such a study that all available materials could not be consulted. Although I have had to be selective in my choice of materials I have taken pains to ensure that this has not affected my objectivity or impartiality.

In chapter two I deal with definitions of parājika and asaṃvāsa. Most

54 HC, vol. 14, p. 129: 波羅夷罪は教団追放の罪であり、永久に復帰が許されないのであるが、しかし姓戒にのみ特例がある。“Parājika offences are offences entailing expulsion from the Order [from which] re-admission is permanently disallowed. However, there is an exception only in the case of the precept on sexual intercourse.” Also, p. 131: しかし波羅夷戒は、比丘のみに許されているのであり、比丘尼律には存在しない。“However, parājika penance is only permitted to bhikṣus and does not exist in bhikṣuni Vinayas.”
of these definitions come from the respective Vibhaṅgas of the various Vinayas. It is my belief that any such study must define its terms correctly and furthermore define them in context. Thus, dictionary definitions are not appropriate. The only acceptable definition of, for example, the Mūlasarvāstivādin interpretation of the term pārajika is that found in the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vibhaṅga.

In chapters three to seven I have looked at the Vinaya texts of each of the five schools as preserved in Chinese and presented translations of various texts dealing with the ideas of pārajika penance and the śikṣādattaka. I have allocated a chapter to each school. The order in which I present these chapters bears no relation to any historical or chronological order and is chosen purely for stylistic purposes. In the final chapter I have presented my conclusions.

Text Editing Conventions

I have usually made little attempt to edit the text except in that I have freely repunctuated. Where I would suggest a particular variant should be adopted I have noted this in the footnotes to the texts by accepting the variant in place of the reading adopted in the Taishō edition. The general sigla I have adopted in the footnotes are as follows:
G: 宮内省圖書寮本(舊宋本) "Old Song" edition (1104-1148) belonging to the Library of the Japanese Imperial Household.
K: 高麗本 Korean edition (1151) (K for "Korean" and not G for gao 高 to avoid confusion with the "Old Song" edition (G)).
M: 明本 Ming edition (1601).
N: 正倉院聖語藏本 Tempyō mss. (729-) and the Chinese mss. of the Sui (581-617) and Tang (618-907) Dynasties belonging to the Imperial Treasure House Shōsōin in Nara, collectively called the Shōgozō (N for "Nara" and not S for sheng 聖 (siglum used in the Taishō) to avoid confusion with the Song edition).
N²: Another copy of "N." Cf. the Taishō's own sigla.
S: 宋本 Song edition (1239).
Y: 元本 Yuan edition (1290).

Sigla relating to manuscripts not mentioned above are given at the beginning of the text in question. With the exceptions of K and N above, the first characters in each case (宮, 元, etc.) are those which appear in the Taishō's own apparatus. Although it is impossible to tell for certain exactly what witness texts were collated in the compilation of the Taishō edition, the above editions and any others mentioned in the notes to a specific text can be assumed to have been used from their appearance or nonappearance in the Taishō's own apparatus; all that is except for K, which I am assuming is the base text for the Taishō. One should not assume that all witness texts mentioned in a certain fascicle of the Taishō have been utilized by the redactors of the Taishō for all fascicles of that text. I am, perhaps uncritically, assuming that the apparatus of the Taishō is correct.

Translation Conventions

Square brackets [ ] have been used to signify words which do not actually appear in the original. Sometimes, especially when translating from Chinese, the exact meaning may be obscure, elusive or just difficult to express in English. In these situations, where Sanskrit terms are available I have endeavoured to present them; where this was not possible I offer Pāli equivalents where available and practicable. The translations offered are, except where otherwise noted, mine.

Transliteration Conventions

Chinese terms are transliterated according to the Pinyin conventions except where Wade-Giles or other systems are used in quotations. Japanese is
transliterated according to the modified Hepburn system of romanization as found in Kenkyūsha’s *New Japanese-English Dictionary* (4th edition) except where quoted works employ a different system (e.g., Wogihara instead of Ogihara). Sanskrit and Pāli are romanized according to the present standard followed by Indologists and Buddhologists alike, which has become so entrenched that nobody seems to remember what it is called. Finally, Tibetan terms follow the Wylie system of transliteration. Japanese and Chinese names have been presented in the traditional manner, viz. surname first.

In the chapters below the following abbreviations have been employed:55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AKB</td>
<td>Vasubandhu’s <em>Abhidharmakośabhaṣya</em> as translated by Pruden from de La Vallée Poussin’s <em>L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCSD</td>
<td>Hirakawa’s <em>Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>Horner’s <em>The Book of the Discipline</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSD</td>
<td>Edgerton’s <em>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKDJ</td>
<td>Ono’s <em>Bussho kaisetsu daijiten</em> 佛書解説大辭典</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPSS</td>
<td>Chatsumarn Kabilsingh’s <em>The Bhikkhuni Pātimokkha of the Six Schools</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV</td>
<td>Roth’s <em>Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya: Manual of Discipline for Buddhist Nuns</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWD</td>
<td>Wogihara’s <em>Bon-wa daijiten</em> 梵和大辭典</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBKK</td>
<td>Satō Tatsugen’s <em>Chūgoku Bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū</em> 中国仏教における戒律の研</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Bapat and Hirakawa’s English translation of the Chinese <em>Samantapāsādikā</em> (T. 1462)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55 This is only a list of common abbreviations. Others are given throughout the text. For full bibliographical details, see pp. 260-277.
Although the outward appearance of this thesis is, hopefully, that of a thesis, it appears to have somehow taken the form of an entry level course on translating Buddhist texts. I have sometimes chosen to translate and present texts not because they are vital to my thesis, but simply because they proved to be particularly difficult and/or interesting. The reasoning behind this is that I hope my examiners will have the time and patience to carefully read, check and comment on many if not all of my translations. Nevertheless, I do hope that deep in the recesses of this jungle of translation something slightly resembling a thesis may come to light.
The limitations of the present study are great. It is a study of very narrow focus looking at one particular phenomenon in early Indian monastic Buddhism undertaken by a student linguistically and doctrinally ill-equipped in his first year of Vinaya studies. It is my belief, however, that the present study has been of immense value in terms of my own linguistic training if nothing else. It is a springboard from which I hope to leap into deeper waters—when I learn to swim that is.
Despite von Hinüber’s assertion that “...the name given to the first group of offenses is easily understood...”¹ the derivation of the term pārājika has proved to be a major challenge for Buddhologists. Burnouf derived the term from parā + vaj and takes it to mean “to expel.”² Lévi, on the other hand, suggested that it may be derived from Sanskrit parānic- “not returning, gone, departed”³ (*pārācika < parāc < parānic + ika) and uses Ardha-Māgadhī pāraṇciya in support of his theory.⁴ Indeed, this sounds plausible in light of the fact that, as S. B. Deo tells us in his History of Jaina Monachism, the Jains referred to their most serious preceptual infraction as pāraṇciya.⁵

Horner, who follows Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, suggests that it is best understood as deriving from parā + vji and offers “involving or suffering defeat” as an appropriate translation.⁶ This is based partly on Buddhaghosa’s


³ See M. Monier-Williams, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s.v. parānic.


Vinaya commentary, the *Samantapāsādikā*, in which we find the following glosses:  

\[ pārājiko ti parājitoparājayaṃ āpanno \]

*Pārājika* means defeated, fallen into defeat.

The term *pārājika* is the same in phonetic form in both Sanskrit and Pāli. This in itself suggests that it may well be a very old term which was used within the religious milieu of ancient India. Indeed, the degree of confusion as to its etymology suggests that its usage may have been established and its original derivation forgotten prior to the advent of Buddhism. An insight into this problem may perhaps be gleaned from early Chinese renderings of this term.

The term is usually phonetically transcribed in Chinese as *boluo̍yī* with notable exceptions being the *Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya*, which uses *boluoshi̍jia* and *Binaye* 鼻奈耶 (T. 1464), translated in 383 C.E.\(^8\) by the śramaṇa Zhu Fonian\(^9\) 竪佛念 (fl. ca. 365-416 C.E.),\(^12\) in which the logographs 波羅移\(^13\) (*boluo̍yī*) are used in the transcription.\(^14\) The very

---

\(^7\) *Samantapāsādikā*, PTS, vol. 1, p. 259, line 17.

\(^8\) It should be noted that the transliterations given are modern Pinyin transcriptions. These do not represent the pronunciation of Tang dynasty Chang’an. Modern Pinyin *bōluóyì* 波羅夷 would be, according to Karlsgren’s reconstructions, *pǔlăi* in “Ancient Chinese.” For a detailed discussion on the phonology of pre-modern Chinese, see *inter alia*, Bernhard Karlsgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Cf. also E. G. Pulleyblank, *Middle Chinese: A Study in Historical Phonology*. Cf. Tōdō Akiyasu 藤堂明保 ed., *Kan-wa daijiten* 漢和大字典.

\(^9\) Also note *boluo̍jiduo* 波羅絨多 in T. 2130, p. 1004a10, note 3. On the authorship of this work, see *BKDJ*, s.v. *honbongo* 翻梵語. Cf. T. 2145, p. 81c10 for the transliteration *bolaiyi* 畿臠夷.

\(^10\) On this date, see the note in Ono, *BKDJ*, vol. 9, p. 149.

fact that it is often transcribed as opposed to translated suggests that it may
have been a problematic term for early Chinese translators.

Nevertheless, translations of the term pārājika do exist. In fact, there is
an extraordinarily large number of translations of this term which also suggests
that it was problematic. These translations can be loosely divided into categories
according to meaning. They include translations in the sense of ‘defeated by
another’ such as tasheng 他勝, tashengchu 他勝處 and tashengzui 他勝罪;
‘abandoned, rejected’ such as qi 棄; translations carrying the sense of ‘evil’
such as e 惡, ji’e 極惡; an ‘extreme or serious offence’ such as bianzui
邊罪,15 zhong 重, zhongzui 重罪,16 zhongjin 重禁 and zhongjinjie 重禁戒;
translations meaning ‘fallen, fallen beyond the pale’ such as duo 墮, duoburu
墮不如 and duoburuyichu 墮不如意處; mixtures of ‘extremely serious’ and
‘fallen’ such as jizhongganduo 極重感墮; interpretations suggesting a meaning
of ‘fundamental offence’ such as genbenzui 根本罪, genbenxingzui 根本性罪
and genbenzhongzui 根本重罪; translations which suggest the permanence
of the offence such as touduan 斷頭 ‘decapitation’; and wuyu 無餘 ‘without
remainder,’ in which the implication is that one who has committed such an
offence may not remain within the samgha.17

Thus we see that the Chinese translations of the term pārājika do not

---

12 For the first date, see Demiéville, ibid. See Foguang dacidian 佛光大辭典
(FG), s.v. Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 for the second.

13 See, e.g., T. 1464, p. 860a27, b6, b10 et passim.

14 This and the following lists are not comprehensive. For a more detailed review
of the terminology, see the chart in Hirakawa, RK, p. 179.

15 See, e.g., T. 1421, p. 118a23. Cf. NBD, s.v. henzai 邊罪.

16 Care must be taken with the term zhongzui 重罪 as it sometimes appears to
encompass samghāvāseṣa as well.

17 Cf., inter alia, MBD, s.v. harai 波羅夷, and NBD, index pārājika.
all point to a single derivation or interpretation. It is worthy of note, however, that many of the Chinese translations do not attempt to show the derivation or meaning of this term, rather they simply tell us what it is, viz. an extremely serious or fundamental offence. Where they do define the term, translations such as tasheng 他勝 ‘defeated by another’ point to a derivation in line with Rhys Davids and Oldenberg’s suggestion of parā + ʒjī in light of Buddhaghosa’s Samantapāśādikā. Conversely, perhaps touduan 斷頭 ‘decapitation,’ but certainly wuyu 無餘 ‘without remainder’ would suggest the derivations espoused by Burnouf or Lévi.

Indeed, as we have seen, there is much scholarly debate over the etymology of this term. It is, however, its meaning in practice that here concerns us rather than its original etymological derivation.\(^\text{18}\) Accordingly, perhaps the most appropriate place to start looking for a definition of pārājika is the vibhaṅgas of the various nikāyas.

The vibhaṅgas are prātimokṣa commentaries embedded in the Vinayas which provide a word-by-word, although not always complete, commentary on the rules of the prātimokṣa, and as such they are an extremely important tool for understanding the exact meaning of a given precept. Accordingly, our first port of call\(^\text{19}\) is the term pārājika as defined in the Sutta vibhaṅga of the Theravādin Vinaya:\(^\text{20}\)

\[ \text{pārājiko hotiti: seyyathāpi nāma puriso sīsacchinno abhabbo tena sarīrabandhanena jīvitum. evam eva bhikkhu methunam dhammam paṭisevitvā asamāno hoti asakyapattiyo, tena vuccati pārājiko hotiti.} \]

\(^{18}\) For a survey of the scholarship on the derivation of this term, see Roth, “Terminologisches aus dem Vinaya der Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādin,” ZDMG, 118 (1968), pp. 341-343.

\(^{19}\) The order of the following texts has no particular reasoning behind it other than stylistic purposes.

“He is pārājika” means: just as a man with his head cut off is unable to live with that bodily constitution,\(^{21}\) in exactly the same way a bhikkhu having engaged in sexual intercourse is no samaṇa, no follower of the Sakyān (hereinafter ‘the Buddha’); therefore it is said “he is pārājika.”

This definition seems to be saying, by way of analogy to a person who has been decapitated, that pārājikas are final and irrevocable. It is perhaps worth noting that this analogy is not the only one used in the Theravādin Bhikkhu vibhaṅga. Although the other pārājikas use different analogies their purport is much the same. The second, third and fourth pārājikas respectively compare the state of one who has committed such a crime to a withered leaf which cannot become green again,\(^{22}\) a stone split asunder which cannot be put back together again\(^{23}\) and a palmyra tree which cannot grow again on account of having its crown severed.\(^{24}\)

Indeed, the metaphor of a person with their head cut off is very common in definitions of the term pārājika. It is also to be found in the Mahīśāsaka vibhaṅga.\(^{25}\)

波羅羅者。名受法。名惡法。名斷頭法。名非沙門法。
Pārājika is known as the state of having fallen, it is known as the state of evil, it is known as the state of being decapitated, it is known as the state of being no śramaṇa.\(^{26}\)

The Dharmaguptaka vibhaṅga also has a similar definition:\(^{27}\)

\(^{21}\) See PED, s.v. bandhana.

\(^{22}\) Pārājika 2; VP, vol. 3, p. 47: pārājiko hotitī: seyyathāpi nāma pandupalāso bandhanā pamutto, abhabbo haritattāya....

\(^{23}\) Pārājika 3; VP, vol. 3, p. 74: pārājiko hotitī: seyyathāpi nāma puthusilā dvedhā bhinnā appaṭisandhiṅkā hoti....

\(^{24}\) Pārājika 4; VP, vol. 3, p. 92: pārājiko hotitī: seyyathāpi nāma tālo matthakacakchinnaho abhabbo punavirūḷhiyā....

\(^{25}\) T. 1421, p. 4c21-23.
Thus we see that the vibhaṅgas of the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka traditions tend to emphasize the so-called permanency of a pārājika. The Sarvāstivāda vibhaṅga, however, seems to make no mention of any of the above analogies. Instead it stresses the gravity of such offences and perhaps even points to an etymological discrepancy between the Theravādin and Sarvāstivāda derivations of pārājika. The text reads:

波羅夷者。名墮不如。是罪極惡深重。作是罪者。即墮不如。不名比丘。非沙門非釋子。失比丘法。

Pārājika is called fallen beyond the pale. This offence is exceedingly evil and extremely serious. One who commits this offence is immediately fallen beyond the pale. He is not called a bhikṣu, he is no śramaṇa, no follower of the Buddha, he has lost his monkhood.

This interpretation is similar to the first part of the Mahīśāsaka Vibhaṅga’s treatment of the term in which the idea of being ‘fallen’ is found. It is interesting to note that although this interpretation differs from the Theravādin as we have it today, a parallel is to be found in the Samantapāsādikā. The Chinese translation of the Samantapāsādikā, the Shanjianlü piposha 善見律毘婆沙

---

26 It appears, at least upon cursory examination, that the Mahīśāsaka Bhikṣunī vibhaṅga does not contain a definition of pārājika. Obviously the monks’ text was taken as read.

27 T. 1428, p. 571c6-8.

28 The nuns’ text is virtually identical. T. 1428, p. 714a22-24: 波羅夷者。譬如人斷頭不可復起。比丘尼亦復如是。犯波羅夷已不復成比丘尼。故名波羅夷。

29 T. 1435, p. 2c16-18.
(T. 1462) contains a line in which pārājika is defined as ‘fallen beyond
the pale.’ It then goes on to state that:

此是犯波羅夷重罪。此人名為墮。亦言從如來法中墮非釋迦種子。於
比丘法中不如。是名波羅夷。
Such is committing the grave offence of pārājika. He is called fallen. It
is also said that he is fallen from the dhārma of the Tathāgata; he is no
follower of the Buddha. He is beyond the pale in monkhood. This is
called pārājika.

It is interesting to note that there seems to be no parallel for the phrase
‘fallen’ or ‘fallen beyond the pale’ in the Theravādin Bhikkhu vibhaṅga
commentaries on the term pārājika as it appears in the Chinese recension
of the Samantapāsādikā. Perhaps the most divergent interpretation of the term
pārājika, however, is that of the Mahāsāṃghikas:

波羅夷者。謂於法智退沒墮落無道果分。是名波羅夷。如是未知智等
智他心智苦習盡道智盡智無生智。於彼諸智退沒墮落無道果分。是
名波羅夷。又復波羅夷者。於涅槃退沒墮落無證。是名波羅夷。
於梵行退沒墮落無道果分。是名波羅夷。又復波羅夷者。於梵行退
沒墮落無道果分。是名波羅夷。又復波羅夷者。所可犯罪。不可發露悔
過。故名波羅夷。

Pārājika means there is no share in the fruits of the path as one has

30 T. 1462, p. 722a15: 波羅夷者。退墮不如。
   ayam hi pārājikasaddo sikkhāpadāpattipuggalesu vattati.
33 T. 1425, p. 237b23-c2. I have collated the monks and nuns’ texts together. The
   nuns’ vibhaṅga (T. 1425, p. 514b26-c3) is slightly different from that of the monks. The
differences can be seen in the notes to the text. “A” refers to the text of the Bhikṣu
   vibhaṅga. “B” is that of the nuns’ vibhaṅga. For an English translation of the nuns’ text,
   see MDBN, pp. 104-105.
34 未知智等智他心智苦習盡道智盡智無生智
35 證 A: 道 B
36 無道果分 A: om. B
lapsed and fallen away from the knowledge of dharmas [dharmajñāna]. This is called pārajika. In this way, there is no share in the fruits of the path as one has lapsed and fallen away from the knowledges [such as] knowledge of the unknown [anvayajñāna], common knowledge [saṃvṛti-jñāna], knowledge of the minds of others [paracittajñāna], the knowledges of suffering [duḥkhajñāna], accumulation [samudayajñāna], destruction [nirodha-jñāna], the Path [mārgajñāna], knowledge of extinction [ksayajñāna], and knowledge of non-arising [anutpādajñāna]. This is called pārajika. Furthermore, pārajika means there is no share in the fruits of realization as one has lapsed and fallen away from nirvāṇa. This is called pārajika. Furthermore, pārajika means there is no share in the fruits of the path as one has lapsed and fallen away from brahmacarya. This is called pārajika. Furthermore, pārajika [offences] are called pārajika because one is unable to confess and repent any of the crimes one may have committed [from this category].

Although there seems to be no extant Sanskrit parallel for the Mahāsāṃghika text there is a parallel in the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin Bhikṣuṇi Vinaya. In Pārajika-Dharma five we find the following passage.\(^{39}\)

\(^{37}\) 又復 AKN: om. A\(^{GMSY}\), B

\(^{38}\) Hirakawa translates this passage in HC, vol. 14, pp. 127-128. His third sentence reads as follows: 是の如く未知智・等智・他心智・苦・習・尽・道智・無生智（等の）彼の諸智において退没・堕落して、道果の分なし。The Chinese text, however, reads: 如是未知智等等智他心智苦習盡道智盡智無生智。於彼諸智退沒墮落無道果分。Hirakawa seems to have failed to include ksāya-jñāna jin-zhi (J. jinchi) 盡智 in his translation. Furthermore, he also states (ibid., p. 128) that these knowledges appear to be identifiable with nine of the Ten Knowledges or daśajñānāni as found in the Abhidharmakosā (the exception being conventional knowledge shisuzhi (J. sezoekuchi) 世俗智) (法智等は、『俱舍論』等でいう「十智」（世俗智・法智・類智・苦智・集智・滅智・道智・他心智・尽智・無生智）のうち、世俗智を除いた九智に相当するであろう。). Hirakawa, however, appears to have missed one of the knowledges. As far as I can tell all ten seem to be directly identifiable with the ten as expounded in the Abhidharmakosā (T. 1558, p. 134c7-9 reads: 論曰。智有十種攝一切智。一世世俗智。二法智。三類智。四苦智。五集智。六滅智。七道智。八他心智。九盡智。十無生智。). Hirakawa says that shisuzhi (J. sezoekuchi) 世俗智 is the exception. Shisuzhi (J. sezoekuchi) 世俗智 (saṃvṛti-jñāna), however, is represented by the Chinese dengzhi (J. tōchi) 等智; see NBD, ss.vv. tōchi 等智 and sezoekuchi 世俗智. On the Ten Knowledges, see AKB, vol. 4, pp. 1095-1097.

\(^{39}\) Roth, BV, §123, lines 14-15.
pārājiketi pāram nāmocyate dharmajñānam / tato jīnā ojīnā samjīnā parihiṃā / tenāha pārājiketi

Pārājikā: the pāra (far shore) is known as dharmajñānam (the knowledge of dharmas). From that she is (विज) vanquished, conquered, overpowered and fallen away.\(^{40}\) Therefore she is said to be pārājikā.

Although the text is lexically rather problematic, we can clearly establish the link between this text and the Chinese Mahāsāṃghika vibhaṅga which also mentions dharmajñāna. This text appears to suggest a derivation of pārājika from pāra + विज as opposed to Buddhaghosa’s parā + विज.

Hirakawa suggests that there may be a link between the duofa 墜法 ‘the state of being fallen’ of the Mahīśasaka, the duoburu 墜不如 ‘fallen beyond the pale’ of the Sarvāstivāda and tuimo duoluo 退沒堕落 ‘lapsed and fallen away from [the knowledges etc]’ as found in the Mahāsāṃghika vibhaṅga.\(^{41}\) Indeed, Hirakawa’s theory gains even more credibility in light of the text of the Chinese translation of the Samantapāsādikā in which tuiduo 退 墜 appears to be an abbreviated form of tuimo duoluo 退沒堕落 as found in the Sarvāstivādin vibhaṅga.

The Mūlasarvāstivādin Vibhaṅga’s treatment of this term is also interesting. Pārājika is defined in the first fascicle of the Genbenshuyiqieyoubu pinaye 根本説一切有部毘奈耶 (T. 1442) as follows:\(^{42}\)

波羅市迦者。是極重罪極可厭惡。是\(^{43}\)可嫌棄不可愛樂\(^{44}\)。若苾芻亦纔犯時。即非沙門非釋迦子。失苾芻性乖涅槃性。墮落崩倒被他所勝不

\(^{40}\) BV, index, marks ojīnā and samjīnā with asterisks denoting the fact that they do not appear in dictionaries.

\(^{41}\) HC, vol. 14, p. 128.

\(^{42}\) T. 1442, p. 630c6-10.

\(^{43}\) 業 K: om. GMSY

\(^{44}\) 業 K: om. GMSY
This definition of pārājika seems to intertwine the idea of permanency, as seen in the severing of the crown of the tāla tree, with the concept of being fallen. Furthermore, it also makes mention of the seriousness of the offence. In these respects, it is very similar to the definition as found in the Mahiśasaka vibhaṅga above in which these three concepts appear. The only exception is that the Mūlasarvāstivādin recension is much fuller in its coverage of the term.

The Tibetan recension of the Mūlasarvāstivādin vibhaṅga offers a similar commentary on pārājika. sTog Ca46a7-b5 ('Dul ba rnam par 'byed pa) reads:

pham par gyur gyur\(^{45}\) pa yin gyis zhes bya ba ni / de mthar gyur pa dang / ltung ba dang / dman pa dang / mjug na 'phug\(^{46}\) pa dang / tha chad dang / yid dang mi mthun pa yin pa'o // yang gang gis ltung ba de byas na / byas ma thag tu dge slong du mi rung bar 'gyur / dge sbyong du mi rung / shākya'i sras kyir mi rung / dge sbyong gi dngos po las nyams par 'gyur te / de'i dge sbyong gi tshul zhig par 'gyur zhiṅ / nyams pa / bcom pa / ltung pa / pham par gyur pa ste / de'i dge sbyong gi tshul phyir bslang du med par 'gyur ro // 'di lta ste dper na / shing tā la'i mgo bcad na sngon por 'gyur du mi rung la / 'phel zhiṅ rgyas pa dang / yangs par 'gyur du mi rung ba de bzhin du / dge slong gis gnas de lta bu byas na / byas ma thag tu dge slong du mi rung bar 'gyur / dge sbyong du mi rung / shākya'i sras kyir mi rung / dge slong gi. dngos po

\(^{45}\) The second gyur here appears to be dittographic.

\(^{46}\) Text is hard to read; could be 'dug pa or 'phug pa.
las nyams par 'gyur te / de'i dge sbyong gi tshul zhig par 'gyur zhing / nyams pa / bcom pa / lhung pa / pham par gyur pa ste / de'i dge sbyong gi tshul phyir bslang du med par 'gyur bas / des na pham par gyur pa yin gyis zhes gsungs so //

Having become defeated (pārājika): it is the ultimate offence, it is the lowest of all (?) and must be criticized (?), it is very bad and unpleasant. Whoever commits that offence, as soon as he does so, he is not fit to be a bhikṣu, not fit to be a śramaṇa, not fit to be a follower of the Śākyan. [His] śramaṇa-hood becomes damaged, his status as a śramaṇa becomes lost and damaged, conquered, fallen and defeated (pārājika). His status as a śramaṇa cannot be revived again.

Just as, for example, a tāla tree that has had its crown cut off, cannot become as it was before or flourish or grow in height or size, in the same way as soon as a bhikṣu transgresses that precept he is not fit to be a bhikṣu, he is not fit to be a śramaṇa, not fit to be a follower of the Śākyan. [His] monkhood becomes damaged, his status as a śramaṇa becomes lost and damaged, conquered, fallen and defeated (pārājika). His status as a śramaṇa cannot be revived again. Because of that it is said that he is on that account defeated (pārājika).

The Tibetan text is, as we have seen, much fuller than its Chinese parallel. Both texts comment on the permanence of a pārājika by analogy with a tāla tree with a severed crown. They also both mention the loss or damage to the offender's monkhood. Furthermore, they each refer to the offender as 'vanquished' or 'conquered.'

There is also a prātimokṣa commentary in this tradition—the Genbensapoduobu lìu she 根本薩婆多部律攝 (T. 1458) or Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya-samgraha translated by Yijing 義淨 (635-713 C.E.) in 700 C.E. This commentary clarifies the vibhaṅga interpretation of pārājika with the following three passages:48

---

47 Sense obscure.

48 T. 1458, p. 532c21-25.
As for that which is called pārājika, this means [something that is] exceedingly evil, because a person who commits these offences is to be detested in the extreme. This also means vanquished by another. This is because as soon as one commits [one of] these offences one suffers on account of being scorned and vanquished by a person of pure conduct. Or one suffers on account of being destroyed and vanquished by the evil passions of another. Mendicants and [fully] ordained people are engaged in removing evil passions. Now, breaking [these] precepts one would on the contrary suffer defeat.

Later the same text observes (533b12-14):

Furthermore, as for pārājika it is to suffer the coming of and submission to the army of non-dharma. The follower of the King of the dharma experiences defeat by another. On account of the fact that he has already lost his honour he is called vanquished by another. Therefore it is said that this person is no śramaṇa nor a follower of the Buddha.

To which it adds (534b22-24):

On account of being able to harm good conduct and obliterate it, this is called pārājika. Also, being able to give rise to offences of the evil destinies, this is called pārājika.

It is worthy of note that the second of these passages in which we see that one who is pārājika suffers defeat by the host of non-dharma would tend to support Horner's hypothesis that it refers to "...defeat in the struggle with Māra; or more probably defeat in the struggle against evil generally...."

---

49 被 GKNN²S: 彼 MY

As we have seen there seems to be a vast divergence within the traditions in the interpretation of the term pārājika as reflected in the vibhaṅgas. Moreover, although there exist many analogies with decapitated heads and other such irreversible procedures, the definitions found in the vibhaṅga tell us very little about what the term means in terms of the logistics of dealing with a bhikkhu or bhikṣuṇī who is ‘pārājika’ or what the practical implications are. Furthermore, the term pārājika does not usually appear in isolation in the vibhaṅga or prātimokṣa sections in which it is usually found. Indeed, it most often occurs in collocation with the term asaṃvāsa (not in communion). Accordingly, as this term seems to designate the actual punishment to be meted out, there seems little need to take further issue with a term as obscure in both derivation and meaning as pārājika and force upon it translations so constrained and specific as ‘expulsion’ when it is perhaps best, and most convenient, to leave it untranslated simply as ‘pārājika.’

We must now turn our attention to the precise meaning of the term asaṃvāsa. It is perhaps best to look at this term as it is actually used in the formulaic wording of, for example, the first pārājika.

The first pārājika rule was, according to the Theravādin tradition, amended after the Buddha’s original rule was misconstrued by a bhikkhu in the Great Wood at Vesāli who was adamant that it only applied to human females and did not infringe upon his activities with the female monkey. The rule which was then clarified to include even animals was amended for the second time after Ānanda approached the Blessed One on behalf of the Vajjins and as a result the clause about declaring one’s weakness and

---

51 BD, vol. 1, p. xxvii, notes that “...it seems unnecessary to take the etymologically obscure pārājika itself to mean expulsion, when this notion is covered by the word asaṃvāsa, with which... pārājika is always coupled in the formulation of the Pārājika rules.”

disavowing one’s training was added.\textsuperscript{54}

The final version of the first pārājika in the Theravādin Vinaya reads as follows:\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhūnām sikkhāsājīvasamāpanno sikkhām apaccikkhāya\textsuperscript{56} dubbalyam anāvikaṭvā methunam dhammam paṭiseveyya, antamaso tiracchānagatāya pi, pārājiko hoti asamvāso ‘ti.}\textsuperscript{57}

"Whatever bhikkhu, having embarked upon the training and rules of [monastic] life for bhikkhus, should, without disavowing the training and without disclosing his weakness, engage in sexual intercourse, even with an animal, is pārājika and is not in communion (asamvāsa)."

The question, however, that we must ask is, what exactly does ‘not in communion’ mean? Grammatically, the Pāli term asamvāsa is perhaps best understood as a bahubbīhi in which samvāsa (‘co-residence,’ ‘living with,’ ‘cohabitation’ etc) is prefixed with the negative affix ‘a.’ Horner, Chatsumarn Kabilsingh and Rhys Davids and Oldenberg translate the term along the lines

\textsuperscript{53} See, e.g., \textit{BD}, vol. 1, pp. 40-42.


\textsuperscript{55} \textit{VP}, vol. 3, p. 23, lines 33-36.

\textsuperscript{56} apaccakkhāya Vibhaṅga: \textit{apaccakkhāya} Pāṭimokkha (Nāṇamoli, \textit{The Pāṭimokkha}, p. 19).

\textsuperscript{57} ‘ti Vibhaṅga: om. Pāṭimokkha (ibid.).
of 'no longer in communion.' The best place to look for a definition, however, is once again the appropriate vibhaṅga commentary to the first pārājika. Asaṁvāsa is defined in the Sutta vibhaṅga of the bhikṣus as:\(^{59}\)

\[
\text{asaṁvāso 'ti: saṁvāso nāma ekakammam ekuddeso samasikkhātā, eso saṁvāso nāma. so tena saddhiṁ n'atthi, tena vuccati asaṁvāso 'ti.}
\]

Not in communion (asaṁvāsa) means: communion (saṁvāsa) is called sharing the same formal acts [of the saṅgha],\(^{60}\) sharing the same teaching,\(^{61}\) sharing the same training; this is called communion (saṁvāsa). He is not together [in this respect] therefore he is called not in communion (asaṁvāsa).

The Chinese recension of the Samantapāsādikā provides us with a useful interpretation of this term. It reads as follows:\(^{62}\)

不共住者。不共行為初。法師曰。我當次第說罪。僧有四行。於戒壇中作四法事和合。是名一行。亦言五行波羅提木叉。應一處說波羅提木叉。無懲愧人不得入。於一衆僧事不得同入。顯出在外。是名不共

---

\(^{58}\) BD, vol. 1, p. 42, gives "not in communion"; BPSS, p. 5, gives "no more in communion"; SBE, vol. 13, p. 4, gives "no longer in communion."


\(^{60}\) Horner (BD, vol. 1, p. 48) translates ekakammam as "one work." Although possible it does not seem to make much sense.


住。是故律本說。不共布薩及諸羯磨。是比丘得波羅夷罪不應共住。
Not in communion means: together [with him] one cannot carry out formal acts and the like. The Dharma Teacher says, “I will expound the offences in proper order. The samgha has four kinds of official acts. Within the sīmā, the samgha performs the four acts of dharma in harmonious union. This is called sharing the same formal acts. Also it is said that as for the five-fold [recitation of the] prātimokṣa, it should be recited [with everyone gathered] in one place. One who is shameless is not allowed to enter. Similarly, he may not participate in any of the business of the samgha. He is to be driven out. This is called not in communion. On account of this, in the Vinaya it originally said that the poṣadha and other formal acts cannot be carried out with him. This bhikṣu has committed a pārājika offence and should not be in communion.

Thus we see that, at least in the Theravādin vibhaṅga and the Chinese translation of the Samantapāsādikā, asamvāsa appears not to mean that one is expelled but rather that he is excommunicated. Indeed, although the Samantapāsādikā states that he is ‘driven out’ this does not necessarily suggest expulsion. It could simply mean that he is not allowed to be within the boundaries of the sīmā while the samgha performs any ecclesiastical business, viz. he is driven out from the boundaries of the sīmā. Or, put another way, that he may not participate in any of the business of the samgha. Accordingly, it is quite possible to take this as simply referring to excommunication and not expulsion.

Another intriguing passage in this connection is to be found in Binaye 鼻奈耶 (T. 1464) which was translated in 383 C.E. and appears to be the

---

63 The text reads jīetan 戒壇. NBD, s.v. kaidan 戒壇 gives Pāli sīmā mandala (?). Cf. T. 1462, p. 682a, the footnote to jīetan 戒壇 gives upasampadāsīmāmaṇḍala. Hirakawa suggests “boundary limits of the parish” (CSP, p. 197). On jīetan 戒壇, see Hirakawa, GBK, pp. 372-382. For a diagram, see T. 1804, p. 16a.

64 I am unsure as to what this exactly refers to. A possibility is the five ways of reciting the prātimokṣa (cf. BD, vol. 4, p. 147; VP, vol. 1, p. 112, ime kho bhikkhave pañca pātimokkhuddesā ‘t). Cf. also BD, vol. 6, p. 1, note 6.

oldest extant Chinese Vinaya text we have today. T. 1464, p. 852b9-11 reads:

若比丘比丘犯戒。不捨戒戒羸不自悔。無淨行犯姦法者。此比丘波羅
移^{67}菩提阿薩婆肄。阿薩婆肄^{68}者。不受僧不審^{69}也。

If a bhikṣu, having [trained in] the infractional precepts of a bhikṣu,
without disavowing his precepts and without disclosing his weakness in
regard to the precepts, commits the impure act of sexual intercourse, this
bhikṣu is pārājika, and should not be in communion.\(^{70}\)

Should not be in communion is not being accepted as a monk, nor being
greeted as one.\(^{71}\)

In the above passage we find that \textit{asamvāsa} is not translated, but
phonetically transcribed and then glossed with an explanation as to its meaning.
This suggests that the translators of this text also found the term rather
problematic. Directly after this passage the story about a monk and a female
monkey is given, and here again we find a rather different wording. The final
line reads 犯者不受棄捐 ‘If he [thus] transgresses he is not received, he is
rejected.’\(^{72}\)

The \textit{Mahīśāsaka vibhaṅga} provides us with the following version of
the first pārājika:\(^{73}\)

若比丘\(^{74}\)共諸比丘\(^{75}\)同學戒法。戒羸不捨\(^{76}\)行姦法\(^{77}\)乃至共\(^{78}\)畜生。是比

---

\(^{66}\) See note 10 above.

\(^{67}\) 波羅移 K: 波羅夷 GMSY

\(^{68}\) 肆 M: 四 GKSy

\(^{69}\) 審 GMSY: 客 K

\(^{70}\) Note the text here is a transliteration. The Chinese reads \textit{boluoyi puti asaposi} 波
羅移菩提阿薩婆肄; this is probably Sanskrit \textit{pārājiko hoti asamvāsaḥ/asamvāsyah}. On
\textit{hoti} for \textit{bhavati} in BHS, see BHSG, pp. 223-224, s.v. \textit{bhū-} (2); cf. BHSD, s.v. \textit{hoti}. This
passage is discussed by Hirakawa in RK, pp. 171-172.

\(^{71}\) This passage makes no mention of the prohibition of sexual activity with animals.
This, however, is to be found directly below (T. 1464, p. 852c15-17).

\(^{72}\) T. 1464, p. 852c17.
丘三多波羅夷不共住。  
If a bhikṣu, having trained in the same precepts and rules together with the other bhikṣus, should, without [disclosing] his weakness in regard to the precepts and without abandoning his training, have sexual relations even with an animal, this bhikṣu incurs a pārājika and is not in communion (不共住).

Not in communion (不共住) is defined as follows:  
不共住者。如先白衣時。不得與比丘共一學等學不等學不餘學。不與比丘共一羯磨等羯磨不等羯磨不餘羯磨。不與比丘共一誡戒等誡戒不等誡戒不餘誡戒。是名不共住。  
Not in communion means: as previously when he was a lay person, he may not, together with the bhikṣus, [participate in] the same training, equivalent training, unequal training or not other training. He may not, together with the bhikṣus, [participate in] the same formal act, equivalent formal acts, unequal formal acts or not other formal acts.

73 T. 1421, p. 4b2-4 “A” (Bhikṣuni vibhaṅga T. 1421, p. 77c4-6 “B”). The Bhikṣu vibhaṅga follows identically the wording of the first recension of the Mahiśāsaka Bhikṣu prātimokṣa to be found at T. 1422, p. 195a8-10. There is, however, a slight difference in phraseology in the second recension, also attributed to Buddhajīva et al. 佛陀什, found at T. 1422, p. 200c20-22. The text reads: 若比丘。於和合僧中受具足戒。不還戒戒贏不出想。行姦法乃至共畜生。是比丘犯波羅夷罪。不應共事。For a note on the two recensions of the Mahiśāsaka prātimokṣa in T. 1422, see BKDJ, vol. 3, pp. 278-279. The wording of the Bhikṣuni prātimokṣa (T. 1423, pp. 206c29-207a2) is identical to recensions K and N of the Bhikṣuni vibhaṅga (i.e. no variants for 共).

74 比丘 A: 比丘尼 B
75 比丘 A: 比丘尼 B
76 不捨 A: 不捨隨意 B
77 法 A: om. B
78 共 A, BKN: om. Bgmsy
79 比丘 A: 比丘尼 B
80 T. 1421, p. 4c23-26.

81 The terminology here (which I have translated as “the same,” “equivalent,” “unequivalent” or “not other”) is a little problematic. I have not been able to find a parallel for it. Accordingly, the translation is extremely tentative.
He may not, together with the bhikṣus, [participate in] the same recitation of the precepts, equivalent recitations of the precepts, unequivalent recitations of the precepts or not other recitations of the precepts. This is called not in communion.

Thus we see that the Mahāsākāra tradition is basically in agreement with the Theravādin vibhaṅga as to the meaning of asamvāsa. Both make mention of three facets which comprise ‘communion,’ viz. sharing the same formal acts, the same training, and the same precepts or teaching. The Dharmaguptaka tradition, however, only mentions two such facets. The Dharmaguptaka vibhaṅga reads:82

若比丘共比丘同戒。若不還戒戒羸不自悔。犯不淨行乃至共畜生。
是比丘波羅夷不共住。
If a bhikṣu, having [trained] in the same precepts together with the bhikṣus, should, without returning his training and without disclosing83 his weakness in regard to the precepts, commit an impure act even with an animal, this bhikṣu incurs a pārājika and is not in communion (不共住).84

Not in communion (不共住) is defined as follows:85

云何名不共住。有二共住86。同一羯磨同一說戒。不得於是二事中住。故名不共住。
What is that which is called not in communion? There are two facets to communion. Sharing the same formal acts and sharing the same recitation of the precepts. On account of not being allowed to engage in these two matters one is called not in communion.

83 On hui 悔 as a translation for Sanskrit āviṣ + န, see BWD, ss.vv. āviṣ-karana, āviṣ-kṛta; cf. Sakaki’s Mahāvyutpatti, entry no. 2803; BCSD, s.v. hui 悔.
84 Text is identical with the corresponding passage in the Dharmaguptaka Bhikṣu prātimokṣa (T. 1429, p. 1015c6-8).
85 T. 1428, p. 571c8-10.
86 共住 GKMSY: 不共住 N
The sharing of the same formal acts and the recitation of the precepts were both seen in the Mahiśāsaka and Theravādin vibhaṅgas. The Dharmaguptaka text, however, makes no mention of sharing in the same training and unlike these other two traditions actually enumerates the component facets of communion as two. It is perhaps possible that sharing in the same training is to be understood as an integral part of sharing the same recitation of precepts as found in the Dharmaguptaka vibhaṅga. If one takes this view, then all three texts could be considered to define communion as a two-fold concept, the only difference being that the vibhaṅgas of the Mahiśāsaka and Theravādin Vinayas are much fuller in their commentary.

The Sarvāstivāda text reads as follows:87

若比丘同入比丘學法。不捨戒戒羸不出行姦法。乃至共畜生者。是比丘得波羅夷不應共住。
If a bhikṣu, having similarly entered upon the rules of training for a bhikṣu, should, without abandoning the precepts and without disclosing his weakness in regard to the precepts, have sexual relations even with an animal, this bhikṣu incurs a pārājika and should not be in communion (不應共住).

Not in communion (不共住) is defined as:88

不共住者。不得共作比丘法。所謂白羯磨白二羯磨白四羯磨布薩自恣。
Not in communion means: one may not carry out the bhikṣu-dharma, viz. jñapti karmans, jñapti-dvitiya karmans, jñapti-caturtha karmans,89 poṣadha and pravāraṇa. He may not be counted among the fourteen persons.90 This is called pārājika, not in communion.

---

87 T. 1435, p. 2a25-29. This text is slightly different to the parallel passage in the Bhikṣu prātimokṣa of the Sarvāstivādins. The prātimokṣa text reads (T. 1436, p. 471a4-6): 若比丘。共諸比丘入戒法中。不違戒戒羸不出。行姦法。乃至共畜生。是比丘得波羅夷罪。不應共住（住 GMNSY: 事 K）。

88 T. 1435, p. 2c18-21.
Clearly, the *Sarvāstivādin vibhaṅga* here diverges from those of the Theravādin, Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka traditions. The emphasis in this tradition seems to be one of participation in the formal acts or business of the *saṃgha*. This is perhaps further evidenced by the reference to not being able to be counted among the fourteen persons. I tentatively take this to be a reference to the fourteen kinds of permanent ecclesiastical positions held within the *saṃgha*.\(^{91}\) At any rate, this *vibhaṅga* clearly does not mention the sharing of

\[^{91}\text{Although the meaning is clear and straightforward these terms are rather problematic in derivation. The Chinese for jñāpti-caturtha karman is baisijieno 白四羯磨 (Mahāsāṃghika give baisanjiemo 白三羯磨). A jñāpti-caturtha karman consists of a jñāpti (Chinese bai 白) 'motion' or 'proposal' and then three subsequent readings or kārvācānaṃ of the motion in which it is put to the *saṃgha* and, if there are no objections, it is then officially ratified by the officiant of the *karman*. For an example of one of these karmans, see, inter alia, Sasaki Shizuka, *Buddhist Sects in the Asoka Period (4): The Structure of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya (BSAP)*, Bukkyō Kenkyū, 1994, p. 86-88. Cf. p. 114 below; the part where the officiant says, "Honourable monks, [please] listen... This is the motion," is the jñāpti (Chinese bai 白) 'motion' or 'proposal.' The officiant then continues and repeats the motion asking for the *saṃgha*’s consent: "Honourable monks, [please] listen... If, honourable ones, you accept that the *saṃgha* should ... [please] remain silent. If you do not consent then speak out." In this manner the motion is put before the *saṃgha* three times. Finally, the officiant says, "The *saṃgha* has consented on account of its silence. Thus I hold this matter to be so." Here the motion is officially passed. What is problematic is how exactly we are to understand the jñāpti-caturtha of jñāpti-caturtha karman and similarly the baisi 白四 of baisijieno 白四羯磨. The formal act in itself appears to contain three parts, an initial announcement of the motion, the putting of the motion to the *saṃgha* for approval, and a resolution (see Hirakawa, *GBK*, p. 304-305; *HC*, vol. 14, p. 85). In this case how exactly are we to understand jñāpti-caturtha karman and baisijieno 白四羯磨? Are we to take it as a formal act karman (jiemo 磨) consisting of a motion or jñāpti (bai 白) and four parts, viz. three questions thereof and a resolution? Or are we to understand it as a formal act or karman (jiemo 磨) in which the resolution comes fourth (caturtha si 四) following the initial proposal (jñāpti 白)? Or, do we take the jñāpti (bai 白) as the resolution, viz. a formal act in which the resolution comes fourth? This seems to me the most natural (especially as caturtha is an ordinal number). However, the resolution appears to come fifth if we count the initial proclamation of the motion as the first. Furthermore, Edgerton (s.v. jñāpti) suggests that the jñāpti is the motion and not the resolution. Due to this apparent confusion I have chosen not to translate these terms but to give them in their Sanskrit forms. Cf. Jin-il Chung's *Die Pravāraṇā in den kanonischen Vinaya-Texten der Mūlasarvāstivādin und der Sarvāstivādin*, pp. 27-28 (I am indebted to Professor Yamagiwa for this reference, and indeed a photocopy). Cf. also Frauwallner, p. 73.\]
training or the same precepts as part of its commentary on the term pārajika and as such displays a degree of deviation from the aforementioned vibhaṅgas.

Similarly, the Mahāsāṃghika vibhaṅga also exhibits a stark divergence from these three vibhaṅgas in its commentary on the term asaṃvāsa. The text reads:92

若比丘93. 於和合僧94中受具足95戒96. 不還戒97戒羸不出。相行98姪
法。乃至共99畜生。是比丘100得101波羅夷102。不應103共住104。

90 This does not appear to refer to a quorum. A saṃgha may be comprised of 4, 5, 10, 20 or more than 20 monks. Four monks are the minimum to make up a quorum and although they are technically a saṃgha they are limited in the number and nature of formal acts that they may initiate. See BD, vol. 4, pp. 457-458 (VP, vol. 1, pp. 319-320) on the five kinds of saṃghas (pañca saṃgha) in the Theravādin Vinaya. Cf. T. 1421, 162c13-15 for the Mahiśāsaka Vinaya; cf. Sarvāstivādin Vinaya, T. 1435, p. 5c23 ff. I take this as a reference to the number of people to be commissioned to take care of business arising in the saṃgha. Cf. Dutt, Early Buddhist Monachism, pp. 154-156 for a list of fourteen permanent officers (note Dutt lists 15 but states that only 14 are permanent roles). Cf. also Horner, BD, vol. 5, pp. 246-249. Note that, as Frauwallner p. 124 points out, there is a large degree of variation among the traditions with regard to these offices. For a detailed discussion on these and other offices, see Satō Mitsuo 佐藤密雄, Genshi Bukkyō kyōdan no kenkyū 原始佛教教團の研究 (SGBK), pp. 310-318. Cf. also T. 1435, p. 119c28.

91 Cf. note 90 above.

92 The prātimokṣa text (Bhikṣu prātimokṣa (BP), T. 1426, p. 549b27-29; Bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa (NP), T. 1427, p. 556c4-7) is almost identical. Accordingly, I have noted the lexical variations between the Bhikṣu and Bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga and prātimokṣas in the text below (BV=Bhikṣu vibhaṅga, T. 1425, p. 235c15-17; NV=Bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga, T. 1425, p. 514b16-18).

93 比丘 BV, BP: 比丘尼 NV, NP

94 僧 BV, BP: 二部僧 NPgKN

95 具足 BVgKN, BP, NPgKN: 具 BVgMSY

96 於和合僧中受具足戒 om. NPMSY, NV

97 不還戒 BV, BP, NV, NPgKMSY: om. NPgN

98 相行 BVgKN, BP, NPgK: 行 BVgMSY, NPgN: 受 NV, NPMSY

99 共 BVgKMSY, BP, NV, NP: om. BVg
If a bhikṣu, having received the precepts of the higher ordination amidst the harmonious saṃgha, should, without returning the precepts and without disclosing his weakness in regard to the precepts, have sexual relations even with an animal, this bhikṣu incurs a pārājika and should not be in communion (不應共住).

The Bhikṣu vibhaṅga of the Mahāsāṃghikas does not appear to contain a separate explanation of the term ‘communion.’ An explanation of sorts, however, is to be found in the word-commentary on the term bhuhuanjie 不還戒 ‘not returning one’s precepts.’ The commentary describes two terms shegongzhu 捨共住 ‘rejecting communion’ and shegongli 捨共利 ‘rejecting communal benefit.’ The relevant passage reads:

云何捨共住。共住有二種。一者清淨共住。二者相似共住。清淨共住者。衆悉清淨共作布薩。是名清淨共住。相似共住者。不淸淨作清淨相。與清淨者共作布薩。是名相似共住。彼清淨共住相似共住。盡名共住。若言我捨共住。是名捨戒。如上捨佛中廣說。彼諸外道亦有共住。若實欲捨此共住。假言捨彼共住。是不名捨戒。得偷蘭罪。若顖笑說捨共住。得越比尼罪。若誤說心狂捨共住者無罪。云何捨共利。共利者有二種。一者法利。二者衣食利。法利者。名受誦問答。衣食利者。同受一施。彼法利衣食利者盡名共利。若比丘言我捨此利。是名捨戒。餘如上捨佛中廣說。

What is rejecting communion? There are two kinds of communion. The first is pure communion. The second is pseudo-communion. Pure communion is performing the posadha together when the assembly is completely pure. This is called pure communion. Pseudo-communion is

---

100 比丘 BV, BP: 比丘尼 NV, NP
101 得 BV, NP: om. BP: 犯 NV, NP
102 波羅夷 BV, BP, NV, NP: 波羅夷罪 BV, NP
103 應 BV, NP, NV: om. BP
104 住 BV, BP, NV, NP: 供 NV, 事 NP
106 者 KN: om. GMSY
making the appearance of being pure when one is not pure and performing the poṣadha together with those who are pure. This is called pseudo-communion. Both pure communion and pseudo-communion are called communion. If one says “I reject communion,” this is called rejecting one’s precepts. It is as it is extensively explained in the above section on rejecting the Buddha. Those followers of other ways also have communion. If truly wishing to reject this communion one were to say, “What now if I were to reject that communion?,” this is not called rejecting one’s precepts; one incurs a sthūlātyaya offence. If one jokingly says he rejects communion he incurs a minor transgression of the Vinaya. If he erroneously says, or his mind is demented and he says that he rejects the communion there is no offence.

What is rejecting communal benefit? There are two kinds of communal benefit. The first is benefit of dharma. The second is benefit of food and clothing. The benefit of dharma is that which is called receiving recitations and asking questions. The benefit of food and clothing is sharing in the receipt of the same donations. Both the benefit of dharma and the benefit of food and clothing are called communal benefits. If a bhikṣu says “I reject this benefit,” this is called rejecting one’s precepts. The rest is as extensively explained in the above section on rejecting the Buddha.

This text highlights the importance of participation in the formal acts of the samgha and in this respect is very similar in its purport to that of the Sarvāstivādins. In addition to this it also discusses two kinds of communion—pure communion and pseudo-communion—and as such is unique amongst the vibhaṅgas we have so far examined.

Furthermore, this text illuminates the concept of communal benefit or benefits which accrue through association with the samgha. These are divided into two—spiritual and material. The spiritual benefit or benefit of dharma is perhaps the same as the sharing in the same training and recitation of precepts discussed in the Theravādin, Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka vibhaṅgas. The material benefits of association with the Buddhist samgha, viz. food and

---

clothing, are also very interesting. Perhaps more important than what the text says is what it does not say—there is no mention of the benefit of accommodation. Thus, although it would appear that a bhikṣu who commits a pāraṇjika is then and there no longer in communion (asaṃvāsa), the texts do not explicitly state that he is expelled. Although such a bhikṣu may not share in donations of alms food or clothing, it does not appear to state that he may no longer reside within the monastery.\footnote{The question, “what exactly is a monastery?” seems to jump out at me. I have no answer as yet.}

The Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣunī vibhaṅga also contains a similar gloss on asaṃvāsa:\footnote{T. 1425, p. 515c9-11.}

不共住者。不得共比丘尼住。法食味食。
Not in communion: one may not be in communion with the bhikṣunīs
[and may not receive] dharma-food or material food.\footnote{BCSD, p. 250, gives āmiśa-sāmbhoga.}

Thus we see that a bhikṣunī who is no longer in communion does not appear to be entitled to the ‘communal benefits’ of dharma-food and material food as described in the bhikṣus’ text. Furthermore, even if we take budegongbiqiuinizhu 不得共比丘尼住 in its literal sense meaning ‘she is not allowed to reside with the bhikṣunīs’ this does not necessarily mean that she was expelled—she may have been allowed to reside in some part of the greater limits of the monastic environment, but, as an excommunicated member of the samgha, she is simply not to partake in the material or spiritual food of the Order. I do not wish to press this point too much as it is only an observation and not the main thrust of the present thesis. One fact, however, does remain—we know almost nothing of how samgha members were actually expelled from their respective Orders.
The Sanskrit text of the Ārya-Mahāsaṅghika-Lokottaravādin Bhikṣu prātimokṣa reads as follows:111

yo112 puna bhikṣu113 bhikṣunā114 śikṣāsāmicīsamāpanno śikṣām āpratāpyaḥya115 dauṛvvalyam anāviṣkṛtya116 maithunam grāmyadharmanam117 pratiseveya118 119 antamaśa to tiryagyoniṣṭhāya-m-api120 sāṛddham121 ayam bhikṣuh pāṛājiko bhavaty asaṃvāsyo na labhate bhikṣuhi122 sāṛddhasamvāsam.

Whatever bhikṣu, having attained to propriety in the training of the bhikṣus,

111 W. Pachow and Ramakanta Mishra eds., “The Prātimokṣa Sūtra of the Mahāsaṅghikas,” Journal of the Ganganāth Jhā Research Institute, 1952-1953, p. 5. I have emended the spacing of the original text as required.

112 On the use of o for final a and aḥ in BHS, see BHSG, 3.79., ff.

113 On the nom. sg. masc. -u in BHS, see BHSG, 12.13., ff.

114 Probably best understood as BHS bhikṣuṇa (gen. pl.), see BHSG, 12.70., ff; or Classical Sanskrit bhikṣuṇām (gen. pl.).

115 On ā for a, see BHSG, 3.5., ff., esp. 3.11.

116 The text I am going by seems to suggest dauṛvvalyam. I have understood this as daurb(b)alyam. The script in the manuscript is according to Roth, Proto-Bengali-cum-Proto-Maithili (BV, p. xxi). I am assuming that there is not a lot of difference in ba and va (assumptions loosely based on the similarities of the Devanāgarī, Gilgit and Siddham scripts). This, however, needs further looking into. There is also a doubling of consonants occurring here vva or bba. Cf. dharm(m)am, sāṛḍ(d)ham and sāṛḍ(d)ha. On geminate consonants after a superscript r, see BV, p. xxvi.

117 Maithunam and grāmya could be taken as “sexual intercourse” (maithunan) and “vulgar act(s)” (grāmyadharman) or as one, viz. “sexual intercourse.” In the latter case, grāmyadharmanam would be construed as a gloss on maithunam. Thus understood.

118 pratiseveya: note 3 in text specifically points out the use of s for s. On this (the use of s for s), see BHSD, s.v. pratisevati. On 3rd sg. optatives in eya, see BHSG, 29.28.ff.

119 See BHSG, 4.55.ff., on hiatuses.

120 tiryagyoniṣṭhāyamapi Pachow et al. eds.: tiryagyoniṣṭhāryamapi ms. See BHSG, 8.42. on inst. sing. in āya. I have taken m as a hiatus bridger (BHSG, 4.59.).

121 sāṛddham Pachow et al. eds.: sāṛddham ms.

122 bhikṣuham: Pachow et al. eds. give bhikṣu hi. I would suggest that this should be emended to read bhikṣuhi (BHS inst. pl.), see BHSG, 12.67.ff. Thus understood.
should, without rejecting his training and not having disclosed his weakness, engage in the vulgar act of sexual intercourse together even with so much as an animal, this bhikṣu is pārājika and should not be in communion; he does not obtain communion together with the bhikṣus.\(^{123}\)

As we do not appear to possess a Sanskrit Bhikṣu vibhaṅga for this tradition we have no way of knowing how this nikāya understood the term asaṃvāsa. Furthermore, although a Sanskrit recension of the Ārya-Mahāsaṃghika-Lokottaravādin Bhikṣunī vibhaṅga is extant, it does not appear to contain a gloss of any importance to our understanding of the term (asaṃvāsa). The wording of the first pārājika in this tradition is, however, worthy of note and thus justifies our attention. BV, §117, lines 25-27 read:

\begin{quote}
yā punar bhikṣunī chandaśo maithunam grāmyadharmaṃ pratiśeveya antamasato tiyagyoniṇataṃ sārdham iyaṃ bhikṣunī pārājikā bhavaty asaṃvāsyā.
Whatever bhikṣunī willingly engages in the vulgar act of sexual intercourse, together even with so much as an animal, this bhikṣunī is pārājika and should not be in communion.
\end{quote}

This recension of the first pārājika rule for nuns leaves out two important features of the pārājika rule as found in the monks’ text. Firstly, it only states yā punar bhikṣunī ‘whatever bhikṣunī’ and does not go on to state *bhikṣunīnāṃ. śikṣāsāmicīsamāpattā ‘having attained to propriety in the training of the bhikṣunīs.’ Secondly, the text makes no mention of the clause about disclosing

\(^{123}\) Prebish’s translation of the same Sanskrit text (Prebish, 1996, p. 50) is a fine example of how conventional misunderstandings based on perhaps an over-reliance on secondary literature can influence a scholar and lead to misleading and erroneous translations. Prebish translates the text as: “Whatever monk, having undertaken the proper course and training of the monks, should, not having rejected the training and revealed his weakness, engage in sexual intercourse, even so much as with an animal, this monk is pārājika, expelled [from the monastic community]; he is not to obtain dwelling together with the monks.” Clearly asaṃvāsyo should not be translated as “expelled.” To do so is to replace the text with what, in all practicality the text may be pointing to, but certainly not what the text says. In this respect, Horner’s translation of the Pāli text is much more careful and scholarly. Cf. BD, vol. 1, pp. 41-42.
one's weakness and disavowing one's training. Furthermore, the nuns' text includes the term chandaśo 'willingly.'\textsuperscript{124} Strangely, however, the Chinese translation of the Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga includes the clause permitting the disavowing of training. The text reads:\textsuperscript{125}

若比丘尼。不還戒戒羸不出。受姦法乃至共畜生。是比丘尼犯波羅夷。不應共住\textsuperscript{126}。 
If a bhikṣuṇī, without returning her precepts and not having disclosed her weakness in regard to the precepts, willingly engages in sexual intercourse\textsuperscript{127} even with an animal, this bhikṣuṇī commits a pārājika and should not be in communion.

Similarly, the Mūlasarvāstivādin Bhikṣu vibhaṅga reads:\textsuperscript{128}

若復苾芻\textsuperscript{129}與諸苾芻\textsuperscript{130}同得\textsuperscript{131}學處。不捨學處。學贏不自説。作不淨行。兩交會法乃至共傍生\textsuperscript{132}。此苾芻\textsuperscript{133}亦得波羅市迦。不應共住。 
Whatever bhikṣu, having acquired the same code of training as other

\textsuperscript{124} For a note on the etymology of Pāli chandaso, see K. R. Norman, "Seven Pāli Etymologies," JPTS, vol. 15, pp. 146-147. 

\textsuperscript{125} T. 1425, p. 514b16-17. 

\textsuperscript{126} 住 GKSY: 供 M 

\textsuperscript{127} Note that shouyīnfa 受姦法 which I have translated as 'willingly engages in sexual intercourse,' is glossed in the vibhaṅga commentary as: "shou 受 (lit. 'to accept') means to accept with a desirous mind" (T. 1425, p. 514b22: 受者欲心受). Cf. Sanskrit chandaśo maithunaṃ grāmyadharman pratiṣeveya. Cf. BHSD, s.v. chanda. 

\textsuperscript{128} The prātimokṣa texts agree almost word-for-word with the passages in their corresponding vibhaṅgas. There is also a commentary on the Bhikṣu prātimokṣa to be found at T. 1458. Below I have compared the texts of both prātimokṣas, vibhaṅgas and the prātimokṣa commentary (BPC). BPC, T. 1458, p. 532a18-20; BV, T. 1442, p. 629c26-28; BP, T. 1454, p. 501a8-10; NV, T. 1443, p. 913a19-21; NP, T. 1455, p. 508c10-12. 

\textsuperscript{129} 芷芻 BV, BP, BPC: 芷芻尼 NV, NP 

\textsuperscript{130} 芷芻 BV, BP, BPC: 芷芻尼 NV, NP 

\textsuperscript{131} 得 BV, BP, BPC, NP, NV\textsuperscript{GKSY}: 待 NV\textsuperscript{M} 

\textsuperscript{132} 生 BV, BP, NV, NP, BPC\textsuperscript{GKSY}: 生人 BPC\textsuperscript{NN2} 

\textsuperscript{133} 芷芻 BV, BP, BPC: 芷芻尼 NV, NP
bhikṣus, should, without rejecting his code of training and without himself declaring his weakness in regard to his training, perform an impure act of coupling even with a beast, then this bhikṣu also incurs a pārājika and should not be in communion (不應共住).

Not in communion (不應共住) is explained as:

言不共住者。謂此犯人不得與諸苾芻而作共住。若褻瀆佗若隨意事。若舉自白二白四羯磨。若衆有事應差十二種人。此非差限。若法若食不共受用。是應棄棄。由此名為不應共住。

That which is called not in communion means this offender may not with the other bhikṣus be in communion, participate in the poṣadha, pravārana, jñāpti, jñāpti-dvitiya and jñāpti-caturtha karmans. If the assembly has business [which arises] for which it ought to commission [one of] the twelve kinds of people, this person is not within the limit that may be commissioned. He does not receive the use along with the others of dharma or food. This person ought to be banished. Therefore, this is called one who should no longer be in communion.

Similarly, there is also a Tibetan parallel for this. sTog Ca 42a3-5 (’Dul bar nram par ’byed pa) reads:

*yang dge slong gang dge slong rnams dang lhan cig bslab pa mtshungs par gyur pas bslab pa ma phul / bslab pa nyams bar ma byas par mi mtshangs par spyod pa ’khrig pa’i chos bsten na / th na dud ’gro’i skye gnas su skyes pa dang lhan cig kyang rung ste / dge slong de pham par gyur pa yin gyes / gnas par mi bya’o //

Whatever bhikṣu, having trained in the same training together with the bhikṣus, without disavowing his training and without revealing his weakness in regard to the training, engages in the unchaste practice of sexual intercourse, even together with an animal, that bhikṣu is pārājika. He should not be in communion.

---

135 芥芻 BV: 芥芻尼 NV
136 非 NV, BV: 罪 BV:KMSY
137 Cf. note 90 above.
Asamvāsa is explained at sTog Ca 46b5-7 ('Dul ba rnam par 'byed pa):

gnas par mi bya’o zhes bya ba ni / dge slong rnam s kyis de dang gso sbyong dang / dgag dbye dang / gsol ba dang / gsol ba dang gnyis dang / gsol ba dang bzhi’i las la gnas par mi bya’o / gang zag bcu gnyis po dag tu bsko bas bsko bar mi bya ba ste / des na gnas par mi bya’o zhes gsungs so //

Should not be in communion means that with him the bhikṣus should not have communion in the poṣadha, the pravāraṇa, jñāpti, jñāpti-dvitīya or jñāpti-caturtha karmans. He should not be appointed as one of the twelve appointees. Therefore it says that he should not be in communion.

Here we see that the Mālasarvāstivādin Bhikṣu vibhaṅga interpretation of asamvāsa appears to be in line with that of the Sarvāstivādins in as much as it defines communion as being able to participate in formal acts of the assembly and be appointed to specific ecclesiastical offices. The Mālasarvāstivādins, however, only list twelve as opposed to fourteen offices. Furthermore, although the Tibetan offers no parallel, the Chinese recension of the Mālasarvāstivādin text makes mention of the benefits of dharma and food as we saw in the Mahāsāṃghika texts. It is quite possible that the food in this text is a metaphor for material as opposed to spiritual (dharma) benefits and may well also encompass clothing as we saw in the Mahāsāṃghika tradition.

Furthermore, the commentary on the Mālasarvāstivādin Bhikṣu prātimokṣa provides the following explanation of asamvāsa: 138

言不應共住者。謂此犯人法食二事永無其分。譬若死屍。故云不共住。

That which is called not being in communion means this offender is always without a share in the two items of dharma and food. It is as if he is the corpse of a dead man. Accordingly, it is called not being in communion.

138 T. 1458, pp. 532c25-533a2.

139 兩 KMNN²SY: 雨 G
Thus, as we have seen from the above texts, it is apparent that \textit{asamvāsa} means that one is effectively excommunicated, that one is no longer fit to take part actively in ecclesiastical acts or to reap the benefits, be they spiritual or material, of association with the \textit{samgha}. Thus translations such as ‘should be expelled,’ etc., would seem to be misleading. In the \textit{vibhaṅga} interpretations we have seen, the only mention of banishment was that found in the Chinese text of the \textit{Mūlasarvāstivādin vibhaṅga} and does not seem to appear in the Tibetan parallel. The only other reference to ‘expulsion’ is that found in the \textit{Samantapāśādikā}. Accordingly, even though it is certain that the violation of a \textit{pārājika} offence entailed some kind of ecclesiastical ostracisation I hesitate to accept that this can only be understood as expulsion.

As we have seen, punishment for committing a \textit{pārājika} offence seems to entail some kind of excommunication. The punishment, however, is actually two-fold; this-worldly and other-worldly. Whereas this-worldly punishment is the ostracising of a \textit{bhikṣu}, other-worldly punishment consists of a visit to one of the Buddhist hells.

The \textit{Fanjie zuibao qingzhong jing} 犯戒罪報輕重經 (T.1467), the colophon of which bears the name of An Shigao 安世高 (148-170 C.E.) as translator,\footnote{This text is probably incorrectly ascribed to An Shigao. For a list of his genuine works, see, \textit{inter alia}, E. Zürcher, “A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts,” in Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen eds., \textit{From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-Hua}, pp. 277-300. Cf. also P. Harrison, “The Ekottarikāgama Translations of An Shigao,” in \textit{Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechtel on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday}, pp. 261-284.\textsuperscript{140}} provides an instructive warning against the violation of \textit{pārājika} offences. The relevant passage reads:\footnote{T. 1467, p. 910c4-8. Note that this text is also to be found in fascicle 40 of the \textit{Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya} (T. 1425, p. 548c).}

\begin{quote}
佛告\textsuperscript{142}目連。無\textsuperscript{143}惭無\textsuperscript{144}愧輕慢佛語。犯波羅夷。如他化自在天壽十
\end{quote}
六千歲。墮泥犁中。於人間數。九百二十一億六千十歲。時尊者目連聞佛所說歡喜奉行。
The Buddha said to Mahāmaudgalyāyana, "If shamelessly and immodestly, one slights the word of the Buddha and commits a pārājika, [then] he will fall into niraya and have like the Paranirmitavaśavartins a lifetime of 16,000 years. In human calculation, 9,216,000,000 years." Then, the Reverend Mahāmaudgalyāyana having heard that which the Buddha had expounded, rejoiced and accepted it.

Similarly, the Mulian su Owen jing 目連所問經 (T. 1468) which appears to have been translated by Fatian (Dharmadeva?) 法天 sometime after 973 C.E. reads as follows:

尊者大目犍連。白佛言。世尊。若有苾芻苾芻尼。迷醉犯戒無慚無愧。輕慢律儀。犯波羅夷法。彼等云何得多福利。世尊告言。尊者大目

142 佛告 KN²: 復次 GMSY
143 無 K: 若無 GMN²SY
144 無 K: om. GMN²SY
145 六 GKMSY: 九 N²
146 時 KN²: om. GMSY
147 According to MBD, pp. 3467 and 3771, one Paranirmitavaśavartin day-and-night is equivalent to 1,600 human years and they live for 16,000 years.

148 Cf. AKB, p. 472.
149 Namely, 360 days (number of days to a human year (see, e.g., T. 1488, p. 1072a 6-7: 如是三十日為一月。十二月為一歲。)) multiplied by 1,600 (the number of human years to a Paranirmitavaśavartin day-and-night) multiplied by 16,000 (their lifespan). On the calculation of 360 day years, see also the AKB, vol. 2, pp. 539-41, notes 468 and 490. The lowest gods of the Kāmadhātu have fifty human years as a day-and-night and live for five hundred years. The higher gods increase in lifespan by multiples of two. Their calculation of a day-and-night also increases by two times that of the gods directly below them (see AKB, vol. 2, pp. 470-1). Thus, if the lifespan of the Cātur-mahārājas is 9 million years this is simply multiplied by 4 to get the lifespan of the next level of gods, viz.: the Trayastrimśa. The life-spans are as follows: Cātur-mahārāja 四天王天 9 million (human) years; Trayastrimśa 三十三天 36 million years; Yāma 夜摩天 144 million years; Tuṣita 兜率天 576 million years; Nīramāna-rati 不橋棄天 2,304 million years; Paranirmitavaśavartī 他化自在天 9,216 million years.
Reverend Mahāmaudgalyāyana said to the Buddha, “World-Honoured One, if a bhikṣu or bhikṣuni misguidedly violates a rule, and immodestly and shamelessly slighting the Vinaya rules violates a pārājika dharma, how are they to acquire much merit?”

The World-Honoured One said, “Reverend Mahāmaudgalyāyana, if a bhikṣu or bhikṣuni misguidedly violates a rule, and immodestly and shamelessly slighting the Vinaya rules violates a pārājika dharma, that person will be reborn in hell when their life ends. Their life span will be equivalent to that of the 16,000 years of a Paranirmitavasavartin. The total of which is, in human calculation, 921 kotis and 6,000,000 years.”

Thus we see that a fully ordained samgha member who transgresses a...

---

150 It would appear that either the text is in error or that somebody was not very good at mathematics. I suggest that the following passages (referring to the other levels of gods) be emended as follows: (p. 910b27-8) 如夜 (夜 K: 焰 GMNSY) 摩天壽二千歳…於人間數二十 (十 KN: 十四 GMSY) 億四十千歳. emend to read: 如夜摩天壽二千歳…於人間數十四億四十千歳. thus giving a lifespan of 144 million human years for the Yāmas (as opposed to 204/244 million years); (p. 910b29-c2) 如兜率天壽四千歳…於人間數. 五十億六十千歳 emend to read: 如兜率天壽四千歳…於人間數. 五十七億六十千歳. in order to render a lifespan of 576 million years (contra 506 million). Furthermore, p. 910b22-3 (如四天王天壽五百歳…於人間數九百千歳.) should be understood as 9 million years. Throughout this text it seems as if yi 億 is to be understood as 10,000,000 and shiqian 十千 as 1,000,000. Perhaps, we are to understand shiqian 十千 as a scribal error for qianqian 千千 (?) a thousand times a thousand, viz. a million (?).

151 See Demiéville, p. 257 for the re-Sanskritization of his name.


154 Again, there seems to be a discrepancy in the text. The text reads, “915 kotis and 6,000,000 years.” This should read 9,216,000,000 years (360 days to a human year) multiplied by 1,600 (the number of human years to a Paranirmitavasavartin day-and-night) multiplied by 16,000 (their lifespan). I suggest that the passage be emended to read as follows: 計人間算數九百二十一俱胝六百萬歳. Cf. T. 1467, p. 910c4-8.
pārājika dharma is sentenced to rebirth in hell for the next 9,216,000,000 years. Although these texts no doubt had an admonitory purpose, it is the this-worldly logistics of dealing with a bhikṣu or bhikṣunī who has committed a pārājika offence that here concern us.

As we have seen, the offender is usually excommunicated (asamvāsa) and as a consequence is no longer able to participate in formal acts or reap the benefits of association (samvāsa) with the samgha. There is, however, one very important exception to this rule—the śiksādattaka.

The śiksādattaka is, at least according to Hirakawa’s definition,155 a bhikṣu who has transgressed against the first pārājika, viz. abrahmacarya, and is granted a special penance, the details of which set out the conditions under which he may remain within the samgha. The details of the penance itself vary between the extant Vinaya traditions. These provisions appear in all of the extant Chinese translations of the five major nikāyas of the Mainstream156 Buddhist tradition. Furthermore, the Sanskrit and Tibetan extant recensions of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya also contain a number of important references to the śiksādattaka. The only extant major Vinaya tradition that appears to remain completely silent in this respect is the Theravādin Vinaya.157

In order to establish a clear picture of what exactly this penitent status of monkhood is, its logistics and implications, we will systematically examine the material relating to the śiksādattaka extant in the Vinayas of, in no particular

156 I am using “Mainstream” in the sense espoused by Harrison, The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present, p. xviii, note 8.
order, the Mahīśāsaka, Sarvāstivādin, Mahāsāṃghika, Dharmaguptaka and Mūlasarvāstivādin traditions.
Chapter Three
Mahīśāsaka Tradition

The Vinaya of the Mahīśāsakas is perhaps the least complete of any of those of the major nikāyas for which texts are extant.¹ The only surviving recension is that preserved in the Chinese translation of the Mishasaibu huoxi wufenlű 彌沙塞部和觝五分律² or “Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka Nikāya in Five Parts” (T. 1421). Tradition accords that Faxian 法顯 (ca. 340?-420? C.E.) obtained a manuscript in Ceylon during his visit there between the years 410-412 C.E.³ This manuscript, apparently never translated by Faxian, appears to have been translated by the Kashmiri Tripiṭaka Master Buddhajīva 佛陀什 in collaboration with others including Zhu-Daosheng 竺道生 (d. 434 C.E.) between the years 423-424 C.E.⁴

The text as we have it today is thirty fascicles in length. This accords with Zhisheng’s 智昇 (668-740 C.E.) Kaiyuan shijiao lu 開元釋教錄 (T. 2154) of 730 C.E. in which it is listed as comprising only thirty fascicles.⁵ According to the Chu sanzangjiji 出三蔵記集 (T. 2145) compiled by Sengyou 僧祐 (445-518 C.E.) between 510-518 C.E., however, the original manuscript

¹ See Frauwallner, pp. 182-184 on what he describes as the “worst tradition.” The texts extant are as follows: T. 1421 contains the Bhikṣu vibhaṅga (pp. 1a-77b), Bhiksuni vibhaṅga (pp. 77b-101a) and skandhaka (pp. 101a-194b). There are two recensions of the Bhikṣu prātimokṣa at T. 1422. The first is to be found at pp. 194c-200b, the second from pp. 200b-206b (note that Prebish, 1994, p. 66, does not mention the existence of the second text in the Mahīśāsaka tradition). The Bhiksuni prātimokṣa is to be found at T. 1423, pp. 206b-214a. Furthermore, T. 1424 (pp. 214a-226a) contains the karmavācanā.

² For a discussion on the exact meaning of the name Mishasaibu huoxi wufenlű 彌沙塞部和觝五分律, especially on the problematic huoxi 和觝, see BKDJ, vol. 10, p. 312.

³ BKDJ, vol. 10, p. 312.

⁴ BKDJ, vol. 10, p. 312.

⁵ T. 2154, p. 523c11: 五分律三十卷亦云彌沙塞律或三十四卷別錄云二十四卷
恐謬（謬 K: 誤 MSY）見道慧（慧 K: 慧 MSY）宋齊錄及僧祐錄。
appears to have been thirty-four fascicles in length.  

It is to the twenty-eighth fascicle, as it appears in the fifth part of the “Vinaya in Five Parts,” that we now turn. In what Frauwallner describes as an addendum to the text, under the subheading tiaoju 法伏法 we find an interesting episode about a bhikṣu who is seduced by a woman and although he breaks his brahmacaryya—which would normally entail a pārājika offence—he is granted a special pardon and allowed to remain within the Order. The text reads as follows:  

有一比丘坐禅。魔女來至其前。比丘見生染著心。不覺起捉彼女。女便走比丘亦追拒之。彼女至一死馬中沒。比丘便於馬上行姦。即生悔心語諸比丘。諸比丘以是白佛。佛言。僧與彼比丘作波羅夷白四羯磨。彼比丘應至僧中斡革屍頌出。右肩禮僧足。跪合掌作如是言。我某甲比丘犯姦即生悔不覆藏。今從僧乞波羅夷羯磨。願僧與我波羅夷羯磨。如是三言。應知法比丘唱言。大德僧聽。此某甲比丘犯姦即生悔不覆藏。從僧乞波羅夷羯磨。僧今與作波羅夷羯磨。若僧時到僧忍聽。白如是。大德僧聽。此某甲比丘犯姦。乃至僧今與作波羅夷羯磨。誰諸長老忍默然不忍者說。如是第二第三說。僧與某甲比丘作波羅夷羯磨竟。僧忍默然故是事如是持。佛言。彼比丘等得授大比丘食而自從淨人受。若布薩自恣作諸羯磨時。若來者善。若不來彼無犯。  

6 T. 2145, p. 12b3: 疊沙塞律三十四卷即釋法顯所得胡（胡 KS: 梵 MY）本以宋景平元年七月譯出已入律錄。  

7 Frauwallner, pp. 182-183.  

8 Abhicāraka(?) This term appears to be often used in Tantric Buddhism in the sense of subduing adversaries, etc. I am not sure if the nuance is exactly the same in the Vinaya. It seems, however, to be pointing to guidelines for “subduing” evil. For a detailed discussion on this term, see BDJ, p. 3720 (vol. 4).  

9 T. 1421 p. 182c10-27.  

10 偏 GKMSY: 偏 N  

11 胡 G: 嬲 KMNSY  

12 得 GN: 不得 KMSY
A certain bhikṣu was sitting in meditation. A daughter of Māra came up in front of him. The bhikṣu saw her and felt thoughts of longing. Without being conscious [of what he was doing] he got up and grabbed at her. The woman then ran off and the bhikṣu likewise ran after her. She came upon a dead horse and disappeared inside it. The bhikṣu then performed a sexual act on the horse. Immediately, he felt remorse and related this to the bhikṣus.

The bhikṣus told this to the Buddha. The Buddha said, ‘I allow the saṃgha to grant that bhikṣu the jñāpti-caturtha karman of pārājika [penance]. That bhikṣu should come amidst the saṃgha, take off his leather sandals, bare his right shoulder, prostrate himself before the saṃgha, kneel down [on one knee], join his palms together and make the following declaration, ‘I, bhikṣu so-and-so, have committed a sexual act. Immediately I felt remorse and did not conceal the fact. Now from the saṃgha I beg for the formal act of pārājika [penance]. May the saṃgha grant me the formal act of pārājika [penance].’ In this manner he is to beg three times.

A bhikṣu knowledgeable in the dharma should announce [as follows]: ‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. This bhikṣu so-and-so has committed a sexual act. Immediately he felt remorse and did not conceal the fact. From the saṃgha he begs for the formal act of pārājika [penance]. Will the saṃgha now grant him the formal act of pārājika [penance]? If the saṃgha thinks that the time is right the saṃgha should consent. This is the motion.’

‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. This bhikṣu so-and-so has committed a sexual act ... will the saṃgha now grant him the formal act of pārājika [penance]? Those Elders who consent should remain silent, those who do not consent should speak out.’

In this manner the second and third articulations [of the motion] are to be made.

[The bhikṣu knowledgeable in the dharma continues,]14 ‘The saṃgha has finished granting the formal act of pārājika [penance] to bhikṣu so-and-so. The saṃgha has consented on account of its silence. Thus I hold this

---

13 I have translated in accordance with the variant in G, viz. hu 胡. If we understand hu 胡 then this is to be translated as “squat.” Cf. p. 173 below.

14 It is quite difficult to know exactly who is talking and exactly where their dialogue ends in the Chinese.
matter to be so."

The Buddha said, "For the rest of his life that bhikṣu is to give food to the full bhikṣus and he himself is to receive [food] from the ‘factor.’ When the formal acts of the poṣadha and the pravāraṇa are carried out, if he comes, well and good, if he does not come there is no offence on either side."

The text, as we have it, is relatively clear and unambiguous. A bhikṣu, who is unnamed in this passage, was engaged in meditation. Thereupon, one of Māra’s daughters approached the bhikṣu and before he knew it he desired her. She, however, decided to run away. A chase ensued and in her flight she came across the carcass of a horse and somehow disappeared into it. The bhikṣu, inflamed by lust, performed a sexual act upon the horse without

---

15 The text may be corrupt. Notice that the negative drops out of the text. This perhaps suggests that the transmitters of the text also had trouble with this. I have translated in accordance with mss. G and N. The other possibility would be to leave in the negative and understand shou ‘accept’ for shou ‘give.’ The meaning, however, is not problematic. The śīkṣādattaka may give food to but may not accept it from bhikṣus in good standing.

16 Skt. kalpikāraka. See BHSD, ss.vv. kalpikāra and kalpikāraka. See also Gombrich, Theravāda Buddhism, pp. 102-103 ff., for a detailed discussion on the Pāli equivalent of this term (kappiya-kāraka). I have chosen to translate this term as ‘factor’ in the sense of a doer, maker or agent. Edgerton, s.v. suggests that it seems to mean “some kind of servant of monks in a temple or monastery.” Gombrich, states (p. 103) that he may be “a monastery servant or just a pious layman.” Dutt, Early Buddhist Monachism (EBM), p. 154 states that this officer’s duty was “to ascertain what provisions were allowable and what not. He would receive gifts of money from lay men and convert them into proper commodities.” It is this sense, as explained by Dutt, in which I have understood this passage. Dutt’s explanation seems to suggest that this officer was a monk; this, however, does not appear to be the case. See, inter alia, Satō Mitsuo 佐藤敏雄, Genshi Bukkyō kyōdan no kenkyū 原始佛教教團の研究, pp. 310-318, esp. p. 316 in which he states that the kappiya-kāraka is the only one (of the seventeen offices he mentions) not taken by a monk, but by a layman. As Frauwallner (p. 124) points out, there is a large degree of variation among the traditions with regard to these offices. Dutt (p. 156) states that this office and thirteen others were permanent appointments. Cf. the Sarvāstivādin vibhaṅga commentary on asamvāsa (pp. 41-43 above) in which we saw that one who is not in communion is not allowed to be appointed to any of these fourteen offices. Cf. also the Mulasarvāstivādin Chinese and Tibetan parallels in which only twelve offices are mentioned (pp. 50-51 above).

17 In all likelihood this bhikṣu is Nandika.
knowing what he was doing. As a meditator it is possible that he visualised the horse as being the daughter of Māra and did not realise he was actually engaged in a sexual act with a horse. Immediately after this he felt remorseful and without trying to conceal the fact told the bhikṣu who in turn told the Buddha.

The prerequisite conditions under which such a pardon may be granted do not seem to be specifically set out in this Vinaya. However, the fact that the bhikṣu immediately felt remorseful of his actions seems to play an integral part as a prerequisite for pārājika penance.\(^\text{18}\) Secondly, the fact that the bhikṣu did not try to conceal his actions also seems important. Thirdly, it seems that the bhikṣu is to request the saṅgha to grant him penance through a jñāpti-caturtha karman, viz. a formal act used for the most important of ecclesiastical matters. In requesting the formal act of pārājika penance he appears to perform a variation of the five repentance dharmas.\(^\text{19}\) The motion is put to the saṅgha and on account of their silence it is passed. The conclusion of the motion is marked with the phrase shishirushichi 是事如是持 which I have translated as “thus I hold this matter to be so.”\(^\text{20}\)

\(^{18}\) I use the term penance in its original sense of punishment. The term reprieve is not suitable here as it implies a temporary respite from the punishment entailed upon committing a pārājika. Pārājika penance is not a temporary respite. Indeed, if it was, then the bhikṣu would still eventually be subject to the normal punishment for a pārājika. This, however, is not the case.

\(^{19}\) Zongmi 宗密 (780-841 C.E.) seems to state in his Yuanjuejing dashu shiyi chao 圆覺經大疏釋義鈔 that according to the Hinayāna there are five things that must be done when confessing one’s offences: circumambulate the saṅgha keeping one’s shoulder to the right, touch the ground with one’s right knee, join the palms of one’s hands in reverent salutation, state the name of their offence and pay homage to the feet of the saṅgha (大日本續藏經 Dainippon zokuzōkyō, collection 1, set 15, vol. 1, fasc. 13a, p. 26 left, b15-16: 小乘懺要。請大比丘為證。對大僧具五法。一袒右肩。二右膝著地。三合掌。四說罪各種 …五禮足). See FG and MBD chanhui (J. sange) 懺悔 s.v. respectively.

\(^{20}\) Cf. BV, §98, line 11, evam etam dhārayāmi.
In our text the Buddha then proceeds to set down the conditions accompanying the bhikṣu’s penance. From this it is evident that the penance, is to be observed for the rest of his life.\textsuperscript{21} Furthermore, although he may give food to the bhikṣus he himself is only permitted to accept food from the factor. This is quite different to the rules of the other Vinayas. Although a number of Vinayas state that he is to give food to the full bhikṣus, it is the second part in which divergence becomes most apparent. In the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, for instance, the śīkṣādattaka is to receive food and drink from śrāmaṇerās and the laity.\textsuperscript{22} The Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya states that he may receive food from the śrāmaṇerās.\textsuperscript{23} Whereas the Mālasarvāstivādin Vinaya remains quiet on this issue, the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas clearly states that the śīkṣādattaka is not to associate with the laity.\textsuperscript{24}

Furthermore, the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya’s stance on the ceremonies of the poṣadha and pravāraṇa is also interesting. Under normal situations the attendance of both of these is mandatory for bhikṣus and forbidden to those who are not fully ordained, viz. novices and the laity.\textsuperscript{25} This Vinaya, however, does not seem to be worried whether the śīkṣādattaka attends these ceremonies or not. The Sarvāstivādin Vinaya clarifies its position by stating that although he may participate in these two formal acts he may not be counted as a sufficient member to make up a quorum.\textsuperscript{26} The Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya seems

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. the Nandika story as found in the Mālasarvāstivāda Vinaya; in this Vinaya the penance is only until the bhikṣu attains arhatship (see pp. 176 and 182 below). Cf. also T. 1458 in which it is stated as being for only 6 months (pp. 182-183 below).

\textsuperscript{22} T. 1435, p. 3b3-4: 自從沙彌白衣受飲食。

\textsuperscript{23} T. 1425, p. 44126-27: 彼應從沙彌受食。

\textsuperscript{24} T. 1428, p. 809b19: 不得親近外道白衣。

\textsuperscript{25} See GBK, p. 372 on the mandatory status of these two ceremonies and ibid., p. 250 on the exclusion of novices and the laity.
to state that he may not listen to the \textit{poṣadha} or receive the \textit{pravāraṇa}.\textsuperscript{27} Likewise, the \textit{Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya} states that a \textit{ṣīkṣādattaka} may not participate in these ceremonies.\textsuperscript{28} The \textit{Dharmaguptaka Vinaya} states that he may not perform any formal acts but that he may attend the recitation of the precepts and other formal acts.\textsuperscript{29}

In short, the Mahīśāsaka tradition seems to only list two major conditions of penance for the \textit{ṣīkṣādattaka}, viz. rules relating to the acceptance of meals, and those related to participation in the \textit{poṣadha} and \textit{pravāraṇa}. Thus, it would appear that the Vinaya tradition of the Mahīśāsakas is not very well developed in terms of the doctrine of \textit{pārājika} penance.

This text, however, is not the only text in the Mahīśāsaka tradition dealing with \textit{pārājika} penance. A second text is to be found in the \textit{karmavācanā} of the Mahīśāsakas. The \textit{Mishasai jiemo ben} (T. 1424) was, according to the colophon of the text, recorded by \textit{śramaṇa} Aitong 愛同 (ca. fl. 705-706 C.E.) of the Dakaiye Temple 大開業寺. This text is divided into ten sections, the ninth of which is entitled \textit{chanhui zhufan} 懺悔諸犯 “confession of offences.” Here we find another text dealing with \textit{pārājika} penance:

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26} T. 1435, p. 3b5-7: 得與具戒比丘作布薩自恣二羯磨。與學沙彌不得足數作布薩自恣羯磨。
\item \textsuperscript{27} T. 1425, p. 441c2-3: 不得聽布薩自恣。The Mahāśāṃghika situation is not, however, straightforward. It then proceeds to state at T. 1425, p. 441c3-4: 布薩。自恣日（日 GKS: 自 MY）。到僧中作如是言。我（我 K: 如我 GMSY）清淨僧憶持。如是三説已應還（應還 K: 還應 GMSY）。“On the day of the \textit{poṣadha} and the day that the \textit{pravāraṇa} is received, going into the \textit{saṃgha} he should speak thus, ‘I am pure, let the \textit{saṃgha} bear it in mind.’ Having spoken thus three times he should go back.” See pp. 121-122 below for a more detailed discussion of this.
\item \textsuperscript{28} T. 1451, p. 245c14-15: 不得長淨及隨意事. Cf. also the Tibetan recension which reads: \textit{gso sbyong ma yin / dgag dbyes ma yin /}
\item \textsuperscript{29} T. 1428, p. 809b22-23: 不得非僧羯磨及作羯磨者; b28: 僧說戒及羯磨時。來與不來。
\end{itemize}
Confessing a pārājika dharma

Committing a pārājika is known as destroying the root, splitting a stone, cutting off one’s head. How can it again be restored to wholeness? Although according to the Great Vehicle (Mahāyāna) confession [rites] it can be extirpated, this has not been something that has ever been used by the samgha of our sect (?). These are fundamental prohibitions, they are dissimilar to other transgressions. In particular, they necessitate that one spares no pains in strictly observing them. Sentient beings [being what they are] easily lapse under such conditions.\(^{33}\) If one does not have even a single thought of concealing [his transgression], it is permitted within the Vinaya that he repent. However, if one was able to purify the karma from one’s transgressions, how could monkhood be comfortable with it? Since repentance of [such] transgressions is rare, the details are as explained in the text.

This passage is lexically and grammatically rather problematic. Accordingly the above translation is extremely tentative. Nevertheless, despite the lexical difficulties the text does raise a number of important issues. It mentions the fact that according to the Mahāyānists it is possible to totally eradicate the adverse affects of a pārājika offence.\(^{34}\) Although later developments such as Mahāyāna purification rites are not germane to the present study, it is worthy of note that this text seems to view the followers of the Mahāyāna in rather

---

\(^{30}\) Note only the title is in the Taishō’s usual size type. The main text is two lines of characters per one standard line. In order to aid legibility, in the translations and reproduction of the texts, I have used a dotted underline to correspond with the large typeface in the Taishō and a plain font (i.e. no underline) to represent the smaller typeface.

\(^{31}\) 折 KSY: 析 M

\(^{32}\) 境 K: 鏡 MSY

\(^{33}\) Cf. p. 68 below (note 13).
disparaging terms and appears to imply that their own sect, or Mainstream Buddhism as a whole depending on the interpretation of zongfu 宗法, is not so lax as to permit total eradication, or perhaps more properly purification, of such heinous offences.

In the same light, the text then goes on to state that if a bhikṣu does not attempt to conceal his offence at all, he may be granted pārājika penance. The implication here seems to be that pārājika penance is in no way a position of laxity with regard to the precepts of the prātimokṣa. Indeed, pārājika penance does not seem to be an easy option at all; it would appear to entail humiliation for the bhikṣu in question as a consequence of his life-long loss of seniority evidenced in the fact that he may give food to the full bhikṣus, but he himself is to receive his alms from the factor. Moreover, the samgha seems to be totally indifferent to his existence—they seem not to care whether or not he participates in the pravāraṇa or poṣadha.

Furthermore, it also appears to state that monks, who are after all sentient beings, are vulnerable to temptation. This theme of temptation, although perhaps only hinted at in the previous story about a bhikṣu who was sitting in meditation, is very strong in some of the parallel passages from the other traditions in which Nandika the Meditator is clearly beguiled. It is to one such tradition that we now turn—our next port of call is the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya.

---

34 For further details on confession rites, see, inter alia, FG, pp. 6772-6774, s.v. chanhui 禪悔; Kuo Li-ying, Confession et contrition dans le bouddhisme chinois du V au Xe siècle, esp. pp. 62-64 in which she discusses Zhiyi’s 智顕 (538-597 C.E.) three-fold theory on confession, viz. zuofa chanhui 作法懺悔 “confession par les Actes,” guanxiang chanhui 観相懺悔 “confession faite en méditant sur les visions” and guanwusheng chanhui 観無生懺悔 “confession par le moyen de la méditation sur la non-production.” Cf. also ibid., p. 24 on the distinction between shichan 事懺 “confession phénoménale” (viz. the first type of confession listed above) and lichan 理懺 “confession nouménale” (the other two types of confession). See, inter alia, Fukushima Kōsai 福島光哉, “Chigi no kairitsu shisō 慈悲の戒律思想” in Sasaki Kyōgo 佐々木教悟 ed., Kairitsu shisō no kenkyū 戒律思想の研究, pp. 343-365; Brian C. Beresford ed., Mahāyāna Purification, 1980.
Chapter Four
Sarvāstivāda Tradition

The Sarvāstivādin Vinaya was translated into Chinese between the years 404-409 C.E.¹ as the Shisong lü 十誦律 ‘Vinaya in Ten Recitations’ or ‘Vinaya in Ten Adhyāyas’ (T. 1435) by Kumārajiva 鳳摩羅什 (350-409 C.E.) in collaboration with Puṇyatara 弗若多羅 (fl. ca. 399-405? C.E.),² who is said to have recited the text from memory.³ Puṇyatara, however, died before the translation was finished and it was only able to be continued when Huiyuan 慧遠 (334-416 C.E.) heard that Dharmaruci 瑪摩流支 (fl. ca. 405 C.E.) had entered the capital of Chang’an 長安 and requested him to recite the text so as to facilitate its completion.⁴ The text was then later revised by Vimalākṣa 卑摩羅叉 (fl. ca. 409 C.E.) after the death of Kumārajiva.⁵

The Bhikṣu vibhaṅga is contained within the first three recitations or adhyāyas of the text.⁶ The first recitation contains the four pārājika dharmas

---

¹ RK, p. 128. SVL, p. 79, gives 404 C.E.; FRAUWALLNER, pp. 177-178, puts the date between 404-405 C.E. Note, however, these dates do not appear to take into account the revisions made by Vimalākṣa (the last three fascicles (?) (see note 5 below)) shortly after Kumārajiva’s death in 409 C.E.

² Demiéville, p. 249, gives ca. 399-415 for his date of arrival in Chang’an. Zürcher, The Buddhist Conquest of China, vol. 2, p. 409, note 89, tells us that the translation was interrupted when Puṇyatara died, and was not able to be continued until Dharmaruci arrived in 405 C.E.

³ Zürcher, ibid.

⁴ PKDI, p. 167; Zürcher, ibid.

⁵ Although Zürcher (ibid.) suggests that Vimalākṣa completed the “three remaining chapters,” the colophon of fascicle 59 clearly states that it was translated by Puṇyatara. Furthermore, only two colophons of the 61 fascicles of the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya as contained in the Taishō edition, bear the name of Vimalākṣa. RK, p. 125, states that there is evidence that fascicles 60 and 61 as found in the Taishō edition were originally split into three fascicles. For a detailed discussion on this, see RK, pp. 122-127.

⁶ SVL, p. 80.
and it is here where we first encounter the Nandika story. It is interesting to note that this is not the only version of the Nandika story in the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya, it also appears in fascicle fifty-seven (p. 425a14-b21) in the tenth and final recitation. Apparently the same Nandika is mentioned also in fascicle thirty-eight.

The text of the Nandika story as found in fascicle one of the Sarvāstivādin vibhaṅga reads as follows:

The Buddha was in the country of Śrāvastī. There was a mendicant bhikṣu called Nandi[ka]. Early in the morning, when the time came, he put on his robe and took his bowl and entered the city to beg for food. After he had eaten he took his niṣidana and put it on his left shoulder and entered the Andhavana. Under a tree he spread out his niṣidana and sat with a straight back. There was an evil deity who, because she desired to destroy this bhikṣu’s samādhi, manifested in the form of a beautiful...

---

7 Note that this section is not exactly the same as the pārājika section in fascicle 1. Whereas fascicle 1 begins with the story of Sudinna-Kalandaputra 須提那加蘭陀子 (p. 1a9-c21) followed by the story of a bhikṣu named Vṛjiputra? 跡耆子 (p. 1c22-29), the story of the bhikṣu and the female monkey (p. 2a1-c28) and ends with the Nandika story (pp. 2c29-3b7), the first pārājika section contained in fascicle 57 begins with the story of Sudinna-Kalandaputra 須提那加蘭陀子 (pp. 424b17-425a13) but is followed directly by the Nandika story (p. 425a14-b21). Furthermore, there are stories of bhikṣunīs in this section. Although a detailed comparison of these sections is not totally unwarranted it is not germane to the present thesis; thus I have placed it in the ever-increasing pile of things to do before my 70th birthday.

8 Here a short episode tells of a śiśūdattaka-śrāmanaṇera called Nandika who commits a duṣkṛta offence by picking hariṇaki fruit and, having given it to a factor, then receives it back again from the factor and eats it (T. 1435, p. 275c8-13: 佛在王舍城。爾時六群比丘。自取訶梨勒果與淨人已從受鉢。是事白佛。佛語諸比丘。不應自手取訶梨勒果與淨人更從受鉢。犯者突吉羅。餘一切果亦如是。佛在舍衛國。有比丘名難提。是比丘作與學（與學 GMSY: 與淨學 K）沙彌。如先所說。).

9 T. 1435, pp. 2c29-3b7. For the text, see Appendix 1, pp. 229-233 below.

10 See Sarvāstivāda Addendum 1, pp. 100-103 below.

11 Although the texts reads nanti 難提 ‘Nandi,’ I have transcribed this as Nandi[ka] owing to the fact that the only Sanskrit reference I have been able to find to this bhikṣu gives his name as Nandika, as do some other Chinese texts.
woman and stood in front of him. The bhikṣu emerged from the samādhi and seeing this woman’s body immediately felt thoughts of longing. Worldly meditations not being firm, he quickly lapsed and desired to touch the woman’s body. She then drew back and gradually distanced herself. Then he got up and followed after her desiring to embrace her body. At that time in that forest there was a dead horse. The woman went to the horse and hid her body so that she was no longer visible. Because this bhikṣu’s body was ablaze with sexual desire, he then had sex with the dead horse. Then after having sex the heat of his desire subsided. Then he felt remorseful and said, “I have lapsed and fallen. This is not [the act of] a bhikṣu or follower of the Buddha. Now the bhikṣus must abandon me and distance themselves from me, we can no longer be in communion. I should not wear this dharma-robe on my impure body.” Then he took off the kāśāya and put it in a bag and placing this on his shoulder went to the Buddha. At that time, the Buddha was venerated and encircled by an assembly of hundreds of thousands of myriads [of people] and was expounding the dharma to them. The Buddha saw him coming from afar and then thought as follows, “If I do not make kind enquiries with gentle speech, his heart will surely break and blood will come boiling out of his facial orifices.” This bhikṣu reached the Buddha. The Buddha said, “Welcome, Nandika, do you still desire to train in that which is trained in by a bhikṣu?” Hearing the Buddha say, “Welcome, Nandika,” his mind was overjoyed and he then thought, “I will be able to be in communion with the bhikṣus. They surely will not expel me.” After

12 The niṣīdana is a rug for sitting on. See BHSD, s.v. Cf. Upasak, Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastı Terms, s.v. niṣīdana. Cf. pācittiya 89 for the bhikṣus in the Theravādin Vinaya (BD, vol. 3, pp. 94-96 and VP, vol. 4, pp. 170-171) in which the size of this rug or mat is laid down (no pun intended).

13 I am unsure of the exact sense of this. Cf. Mahiśasaka karmavācanā, (p. 64 above (note 33)), T. 1424, p. 224b5: 但引消易易對境 K: 鏡 MSY)容虧。“Sentient beings [being what they are] easily lapse under such conditions.” It may simply be saying that worldly meditations are not enough to deliver one from temptation.

14 I.e. his robe. See BHSD, s.v. kāśāya. Cf. Upasak, s.v. kāśāya.

15 Note the similarity between this phrase and that found in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins (T. 1451, p. 245b5: 彼爛熱血即命終). Cf. E. H. Johnston’s text and translation of Aśvagoṣa’s Buddhacarita, p. 159: yady evam pāpakarmāṇah paśyeyuh karmanām phalam / vameyur uṣnaṁ rudhiram marmavabhīhatā īva /
having thought this he replied saying, “World-Honoured One, I still desire to train in the rules of training of the bhikṣus.” Thereupon, the Buddha said to the bhikṣus, “You should once more grant the bhikṣu Nandika the rules of training. If there are others like the bhikṣu Nandika, they also should be granted the rules of training.

The saṅgha should be of one mind in agreement. The bhikṣu Nandika should bare his right shoulder, take off his leather sandals, and kneel down joining his palms together and speak as follows, ‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. I, the bhikṣu Nandika, without abandoning the precepts, without disclosing my weakness with regard to the precepts,¹⁶ have engaged in sexual activity. I, now, from the saṅgha again beg for the rules of training. Out of compassion for me may the saṅgha again grant me the rules of training.’

The second and third [times] are also to be articulated like this.

Here, one bhikṣu is to call out within the saṅgha, ‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. The bhikṣu Nandika has, without returning¹⁷ the precepts and without [declaring his] weakness with regard to the precepts, engaged in sexual activity. This bhikṣu Nandika from the saṅgha begs for the rules of training again. Will the saṅgha now, out of compassion, again grant him the rules of training? If the saṅgha thinks that the time is right the saṅgha should assent and again grant the bhikṣu Nandika the rules of training. This is the motion.’

‘In this manner using a jñāpti-caturtha karman the bhikṣu Nandika is again granted the rules of training. The saṅgha assents by virtue of [their] silence. Thus I hold this matter to be so.’”

As for the rules for the behaviour of the śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera, all precepts set down by the Buddha should be entirely accepted and obeyed. He should sit below the bhikṣus. He should give the full bhikṣus food, drink and medicines. He himself is to receive food and drink from śrāmaneras and the laity. He may not stay more than two nights in the same room as the full bhikṣus. He himself may not stay for more than two nights with the laity or the śrāmaneras. He may, with fully ordained bhikṣus, participate in two formal acts, [those being] the poṣadha and the pravāraṇa. A śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera may not make up the number

¹⁶ On the importance of abandoning or disavowing one’s training and declaring one’s weakness, see p. 35, note 54 above.

required to perform the formal acts of the posadha and pravaraṇa. He may not make any formal acts. Here ends the section on sexual matters.

This recension of the Nandika story is most interesting and rather more developed than that of, for instance, the Mahīśāsaka tradition which, as we have seen, talks of an anonymous bhikṣu and only lists two major rules of penance.\(^\text{18}\)

Another interesting feature of this tradition is the use of the term yuxue shami 與學沙毘 or śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera. Yuxue 與學 appears to mean ‘one who has been granted the training,’ viz. a śikṣādattaka. The Chinese term, however, is not intuitive and if translated literally would be more likely to be understood as ‘one who grants the training’ as there are no passive markers or anything else to assist in the interpretation of this term. It is perhaps this same ambiguity which appears to have lead Alice Sárközi in her edition of the Mongolian Mahāvyutpatti to translate the terms surtaqun-i öggügči and suryañulü ögtëgsen, viz. śikṣādattaka, as ‘instructor.’\(^\text{19}\) The Tibetan, for which Ishihama and Fukuda’s critical edition of the Tibetan Mahāvyutpatti is essential, gives it as bslab pa byin pa (bslab pa ‘training’ and byin pa the pf. of shyin pa ‘to bestow’) and is relatively unproblematic.\(^\text{20}\) The Chinese term for śikṣādattaka, in the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya at least, is suffixed with the characters shami 沙毘 being the usual transliteration for śrāmaṇera. It appears that the śikṣādattaka is not referred to in this tradition as a bhikṣu but as a śrāmaṇera. Indeed, his position seems to be one of limbo between the

\(^{18}\) Cf. pp. 58-60 above.


status of a bhikṣu and a śrāmaṇera.

From the above text it would appear that a truly remorseful bhikṣu who has broken the first pārājika may be granted a special penance by means of a jñāpti-caturtha kārman under which, although he loses the privileges and status of a bhikṣu and whatever seniority he may have had within the Order, he is nevertheless allowed to remain within the saṅgha. The restrictions imposed upon him are outlined in the second part of the Nandika story and are also to be found in a separate text within this tradition. Accordingly, we will now take a closer look at this other passage. It is to be found in fascicle fifty-six, as contained in the tenth and final recitation, under the heading xīngfǎ 行法 ‘Rules of Behaviour.’ It reads as follows:22

波羅夷與學沙彌行法者。若比丘作姦欲已。乃至彈指頃。不生覆藏心。衆僧以白四羯磨。還與是比丘學法。廣説如與難提。是名與學沙彌。大比丘戒一切應持。應在大比丘下行坐。應授大比丘飲食。自應從未受具戒23人受飲食。得與大比丘同室再宿。自不得與未受大戒人過再宿。是與學沙彌。得作二羯磨。布薩羯磨自恣羯磨。是與學沙彌。不得與衆僧足數作布薩及諸羯磨。是名波羅夷與學沙彌行法。

The rules of behaviour for a pārājika sīkṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera. If a bhikṣu having performed a sexual act does not entertain thoughts of concealment for even an instant,24 [then] the saṅgha should, with a jñāpti-caturtha kārman, once again grant this bhikṣu the rules of training—the details of which are like those given to Nandika. This is called the sīkṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera. He should uphold all of the precepts for a full bhikṣu. He

21 This appears to be an appendix to the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya. Banerjee, Sarvāstivāda Literature, p. 35 states that the “tenth book contains the sections dealing with the Bhikṣuprātimokṣasūtra and the Bhikṣuniprātimokṣasūtra.” He is of course referring to the headings biqiusong 比丘誡 and binisong [xīngfǎzhīyu] 比尼誡 [行法之餘] on pp. 410 and 418 respectively. These appear to be commentarial passages on the precepts for monks and nuns.

22 T. 1435, p. 418b29-c10.

23 具戒 K: 大戒 GMSY

24 Lit. even for as long as it takes to click or snap one’s fingers.
should walk and sit below the full bhikṣus. He should give food and drink to the full bhikṣus. He himself should receive food and drink from those who are not yet fully ordained. He may spend a second night in the same lodging as the full bhikṣus. He himself may not spend more than a second night with those who are not yet fully ordained. This is the śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera. He may participate [with the full bhikṣus] in two formal acts; the formal act of the poṣadha and the formal act of the pravāraṇa. This is the śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera. He may not be counted as a sufficient saṃgha member to make the poṣadha or other formal acts. These are called the rules of behaviour for a pārājika śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera.

Thus, in both the above texts we see that the śikṣādattaka, who is effectively now only a śrāmaṇera, is subject to all of the precepts laid down by the Buddha for bhikṣus. Moreover, he is to sit below the bhikṣus, make offerings of food, drink and medicines, but is himself only allowed to accept such offerings from unordained persons. We see that he is placed at the bottom of the strictly hierarchical order of the bhikṣus. It is quite possible to conceive that such a punishment might entail him taking orders from bhikṣus previously his junior and this, especially for a bhikṣu of long standing, must


26 That is to say that he may not spend more than two nights' lodgings with the mahābhikṣus. This point is made clearer in recensions GMSY of T. 1435, p. 3b4: 不得與大比丘同室過二（二 GMSY: 而 不）宿。

27 Cf. pātayantika 54 of the Sarvāstivādin Bhikṣu prātimokṣa and pācittiya 5 in the Theravādin Bhikkhu pātimokkha.

28 The text here seems to be misleading. In accordance with T. 1435, p. 425b19-20 and T. 1435, p. 3b 5-6 which read 得與大比丘布薩自恣二羯磨 and 得與具戒比丘作布薩自恣二羯磨 respectively, I recommend that this passage be understood as: 得 [與大比丘] 作二羯磨布薩自恣羯磨 and have translated it accordingly.

have been a very humiliating penance.

It would seem, however, that it was not only a humiliating penance, but also a very lonely one. From the texts above we see that the śikṣādattaka was not allowed to spend more than two nights together with the bhikṣus, the laity or even the śrāmaṇeras. Accordingly, his life must have been one of extreme loneliness, a loneliness that was perhaps for some bhikṣus what they were trying to escape from in entering the Order.

Furthermore, the śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera does not appear to have had any so-called voting rights in the saṅgha, as evidenced by his inability to make up a quorum. He is, however, allowed to attend both the poṣadha and the pravāraṇa, the attendance of which is forbidden to novices and laymen.  

It is thus evident that the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya accepts the existence of the śikṣādattaka and that, as we have seen, even if a bhikṣu violates a pārājika (the first is all we have evidence for), but does not attempt in any way to conceal this fact, is truly remorseful and wishes to remain within the saṅgha, then he may remain. Thus, violation of a pārājika does not necessarily entail permanent and immediate expulsion.

The two passages above, however, are not the only mention of such penitent bhikṣus. The Sarvāstivādin Vinaya is rich in such materials. They are also to be found, inter alia, in the Cīvaravastu.

The fourth of the ten adhyāyas of the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya is made up of seven vastus contained in eight fascicles—fascicles twenty-seven and twenty-eight of which make up the Cīvaravastu (yīfa 衣法). Fascicle twenty-eight, the colophon of which bears an attribution to Puṇyatara 弗若多羅, contains the following passage which sheds light on the division of the estate of a

deceased šikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera.  

The territory of Kośalā a šikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera died. The bhikṣus did not know what to do with his possessions. They told the Buddha about this.

The Buddha said, “His possessions should be divided amongst the monks who were present at the time of death.”

A further interesting insight into the status of the šikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera can also be gleaned from the the ninth adhyāya of the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya. This recitation takes the form of a dialogue between the Blessed One and Upāli who takes on the role of interlocutor. Upāli seeks clarification of the Buddha’s position on various prātimokṣa rules ranging from the pārājikas down to the seven adhikaraṇaśamathas and other miscellanea. It is within these texts that we once again encounter the šikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera. One such passage reads:

又問。頗有不受具戒人行偽得波羅夷耶。答有。與學沙彌是也。  

Again [Upāli] asked, “Are there some people who are not fully ordained”.

---

31 T. 1435, p. 203a5-7.
32 Lit. robe[s], bowl[s] and things.
33 Although it would be interesting to compare this passage with similar passages dealing with bhikṣus and śrāmaṇeras both within the Sarvāstivādin tradition and in comparison with other traditions, I have neither the space nor time to do so here.
34 T. 1435, p. 379b20-22.
35 具戒 KN: 大戒 GMSY
36 有與 KN: 曰有 GMSY (according to the Taishō; it seems odd, maybe it is 答有 KN: 曰有 GMSY?).
37 也 GKMSY: om. N
38 The text, here and below, literally reads “those who have not received the full ordination.” This, however, is slightly confusing as a šikṣādattaka has received but lost, for want of a better term, the full ordination. Thus I have chosen to translate as above.
for whom having sex results in a pārājika?"
[The Buddha] replied, "Yes. A śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera is such."

It would appear from this text that the śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera is the only person who is not fully ordained for whom having sex results in a pārājika. Indeed, although śrāmaṇeras count as people not fully ordained, and notwithstanding the fact that they are also not allowed to indulge in sexual intercourse and may actually be expelled for doing so, this is not deemed to be a pārājika. Pārājikas can technically only be committed by fully ordained members of the saṃgha. The same also appears to apply for the other pārājika offences. The passage relating to the second pārājika reads:39

问颇有不受具戒人杀人得波罗夷耶。答40有。与学沙弥是也41。
[Upāli] asked, “Are there some people who are not fully ordained for whom murder results in a pārājika?”
[The Buddha] replied, “Yes. A śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera is such.”

Similarly, the text relating to the third pārājika reads:42

问颇有不受具戒人盗他重物得波罗夷耶。答43有。与学沙弥是。
[Upāli] asked, “Are there some people who are not fully ordained for whom stealing another’s valuable possessions results in a pārājika?”
[The Buddha] replied, “Yes. A śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera is such.”

Finally, the fourth pārājika is alluded to in the following passage:44

问颇有不受具戒虚妄说我得圣法得波罗夷耶。答有。与学沙弥是。
[Upāli] asked, “Are there some [people] who are not fully ordained for whom falsely claiming that they have acquired sagehood45 results in a

40 答 KN: 答言 GMSY
41 也 GKMSY: om. N
42 T. 1435, p. 381a29-b1.
43 答 KN: 答曰 GMSY
44 T. 1435, p. 383b8-12.
pārājika?"

[The Buddha] replied, "Yes. A śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera is such."

The above four passages correspond to the four pārājikas of the bhikṣus. From this we can ascertain that although the śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera was formerly a fully ordained bhikṣu, upon transgressing against the first pārājika dharma and subsequently being granted penance and demoted to the status of a śikṣādattaka, he is no longer regarded as being fully ordained. However, unlike other non-fully-ordained persons, e.g. novices, he is still bound by the pārājika dharmas.\textsuperscript{46} The text does not, however, appear to state what would happen to the śikṣādattaka in the event that he was to re-offend against one of the pārājika dharmas and thus remains silent on the issue of how many times a bhikṣu can receive this special penance.

After enquiring as to the pārājika dharmas Upāli then proceeds in a similar fashion to ask the Buddha about samghāvaśesa offences. Interestingly enough, Upāli only appears, at least in the text as it stands, to ask in relation to those who are not fully ordained about two of the thirteen samghāvaśesas. T. 1435 p. 383c19-21 reads as follows:\textsuperscript{47}

[Upāli] asked, "Are there some people who are not fully ordained for whom the intentional emission of semen results in a samghāvaśesa?"

[The Buddha] replied, saying, "Yes. A śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera is such."

\textsuperscript{45} Probably a cultural translation of Sanskrit uttari-manusya-dharma. See BHSD, s.v. uttari.

\textsuperscript{46} This is not to say that a novice may commit a ‘pārājika’; clearly this would not be allowed. Even if a novice is ‘expelled’ for committing a ‘pārājika’ offence it is technically not termed ‘pārājika.’ See GBK, p. 249.

\textsuperscript{47} Cf. Sarvāstivādin Bhikṣu prātimoksa samghāvaśesa 1; cf. Theravādin Bhikkhu pātimokkha samghādisesa 1.

\textsuperscript{48} 有不 GMSY: 不 KN
Similarly, T. 1435 p. 385a12-13 reads:49

問頗不受具戒人作媒。得僧伽婆尸沙耶。答50有。與學沙彌是。
[Upāli] asked, “Are there some people who are not fully ordained for
whom acting as a go-between results in a samghāvaśesa?”
[The Buddha] replied, “Yes. A śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera is such.”

These passages are important as they confirm the fact that a śikṣādattaka may
in fact commit other offences after being granted pārājika penance. Thus we
find ourselves asking whether a śikṣādattaka would be expelled for committing
a samghāvaśesa, the second gravest of all offences, or not. The answer to this
can perhaps be gleaned from the following passage. T. 1435, p. 404a23-28
reads:

問頗有不受具戒人。得僧伽婆尸沙罪。隨覆藏日。從僧乞別往。僧與是
人隨覆藏別往。名為善與耶。從衆51僧乞六夜摩那埵。衆僧若與摩那
埵。亦名善與耶。從僧52乞出罪羯磨僧與出罪羯磨。亦名善與耶。答與
學沙彌是也53。
[Upāli] asked, “Are there some people who are not fully ordained for
whom incurring a samghāvaśesa offence and begging from the samgha
for parivāsa according to how many days they have concealed [the offence]
and the samgha granting them parivāsa according to how many days
they have concealed [the offence], is called well-granted?54 [Or for whom]
begging from the samgha the six-night mānatva and if the samgha grants
them the six-night mānatva it is also called well-granted? [Or for whom]
begging from the samgha the formal act of re-admission55 and the samgha
granting them the formal act of re-admission is also called well-granted?”
[The Buddha] replied, “A śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera is such.”

49 Cf. Sarvāstivādin Bhikṣu prātimokṣa samghāvaśesa 5; cf. Theravādin Bhikkhu
pāṭimokkha samghādīsesa 5.
50 答 KN: 答言 GMSY
51 衆 K: om. GMSY
52 僧 K: 衆僧 GMSY
53 也 K: om. GMSY
54 Sense obscure.
Thus, we see that a śikṣādattaka is not expelled for committing saṃghāvaśeṣas and, in fact, would appear to be eligible for the parivāsa and mānatva penances as is any other bhikṣu. Presumably, however, when he applies for and is granted a formal act of re-admission he is only reinstated back to his position of śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera and not to that of a bhikṣu.

We next encounter the śikṣādattaka in Upāli’s questions on the naiḥsargika-pātayantika and pātayantika offences. T. 1435 p. 389a6-8 reads as follows:\(^{57}\)

間頗有\(^{58}\)不受具戒\(^{59}\)人。令非親里比丘尼浣染打故衣。得尼薩耆波逸提耶。答有\(^{60}\)。與學沙彌是也。

[Upāli] asked, “Are there some people who are not fully ordained for whom making an unrelated bhikṣunī wash, dye and beat their old robe[s]\(^{61}\) results in a naiḥsargika-pātayantika?”

[The Buddha] replied, “Yes. A śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera is such.”

---


\(^{56}\) These terms have many variants and there appears to be a lot of debate on the original Sanskrit terms. Sanskrit variants for naiḥsargika-pātayantika include nissargikāpācattikā, naisargikāpāyantikā, niḥsargikāḥ pātayantikā and naiḥsargikā pāyattikā (HC, vol. 15, p. 48). Similarly, variants for pātayantika seem to include amongst others pācattika, prāyaścittaka and pāyattika (HC, vol. 16, pp. 14-18). A systematic study of these terms has not been presented here (interested parties should see HC, vols. 15 and 16, pp. 47-56 and 3-48 respectively). For the sake of simplicity I have used the Sanskrit naiḥsargika-pātayantika and pātayantika, these being the terms used by Valentina Rosen in her Der Vinayavibhāṅga zum Bhikṣuprātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins. See BD, vol. 2, p. 3, note 4 for an informative discussion on prāyaścittaka and pāyantika. As Horner states, these offences involve confession and not expiation. On this point and for a more detailed discussion of the term, see HC, vol. 16, pp. 12-18.

\(^{57}\) Cf. Sarvāstivādin Bhikṣu prātimokṣa naiḥsargika-pātayantika 5; cf. Theravādin Bhikkhu pātimokkha nissaggīya-pācittiya 4.

\(^{58}\) 有 KN: om. GMSY

\(^{59}\) 具戒 KN: 具足戒 GMSY

\(^{60}\) 答有 KN: 答曰有 GMSY
In similar fashion, Upāli also asks about begging for robes from an unrelated householder or householder’s wife (從非親里居士居士婦乞衣), and is duly informed that this too would indeed constitute a naiḥṣargika-pātayantika in the case of a śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera.

Upāli then asks whether criticizing a bhikṣu (毀訾 比丘), bringing up a matter which has been settled in accordance with the dharma (如法滅事還發起), telling one who is not yet fully ordained about a bhikṣu’s grave offence (向未受具 戒人。說比丘麤罪), telling others to shake down fruit from trees (語他人令搖樹落葉), or the destruction of vegetation (殺草菜)

---

61 According to Pachow, A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa, p. 100, the Sanskrit and Pāli terms here are purāṇascīvaram [sic] and purāṇacīvaram respectively. These both suggest a translation along the lines of ‘old’ robes. Horner (BD, vol. 2, p. 31), however, chooses to translate this as ‘soiled’ robes. See ibid., p. 32, note 3, for her reasons.


63 毁訾 K: 以毀訾 GMSY

64 T.1435, p. 391b24-26. It would appear that only GKMSY have been used in fascicle 53, whereas fasc. 52 also utilized N. Note that in the answer to this question (b25-26) the Chinese reads yuexeji shami 與學戒沙彌; this is probably an uncommon variant of yuexe shami 與學沙彌. Thus read. Cf. Sarvāstivādin Bhikṣu prātimokṣa pātayantika 3; cf. Theravādin Bhikkhu pātimokkha pācittiya 3.


66 具 K: 大 GMSY

67 T. 1435, p. 392b20-22. Text reads 問頗未受具戒人; emend to read 問頗不受具戒人—perhaps the copyist’s eye has jumped to the second sentence in which the 受具戒人 is preceded by 未. At any rate the text as it stands in the Taishō yields nonsense. Thus understood on the basis of the parallel passages. Cf. Sarvāstivādin Bhikṣu prātimokṣa pātayantika 9; cf. Theravādin Bhikkhu pātimokkha pācittiya 9.


entails a pātayantika offence for one who is not fully ordained. He is then informed by the Buddha that the śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera (yuxue shami 與學沙彌) is such a person, viz. one who is not fully ordained but bound by the rules of the bhikṣus.

Similarly, the following text refers to the sixth bhikṣu pātayantika dharma. T. 1435 p. 392b2-6 reads:

問頗不受具戒人。以音句誦法。教未受具戒人讀誦。得波夜提耶。答有。與學沙彌是也。若與學沙彌。教僧人讀人讀誦。得突吉羅。若與學沙彌。以音句誦法。教比丘比丘尼讀誦。得突吉羅。

[Upāli] asked, “Are there some people who are not fully ordained for whom it results in a pātayantika if they should teach one who is not yet fully ordained to recite by reciting the dharma by word or by phrase?”

[The Buddha] replied, saying, “Yes. A śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera is such. If a śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera teaches a dumb person, a deaf person or a person who is both deaf and dumb to recite, it results in a duśkṛta. If a śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera teaches a bhikṣu or bhikṣunī to recite by reciting the dharma by word or by phrase it results in a duśkṛta.”

The last such text relating to the śikṣādattaka in the ninth adhyāya of the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya is found under the subheading wenzashi 問雑事 ‘Enquiries on miscellaneous matters.’ T. 1435, p. 406b3-4 reads as follows:

問與學沙彌齊何作淨施。答隨所得時作淨施。

[Upāli] asked, “How is a śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera restricted [when] making a gift?”

[The Buddha] replied, “He may make a gift anywhere and at any time.”

---

70 See HC, vol. 16, pp. 92-104 for a detailed discussion of the sixth pātayantika.

71 答 K: 答曰 GMSY

72 學 K: 學戒 GMSY

73 For a discussion on the wording of this rule, see pp. 104-105 below.

74 Cf. the 4th pācittiya in the Theravādin Bhikkhu pātimokka.

75 I am unsure of the exact meaning of qi 齊. It seems to mean to limit or restrict.
The above text perhaps requires little interpretation; it appears to state that a śikṣādattaka is free to make gifts, presumably to the samgha, as he feels appropriate.

Despite the very repetitive and formulaic nature of Upāli’s questions the ninth adhyāya seems to lack completeness with regard to its treatment of the śikṣādattaka. Technically, all rules for the bhikṣus appear to apply to the śikṣādattaka and as such could warrant similar enquiries from Upāli. I cannot offer any explanation for why Upāli asks the Buddha with regard to, for example, only two of the thirteen samghāvaṣeṣa offences. These texts, however, are not specifically devoted to any real kind of explanation of the śikṣādattaka. They are a clarification, through the medium of Upāli’s questions, of the prātimokṣa rules. Thus, the appearance of the śikṣādattaka is perhaps more incidental than anything else and this may well explain the apparent incompleteness of the text.76

Clearly, the above texts suggest that the status of a śikṣādattaka-śrāmanera is, it would seem, a very peculiar one which, as we have already seen, could perhaps be described as a kind of limbo state between the fully ordained and the novices. Indeed, from the above texts it would seem that the śikṣādattaka is the only class of samgha membership in which one does not enjoy the benefits of being fully ordained and is yet bound by all the rules governing the monastic life of a bhikṣu. It goes without saying that it is an extremely harsh penance.

As we have already seen, the śikṣādattaka appears to have very little in terms of ecclesiastical responsibilities and rights. His lack of rights is very much evident in the following passage. The final section of fascicle sixty-one,

---

76 Note that the appearances of the śikṣādattaka cited above are not comprehensive, they are merely a representative selection based on a cursory examination of the text.
which also happens to be the final section of the *Sarvāstivādin Vinaya*, contains the following text:\(^{77}\)

優婆離間佛。佛餘處說。有二因緣知破僧。一僧中唱。二受籌。有賊住。僧中唱行籌。是名破僧不。佛言。不破。與學沙彌。僧中唱行籌。是名破僧不。佛言。不破。

Upāli asked the Buddha, “The Buddha has elsewhere stated that there are two ways to make known a split in the *samgha*. One is to proclaim it amidst the *samgha*. The second is to take a vote.\(^ {78}\) [If] an interloper\(^ {79}\) proclaims or carries out a vote amidst the *samgha* is this called splitting the *samgha*?”

The Buddha said, “It is not splitting.”

“[If] a *śīkṣādatta*-śrāmanera proclaims or performs a vote amidst the *samgha* is this called splitting the *samgha*?”

The Buddha said, “It is not splitting.”

Thus, we see that the *śīkṣādatta* has no powers to declare a split in the *samgha*. In fact, it would appear that he is, at least in this connection, afforded exactly the same rights as an interloper—none at all.

Within a few lines of this the text then goes on to outline rules relating to sitting together with non-ordained persons:\(^ {80}\)

優婆離間。若草敷座若長床。得共未受具戒人坐不。佛言。可坐。得共黃門坐不。佛言。不可。與學沙彌可共坐不。佛言。可坐。二與學沙彌。可共坐不。佛言。不可。

Upāli asked [the Buddha], “May one sit together with one who is not yet fully ordained on a grass mat\(^ {81}\) or a couch?”

---

\(^{77}\) T. 1435, p. 466b15-18.

\(^{78}\) A bamboo stick used for this and other purposes, see *BHSD*, s.v. *ṭālaṅkā*.

\(^{79}\) *NBG*, p. 891 gives *steyā-samvāṣika*. *BHSD*, s.v. defines it as a “thief-like inhabitant, one who tries to associate himself with a Buddhist monastic community without a right to it.” See, *BD*, vol. 4, p. 480, line 29; *VP*, vol. 1, p. 335, line 4: Cf. also *BD*, vol. 6, p. 363, line 1; *VP*, vol. 5, p. 222, lines 7-8. Edgerton, s.v. cites *SBE* 13. 216 for a story illustrating the meaning; note this should be *SBE* 20. 216.

\(^{80}\) T. 1435, p. 466b21-24.
The Buddha said, “It is permissible to sit [in such a manner].”
“May one sit together with a eunuch?”
The Buddha said, “It is not permissible.”
“May one sit together with a šikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera?”
The Buddha said, “It is permissible to sit [in such a manner].”
“May one sit together with two šikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇeras?”
The Buddha said, “It is not permissible.”

Thus we see that although it is permissible to sit together with people who are not fully ordained, a category which the šikṣādattaka falls into, it is not permissible, presumably for a bhikṣu, to sit together with two šikṣādattakas. The idea behind this is unclear to me, but it seems possible, at least from the point of view of the saṅgha or one trying to control the saṅgha, that one may not want to have šikṣādattakas joining forces. Furthermore, sitting together in close proximity with two such delinquents may somehow affect the purity of bhikṣus in good standing and was perhaps accordingly prohibited.

We next turn in our examination of texts dealing with the šikṣādattaka to the pitfalls of eating stored food. T. 1435 p. 394b28-c4 reads as follows:

比丘三種。名為共食內宿。若比丘。比丘僧。與學沙彌。比丘尼四種。名為共食內宿。比丘尼。比丘尼僧。與學沙彌尼。式叉摩尼。是四種人。內宿不應食。若食得突吉羅。若白衣若沙彌。為自身共食內宿。比丘食無罪。

There are three kinds of bhikṣus of whom it is said that they might be commensal eaters of stored food. They are bhikṣus, bhikṣu-saṅghas and šikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇeras. There are four kinds of bhikṣuni of whom it is said that they might be commensal eaters of stored food. They are bhikṣunis, bhikṣuni-saṅghas, šikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerīs and šikṣamāṇās. These are the four kinds of people. They should not eat stored food. If

---

81 NBD, p. 870 gives trṇa-sa vyā for caozuo 草座.

82 NBD, p. 870 gives Sanskrit pandaka. For a more comprehensive treatment of this term see, Leonard Zwilling, “Homosexuality as Seen in Indian Buddhist Texts,” in Cabezón ed., Buddhism, Sexuality, and Gender.

83 若 K: om. GMSY
they eat it they incur a duṣkṛta. If a layman or a śrāmaṇera on their own account together eat stored food, and a bhikṣu eats it there is no offence.  

This passage is extremely significant. Its importance, however, is not to be found in discourses on the commensal eaters of stored food, although this is not to say that such an offence should be regarded as trivial. This passage, if I have translated it correctly, is important as it introduces a special class of bhikṣunī, viz. the śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī.

The existence of the śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī has been categorically denied by Hirakawa on more than one occasion. In his opus on primitive Buddhism, Hirakawa makes the following observations in relation to pārājika penance and the resulting status of a śikṣādattaka:

Moreover, pārājika penance is a privilege permitted only to bhikṣus and does not exist in the Bhikṣunī Vinaya.

If Hirakawa is correct, and it is with a great deal of reservation that I challenge his interpretation, then how do we explain the apparent existence of a śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī in the above text? Could the term yuuxue shamini 與學沙彌尼 mean something quite different and not merely be the feminine equivalent of a yuuxue shamini 與學沙彌—a term which Hirakawa himself uses in referring to the śikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera? Could this be an isolated occurrence, perhaps even a corrupt text? Whether it is a corrupt text or not is very difficult to answer and perhaps only tentative conclusions can be offered at the present time. Nevertheless, it does seem to warrant a careful re-examination

---

84 For a detailed discussion of this offence, see HC, vol. 16, pp. 423-434.

85 This translation is tentative in the extreme. I am not quite sure exactly what is going on here, especially in the last sentence. Perhaps it means that if a meal of stored food is served to him he is not to refuse it (?). I am also unsure of the difference, if any, between neisu 内宿 and cansushi 残宿食. This area requires more work!

86 GBK, p. 252: なお波羅夷戒は比丘のみに許された特典であり、比丘尼律には存在しない。Hirakawa also makes a similar comment in HC, vol. 14, p. 131.
of the textual evidence.

It would appear that this is by no means an isolated occurrence, for, indeed, the term *yuxue shami 與學沙彌尼 ‘śikṣādattā-śrāmaneri’* is to be found *ad nauseam* in fascicle twenty-four of the *Sarvāstivādin Vinaya*. Furthermore, if the term *yuxue shami 與學沙彌尼* was being used where one might expect *yuxue shami 與學沙彌 Āśīṣādatta-śrāmanera, shami 沙彌尼 śrāmanerī* or *biqiuni 比丘尼 bhikṣuni* one might well expect a corrupt text. This, however, is not the case as will be seen below.

The *Varṣāvastu* (anuṭa 安居法, found in fascicle twenty-four of the *Sarvāstivādin Vinaya*) contains detailed regulations regarding the conditions under which members of the monastic community may be permitted to take leave from their residence during the rainy season. The text once again takes the form of a dialogue between Upāli and the Buddha. T. 1435 p. 175c17-29 reads:87

云何為與學沙彌尼故應去。如與學沙彌尼。為僧故88作房舍溫堂涼堂
合霑89堂重閣一重舍平覆舍。遣使言比丘所白言。大德90⑨我為僧
故。作房舍溫堂涼堂合霑91堂重閣一重舍平覆舍。大德來作入舍供
養。有如是事聽去七夜。若為多比丘二一。多比丘尼二一。多式叉摩尼
二一。多沙彌二一。多沙彌尼二一。多出家二一。多出家尼二一92。若
為一出家尼故。作房舍溫堂涼堂合霑93堂重閣一重舍平覆舍。遣使言

87 It seems that either only GKMSY have been consulted or N is identical to K.
88 故 K: 溜 GM
89 霑 K: 溜 GMSY
90 大德 K: om. GMSY
91 霑 K: 溜 GMSY
92 多比丘二一。多比丘尼二一。多式叉摩尼二一。多沙彌二一。多沙彌尼二一。
多出家二一。多出家尼二一。K: 比丘多比丘尼二一比丘尼多式叉摩尼二一式叉摩尼
多沙彌二一沙彌多沙彌尼二一沙彌尼多出家二一出家多出家尼二出家尼 GMSY
93 霑 K: 溜 GMSY
比丘所白言。大德。我爲一出家尼故。作房舍温堂凉堂合剎94堂重閣一重舎平覆舎。大德来作入舎供養。有如是事聴去七夜。

“How should one go for the sake of a śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇeri?” “If a śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇeri, for the sake of the saṃgha, builds a dwelling,95 a warm [bath]-hall,96 a cool [bath]-hall, a room to collect rain-water,97 a multi-storeyed pavilion, a single-storeyed building or a level-roofed building and sends a messenger to a bhikṣu saying, ‘Reverend One, for the sake of the saṃgha I have built a dwelling, a warm [bath]-hall, a cool [bath]-hall, a room to collect rain-water, a multi-storeyed pavilion, a single-storeyed building, a level-roofed building. Reverend One, [please] come and perform the opening ceremony.’ In such a situation he is authorized to go for seven nights. If for the sake of many bhikṣus or two or one, [for] many bhikṣunīs or two or one, [for] many śikṣāmāṇās or two or one, [for] many śrāmaṇeras or two or one, [for] many śrāmaṇerīs or two or one, [for] many laymen98 or two or one, [for] many laywomen or two or one, for the sake of one laywoman she builds a dwelling, a warm [bath]-hall, a cool [bath]-hall, a room to collect rain-water, a multi-storeyed pavilion,99 a single-storeyed building, a level-roofed building and sends a messenger to a bhikṣu saying, ‘O Reverend One, for the sake of one laywoman I have built a dwelling, a warm [bath]-hall, a cool [bath]-hall, a room to collect rain-water, a multi-storeyed pavilion, a single-storeyed building, a level-roofed building. Reverend One, [please] come and perform the opening ceremony.’ In such a situation he is authorized to go for seven nights.”100

The above text seems to be stating the cases in which a bhikṣu may take leave from his rains retreat.101 It appears that if a śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇeri is to donate any kind of building to the saṃgha or to groups of, or even individual bhikṣus, bhikṣunīs, śrāmaṇeras, śrāmaṇerīs, śikṣāmāṇās and lay devotees then a bhikṣu may be excused for up to seven nights in order to perform an

94 霧 K: 噑 GMSY
95 Skt. āvasātha, āvāsa or vihāra?
96 Pāli jantāghara? See Upasak, s.v. on this term.
97 Perhaps, ‘a water-tank’?
opening ceremony.\textsuperscript{98}

This text is by no means an isolated occurrence. Similar passages occur in which the same question is posed to the Buddha with the only difference being that the donor is an \textit{upāsikā}, \textit{upāsaka}, \textit{srāmaṇerī}, \textit{srāmaṇera}, \textit{\textsuperscript{99}}

\textsuperscript{98} The Chinese term \textit{chujia} 出家 'one who has left home for the religious life,' while not ordinarily problematic, does not seem to fit here unless we understand a distinction between someone who has gone forth \textit{chujia} 出家 and someone who has received the novitiate ordination, viz. a \textit{chujia} 出家 as someone who has gone forth but who does not become a \textit{shami} 沙彌 \textit{srāmaṇera} until he has received the novitiate ordination. On the other hand perhaps we are to understand it as referring to non-Buddhist renunciants (there is perhaps good evidence for this; T. 1435, p. 174a21-24 reads 如優婆夷。為多比丘二一。為多比丘尼二一。為多式叉摩尼（尼 KM: 那.GSY）二一。為多沙彌二一。為多沙彌尼二一。為多沙彌尼二一。為多出家二一。為多出家尼二一。若為一出家尼（一……尼 K: 出家尼為一出家尼 GMSY）故作房舎……. The other possibility is that the text is corrupt and that we should understand \textit{chujia} 出家 as \textit{zauija} 在家 'lay devotee.' However, just when I thought I knew what was going on I came across T. 1435, p. 372a21-22, which includes the following list: 一比丘尼一式叉摩尼一沙彌一沙彌尼一出家一出家尼. Similar lists also appear at pp. 43a, 44a, 84b and 267a. Note, however, that the list does seem to be going down in descending order. Note also the following passage (T. 1435, p. 174a8-11): 長老優波離問佛。有事七夜聽去。為誰故應去。佛言。為七衆故應去。何等七。一比丘。二比丘尼。三式叉摩尼。四沙彌。五沙彌尼。六優婆塞。七優婆夷. I have tentatively understood the text to be corrupt and suggest that in the above instances \textit{chujia} 出家 be read as \textit{zauija} 在家. Thus understood. Cf. T. 2248, pp. 477c24-478a1 for what appears to be a commentarial passage on this text. Cf. also T. 1804, p. 41b17-20(?). Furthermore, Professor Yamagiwa informs me (personal communication: 98.9.25) that \textit{chujia} 出家 also appears to be used for those who have previously been followers of other sects and are granted the four month \textit{parivāsa} (different to the normal \textit{parivāsa}; cf. Upasak, s.v. \textit{parivāsa} (II)) before ordination into the Buddhist \textit{saṅgha} (cf. \textit{VP}, vol. 1, pp. 69-71; \textit{BD}, vol. 4, pp. 85-89) and the rather obscure Pāli term \textit{panḍupalāsa} (cf. \textit{PTS Samantapāsādikā}, vol. 2, p. 469 ff.; \textit{CSP}, p. 329 ff.).

\textsuperscript{99} Skt. kūṭāgāra-śālā?

\textsuperscript{100} Cf. \textit{VP}, vol. 1, pp. 139, line 26-142, line 7; \textit{BD}, vol. 4, pp. 186-189.

\textsuperscript{101} See Upasak, s.v. \textit{sattāhakaraṇīya}, on this and other situations in which a monk may break his rains retreat.

\textsuperscript{102} The implications of a single penitent \textit{bhikṣuṇī} or a lay person making a donation of a multi-storeyed pavilion are perhaps worth closer examination. On nuns as donors, see Schopen, "On Monks, Nuns, and 'Vulgar' Practices," in \textit{Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks}, pp. 238-257.
śīkṣāmāṇaḥ, śīkṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera, bhikṣu or bhikṣunī. This in itself suggests, at least to me, that the text is not corrupt and that we are in fact dealing with a bhikṣunī who has been granted pārājika penance.

In a similar fashion the text then states that a bhikṣu is authorized to go for seven nights under the following situation:  

如與學沙彌尼。若王捉若賊若怨若怨黨若怨黨之黨捉捕治。遣使詣比丘所白言…大德來。欲見比丘。  

If a śīkṣādattaka-śrāmaṇerī is apprehended by a king, or a thief, or an enemy or a gang of enemies, or seized and held prisoner by a faction of a gang of enemies and sends a messenger to a bhikṣu … asking him to come as she wishes to see a bhikṣu.

These provisions are not solely for a śīkṣādattaka-śrāmaṇerī who wishes only to see a bhikṣu—she may also wish to to hear the dharma, make a donation or any combination of these three. Similarly, he is also permitted to go if a

\textsuperscript{103} T. 1435, p. 174a17-28.

\textsuperscript{104} T. 1435, p. 174c3.

\textsuperscript{105} T. 1435, p. 174c4-15.

\textsuperscript{106} T. 1435, p. 175a22-23.

\textsuperscript{107} T. 1435, p. 175a24-b7.

\textsuperscript{108} T. 1435, p. 176c10.

\textsuperscript{109} T. 1435, p. 176c11-15.

\textsuperscript{110} T. 1435, pp. 175c29-176a4.

\textsuperscript{111} T. 1435, pp. 175c29-176a7: 如與學沙彌尼。若王捉若賊若怨若怨黨若怨黨之黨捉捕治。遣使詣比丘所白言。大德。我若王捉若賊若怨若怨黨若怨黨之黨捉捕治。大德來。欲見比丘。有如是事聽去七夜。為欲聽法聽去七夜。為欲布施聽去七夜。為欲見比丘聽法。為欲見比丘布施。為欲見比丘聽法布施。為欲見比丘布施。有如是事聽去七夜。Cf. Theravādin Mahāvagga, VP, vol. 1, pp. 139, line 26-142, line 7; BD, vol. 4, pp. 186-189. It is interesting that this text (at least the part about wishing to see a bhikṣu, hear the dharma and make a donation) and the previous text of the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya seem to be treated as one in the Theravādin Vinaya. Although there are several mentions of thieves in the Theravādin text there does not seem to be a parallel for this.
śikṣādattā-śrāmaneri is suffering from illness and sends a messenger to a bhikṣu asking him to come for any of the above reasons or combinations thereof.\textsuperscript{112}

Similarly, a bhikṣu is permitted to take leave from his rains retreat for seven nights if a śikṣādattā-śrāmaneri is afflicted by illness and sends a messenger to a bhikṣu asking him to come and advise her as to food or medicine appropriate to her illness, an adequate nurse or any combination of these three requests.\textsuperscript{113} This is particularly noteworthy as it suggests that monks may have been expected to provide medical advice within the samgha. Indeed, the Buddha himself upon seeing a bhikṣu who was not being attended to lying in his own excrement admonished the monks reminding them that they no longer had parents or siblings to look after them and that if they did not tend to each other when sick nobody else would.\textsuperscript{114} It appears, however, that monks and nuns may have been restricted in their practice of medicine—in the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya, for example, pācattika eighty-two of the Bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa states that a nun must not earn a living from medicine,\textsuperscript{115} nor may she instruct the laity or followers of other ways in medical knowledge.\textsuperscript{116} In any case, it seems relatively sure that the samgha offered medical care, at least to some degree, to its own members.

\textsuperscript{112} T. 1435, p. 176a7-12: 如與學沙潑尼病苦。遣使詣比丘所白言。我病苦。大德來。欲見比丘。有如是事聽去七夜。為欲聽法聽去七夜。為欲布施聽去七夜。為欲見比丘聽法。為欲見比丘布施。為欲聽法布施。為欲見比丘法布施。有如是事聽去七夜。


\textsuperscript{115} T. 1427, p. 562a22: 若比丘尼。作醫師活命（命 GKMSY: om. N）。波夜提。
A similar parallel is to be found in the following text in which it appears that a monk may take leave from his rains retreat in order to move an ailing śikṣādatta-śrāmaṇerī. T. 1435 p. 176a18-21 reads:

如與學沙彌尼病苦，遣使詣比丘所白言。大德。我病苦。大德來。若此間將我到彼間如法。若彼間將我到此間如法。有如是事聽去七夜。

If a śikṣādatta-śrāmaṇerī is suffering from illness and sends a messenger to a bhikṣu saying, "O Reverend One, I am suffering from illness. Reverend One, [please] come. If [you are?] here take me there in accordance with the dharma. If there take me here in accordance with the dharma." In such a situation he is authorized to go for seven nights.¹¹⁷

Furthermore, a bhikṣu is also allowed to break his rains retreat for seven days if a śikṣādatta-śrāmaṇerī is melancholy in her thoughts and, wanting to abandon her precepts, sends a messenger asking him to come and expound the dharma to her,¹¹⁸ or has wrong views and asks a bhikṣu to come and

¹¹⁶ T. 1427, p. 562a23: 若比丘尼。授俗人外道醫方者。波夜提。(pācattika eighty-three). Hirakawa states that neither of these precepts are found in other Vinayas (MDBN, pp. 271, note 93 and 273, note 94). This, however, is incorrect as they are to be found in pācattikas 145-148 of the Mahiśāsaka Bhikṣuṇi prātimokṣa (T. 1423, p. 211c8-11): 若比丘尼詣治病方。波逸提。若比丘尼教他詣治病方。波逸提。若比丘尼為人治病以為生業。波逸。若比丘尼教他治病以為生業。Chatsumarn Kabilsingh (BPSS, pp. 111-112) translates Mahiśāsaka Bhikṣuṇi pācattika 144 as "Whatever bhikkhuni should learn worldly knowledge, there is an offence of expiation,"—note it is not ‘worldy,’ but ‘medical’ knowledge. Similarly pācattika 145. She notes that these two pācattikas are the same as numbers 49 and 50 in the Theravādin Bhikṣuṇi pātimokkha which relate to tiracchānavījī or worldly knowledge. Note, however, that certain kinds of medical knowledge appear to be classified as worldly knowledge in the Dīgha nikāya (T. W. Rhys Davids et al. eds., The Dīgha Nikāya, Brahmajāla sutta, Mahā-silā, 27 (p. 12); cf. T. W. Rhys Davids transl., Dialogues of the Buddha, part 1, pp. 25-26). For an excellent discussion on Buddhist monks and medicine, see Kenneth G. Zysk, Asceticism and Healing in Ancient India: Medicine in the Buddhist Monastery, esp. chapters 3 and 4.

¹¹⁷ This passage is puzzling. I am unsure of the exact meaning and cannot find a parallel in the Theravādin tradition.

remove them,\textsuperscript{119} or if she asks him to remove her doubt and remorse in accordance with the \textit{dharma}.\textsuperscript{120}

A \textit{bhiksu} is also authorized to go if a \textit{śikṣādatta-śrāmaṇeri}, on account of the \textit{samgha} desiring to make a formal act of punishment\textsuperscript{121}—a formal act of censure,\textsuperscript{122} of guidance,\textsuperscript{123} of suspension,\textsuperscript{124} or of reconciliation\textsuperscript{125}—sends a messenger to a \textit{bhiksu} to that effect asking him to come and help her in accordance with the \textit{dharma}.\textsuperscript{126} Similarly, if the \textit{samgha} has already carried out any of these punitive procedures the \textit{śikṣādatta-śrāmaṇeri} may ask a \textit{bhiksu} to come and convince the Order to show leniency so that her punishment may be made lighter.\textsuperscript{127} The same formula is also applied in the case that the \textit{samgha} desires to make\textsuperscript{128} or has made\textsuperscript{129} a formal act of investigation\textsuperscript{130}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{119} T. 1435, p. 176a24-26: 如與學沙彌尼有惡邪起。遣使詣比丘所白言。大德。我有惡邪起。大德來為我除惡邪。有如是事聽去七夜。 Cf. Theravādin Mahāvagga, 
\textit{VP}, vol. 1, pp. 142, line 36-143, line 6; \textit{BD}, vol. 4, p. 190.

\textsuperscript{120} T. 1435, p. 176a26-29: 如與學沙彌尼心疑悔。遣使詣比丘所白言。大德。我心疑悔。大德來為我如法除疑悔。有如是事聽去七夜。 Cf. Theravādin Mahāvagga, 
\textit{VP}, vol. 1, p. 142, lines 30-36; \textit{BD}, vol. 4, p. 190.

\textsuperscript{121} I am understanding \textit{zuo} 作 as the verb, and \textit{chijiemo} 治羯磨 as being equivalent to \textit{chizuijiemo} 治罪羯磨. Accordingly, I have understood these \textit{karmans} as all belonging to the category of punishment or punitive \textit{karmans} and not as a list of five \textit{karmans}.

\textsuperscript{122} Skt. \textit{tarjaniya karman}; Pāli \textit{tajjaniya-kamma}. Cf. BHSD, s.v. \textit{tarjaniya}; Upasak, s.v. \textit{tajjaniya-kamma} (note Upasak has a tendency to lengthen some vowels). For a detailed discussion on this formal act, see SGBK, pp. 432-439.


\textsuperscript{126} T. 1435, p. 176a29-b5: 如與學沙彌尼僧欲作治羯磨。若苦切羯磨。若依止羯磨。若驅出羯磨。若下意羯磨。遣使詣比丘所白言。大德。僧欲為我作治羯磨。若苦切羯磨。若依止羯磨。若驅出羯磨。若下意羯磨。大德來如法助我。有如是事聽去七夜。 Cf. Theravādin Mahāvagga, 
\textit{VP}, vol. 1, pp. 143, line 32-144, line 2; \textit{BD}, vol. 4, pp. 191-192.
\end{footnotesize}
against a śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī.

Likewise, he may take leave if a śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī sends a messenger to the effect that the saṅgha wishes to carry out a recollection procedure\(^{127}\) or a no-longer-insane procedure\(^{128}\) against her.\(^{133}\) Furthermore, the same applies


\(^{128}\) T. 1435, p. 176b13-16: 如興學沙彌尼。僧欲與作實見羯磨。遣使詣比丘所白言。大德。僧欲為我作實見羯磨。大德來如法助我。有如是事應去七夜。

\(^{129}\) T. 1435, p. 176b16-19: 如興學沙彌尼。僧與作實見羯磨竟（竟 K: om. GMSY）。遣使詣比丘所白言。大德。僧為我作實見羯磨竟。大德來令輕作莫令（令 GKMS: 念 Y）重作。有如是事應去七夜。

\(^{130}\) NBD, s.v. jitsumyakuhō 實見法 gives Pāli tassa-pāpiyyasikā-kamma for shimija 實見法 and mizuixianjiemo 見罪相羯磨。Skt. tattsvabhāvaiṣṭya. See Upasak, s.v. tassapāpiyyasikā. Edgerton, BHSD, s.v. tattsvabhāvaiṣṭya, states: “(procedure of discipline) which investigates the special nature of that (accused monk).” Nolot, p. 110, gives “A verdict of obstinate wrongness (tassa-pāpiyyasikā), given against a convicted offender who tries to equivocate about the offence committed....It is valid only if...he does eventually acknowledge some offence...after due inquiry.” NBD, s.v. jitsumyakuhō 實見法, says: “It is a provision under which a bhikṣu who does not admit his offence is incapacitated as a bhikṣu until he admits his true offence” (罪を自白しない比丘に対して、真実の罪を自白するまで、比丘の資格を失わせる規定。). Although they all seem to be saying something different they are, I think, picking up on different parts of the same procedure.

\(^{131}\) One of the sapta-adhikaraṇaṣaṃathā-dharmā (qimiezhefga 七滅顚法), the seven procedures for settling disputes. MBd, p. 1923 gives saṃmukhaṇina (xiangianpin 現前毘尼), smṛtiṇinaya (yinianpin 憶念毘尼), amūdhavinaya (buchipini 不癡毘尼), pratijñākāraka (ziyanpin 自言毘尼), tattsvabhāvaiṣṭya (mizuixiang 見罪相), yadbhūtyaiṣṭya (duorenmizuixiang 多人競罪相), and trnāprastāraka (rucaofudi 如草覆地). See also the entry on samathā in Upasak. For an extensive discussion of these seven procedures, see HC, vol. 17, pp. 615-633.

Upasak’s explanation of sativinayā (Skt. smṛtiṇinayā) seems to be rather misleading. He says (p. 223): “...the ‘settlement’ is arrived at when an Arakanta monk makes an ‘appeal’ to the Saṅgha about his immunity from committing any ‘offence,’” What he fails to mention is that the appeal is based on the fact that the monk does not recollect committing any such offence. See BHSD, p. 614 for a better explanation. See also Nolot, p. 109. Nolot refers to sativinayā as a verdict of innocence—innocence, that is, based on the fact that he does not recollect the event.
if the *samgha* desires to make a suspension procedure\textsuperscript{134} against a *śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇeri* for not seeing an offence,\textsuperscript{135} for not making amends for an offence,\textsuperscript{136} or for not discarding wrong views\textsuperscript{137} and she sends a messenger asking a monk to come and instruct her to see that which she does not see, to make amends for that which she does not make amends for, or to discard that which she does not discard.\textsuperscript{138}

Furthermore, if a *śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇeri* commits a *samghāvaśeṣa* offence and is to be granted the *mānatva* penance, is to have her penance started again from the beginning,\textsuperscript{139} or is to be granted a formal act of re-admission\textsuperscript{140} and sends a messenger to a *bhikṣu* to that effect, he is allowed to break his rains

\textsuperscript{132} Skt. *amūṭhavina*ya. NBD, s.v. *fuchibini* 不癲比尼 gives Pāli *amūṭhavinaya*. Lit. “not insane,” this is based on the idea that the defendant is no longer insane but makes a plea of past insanity. See Upasak, s.v. *amūṭhavinaya*. Cf. BHSD, p. 63. See, *inter alia*, Dutt, *EBM*, p. 131 and Nolot, pp. 109-110.

\textsuperscript{133} T. 1435, p. 176b9-13 (after the occurrences of *bini* 比尼 denoted with an asterisk in the text the Taishō’s own apparatus has *bini* K: 比尼 GMSY and follows this with *xiatong* 下同. This is presumably the same as an asterisk in their notation. For some reason the editors have not used an asterisk as is their normal practice. Thus understood and denoted by an asterisk): 如與學沙彌尼。僧欲作憶念比尼*不癲比尼*。遣使詣比丘所白言。大德。僧欲為我作憶念比尼*不癲比尼*。大德來。當令與我憶念比尼*不癲比尼*。有如是事聽去七夜。

\textsuperscript{134} The generic term for these three procedures in Sanskrit is *utkṣepanīya karman*. This, however, is further sub-divided into three. On these three, see Dutt, *EBM*, p. 141. Cf. FG, p. 3793c, also *OBD* and *NBD*, ss.vv. sanko 三舉 and Upasak, s.v. *ukkhepaniyakamma*.

\textsuperscript{135} Pāli *āpattiyā-adasanake-ukkhepaniyakamma*.

\textsuperscript{136} Pāli *āpattiyā-apatikamme-ukkhepaniyakamma*.

\textsuperscript{137} Pāli *pāpikāya-dīṭṭhiyā-apatinissagge-ukkhepaniyakamma*.

\textsuperscript{138} T. 1435, p. 176b19-23: 如與學沙彌尼。僧欲作不見揺不作揺惡邪不除揺。遣使詣比丘所白言。大德。僧欲為我作不見揺不作揺惡邪不除揺。大德來我不見教見不作教作不除教除。有如是事聽去七夜。

\textsuperscript{139} See BHSD, s.v. *mūla* (3). On Pāli *mūlayatikassanā*, see Upasak, p. 186.

\textsuperscript{140} Skt. *āvarhāṇa*; Pāli *abbhāṇa*. On Sanskrit and BHS variants, see Nolot, p. 134.
retreat.¹⁴¹ This is interesting as it suggests that if a bhikṣuṇī who has committed a pārājīka and has been subsequently granted pārājīka penance commits a samghāvaśeṣa offence she is punished in the exact same way as a bhikṣuṇī in good standing—in good standing until she committed a samghāvaśeṣa, that is.¹⁴²

The regulations governing when a bhikṣu may temporarily break his rains retreat do not cover only medical and punitive situations, they also


¹⁴² Note, whereas monks are punished by the mānatva penance for six nights for their offence and an additional parivāsa probation for however long the offence was concealed for (if concealed at all), nuns are subject to a two week mānatva, and according to Upasak, do not undergo a parivāsa even if they have concealed their offence (Upasak, s.v. parivāsa (I)). There is no debating the fact that nuns undergo a two week mānatva; I am, however, having trouble finding evidence in support of Upasak’s claim that nuns have no parivāsa. At the end of the samghādisesa section in the Theravādin Bhikkhu vibhaṅga it states that a parivāsa probation applies for as long as he has concealed the offence (yesam bhikkhu aṇṇataram vā aṇṇataram vā āpajjivā yāvatiham jānam paṭicchādeti tāvatiham tena bhikkhunā akāmā parivatthabbam... (VP, vol. 3, p. 186; BD, vol. 1, p. 328)). The parallel passage in the nuns’ vibhaṅga only mentions the fortnight-long mānatta and admittedly does not mention a parivāsa for concealment of an offence (VP, vol. 4, p. 242; BD, vol. 3, p. 212). I am hesitant, however, to accept an argument from silence. On the fortnight mānatva, see BD, vol. 3, p. xxxvii; cf. Nolot, pp. 135-136; cf. Sarvāstivādin gurudharma, no. 3 (T. 1425, p. 345c10-12); Pāli gurudhamma, no. 5 (VP, vol. 2, p. 255; BD, vol. 5, p. 355). Also note that, as Nolot, p. 117, note 6, states, Edgerton’s entry on mānatva is misleading: BHSD, s.v. gives “a kind of penance which is superimposed, after parivāsa, on a monk guilty of a samghāvaśeṣa offense which he has concealed,”—the mānatva applies irregardless of whether the offence has been concealed or not. Also note Karma Lekshe Tsomo, in her section on the structure of the Bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa sūtra, states that an offender of a samghāvaśeṣa is “subject to a period of probation called parivāsa...” (Sisters in Solitude, p. 134). She then refers to Prebish, Buddhist Monastic Discipline, p. 12, which is an explanation of the samghāvaśeṣa offences for bhikṣus. One must be careful not to take rules for the monks as applying in exactly the same manner for nuns. Note Karma Lekshe Tsomo (ibid.) erroneously refers to homicide as the first pārājīka. This rule is given as the third pārājīka in 14 texts for monks (RK, p. 443) and 6 for nuns (Chatsumarn Kabilsingh, 1984, p. 55). Furthermore, it is given as the third pārājīka by Karma Lekshe Tsomo herself (ibid., pp. 28 and 81).
include a section on transmission of the dharma. T. 1435 p. 176b28-c4 reads:

如與學沙彌尼，二部波羅提木叉分別。若未學欲學。若學忘欲誦。遣使承其手所言。大德。我二部波羅提木叉分別。若未學欲學。若學忘欲誦。大德來。教我受學誦問義。有如是事聽去七夜。

If a śikṣādattā-śrāmaneri, as for the two divisions\(^{143}\) of the prātimokṣa, if she has not yet learned them but wishes to learn them, or has learned and forgotten them but wishes to recite them, and sends a messenger to a bhikṣu saying, “Reverend One, as for the two divisions of the prātimokṣa, I have not yet learned them but wish to learn them,” or “I have learned and forgotten them but I wish to recite them. Reverend One, [please] come, instruct me so that I may receive training in recitation and ask as to the meaning.” In such situations he is authorized to go for seven nights.

It is important to remember that this section of the Vinaya is not devoted to the śikṣādattā-śrāmaneri, but to the situations under which a bhikṣu may break his rains retreat. As such, it also includes many similar parallels in which we see that a monk is also allowed to take leave if, for example, an upāsikā\(^{144}\) or a śrāmaneri wishes to donate a building,\(^{145}\) or requires medical advice, etc.\(^{146}\) As one would expect, however, this text seems to have no parallel in which upāsikās or śrāmaneriṣ learn or recite the two divisions of the prātimokṣa. Indeed, this would entail a pātayantika offence as it is not permitted to recite the prātimokṣa to non fully ordained persons.\(^{147}\) Thus, we notice that the śikṣādattā-śrāmaneri does not seem to be prevented in any

\(^{143}\) The divisions of the bhikṣu and bhikṣuni prātimokṣas. Note, fenbie 分別 is also used for Sanskrit vibhaṅga. If taken in this sense it yields a translation suggesting that a śikṣādattā-śrāmaneri may perhaps learn the bhikṣu and bhikṣuni vibhaṅgas. This seems rather unlikely.

\(^{144}\) T. 1435, p. 174a11-21.

\(^{145}\) T. 1435, p. 174c4-8.

\(^{146}\) T. 1435, p. 174b6-17 and pp. 174c22-175a7.

\(^{147}\) T. 1436, p. 474a23-24. Cf. Theravādin Bhikkhu pāṭimokkha, pācittiya no. 4 (cf. no. 100 in the Bhikkhunīs' text).
way from learning or receiving training in the recitation of the \textit{prātimokṣas}. This appears to be in line with the Sarvāśṭivādin position with regard to the \textit{sīkṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera} who, as we saw in the story of Nandika, does not appear to be specifically barred from \textit{dharma} transmission. This is in stark opposition to the Mahāsāṃghika tradition which, as we will see in the following chapter, does not allow monks to recite the \textit{prātimokṣa} to a \textit{sīkṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera}. Moreover, even if the \textit{sīkṣādattaka} formerly recited the \textit{prātimokṣa}, while undergoing his penance he may no longer recite it out loud. If he is to recite it at all, it must be mentally.\footnote{\textit{148}}

The transmission of \textit{dharma}, however, is not restricted to the recitation of the \textit{prātimokṣa sūtras} as indeed these are no more than precepts for monks and nuns. \textit{Dharma} transmission also takes the form of many great \textit{sūtras} expounded by the Buddha which may be recited to ordained and lay people alike.

T. 1435 p. 176c4-15 reads:

\begin{quote}
如與學沙彌尼。為是多識多知。諸大經波羅彌提伽乃至\textsuperscript{149}薩耆陀舍修如路。若未學欲學。若學忘欲誦。遣使詣比丘所白言。大德。是多識多知。諸大經波羅彌提伽乃至薩耆陀舍修如路。我若未\textsuperscript{150}學欲學。若學忘欲誦。大德來教我受學誦問義。有如是事應去七夜。如為\textsuperscript{151}學沙彌尼\textsuperscript{152}應去。與學沙彌亦如是。除隨其所應。如為比丘應去。為比丘亦是。如他事應去。自事應去亦如是。遣使應去不遣使應去亦如是。比
\end{quote}

\footnote{\textit{148} T. 1425, p. 441b27-c2: 比丘不得向詣波羅彌提伽 \ldots 若本誦波羅彌提伽者。不得高聲誦。若敬法者。得心誦。}

\footnote{\textit{149} 乃至 K: 波羅彌提伽、那闍提利劍摩那闍藍褐、婆羅小闍藍、阿吒那剌、摩訶彌摩香劍阿婆伽度波摩、室喩吒那、都叉那時月提、釋伽羅波羅呂奈、摩訶尼陀那婆槃耶夜、頻波婆羅波羅時伽摩摩、般闍復陀那貳提伽、沙陀耶多尼、尼陀那散猶乞多、波羅延、阿陀婆婆耶修如路 GMSY}

\footnote{\textit{150} 未 GKMS: 不 Y}

\footnote{\textit{151} 爲 K: om. GMSY}

\footnote{\textit{152} 尼 K: 尼事 GMSY}
丘比丘尼。若為自身若為他。遣使若不遣使應去。聴一七夜不聴二
七夜。

If a šikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī has not yet learned but wishes to learn, or has
learned and forgotten but wishes to recite the great sūtras of much
knowledge and much wisdom from the Prāśādika down to the Satyadrṣa-
sūtra\(^\text{154}\) and sends a messenger to a bhikṣu saying, “Reverend One, I have
not yet learned but wish to learn,” or “I have learned and forgotten but
wish to recite the great sūtras of much knowledge and much wisdom
from the Prāśādika down to the Satyadrṣa-sūtra. Reverend One, please
come, instruct me so that I may receive training in recitation and ask as
to the meaning.” In such situations he is authorized to go for seven
nights. If it is for the sake of a šikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī he should go, and so
too for the sake of a šikṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera, except in accordance with
his requirements. If it is for the sake of a bhikṣu he should go, and so too
for the sake of a bhikṣu. If it is on account of the affairs of another he
should go, and so too he should go on account of his own affairs. If a
messenger is sent he should go, similarly even if a messenger is not sent
he should [still] go. If a bhikṣu or bhikṣu, either for their own sake or
for the sake of another, sends a messenger or even if they do not
send him then he should go. He is authorized to go for one period of
seven nights, he is not authorized to go for two periods of seven nights.

This passage similarly seems to reinforce the Sarvāstivādin stance that a
penitent nun (šikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī) is in no way disbarred from participation
in the acquisition and transmission of the dharma. It is also worthy of note

\(^{154}\) Viz. the following texts: Prasādaniya 波羅窣太尼, Pañcatraya 那闍提利劍,
Māyājāla 摩那闍藍黓, Brahmajāla 婆羅小闍闍, Ājānā[i]jikam 阿吒那剎, Mahāsāmanājikam
摩訶紫摩耆剎, Alagardopama 阿羅伽度摩摩, Trṣṇāśankṣayavimukti 窄呪吒那磐那時
月謁, Śakrapraśna 釋迦波羅婆念訶, Mahānidānaparyāya 摩訶尼陀那波梨耶訶,
Bimbisārapratyudgamana[m] 頻波紫羅波羅時伽摩摩, Pañcopādānaskandhaka 般闍復
波陀那肝提伽, Saḍāyatana 沙陀耶多尼, Nidānasamyukta 尼陀那散猶伽多, Pārāyaṇa
波羅延, Arthavargiya-sūtra 阿陀婆耆耶修虶路. See RK, pp. 778-780; Peter Skilling ed.,
as listed in the IDan dkar ma Catalogue,” in Bukkyō kenkyū, Hamamatsu, vol. 15, 1985
(quoted in Skilling, ibid. I have not been able to consult this directly); cf. T. 1435, p.
174b18-c1; T. 2130, pp. 983c-984a. Also see Sylvain Lévi, “Sur la récitation primitive des
textes bouddhiques,” Journal asiatique, sér. 10, XIX, 1912, pp. 401-447.
that parallels to this passage exist in which lay men and women,\textsuperscript{155} śrāmaṇeras, \textsuperscript{156} śrāmaṇerīs\textsuperscript{157} and śiksamānās\textsuperscript{158} who have not learned but wish to learn, or who have learned but forgotten ask a bhikṣu to teach them the aforementioned sūtras.

As we have seen from the twenty or so occurrences of the term śikṣādatta-śrāmaṇerī in the above passages, the appearance of this term in the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya can in no way be described as an isolated occurrence or be discounted as an aberration. Those still unconvinced may suggest that it is perhaps a Chinese interpolation as, after all, the only textual evidence I have presented are Chinese Vinaya materials.\textsuperscript{159} If only these texts were extant in Sanskrit the minds of the disbelievers would surely be put at rest.

Sadly, these texts do not appear to have survived. However, what is perhaps the critical missing link in the theory that pārājika penance was also a valid option for bhikṣunīs may be provided by a Sanskrit fragment discovered on the Turfan Expedition. The fragment contains the following text:\textsuperscript{160}

\begin{verbatim}
| bhagavān āha yāvad eva O samghasya
kanthāvrajavātāparikhayā anuparikṣiptaṁ bhavati | .. ...i.o ///
vareṇa śikṣādattakasya śrāmaṇerasya tricivarena śikṣādattāyāh
śrāmaṇeryāh [sic] paṇcacivarena ||
\end{verbatim}

This text was identified by Sander as corresponding to the following Chinese

\textsuperscript{155} T. 1435, p. 174b17-c3.

\textsuperscript{156} T. 1435, p. 175a22-23.

\textsuperscript{157} T. 1435, p. 175a17-23.

\textsuperscript{158} T. 1435, p. 175c11-17.

\textsuperscript{159} For more evidence, e.g. a reference to Nandika in the Māhāsāṃghika Bhikṣunī Vinaya, see p. 128 below.

\textsuperscript{160} Fragment B1.9 R from the Turfan Expedition. For full details and the text itself see Sander, Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden, vol. 5, pp. 41-42.
text.\textsuperscript{161}

間若未作不離衣羯磨。齊遠近名不離衣。答\textsuperscript{162}若牆壁塲築\textsuperscript{163}柵。齊是來比丘不離三衣。比丘尼不離\textsuperscript{164}五衣。與學沙彌不離三衣。與學沙彌尼不離五衣。

[Upāli] asked, “If one has not yet made the formal act of [limiting the proximity from which one may be without being] ‘parted from one’s robes,’ how far may one go before it is called being ‘parted from one’s robes’?”

[The Buddha] replied, “If there is a wall, a moat, a fence or a palisade, a bhikṣu may come as far as this without being apart from his three robes. A bhikṣunī may come as far as this without being apart from her five robes. A śīkṣādattā-śrāmaṇera may come as far as this without being apart from his three robes. A śīkṣādattā-śrāmaṇeri may come as far as this without being apart from her five robes.”

Although the Sanskrit fragment is incomplete it provides us with more than enough text to place beyond reasonable doubt the existence in Indian Buddhism of the śīkṣādattaka-śrāmaṇera’s female counterpart—the śīkṣādattā-śrāmaṇeri. In short, Hirakawa seems to be off-track in his observations that pārājika penance is only applicable to the male saṅgha. As we have seen above, the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya alone provides us with more than ample testimony that the first pārājika was not considered final—as evidenced by Nandika’s penance—and that this special provision was by no means the province of bhikṣus alone. It was, as far as we can tell, a very valid option open to both bhikṣus and bhikṣunīs alike.

\textsuperscript{161} T.1435, p. 388c7-10.

\textsuperscript{162} 答 K: 答言 GMSY

\textsuperscript{163} 塲築 K: 閣塲 GMSY

\textsuperscript{164} 離 KMSY: 失 G
Sarvāstivāda Addendum 1
What is a bhikṣu?

The Sarvāstivādin recension of the Nandika story describes Nandika as qishi biqiu 乞食比丘 which I have tentatively translated as ‘mendicant bhikṣu’—this, however, is rather problematic. The Sarvāstivādin tradition lists four kinds of bhikṣus:¹ mingzi biqiu 名字比丘 (samijñā-bhikṣu), ziyan biqiu 自言比丘 (pratijñā-bhikṣu), weiqi biqiu 爲乞比丘 (bhikṣata iti bhikṣu) and pofannao biqiu 破煩惱比丘 (bhinna-kleśatvād bhikṣu).²

Similar enumerations are also to be found in the other Vinayas. In the Theravādin Vinaya, for instance, we find twelve types of bhikkhus listed, the last of which is samaggena samghena ṇatticatutthena kammena akuppana thānārahena upasampanno 'ti bhikkhu.³ It is this bhikkhu, and he alone who is the ‘true’ bhikkhu to which the Vinaya refers.⁴ Likewise, the Mahiśāsaka vibhaṅga enumerates eleven,⁵ the Dharmaguptaka lists eight,⁶ and the Mūlasarvāstivādin Bhikṣu vibhaṅga has five.⁷

The Mahāsāṅghika vibhaṅga, however, does not appear to enumerate

---

¹ T. 1435, p. 2b27-29.
⁵ T. 1421, p. 4b5-8: 比丘者。乞比丘。持壇色割截衣比丘。破惡比丘。實比丘。堅固比丘。見過比丘。一語受戒比丘。二語受戒比丘。三語受戒比丘。善來受戒比丘。如法白四羯磨受戒比丘。是名比丘。
⁶ T. 1428, p. 571a24-b2: 若比丘者。名字（字 GKMSY: 爲 N）比丘。相似比丘。自稱比丘。善來比丘。乞求比丘。著割截衣比丘。破結使比丘。受大戒白四羯磨如法成就者得處所比丘。住比丘法中。是謂比丘義。是共比丘者。餘比丘受大戒白四羯磨如法成就得者所住比丘法中。是共比丘義。
⁷ T. 1442, pp. 629c29-630a2: 若復苾拏者。謂苾拏等。苾拏有五一名字苾拏。二自言苾拏。三乞求苾拏。四破煩惱苾拏。五白四羯磨圓具苾拏。
such a list and at first seems strikingly dissimilar as it gives only a definition. The definition given is as follows:  

比丘者。受具足善受具足。如法非不如法。和合非不和合。可稱歎非不可稱歎。滿二十非不滿。是名比丘義。

A bhikṣu is one who has received the full ordination and is one who has received the full ordination well; in accordance with the dharma and not not in accordance with the dharma; in harmony and not in disharmony; one who can be praised and not one who can not be praised; a full twenty years in age and not less [than this]; this is called the meaning of bhikṣu.

Similarly, in the Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins we find the following definition of a bhikṣuṇī:  

yā puna bhikṣuṇī ti upasampannā sūpasampannā traivācikena karmanā jñāpti-caturthena anāghāta-pañcamena samagreṇa saṃghena ubhayataḥ saṃghena iyaṃ bhikṣuṇī

Whatever bhikṣuṇī: fully ordained and fully ordained well by a formal act with three articulations with the resolution coming fourth and having nondissent as the fifth element, by the harmonious samgha and by the saṃgha on both sides; this is a bhikṣuṇī.

On closer investigation, however, it appears that the Mahāsāṃghika interpretation may not be as different as first thought. The Mahāsāṃghika texts seem to be saying that a bhikṣu (or bhikṣuṇī) is one who has been properly ordained by means of a jñāpti-caturtha karman. Indeed, this would appear to be no different from the Theravādin vibhaṅga which, after enumerating eleven other types of bhikkhus, lists the twelfth—the only ‘true’ bhikkhu—as

---

8 T. 1425, p. 235c18-20.
9 聚 KGMSY: 集 N
10 可 KMNSY: om. G
11 義 KN: om. GMSY
12 BV, p. 76, §114, 8-10.
13 T. 1425, p. 514b18-21 has wuzhefā 無遮法 “without obstructing dharmas.”
samaggena samghena niitticatutthena kammena akupenna thanarahena upasampanno 'ti bhikkhu.

Likewise, we see the same in some of the other Vinayas.\textsuperscript{14} The Mūlasarvāstivādin Bhikṣu vibhaṅga, for example, in explaining baisiïjēmō yuanju bichu 白四羯磨圓具苾芻 'bhikṣu fully ordained by means of a ājñapti-caturtha karman' (the fifth type of bhikṣu enumerated in their list) similarly seems to state that this type of bhikṣu is the vibhaṅga's referent.\textsuperscript{15} From this we may deduce that the other types of bhikṣus are not 'true' bhikṣus in the Buddhist sense and are thus not the audience to which the Vinaya was directed. These bhikṣus are, perhaps, best understood as bhikṣus in the original sense of the term, viz. beggars or religious mendicants who rely on alms for sustenance. Indeed, although Buddhist bhikṣus can be considered to be 'bhikṣus' in this wider sense, the converse does not follow; it is quite possible to be a bhikṣu (in the wider sense) and not a follower of the Buddha.

Furthermore, the situation in the Sarvāstivādin tradition is rather more confusing. In the vibhaṅga commentary on the second type of bhikṣu we find the following remarks:\textsuperscript{16}

自言比丘者。用\textsuperscript{17}白四羯磨受具足戒。又復賊住比丘。剃除鬚髮被著袈


\textsuperscript{15} T. 1442, p. 630a12-14: 云何白四羯磨圓具苾芻。謂身無障難作法圓滿。是不應呵。是名羯磨圓具苾芻。今此所言苾芻義者。

\textsuperscript{16} T. 1435, p. 2a29-b2.

\textsuperscript{17} 用 KMSY: 周 G
A self-professed bhikṣu receives the full ordination by a jñāpti-caturtha karman. Or, also, it is an interloper bhikṣu¹⁸ who shaves off his hair and beard, wears the kāśāya¹⁹ and self professes to be a bhikṣu. This is called a self-professed bhikṣu.

Thus it appears that although the Sarvāstivādin vibhaṅga only enumerates four kinds of bhikṣus, for some strange reason the bhikṣu who has been fully ordained by means of a jñāpti-caturtha karman has somehow become intertwined with the pratiṇā-bhikṣu. Thus, no matter how we understand the text, it is quite evident that the weiqi biqiu 繽乞比丘 (bhikṣata iti bhikṣu) that Nandika is described as being in our text can in no way be interpreted as a jñāpti-caturtha-karmopasaṃpanno bhikṣu as, at least in the Sarvāstivādin tradition, this is a ziyan biqiu 自言比丘 pratiṇā-bhikṣu. Furthermore, it would also appear that in no other tradition is a bhikṣata iti bhikṣu to be understood as a jñāpti-caturtha-karmopasaṃpanno bhikṣu. Moreover, if we are to understand the jñāpti-caturtha-karmopasaṃpanno bhikṣu as the only ‘true’ bhikṣu then Nandika can not have been a ‘true’ bhikṣu. Thus the question remains: if a weiqi biqiu 繽乞比丘 ‘mendicant (lit. beggar) bhikṣu’ is not a ‘true’ bhikṣu, viz. not a Buddhist bhikṣu, then why are his actions the apparent impetus for the Buddha’s ruling? Why does this bhikṣu fear that he will no longer be able to live with the other bhikṣus? Surely, if he was not a ‘true’ bhikṣu he would not be living with the other bhikṣus to start with. Accordingly, there would be no question of him no longer being in communion with the bhikṣus. I find this rather puzzling.²⁰

¹⁸ See p. 82, note 79 above.

¹⁹ See p. 68, note 14 above.

The precise meaning of yiyoujusongfa 以音句詁法 above was somewhat problematic. The obvious place to look for help, I perhaps mistakenly thought, was the Sarvāstivādin prātimokṣa. The relevant passage, pātayantika six reads as follows:¹

若比丘。以闡陀偈句。教未受具戒人者。波夜提。
If a bhikṣu teaches one who is not yet fully ordained using the chando² gāthā³ it is a pātayantika.

The vibhaṅga, however, contains a slightly different wording:⁴

若比丘以偈句。教未受具戒人者。波夜提。
If a bhikṣu teaches dharma line by line to one who is not yet fully ordained it is a pātayantika.

The vibhaṅga also goes on to define jufa 句法 as follows:⁵

句法者。足句不足句足字⁶不足字⁷足味⁸不足味⁹。
Line by line means complete lines and incomplete lines, complete words and incomplete words, complete syllables and incomplete syllables.

² Chandas (chando) appears to be one form of metre used in Vedic literature. See Monier-Williams, s.v.
³ This phrase is also somewhat problematic. Jīju 僧句 could be taken as ‘gāthā’ or ‘gāthā and phrases,’ thus yielding the following translation: ‘using the chando gāthā and phrases.’
⁴ T. 1435, p. 71a21-22.
⁶ 字 K: 味 GMSY
⁷ 字 K: 味 GMSY
⁸ 味 K: 字 GMSY
⁹ 味 K: 字 GMSY
This appears to have led Pachow to come up with the following translation.\textsuperscript{10}

If a Bhikṣu teaches the Padaśo dharma to un-ordained [sic] persons,—that is a Pā... Padaśo dharma means the doctrine of the Buddha whether complete or incomplete in sentences, in meaning and in words.

Although I hesitate to suggest Pachow's interpretation may be erroneous, I would suggest that the original text should, perhaps, be emended omitting fa to read 句者。足句不足句 etc. This seems, at least to me, more logical as the ensuing vibhaṅga explanation is an explanation of ju 句 and not jusfa 句法. Furthermore, fa 法 is itself defined a couple of lines on. T. 1435, p. 71b1-2 reads as follows:

法者。佛所說。弟子所說。天所說。仙人所說。化人所說。
Dharma is that which is expounded by the Buddha, that which is expounded by disciples, that which is expounded by the gods, that which is expounded by Rṣis, that which is expounded by magically created beings.\textsuperscript{11}

If we thus emend the text we can now justify the rendition 'teaches dharma line by line' as opposed to Pachow's almost nonsensical 'teaches the Padaśo dharma.' This then brings our text back in line with the Theravādin recension, only leaving the prātimokṣa as aberrant. This, however, can perhaps be explained by Hirakawa's suggestion that Kumārajīva's Chinese translation of the prātimokṣa text may be inexact as it was completed, but not revised, just prior to his death.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{10} Pachow, p. 124, note 1. Pachow only identifies his text as Sarvāstivādin Vinaya Nanjio no. 1115 (T. 1435) ch. 9.

\textsuperscript{11} Skt. nirmitaka (?)

\textsuperscript{12} HC, vol. 16, p. 97.
Chapter Five
Mahāsāṃghika Tradition

The Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghikas or *Mohosengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (T. 1425) appears to have been translated sometime between the years 416-418 C.E. at Daochang Temple 道場寺 by Buddhhabhadra 佛陀跋陀羅 (359-429 C.E.) and Faxian 法顯 (ca. 340?-420? C.E.) from a manuscript found by the latter at Pātaliputra in Magadha.¹

The first pārājika section of the vibhaṅga spans the first one and a half fascicles of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya. It is in this section where we once again encounter the story of Nandika. The recension of the Nandika story preserved in this section appears to be the longest of any of the extant Vinayas.²

It owes its length to the inclusion of a jātaka which expounds a previous birth story of the bhiksū Nandika. It is this story to which we now turn.³

Once the Buddha was residing in the city of Śrāvasti. *See above for full details.* At that time in the city of Śrāvasti there was an Elder named Nandika. With faith he left the home for the homeless life, he abandoned his home and became a mendicant. In the city of Śrāvasti he was well-known by many people and they often made offerings and nourished him. His four requisites were fully furnished. There were many others [also] named Nandika. However, this Elder meditated while walking, he meditated while standing, he meditated while sitting and he meditated while lying down. In time, he came to be known as Nandika the Meditator. Once, Nandika built a grass hut in the Andhavana. There he practised self-cultivation in the first, middle and latter [watches] of the night. He obtained the worldly samādhi⁴ and so passed seven years. When seven years had elapsed he withdrew from his dhyāna. Again, under a tree he returned to

---

¹ *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集: T. 2145, p. 21a6-10. Cf. also *BKD*, vol. 10, p. 261. For a fuller discussion, see *RK*, pp. 137-142.

² What seems to be an abridged version of this appears in fascicle 19 of the *Jinglũoyixiang* 經律異相 (T. 2121). See Mahāsāṃghika Appendix (pp. 234-236 below).

his practice of samādhi and sought his original [state of] meditation. At that time, [one of] Māra’s retinue was continuously devising stratagems, and spying on people practising the True Dharma, in search of their weak points. She changed into human form unparalleled in beauty, bedecking her body with various flowers, perfumes and necklaces and appeared in front of Nandika. To Nandika she said, “O Bhikṣu, let’s have some fun together—come and have sex with me!” Thereupon, Nandika said, “Evil [one], be gone! Evil [one], be gone!” Saying this he did not look at her. The goddess again spoke as above for a second and a third time. Then, Nandika, also for a second and a third time, spoke as follows, “Evil [one], be gone! Evil [one], be gone!,” and did not look at her. At that point the goddess then took off her garment of necklaces and revealed her body. Standing in front of Nandika she said to him, “Come, let us have sex together.” Thereupon, Nandika, seeing her form, spawned lustful thoughts and replied, saying, “Okay,” Then, the goddess gradually drew back. Nandika called out [to her], saying, “You should stay a while, we can have some fun together.” Nandika approached her. The goddess quickly departed. Nandika chased her to the Jetavana moat. In the moat there was a dead royal horse. The goddess entered the dead horse and hid her form so she was invisible. Then, Nandika, ablaze with numerous lustful thoughts, thereupon had sex with the dead horse. His lustful thoughts having been assuaged he then and there reflected thus, “I have been exceedingly bad and have acted contrary to the dharma of a śramaṇa. With faith I left the lay life [to become a monk], but I have committed a pārājika offence. Thus have I worn the monastic robes and eaten food donated in faith by other people.” Thereupon he took off his monastic

4 *Shisuzhengshou* 世俗正受 is presumably a variant of *shijianchan* 世間禪 Pāli lokiya-samādhi (Skt. lokika/laukika samādhi?) which is given on p. 1528a of the FG. See, *inter alia*, OBD, s.v. sanshuzen 三種禪 and NBD, p. 469. Cf. also FG, pp. 662-3, s.v. sanzhongchan三種禪. All three distinguish the following three types of dhyāna: shijianchan 世間禪, chushijianchan 出世間禪 and chushijianshangshangchan 出世間上上禪. *Shijianchan* 世間禪 may be further divided into two: genbenweichan 根本味禪 and genbenjingchan 根本淨禪. Genbenweichan 根本味禪 is further subdivided into three: sichan 四禅, siwulian 四無量 and sikong 四空. This area requires more work!

5 In a footnote in *Kokuyaku issai kyō Indo senjutsubu* 國訳一切經印度撰述部, ritsubu 律部, vol. 8, p. 50, note 131, Nishimoto Ryūzan 西本龍山 suggests that this is talking of the undefiled meditation which is attained by Arhats.

6 Cf. Sanskrit *avatāra-prekṣin* (BHSD, s.v. *avatāra* (4)).
robes and carried them in his right hand. With his left hand he covered his form and hurried towards the Jetavana and spoke thus to the bhikṣus, “Elders, I have committed a pārājika, I have committed a pārājika.” Then, at the gate to the Jetavana the bhikṣus strolled around and wandered about pondering their own affairs, saying to each other, “This is Nandika the Mediator who cultivates brahmacarya. He cannot have committed a pārājika.” Nandika, again said, “Elders, that is not so. I have truly committed a pārājika.” The bhikṣus then asked about the incident. Nandika fully explained the above matter. The bhikṣus fully explained this matter to the World-Honoured One. The Buddha told the bhikṣus that the noble Nandika had himself explained that he had committed a grave offence for which he should be banished. Then, when the bhikṣus were thus told of the banishment, the bhikṣus said to the Buddha, “World-Honoured One, has not Elder Nandika for a long time cultivated brahmacarya? Yet by this goddess he has been inveigled.” The Buddha said to the bhikṣus, “This bhikṣu Nandika has not only today been misled by a goddess and lapsed from brahmacarya. In a previous lifetime he was also tricked by her into losing [his] brahmacarya.” The bhikṣus said to the Buddha, “Was it like this before?” The Buddha said, “Yes.”

The Buddha said to the bhikṣus:⁸ “In a previous age there was a city called Vārānasi in the kingdom of Kāśi. At this time, in the kingdom of Avanti in Dakśināpatha there was a member of the Kāśyapa-gotra who had left the lay life to follow another path.⁹ He was sagacious, erudite, and well versed in all kinds of books. Of his many talents and mysterious abilities there were none that was not developed. That follower of another path aided the king in ruling the kingdom. At the time, the king of that country captured villains and thieves and punished them in various ways. He cut off the hands and feet of some of them, he sliced off the ears and noses of others; he punished extremely severely. At that time, that follower of another path pondered these matters deeply, ‘Since I have left the lay

---

⁷ Although the text does not specify what exactly Nandika is covering, it would appear to be his genitalia. Note the interesting use of the character yan 奄. Cf. also yan 奄 and yan 閘 ‘eunuch’ (See Shirakawa Shizuka 白川静, Jitō 字統, ss.vv.).

⁸ For a French translation of the following section, see Édouard Chavannes, Cinq cents contes et apologues, Tome 2, pp. 282-287.

⁹ I.e. non-Buddhist.
life [for the religious life] how is it that I together with the king take part in these acts?’ Then he said to the king, ‘[Please] allow me to leave the lay life [for the religious life].’ The king then replied, saying, ‘Master, you have already left the lay life [for the religious life]. How is it that now you say that you wish to again leave the lay life [for the religious life]?’ He replied, ‘Great king, now I am involved in these various kinds of punishments and tormenting of sentient beings. How can this be called leaving the lay life [for the religious life]?’ The king asked him, saying, ‘Master, now what path do you wish [to follow] leaving the lay life [for the religious life]?’ He replied, ‘Great king, I wish to leave the lay life [for the religious life] studying the [path of the] recluse.’ The king said, ‘So be it. According to your wishes leave the lay life [for the religious life].’ Not far from the city there was a mountain with hundreds of cliffs, with rivers, springs, valleys, ponds and flowers and fruit flourishing in abundance. He went then to that mountain and built a hermitage. In the midst of the mountains he cultivated and practised the other path. He obtained the worldly samādhi, and brought forth the five supernatural faculties. In the last month of spring, from eating fruit and berries his four elements became unbalanced. Consequently, his urine did not run pure. At one time a herd of deer in rut were chasing each other around. Thirsty, exhausted and in search of water one drank this urine. The semen came to stay on her tongue [with which] she licked her vagina. The consequence of sentient beings’ actions is inconceivable. Because of this she conceived. She always stayed near the hut eating grass and drinking water. When she came to term the deer gave birth to a child. At that time the recluse was out gathering fruit. Because the deer was having difficulty in labour it let out great bellows of lament. Hearing the deer bellowing

10 Zysk, p. 27, tells us that “the etiology particular to Indian medicine is the three-humor (tridōṣa) theory,” and that (p. 68) “the Indian etiological conception of disease causation based on the idea of ‘peccant’ humors (doṣas) appeared in Chinese sources only in the form of a fourfold system based on the principal elements (earth, air, fire, and water), of which the Chinese had a much clearer conception, even though they believed there existed a fifth element, ether.”

out the recluse leapt to the conclusion that she had been bitten by a harmful insect. Just as he was about to go to the aid of the deer, he saw it give birth to the child. Having seen this the recluse marvelled at it and also thought to himself thus, 'How is it that an animal gives birth to a human?' Subsequently he entered meditative contemplation and saw the original causation. He then realized that it was his child, and thereupon felt affection for the child. He wrapped up the child in a leather cloak, took it home and nurtured it. The recluse carried the child in his arms and the deer mother suckled it. Gradually the child grew up and he named it Deer Stripe. Because the child was dependent on its mother for its birth, its body was striped like its mother. Because of this the child was given the name Deer Stripe. This child gradually grew up and reached the age of seven. He was humble towards his juniors and respectful towards his elders, benevolent, loving, filial and compassionate. Gathering water and fruit he served and looked after the recluse. At this time the recluse thought as follows, 'In the whole wide world there is nothing more fearful than women.' Then the recluse admonished the child, saying, 'For exceeding fearfulness nothing surpasses women. Destruction of rectitude, ruin of virtue—without exception all emanate from them.' Thereupon he instructed the child in meditation and taught him the five supernatural faculties. As it is said [by the Buddha]:

All manner of sentient beings
Return without exception to death
According to the trend of their karma;
They receive their own recompense.
A doer of good is reborn in the heavens,
One who performs evil enters hell,
One who practises the path and cultivates brahmacarya
Has his corruptions eliminated and attains nirvāṇa.

At that time the recluse's life thereupon ended. At this time, the child purely cultivated brahmacārya and attained the four meditations of the non-Buddhist path. He gave rise to the five supernatural faculties and possessed great magical powers. He was able to move mountains, stop rivers and touch the sun and the moon with his hand. At that time, riding

---

12 Or 'Deer Spot.'

13 Or 'spotted.'
a white elephant Śakro devānām Indrah\textsuperscript{14} came to this world in search of one who showed filial piety to their parents and venerated śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas and was also able to give alms, observe precepts and cultivate brahmacārīya. While travelling around the world in his search, he saw this recluse's child. The Lord of the gods thought thus, 'When this child desires to seek [the status of] Indra and Brahmā, he will be able to attain it all. He should be destroyed as soon as possible. As it is said [by the Buddha]:

\begin{quote}
All gods and people of the world, 
All manner of sentient beings,
All without exception are in bondage:
At the end of their lives they fall into an evil path.
\end{quote}

Everyone is bound by the two shackles of avarice and jealousy. The gods have three time-drums. When the gods battle with the Asuras they beat the first drum. When in the park of Kuvera many flowers blossom they beat the second drum. When they gather at the Sudharma-assembly hall to listen to the Good Dharma they beat the third drum. Śakro devānām Indrah hit the drum of dharma exposition. Innumerable hundreds and thousands of deities all came and assembled. Everyone asked Indra what his bidding was. Indra informed them, 'In Jambudvīpa there is a recluse's child called Deer Stripe. The child has great merit. I desire a stratagem to destroy him. When the innumerable deities heard this they were not happy, then they thought to themselves, 'Whoever destroys this child will decrease the [number of] divinities and increase the number of Asuras.' Among them [however] there were those who were indifferent to success or failure. Furthermore, there were some who rejoiced in this desire to destroy him. One deity called out, saying, 'Who should go?' Then, there was a reply, saying, 'For this a goddess should go.' These gods travelled around looking in the parks; in the parks of Nandana, the parks of Citraratha\textsuperscript{15} and Pāruṣakavana.\textsuperscript{16} Saying, 'A goddess should go,' they then summoned them. Straight away hundreds of thousands of goddesses

\textsuperscript{14} I.e. Indra as opposed to Śakra. Note there seems to be confusion even in Indic texts, see Malalasekera, \textit{Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names}, pp. 957-965, especially the last note on p. 965.

\textsuperscript{15} See Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善, \textit{Indo Bukkyō koyūmeishi jiten} 印度佛教固有名詞彙典 (IBKJ), pp. 683 (table) and 132.

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{IBKJ}, p. 501.
all came and assembled. There was one goddess named Alambusā.\textsuperscript{17} Her hair was variegated. Her hair was four colours; green, yellow, red and white. Accordingly, it was called variegated. They ordered this goddess to Jambudvīpa to destroy the child, Deer Stripe. Then, that goddess said to Indra, ‘From antiquity onwards I have often destroyed people’s brahma\cārya and caused them to lose their magical powers. I request that in my place you dispatch another goddess who is beautiful in form and well adorned who makes others delight in her.’ Thereupon, Indra again expounded gāthās variously in the assembly admonishing the goddess, ‘Alambusā, you may go and destroy Kośābindu.’\textsuperscript{18} As it is expounded within the Jātaka sūtra, thereupon the goddess then brought the recluse’s child to ruin.” The Buddha told the bhikṣus, “At that time, the recluse’s child, Kośābindu, surely was none other—he was indeed Nandika the Meditator here. The goddess Alambusā was this goddess here. And Nandika was formerly destroyed by her. Now as a bhikṣu he is again destroyed by her.” Thereupon the World-Honoured One said to the bhikṣus, “Down to among non-humans it is also a pārājika. He should not be in communion.”

From the above text it would appear that Nandika may have been banished on account of his sexual misadventures and that the Buddha was not impressed at all with the actions of this bhikṣu who, in a previous life, had committed similar offences. Although this story has all the elements of a good Bollywood movie, viz. sex, conspiracy and moral ruination, it does not paint an accurate picture of the Mahāsāṃghika’s approach to pārājika penance. Indeed, according to this recension of the Nandika story it would appear that our hero, Nandika, was banished and the case closed.

This, however, does not seem to be entirely the whole truth. For reasons which I cannot as yet account for,\textsuperscript{19} an explanatory passage dealing with the story of Nandika is to be found in fascicle twenty-six of this Vinaya in the

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. jātaka 523 on the tempting by the nymph Alambusā (Cowell, 1973).

\textsuperscript{18} Note, Chavannes, ibid., p. 287 gives Kuśābindu.
The Buddha was residing in the city of Śrāvastī. See above for full details. At that time in the city of Śrāvastī, there was one called Nandika who did not enjoy the household life. Abandoning the household life he left home [for the religious life]. He meditated while walking, he meditated while standing, he meditated while sitting and he meditated while lying down. At the time there were also many other people called Nandika so they called this one Nandika the Meditator. See the pārājika section for full details. The bhikṣus then banished him. Having been banished, standing between the gates of the Jetavana he cried, saying, “Elders, I have committed a pārājika and have had not a single thought of concealing it. I take delight in the kāśāya. I do not wish to abandon the dharma of the Buddha.” At that time, Nandika’s mother came and also cried, saying, “My son takes delight in the life of a monk, yet the World-Honoured One banishes him.” Nandika’s elder sister also came and she too cried, saying, “My younger brother takes delight in being a śramaṇa, yet the World-Honoured One banishes him.”

The bhikṣus went and told the World-Honoured One of this matter. The Buddha informed the bhikṣus, thus: “This [one], Nandika, has committed a pārājika and has had not a single thought of concealing it. The saṃgha

---

19 We must remember that although the story of Nandika is preserved, inter alia, in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya tradition it is not an exclusively Mahāsāṃghika text. What we have here is nothing more than the Mahāsāṃghika recension of this story. Consequently, it is possible that this tradition has not preserved the story of Nandika in its entirety. We know that some other traditions explicitly state that a śikṣādattaka may be rehabilitated and returned to his previous position in the saṃgha’s hierarchy. Cf. the Mūlasarvāstivādin recension of the Nandika story (esp. p. 176 below).

20 On this point, see Frauwallner, pp. 198-207 and, for an excellent summary of the Mahāsāṃghika skandhaka, see Sasaki Shizuka, BSAP, 1994.

21 未 K: om. GMSY.

22 T. 1425, p. 441a26-27.

23 T. 1425, p. 441a28-c7. See pp. 244-245 below for the text.
should grant the formal act of pārājika penance. He should beg from the samgha. Baring his right shoulder, he is to kneel down\(^{24}\) and join his palms together and speak thus, ‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. I, Nandika, have committed a pārājika and have had not a single thought of concealing it. Now, from the samgha I beg for pārājika penance. Out of compassion may the samgha grant me the formal act of pārājika penance.’ In this way he is to beg three times.”

“The officiator\(^{25}\) should speak as follows, ‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. The bhikṣu Nandika has committed a pārājika and has had not a single thought of concealing it. He has already begged for the formal act of pārājika penance from the samgha. If the samgha thinks that the time is right, the samgha should grant Nandika the formal act of pārājika penance. This is the motion.’

‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. The bhikṣu Nandika has committed a pārājika and has had not a single thought of concealing it. He has already begged for the formal act of pārājika penance from the samgha. Let the samgha now grant the bhikṣu Nandika the formal act of pārājika penance. If, honourable ones, you accept that the samgha should grant the bhikṣu Nandika the formal act of pārājika penance [please] remain silent. If you do not consent then speak out.’

This is the first [articulation of the] formal act; the second and third are also to be articulated in this way.

‘The samgha has finished granting the bhikṣu Nandika the formal act of pārājika penance. The samgha has consented on account of its silence. Thus I hold this matter to be so.’”

“He should sit below all bhikṣus and above all śrāmaṇeras. He may not stay for more than three nights in the same room as the bhikṣus. Furthermore, he may not stay for more than three nights with the śrāmaṇeras. That which is impure for the bhikṣus to eat may also be impure for him. That which is impure for him to eat may also be impure for the bhikṣus. He may give food to the bhikṣus, with the exception of the five kinds of vegetable growth\(^{26}\) purified [i.e. cooked] by fire,\(^{27}\) and gold and silver. He should receive food from the śrāmaṇeras. The bhikṣus may not recite to him the prātimokṣa—the pārājika offences, the samghāvaśesā [offences]

\(^{24}\) He is to kneel down in the Western, i.e. Indian manner. Cf. hugui 翻屈.

\(^{25}\) See Nolot, pp. 88-9 and Sasaki Shizuka, 1994, p. 87 on this term.
down to [minor] offences involving transgression against the Vinaya. They may tell him that he may not perform abrahamacarya, he may not steal, he may not kill, he may not lie, [and] he may not drink alcohol. In this way, one by one, they may instruct him.\textsuperscript{28} If he is one who formerly recited the prâtimokṣa, he may not recite it out loud. If he reveres the dharma, he must recite it mentally. He may not listen to the poṣadha or receive the pravâraṇa. On the day of the poṣadha and the day that the pravâraṇa is received, going forth into the samgha he should speak thus, ‘I am pure, let the samgha bear it in mind.’ Having spoken thus three times he should go back. With regard to the four pârâjikas, if he transgresses he should be expelled.\textsuperscript{29} The thirteen samghâvaśeṣa and below are all to be regarded as duṣkṛta penances. This is the procedure to be followed for what is called granting the formal act of pârâjika penance.’

There can be little doubt that this text is dealing with the same Nandika as encountered in the first pârâjika text. Indeed, although both passages state that in the city of Śrāvasti there were many others of this name, our hero is identified as Nandika the Meditator. Furthermore, the second text refers us back to the pârâjika section for full details of Nandika’s offence.

The latter text provides us with a valuable insight as it seems to begin

\textsuperscript{26} Wushengzhong 五生種 Pāli pañca bijajātānī(?). Pācittiya 11 of the Theravādin Bhikkhu vibhaṅga, VP, vol. 4, p. 34 gives: bhūtagāmo nāma, pañca bijajātāni, mūlabijām khandhabijām phaṭubijām aggabijām bijabijān c’ eva paṇḍcamam. Horner, BD, vol. 2, p. 227 translates this as “Vegetable growth means: there are five kinds of propagation: (what is) propagated from roots, propagated from stems, propagated from joints, propagated from cuttings, and fifthly (what is) propagated from seeds.” Note that the title of the Bhūtagāma section (pācittiya 11 on destroying vegetable growth) in the Theravādin Vinaya seems to correspond with rule 11 entitled huasihengzhongxuechu 壞生種學處 ‘the śikṣāpada on destroying vegetative growth’ in the Chinese recension of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya. Also note that the Taishō shinshū daizōkyō sakūrin, vol. 12, p. 158 classifies wushengzhong 五生種 as zhìwù (J. shokubutsu) 植物 ‘vegetation, flora.’ T 1425, p. 339a18-19 defines five zhongzi 種子 (bijā?) as: 種子者有五種根 (根 K: 根 GMS-Y) 種莖 (莖 K: 根 GMS-Y) 種心種節種子種。是為五種 (“Germs: there are five kinds—root germs, stalk germs, thorn germs, joint germs, seed germs. These are the five kinds.” The text then goes on to describe how each of these five groups should be made pure so that they may be accepted and consumed by the bhikṣus and then refers to them as a collective group calling them wushengzhong 五生種 (see T. 1425, p. 339c3 and c10).
where the former text ends. We see Nandika’s mother and elder sister imploring the World-Honoured One not to expel Nandika. Consequently, he is granted

There are five ways (OBD, p. 534 gives ten for the Dhamaguptakas) of preparing (purifying) food so that it may be eaten by the bhikṣus. These are known as wushengjingshi 五種淨食. The five are huojing 火淨 [fire-purification], daojing 刀淨 [knife-purification], zhuajing 爪淨 [[fingernail-purification], yanganjing 餓乾淨 [shriveled and dry purification], niaozhuojing 鳥啄淨 [pecked by a bird purification] (OBD, p. 534; Uj Hakuju’s 字井伯壽, Konsaisu Bukkyō jiten コンサイス佛教辞典, p. 273; and FG, p. 1185). See HC, vol. 16, pp. 171-173 for a more detailed discussion of these terms. Cf. MBD, pp. 2764-2765. It appears that although the concepts may be common to all the traditions there is a great deal of divergence in the terminology.

Hirakawa gives an illuminating footnote on these food preparation methods (MDBN, p. 410). Hirakawa lists the five methods of “killing” living plants (fruit and vegetables) for consumption by the bhikṣus as follows: “(1) boiling or roasting plants over fire, (2) cutting plants with a knife, (3) peeling the skin from fruits and vegetables, (4) crushing the fruits, leaves or flowers of plants with the hands, (5) scratching fruits and vegetables with the fingernails.” The first two are obviously huojing 火淨 [fire-purification] and daojing 刀淨 [knife-purification] respectively, and are not problematic at all. The remaining three methods, however, seem to diverge in terminology (and perhaps meaning) throughout the different Vinaya traditions. Hirakawa refers to VP, vol. 2, p. 109; the relevant clause reads: anvānāmi bhikkhave pañcahi samanakappethi phalaṃ paribhāṣitum aggiparicitaṁ satthaparicitaṁ nakhaparicitaṁ abiṣampi nibbhabitaṁ heva pañcamam (SBE, vol. 20, p. 75, note 1, suggests pariṣiṣṭaṁ for paricitaṁ on the basis of Buddhaghosa’s Samantapāṇḍikā). BD, vol. 5, p. 147, translates these five as follows: “...damaged by fire, damaged by a knife, damaged by (one’s) nail, if it is seedless, and the fifth is if the seeds are discharged.” Although Rhys Davids’ translation does not differ significantly from this, he does include the following footnote: “The principle of the injunction throughout its five divisions is one and the same —the seed, or the capacity of fructification, must have either never existed, or have passed away, or have been destroyed.” (SBE, vol. 20, p. 75, note 3). This requires further investigation.

Hirakawa, GBK, p. 251 states that according to the Mahāsāṃghika tradition a śīksamāṇā may instruct other bhikṣus (僧祇律の説く波羅夷学侮の行法は、十説律の説と大差ない。〈中略〉 また他の比丘に教授をしてもよいとなしている。). Although he cites no textual evidence for this, his statement appears in the middle of a paragraph in which he deals with our text. Accordingly, I am assuming that he is taking this line as his textual evidence. Hirakawa’s assertion would involve an active construction (which is grammatically fine) as opposed to one in the passive as I have chosen to translate. The problem I have with this is one of context; I feel it is a lot more probable that a śīksamāṇā was not permitted to instruct others. Furthermore, in the parallel passage discussed below Hirakawa chooses to translate a similar sentence passively. See MDBN, p. 304 (8) and (9). Hirakawa, however, is inconsistent even in his treatment of the śīksamāṇā, cf. MDBN, p. 54-55 (8) and (9) for a second parallel passage. Cf. point 3 in note 36 below.
pārājika penance, the details of which are then set forth.

The first part of this section of the text confirms the position of the šikṣādattaka in the samgha’s hierarchy as a kind of limbo state above the śrāmañeras and below the bhikṣus. The text then goes on to state that the šikṣādattaka may not spend more than three nights’ lodgings with either the bhikṣus or the śrāmañeras. Indeed, this is in line with pācattika thirty-two of the Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣu prātimokṣa which states that a bhikṣu should not spend more than two or three nights with an unordained person. These prohibitions, however, are not unique as parallels exist in other Vinayas. The rest of the prohibitions, however, appear to be unique to the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya and thus warrant further investigation.

The text states that what is impure for the bhikṣus to eat is also impure for the šikṣādattaka and vice versa. Although I am not sure of what this really means, for the meantime at least, I will take the text at face value. It is interesting to note that there are a number of parallels to this passage to be found throughout the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya. T. 1425, p. 547c25-28 reads:

29 I have here chosen to translate quchu 驅出 as ‘expel.’ In other places I have usually translated it as ‘banish.’ Although either may be acceptable in a non-Vinaya text, here, in the case of a re-offending šikṣādattaka the permanency involved seems to justify ‘expel.’ It should be noted that this term quchu 驅出 is also used as a translation for Sanskrit pravāsaniya in pravāsaniya karman (quchu jiemo 驅出羯磨) (Pāli pabbajaniya kamma). On this term, see BHSD. s.v. pravāsaniya; Upasak, s.v. pabbajaniyakamma; SGBK, pp. 442-445.

30 Note, I am using the Sanskrit pācattika here for what were called pātayantika in the preceding chapter. The basis for the use of this Sanskrit form is the extant Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin Bhikṣuni Vinaya. See BV, p. 186 ff. Cf. Pāli pācittiya.


32 Cf., for instance, T. 1435, p. 3b2-5 (Sarvāstivādin Vinaya). Note the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya only states he is to sit below the bhikṣus and that he is not allowed to spend more than two nights’ lodgings with bhikṣus, śrāmañeras or the laity.
食於比丘不清比丘尼淨。比丘尼不清比丘淨。比丘得使比丘尼授食。除金銀及錢五生種火淨。比丘尼得從比丘受食。除金銀及錢火
淨五生種。

That which is impure for a bhikṣu to eat may be pure for a bhikṣunī.\textsuperscript{34} That which is impure for a bhikṣunī may be pure for a bhikṣu. A bhikṣu
may have a bhikṣunī give him food, with the exception of gold, silver, money and the five kinds of vegetable growth purified by fire. A bhikṣunī
may receive food from a bhikṣu, with the exception of gold, silver, money and the five kinds of vegetable growth purified by fire.

Furthermore, another parallel is to be found in the eighteen rules of conduct for śīksamānas.\textsuperscript{35} T. 1425, p. 535a22-b8 reads:\textsuperscript{36}

何等十八。一切比丘尼下一切沙彌尼上飲食。於其不清比丘尼淨。於比丘尼不清於其亦不清。得與比丘尼同室三
宿。與沙彌尼亦齊三宿。得與比丘尼授食。除火淨五生種
已。從沙彌尼受食。不得向說波羅提木叉。從波羅夷乃至越比尼\textsuperscript{37} 罪。得語言不得姦。不得盜。不得殺人。如是比丘\textsuperscript{37} 得教。不得\textsuperscript{38} 聽
布薩自恣。至布薩自恣日。至上座前頭面禮僧足\textsuperscript{39} 作是言。我某甲
清淨懺念持。如是三說已。却行而去。後四波羅夷。若一一犯
者。即日\textsuperscript{40} 應更受學法。若十九僧伽婆尸沙已下一切作突吉羅\textsuperscript{41}
悔。若破五戒。何等五。非時食。停食食。受金銀及錢。飲
酒。著香華。隨其犯日。從始學戒。滿減者減二雨學。是名不滿
學。不滿學與受具足者。波夜提。是故世尊説。

What are the eighteen? [1]\textsuperscript{43} [The śīksamāna is] to eat and drink below all bhikṣunīs and above all śrāmaṇeris. [2] That which is impure for her
may be pure for a bhikṣunī. [3] That which is impure for a bhikṣunī is

\textsuperscript{33}授 GKMSY: 受 N

\textsuperscript{34} Hirakawa translates this passage in \textit{MDBN}, pp. 409-410. He suggests that it may
be understood in light of \textit{bhikṣu pācattika} no. 30 (Mahāsāṃghika; Theravādin no. 29) in
which it states that it is an offence for bhikṣus to knowingly eat alms food procured by a
bhikṣunī. This, Hirakawa says, is not an offence for bhikṣunīs. Furthermore, \textit{bhikṣunī pācattika} no. 80 (Mahāsāṃghika; Theravādin no. 1) states that \textit{bhikṣunīs} must not eat
garlic. Again, Hirakawa states that this is not an offence for monks. Thus, eating garlic
(that which is impure for a bhikṣunī) may be pure for a bhikṣu.

\textsuperscript{35} As far as I can tell it is only the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya which lists eighteen rules
for śīksamānas; all of the other Vinayas seem to list only six. See Upasak, s.v. sikkhamāna.
It appears that this may be an area which has escaped any detailed study.
also impure for her. [4] She may share a room with bhikṣuṇīs for three

36 There is also another parallel passage to be found at T. 1425, p. 471c2-15. Hirakawa, MDBN, pp. 53-55, translates this passage. There are, however, a number of problems with his rendition:

- Hirakawa translates 於式叉摩尼不淨於大尼淨。於大尼不淨於式摩尼亦不
浄 as “(2) Something that is an offence for a Śikṣamānā (need) not be an offence for a bhikṣuṇī. (3) Something that is an offence for a bhikṣuṇī is also an offence for a Śikṣamānā.” In an earlier explanation in Japanese of these eighteen rules, Hirakawa (GBK, pp. 511-512) explains that the distinction between jìng 淨 and bujìng 不淨 is one of food that is pure or able to be accepted and impure food or food that is not able to be accepted (「浄・不浄」
受けてよい食物と悪い食物の区別であり, ・…)) (GBK, p. 511). Yet, here he implies (MDBN, p. 54 (2) and (3)) that it is nothing to do with food which is pure or impure, but to be understood as relating to purity of action and thus yielding a translation focusing on what is and is not an offence.

- Hirakawa (MDBN, p. 54) translates wushengzhong 五生種 as “the five kinds of vegetables,” however, on p. 304 of the same text he translates them as “the five kinds of (grain).” To further compound the problem Hirakawa then proceeds on p. 410 to call them “the five kinds [sic] food.” He does, however, footnote this with a note referring to bhikṣuṇī-pācattika no. 11 which, as discussed above (note 26), prohibits the damaging of plant life.

- Hirakawa translates 尼不得 (得 KN: 得語 GMSY) 向説波羅夷乃至越毘尼
罪。得語不姦。不盗。不殺。不妄語如是等 as (pp. 54-55) “(8) (A Śikṣamānā) should not point out to a bhikṣuṇī any of the bhikṣuṇī’s offences from the pārājika down to the vinayātikrama. (9) (A Śikṣamānā) may speak (to a bhikṣuṇī) concerning (matters of) not committing [sic] sexual intercourse, not stealing, not killing, not lying.” Surely, however, this should be understood as meaning a bhikṣuṇī may not expound to a Śikṣamānā the prātimoksa precepts, viz. the pārājikas down to the minor transgressions of the Vinaya, but she may orally instruct her that she is not to have sex, not to steal, not to kill and not to make false claims, etc. This would be in line with Hirakawa’s translation of the other parallel passage (MDBN, pp. 303-304) and would seem to make more sense. Cf. note 28 above.

37 比丘 GMSY: 比 K

38 得 K: om. GMSY

39 足 K: 足已 GMSY

40 即日 K: om. GMSY

41 悔 K: om. GMSY

42 戒 K: om. GMSY

43 The eighteen are not numbered in the text; my numbering is provisional.
[nights’] lodgings. [5] Furthermore, she is limited to [only] three [nights’] lodgings with śrāmaṇerīs. [44] [6] She may give food to a bhikṣunī with the exception of the five kinds of vegetable growth purified by fire. [7] She is to receive food from the śrāmaṇerīs. [8] One may not recite to her the prātimokṣa from the pārajika offences down to minor offences involving transgression against the Vinaya. [9] One may tell her that she may not have sex, she may not steal, she may not kill people. In this way she may be instructed by a bhikṣu. [10] She may not listen to the poṣadha or the pravāraṇa. [45] [12] On the day of the poṣadha and the pravāraṇa she is to go before the seat of the Elders and, having made homage by placing her head at the feet of the saṃgha, she should speak thus, “I, so-and-so, am pure [may the saṃgha] bear it in mind.” Having said this three times she is to withdraw and depart. [13] With regard to the latter four pārajikas, if she transgresses any one of them, immediately she should begin her rules of training anew. [46] If she transgresses [any of] the nineteen samghāvaśesa offences and below these are all to be regarded as duṣkṛta penances. If she breaks her five precepts—what are the five? [14] Eating at an improper time; [48] [15] eating stored food; [49] [16] accepting gold, silver and money; [50] [17] drinking alcohol; [51] and [18] wearing perfumes and flowers [52]—she is to immediately, on the day she transgresses, [re-]train in the precepts.

---


45 Indeed, it is an offence to recite dharma to those who are not fully ordained. Cf. paccittika no. 6 in the Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣu prātimokṣa (T. 1426, p. 552a25). Cf. Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣunī prātimokṣa, paccittika no. 6 (T. 1427, p. 559c18). Cf. Theravādin Bhikkhu pāṭimokkha, pācittiya nos. 4 and 100 in the bhikkhunīs’ text.

46 Presumably the first four pārajikas which bhikṣunīs share with the bhikṣu saṃgha are also not to be transgressed. It is interesting, however, to note that the śikṣamāna only has to restart her two-year training if she commits one of the latter pārajikas. Cf. T. 1425, p. 514c13-14: 比丘尼共沙彌行姦者。比丘尼波羅夷。沙彌驅出。[If] a bhikṣunī has sex with a śrāmanera the bhikṣunī is pārajika and the śrāmanera is banished.

47 There are nineteen samghāvaśesa offences for bhikṣunīs in the Mahāsāṃghika tradition. All other traditions, except the Mūlasarvāstivādins who enumerate twenty, appear to list only seventeen offences. See BPSS, p. 2 or MDBN, p. 40.

from the beginning. As for her term, if it is less than two rainy seasons of training\textsuperscript{53} she is known as one whose training is incomplete. Granting one whose training is incomplete the full ordination incurs a pācattika [offence].\textsuperscript{54} Thus it was expounded by the World-Honoured One.

It is thus apparent from the above texts that neither the śikṣādattaka nor the śikṣamāṇā are allowed to attend the posadhā or the pravāraṇa. This is quite understandable as these ceremonies are restricted to fully ordained samgha members.\textsuperscript{55} It is interesting to note, however, that it would appear that although neither are permitted to attend these ceremonies, on the day on which the posadhā and the pravāraṇa are held they both are to approach the samgha (the Elders in the case of the śikṣamāṇā) and make known the fact that they have been pure in regard to their precepts. Moreover, although it seems likely

\textsuperscript{49} Cf. Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣu prātimokṣa, pācattika no. 37, T. 1426, p. 552c18: 若比丘。停食食波夜提。Cf. the Sanskrit text, p. 25: samnidhekāra bhojane pācattikam. Cf. Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa, pācattika no. 27, T. 1427, p. 560b7: 若比丘尼。停食食波夜提。Chatsumarn Kabilsingh translates this literally as, “Whatever bhikkunī, having finished eating, should eat again, there is an offence of expiation.” (BPSS, p. 59) and in her earlier work on the Bhikkhuni pātimokkha states that there is no rule in the Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa on eating stored food (1984, p. 110). Admittedly it depends on how one translates tingshi 停食. However, I tend to agree with Hirakawa that tingshi 停食 can be taken as stored food (see HC, vol. 16, pp. 423-434 (cf. Pachow, p. 141)). Accordingly, in this light Chatsumarn Kabilsingh would perhaps appear to be mistaken. Cf. Therāvādin Bhikkhu pātimokkha, pācittiya no. 38 and no. 121 in the bhikkhunis’ text.

\textsuperscript{50} Cf. niḥsargika pātayantika no. 20 in the Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣu prātimokṣa (T. 1426, p. 551c13). Cf. Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa, niḥsargika pātayantika no. 25 (T. 1427, p. 559b19-20). Cf. Therāvādin Bhikkhu pātimokkha, nissaggya pācittiya no. 18 and no. 22 in the bhikkhunis’ text.


\textsuperscript{52} Cf. Therāvādin Mahāvagga, VP, vol. 1, pp. 83-84; BD, vol. 4, pp. 105-106 on these five rules.

\textsuperscript{53} Note it appears that years of training are counted in terms of rainy seasons.

\textsuperscript{54} Cf. Therāvādin Bhikkhunī pātimokkha pācittiya no. 63. Note a nun must be ordained by both Orders.
that the śikṣādattaka would also engage in the rains retreat, the fact that he is not allowed to participate in the pravāraṇa at the end of the rains retreat appears to suggest that he is regarded as impure and would thus affect the purity of the saṅgha. Accordingly, in order to maintain the purity of the Order, he is barred from attending the pravāraṇa and poṣadha. However, as the Order must ascertain the pariśuddhi56 or “purity” of the saṅgha as a whole it is presumably necessary to have the śikṣādattaka (and similarly the śikṣamāṇā) report as to their purity before these ceremonies are held in a similar way to the proxies of purity issued by sick saṅgha members.57

There can be no denying that, at least within the Mahāsāṃghika tradition, similarities exist between the śikṣādattaka and the śikṣamāṇā.58 The śikṣamāṇā is a two-year probationary state for a śrāmaṇerī who has finished her training (as a śrāmaṇerī) but is not yet eligible to receive the full ordination. In this sense she is above the śrāmaṇerīs, but below the bhikṣunīs. Indeed, the śikṣādattaka is, as we have seen, also a limbo state between the statuses of śrāmaṇera and bhikṣu. It is perhaps the fact that the śikṣamāṇā has no male counterpart in the Buddhist cenobitic tradition that prompted the Mahāsāṃghikas to juxtapose the śikṣādattaka in such a position.

The śikṣādattaka and the śikṣamāṇā are technically not fully ordained

55 T. 1425, p. 450b26-29 lists those who are not fully ordained among people prohibited from the poṣadha (布薩有七事應遮…三未受具足人). Cf. Theravādin Mahāvagga, VP, vol. 1, p. 135, lines 25-30; BD, vol. 4, p. 180. Hirakawa, GBK, p. 330, states that people other than bhikṣus attending a gathering of the [bhikṣu] saṅgha under false pretences are deemed to be interlopers zeizhubiqiu 賊住比丘 (steya-samvāsika bhikṣu). Furthermore, Hirakawa also states that novices and the laity are not allowed to attend these ceremonies (ibid., p. 250).


57 Cf. Theravādin Mahāvagga, VP, vol. 1, p. 120; BD, vol. 4, pp. 158-159.

58 These similarities, however, appear to exist only in the Mahāsāṃghika tradition.
and as such, it is perhaps not surprising to see that they may not be instructed as to the contents of the prātimokṣa. Indeed, in the case of the śikṣādattaka even if he had formerly been a reciter of the prātimokṣa he is no longer allowed to recite it aloud and is limited to mental recitation. They are, however, allowed to be individually instructed as to what constitutes appropriate behaviour. Although not explicitly mentioned in the text relating to Nandika’s penance the śikṣādattaka appears to be bound by all of the rules for monks. Similarly, the śikṣamāṇā—although not officially bound by all the rules of the prātimokṣa—nevertheless is punished for transgressing any of them. It is interesting to note that not only must she begin her training anew if she commits a pārājika, but the same applies if she breaks one of the five precepts. It seems puzzling that a pārājika offence and eating past midday are dealt with in the same manner—especially when samghāvaśeṣas are treated as duṣkṛta offences. Perhaps we are to understand the ruling that she is to begin her training anew if she commits a pārājika, not as referring to the śikṣamāṇā training but as meaning that she is to start her training as a śrāmaṇeri again.

The text dealing with pārājika penance also stated that if a śikṣādattaka commits a pārājika he is to be expelled. From this it becomes clear that pārājika penance is a one-off provision and cannot be invoked in cases of re-offending. Indeed, we must remember that the śikṣādattaka has already committed a pārājika and any subsequent talk of pārājikas can only refer to a second offence.59

Furthermore, the text states that samghāvaśeṣa offences are to be treated as duṣkṛta penances. This is most interesting as the duṣkṛta penance would only appear to involve the transgressor confessing his offence to one bhikṣu.60 This is in stark opposition to the mānatva (and parivāsa if he had concealed

59 A second transgression of any of the pārājika dharmas, that is.
the offence) which would be meted out to a normal bhikṣu. Thus we see that the śikṣādattaka is indeed no longer treated as a bhikṣu. Furthermore, not only does he have to obey a number of observances in addition to the 218\textsuperscript{61} rules of a bhikṣu, but if he transgresses any rule from the samghāvaśeṣa down his actions do not seem to warrant the attention of the samgha.

The final Chinese text that I wish to present from the Mahāsāṃghika tradition is a very short passage from the skandhaka which deals with various offences and their corresponding punishments. The text reads:\textsuperscript{62}

波羅夷罪當云何治。若作俗人。若作等\textsuperscript{63}學沙彌。若僧中驅出。

How indeed is a pārājika offence to be dealt with? One is to become a lay person, or become a śikṣādattaka or be banished from within the samgha.

Thus we see that the path of the śikṣādattaka is not only a legitimate one but in fact perhaps the only viable path open to a bhikṣu who wishes to remain within the samgha, but has engaged in sexual intercourse without disavowing his training. It still seems to me to be a very curious choice. The obvious choice, one would assume, would be to disavow one’s training, abandon the dharma, return to the lay life, have sex to one’s heart’s content and then re-apply for the novitiate ordination.

Indeed, the disavowing of one’s training seems to be a very simple practice in which one declares that one no longer has the strength to continue

\textsuperscript{60} See MBD, pp. 3927-3928 and FG, p. 3924. It appears that this offence is to be confessed to another when it was done intentionally. Self reflection or confession is evidently enough in cases of unintentional transgressions.

\textsuperscript{61} There are only 218 rules for bhikṣus in the Mahāsāṃghika tradition. Compare this with 227 in the Theravādin tradition. On the number of rules in the various traditions, see MDBN, p. 39 ff. or HC, vol. 14, pp. 7-11.

\textsuperscript{62} T. 1425, p. 496c1-3.

\textsuperscript{63} 作與 G: 與作 KMNSY
in one’s training, disavows the Tathāgata and returns to the lay life or to the status of a śramaṇera as appropriate. The only conditions seem to be that his declaration is heard and understood by another person. Furthermore, it seems that there is no limit to the number of times one can take up and then subsequently abandon one’s training. Indeed, Bhartrhari appears to have done this seven times.

The main drawback to disavowing one’s training is that one necessarily forfeits all seniority on returning to the lay life and as such if one returned back to the dharma one would have to be subservient to bhikṣus who were previously one’s junior. This, however, seems a small price to pay when one considers the alternative, viz. not disavowing one’s training but remaining as a śikṣādatta. The only possible reason I can suggest for Nandika’s actions is that he was absolutely overcome with lust and did not think of the consequences of his actions until it was too late. Indeed, this view is perhaps supported by the fact that Nandika appears to have tried to control himself as we saw in his statements “Evil [one], be gone!” and the fact that he did not look at the goddesses attempting to seduce him.

Thus, it would appear that the most plausible account of Nandika’s actions are that he was so overcome with sexual desire that he acted on his impulses without considering the consequences. The Tathāgata then took pity on this once fine bhikṣu who had succumbed to temptation and set down a special provision for Nandika and indeed other bhikṣus who found themselves in a similar predicament. Indeed, we notice that when Nandika told the bhikṣus


65 GBK, p. 96. The original text quoted by Hirakawa is to be found in the Nanhai jigui nei jia zhang at p. 229a21-22: [伐致河利]希勝法而出家。懲繫纏而便俗。斯之往後數有七焉。
that he had committed a \textit{pārājika} they appear not to have believed him and then when they related this to the Buddha they stressed the fact that he had been seduced by a goddess.

Indeed, the theme of seduction by women is often encountered in the Vinaya. We find in the \textit{Theravādin Vinaya}, for instance, the story of Sundara who was innocently walking along minding his own business when he was stopped by a woman who—under the guise of paying homage to the monk—performed a lewd act upon him.\footnote{BD, vol. 1, pp. 56-60; VP, vol. 3, p. 39.} There are also stories of women “sitting down” upon monks who were resting after having travelled far,\footnote{BD, vol. 1, p. 56; VP, vol. 3, p. 36.} and lay female devotees wishing to give themselves as sexual gifts to monks.\footnote{BD, vol. 1, p. 61; VP, vol. 3, p. 39.} Women often appear to be portrayed as extremely promiscuous and lustful. What then do the texts say about nuns? Was the provision of \textit{pārājika} penance only applicable to male members of the \textit{samgha} or was it also open to \textit{bhikṣunīs}?

The text of the first \textit{pārājika} in both the \textit{Bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa}\footnote{T. 1427, p. 556c4-7.} and \textit{Bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga}\footnote{T. 1425, p. 514b16-18.} expressly sets out the provision for disavowing one’s training. Thus we can assume that sexual desire and the possibility of temptation existed not only in the \textit{bhikṣu samgha} but also for the \textit{bhikṣunīs}. The \textit{vibhaṅga} text for the \textit{bhikṣunīs}, however, does not seem to deal with this explicitly. Indeed, as many of the rules and provisions that apply to \textit{bhikṣunīs} are common to both \textit{samghas} it is often the case that a \textit{bhikṣunī} text will refer back to the text of the \textit{Bhikṣu vibhaṅga} for clarification of details which are omitted or abbreviated in the \textit{Bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga}. Hirakawa makes the following
observations in this connection.\footnote{MDBN, pp. 5-6.}

In both the Sanskrit and the Chinese versions of the Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya, the Bhiksuni-vinaya is not treated as an independent unit, but as an appendix to the Bhiksu-vinaya. Many precepts are listed in both the Bhikṣu-vinaya and the Bhiksuni-vinaya. However, these precepts are explained in full only in the Bhikṣu-vinaya; they are referred to only by simple “key words” in the Bhiksuni-vinaya. Both the texts and explanations of precepts held in common by bhikṣus and bhikṣunīs are omitted in the Bhiksuni-vinaya. A complete understanding of the precepts for bhikṣunīs can not be obtained from the Bhiksuni-vinaya alone; the Bhikṣu-vinaya must also be consulted.

Thus it is these “key words” in the Bhiksuni Vinaya of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin tradition to which we now turn. The text of the first pārājika dharma contains a passage in which six such “key words” are found.\footnote{BV, p. 75, § 113. ekam idam gautami samayan tathāgato vaiśāliyam viharati / vistareṇa yaṣikasyārthopattiḥ prathamā / tasmāt tarhi gautāmi bhiksunyāpi atraiva śikṣitavyam / dvinnām licchavikumārāṇām arthopattiḥ / dvitiyā jāvan nāsti bhiksuniye śikṣāpratvākhyānam / tritīyā nāsti daurbalyāvīskarākarma / caturthā / nandikasārthopattiḥ / pañcamī / mārkaṭṭāya arthopattiḥ [ṣaṣṭhi] / vistareṇa tasmād iha gautāmi bhiksunihi atraiva śikṣitavyam/}

The first (yaṣikasyārthopatti) is to the story of Yaśika son of Kalandaka.\footnote{See T. 1425, pp. 229a17-231b22. Cf. the story of Sudinna son of Kalandaka in the Theravādin vibhaṅga, VP, vol. 3, pp. 11-21; BD, vol. 1, pp. 21-38.} The second (dvinnām\footnote{See BHSG, 19.5. for gen. pl. dvinnām.} licchavikumārāṇām arthopattiḥ) is the story of the two youths of Licchavi.\footnote{The third (nāsti bhiksuniye śikṣāpratvākhyānam) is the setting down of the clause which allows bhikṣus and bhikṣunīs alike to disavow their training.\footnote{See BHSG, 19.5. for gen. pl. dvinnām.}} The third (nāsti bhiksuniye śikṣāpratvākhyānam) is the setting down of the clause which allows bhikṣus and bhikṣunīs alike to disavow their training.\footnote{See BHSG, 19.5. for gen. pl. dvinnām.} The fourth (nāsti daurbalyāvīskarākarma) refers to the story in the Mahāsāṃghika vibhaṅga of an anonymous bhikṣu who was having trouble finding the strength to continue
his brahmacarya. Accordingly, the rule is amended to include the declaration of weakness.\textsuperscript{77} The fifth (nandikasyārthotpattiḥ) refers us to none other than the story of Nandika.\textsuperscript{78} Finally, the text (markatiya arthotpattiḥ) refers us to the story about a bhikṣu and a female monkey which, in the Theravādin recension, led the Buddha to include the clause prohibiting sexual intercourse with animals.\textsuperscript{79}

Admittedly the Mahāsāṃghika recension of the Nandika story to which this Bhikṣunī vibhaṅga refers nuns to does not, as we have seen above, mention anything about Nandika being granted pārājika penance—this is only mentioned in the skandhaka. However, this skandhaka is presumably common to both saṅghas and thus I assume it was also read by bhikṣunīs. Accordingly, it is possible to hypothesize that the path of the sīksādattaka was also open to nuns in at least the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin tradition, if not the Mahāsāṃghika tradition as a whole. Thus we once again find ourselves re-examining Hirakawa’s theory that the sīksādattaka was a provision available only to bhikṣus.

\textsuperscript{77} See T. 1425, p. 231b23-c17. Cf. Theravādin vibhaṅga, VP, vol. 3, pp. 39-40; BD, vol. 1, pp. 61-62. Note that these stories do not correlate exactly; it seems that the Mahāsāṃghika text is a story about two bhikṣus who got into trouble for disrobing without officially disavowing their training, as a consequence the precept was amended to include the “without disavowing one’s training” clause. Cf. the story of the Vajjins in the Theravādin Vinaya, VP, vol. 3, p. 23; BD, vol. 1, pp. 40-42.

\textsuperscript{76} T. 1425, p. 231c17-19. See note 75 above.


\textsuperscript{78} See T. 1425, pp. 232a13-233a26. Sadly there seems to be no Theravādin parallel for the Nandika story. Note that this appears to be the only extant Indic evidence for the name ‘Nandika,’ with regard to pārājika penance, that is.

Chapter Six  
Dharmaguptaka Tradition

The Chinese translation of the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya appears, at least according to the colophon, to have been made by the Kashmiri monk Buddhayaśas (fl. ca. 408-412 C.E.) in collaboration with Zhu Fonian¹ and others around 408 C.E.² It is to be found in the Taishō edition at T. 1428 as the Sifen lü 四分律 or ‘Vinaya in Four Parts.’³

Two separate but almost identical recensions of the Nandika story are to be found in this Vinaya—the first in the shoujie jiandu 受戒犍度 or Pravrajyāvastu⁴ which deals with regulations surrounding ordination, and the second in fascicle fifty-five in the appendix diaobu 調部.⁵ The story reads as follows:⁶

At that time the Buddha was residing at the city of Rājagṛha. In the city there was a bhikṣu named Nandika. He always enjoyed sitting in meditation; he attained mental liberation through worldly meditation.⁷ When he rose from the fourth dhyāna⁸ a daughter of Māra came and stood before him.

¹ On Zhu Fonian, see p. 23, note 11 above.
² Cf. p. 24, note 12 above.
⁴ For a full description of the four divisions, see BKDJ, vol. 4, p. 220.
⁵ For a general discussion of the Pravrajyāvastu, see Frauwallner, pp. 70-78.
⁶ On this appendix, see Frauwallner, pp. 182-183, note 2.
⁷ The texts are similar enough to warrant them being collated together; this I have done calling the text found in fascicle 34 ‘Recension A’ and that of fascicle 55 ‘Recension B.’ See Dharmaguptaka Appendix (pp. 246-250 below) for the collated texts. Recension A is found at T. 1428, p. 809a8-c2; Recension B at T. 1428, pp. 972b11-973a3.
⁸ Cf. p. 107, note 4 above.
The bhikṣu grabbed at her desiring to violate her. Māra[’s daughter] then went outside. The bhikṣu also followed her outside. That [daughter of] Māra went outside the railing around the cell.\textsuperscript{10} The bhikṣu also followed her outside the railing around the cell. She went into the courtyard. The bhikṣu also went into the courtyard. Māra[’s daughter] then went outside the monastery. The bhikṣu also went outside the monastery. Outside the monastery there was a dead mare. Then Māra[’s daughter] went to the dead horse and disappeared—the goddess’s body was no longer visible. Thereupon, the bhikṣu Nandika then performed an impure act on this dead horse. Having performed the impure act, he had not a single thought of concealing it, at once he thought, “The World-Honoured One has set down precepts for the bhikṣus. If a bhikṣu performs an impure act, it is a pārājika and he is not in communion. I have now committed an impure act and have not had thoughts of concealing it. Could it be that I have not committed a pārājika? What should I do now?” He then said to a close bhikṣu friend, “The World-Honoured One has laid down precepts for the bhikṣus. If one commits an impure act, he incurs a pārājika and is not in communion. Now, I have committed the impure act of sex and have not had a single thought of concealing it. Could it be that I have not committed a pārājika? Good! Elder, [please] go and inform the World-Honoured One on my behalf that if there are regulations [in this regard] I will uphold them.” When the bhikṣus told this matter in its entirety to the World-Honoured One, the World-Honoured One in regard to this matter assembled the bhikṣusāṅgha and said to them, “Monks, now grant the bhikṣu Nandika the jñāpti-caturtha karman for pārājika penance. It is to be granted as follows.

Having the bhikṣu Nandika come into the midst of the sāṅgha, he should bare his right upper arm, take off his leather sandals, venerate the feet of the sāṅgha and with his right knee touching the ground and his palms together he is to speak as follows, ‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. I, the bhikṣu Nandika, have committed an impure act and have not had a single thought of concealing it. Now from the sāṅgha I beg for pārājika penance. I request that the sāṅgha grant me pārājika penance out of compassion.’

The second and the third [articulations] are also to be articulated in this

\textsuperscript{9} Cf. p. 107, note 4 above.

\textsuperscript{10} Exact sense obscure.
manner. From amongst the assembly a competent officiator of formal acts should be appointed to make the following motion as above: ‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. This bhikṣu Nandika has committed an impure act and has had no thoughts of concealing it. Now from the saṃgha he begs for pārājika penance. If the saṃgha thinks that the time is right and the saṃgha assents, the saṃgha should now grant the bhikṣu Nandika pārājika penance. This is the motion.’

‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. This bhikṣu Nandika has committed an impure act and has had no thoughts of concealing it. Now from the saṃgha he begs for pārājika penance. Will the saṃgha now grant the bhikṣu Nandika pārājika penance? Those elders who agree to the saṃgha granting the bhikṣu Nandika pārājika penance [should] remain silent. Those who do not agree should speak out.’

‘This is the first [articulation of the] formal act. The second and the third are also to be articulated in this manner.’

‘The saṃgha has finished assenting to granting the bhikṣu Nandika pārājika penance. The saṃgha has assented on account of its silence. Thus I hold the matter to be so.’

Having been granted pārājika penance he ought to observe and perform various things. As for the rules for behaviour which are to be observed\textsuperscript{11}—he may not impart the full ordination to others. He may not grant guidance

\textsuperscript{11} There is an extremely close parallel for these observances in the Dharmaguptaka tarjanīya karman. In Sifen lü shanbu suiji jiemo 四分律刪補隨機羯磨 Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667 C.E.) states (T. 1808, p. 506c12-13) that there are thirty-five observances to be adhered to by the śikṣādattaka. Similarly, approximately 35 observances—depending on how one subdivides—also appear in the Dharmaguptaka Nandika story (cf. HC, vol. 14, p. 130, which states that there are only 24 observances in the Dharmaguptaka tradition. Clearly Hirakawa does not recognize the similarities between pārājika penance and the tarjanīya karman). Furthermore, in a commentarial passage on the tarjanīya karman of the Dharmaguptakas, Daoxuan classifies these 35 observances into seven groups of five and then further enumerates each five (T. 1804, p. 19c6-28). Daoxuan’s classification, however, does not have a parallel in either recension of the Dharmaguptaka Nandika story and is perhaps a device employed by Daoxuan in order to aid understanding of these observances (note, however, that a similar system of numbering is to be found in the Theravādin Vinaya, cf. VP, vol. 2, pp. 23-24; BD, vol. 5, p. 33-35). Daoxuan’s commentary is undoubtedly valuable to our understanding of the original text. It should not, however, necessarily be taken as correct and it must always be borne in mind that Daoxuan is commenting on the tarjanīya karman and not pārājika penance. Below, I have utilized Daoxuan’s commentary to varying degrees in understanding the observances set down for Nandika. Where I disagree with Daoxuan’s commentary I have noted accordingly.
to others. He may not be in charge of a śrāmaṇera. If he is appointed to admonish the bhikṣunīs he may not accept, if he was [previously] appointed he should not go to admonish [the bhikṣunīs]. He should not recite the rules on behalf of the saṃgha. He should not discuss the Vinaya amidst the saṃgha. He should not accept if the saṃgha appoints him as a monastic official. He should not accept if the saṃgha appoints him to adjudicate at another place. He should not accept if the saṃgha appoints him [to go] as a messenger. He should not enter a village early or return in the evening. He ought to associate with bhikṣus. He may not associate with followers of other ways or the laity. He ought to adhere to the bhikṣu dharma. He may not [evasively] speak of other mundane matters. He may not recite the Vinaya amongst the assembly—if there is no one able to recite it, he is allowed. He may not again commit this offence. Nor


13 The precise meaning of yusuyu 餒俗語 which I have tentatively translated as ‘[evasively] speak of other mundane matters’ is rather problematic. It may simply mean that he is to comply with the bhikṣu dharma and not worry himself with mundane matters or worldly speech (yusuyu 餒俗語). On the other hand, the parallel in the _Dharmaguptaka Pāṇḍulaḥitakavastu_ (T. 1428, p. 889c14) gives yīyu 異語 (Skt. anyavāda, anyathāvāc (BCSD, p. 850, s.v. yīyu 異語)) which is also confirmed in Daoxuan’s commentary (T. 1804, p. 19c17). Furthermore, yūyu 餒語 (Skt. anyavāda) is given in the story of bhikṣu Chanda 鬇陀 in pācattika 12 of the _Dharmaguptaka Bhikṣu Vibhāṅga_ in which it is certainly used in the sense of ‘evasion’ (T. 1428, pp. 642a20-643a12) (cf. pācittiyā 12 in the Theravādin Bhikkhu Vibhāṅga (BD, vol. 2, pp. 230-234); BHSD, s.v. anyavāda-. See also _HC_, vol. 3, pp. 177-189). There can be no doubt that yīyu 異語 or yusuyu 餒俗語 represents Sanskrit anyavāda in the sense of ‘evasion.’ Indeed, this is evidenced in Yuanzhao’s 元照 sub-commentary Sifen lü xingshichao zichiji 四分律行事鈔資持記 on Daoxuan’s commentarial passage on the _tarjaniya karman_—T. 1805, p. 211a17-18: 第五不應異語者即九十中口綴 ‘The fifth—one should not [evasively] speak of different matters—refers to the specious speech of the ninety.’ The ‘ninety’ I have understood as a reference to the pācattikas (of which there are ninety in the _Dharmaguptaka Bhikṣu Vibhāṅga_)—thus a direct reference to pācattika twelve as above. The only thing that is not beyond doubt is whether yusuyu 餒俗語 is the same as yūyu 餒語—this, however, seems a reasonable assumption in light of the similarities in the _Dharmaguptaka Pāṇḍulaḥitakavastu_ and Daoxuan’s commentary. Note that in the _Dharmaguptaka Pārīvāṣikavastu_ (T. 1428, p. 904a28) the text reads 不隨順比丘說異教. 佛言不應爾 ‘not adhering to that of the bhikṣus but expounding a different teaching—the Buddha said that should not be done.’ The context of this would seem to favour the interpretation found in the _Dharmaguptaka Pārīvāṣikavastu_, viz. he should follow the teachings of the Buddha and none other. This requires further work.
should he commit others, whether they be similar, offences arising from this or more serious offences.\textsuperscript{15} He may not criticize a formal act of the samgha or the officiater of the formal act. He may not accept from a pure bhikṣu the laying out of a seat, washing of one’s feet or the water for such, wiping of leather sandals, massages or reverence, greetings,\textsuperscript{16} or salutations. He should not accept from a pure bhikṣu the holding of robes or bowls. He may not accuse a pure bhikṣu, make him remember or make him confess [to an offence]. He should not testify to another’s affairs. He may not prevent a pure bhikṣu from [attending] the recitation of the precepts or the pravāraṇa. He may not together with a pure bhikṣu [engage in] debate. Whether a bhikṣu who has been granted pārājika penance comes or not when the samgha recites the precepts and [performs] formal acts there is no offence for the samgha assembly.”

The bhikṣus asked, “As for a bhikṣu who has been granted pārājika penance, if that bhikṣu re-offends committing the impure act of sex, may he once more be granted pārājika penance or not?” The Buddha said, “He should not. He should be expelled.”\textsuperscript{17}

This text is extremely important to our understanding of the penance granted to a śīksādattaka. The seduction of Nandika by a daughter of Māra is similar

\textsuperscript{14} Note recension ‘B’ omits this. Cf. note 45 below.

\textsuperscript{15} Note although this seems to be the only logical way to understand the Chinese, Daoxuan’s commentary divides the parallel text up as follows (T. 1804, p. 19c17-21): 四五奪其相續後犯，一不應更犯此罪。餘亦不應犯謂為殘作詞貴指下文是餘也。若相似若住從此生相似謂同一篇罪也，從此生者。謂為摩訶詞貴而與女屏坐三若復重於此謂犯提被治換更犯殘零四不應謙羯磨。五不應詎羯磨人。“If one follows Daoxuan our text would read: [1] He may not again commit this offence, nor should he commit others, [nor should he commit] [2] similar or offences arising from this, or [3] more serious offences.” In order to neatly place everything into groups of five, Daoxuan appears to have perhaps distorted or ‘creatively interpreted’ the original text. Note, however, the text of the Dharmaguptaka Pārivāsika parallel (cf. note 46 below).

\textsuperscript{16} See Dharmaguptaka Addendum 1, pp. 162-165 below.

\textsuperscript{17} Note the term here which I have translated as ‘expel’ is miebin 滅摘. Unlike the term used in the pārājika dharmas (bugongzhu 不共住 ‘not in communion’), which is, as we saw in chapter two, often, in fact usually, mistranslated as ‘expel’ this term is not ambiguous and not open to interpretation. Cf. Hüsken, “The Application of the Vinaya Term nāsanā,” \textit{JlABS}, 20.2, pp. 93-111.
to that found in the Mahīśāsaka and Sarvāstivādin recensions. It is in the
details of the penance, however, that the divergence between the traditions
becomes apparent. All in all, there appear to be just over thirty-five regulations
propounded by this text. These regulations most likely do not apply only to
bhikṣus who are granted pārājika penance, but also to bhikṣunīs. This point is
made clear in a Vinaya commentary written by Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667 C.E.)
in 635 C.E. entitled Sifen lù shanbu suiji jiemo 四分律删补随机羯磨 (T.
1808).\textsuperscript{18}

倹波羅夷法\textsuperscript{19}
佛陀言。若比丘比丘尼。若犯波羅夷已。都無覆藏心當如法倹悔。與學戒
羯磨勅三十五事盡形行之。若衆僧說戒羯磨時來與不來無犯。若更犯
重應滅揵。
Rules for Pārājika Confession
The Buddha said: “If, after a bhikṣu or bhikṣunī has committed a pārājika,
they have not a single thought of concealment, they ought to confess in
accordance with the dharma and be granted the formal act of training
which determines the thirty-five things which they should observe for as
long as they live. Whether they come or not when the saṅgha recites the
precepts and [performs] formal acts, there is no offence. If they again
commit a grave offence they should be expelled.”

This text raises and also clarifies a number of important issues. It must,
however, be borne in mind that this text is not canonical and is simply a
Vinaya commentary. Nevertheless, it is a commentary written by Daoxuan 道
宣—arguably the greatest Vinaya commentator of all time.\textsuperscript{20} Even though it
may not tell us of Indian practices in this regard, the text is still of great
significance as it tells us that at least by 635 C.E. some Vinaya commentators
in China regarded pārājika penance as being also applicable to female members

\textsuperscript{18} BKDI, vol. 4, pp. 226-227.

\textsuperscript{19} T. 1808, p. 506c12-13.

\textsuperscript{20} See note 80 below.
of the Order. This is an extremely important point—a point which, as we have seen, lies in direct contrast to Hirakawa’s stance that pārājika penance is restricted in its application to the male saṃgha—which I will come back to later. In the meantime it will suffice to note that this text clarifies the importance of not concealing one’s actions. It also states, as does the story of Nandika, the saṃgha’s indifference toward the penitent’s attendance at formal acts of the Order and makes it clear that re-offending results in expulsion. Furthermore, it refers directly to thirty-five regulations which are to be observed.

Most of these thirty-five regulations are to be found, to varying degrees, in other Vinayas, albeit with reference to the mānatva and parivāsa or punitive procedures such as the tarjaniya karman.21 Furthermore, as mentioned in note eleven, there is a parallel to be found in the thirty-five observances enumerated in Daoxuan’s 道宣 Sifen lü shanfan buxue xingshichao 四分律删繁補闕行事 鈔 (T. 1804) written in 626 C.E.22 in what appears to be a commentary on heze jiemo 詶責羯磨 tarjaniya karman.23 Similarly, there is a significant sub-commentary on this text—Yuanzhao’s 元照 (1048-1116 C.E.) Sifen lü xingshichao zichiji 四分律行事鈔資持記 (T. 1805) in Chinese—and a

---

21 Although a comparative study of the minor differences in the application of rules governing the mānatva, parivāsa and other punitive procedures is not unwarranted it is beyond the scope of the present study. We will limit ourselves to a brief look at the rules as they appear in relation to the śikṣādattaka.


23 Satō Tatsugen refers to this commentary in his explanation of pārājika confession (鐵波羅夷法) (Chūgoku Bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū 中国仏教における戒律の研 (CBKK), pp. 148-149). Satō falls short of stating—but nevertheless implies—that these 35 matters are one and the same. Although they appear to be for the most part identical, there do exist a number of differences between the 35 matters enumerated by Daoxuan with regard to the tarjaniya karman and those expounded in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya for the śikṣādattaka. Below, I have reproduced the text of Daoxuan’s commentary and the sub-commentaries for reference, and have indicated where they differ from the rules for the śikṣādattaka.
commentary on both texts by the Japanese monk Shōon 照遠 (1302?-1361) known as the Shigyōshō 資行釿 (T. 2248).

The first five restrictions—the prohibitions on imparting the full ordination and guidance, taking charge of a śrāmaṇera and admonishing the bhikṣunīs—are to be found in varying degrees, inter alia, in the Pārīvāsikavastu and Pāṇḍulohitakavastus of the Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, Mahāsāṃghika, Sarvāstivādin, Mūlasarvāstivādin and Theravādin.

24 Demiéville, p. 278.

25 What may seem like four restrictions is traditionally viewed as five, the prohibition on admonishing nuns being taken as two.

26 Note some texts fluctuate between shouyizhi 受依止 and showyizhi 授依止. Although most probably one is a corruption of the other, these may be interpreted as different ways of viewing the same thing, viz. 'accept dependence' and 'grant guidance.' See Upasak, s.v. nissaya (II).

27 Although below for the sake of convenience I have mainly referred to the tarjaniya karman (Pāli tajjāniya-kammaṁ), in the Theravādin tradition, for instance, the 18 observances of the tajjāniya-kammaṁ are common also to the formal acts of guidance (nissaya-kammaṁ), banishment (pabbājaniya-kammaṁ), reconciliation (patiśāriṇiya-kammaṁ) and suspension for not giving up a wrong view (pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā appatīnissagge ukkhepaniya-kammaṁ). Note there are also similarities to the 43 observances for a formal act of suspension for not seeing an offence (āpattiya adassane ukkhepaniya-kammaṁ) or for not making amends for an offence (āpattiya appatīkamme ukkhepaniya-kammaṁ). Similarly, although I refer specifically to the parivāsa probation, the observances set down for a pārīvāsika appear to be almost identical to those for one undergoing the māṇatva in, for example, the Dharmaguptaka and Theravādin traditions. See Dharmaguptaka Pārīvāsikavastu, T. 1428, p. 906a2: 佛言。聼行摩那秀比丘亦行如上諸事。 See, inter alia, SBE, vol. 17, p. 394 on the two minor differences between the parivāsa probation and the māṇatta penance. Cf. also the Mūlasarvāstivādin Pārīvāsikavastu (Mūlasarvāstivādin Appendix, pp. 251-259).

28 T. 1428, p. 904a20-22: 彼行覆藏者。與他受大戒。與他依止。畜沙彌。受僧差。差已教授比丘尼。佛言。行覆藏者不應爾。 T. 1428, p. 889c4-6: 一不應授人大戒。二不應受人依止。三不應畜沙彌。四不應受僧差教授比丘尼。五若僧差不應教授。

29 T. 1421, p. 181b6-7: 時諸別住比丘。度沙彌與受具足戒。作依止師。畜沙彌。諸比丘以是白佛。佛言。不應爾。 T. 1421, p. 163a20-23: 不應授人具足戒。不應與人作依止。不應畜沙彌。不應作行糧人。若僧差亦不應受。不應教誡比丘尼。若僧差亦不應受。
Vinayas.\textsuperscript{34}

The second five appear to prevent him from accepting positions of responsibility within the samgha. They prevent him from reciting the precepts, discussing the Vinaya, accepting a commission as a monastic official, adjudicating at another place\textsuperscript{35} or going as a messenger.\textsuperscript{36} All five rules appear to have parallels in the Dharmaguptaka Pārīvāśikavastu.\textsuperscript{37} The Dharmaguptaka Pāndulohitakavastu, however, appears to contain only three parallels—rules one, two and five—in its explanation of the tarjaniya karman.\textsuperscript{38} These five do

\textsuperscript{30} T. 1425, p. 433a16-19: 不得往教誨比丘尼。若已受者不得往...不得與人受具足。不得受人依止及畜沙彌。Note the Mahāśāmgika Pāndulohitakavastu is considerably different from that of other Vinayas (cf. Frauwallner’s comments to this effect (1956: p. 107, note 3)).


\textsuperscript{34} Daoxuan’s commentary on the first five reads (T. 1804, p. 19c8-11): 初五奪其眷屬。一不應授人大戒。二不應受人依止。三不應畜沙彌。四不應受僧差教授比丘尼。五者僧差不應往。Cf. T. 1805, p. 211a11-14: 初五中四五事同。受往分異既不聽受。何有差者。然僧既加罰理必不差。為顯行法在身不堪訓衆。故制之耳。Cf. T. 2248, p. 401b24-27: 鈔。不應授人大戒云云 案玄云。前足數篇據呵責等四。體未壞故。得授大戒。今言不得者。且約制為言○有佛開制不相違文 不應受僧差教授比丘尼。
not appear to have exact parallels in the eighteen observances for a formal act of censure (Pāli tajjāniyakamma) or the ninety-four for one undergoing the parivāsa as expounded in the Theravādin Cullavagga.\textsuperscript{39}

The third set of five are relatively straightforward.\textsuperscript{40} He is not to (1) enter a village early or (2) come back in the evening. He is to (3) associate with the bhikṣus, but (4) not with the laity or followers of other ways. Furthermore, he is to (5) comply with the teachings of the bhikṣus without

\textsuperscript{35} This is probably the same as rule four in Daoxuan’s commentary (cf. note 36 below) and the Dharmaguptaka text on tarjaniya karman (cf. note 38 below)—若僧中簡集智者共評論眾事。不在其例。‘If amidst the saṅgha those of knowledge and wisdom are selected and assembled and together they discuss various matters, he may not join their ranks.’

\textsuperscript{36} Cf. T. 1804, p. 19c11-14: 二五奪其智能。一不應說戒。二若僧中間答毘尼義。不應答。三若僧差作羯磨。不應作。四若僧中簡集智者共評論眾事。不在其例。五若僧差作信命。不應作。 Cf. T. 1805, p. 211a14-15: 二五中第四律中斷罰。先作衆白簡集智人。愚不預數治者同然。 Cf. T. 2248, p. 401b22-c2: 僧中間答毘尼義。治者同然。鉈。若僧差作信命云雲。會正云。信命供僧作使文簡正記云。若爾者既見僧作今不受。莫違僧命不。答。但自陳情即得文

\textsuperscript{37} T. 1428, p. 904a23-26: 知有餘比丘能說戒者而為他說戒。於僧中或問毘尼義或答。在衆僧作羯磨人數中。受僧羯磨差平斷事。受衆僧差使。佛言。行覆藏者不應爾。 Notice the wording of the third rule—"[He may not] be in the number to perform a formal act in the saṅgha" (tentative)—is rather different from that of the śikṣādatta text (T. 1428, p. 809b16-17: 不應受僧差使作知事人). This could be taken to mean he cannot make up a quorum or that he cannot officiate a formal act (cf. Mūlasarvāstivādavinayavastu, ibid., p. 49, line 11: na karma kartavyam / na karmakārakah saṁmantavyah).

\textsuperscript{38} T. 1428, p. 889c8-11: 不應說戒。若僧中間毘尼義。不應答。若衆僧差作羯磨。不應作。若僧中揵（揵 K: 簡 GMNSY 集智慧者共評（評 K: 平 GMNSY）論衆事。不得在其例。若僧差作信命。不應作。The third rule (若衆僧差作羯磨。不應作。) is probably best translated as, ‘If the assembly of monks appoints him to perform a formal act, he should not perform it,’ cf. note 37 above. Note rules three and four agree with Daoxuan’s commentary; cf. note 36 above.

\textsuperscript{39} See VP, vol. 2, p. 5 (BD, vol. 5, pp. 7-8) and VP, vol. 2, pp. 31-33 (BD, vol. 5, pp. 45-48) respectively. Again, this is somewhat dependent upon interpretation of the exact meaning of the observances. One possible parallel in the Theravādin tradition to the fourth in Daoxuan’s group of five is na amvādo paṭṭhapesatto (VP, vol. 2, pp. 5 and 32) which Horner (BD, vol. 5, pp. 8 and 45) translates as ‘[he] should not set up authority.’
evasively speaking of other mundane matters. These observances restrict his movements—the first two seem to act as a curfew and the next two ensure that he mixes only with Buddhists and not the laity or followers of other ways. These five have parallels in the Pārīvāsika and Pāṇḍulohitakavastus of the Dharmaguptaka tradition. They do not, however, appear to have specific parallels, at least upon cursory examination, in the Theravādin counterparts to these texts.

At the beginning of the fourth group of five, recension A (shoujie jiandu 受戒犍度 Pravrajyāvastu) reads 不得衆中誦律若無能誦者聽 “He may not recite the Vinaya amongst the assembly—if there is no one able to recite it, he is allowed.” This, however, has no parallel in the second recension of the Nandika story, viz. fascicle fifty-five in the appendix (diaobu 調部).

40 Cf. T. 1804, p. 19c14-17: 三五奪其順從。一不得早入聚落。二不得僦暮還。三親近比丘。四不應近白衣外道。五應順從諸比丘教。不應作異語。Cf. T. 1805, p. 211a15-21: 三五中第三制親近者先遠離故。律文上有應字。第四令遠離者喜親近故。第五不應異語者今九十中口縫。間前後五種未治得作可。得名奪。第三五過及第四前三過餘時並制。本不得作何名奪耶。答誠如來問。今望遮斷前所喜犯。亦得名奪。但違行法故異常犯。Cf. T. 2248, p. 401c3-5: 鈔。三五奪其順從雲云。問其順從之樣如何。答。此順從自合雲爾也。即玄記云情意作名順從。今奪其順逆彼情也文

41 Cf. note 13 above.

42 T. 1428, p. 904a26-28: 彼行覆藏者。或早入聚落。逼暮還。或不親附沙門親近外道。不隨順比丘說異教。佛言不應爾。T. 1428, p. 889c12-14: 不得早入聚落。不得逼暮還。應親近比丘不應親近外道。應好順從諸比丘教。不應作異語。

43 Although not a direct parallel, note that in the Theravādin Pārīvāsikavastu (VP, vol. 2, p. 32) it states that a bhikkhu is not to perform the alms practice (na piṇḍapātikaṅgam samāditabbam)—this and the passages that state that he should not travel to anywhere there are no monks unless accompanied by a monk except in the case of danger (BD, vol. 5, pp. 46-47) should effectively keep him out of the village and away from the laity. There is, however, a partial parallel for the last three observances in the Theravādin rules relating to a formal act of suspension for not seeing an offence (āpattiya adassane ukkhepaniyakamman). VP, vol. 2, p. 22: na tītthiyā sevitabbā, bhikkhū sevitabbā, bhikkhusikkhāya sikkhitabbam (cf. BD, vol. 5, p. 32).

44 T. 1428, p. 809b20.
five observances in this section, however—if we take our lead from Daoxuan, that is—do have parallels in the *Dharmaguptaka Pāṇḍuholitaka* and *Pārivāsikavastus* and the *Theravādin Cullavagga*. They state that he may not again commit this offence. Nor should he commit others, whether they be similar, offences arising from this or more serious offences. Furthermore, he may not criticize a formal act of the *samgha* or the officiant of the formal act.

On the basis of Daoxuan’s gloss—*指下篇為餘也* “‘Other’ refers to

---

46 This does not appear in Daoxuan’s commentary on the thirty-five observances. Cf. note 48 below and 14 above. Note, however, a parallel in T. 1809 and T. 1810 (see p. 156 below (note 111)).


48 See note 15. Cf. T. 1804, p. 19c17-21: 四五奪其相續後犯。一不應更犯此罪。餘亦不應犯謂為隨作誣作指下篇為餘也二若相似若從此生相似謂同名罪也。從此生者謂為摩那利與女屏三若復重於此讎犯提被治後更犯等四不應嫌羯磨。五不應詁羯磨人。 Cf. T. 1805, p. 211a21-28: 四五中初二並兼兩相。初云此罪者即被治之過。注餘罪中且約惡論。提下相望例亦應爾。但至吉羅則無餘也。第二注中相似謂同名罪。從生謂種類罪。三中注文準知。此治不至四重。四約誦法。五是誦人。心嫌口誦。誦必因嫌。上下互舉然據四五。本非眾聚。而列相續犯中未詳所以。亦可上三犯罪下二犯事。 Cf. T. 2248, p. 401c6-29: 記。但至吉羅則無餘也 *雲* 答正記云。復犯吉指上篇為餘也文 此聊亂若復重於此故今記云吉羅 輯無餘誦。紹若相似若從此生 *雲* 此從此生。紹從方便罪得意。即彼記云。若從此生者。謂從根本之前方便之罪生也。由前方便能成根本。故知根本是從方便生。故云若從此生也文 此誦相似之同一篇罪從方便罪生得意。爾者相似即從此生得意賦。今紹注並記譯種類之罪 *雲* 問。若爾者上餘亦不應犯。何不同哉。答。彼廣指下篇。此別約種類之犯賦。紹。四不應嫌羯磨等 *雲* 今記意四五之二事無相續之義。而此中列之不詳所以 *雲* 答正記中釋相續犯事。即彼記云。不應嫌羯磨人及呵者。謂本為於僧比丘前造作被呵責也。今更嫌羯磨。還共先來。向僧比丘前作過。便是相續後犯。謂僧比丘前倒誣四事。今呵此羯磨法為非法。呵人等約是續作不止。即成相續犯也文 爱知今記意不同也記。上下互舉 *雲* 四與五上下互或云嫌或云誦也記。下二犯事 *雲* 以嫌為犯。又羯磨是事也。事之言通一切。如攝量前事。云通四緣事也。
lower classes [of offences]”—I take the first rule to mean that if he has committed a pārājika he may not again commit that pārājika (same) or any other class of offence (another).\textsuperscript{49} Furthermore, Daoxuan’s gloss—相似謂同一篇罪也。從此生者。謂為摩觸詐責而與女屏坐 appears to state\textsuperscript{50} that “Similar’ means offences from the same section. ‘One arising from this’ means censure for touching [a woman] while sitting in seclusion with a woman”\textsuperscript{51}—suggests that the second rule may refer to the fact that not only, as stated in the first observance of this section, may he not commit the same pārājika again, but he may not commit any other pārājika (similar). Furthermore, the second part of the gloss seems to suggest that ‘offences arising from this’ may refer to the aniyata or undetermined offences.

‘More serious offences’ may refer to the fact that some pārājikas appear to be more serious than others. In the Fanwangjing pusajie bensu 梵網經菩薩戒本疏 (T. 1813) written by Fazang 法藏 (643-712 C.E.),\textsuperscript{52} for example, we are told that there are ten objects of a first pārājika offence. These ten are then given in increasing order of severity of the offence as intercourse with (1) an undecomposed corpse, (2) a demon, (3) an animal, (4) a human, (5) relatives, (6) sisters, etc., (7) the two classes of laity which uphold the five (pañca-śīla) and eight precepts (*aṣṭāṅga-śīla)\textsuperscript{53} [respectively], etc., (8) the two classes of those who have left home for the religious life and those who are fully ordained, etc., (9) parents and (10) a holy person—a female arhat, etc.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{49} T. 1804, p. 19c18.

\textsuperscript{50} Note Daoxuan’s glosses are sometimes extremely difficult to follow. The above translation is tentative.

\textsuperscript{51} T. 1804, p. 19c19.

\textsuperscript{52} See BKD. vol. 10, p. 239.

\textsuperscript{53} See BCSD, s.v. bajie 八戒.
The other and more likely possibility is that, on the basis of the similarities in this tradition between pārājika penance and tarjaniya karman or even the parivāsa probation, this passage has simply been borrowed from either the Pāṇḍulohitakavastu or the Pārivāsikavastu with little thought as to the context. In the Pārivāsikavastu, for example, it makes perfect sense to talk of more serious offences—a pārājika is indeed a more serious offence than the samghāvaśeṣa perpetrated by the pārivāsika. While there can be no offence more serious than a pārājika, there can, however, be degrees of severity in even the pārājikas. This passage tends to suggest that the whole framework of observances for pārājika penance may perhaps have been, at least in this tradition, taken directly from either the Dharmaguptaka text on tarjaniya karman or the text relating to parivāsa probation. This would certainly account for the awkward fit of the above passage concerning future offences by the penitent and is furthermore supported by the similarities between the two procedures which seem to be unparalleled in other traditions. The implications of this from the standpoint of determining the beginnings of the Vinaya tradition and establishing what may have been in the earliest Vinaya are significant. It would thus appear that pārājika penance may have developed, at least in this tradition, from procedures such as the tarjaniya karman—for to argue, in light of the above evidence, that the procedures for pārājika penance influenced the tarjaniya karman seems nonsensical.

The last two rules in our list—he may not (4) criticize a formal act of the samgha or (5) the officiant of the formal act—are presumably to be understood as meaning he is not to criticize the formal act carried out against

\[54\] T. 1813, p. 621c10-14: 初犯境有十。一死屍未壞。二與鬼交通。三畜生。四人。五諸親。六女妹等。七在室二衆持五八戒等。八出家二衆具大戒等。九父母。十聖人。如犯羅漢尼等。皆前輕後重可知。Cf. also pañcānantariyāṇi—the five heinous crimes.

\[55\] See Frauwallner, The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature.
him or those who have performed it.

The fifth group defines what he may accept from a pure bhikṣu.⁵⁶ He may not accept (1) a seat that is laid out for him, he may not have (2) his feet washed or (3) accept water for such, he may not have (4) his leather sandals wiped or (5) his body rubbed. This theme of non-acceptance of service is further continued in the sixth group in which it is stated that he may not accept reverence, greetings,⁵⁷ salutation or the holding of his robes or bowls by a pure bhikṣu.⁵⁸ Both groups of five seem to deal with the amount of veneration or seniority due to him—none. Although Yuanzhao's 元照 Sifen lü xingshichao zichiji 四分律行事鈔資持記 (T. 1805) suggests that these two sections are self-evident and require no further explanation, the subdivision of the sixth set of five is extremely tentative.⁵⁹ Both groups have parallels in the Pārivāsika and Pāṇḍulohitakavastus of the Dharmaguptakas,⁶⁰ but do not appear to have parallels in the Theravādin counterparts to these texts.⁶¹


⁵⁷ See Dharmaguptaka Addendum 1, pp. 162-165 below.

⁵⁸ Cf. T. 1804, p. 19c24-25: 六五制其恭敬。一不應受善比丘禮拜合掌問訊迎逆持衣鉢等。The parallel text in T. 2248 is dealt with at Dharmaguptaka Addendum 1, pp. 162-165 below.

⁵⁹ T. 1805, p. 211a28-29: 五六二五尋文可解。For a fuller discussion on the subdivision of the five observances of the sixth group, see Dharmaguptaka Addendum 1, pp. 162-165 below.

The seventh and final group of five states that he is (1) not to accuse a pure bhikṣu of an offence, make him remember or make him confess to such. Neither should he (2) testify to another’s affairs, (3) prevent a pure bhikṣu from attending the recitation of the precepts or (4) the pravāraṇa, or (5) engage in debate together with a pure bhikṣu. These five rules have parallels both in the Pārivāsika and Pāṇḍulohitakavastus of the Dharmaguptakas and the Theravadins. The third of these observances appears to refer to the fact that normally a bhikṣu may suspend those who have committed offences from

---

61 Note, however, partial parallels—observances 1, 3 and 5 of the fifth group and 1, 3, 4 and 5 of the sixth group—are to be found in the Theravadin āpattiyā adassane ukkhepaniyakammam rules. VP, vol. 2, p. 22: na pakatatassa bhikkhuno abhivādaṇāṃ paccuṭṭhānaṃ aññalikammam sāmīcikammam āsanābhīhāro seyyābhīhāro pādodakam pādapiṭham pādakathalikam pattaṭivarapapatiṭṭaṇaṃ nāhāne piṭṭharpikammam sāditabbam (cf. BD, vol. 5, p. 32). Note that the last thing he is not to consent to in this list is nāhāne piṭṭharpikammam which Horner (ibid.) translates as “treating his back by massaging” (cf. SBE, vol. 17, p. 373: “nor to shampoo him.” I have understood it as “the rubbing of one’s back in the bath.” Horner does not seem to translate nāhāne.


63 T. 1428, p. 904b5-7: 彼行覆藏者。舉清淨比丘作憶念。作自言。為他作證。遮説戒。遮自恣。與清淨比丘共闃。佛言不應爾。T. 1428, p. 889c25-27: 不應贊善比丘為作憶念。作自言。不應證他事。不應遮蔽薩自恣。不應共善比丘諫。

64 VP, vol. 2, p. 32 (cf. BD, vol. 5, p. 45): na pakatatassa bhikkhuno uposatho ṭhapetabbo, na pavāraṇa ṭhapetabba, na sacvaniyaṃ kātabba, na anuvādo paṭṭhapetabbo, na okāso kāretabbo, na codetabbo, na sāretabbo, na bhikkhūhi sampayojetabbaṃ. VP, vol. 2, p. 5 (cf. BD, vol. 5, pp. 7-8): na pakatatassa bhikkhuno uposatho ṭhapetabbo, na pavāraṇa ṭhapetabba, na sacvaniyaṃ kātabbaṃ, na anuvādo paṭṭhapetabbo, na okāso kāretabbo, na codetabbo, na sāretabbo, na bhikkhūhi sampayojetabbaṃ ti. Note, however, there seems to be no parallel to making a bhikṣu confess. Furthermore, the closest parallel to accusing him of an offence seems, at least here, to be reproof. There is perhaps a closer parallel in the āpattiyā adassane ukkhepaniyakammam (VP, vol. 2, p. 22 (BD, vol. 5, p. 32)): na pakatatto bhikkhu silavipattiyā anuddhamsetabbo, na ācāravipattiyā anuddhamsetabbo, na diṭṭhīvipattiyā anuddhamsetabbo, na ājīvavipattiyā anuddhamsetabbo.
the prātimokṣa ceremony.⁶⁵ Furthermore, the pravāraṇa may also be similarly suspended.⁶⁶ These five all appear to reduce to the fact that a penitent bhikṣu may not testify about the actions of another bhikṣu (2); accordingly he may not accuse another bhikṣu of an offence (1, 3 and 4).

The relationship between the śikṣādattaka, pārivāsika, one on the mānatva penance and one undergoing a punishment such as the tarjanīya karman is perhaps best illustrated by the following table.⁶⁷

---


⁶⁷ Note for the sake of convenience in the table below I have followed Daoxuan’s classification even though I do not always agree with his subdivision. Note only observances supported by both recensions ‘A’ and ‘B’ of the Nandika story are included (cf. note 14 above).
## Comparative Table of the Thirty-Five Observances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impart ordination</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impart guidance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take charge of a śramaṇa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept appointment to admonish bhikṣunīs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admonish bhikṣunīs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recite the precepts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the Vinaya</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept appointment as monastic official</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept appointment to adjudicate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept appointment as messenger</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter a village early</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return in the evening</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not associate with bhikṣus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate with followers of other ways or the laity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adhere to the bhikṣu dharma...</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. He may not recite the rules if there is someone else who can perform the recitation. Cf. note 37 above.
2. The text is ambiguous: it could refer to appointment as a monastic official or it could simply be stating that he can not make up a quorum. Cf. note 37 above.
3. Text appears to state that he should not make a formal act even if so appointed. Cf. note 38 above.
4. Text states na anuvīdā paṭhipatettabbabbu 'he should not set up authority.' Cf. note 39 above.
5. Possibly the same—text reads: If amidst the sangha [those of] knowledge and wisdom are selected and assembled and together they discuss various matter, he may not join their ranks. Cf. notes 35 and above.
6. He is not to undertake the alms practice, (na pindaṇṭi-kānaṁ samādhānīya)—indirectly this may keep him out of the village period. Furthermore, he is not to go anywhere where there are no monks unless accompanied by a monk except in the case of danger (BD, vol. 5, pp. 46-47). Cf. note 40 above.
8. Text only states he should not associate with followers of other ways. Cf. note 42 above.
9. He is not to approach the laity as he is not to go for alms. Cf. note 43 above.
10. Text only states he should not associate with followers of other ways. Cf. note 42 above.
11. Text only states he should not associate with followers of other ways (na tīthiyā sīvissabba), no mention of the laity. Cf. note 43 above.
12. The text only states he should train in the training of the bhikkhus (bhikkhu-sīvissabba)—no mention of not evading questions, etc. Cf. note 43 above.

Abbreviations: Dhgp=Dharmaguptaka; Thvd=Theravādin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommit the same or another offence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit a similar or an offence arising from this</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit a more serious offence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize a formal act</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize the performer of a formal act</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept seating</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept a foot-wash</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept water for a foot-wash</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept wiping of sandals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept massages</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept reverence*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept greetings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept salutations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept holding of robes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept holding of bowls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuse, remind or make a bhikṣu confess an offence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testify to another's affairs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspend from prātimokṣa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspend from pravāṣaṇa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in debate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text only states he may not commit the same offence, no mention of another offence. Cf. note 15 above on what appears to be Daoxuan's misreading of the text. Cf. notes 46 and 47 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text only states he may not commit a similar offence, no mention of offences arising from this. Cf. note 47 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text reads: He may not accept things for washing his feet. Could also be translated as may not have his footwear washed. Cf. note 60 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On the subdivision of this group of five, see Dharmaguptaka Addendum I, pp. 162-165 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No mention of making a bhikkhu confess; the closest parallel to accusing him is reproval (na cedtabbho). Cf. note 64 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No mention of making a bhikkhu confess. Cf. note 64 above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table it is evident that most of the observances set forth for the śikṣādattaka within the Dharmaguptaka tradition have parallels not only elsewhere in the same tradition but also in the Theravādin tradition. The closest parallels appear to be the Dharmaguptaka tarjaniya karman—of thirty-five observances thirty-one have definite parallels, two more seem to equate to the same thing although they are phrased slightly differently,68 one is only a partial match69 and one appears to be quite dissimilar70—and the pārivāsika—thirty-one exact parallels,71 two partial matches72 and one which is open to interpretation.73 The Theravādin āpattiya adassane ukkhepaniya, by comparison, has nineteen exact and three partial matches. It is interesting to note that there seems to be little difference in the Dharmaguptaka tradition between one who is granted penance on committing a pārājika, a pārivāsika and one against whom a formal act of censure is carried out. In fact, the Dharmaguptaka tradition would suggest that the tarjaniya karman and parivāsa probation were equally severe sentences to that imposed upon the śikṣādattaka. Furthermore, both the tarjaniya karman and parivāsa carry with them the possibility of rehabilitation—as does the śikṣādattaka’s penance in, as we will see, the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition74—inasmuch as they may be revoked.75

As we have seen, the Dharmaguptaka tradition does not view a pārājika

68 See p. 146, (table) note 5 and p. 147, (table) note 3.

69 See p. 146, (table) note 10.

70 See p. 146, (table) note 3. Cf. note 38 above.

71 If we do not include Daoxuan’s interpretation of the first observance of the fourth group (cf. note 15 above), that is. See p. 147, (table) note 1.

72 See p. 146, (table) notes 1 and 8.

73 See p. 146, (table) note 2.

74 Cf. Mūlasarvāstivādin Chapter (p. 176 below), on Nandika’s return to seniority on attainment of arhatship. Cf also pp. 182-184 below.
as entailing permanent or irrevocable expulsion—on the contrary, it makes
the path of the šikṣādattaka available to monks who have not concealed their
offences so that, if they so desire, they may remain within the Order. One
question, however, remains—the question of applicability of this option to
nuns.

As we have already seen in Daoxuan’s Sifen lü shanbu suiji jiemo 四分律删補隨機羯磨 (T. 1808), it appears, at least in China, that this path was
open to the female saṃgha. Further evidence for this is to be found, inter
alia, in Daoxuan’s Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshichao 四分律删繁補闕行事
鈔 (T. 1804):

四分云。若比丘及尼。犯波羅夷已。都無覆藏心。令如法懺悔。
The Dharmaguptakas say: If a bhikṣu or bhikṣuṇī having committed a
pārājīka has not a single thought of concealment, they are to be made to
confess in accordance with the dharma.

It is important to note here that pārājikas are often referred to as offences for
which one cannot confess, or perhaps more correctly, one’s confession cannot
be accepted. Accordingly, any mention of confession of a pārājīka can only
refer to the path of the šikṣādattaka. Here the text quite specifically states that
bhikṣus and bhikṣuṇīs alike are eligible to receive the šikṣādattaka penance
upon committing a pārājīka as long as they have made no attempt to conceal
it. Evidence for this, however, is not limited to texts written by Daoxuan.

There are a number of non-canonical karmavācanā texts in the

---

75 On the revocation of a tarjanīya karman, see, inter alia, T. 1428, p. 890a-b; cf. BD, vol. 5, pp. 8-10; VP, vol. 2, pp. 5-7. Note the parivāsa is only enforced for the
duration of concealment, thus technically it is the mānatva which after six days is revoked; see BD, vol. 5, p. 57-59; VP, vol. 2, pp. 39-43.


77 T. 1804, p. 96c15-16.
Dharmaguptaka tradition which also provide evidence in support of the existence of the śikṣādattā or female penitent. Nijieo 尼羯磨 (T. 1810) "Nuns’

78 See, inter alia, HC, vol. 14, p. 117: (・「波羅夷」(pārājika)は「不可悔罪」と言って、懲悔を許されない罪である。— "Harai" (pārājika) are called ‘śikakezai’ (offences which cannot be repented) and are offences for which confession is not permissible.” The Chinese term chanhui 懲悔 is generally regarded as a rendition of Sanskrit deśanā “confession” (BCSD, s.v. chanhui 懲悔; CBKK, p. 333). As Hirakawa (HC, vol. 16, p. 15) notes Buddhist monastic notions of confession do not involve expiation (cf. BD, vol. 2, p. 3, note 4). Cf. also SGBK, pp. 459-460. For an excellent, albeit brief, discussion of confession in Buddhism, see J. Duncan M. Derrett, “Confession in Early Buddhism,” in Baudhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, pp. 55-62. In connection with the acceptance of confessions (BHS pratigrinnāti; cf. BHSD, s.v.), Derrett (p. 59) states that "The hearer(s) do not absorb his offence, impairing their own ‘holiness’; they do not forgive or pardon him, nor is the offence atoned for, or washed away.” He also refers to offences which are appatiikamma “not capable of being (effectively) rendered up” (p. 60). Whereas for most Vinaya offences only confession is required to return a monk to purity, pārājikas are offences for which a confession cannot be accepted. Thus understood.

79 There are also many other important references to both the śikṣādattā and the śikṣādattā sūrāmaṇerī in the commentarial literature—many more than can be adequately presented here. The scope of the present study is limited to proving beyond doubt the existence of both the monk and nun penitent; it is not a comprehensive study of every extant passage concerning the śikṣādattā. Note, however, that there is an important text which mentions the xuehūini 學侮尼 śikṣādattā [sūrāmaṇeri] at T. 2248, pp. 477c24-478a1 (cf. T. 1804b17-19). There is also a passage in T. 1804 which talks of a female [pārājika] penitent who requests a bhikṣu to come and grant her the mānava and re-admission, etc on transgression of a samghāvaśeṣa (T. 1804, p. 156a7-8: 學侮尼犯僧殘請比丘來與我摩那唾出罪等 (cf. T. 2248, p. 857b-c; T. 1804, p. 47b3 ff.) Although this passage quotes the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya (cf. p. 77 above) it is interesting—but perhaps dangerous—to speculate what might happen if a Dharmaguptaka penitent committed a samghāvaśeṣa. Assuming the penitent was not expelled on account of the samghāvaśeṣa—and I can find no evidence to suggest this may be the case—a parivāsa, if imposed, that is to say if the offence was concealed, would be almost identical to the observances constituting the penitent’s pārājika penance. In such a case, the fourth group of observances for the śikṣādattā, however, state that: he may not again commit this offence, nor should he commit others, whether they be similar, offences arising from this or more serious offences (see pp. 140-142 above). Transgression of a samghāvaśeṣa would seem to count as a breach of these observances as he has presumably committed an other offence. Thus, it would seem that although these observances are to be complied with, there may in fact be no—none that I can find so far, that is—specific procedures for dealing with a penitent who does not observe the terms of his penance. Indeed, the texts only seem to state that a penitent may be expelled if he re-offends against the pārājika dharma. Cf. Dharmaguptaka Addendum 2, pp. 166-170.
"karmavācanā" was apparently compiled by śramaṇa Huaisu 懷素 (634-707 C.E.)\(^8\) of the Xitaiyuan Temple 西太原寺 in 676 C.E.\(^8\) This text is a sister text of Sengjiemo 僧羯摩 (T. 1809) "Monks' Karmavācanā" similarly compiled by Huaisu.\(^8\) Tsuchihashi Shūkō describes these texts—in connection with manuscript copies in the Stein collection—as texts for use in ceremonial observances.\(^8\) Although this tells us little of the situation in early Indian monasticism, the fact that these texts were utilized in ritual observances is significant when we consider their contents. While these texts appear to have been compiled from extracts from the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, the following passages do not appear to have parallels in the other Dharmaguptaka karmavācanā texts as found in the Taishō edition. With regard to the eradication of pārājika offences there is the following passage:\(^8\)

除波羅夷罪法\(^8\)
按\(^8\)律。懺悔有五種。或有犯自心念懺悔。或有犯小罪從他懺悔。或有

\(^8\) Huaisu was no ordinary śramaṇa. The Dharmaguptaka tradition comprised of three main sects in China—Xiangbu 相部宗, Nanshan 南山宗 and Dongta 東塔宗 (T. 2348, p. 16b6-7; 四分律義分三宗。相部宗南山宗東塔宗 (quoted and repunctuated at CBKK, p. 219; for an English translation, see Leo M. Pruden, The Essentials of the Vinaya tradition, BDK English Tripiṭaka series, vol. 97.1, p. 115). Huaisu was the founder of the Dongta sect. Daoxuan founded the Nanshan sect (CBKK, ibid.).

\(^8\) T. 1810, p. 538b (colophon); BكدJ, vol. 8, p. 314. For further information on this text, see (with caution) Nanjiō Bunyiu, A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka, s.v. 1116 (Nanjiō gives "5 fasciculi"—it appears, however, to consist of only 3 fascicles). Cf. Tokiwa et al. ed., Japanese Alphabetical Index of Nanjiō's Catalogue of Buddhist Tripiṭaka with Supplements and Corrections 大蔵經南條目録補正索引, p. 100; BكدJ (ibid.); Yuyama Akira, Vinaya-Texte, Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur, pp. 35-36.

\(^8\) T. 1809, p. 511b (colophon).

\(^8\) Tsuchihashi Shūkō 土橋秀高, Kaiรitsu no kenkyū 戒律の研究, p. 375. I am indebted to Prof. Nobuyuki Yamagiwa for supplying me with this reference.

\(^8\) The monks' text and that of the nuns are almost identical. I have collated both texts together and indicated any divergences in the footnotes. I have referred to T. 1810 (nuns') as "A" (p. 548c8-10) and T. 1809 (monks') as "B" (p. 521b18-20).
Rules for Eradication of Parājika Offences

According to the Vinaya there are five kinds of confession. There is confession that is borne in one's own mind upon committing an offence. There is confession from another upon committing a minor offence. There is also confession from another also upon committing a middling offence. There is confession from another upon committing a grave offence. There is [also] the committing of offences which cannot be confessed. These offences which cannot be confessed are called parājika offences. One who has committed a parājika offence incurs [one of] three rules. First, one who has committed [a parājika] and conceals it is granted the formal act of expulsion. Second, one who has committed [a parājika] and does not conceal it is granted the formal act of life long penance. Third, a penitent who recommits [a parājika] is granted the formal act of expulsion.

It is interesting to note that this text clarifies the fact that, as we saw above, parājikas are offences which cannot be confessed. The text then introduces the five kinds of confession and goes into detail on what appears to be the fifth type of confession—confession of that which cannot be confessed. It states that there are three main procedures in this connection. One, a simple act of expulsion for one who has concealed the fact that they have committed

---

85 Note only the title is in the Taishō's usual size type. The main text is two lines of characters per one standard line. A smaller typeface has been used to a varying degree in the Taishō edition throughout these passages. It appears that the larger type represents the actual text of the karmavācanā (not to mention the title), whereas the smaller typeface appears to act as a gloss. In order to aid legibility, in the translations and reproduction of the texts I have used a dotted underline to correspond with the large typeface in the Taishō and a plain font (i.e. no underline) to represent the smaller typeface.

86 按 B: 案 A

87 罪 A^K: om. A^{GMSY}, B

88 三 A, B^{KMSY}: om. B^G

89 也 A^K: om. A^{GMSY}, B
a pārājika. Two, the formal act of pārājika penance for one who has not concealed the offence, and finally the formal act of expulsion for one who has previously been granted pārājika penance but has re-offended. The text then proceeds to clarify these three possibilities. As the first formal act—expulsion of one who has concealed a pārājika—does not concern us here, we will only look at the second and third passages.\(^90\)

90 Note passage one is covered, albeit in the form of a re-offence, by passage three. The English translation represents the text of recension “A.” The text of recension “B” is practically identical with the exception that monk replaces nun, etc.

91 T. 1810, pp. 548c22-549a13; T. 1809, p. 521c4-22.

92 若 A: 若比丘 B

93 復 A: 備 B

94 彼 A:\(^K\): om. A\(^G\), 彼比丘 B

95 比丘尼 A: om. B

96 大姊 A: 大德 B

97 比丘尼 A: 比丘 B

98 大姊 A: 長老 B

99 壽 A:\(^K\), B\(^G\): om. A\(^G\), B\(^M\)

100 事事 A:\(^K\), B: om. A\(^G\)
Rules for Granting the Life-long Penance to a Non-Concealer

The Vinaya says: “If one has not yet committed a pārājika and [knows that] she will never commit one, but happens to have committed [a pārājika] and has not had a single thought of concealing it, and confesses in accordance with the dharma, it is allowable for the sangha to grant her the formal act of pārājika penance. That bhikṣuṇī should, with [proper] deportment, amidst the sangha beg as follows, ‘Venerable Sisters, [please] listen. I, the bhikṣuṇī so-and-so, have committed such-and-such a pārājika offence and have not had a single thought of concealing it. Now from the sangha I beg for pārājika penance. I implore the sangha to grant me, the bhikṣuṇī so-and-so, pārājika penance out of compassion.’ Thrice [it is to be] articulated. The sangha should grant the procedure as follows: ‘Venerable Sisters, [please] listen. This one, the bhikṣuṇī so-and-so, has committed such-and-such a pārājika offence and has not had thoughts of concealing it. Now from the sangha she begs for pārājika penance. If

101 沙彌尼 A: 沙彌 B

102 爲比丘尼僧請 A: om. B

103 教誡 A: 教誡比丘尼 B

104 往 A: 往教誡 B

105 道白 A, B\textsuperscript{KMSY}: om. B\textsuperscript{G}

106 坐 A, B\textsuperscript{K}: om. B\textsuperscript{GMSY}

107 水 A, B\textsuperscript{K}: 求 B\textsuperscript{GMSY}

108 摩 A\textsuperscript{K}, B: 磨 A\textsuperscript{GMSY}

109 迎送 A: 迎逆 B\textsuperscript{K}, 迎 B\textsuperscript{GMSY}
the samgha thinks that the time is right and the samgha assents, the samgha should now grant the bhikṣunī so-and-so pāraṇika penance. This is the motion.’

‘Venerable Sisters, [please] listen. This one, the bhikṣunī so-and-so, has committed such-and-such a pāraṇika offence and has not had thoughts of concealing it. Now from the samgha she begs for pāraṇika penance. The samgha should now grant the bhikṣunī so-and-so pāraṇika penance. Those Venerable Sisters who assent to the samgha granting the bhikṣunī so-and-so pāraṇika penance [should] remain silent. Those who do not assent should speak out.’ Thrice [it is to be] articulated. ‘The samgha has assented and granted the bhikṣunī so-and-so pāraṇika penance. On account of its silence the samgha assents. Thus I hold this matter to be so.’ After receiving pāraṇika penance there are things that must be observed as long as she lives. The rules of behaviour to be followed are: She may not impart the full ordination to people. She may not grant guidance to people. She may not be in charge of a śrāmaneri. If she is commissioned to request admonition for the bhikṣunī samgha she may not accept, if she was [previously] appointed she should not go. She should not recite the precepts on behalf of the samgha. She should not discuss the Vinaya amidst the samgha. She should not accept if the samgha appoints her as a monastic 110 For a parallel, see T. 1428, p. 1000c6-14: 如是比丘比丘尼。於波羅夷法生大恐畏。作如是念。若未犯波羅夷終已不犯。若犯都無覆藏心如法懺悔。此是第一犯畏。有如是男子。被髮著黑衣持合剎刀。至大衆中（中 K: 中作如是 GMN2SY）言。我作惡不善隨衆人所意我當作。時彼衆人。即奪取刀。打之驅出右門。有智人見作如是言。此人作惡罪。今今當自勦并教（教 K: 教餘 GMN2SY）人。真作如是惡罪。‘Similarly, if a bhikṣu or a bhikṣunī engenders great fear with regard to the pāraṇika dharma and thinks the following, ‘I have not yet committed a pāraṇika, I will never commit [a pāraṇika]. If I do commit [a pāraṇika] I will not have any thoughts of concealment. I will repent in accordance with the dharma.’ This is the fear of the first violation. [If] there is the following kind of son: [one who] has dishevelled hair, wears a black robe and carries a scabbard and sword and comes amidst a large crowd and says, ‘I am evil, not good. Accordingly, I will do whatever the crowd may wish.’ Then, the crowd immediately confiscates his sword and hitting him they banish him through the right gate. A wise person sees [this] and says the following, ‘This person has committed evil offences, I will now, of my own accord, admonish and teach others not to commit this kind of evil offence.’’ (Transl. tentative). Both passages seem to suggest the importance of non-premeditation in committing a pāraṇika. It appears that pāraṇika penance is only to be granted to those who have not concealed their offences, and whose transgression was not premeditated. Blatant trangression, viz. premeditated but not concealed transgressions, would not make one eligible for pāraṇika penance.
official. She should not accept if the samgha appoints her to adjudicate at another place. She should not accept if the samgha appoints her [to go] as a messenger. She should not enter a village early or return close to evening. She ought to associate with bhikṣunīs. She may not associate with followers of other ways or the laity. She ought to adhere to the bhikṣunī dharma. She may not [evasively] speak of other mundane matters. She may not recite the Vinaya amongst the assembly—if there is no one able to recite it, she is allowed. She may not again commit this offence. Nor should she commit others, whether they be similar, offences arising from this or more serious offences. She may not criticize a formal act of the samgha or the officiator of the formal act. She may not accept from a pure bhikṣunī the laying out of seating, washing of one’s feet or the water for such, wiping of leather sandals, massages or reverence and greetings upon meeting. She should not accept from a pure bhikṣunī the holding of robes or bowls. She may not accuse a pure bhikṣunī, make her remember or make her confess [to an offence]. She should not testify to another’s affairs. She may not suspend a pure bhikṣunī from [attending] the recitation of the precepts or the pravāraṇa. She may not together with a pure bhikṣunī [engage in] debate. Whether a bhikṣunī who has been granted pārājika penance comes or not when the samgha recites the precepts and [performs] formal acts, there is no offence for the samgha assembly.”

From the above karma vācana text it is evident that if a nun commits a pārājika without concealing the fact, she too, like her male counterpart, is eligible for pārājika penance. Furthermore, the rules for the nuns are virtually identical to those of the penitent monk. There are no differences other than the obvious differences one would expect between a text for monks and one for nuns. Where it states that she may not be in charge of a śrāmaneri, the monks’ text states that he may not be in charge of a śrāmanera. Furthermore, where the nuns’ text states that if she is commissioned to request admonition for the bhikṣunī samgha she may not accept and that even if she was previously appointed to do so she should not go, the monks’ parallel refers not to requesting admonition, but to administering it. The bhikṣunī text states that she ought to

111 Cf. notes 14 and 45 above.
associate with bhikṣuṇīs and adhere to the bhikṣuṇī dharma; the bhikṣu parallel
naturally states that a penitent monk is to associate with the bhikṣus and
adhere to their dharma. Similarly, the nuns’ text talks of not accepting acts of
respect from a pure bhikṣuṇī, accusing a nun in good standing of an offence,
suspending their posadha or pravāraṇa, or engaging in debate with a pure
bhikṣuṇī. The monks’ text refers to these observances in relation to pure
bhikṣus.

Furthermore, the texts state that neither a penitent nun or monk may
recite the Vinaya amongst the assembly unless there is no one else able to
recite it. This passage, as we saw above, was found in only one of the
Dharmaguptaka Vinaya texts relating to the śikṣādattaka and does not constitute
one of the thirty-five observances.\textsuperscript{112}

This text is fundamental to our understanding of pāraṇīka penance. Not
only does it provide further evidence in support of the existence of the śikṣādattā-
śrāmaṇerī, it also suggests that pāraṇīka penance may not be solely applicable
in the event of a transgression against the first pāraṇīka, but in fact may also
apply to all of the pāraṇīkas. The wording of the karmavācanā—the most
important part of this text—reads: 我某甲比丘尼。犯某波羅夷罪。都無覆藏
心。“I, the bhikṣuṇī so-and-so, have committed such-and-such a pāraṇīka
offence and have not had a single thought of concealing it.” The interpretation
of the phrase fanmouboluoyizui 犯某波羅夷罪 (I have committed such-and-
such a pāraṇīka offence) is central to our understanding of the application of
pāraṇīka penance. This phrase is a simple Chinese construction (verb fan 犯 +
indefinite pronoun mou 某 + object boluoyizui 波羅夷罪). Mou 某 is described
by Dobson as an indefinite pronoun which indicates without naming in the
sense of “such and such [place], [person], [time] [affair]” or “so and so”

\textsuperscript{112} Cf. note 14 above.
Accordingly, this passage can only be understood as referring to all four of the pārājikas shared by both samghas and presumably the four additional pārājikas solely for nuns. This one indefinite pronoun, however, is not the only evidence for this theory. Indeed, we recall the wording of two other texts examined in this chapter—T. 1804, p. 96c15-16 and T. 1808, p. 506c12-13. Both texts state that if a bhikṣu or bhikṣunī has committed a pārājika and has not had a single thought of concealment they may be allowed to confess. Although these texts do not specifically state that monks or nuns who have committed any pārājika may be granted pārājika penance, neither do they specify that it is only for the first pārājika.

Hirakawa states that pārājika penance only applies in the case of the first pārājika. It is worth noting, however, the entry under gakke 學悔 “[pārājika] penitent” in Oda Tokunō’s 織田得能 Bukkyō daijiten 佛教大辭典:

一旦姦盜殺妄の一を犯せし比丘の懺悔せしもの。蓋し一度此重罪を犯せし者は比丘たるの資格を失へども、若し懺悔すれば之を學悔と名けて終身比丘の最末にて列す。

---

114 See pp. 149 and 134 above.
115 T. 1804, p. 96c15-16: 若比丘及尼。犯波羅夷已。都無覆藏心。令如法懺悔。T. 1808, p. 506c12: 若比丘比丘尼。若犯波羅夷已。都無覆藏心。當如法懺悔。
116 Cf. p. 16, note 54 above. Hirakawa makes similar statements at RK, pp. 442, 647 and GBK, p. 250. Hirakawa, however, is not alone in his assumption that it only applies to the first pārājika—cf., inter alia, NBD, s.v. yogakushami 奈院善首, MBD, s.v. harai 波羅夷; CBKK, p. 146.
117 Cf. FG, s.v. xuehui 學悔: 指犯殺、盜、淫、妄四波羅夷罪之一而後懺悔之比丘。犯此重罪者，即失比丘之資格，然若懺悔，則稱為學悔，終身列於比丘之最末。Cf. Aruga Yōen's 有賀要延 Bukkyōgo yomikata jiten 仏教語読み方辞典, s.v. gakke 學悔: 一度、姦盜殺妄の一を犯した比丘で懺悔したものものをいう。終身比丘の最末に列す。I am unable to locate the original text—if there is an original, that is. I wonder if the Chinese in the FG is not a translation of Oda’s Japanese. Aruga’s is presumably also taken from Oda’s dictionary.
A bhikṣu who has confessed having committed one of [either] sex, theft, murder or falsehood. Although one who has once committed this grave offence loses his qualifications as a bhikṣu, if he confesses he is known as a penitent and takes his place at the end of the bhikṣus for life.

Oda Tokunō’s dictionary makes it quite clear that the application of pārājika penance is in no way limited to the first pārājika, but applies to any case in which a bhikṣu has committed a pārājika. The only suggestion I would make is that the entry should mention the importance of non-concealment of the offence and its applicability to the female sangha. The evidence I can at this time offer to substantiate the claim that pārājika penance applies to all of the pārājikas, however, is admittedly not much more than one dictionary entry and a number of texts of Chinese authorship. Although not enough to entirely convince even the present author, the texts do stand in stark contrast to received scholarship on this matter and as such cannot be totally dismissed. Indeed, further research is needed—questions as to what exactly constitutes a re-offence of a pārājika remain unresolved. There is no denying that a penitent who recommits the same pārājika is expelled. If, however, a bhikṣu who had broken the first pārājika and had been granted pārājika penance then killed someone, would this constitute a re-offence? Or would he have to re-offend against the first pārājika to be expelled?

The last and final text in our present examination deals with the expulsion of a penitent nun (or monk in text B) who re-offends against the pārājika dharma.

與學悔人重犯者作滅癈法

---

118 Although similar entries are to be found in two other dictionaries (see note 117 above), whether their entries are independent of Oda’s or based upon it remains questionable.

119 See also Mūlasarvāstivāda Addendum 1, p. 191 below.

120 T. 1810, p. 549a14-b2 (A); T. 1809, pp. 521c23-522a11 (B).
Rules for Granting Expulsion to a Penitent who Re-offends

If having been granted pārājika penance one re-offends, she should be expelled. The accusations should be made as follows: "Venerable Sisters, [please] listen. This one, the bhikṣuṇī so-and-so, committed such-and-such a pārājika offence and did not have thoughts of concealing it. She begged for pārājika penance from the samgha. The samgha granted the bhikṣuṇī so-and-so pārājika penance. This bhikṣuṇī has, whilst on penance, recommitted such-and-such a pārājika offence. If the samgha thinks that the time is right and the samgha assents the samgha should now grant the bhikṣuṇī so-and-so a formal act of expulsion for recommitting such-and-such a pārājika offence. She may not be in communion, she may not participate in communal affairs. This is the motion."

"Venerable Sisters, this one, the bhikṣuṇī so-and-so, has committed such-and-such a pārājika offence and did not have thoughts of concealing it. She begged for pārājika penance from the samgha. The samgha granted the bhikṣuṇī so-and-so pārājika penance. This bhikṣuṇī has, whilst on penance.

121 若 A: 諸比丘言。若 B

122 與波羅夷戒 A: 與波羅夷戒比丘 B

123 已 A: om. B

124 重犯 A: 重犯復得與彼（彼 B^GSMY: om. B^K）波羅夷戒不。佛言不應爾。B^GSMY

125 大姊 A: 大德 B

126 比丘尼 A: 比丘 B

127 大姊 A: 長老 B
penance, recommitted such-and-such a pārājika offence. The samgha should now grant the bhikṣunī so-and-so a formal act of expulsion for recommitting such-and-such a pārājika offence. She may not be in communion, she may not participate in communal affairs. Those Venerable Sisters who assent to the samgha granting the bhikṣunī so-and-so a formal act of expulsion for recommitting such-and-such a pārājika offence so that she may not be in communion, or participate in communal affairs [should] remain silent. Those who do not assent should speak up.” Thrice [it is to be] articulated. “The samgha has finished assenting and granted the bhikṣunī so-and-so a formal act of expulsion for recommitting such-and-such a pārājika offence so that she may not be in communion, or participate in communal affairs. On account of its silence the samgha assents. Thus I hold this matter to be so.”

The above text offers further evidence in support of the claim that pārājika penance was also available to nuns. Furthermore, the possibility emerges that pārājika penance—be it for nuns or monks—was not restricted to the first pārājika, but was equally applicable in transgressions of other pārājika offences. Although they do not have canonical status, the fact that these karmavācanā texts were apparently used in ritual observances suggests that not only was the šikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī known in scholarly literature of the time, but what seems to be a hitherto undocumented status of samgha membership may have also existed within some of the Chinese—if not also Indian—monastic communities. At the very least, we can categorically state that some time after 676 C.E. when śramaṇa Huaisu compiled the Nijiemo 尼羯磨 (T. 1810), procedures supposedly excerpted from the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya which concretely prescribe the existence of the šikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī were in use as part of a karmavācanā text for ritual observances in at least one Chinese Dharmaguptaka tradition.128

128 See Tsuchihashi, 1980, p. 370, with reference to no. 2974 of the Stein collection.
Dharmaguptaka Addendum 1
Acceptance of reverence

As we have seen, Daoxuan’s commentary *Sifen lü shanbu sui jiemo* states that there are thirty-five observances to be adhered to by the *śīksamādatta*. The broad classification of these rules into seven groups of five and the further subdivision of each five, as found in a passage concerning the *tarjaṇīya karman* in Daoxuan’s *Sifen lü shanshan buxue xingshichao* 四分律删繁補闕行事鈔 (T. 1804), does not seem to appear in the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. It appears to be a descriptive model superimposed upon them by Daoxuan—a device often used by translators to try and render problematic lists. Daoxuan’s classification, while valuable, is not necessarily correct and must be used with caution. The problem then is how exactly are these thirty-five observances to be understood?

Neither the Dharmaguptaka Nandika stories nor the parallel passages in the *Dharmaguptaka Pārīvāsika* or *Pāṇḍulohitakavastus* appear to contain any clues as to how these rules are to be divided. Indeed, it is quite possible that some of the rules Daoxuan has interpreted as separate were originally amplifications of the same rule and *vice versa*. It is significant to note that,

---

3 Although not enumerated, thirty-five matters (三十五事) are mentioned in relation to both the *parivāsa* and the *tarjaṇīya karman* in the following *karmavācanā* texts: *Jiemo* 羅摩 (T. 1433, p. 1054c4: 行覆藏者...三十五事 (parivāsa); p. 1064b28-29: 作呵責羅摩...). (GKN: 以 MSY) 三十五事 (tarjaṇīya karman) (cf. also p. 1064c12) and *Sifen bqiuni jiemo* 四分比丘尼羯磨法 (T. 1434, p. 1070b12 tarjaṇīya karman). Furthermore, there are similarities in the seven-fold classification of observances for a *parivāsika* in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* (T. 1425, p. 433a4-7): 行波利婆沙比丘。應隨順行七事。一比丘事。二比丘尼事。三眷屬事。四比丘聚落事。五受事。六受事。七王事。These groups are explained at T. 1425, p. 433a7-b5.

4 Note, however, that a similar system of numbering is to be found in the *Theravādin Vinaya*, cf. *VP*, vol. 2, pp. 23-24; *BD*, vol. 5, p. 33-35.
5 Cf. p. 133, note 15 above.
unlike the other six groups of five, Daoxuan’s commentary does not subdivide the sixth group. Accordingly, we must divide them as seems logical.

Daoxuan’s commentary, however, differs slightly from the text pertaining to the sīkṣādattaka. Whereas our text reads 不應受清淨比丘…禮拜迎逆…聞諦。不應受清淨比丘捉衣缽 9 “He may not accept from a pure bhikṣu…reverence, greetings or salutation. He should not accept from a pure bhikṣu the holding of the robe or bowl”; Daoxuan’s commentary reads 一不应受善比丘禮拜合掌問訊迎逆持衣缽等 10 and appears to mean “One, he should not accept from a bhikṣu in good standing reverence, the joining of the palms, salutation, or the holding of the robe or bowl, etc., when greeting.” The question, however, remains, how do we understand and thus divide this list of five practices?

This is a question which Shōon 照遠 (1302?-1361 C.E.) answers in his commentary on Daoxuan and Yuanzhao’s commentaries (T. 1804 and 1805 respectively) the Shigyōshō 資行鈔 (T. 2248). Shōon states: 11

禮拜合掌問訊迎逆持衣缽等。
問。此五種如何可分哉。答。二合掌。三問訊。衣缽。五缽文。

Chao [T. 1804] states ‘reverence, the joining of the palms, salutation, or the holding of the robe or bowl, etc., when greeting’ and so forth.

Question: How can these five things be divided?

Answer: Two, the joining of the palms. Three, salutation. Four, robe. Five, bowl. Accordingly know that holding the robe at the time of ‘greeting’ is the fourth and holding the bowl [at the same time] is the fifth.

---

6 得 A: 應 B
7 逆 A, Bottony, 送 B KN
8 捉 A: 持 B
9 T. 1428, p. 809b23-25 (A) and T. 1428, p. 972c24-26 (B).
11 T. 2248, p. 402a5-8.
This text suggests that we should understand Daoxuan’s commentary as 一不應受善比丘禮拜[二]合掌[三]問訊[四]迎逆持衣[五]鉢等 “One, he should not accept from a bhikṣu in good standing reverence, [two] the joining of the palms, [three] salutation, or [four] the holding of the robe or [five] bowl, etc., when greeting.” If thus understood, the original text in which the order is different—不得^12受清淨比丘…禮拜迎逆^13問訊。不應受清淨比丘持^14衣鉢 “He may not accept from a pure bhikṣu…reverence, greetings or salutation. He should not accept from a pure bhikṣu the holding of the robe or bowl”—becomes rather problematic.

These texts—if understood as a five-fold formula—seem to be best interpreted as (1) libai 禮拜 reverence, (2) yingni 迎逆 greeting(s), (3) wenxun 問訊 salutation, (4) zhuoyi 持衣 the holding of the robe or (5) [zhuo]bo [捉]鉢 bowl. Shōon’s commentary, however, suggests that yingni 迎逆 ‘greeting’ is not a practice in itself (and consequently not one of the five) but is to be understood as having one’s bowl held while one pays respects. Indeed, this seems to make sense as it would be rather difficult to pay homage to somebody with an alms bowl in hand. This therefore appears to be stating that the śikṣādattaka is not permitted to have his possessions held when he pays homage to other monks—he is presumably to place them on the ground.15 This may indicate that this phrase in the two Chinese recensions of the Dharmaguptaka Nandika story is corrupt. It seems fair to conjecture that one practice—the aṇjali—may have been omitted from the Nandika stories.16 It goes without saying that Shōon may also be wrong and perhaps

12 得 A: 應 B
13 遇 A, B^MSY: 送 B^KN
14 捕 A: 捕持 B
15 The other way of interpreting this is that he may not hold another’s possessions when they pay their respects to him—this, however, is unlikely as he is not to accept such acts of homage in the first place.
we are to understand this passage quite differently. The fact that Shōon discusses it at all, however, certainly suggests that scholars of antiquity may have also found this subdivision problematic. In any case more work is required here.

\[16\] Note, the parallel passages in the Dharmaguptaka Pārisikavastu and Pāṇḍulohitakavastu both seem to include the aṭṭali (T. 1428, p. 904b3-5): 受清淨比丘起迎逆禮拜執手恭敬問訊為持衣鉢。佛言不應爾。“Accepting from a pure bhikṣu rising, greeting, reverence, veneration by the hands, salutation and the holding of robe or bowl for his sake. The Buddha said these should not be done.” Cf. T. 1428, p. 889c23-24: 不應受善比丘禮拜合掌（掌 KN: 手 GMSY）問訊迎逆持衣鉢。“He should not accept from a bhikṣu in good standing reverence, the joining of the palms, salutation, greeting and the holding of the robe or bowl.”
Dharmaguptaka Addendum 2
Pleading insanity

As we have seen, it appears that if one commits a pārājika without concealing the matter they may be granted pārājika penance. Opting for the path of the śikṣādattaka, however, is not the only recourse for one who has transgressed against a pārājika dharma. Another option is the insanity plea. Indeed, at the end of the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya vibhaṅga section dealing with the first pārājika we find the following statement:

不犯者。最初未制戒。癲狂心亂痛惱所縶無犯。
It is not an offence if he is the first [to do such] and the rule has not yet been laid down. If he is mad, unhinged, or afflicted by pains it is not an offence.

Clearly insanity is a valid defence for even a pārājika. A monk who was previously insane can be granted the no-longer-insane procedure so that he may be protected from reproach for the transgression made during his spell of insanity. This procedure is introduced in the Dharmaguptaka tradition by the following passage:

爾時世尊在王舍城。時有比丘名難提。癲狂心亂。多犯衆罪非沙門法。言無齊限。行來出入不順威儀。後還得心時諸比丘言。彼犯重罪波羅夷僧伽婆尸沙偷蘭遮。諸比丘問言。難提汝憶犯重罪波羅夷僧伽婆尸沙偷蘭遮不。彼即答言。我先癲狂心亂時多犯衆罪。行來

1 T. 1428, p. 572b4-5. Cf. VP, vol. 3, p. 33; anāpatti ajānantassa asādiyantassa ummattakassa khittacittassa vedanaṭṭassa ādikammikassā 'ti (cf. BD, vol. 1, p. 51). This does not only apply to the first pārājika—cf. also T. 1428, pp. 575c1-2, 577b11-12 and 579a8-9 for the other pārājikas (bhikṣu).

2 不 GKMSY: 無 N

3 See BHSD, s.v. amūdha-vinaya; cf. Upasak, s.v. amūlhavinaya.

4 Frauwallner, p. 114.

出入六不順威儀。非我故作。是癲狂故耳。諸長老。不須數見難諦。諸比丘故難諦不止。彼比丘作如是念。我當伺何。白諸比丘。諸比丘白佛。佛言。聴僧與難提比丘不癲毘尼白四羯磨。應如是與。難提比丘。應至僧中偏露右肩脫革屣右膝著地合掌作如是言。大德僧聽。我難提比丘。癲狂心亂時。多犯衆罪。行來出入不順威儀。後還得心。諸比丘問我言。汝憶犯重罪波羅夷僧伽婆尸沙偷蘭遮不。我答言。先癲狂心亂時。多犯衆罪。行來出入不順威儀。非我故作。是癲狂心故。諸長老。不須數難諦問我。而諸比丘故難問不止。我今不癲。從僧乞不癲毘尼。願僧與我不癲毘尼。慈悲故。如是第二第三說。衆中應差堪能羯磨者。如上作如是白。大德僧聽。此難提比丘。癲狂心亂多犯眾罪。言無齊限。出入行來不順威儀。後還得心。諸比丘語言。汝憶犯重罪波羅夷僧伽婆尸沙偷蘭遮不。即答言。我先癲狂時多犯衆罪。言無齊限。出入行來不順威儀。此是癲狂。非是故作。諸長老。莫數難諦問我。而諸比丘故難諦不止。此比丘今不癲。從僧乞不癲毘尼。若僧時到僧忍聽。與難提比丘不癲毘尼。白如是。大德僧聽。此難提比丘。癲狂心亂。多犯衆罪。言無齊限。出入行來不順威儀。後還得心。諸比丘語言。汝憶犯重罪波羅夷僧伽婆尸沙偷蘭遮不。即答言。我先癲狂心亂。多犯衆罪。出入行來不順威儀。此是我癲狂心亂。非是故作。諸長老。莫數難諦問我。而諸比丘故難諦不止。此比丘今不癲。從僧乞不癲毘尼。僧今與難提比丘不癲毘尼。誰諸長老忍。僧與難提比丘不癲毘尼者默然。誰不忍者說。是初羯磨。如是第二第三說。僧己忍。與難提比丘不癲毘尼竟。僧忍默然故。是事如是持。自今以去。與諸比丘結不癲毘尼滅諦。應如是說不癲毘尼。

At that time, when the World-Honoured One was at the city of Rājagṛha, there was a bhikṣu named Nandi[ka]. He was mad and unhinged. He frequently committed numerous offences. He criticized the śrāmaṇa dharma speaking without moderation. In [all] his comings and goings he was contrary to decorum. Afterwards, when he regained his mind the bhikṣus said he had committed serious offences: pārājika,
saṃghāvaśeṣa and sthūlātyaya [offences]. The bhikṣus asked him, saying, “Nandi[ka], do you remember committing serious offences: pārājika, saṃghāvaśeṣa and sthūlātyaya [offences]?” He then replied, saying, “Formerly when I was mad and unhinged I frequently committed numerous offences. In [all] my comings and goings I was contrary to decorum. It was not me acting on purpose. It was on account of this madness. O Elders, it is not necessary for me to be reproached so often.” [Still] the bhikṣus deliberately reproached him without ceasing. That bhikṣu thought as follows, “What shall I do?” He told this to the bhikṣus. The bhikṣus told this to the Buddha.

The Buddha said: “I authorize the saṃgha to grant the bhikṣu Nandi[ka] the jiñānā-caturtha karman for the no-longer-insane procedure. You should grant it as follows: the bhikṣu Nandi[ka] should come into the midst of the saṃgha, bare his right shoulder, take off his leather sandals, place his right knee touching the ground and his palms together and speak as follows, ‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. I, the bhikṣu Nandi[ka], whilst mad and unhinged frequently committed numerous offences. In [all] my comings and goings I was contrary to decorum. Afterwards, when I regained my mind the bhikṣus asked me, “Do you remember committing serious offences: pārājika, saṃghāvaśeṣa and sthūlātyaya [offences]?” I replied, “Formerly when I was mad and unhinged I frequently committed numerous offences. In [all] my comings and goings I was contrary to decorum. It was not me acting on purpose. It was on account of this mad mind. O Elders, it is not necessary to reproach me so often.” Still the bhikṣus deliberately reproach me without ceasing. Now I am no longer insane. I beg for the no-longer-insane procedure from the saṃgha. I request the saṃgha grant me the no-longer-insane procedure out of compassion.’

The second and third are [also] to be articulated in this manner. From amongst the assembly a competent karman officiator should be appointed. As above he is to make the motion as follows: ‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. This one, the bhikṣu Nandi[ka], was mad and

---

11 This may not necessarily be the same monk as the śikṣādattaka Nandi. In fact the Mahāsāṃghika tradition parallel for this text (T. 1425, p. 332a12-c19) lists nanti 難提 (Nandi/Nandiya/Nandin, etc.) and bozhentiti 鉢遮遮難提 (bozhe (unclear) + Nandi/Nandiya/Nandin, etc.). Note Satō Mitsuo (SGBK, p. 386) states that the Dhammagupta tradition does not name the monk whose actions caused the establishment of this procedure—this is clearly incorrect.
unhinged. He frequently committed numerous offences. He spoke without moderation. In [all] his comings and goings he was contrary to decorum. Afterwards, when he regained his mind the bhikṣus said, “Do you remember committing serious offences: pārājika, saṁghāvaśeṣa and sthūlātyaya [offences]?” He then replied, saying, “Formerly when I was mad I frequently committed numerous offences. I spoke without moderation. In [all] my comings and goings I was contrary to decorum. This was [on account of] this madness. I did not act this way on purpose. O Elders, do not reproach me so often.” Still the bhikṣus deliberately reproached me without ceasing. This bhikṣu is now no longer insane. He begs for the no-longer-insane procedure from the saṁgha. If the saṁgha thinks that the time is right, the saṁgha should consent to granting the bhikṣu Nandi[ka] the no-longer-insane procedure. This is the motion.’

‘Honourable monks, [please] listen. This one, the bhikṣu Nandi[ka], was mad and unhinged. He frequently committed numerous offences. He spoke without moderation. In [all] his comings and goings he was contrary to decorum. Afterwards, when he regained his mind the bhikṣus said, “Do you remember committing serious offences: pārājika, saṁghāvaśeṣa and sthūlātyaya [offences].” He then replied, saying, “Formerly I was mad and unhinged. I frequently committed numerous offences. In [all] my comings and goings I was contrary to decorum. This was [on account of] this mad and unhinged me. I did not act this way on purpose. O Elders, do not reproach me so often.” Still the bhikṣus deliberately reproach him without ceasing. This bhikṣu is now no longer insane. He begs for the no-longer-insane procedure from the saṁgha. The saṁgha should now grant the bhikṣu Nandi[ka] the no-longer-insane procedure. Those Elders who consent to the saṁgha granting the bhikṣu Nandi[ka] the no-longer-insane procedure [should] remain silent. Those who do not consent [should] speak up. This is the first [articulation of the] karman. The second and third are [also] to be articulated in this manner. The saṁgha has finished consenting to granting the bhikṣu Nandi[ka] the no-longer-insane procedure. The saṁgha has consented by remaining silent. Thus I hold it to be so.’

Henceforth, [also] grant other bhikṣus the no-longer-insane procedure for the settlement of disputes.\textsuperscript{12} They should articulate the no-longer-
insane procedure in this manner."

It is clear from the above text that a monk is not held to be responsible for his actions during times of insanity. This, however, appears not to have always been the case as this procedure only appears to have been introduced when a monk—in this tradition, Nandi[ka]—was subject to constant reproach from his fellow samgha members. The Buddha then set down this procedure to ensure the protection of monks who had previously been affected by insanity. In order to ensure the legality of this procedure it appears that the following conditions must be fulfilled—he must have been mad at the time the offences were committed, he must not remember committing them (even if he vaguely remembers them as if from a dream) and the samgha must grant him the procedure. It is interesting to note that this procedure may be applied in cases involving even the most serious of offences—pārājikas.

---

Chapter Seven
Mūlasarvāstivāda Tradition

The Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya was translated into Chinese by Yijing (635-713 C.E.) between the years 700-712 C.E.¹ Despite the Chinese translation’s voluminosity—the Vinayavastu alone occupies some eight separate works in the Taishō²—it is an incomplete translation of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, the only complete and extant form being found in Tibetan translation. The first text to which we now turn our attention with regard to the śikṣādattaka is the story of Nandika in the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya kṣudrakavastu. Unfortunately, as this text is not available in the extant Sanskrit manuscripts of this tradition, our only access to this text is in translation. Genbenshuoyiqiyeoubu pinaye zasli 根本説一切有部毘奈耶雜事 (T. 1451)—the eighth text in the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinayavastu—contains the following text:³

The nidaṇa is at the city of Śrāvasti.⁴ There was a bhikṣu named Nandika.⁵ He dwelled in a quiet part of the aranya⁶ and constantly enjoyed sitting in dhyāna. Because he practised meditative contemplation the people of the time called him Nandika Abiding in Meditative Contemplation. When

¹ Lamotte, History of Indian Buddhism, p. 170.
³ T. 1451, pp. 245a21-246a11. See Mūlasarvāstivāda Appendix (pp. 251-259 below) for the Chinese text, a Tibetan translation and a Sanskrit parallel. In the notes below I have sometimes referred to the Tibetan text for clarification of the Chinese. Note, however, that I have not listed every minor difference—I have only mentioned those that seem to be significant.
⁴ The Tibetan amplifies this by stating that the Buddha was residing at the Jetavana, in the Park of Anāthapiṇḍada (sangs rgyas bcom ldan ’das mnyan yod na rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med las sbyin gyi kun dga’ ra ba na bzhugs so).
⁵ Although Nandika’s name is translated in the text as huanxi 欽喜 ‘Joyous,’ I refer to him throughout as Nandika.
⁶ I.e. forest.
he was about to enter into meditative contemplation, daughters of Māra came and invited him to have sex together [with them].\(^7\) Nandika did not accept. Afterwards, on a different occasion, again when he was about to enter into meditative contemplation, a daughter of Māra came back and sat on his lap. *Thus, one should know the sphere of a woman. They are great poison, touching them is harmful to men.* Impure thoughts having arisen he then had sex with her. When Nandika had engaged in sex with her, as if a poisoned arrow had entered his chest, his mind was engulfed with thoughts of sadness such as, “I, in my foolishness, have broken the pure practice. I have engaged in the impure act of sex, I must therefore return to the lay life.” He also thought, “I truly did not have thoughts of concealment. I should go to the Buddha and fully explain this affair. If there is a rule by which I can still remain as a mendicant [then] I will behave in accordance with the *dharma.* If that is not the case then I will afterwards return to the lay life.”\(^8\) Then carrying his *dharma*-robes with his right hand, with his left hand he covered his shame.\(^9\) Tears flowing, weeping with grief he went to the Buddha. At that time the World-Honoured One was expounding the True Dharma to a great assembly of innumerable hundreds of thousands of *bhikṣu*s. From afar he saw him coming and thereupon thought, “If I do not first address that *bhikṣu,* saying, ‘Welcome, welcome’ he will vomit hot blood and thereupon his life will come to an end.”\(^10\) Having thought this he addressed Nandika, saying, “Welcome, welcome. Why are you weeping with grief?” He replied, saying, “Reverend World-Honoured One, I was formerly joyous (Nandika), now I am not joyous.” The Buddha said, “What transgression have you committed such that you speak these words?” He replied, saying, “World-Honoured One, I, without abandoning my training, have broken the practice of purity and have engaged in sexual intercourse. Although I have made this

---

\(^7\) Tibetan just states that he was tormented by them and does not mention any invitation (*de gang gi tshe skyiî mo krung beas nas bsam gtan byed pa’i tshe bdud kyi ris kyi lha dag giis gtses so*).

\(^8\) Note Tibetan states that he will indulge in sensual pleasures in such case (*on te med na ni dga’ mgur spyad par bya’o*). Presumably this means he will live as a householder.


\(^10\) Cf. p. 68, note 15.
transgression, I have not had even\textsuperscript{11} the slightest thought of concealing it.” The Buddha said, “Nandika, are you able to accept the training for the rest of your life?” He replied, saying, “Reverend One, I am able to accept and uphold it.” At that time, the World-Honoured One addressed the bhikṣus, saying, “You should know that although the bhikṣu Nandika has transgressed against the precept of purity he has not had thoughts of concealment. It is not a pārājika. You should grant Nandika the life-long training. Furthermore, you ought to also grant it to others like this. It should be granted as follows: lay out the seating, ring the gāndī and state the motion.\textsuperscript{12} Furthermore, when the entire assembly has gathered, after having made the bhikṣu Nandika pay homage to all of the samgha, squatting down in front of the seniors’ seats, placing his palms together, he should beg as follows:

‘Honourable samgha, [please] listen. I, the bhikṣu Nandika, without abandoning my training, have broken the practice of purity and have engaged in sexual intercourse. I have not had even the slightest thought of concealment. I, the bhikṣu Nandika, now from the samgha beg for the life-long training. I implore the honourable samgha to grant me, the bhikṣu Nandika, the life-long training out of compassion.’ He is to beg the samgha in this manner for the second and third time also. Nandika is to be made to stay in a place out of earshot [but] within sight. A single bhikṣu is to be appointed to make the formal act:

‘Honourable samgha, [please] listen. That one, the bhikṣu Nandika, without abandoning his training, has broken the practice of purity and has engaged in sexual intercourse and has not had even the slightest thought of concealment. Now from the samgha he begs for the life-long training. If the samgha thinks that the time is right and consents, the samgha should assent to the samgha’s now granting the bhikṣu Nandika the life-long training. This is the motion.’ Next, the karman is to be made: ‘Honourable samgha, [please] listen. That one, the bhikṣu Nandika, without abandoning his training, has broken the practice of purity and has engaged in sexual intercourse and has not had even the slightest thought of concealment.

\textsuperscript{11} The meaning of \textit{naizhi} 乃至 here and below is unclear. It could be indicating a concessive sense that he has not even had the slightest thought of concealment. However, this sense is already represented by the text: 無有少覆藏心 “I have not had even the slightest thought of concealing it.” The other possibility is that it represents an ellipsis.

\textsuperscript{12} Cf. Tibetan: \textit{dris pa’i tshig gis dge slong rnams la bsgo nas}. 
This one, the bhikṣu Nandika now from the samgha begs for the life-long training. Will the samgha now grant the bhikṣu Nandika the life-long training? If the Venerable Ones consent to granting the bhikṣu Nandika the life-long training [they should] remain silent. If they do not assent [they should] speak up.” The second and third are also to be articulated like this.

“The samgha has finished granting the bhikṣu Nandika the life-long training. The samgha has consented by way of their silence. I now hold it to be so.”

The Buddha said to the bhikṣus: “I will now expound the rules of behaviour for a sīkṣādattaka. A bhikṣu who has been granted the training (a sīkṣādattaka) should not accept from a bhikṣu in good standing respect, reverence, greeting, or the joining of the palms.¹³ He is not to sit on the same seat—whenever he sits down it should be on a low seat. He is not to share the caṅkrama. Even if they do walk together he should yield a step. If he goes to the house of an elder or a brahmin he should not accompany a bhikṣu in [good] standing. Even if they leave together, he is to let the other one go first. He is not to take lodgings in the same room. He is not to grant others the novitiate-ordination, or impart the full ordination. He is not to accept dependence of others. He is not to be in charge of a novice. He is not to make a jñāpti, jñāpti-dvitiya or a jñāpti-caturtha karman. He should not be appointed as the officer in charge of a karman. Furthermore, he is not to be appointed to admonish the bhikṣunīs. Even if he was [formerly] appointed, he should not go. If he sees another bhikṣu with lapses in precepts, lapses in views, lapses in deportment or incorrect livelihood, he should not accuse him of any of these. Furthermore, he may not make rules.¹⁴ He may not join in the poṣadha or the pravāraṇa.¹⁵ Every morning he must always rise early and, having opened the gates, he is to gather together the lamps. He is to wash down and sweep the dwellings, and smear everywhere with fresh cow dung. He ought to also

—

¹³ Cf. Tibetan: bslab pa byin pa’i dge slong gis rang bzhin du gnas pa’i dge slong gi gus par smra ba dang / phyag ’tshal ba dang / mngon du ldang ba dang / thal mo sbyor ba dang / ’dud pa’i las bdag gir mi bya.


¹⁵ The Tibetan continues, or perhaps clarifies, stating: gsol ba’i las ma yin / gsol ba dang gnyis ma yin / gsol ba dang bzhi ma yin.
smear and wipe clean the latrine. Water, earth and leaves should all be
deposited without leaving anything out. The water which is necessary
ought to be cold or warm as appropriate. The drains are to be washed
clean. He is to ring the gaṇḍī and lay out the seating.\footnote{Cf. Tibetan: \textit{dus shes par bya ste / stan bsham par bya / bdug pa'i snod dang bdug pa nye bar gzhag par bya.}} He ought to
prepare the flowers and incense for offerings. If he himself is able, he
should at the appropriate time recite verses in praise of the virtues of
the Buddha. If he is not able he ought to request another person [to do it].\footnote{Note Tibetan continues, stating: \textit{zas kyi skos sa la brtag par bya zhung / zas bskos zin nas khang steng du song ste / 'gaṇḍī brdung bar bya.}} If
it is the summer months, he should fan the bhikṣus with a fan. Whenever
he wishes to sit down it should be below the full bhikṣus and above the
novices and every time he receives food he is to quieten his mind.\footnote{Cf. Tibetan: \textit{de nas bsnyen par rdzogs pa thams cad kyi ni 'og / bsnyen par ma rdzogs pa rnams kyi ni gong du spyod lam zhi bas dge slong gi 'du shes nye bar bzhag ste zas bza' bar. On what appears to be a missing negative in the Tibetan, see Schopen, "Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries: On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices," in \textit{Sūryacandrāya: Papers in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday} (Indica et Tibetica 32), notes 12 and 22.}} When the meal is over he is to gather the rugs and seats.\footnote{Cf. Tibetan: \textit{zas kyi bya ba byas nas gnas mal phug tu brtul bar bya.}} All the eating
utensils are to be placed where they belong.\footnote{Cf. Tibetan: \textit{lhung bzed kyi gzhi dor bar bya. Cf. also Schopen, ibid., note 13 on the Sanskrit parallel—\textit{pātraḥñānam choraṇiḥvṛtāḥ}—in which he states that the \textit{pātraḥñāna} was "almost certainly not 'put away' or 'saved,' but discarded after a meal." This, however, is not supported by the Chinese.}} The dining area is to be
swept and washed down.\footnote{Cf. Tibetan: \textit{dus shes par byas nas / de bzhin gshegs pa'i ddu skra dang sen mo'i mchod rten dag phyag bdar bya zhung / ba lang gi lei ba sar pa bzung pos byug par bya / 'du ba'i dus su gnas mal bsham par bya zhung / bdug pa dang bdug pa'i snod gzhag par bya / ston pa'i yon tan bsgrags par bya.}} Always amidst the assembly he is to announce
the date, by making this kind of announcement: ‘Honourable \textit{samgha},
[please] listen. Today is the first day of the month. All the people of the
great assembly ought to take heed.’ For the sake of the donor who has
built the monastery, the heavenly deity who protects the monastery, the
country’s king, the great ministers, the teacher-monks, parents and the
donors of the ten directions he should recite the wonderful verses in the sūtras on meritorious giving.22 If he himself is unable, he is to request another to do it. The other days are [also] to be measured and [thus made] known.23

When the bhikṣus collectively divided the cells and did not grant one to the sīkṣādattaka, the Buddha said, “It should be granted.” [When] they did not grant acquisitions, the Buddha said, “They should be granted.” [When] sīkṣādattaka bhikṣu was not cultivating virtuous conduct, the Buddha said, “He should cultivate these rules for behaviour until he severs and extinguishes the cankers. He should always obey the practice and not act in a way that will incur an offence.” In time the bhikṣu gradually did that which had been decreed by the Buddha. The bhikṣu Nandika came to meditate, was diligent, and spurred himself on without tiring. Then he severed the fetters of the cankers of the five realms and attained arhatship, the three supernormal knowledges and six supernormal faculties and all the eight liberations. He obtained knowledge in accordance with reality to the effect that, “My rebirths are extinguished, the brahma caryā has been established, what I was to do has been done. I will not undergo further existence.”24 His mind was as unobstructed as a hand cleaving the air, or a knife going through unguent.25 Neither love nor hate arose. He saw gold and dirt as equal, without difference. He completely abandoned honour and wealth, and was revered and respected by Śakra, Brahmā and all the gods. Then, Nandika, after realizing arhatship still complied with his previous regulations. He did not dare to fail or transgress his rules for behaviour. The Buddha said, “He should not perform [the penance] any more. He should sit according to seniority, and be in communion with those in good standing.”

The above text is very important as it adds a number of new dimensions to our knowledge of the sīkṣādattaka. First, and perhaps most importantly, is

22 Cf. Tibetan: gtsug lag khang gi bdag po dang / gtsug lag khang gi lha rnam s Kyi don du tshigs su bcad pa gaungs shig ces nyi ma brjod par bya.

23 Tibetan appears to omit this.

24 On this common formula, see, inter alia, Nathan Katz, Buddhist Images of Human Perfection, p. 2 ff.

25 Xiāngtū 香塗; NBD only gives tuxiang 塗香.
Nandika’s rehabilitation or return to seniority upon realization of arhatship. This, however, will be dealt with later. First let us turn our attention to the details of his penance.\footnote{In the discussion below I have not strictly followed the order in which the observances appear.}

The penance is administered by means of a jñāpti-caturtha karman and is referred to as “life-long training” zhongshen xuechu 終身學處.\footnote{See, for example, T. 1451, p. 245b13.} Once granted, the penitent is referred to as “one who has been granted the training” shouxuezhiren 授學之人\footnote{T. 1451, p. 245c5. Cf. Tibetan bslab pa byin pa.}—a term which in Chinese is non-gender-specific and could refer to either a monk or a nun. It is only in the next sentence that a gender-specific term—“a bhikṣu who has been granted the training” shouxue bichu 授學苾芻 šikṣādattaka bhikṣu—is used.\footnote{T. 1451, p. 245c5-6. The problems of interpretation of this term are the same as those we encountered with the term yuxue shami 與學沙彌; cf. p. 70 above.} As for the actual wording of the formal act there is a parallel for this to be found in the Mūlasarvāstivāda ekaśatakārman\footnote{T. 1453, p. 476b23-c18.}—Genbenshuoqiyoubu baiyi\footnote{Date given at BDKJ, p. 539.} 禪磨 (T. 1453) also translated by Yijing in 703 C.E.\footnote{See Bagchi ed., Mūlasarvāstivādavinayavastu (MSV), vol. 2, pp. 48-50.}

As we saw in the Dharmaguptaka texts, in some traditions there appears to be a close parallel to the details of the penance granted to a šikṣādattaka in the rules for one undergoing the parivāsa, mānatva and the tarjaniya karman. Although this parallel is even closer in the case of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya\footnote{See Bagchi ed., Mūlasarvāstivādavinayavastu (MSV), vol. 2, pp. 48-50.} many of these observances also have parallels in the Theravādin tradition.\footnote{See, for example, T. 1451, p. 245b13.} The šikṣādattaka is not to accept respect, reverence, greeting, or
the joining of the palms from a bhikṣu in good standing, nor, according to the Tibetan, may he accept mgon du ldang ba ‘rising out of respect.’ He is not to sit on the same level—he appears only able to sit on a lower seat. Furthermore, he is not to share the cankrama—if there is somebody on it at the same time it appears that he is to stay one step behind. He should not accompany a bhikṣu in good standing to the house of an elder or a brahmin—if he goes at all he is to follow the monk. Furthermore, he is not permitted to take lodgings in the same room as the bhikṣus in good standing.

Although not specifically stated, it would appear that in this tradition the sīkṣādattaka is, as we have also seen in other traditions, ranked at the bottom of the bhikṣus. Accordingly, these rules all appear to emphasize his loss of seniority and the fact that he is due no reverence from the other bhikṣus. This is also evidenced by the fact that he is to fan the bhikṣus in summer and that he is to sit below the full bhikṣus and above the novices.

Furthermore, as a penitent he is not to grant others the novitiate or full

33 Note, where I have been able to trace Pāli parallels I have given the references to Horner’s translation. The Pāli text is readily accessible with reference to Horner’s numbering. These references, however, are by no means exhaustive and many parallels may exist which I have overlooked.

34 Cf. BD, vol. 5, p. 32 (āpattiyā adassane ukkhepaniyakammaṇ) and p. 144, note 61.

35 Cf. BD, ibid., p. 47 (pārivāsika).

36 Cf. BD, ibid., p. 48.


38 Cf. BD, ibid., p. 47.

39 The Chinese then goes on to state (p. 245c22: 每受食時令心安靜 "every time he receives food he is to quieten his mind." This is probably to be understood as meaning that he is not to get disgruntled at the fact that he is no longer a bhikṣu and has lost his seniority.
ordination, accept dependence of others⁴⁰ or take charge of a novice. Furthermore, he may neither admonish nor accept appointment to admonish the bhikṣunīs.⁴¹ These observances, with the exception of the additional prohibition from performing the novitiate ordination,⁴² form the first group of five in Daoxuan’s commentary explained in the preceding chapter.⁴³

Furthermore, the śikṣādattaka is not to make any kind of formal acts—jñāpti, jñāpti-dvitiya or jñāpti-caturtha.⁴⁴ Neither is he to be appointed as the officer in charge of such procedures.⁴⁵ He may not accuse another bhikṣu of lapses in precepts, views, deportment or of incorrect livelihood.⁴⁶ Nor may he may participate in the poṣadha or the pravāraṇa.

Our text then states quite categorically that he may not make rules.⁴⁷ The Sanskrit parallel reads nānenāvavādah [upa]sthāpayitavyah “They must not provide instruction to another.” The Tibetan, however, is rather problematic—whereas the sDe dge recension reads dbog par mi bya which suggests a translation of “he should not give [admonition],” the sTog and Phug brag recensions clearly have dgag par mi bya “he should not hinder [admonition]. This seems to suggest two different interpretations of Sanskrit

---


⁴¹ Cf. BD, ibid., p. 45.

⁴² Although not found in the Dharmaguptaka śikṣādattaka text a parallel is to be found, for example, in the Mahāśāmghika or Mahiśāsaka Pārīvārikavastus (T. 1425, p. 433a18: 不得度人; T. 1421, p. 181b6-7: 渡沙彌…不應爾).

⁴³ T. 1804, p. 19c8-11. For the text, see p. 137, note 34 above.

⁴⁴ For Dharmaguptaka parallels, see p. 138, notes 37 and 38 above.

⁴⁵ See p. 138, note 36 for a parallel in Daoxuan’s commentary.

⁴⁶ Cf. BD, vol. 5, p. 32 (āpattiyā adassane ukkhepaniyakammā).

⁴⁷ It would be useful to compare this passage with a Chinese recension of the Pārīvārikavastu. Unfortunately, it appears to have not been translated (see SVL, p. 95).
sthāpayitavyah, if this is indeed what the Sanskrit parallel actually read. Accordingly, perhaps the Chinese is best understood in light of the sDe dge recension of the Tibetan and the Sanskrit parallel as meaning he may not proffer advice.\(^{48}\)

The text then goes on to discuss his daily work schedule.\(^{49}\) This involves opening the gates at the crack of dawn, gathering the lamps which had presumably been burning all night, cleaning the dwellings and toilets and making sure that they are properly equipped.\(^{50}\) Furthermore, he is to ring the ganḍi, lay out the seating and prepare the flowers and incense for offerings. He also appears to have a number of kitchen/meal-related duties: after everyone has finished their midday meal he is to collect the seating and eating utensils, return them to where they came from,\(^{51}\) and sweep and wash down the dining area.

Furthermore, the text describes two liturgical practices for which the śikṣādattaka appears to be responsible. First, he is to recite verses in praise of the virtues of the Buddha. Secondly, having announced the date he is to recite verses on meritorious giving for the sake of the donor who has built the monastery, the heavenly deity who protects the monastery, the king and

\(^{48}\) I cannot help wondering if there is not some connection between this and the 不應僧説戒 "He should not expound the rules on behalf of the monks/samgha" as found at T. 1428, p. 809b15 (Dharmaguptaka Nandika story). As mentioned above (see p. 133, note 14 above) recension A of this text (p. 809b20) also adds 不得衆中説律若無能誦者聽 "He may not recite the Vinaya amongst the assembly—if there is no one able to recite it, he is allowed." Both seem to be saying very similar things. I wonder if the first is not to be interpreted differently?

\(^{49}\) For a more detailed discussion of this work schedule (with reference to the Tibetan text and the Sanskrit parallel), see Schopen, ibid., pp. 158-163.

\(^{50}\) See Mūlasarvāstivāda Addendum I (pp. 188-191 below) on toilet duties and the śikṣādattaka.

\(^{51}\) Cf. note 20 above.
ministers, teacher-monks, parents and the donors of the ten directions. The fact that he may request another to do either if he is unable—which is quite different from him undertaking the task if others are unable—suggests that not all monks were able to perform such recitations.\textsuperscript{52}

What strikes me as odd, however, is the fact that such duties were delegated to the šikṣādattaka. Schopen tells us that the upadhivārika\textsuperscript{53} was responsible for many of these chores.\textsuperscript{54} The upadhivārika (Chinese zhangtangshi 掌堂師; Tibetan dge skos), however, is listed as one of the twelve monastic offices in Sakaki’s edition of the Mahāvyutpatti.\textsuperscript{55} Why these duties would be left in the hands of the šikṣādattaka—one who has lost all his seniority and presumably also his trust—is quite beyond me. The only possible explanation I can offer—and it is not a good one—is that this would allow the community to keep a watchful eye on him. This, however, requires further research.

The recensions of the Nandika story preserved in this Vinaya tradition also offer other valuable insights into the position of the šikṣādattaka. When the bhikṣus divided up the cells and other acquisitions they apparently did not feel obliged to let Nandika, the šikṣādattaka, share in these along with the others. In reaction to this, the Buddha decreed that the šikṣādattaka was also to be given a cell and acquisitions. The question that we find ourselves asking is, where did the šikṣādattaka live or stay?\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{52} Schopen, ibid., p. 165. For a more in-depth discussion on these practices, see ibid., pp. 164-167.

\textsuperscript{53} Cf. BHSD, s.v. upadhi-vāraka, “guardian of material objects, beadle, provost.” Cf. also SGBK, p. 317.

\textsuperscript{54} Schopen, ibid., p. 164.

\textsuperscript{55} Sakaki ed., Mahāvyutpatti, s.v. 9067. Note that Sakaki lists twenty entries for these twelve offices. Cf. Ishihama and Fukuda’s critical edition, s.v. 9004.

\textsuperscript{56} See Mūlasarvāstivāda Addendum 2, pp. 192-194.
The final observance set down by the World-Honoured One in response to Nandika’s non-cultivation of virtuous conduct appears to be that a śikṣādattaka should cultivate good conduct and observe all of the rules set down as above. Nandika appears to have diligently obeyed the word of the Buddha. Through his efforts, we are told he was able to attain arhatship. Furthermore, he then appears to have been returned to seniority. Indeed, the Buddha said, “He should not perform [the penance] any more. He should sit according to seniority, and be in communion with those in good standing.” This single line is perhaps the most significant of all the Mūlasarvāstivādin passages so far reviewed. It tells us that the śikṣādattaka’s penance—the life-long training—is not necessarily life-long. It appears that this tradition allows the śikṣādattaka to be fully rehabilitated to his former status. The prerequisite for this return to purity, however, appears to be the attainment of arhatship.

Yijing’s 義淨 translation of Viśeṣamitra’s 勝友 Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya samgraha contains the following passage which throws further light on the śikṣādattaka’s rehabilitation upon attainment of arhatship.\(^{57}\)

蕊叢犯重之時，若無二種惡心，一不怖心，二者害心，為煩惱逼遂行非法。初無隱覆向他陳說者，僧伽應與承白四法。授\(^{58}\)其學事。得法之人行治罰法。皆與遍住行同。唯\(^{59}\)除一事。乃至命存與他授\(^{60}\)食。彼亦自必須受食而嬝。若後獲阿羅漢果。同善蕊叢依本位坐。有餘復云。仍須六

\(^{57}\) T. 1458, p. 534a29-b10. Cf. Tibetan Co ne NU, 109a4-b2 (note, due to time restraints and lack of access to a readily legible Tibetan text, the references given to the Tibetan recension of this text, both here and below, may not be entirely accurate. Furthermore, the Tibetan seems, at least on cursory examination, to be quite different in structure to the Chinese. It is regretted, however, that a detailed study of these Tibetan passages could not be given here).

\(^{58}\) 授 KNN\(^2\): 受 GMSY

\(^{59}\) 唯 KNN\(^2\)SY: 惟 GM

\(^{60}\) 授 KNN\(^2\): 受 GMSY
When a bhikṣu commits a grave offence, if he is without the two kinds of evil minds—one, a mind that does not fear [to transgress the rules of training]; two, an iniquitous mind—and compelled by evil passions consequently performs [acts] contrary to the dharma, if from the beginning he does not conceal the fact and he explains his case to another, the saṃgha should grant him the jñāpti-caturtha dharma and impart the training to him. One who has received that dharma is to undertake the [following] rules of punishment—all are the same as those for the pārivāsika, with only one exception; for as long as he lives he is to give food to others. Furthermore, he must eat having received food for himself. If he subsequently attains the fruit of arhatship, then he is to sit in his former position along with the bhikṣus in good standing. There are others who also say he still must attend upon the saṃgha and serve the seniors for six months, manage the three robes and the pātras and assist in all affairs of the dharma. Thereafter, if he is able to obtain the saṃgha’s consent, and both parties recognize his readiness [the saṃgha] should give rise to compassion and discontinue his training. This is therefore known as rising from an offence.

This text clarifies the Mulasarvāstivādin position on pārājika penance. It tells us that non-concealment of one’s offence from the very outset is a prerequisite to being granted penance. It also states that the śikṣādattaka’s penance is almost identical to that prescribed for the pārivāsika with the exception that a śikṣādattaka is to give food—presumably to the bhikṣus—and receive his own meals by himself. I take these references to be the same as similar passages found in other Vinayas which state that a śikṣādattaka is not to accept food from the full bhikṣus, but is to receive his food from the laity or novices. It is interesting to note, however, that the Mulasarvāstivādin Nandika story appears to make no mention of this additional observance.

---

61 For the Sanskrit text of the Mulasarvāstivāda Pārivāsikavastu, see Mulasarvāstivāda Appendix, pp. 251-259.
This text provides further evidence that the Mūlasarvāstivāda life-long penance is in fact not necessarily life-long, and that one may be returned to one’s previous position of seniority upon attainment of arhatship. In addition, it suggests that others held the view that even if the penitent was to attain arhatship he would still have to offer six months’ service to the samgha. What is not clear, however, is whether this refers to six months of service after one has attained enlightenment or whether, if one attains arhatship whilst undergoing penance, time served is taken into account—thus one who attains arhatship after three months of penance would still be faced with an equal duration of time to serve. Either way, this is extremely significant as it appears to represent what is perhaps the most lax stance towards a penitent bhikṣu so far reviewed.\(^63\)

The Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya saṃgraha is a rich source of textual passages that mention the śikṣādattaka. One such passage reads as follows:\(^64\)

可治不可治者。贼心故犯。是不可治異此可治。謂\(^65\)授\(^66\)學人出罪不同者。授\(^67\)學之人盡形方出。其不淨行中有方便窣呬羅罪。重者須對一切僧伽誦除。輕者下至四人。餘三他勝准此應知。

Whether they are corrigible or incorrigible (?). Having wilfully transgressed with an iniquitous mind, this is incorrigible. Those other than this are corrigible. That the śikṣādattaka's re-admission\(^68\) (?) is not the same, means that the śikṣādattaka is re-admitted only at the end of his life. In his act of impurity if there are stratagems then it results in a sthūla

---

\(^{62}\) Cf. p. 69 above. Cf. also p. 60 in which he is to receive his food from the ‘factor’ (kalpikāraka).

\(^{63}\) See Mūlasarvāstivāda Addendum 3, pp. 195-196.


\(^{65}\) 謂 KNN\(^\circ\): om. GMSY

\(^{66}\) 授 KNN\(^\circ\): 受 GMSY

\(^{67}\) 授 KNN\(^\circ\): 受 GMSY

\(^{68}\) On BHS āhvayana or Skt. abarhana, etc., see Nolot, pp. 134-5. Cf. Upasak, s.v. abbhāṇa.
offence. Grave transgressions need to be stated in front of the whole samgha and eradicated. Minor transgressions [only need] as few as four [monks]. The other three offences involving defeat by another [i.e. pārājikas] are [also] to be known in accordance with this.

The text states that grave offences need to be confessed in front of the whole samgha. Although the term zhong 重 ‘grave’ or ‘serious’ offence is sometimes used in a wider sense to encompass samghāvaśeṣa offences, this, however, is clearly not the sense here as a samghāvaśeṣa would not necessitate confession to the whole samgha. Furthermore, the text then directly refers to the other three pārājikas and states that they are zhuncizinghizhi 准此應知 “to be known in accordance with this.” This appears to be saying that pārājika penance is, as we saw in the Dharmaguptaka tradition, applicable not only to the first pārājika, but to the other three as well. This, however, is in stark contrast to previous scholarship—chiefly that of Hirakawa’s—on pārājika penance.

Indeed, the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya samgraha, or at least Yijing’s translation of it, is so rich in references to the śikṣādattaka that adequate justice cannot be done to them all here. One passage in particular, however, demands our attention. In respect to pāyantika twenty-one of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Bhikṣu prātimokṣa which forbids unauthorized bhikṣus from admonishing the nuns unless they have attained arhatship, we find the following commentary:

---

69 Cf. p. 24, note 16 above.

70 HC, vol. 14, p. 371 states that a samgha of four monks may grant the mānatva but twenty or more are needed to perform the formal act of revocation. Cf. Nolot, p. 77. “The smallest quorum of monks/nuns entitled to act as a regular, complete chapter (samagga-samgha) is four; this chapter may perform all procedures except those involved in ordination (upa-sampadhā), Invitation (pavārana), and re-admission (abhāna).

71 There are also a number of minor references in other Mūlasarvāstivādin texts—see, inter alia, T. 1452, pp. 423c17-23; 424a6-8; 425a5-6; 453a5. See Mūlasarvāstivāda Addendum 4 (pp. 197-202) for a number of lists in which the śikṣādattaka appears.
言除獲勝法者。此顯朱茶76半託迦獲阿羅漢能令時77俗生信敬心。設不
蒙差往教無犯。於近圓尼作近圓想等有六句。二重二輕。後二無犯。若
於彼先犯重等尼。或授學尼黨教非黨尼。或復翻此。為教授時。咸得惡
作。若言不相解者。亦惡作罪。
The words ‘excepting one who has attained the superior dharma’ clearly
refer to Cūḍapanthaka78 who attained arhatship and was able to make
the world bring forth thoughts of faith and respect.79 Although he was not
appointed to go and admonish there was no offence. If he thinks a fully
ordained nun is fully ordained, etc., there are six phrases—a two are
serious, two are light, in the last two there is no transgression. If to a nun
who has previously committed serious offences, or if a faction of śīkṣā
nuns instruct a non-faction nun, or vice versa—if they impart teaching all
incur an offence of wrong doing. If they speak but are not mutually
understood it is also an offence of wrong doing.

72 Another reference to the śīkṣādattaka is to be found at p. 599a19-22 (cf. Co ne,
NU, 253a1-2): 近圓有十種不應禮，行遍住等四人。授學人。三種被（被
GKNS SY: 彼
M）捨置人。諸在家人。及未近圓。是名為十。“There are ten kinds of people whom one
who is fully ordained should not venerate—the four kinds of people undergoing the parivāsa,
etc.; the śīkṣādattaka; the three types of people who have been suspended; the laity and
those not yet fully ordained. These are known as the ten.” A number of minor references to
the śīkṣādattaka are also to be found at T. 1458, pp. 529a24; 531b9; 546a2; 547b2; 550a4;
552c11; 587a15; 587c13; 591a10; 595b4 and 597a6. This list, however, is by no means
comprehensive.

73 Note I have here used the term pāyantika (cf. Pāli pācittiya) as this is the form
found in the Mūlasarvāstivādin Sanskrit prātimokṣa fragment published by Lokesh Chandra
(1960).

74 Cf. Prebish, Buddhist Monastic Discipline, p. 79. Cf. Theravādin Bhikkhu pācittiya,
no. 21. According to Hirakawa (HC, vol. 16, p. 272) only the Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa
includes the exception for those who have attained arhatship.

75 T. 1458, p. 582a26-b3. Cf. Tibetan at Co ne, NU, 217b6-218a2.

76 茶 GKNS Y: 茶 M

77 時 GMSN: 法 KN


79 See MBD, pp. 2404-2405; NBD, s.v. jūrokurakan 十六羅漢.

80 Sense obscure. This may refer to Mūlasarvāstivādin Bhikṣu pāyantika no. 5
(Theravādin Bhikkhu pācittiya no. 7)?). Cf. T. 1442, p. 806a17 on liuju 六句.
Although I have absolutely no idea what this means it is extremely important as it confirms the existence of the penitent nun in at least the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya sāṃgraha. Thus, it seems safe to tentatively conclude that the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition allowed not only monks but also nuns to be granted pārājika penance.

In sum, we have seen from both the Nandika story and Viśeṣāmitra’s Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya sāṃgraha that the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition views pārājika penance in an almost identical manner to the parivāsa penance, the details of both of which seem highly divergent from those of other traditions. Furthermore, this tradition explicitly, or perhaps more accurately canonically, states that a sīkṣādattaka’s penance may be revoked upon attainment of arhatship. Viśeṣāmitra’s commentary, however, suggests that in such cases a minimum sentence of six months service to the sāṃgha must be served. Moreover, the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya sāṃgraha introduces further evidence in stark opposition to Hirakawa’s theories on the sīkṣādattaka that pārājika penance may also be applied to other pārājika dharmas, and that this option was also available to nuns.
Mūlasarvāstivāda Addendum 1
Carrying the can for one’s offences

Toilet duty is, as we have seen in the Mūlasarvāstivādin Nandika story, prescribed as a punishment for the šiksādattaka. After introducing the thirty-five observances seen in the preceding chapter,¹ Satō Tatsugen states in his work on the Vinaya in Chinese Buddhism that Daoxuan, being not content with these observances for a bhikṣu who had been granted pāraṇāka penance, quotes a passage from the Zhichanbing biyaoa 治禪病要法² and demands that a more severe punishment be imposed upon the šiksādattaka.³ The passage in Daoxuan’s commentary reads as follows:⁴

治禪病要法云。犯重懺業。脱僧伽梨。著安陀會。心生懺愧。供僧苦役。掃廁 Election. 此行懺法。須者如彼。

The Zhichanbing sūtra states: one who confesses having committed a grave offence is to take off his samghāti,⁶ wear his antarvāsa⁷ and giving rise to shame in his heart he is to afford the samgha hard labour—cleaning the privy and carrying the faeces, etc. This is the rule for [one] practising confession. The requirements are like that.

This passage clearly states that the šiksādattaka⁸ is to roll up his sleeves—or for those more familiar with Buddhist monastic dress, take off his samghāti and wear his antarvāsa—and carry out toilet duties. Although Satō may indeed

---


² Abbreviated to Zhichanbingjing 治禪病經 in Daoxuan’s commentary. This text appears to have been translated around 455 C.E. by Juquingsheng 拐渠京声. On the translation of this text, see BKDJ, s.v.

³ CBKK, p. 149.

⁴ T. 1804, p. 97a5-7.

⁵ 楫 G: J ([jia 甲) Tokugawa period manuscript held at Shūkyō University (now Taishō University 大正大学 (? 德川時代刊宗教大學蔵本)): K; O ([宽 (? illegible in Taiwanese reprint of Taishō) Kanbun year 10 (1670 C.E.) edition manuscript held at Ōtani University 寛文十年刊大谷大學蔵本)

⁶ One of the three robes. See Upasak, s.v. saṅghāti.

⁷ See Upasak, s.v. antaravāsaka on this type of robe.
be correct in his assumption that Daoxuan demanded such duties be given to the *śikṣādattaka*, he does not offer any evidence in support of this. Satō quotes T. 1804, p. 19c on the thirty-five observances and then the above passage at p. 97a of the same text. The passages at pp. 96-97 represent a range of views on the *śikṣādattaka*. Page 96c5-14, for instance, appears to be a quotation from the *Niepan jing* 涅槃經 (?) *Nirvāṇa sūtra* (?)⁸; lines 15-23 of the same are supposedly a quotation from a Dharmaguptaka text and lines 24-27 appear to be from a Sarvāstivādin text. Accordingly, I do not see any reason for necessarily taking these as Daoxuan’s personal views.

What appears to be the original passage in the *Zhichanbing biyaofa* 治禪病祕要法 quoted by Daoxuan reads as follows:¹⁰

如負債人。心懷慚愧。應當償還之心一意。脫僧伽梨。著安多¹¹會。詣清淨僧所。五體投地。如大¹²山崩。心懷慚愧。懺悔諸罪。為僧執事。作諸苦役。掃除擔餉。經八百日。

Just like one who carries heavy debts, the heart and mind [of a *śikṣādattaka* is full of shame. He should make recompense for every single thought and notion. He is to take off his *samghāti*, wear his *antarvāsa* and go to a pure monk and perform the five-limb prostration, like a great mountain

---

⁸ Note the passage in Daoxuan’s commentary then goes on to give a *karmavācanā* for the granting of *pārājika* penance. T. 1804, p. 97a7-23: 梵中應教乞言。大德僧聽。我某甲比丘。犯淫（淫 GKO: 姬 J）波羅夷無覆藏。今從僧乞波羅夷戒。願僧與我波羅夷戒。慈憫故三乞已。僧索欲問和。答云。與波羅夷戒（戒 GKO: om. J）羯磨。應言。大德僧聽。此某甲比丘。犯淫（淫 GKO: 姬 J）波羅夷無覆藏。今從僧乞波羅夷戒。若僧時到（倒 GJKO）。僧忍聽。僧今與某甲比丘波羅夷戒。白如是。大德僧聽。此某甲比丘。犯淫（淫 GKO: 姬 J）波羅夷無覆藏。今從僧乞波羅夷戒。僧今與某甲比丘波羅夷戒。誰諸長老。忍僧與某甲比丘波羅夷戒者默然。誰不忍者說。是初羯磨第二第三亦爾。僧已忍與某甲比丘波羅夷戒竟。僧忍默然故。是事如是持。佛言。與波羅夷戒已。當行隨順法。常三十五事。略同僧綱法中。唯加不得衆中誦律無能誦者聽。與波羅夷戒已。僧說戒及羯磨時。來與不來隨意。若重犯者減檀。若犯僧殘。已下依篇聚治。

⁹ The texts states 涅槃云 (T. 1804, p. 96c5).

¹⁰ T. 620, p. 337a24-28. Note this is a passage identified by Satō Tatsugen (ibid., pp. 151-152, note 10). I have been unable to locate an exact parallel in T. 620.

¹¹ 多 K: 陀 GMSY

¹² 大 K: 太 GMSY
collapsing. His heart and mind full of shame, he is to confess his offences. He is to attend to duties for the *sangha* and perform hard labour—cleaning the privy and carrying faeces for eight hundred days.

The text then goes on to state that he is to bathe, again don the *sanghāti*, enter the *stūpa* and contemplate the light emitted from the white tuft of hair between the eyebrows of the Tathāgata\(^{13}\) for seven days. Thereafter he is to return and seek confession. The text then goes on to describe a visualization technique in which he is to contemplate his own body as a golden bottle containing four venomous snakes. The technique also involves a six-headed dragon which coils around the bottle and spits venom, a black elephant which comes and tries to uproot trees, and fires arising in all quarters. The snakes are each a different colour and are born of the elements of wind, water, earth and fire. The passage then goes on to state that the six heads of the dragon represent the five aggregates and *śūnya* in one’s body.\(^{14}\) The rest of the visualization technique, while extremely interesting, must be set aside for a rainy day. The text does, however, seem to state quite categorically that this

---

\(^{13}\) See *BHSD*, ss.vv. *ūrṇā, ūrṇā-kośa*.

\(^{14}\) T. 620, p. 337a28-c1: 然後復當澡浴身體。還著僧伽梨。入於塔中。一心合掌。觀如來眉間白毫大如相光。一日至七日。至至者所。求索懺悔。智者應當告言。比丘。汝今自觀汝身。猶如金瓶盛四毒蛇。二上二下吐毒可畏。復觀一龍六頭繞瓶。龍亦吐毒。滴蛇口中。四方大樹。從金瓶出。遍三界。黑象復來。欲拔此樹。四面火起。見此事已。應當告言。比丘當知。金瓶者。是地氣（地氣 K: 蛇器 GMSY）也。青色蛇者。從風大生。是風大毒。緑色蛇者。從水大生。是水大毒。白色蛇者。從地大生。是地大毒。黃色蛇者。從火大生。是火大毒。六頭龍者。是汝身中五陰及空。如此身者。毒害不淨。云何縱惡。犯戒不治。說此語已。復教掃塔塗地。作諸苦役。更教觀佛。見佛放金色光。以手摩頭。然後方當教不淨觀不淨門。徹無有諸障。然後可與僧中說戒。欲說戒時。應唱是語。某甲比丘。某甲比丘尼。已八百日。行於苦役。七日觀佛眉間白毫。作毒蛇觀。地獄想成。復觀一佛。說懺悔法。不淨觀門。無我人鏡（鏡 K: 境 GMSY）。還復通達境界中。佛以澡灌水。灌比丘頂。天神現夢。說已清淨。今已懺悔。我所證知。唯願聽許。爾時律師。復應以律檢問此人。復教誦戒。經八百遍。然後方許。如淨比丘。得無有異。告舍利弗。若有七衆。犯於（於 K: om. GMSY）輕戒。過二夜不懺悔者。是人現身雖行禪定。終不獲道。若犯重戒。殞大地獄。從地獄出。受畜生身。如是具足。足（足 KMSY: om. G）滿三劫。然後为人。雖得人身。貧窮癬病。七十七身。不見佛。不聞法。諸根不具。是故智者。若犯佛戒。於突吉羅。應生怖畏。如被刀斫。極懷慚愧。何況重戒。若能服此持戒藥。當知是人。最上懺悔忍辱丈夫。無能過者。
technique may be used by either monks or nuns. The text states:

欲說戒時。應唱是語。某甲比丘。某甲比丘尼。已八百日。行於苦役。七日觀佛眉間白毫。作毒蛇觀。地獄想成。復觀一佛。

When one wishes to recite the precepts one should call out these words: “Bhikṣu so-and-so [or] bhikṣuni so-and-so has completed eight hundred days of performing hard labour. For seven days he/she has contemplated the white hair between the Buddha’s eyebrows and has done the venomous snake visualization and has completed contemplation on the hells. Furthermore, he/she contemplated a Buddha....”

Thus once again we see that both monks and nuns may confess pārājika offences. This passage, however, is particularly significant as it suggests that the penitent’s sentence may not have been life-long as stated in a number of the Vinaya traditions so far examined, nor until attainment of arhatship as stated in the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya tradition. This text seems to state that hard labour is to be performed for eight hundred days. It is not clear, however, if this is to be carried out in addition and thus presumably concurrently with the observances set forth within the various Vinaya traditions or whether it is to be served in place of these.

---

Mūlasarvāstivāda Addendum 2
Śikṣādattaka accommodation

In the Sarvāstivādin tradition, for instance, we saw that the śikṣādattaka is not to stay for more than two nights in the same room as the full bhikṣus, nor two nights with those who are not fully ordained, viz. laity and novices. A similar situation was also encountered in the Mahāsāṃghika tradition. Indeed, it is a pāyantika offence to spend more than two nights with an unordained person. Where then, does the śikṣādattaka stay? The Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya saṃgraha compiled by Viśeṣamitra 勝友 and translated by Yijing 義淨 (635-713 C.E.) in 700 C.E. as Genbensapoduobu lü she 根本薩婆多部律攝 (T. 1458) offers the following commentary on pāyantika fifty-four:

若與授學人同室者。亦應終宿。此授學人與未近圓人亦終宿。凡眠臥時。若有難緣無餘床席。應留諸羅僧伽為四重而臥其上。以僧伽毘留安頭下。或用覆身安樹蔭下。以充內服。凡臥息時右脇著床。兩足重疊。身不動搖。作光明想。安住正念情無執著。衣服不亂。於睡知量。念當早起。初夜後夜恒修善品。此是沙門眠息之法。若無病苦盡不應臥。若眠息時。有人相惱者。應向餘處。

If one shares a room with a śikṣādattaka then he should purify the lodgings. If this śikṣādattaka stays with one who is not yet fully ordained he should also purify that lodging. Whenever he lies down to sleep, if on

---

1 See p. 69 above (T. 1435, p. 3b4-5).
3 T. 1454, p. 505a18-19: 若與授學人同室者。亦應終宿。同室宿過二夜者。波逸底迦。Cf. Theravādin Bhikkhu pācittiya no. 5.
5 人 KN: 者 GMSY
6 與 KG?: 亦應與 MN?(illegible)SY
7 亦 KN: 而 GMSY
8 墟 K: 累 GMNSY
account of hardship there is no other bed matting, he should fold his *uttarāsaṅga* into four layers and lie down on top of it and fold his *samghāti* and place it under his head. He is to cover his body with his *antarvāsa* using it as an undergarment. Whenever he lies down to rest his right side should touch the bed. His feet should rest one on another. He should not move his body about. Thinking thoughts of light, he is to peacefully abide in correct mindfulness and be without affliction in his emotions. His robing is not to be disordered. In sleep he is to know moderation. He is to bear in mind that he ought to rise early. In the first and last watches of the night he should constantly cultivate good conduct. These are the rules of sleep and rest for a śramaṇa. If he is not suffering from illness he should not lie down during the day. When he sleeps or rests, if people are bothering each other he should head for another place.

Clearly, the *ṣīkṣādāttaka* was considered to be impure and in sharing a room with such an impure person it appears to have been necessary to take precautions so as not to come in contact with the impurity. This, however, still does not tell us exactly where the *ṣīkṣādāttaka* dwelt, if he lived together with the community or not. In relation to pāyantika number sixteen of this tradition—若復苾芻瞋恚不喜。於僧住處牽苾芻出。或令他牽出者。除餘緣故。波逸底迦。“Whatever bhikṣu angered and displeased drives out a bhikṣu from samgha [owned] dwellings or orders another to drive him out, except on account of special circumstances, it is a pāyantika.”—the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya samgraha (T. 1458) states:

---

9 One of the three robes of a monk. See Upasak, s.v. *uttarāsaṅga*.

10 Cf. p. 188, note 6.

11 Cf. p. 188, note 7.


13 *Chuuyuangu* 除餘緣故 “except on account of special circumstances” requires explanation. It is explained at T. 1442, p. 786c11 as 除餘緣者謂除難緣 “excepting special circumstances means excepting circumstances of difficulty”. *HC*, vol. 16, pp. 232-233 states that this refers to *banan* 八難 “the eight difficulties” (see Inagaki, *A Dictionary of Japanese Buddhist Terms*, s.v. *hachinan* 八難).
若以書印等令他牽出者。得突色訖里多。若尼住處授學人處。或先犯人。或非人等所住之處。或自私房。或求寂住處。或於空處。或外道處。於斯等處曳出清淨苾芧。得惡作罪。

If one orders another with a written seal, etc., to drag out [a bhikṣu], he incurs a duṣkṛta. If [from] a bhikṣuni’s dwellings or a śikṣādattaka’s place, or a place dwelt in by a previous offender or non-humans, a private residence, a novice’s dwelling, an empty place, the place of a follower of another way—if one drags a pure bhikṣu away from these [kinds of] places it is an offence of wrong doing.

This text requires little explanation. What is interesting, however, is the term shouxuerenchu授學人處 ‘the [dwelling] place of a śikṣādattaka.’ What exactly is the dwelling place of a śikṣādattaka? Should this be taken as further evidence that penitents lived apart from pure samgha members? If so, where did they live? We know that śikṣādattakas are not supposed to take lodgings in the same room as a monk in good standing. Whether penitent monks lived in solitude or collectively would obviously depend on their numbers. However, if there was more than one penitent would they live separately or would both śikṣādattakas live together? Would they live in the “dwelling place of a śikṣādattaka,” whatever that is? Although no answer can be given here, it is perhaps a point worth considering and one which requires further research.

---

14 T. 1458, p. 580a18-22. Cf. Tibetan, Co ne, NU, 213a5-7. Note the śikṣādattaka does not seem to appear within the list in the Tibetan parallel. Furthermore, before the list it talks of a samgha of śikṣādattakas (bslab pa 'byin pa'i dge 'dun).
Mūlasarvāstivāda Addendum 3
The śikṣādattaka as a position of responsibility

Setting aside laxity, the actual details of the Mūlasarvāstivādin penance cum sentence—a sentence under which one appears to have to wait upon the senior members of the Order and take charge of the robes and bowls—are interesting. What this sentence actually entailed is subject to speculation, but it may be a reference to the monastic offices of either the cīvarapatīgāhaka ‘receiver of robes’\(^1\) or the cīvarabhājaka ‘distributor of robes’\(^2\) and the pattagāhāpaka ‘distributor of bowls.’\(^3\)

These, however, appear to be monastic offices to which bhikṣus are usually elected or appointed. Why a penitent monk should be appointed to them is beyond me. The pattagāhāpaka, for example, is appointed by a jñāptidvitiya karman\(^4\) and is described as being not moved by desire, anger, fear or stupidity and one who knows the difference between that which is taken and that which is not.\(^5\) This sounds very much like a position of responsibility—a position for which one would not intuitively think the śikṣādattaka would be qualified.\(^6\) This, however, is perhaps not without parallel in at least the

---

\(^1\) I have used the Pāli terms for these three offices as I am as yet unable to locate any Sanskrit references for all three. See SBKK, p. 311 for this office. See also BD, vol. 5, p. 247; BD, vol. 4, pp. 400-401.

\(^2\) See SBKK, pp. 311-312. See also BD, vol. 5, p. 247; BD, vol. 4, p. 403.

\(^3\) See Upasak, ss.vv., pattagāhāpaka (I), pattagāhāpaka (II). Cf. SBKK, p. 312 on battagāhāpada [sic]. See also BD, vol. 2, p. 122 (Theravādin Bhikkhu nissaggiya pācittiya note 22) on the ‘assigner of bowls.’


Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition in which, as we saw in the Nandika story, the śikṣādattaka is also to undertake liturgical practices. If this is indeed a reference to the śikṣādattaka taking a monastic office it is in stark contrast to at least the Dharmaguptaka tradition in which this is expressly forbidden.\(^7\) What, however, seems to be a more plausible explanation is that the reference to managing the three robes and bowls is nothing more than a general term to describe the śikṣādattaka's duties and responsibilities as prescribed in this tradition's recension of the Nandika story, and that he is in fact simply used as a menial. Even if we are to accept such an explanation this still leaves us with a similar problem in that the śikṣādattaka appears to be entrusted with certain liturgical duties. In any case, this requires further examination.

\(^6\) Note that in this tradition one who has committed a pārājika (and considered to be asamvāsa) is categorically excluded from appointment to the twelve monastic offices. Cf. p. 50 above (T. 1442, p. 630c11-15).

\(^7\) Cf. p. 132 (note 12) above.
Mūlasarvāstivāda Addendum 4
Sīkṣādattaka miscellanea

The sīkṣādattaka appears in a number of lists in this tradition. From these lists it is possible to gain an insight into the way in which the penitent monk was treated and perceived within the tradition itself. One such lists reads as follows:\(^1\)

具壽郯波離請世尊曰。有幾種人不應詣言不採錄。佛言。有十二種人。云何十二。一者愚。二者癡。三不分明。四不善巧。五者無�UIApplication。六有瑕暇。七界外住。八被捨棄。九言無次緒。十捨威儀。十一失本性。十二授學人。
The venerable Upāli asked the World-Honoured One, saying, “How many kinds of people should not rebuke or collect and record?” The Buddha replied, “There are twelve [such] kinds of people.” “What are the twelve?” “One, a fool. Two, an ignorant [person]. Three, one who has no understanding. Four, one who is unskilful. Five, one who is shameless. Six, one who has faults. Seven, one who dwells outside the boundaries. Eight, one who has been suspended. Nine, one whose speech lacks order. Ten, one who has abandoned deportment. Eleven, one who has lost his nature. Twelve, a sīkṣādattaka.”

The text then goes on to explain these twelve as follows:\(^4\)

云何是愚。佛言。愚者謂思其惡思說其惡説作其惡作說難捨事。云何為癡。佛言。謂不持於善而習於貪不持摩利耶不持則閘室里迦。不分明者。謂不明三藏教文。言不善巧者。不善三藏教理。言無懈者。謂於四他勝事中隨犯一戒。言有瑕隙者。謂新作闊謙或舊有怨嫌。言界外者。謂界外住。人言捨棄者。謂是僧伽以灰四法而為捨棄。言無次緒者。謂作妄語

---

\(^1\) T. 1452, p. 448a14-18. Cf. T. 1453, p. 496b23-27: 具壽郯波離請世尊曰。大德。有幾種人。言不齒錄。詞不成詞。佛言。有十二種人。云何十二。一無懈。二有瑕暇。三愚。四癡。五不分明。六言不善巧。七界外住。八被捨棄。九言無次緒。十捨威儀。十一失本性。十二授學人。廣如尼陀那目得迦中具解。

\(^2\) 瑕 KMSY: 假 G

\(^3\) Sense obscure.

\(^4\) T. 1452, p. 448a20-b5.
"What is a fool here?" The Buddha said, "Fool means one who thinks evil thoughts, makes evil speech and does evil actions. That which he says is difficult for him to give up." "What is ignorant?" The Buddha said, "It means not upholding the sūtras, not upholding the Vinaya, not upholding the mātrkā. One who has no understanding means one who does not understand the teachings of the tripiṭaka. One who is unskilful means one who is unskilful in the doctrines of the tripiṭaka. One who is shameless means one who has transgressed against one of the four pārājikas precepts. One who has faults means one who newly causes a dispute or harbours a grudge from old. One outside the boundaries means one who dwells outside the boundaries. One who people call suspended means one who has been suspended by the saṅgha with a jñāpti-caturtha dharma. One whose speech lacks order means one who makes false speech, [or uses] slanderous, rough, or confused speech. One who is said to have abandoned deportment means [one who has] abandoned one’s original position. One who is said to have lost his nature means that which he does is that which should not be performed and he does not know, cultivate or practise the sīkṣāpadas. One who is called a sīkṣādattaka means one who has thus committed a grave [offence] and has not concealed it. The assembly makes a jñāpti-caturtha [formal act] and grants him an order for training."  

---

5. 礦 K: 磲 GMSY

6. 本性 K: 其本性 GMSY

7. 授 GMSY: 受 K

8. It looks as if the text has been inverted here.

9. Another similar list—this time of fourteen persons—appears in the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya samgraha (T. 1458, pp. 573c25-574a7 (cf. Tibetan, Co ne, NU, 197a5-b2)): 十四人是不應呵。一愚小者。謂思其惡思說其惡說。不應為事而強為之。二無知者。謂不持三藏。三不分明者。謂不聞文義。四不善巧者。於諸言義不善分別。五無羞恥者。謂犯波羅夷迦。六有瑕隕者。謂曾翻譯人。七在界外者。謂居界外或雖界內而離聞處。八異居者。謂居界內而處於空。九治罰者。謂在界內被衆捨置。十言無軌則者。謂具口四過。十一添威儀者。謂從座起去。十二不住本性者。謂苾芻學處不肯勤修。於非所為而常樂作。十三盡形治者。謂授學人。十四樂作如法羯磨。
Another reference to the śīkṣādattaka is to be found in the Mūlasarvāstivāda kaṭhinavastu or Genbenshuoyiqiyoubu pinaye jiechinayishi 根本說一切有部毘奈耶羯鉢缋那衣事 (T. 1449).¹⁰

_Upāli asked the World-Honoured One, saying, “For how many kinds of people is the [kaṭhina] robe not spread?”_ The Buddha said, “There are five kinds of people, viz. one who has no summer [retreat], one who breaks the summer [retreat], one who enters the summer [retreat] late, a novice and one who is not present when the [kaṭhina] robes are spread. There are five more kinds of people for whom the [kaṭhina] robes are not spread—one undergoing the parivāsa, one who has finished the parivāsa, one who is undergoing the mānāpya, one who has finished the mānāpya and a śīkṣādattaka.” “Honourable One, for how many kinds of people is there no merit although they acquire material gain?” The Buddha said, “There are five kinds of people, viz. one who has no summer [retreat], one who breaks the summer [retreat], one who enters the summer [retreat] late, a novice and one who is not present [when the kaṭhina robes are spread]. There are five more kinds of people [who acquire material gain but no merit]—one undergoing the parivāsa, one who has finished the parivāsa, one who is undergoing the mānāpya, one who has finished the mānāpya and a śīkṣādattaka. These are known as those who acquire material gain but no merit.”

An almost identical Sanskrit recension of this text is extant in the Gilgit manuscripts. The passage reads as follows:¹¹

āyuṣmān udāli buddham bhagavantam prechati / katīnāṁ bhadanta kaṭhinam anāstṛtam / pamcānāṁ udālin¹² / avārṣikasya varṣācchinnakasya

¹⁰ T. 1449, p. 98b6-14.
The Venerable Upāli asked the Buddha, the World-Honoured One, “For how many, O Reverend One, is the kathina not spread?” “For five, Upāli. For one who does not observe the rains retreat, for one who breaks the observance of the rains retreat, one who has entered the observance of the rains retreat late, one who has entered the observance of the rains retreat elsewhere, one who, when that kathina was spread, was not present. There are also another five for whom it is not spread. One on the parivāsa, one who has completed the parivāsa, one undergoing the māṇīpya, one who has undergone the māṇīpya and a śikṣādattaka.”

It is interesting to note that the only apparent difference between the Sanskrit and Chinese recension of this passage is that, for Sanskrit anyatra varṣopagatasya ‘one who has entered the observance of the rains retreat elsewhere’ the Chinese text reads qiujiren 求寂人 which is presumably best translated as ‘novice.’[14] Literally it means one who searches for silence, quiet, etc. Indeed, qiuji 求寂 is a well established translation for, amongst other

---

[12] See BHSD, s.v. Upāli on this form.

[13] According to Chang Kun, A Comparative Study of the Kathinavastu, p. 55, Dutt’s text omits the second part of this text (§18 in Chang) as given in the Chinese recension. Chang offers a translation of the text but fails to give the text. The original manuscript (Gilgit) needs to be consulted. Cf. MSVV, vol. 1, p. 250 (G. M. 154-5): tataḥ paścāt kathināstārako bhikṣuh sammantavyah / paṃcabhīr dharmaīh samanvāgatah kathināstārako bhikṣur asammato na sammantavyah sammataś cāvakāśayitavyah / katamaiḥ paṃcabhīh / avārṣiko varṣācchinnakah paścimakām varṣām upagato ‘nyatra varṣoṣitaḥ śikṣādattakah / aparair api paṃcabhīr na sammantavyah / pārīvāsiko mūlāparīvāsiko māṇīpya(cāro) mūlamāṇīpyacāra utkṣiptakah / apare pāmca na sammantavyah / chandd gacchati bhayād dveśan mohād bhayād gacchati / āśṛṭtam cānāśṛṭtam kathinam na jānati / paṃcabhīs tu dharmaīh samanvāgatah kathināstārako bhikṣur asammatas ca sammantavyah sammataś ca (nā) vakāśayitavyah / katamaiḥ paṃcabhīh / na cchandd gacchati na dveśan na mohān na bhayād gacchati / āśṛṭtānāśṛṭtam ca kathinam jānati. For a translation, see Chang, ibid., p. 68 (7).

[14] Cf. Chang’s observation (ibid., p. 71, note 4) that the “Chinese version has ‘novices’ instead of ‘monks who have spent the rains in other places.’"
terms for novices, śrāmaṇera.\(^{15}\)

Further passages that mention the śikṣādattaka are also to be found in the Pudgalavastu of the Gilgit Mulasarvāstivādin Vinaya.\(^{16}\)

\[
\text{athāparah [pudgalah] evam pārivāsika eva vaktavyāḥ / yathā pārivāsikah evam paryusitaparivāso mānāpyacārikaḥ caritamānāpyah śikṣādattakaś catuṣṭikāyāṁ yojayitavyāḥ / yathā vibhrāntah evam śramaṇodddeśakatvam pratijānāti / unmaṭtakatvam viśiptacittakatvam vedanābhinnakatvam adarśanāyotkṣiptakatvam}^{17}\text{ apratikarmāyotkṣiptakatvam apratiniśrito ca pāpake drṣṭigate utkṣiptakatvam iti vistareṇa yojayitavyam.}
\]

Then, there was a certain person who was thus declared to be indeed on the parivāsa [probation]. Just as one on the parivāsa [probation], one who has completed the parivāsa, one who is undergoing the mānāpya, one who has undergone the mānāpya and the śikṣādattaka are to be made use of within the set of four [pillars/walls?]. Just as one who is confused is approved as an attendant of the monks, one who is insane, one whose mind is distraught, one oppressed by painful sensations, one suspended for not seeing [an offence],\(^{18}\) one suspended for not making amends\(^{19}\) and one suspended for not giving up wrong views\(^{20}\) are to be made use of according to the full text.\(^{21}\)

This text appears to state that the śikṣādattaka and other saṅgha members suspended for various offences or on probation, etc., are to be made full use

\(^{15}\) Cf. BCSD, s.v. qiujiren 求寂人 which gives “anyatra varṣopagatasya.” The only problem with Hirakawa’s dictionary is that he does not give references. His source for this entry is probably this passage.

\(^{16}\) MSVV, vol. 2, p. 33. Note this is not intended to be a comprehensive list of passages.

\(^{17}\) See BHSD, s.v. utkṣiptaka.

\(^{18}\) Cf. Pāli āpattiya adassane ukkhepaniyakammam ‘formal act of suspension for not seeing an offence.’

\(^{19}\) Cf. Pāli āpattiya appatikamme ukkhepaniyakammam ‘formal act of suspension for not making amends for an offence.’

\(^{20}\) Cf. Pāli pāpikāya diṭṭhiya appatinissagge ukkhepaniyakammam ‘formal act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view.’
of by the *saṃgha* presumably as monastic menials. Indeed, this is supported at least by the Mūlasarvāstivādin daily work-schedule for the *śikṣādattaka* and the *pārīvāsika*.

---

21 Cf. Bagchi, ibid., p. 34: *athāparah pudgalah evaṃ pārīvāsikah paryuṣitaparīvāso māṇāpya ca rikas caritamāṇāpyaḥ *śikṣādattakaḥ ca vaktavyah / yathā vibhrāntah evaṃ śramaṇaḥōdakatvam pratijānāti / unmatkakatvam pratijānāti / vikṣiptacittakatvam vedanābhinnakatvam adarśanāyotkṣiptakatvam apratiniśrṣte pāpake dṛṣṭigate utkṣiptakatvam iti vistarena vācyam.
Chapter Eight
Conclusion

Having completed the present study of five Vinaya traditions it is perhaps timely to review our findings and see how they fit—if indeed they fit at all—into the wider context of Buddhological scholarship.

As mentioned in the introduction, Western Buddhology tends not to question interpretations of the term pārājika. This term is often translated—or mistranslated—along the lines of 'an offence which entails permanent and irrevocable expulsion.' This, however, is clearly not the case. As we saw in chapter two, transgression against a pārājika dharma may—but does not necessarily—lead to loss of communion. This loss of communion is simply an ecclesiastical ostracisation which prevents the concerned party from active participation in affairs of the Order and from reaping the benefits, be they material or spiritual, of association with the saṃgha. To all intents and purposes it is, for lack of a more appropriate term, a form of expulsion. Furthermore, this ecclesiastical rustication or asaṃvāsa which is meted out to a non-repentant offender of a pārājika is quite separate from the penance—pārājika penance—encountered in chapters three to seven.

In chapters three to seven we saw that if a bhikṣu commits a pārājika and does not make any attempt to conceal the fact, i.e. he is truly repentant and not just a blatant transgressor, he may be granted pārājika penance which, as we have seen, is quite separate from asaṃvāsa and does not entail expulsion or loss of communion. This penance—a penance in which the grantee is subject to various restrictions which differ greatly between the traditions surveyed—appears to be life-long in all of the traditions with the exception of the Mūlasarvāstivādin which seems to accept that a monk may be returned to purity and seniority upon attainment of arhatship.
The penitent monk is usually referred to as a śikṣādattaka and while this term is to be found in Edgerton’s dictionary of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, his existence is usually overlooked in Western Buddhology. The reasons for this oversight are simple: Western Buddhology—especially studies in monastic discipline—tends to place what is perhaps an undue emphasis on Theravādin materials and simply overlooks the extensive sources preserved in Chinese and Tibetan translations. This emphasis placed on Pāli materials is perhaps due to the fact that it is the only Vinaya which has been fully translated into English. Buddhologists, however, should neither limit themselves to English materials,¹ nor rely only on Pāli materials as these often give only a partial picture. In the same light, however, one should not limit oneself to Chinese sources as these are often unintelligible without cross-reference to Sanskrit, Tibetan or Pāli materials.

In Chinese and Japanese Buddhology, however, the śikṣādattaka is comparatively widely known. A number of Japanese scholars have briefly touched upon pārājika confession and penance. Hirakawa, who is accepted as an authority on monastic discipline, has categorically stated that pārājika penance is only applicable in cases of transgressions against the first pārājika and moreover is not available to the female samgha. This, however, is, as we have seen in the preceding chapters, mistaken. In chapter four, we encountered the hitherto undocumented śikṣādattā śrāmaneri or female (nun) penitent who is attested in numerous Chinese passages and at least one Sanskrit fragment.

¹ A. Huxley’s comments on his methodology are a perfect case in point. Huxley in an article on the Theravādin Vinaya states the following: “All quotations from the Pāli are my paraphrase of the standard English translations found in the Pali Text Society and the Sacred Books of the Buddhists series. This unscholarly procedure is bound to introduce some inaccuracies (as I don’t read Pāli), but it has one advantage. Since I indicate what I want the texts to say in my own words, it will be easier for the reader to judge whether I have mistaken the meaning of the English translation or drawn wrong conclusions from it.” (Andrew Huxley, “The Vinaya: Legal System or Performance-Enhancing Drug,” in The Buddhist Forum, 1996, p. 142, note 3).
Furthermore, in chapter five, we found a Sanskrit passage in the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin Bhikṣunī Vinaya which clearly refers the nuns to the story of Nandika—an indication that this tradition may have allowed nuns to be granted pārājika penance. In chapter six, we encountered karmavācanā texts which prescribe the exact formulae for granting penance to nuns who have not concealed pārājika transgressions. Furthermore, chapter six—the Dharmaguptaka chapter—also offered evidence to support the theory that pārājika penance also applies to offences other than just the first pārājika. Finally, chapter seven offers, albeit in a translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya samgraha, further evidence in support of the existence of the female penitent.

In sum, we have seen that violation of a pārājika does not necessarily entail expulsion. Indeed, if the offence has been committed without premeditation and subsequently not concealed, the transgressor may be granted pārājika penance under which they may remain within the Order subject to a number of restrictions. This procedure is open to monks and nuns alike. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that this penance may not have been restricted to only the first pārājika.

The śūkṣadattaka is to be found in the Vinaya traditions of the Mahīśāsakas, Sarvāstivādins, Mahāsāṃghikas, Dharmaguptakas and Mūlasarvāstivādins. References exist in at least Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese and Mongolian. Why then does the Pāli Vinaya of the Theravādins remain silent?

This question, and others like it, are not easily answered. Where such questions are easily answered, the answers are generally not readily accepted. Although only tentative hypotheses may be offered, comparative studies of these Vinayas afford us what may well be the only chance of solving such
mysteries. Accordingly, it is perhaps timely to review the data so far encountered in the first part of the Nandika story, viz. up to the granting of the penance, in the hope that this may shed some degree of light on these questions. This is perhaps best displayed in tabular form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparative table of the details of the Nandika story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text found in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text length approx. characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mention of Andhavana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat down under a tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditates constantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtains Worldly samādhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempted while in meditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of seductress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invites him to have sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She manifests herself as a beautiful woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is not conscious of actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He tries to control himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She persists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She takes off clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He agrees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Length due to the inclusion of a jātaka.
2 Name given in jātaka as Alambusā.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mahāśāsaka</th>
<th>Dharmaguptaka</th>
<th>Sarvāstivāda</th>
<th>Mālasārṣṭivāda</th>
<th>Mahāśāṅghika</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seducer wears flowers,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfumes and necklaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She runs away</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He tells her to stay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase ensues</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase to Jetavana moat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She disappears into a</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dead horse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is ablaze with desire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandika has sex with</td>
<td>The horse</td>
<td>The horse</td>
<td>The horse</td>
<td>She sits on his lap and then they have sex</td>
<td>The horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text states that women</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>States worldly meditations are not firm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are poison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar sentiments appear in Jātaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandika feels remorse</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He reflects on his</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He wonders if it is not</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a pāriṇāma as he has no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thoughts of concealing it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandika frets over</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loss of communion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes off robe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Presumably</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carries robe in right</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Places robe in bag over shoulder</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers himself with</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his left hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goes to Jetavana</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandika tells Monks</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monks do not believe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monks tell Buddha</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandika goes to Buddha</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>(Goes crying)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha expounding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharma to hundreds of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thousands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahiśāsaka</td>
<td>Dharmaguptaka</td>
<td>Sarvāstivāda</td>
<td>Mūlasarvāstivāda</td>
<td>Mahāsāṃghika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha sees Monk approaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha knows blood will come forth if he does not address Nandika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha knows without being told</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha asks why he is sad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk asked if he wants to continue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha states he should not be in communion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of jātaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granted pārājika penance</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon examination of the above tabulated details of the first part of the Nandika story, we come up with a number of interesting results. Firstly, it is significant to note that the Nandika story is common to both the Sthavira traditions, viz. Mahiśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda, and the tradition of the Mahāsāṃghikas. This in itself would tend to suggest that the story was in an ur-Vinaya before the great split between the Sthaviras and the Mahāsāṃghikas. The Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin recensions both agree with the Mahāsāṃghikas in identifying the city as Śrāvastī. The Mahiśāsakas remain silent on this and the Dharmaguptakas state that it was Rājagṛha. Thus, the Dharmaguptaka text does not contradict that of the Mahiśāsakas—the tradition it is often said to have grown out of. All texts, with the exception of that of the Mahiśāsakas which is unusually short, give

---

2 This, however, means very little in light of Schopen’s article, “If You Can’t Remember, How to Make It Up: Some Monastic Rules for Redacting Canonical texts,” in Baudhāvāsikā: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, pp. 571-582.

3 See, inter alia, S. N. Dube, Cross Currents in Early Buddhism, p. 72.
the name of the offender as Nandika. If we compare the Mahīśāsaka text with that of the Dharmaguptakas and, on account of the brevity of the former only consider that which occurs solely in the Mahīśāsaka text without a Dharmaguptaka parallel as a discrepancy, we find that there are only two minor variations between the two. Firstly, the Mahīśāsaka text states that the bhikṣu got up and grabbed at the seductress without being conscious [of what he was doing]. Secondly, the former text states that he immediately felt remorse; this, while not specifically stated in the first part of the Dharmaguptaka Nandika story, is perhaps covered by the fact that he wondered if he had actually committed a pārājika as he had no thoughts of concealing it—a feature not found in the Mahīśāsaka text.

If we now compare the same two texts, focusing on that which is additional to the Mahīśāsaka text in the Dharmaguptaka parallel, we find there are only five items which do not appear in the Mahīśāsaka recension. Firstly, the name of the city and of the monk have been omitted in the latter. The Dharmaguptaka text also states that the monk always enjoyed sitting in meditation and obtained the Worldly samādhi; although these details are left out of the Mahīśāsaka text this is perhaps understandable in light of the brevity of the text. The only other discrepancy is, as mentioned above, the fact that Nandika wonders if his offence really constitutes a pārājika. In short, the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka accounts are similar enough to justify a tentative hypothesis that either they share a common origin or one has developed out of the other.

The Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin recensions, however, are not so straightforward. Minor differences aside, these two recensions exhibit major

---

4 Although one Sanskrit text gives this monk's name as Nandika, we cannot be absolutely sure of the form. Tentatively taken as Nandika.
discrepancies with regard to Nandika’s lapse of chastity. The Sarvāstivādin text is in line with the other Sthavira traditions (not to mention the Mahāsāṃghikas for that matter) inasmuch as it tells of a bhikṣu who is tempted by a daughter of Māra only to have her run away and disappear into the carcass of a dead horse—a horse which the monk who is overcome with desire ends up having sex with. This is different from the Mūlasarvāstivādin recension in which Nandika has sex with the evil goddess after she sits on his lap. Here we have no mention of her refusal, no chase and no mention of a horse. The other differences are rather minor and in sum it seems fair to state that the recensions of the Mūlasarvāstivādin and Sarvāstivādin Vinayas have more in common with each other than with any of the other texts.

Thus we see that not only do the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka recensions appear to stem from the same branch, but in the Mūlasarvāstivādin and Sarvāstivādin recensions, despite one major discrepancy, it appears that one may have either developed from the other or that, at the very least, they share a common origin. What then of the Mahāsāṃghika text? This text is perhaps the most divergent of all; not only does it include a jātaka detailing a previous life of Nandika, but—and more importantly—this text does not allow Nandika to be granted pārājika penance. In fact there appears to be no mention of any such procedure in this passage. Pārājika penance does not appear until later in a quite separate skandhaka text. The question is, why? The actual story of Nandika’s lapse is in fact, for the most part, the same as that of the Sthavira traditions. In fact, if one glances down the column marked Mahāsāṃghika, it should be immediately apparent that this tradition represents the fullest account of the Nandika episode examined so far. Again, one finds oneself asking, why? Could it be that the Mahāsāṃghika text represents a recension which antedates any of the Sthavira recensions? Is it possible that whereas the Mahāsāṃghika recension may stem directly from an ur-Vinaya—or
at least represent an intermediate stage—the Sthavira texts represent a recensional history which has come down through a filter process and denote a much later development?

Now, given that pārājika penance is common to both the Sthavira and Mahāsāṃghika branches, why, then, is there no trace of this in the Theravādin Vinaya? Why does this tradition—a tradition which claims and indeed prides itself on its position as one of the oldest, most complete and accurate preservers of the word of the Buddha—not mention this at all? Could it be that this tradition preserves a stricter tradition than the stance taken by the Mahāsāṃghikas—a tradition which has often been accused of laxity?⁵ There is one problem with these statements—one big problem—the Mahīśasakas, Dharmaguptaka, Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda traditions are in all likelihood Sthavira schools⁶ as well.⁷ Although there is no simple solution to this, one possible answer is, as we have seen in Schopen’s work, the likelihood that the Theravādin Vinaya—the Theravādin Vinaya as we know it, that is—is perhaps not as old as it appears to be, and that pārājika penance has been systematically removed from it.

---

⁵ Janice J. Nattier and Charles S. Prebish offer a very convincing argument for these accusations to be dismissed as unfounded (“Mahāsāṃghika Origins: The Beginnings of Buddhist Sectarianism,” History of Religions, vol. 16, no. 3, Feb. 1977, pp. 237-272). Nattier and Prebish put forward a theory of Vinaya expansion on the part of the Sthaviras as the reason for the initial split, and explain the accusations of laxity as a case of shifting goalposts, viz. the espousal of the bodhisattva ideal in place of the arhat on the part of the Mahāsāṃghikas.


⁷ This whole area is exceedingly complicated. Although some chroniclers have produced lists in which the schools of the Mahīśasakas, Dharmaguptakas and Mūlasarvāstivādins are classified as Sarvāstivādin and viewed as separate from the Sthavira, e.g., Vinītadeva, for reasons of simplicity I have treated them as Sthavira traditions. For a detailed discussion on Buddhist sects and sectarianism, see, inter alia, Dube, pp. 37-89, Lamotte, pp. 517-548, Nattier and Prebish, ibid., and Barea, 1955.
It is perhaps useful to here examine the finer details of the penance granted to Nandika in order to see whether this sheds any light on the question of sectarianism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text found in</th>
<th>Mahīśāsaka</th>
<th>Dharmaguptaka</th>
<th>Sarvāstivāda</th>
<th>Mūlasarvāstivāda</th>
<th>Mahāsāṃghika</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text length approx. characters</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of penance</strong></td>
<td>Pārājika karman</td>
<td>Pārājika precept (?)</td>
<td>Rules of training</td>
<td>Life-long training</td>
<td>Pārājika penance karman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>波羅夷羯磨</td>
<td>波羅夷戒</td>
<td>學法</td>
<td>終身學處 ji srid 'tsho'i bar du bslab pa</td>
<td>波羅夷學悔羯磨</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitent's title</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Penitent 學侮人</td>
<td>(Pārājika) šikṣādattaka-śrāmanera</td>
<td>Penitent (bhikṣu)</td>
<td>šikṣādattaka-bhikṣu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(波羅夷戒)</td>
<td>(波羅夷羯磨)</td>
<td>授學苾芻 or 授學之人</td>
<td>授學苾芻 or 授學之人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>與學沙彌</td>
<td>bslab pa byin pa</td>
<td>bslab pa byin pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability to nuns</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability to all pārājikas</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisites</td>
<td>Non-concealment</td>
<td>Non-concealment</td>
<td>Non-concealment</td>
<td>Non-concealment</td>
<td>Non-concealment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of penance</td>
<td>Life-long</td>
<td>Life-long</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Life-long or until attainment of arhatship/6 months</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitent is to obey all rules for bhikṣus</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitent is to sit below full bhikṣus and/or above novices</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Sit &amp; walk</td>
<td>Also states he must not sit on the same seat</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitent is to give food etc., to full bhikṣus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Except 5 kinds of vegetable growth purified by fire or gold &amp; silver [to buy food?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitent is to receive food etc., from the factor/laity/novices</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Note, in compilation of this table I have, where necessary, drawn on texts from the relevant traditions (dealt with in the chapters above) other than the Nandika story.
2 Note, I have not included the karmavacanā in this calculation.
3 The comparatively long length of this text is due to the recounting of Nandika's attainment of arhatship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mahāsāsaka</th>
<th>Dharmaguptaka</th>
<th>Sarvāstivāda</th>
<th>Mūlasarvāstivāda</th>
<th>Mahāsāṃghika</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>May attend poṣadha and pravāraṇa</strong></td>
<td>No restriction</td>
<td>No restriction</td>
<td>May participate with full bhikṣus</td>
<td>He may not take lodgings in the same room</td>
<td>Forbidden—but must give proxy as to his purity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May not stay for more than 2 nights with full bhikṣus</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May not stay for more than 2 nights with laity or srāmaṇeras</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not more than 3 nights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May not make formal acts</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May not make up a quorum</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>That which is impure for bhikṣus to eat may also be impure for him</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>That which is impure for him to eat may also be impure for bhikṣus</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bhikṣus may not recite prātimokṣa to him</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bhikṣus may instruct him individually as to behaviour</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If formerly a reciter of the prātimokṣa he may no longer recite aloud</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(may recite mentally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expelled if re-offends against pārajaṭa dharma</strong></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duṣkṛta penance for saṅghāvasesa &amp; below</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May not impart ordination</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(novitiate or full)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May not impart guidance/accept dependence</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May not take charge of a srāmaṇera</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May not accept appointment to admonish bhikṣunis</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May not admonish bhikṣunis</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This is an over simplification. Cf. pp. 133 & 140, notes 14 and 45 respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Mahāsāṃghika</th>
<th>Dharmaguptaka</th>
<th>Sarvāstivāda</th>
<th>Mūlasarvāstivāda</th>
<th>May not discuss the Vinaya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May not accept appointment as monastic official</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept appointment to adjudicate</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept appointment as messenger</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not enter a village early</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not return in the evening</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must associate with bhikṣus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not associate with followers of other ways or the laity</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not recommit the same or another offence</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not commit a similar or an offence arising from this</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not commit a more serious offence</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not criticize a formal act</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not criticize the performer of a formal act</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept seating</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept a foot-wash</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept water for a foot-wash</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept wiping of sandals</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept massages</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept reverence</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept greetings</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept salutations</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept holding of robe</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept holding of bowl</td>
<td>Mahāsāsaka</td>
<td>Dharmaguptaka</td>
<td>Sarvāstivāda</td>
<td>Mūlasarvāstivāda</td>
<td>Mahāsāmpghika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accuse, remind or make a bhikṣu confess an offence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not testify to another’s affairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not suspend from prātimokṣa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not suspend from pravāraṇa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not engage in debate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not accept the joining of the palms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not share caṅkrama; if he does he is to yield a step</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not accompany a monk to house of an elder or brahmin; if they leave together he is to follow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He may not make rules</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise early, open gates &amp; collect lamps</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean dwellings &amp; latrine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resupply the latrines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring gaudīt, prepare seating, incense &amp; flowers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If able recite praises of Buddha; if unable request someone to do it</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan the monks in summer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quieten mind when receiving food</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather seating, eating utensils &amp; clean dining area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announce the date &amp; recite verses on giving; or request another if unable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Tibetan is rather different. Cf. pp. 179-180 (cf. also p. 174, note 14).
2 Tibetan is divergent here. Cf. p. 175, note 18.
The above tables represent the details of the penance granted to a šikṣādattaka across the various Vinaya traditions surveyed. Perhaps the first thing that catches one's attention is the amount of disparity between the traditions. In the first set of tables above—the details of the Nandika story—the Mahiśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka traditions exhibited a high degree of agreement, the kind of agreement one might expect given the accepted views of the historical relationship between these two traditions and the relative length of the two texts. Similarly, in the second set of tables—the details of the penance—we notice in the Mahiśāsaka tradition the same brevity encountered in the first part of the text. What is most significant, however, is not the relative length of these passages but their contents. The Mahiśāsaka text states only two observances for the penitent—neither of which have parallels in the Dharmaguptaka tradition. What is even more interesting, however, is the some 35 observances propounded for the šikṣādattaka in the Dharmaguptaka tradition which have not a single parallel in the Mahiśāsaka text on pārājika penance. In fact the only observance—if it can be called that at all—common to both traditions is the indifference to the šikṣādattaka's attendance at the poṣadha and pravāraṇa. Interestingly enough, however, a number of the 35 rules from the Dharmaguptaka tradition—which we have already seen have parallels in the Pārivāsikavastu—are not without parallel in the Mahiśāsaka Pārivāsikavastu.\footnote{A thorough examination of this text is needed. I have only glanced at it.} Why then is there no correspondence between the two passages concerning the šikṣādattaka?

It is extremely puzzling why two traditions which exhibit such a high degree of agreement with regard to the first part of the Nandika story display such a marked discordance in the latter part. If the two parts were separate texts then such discord may perhaps be explained. Here, however, it is not, at least not on the surface, the case. Although I have dealt with the Nandika
story as if it were two separate texts, it must be borne in mind that it purports to be, and indeed appears to be, one text. Why then are the similarities between the two traditions exhibited in the first part of the texts not encountered to at least some degree in the second part?

This divergence is by no means limited to the Mahīśāsakas and the Dharmaguptakas. The two Sarvāstivādin traditions also display a remarkable degree of diversity and discordance. The only observance which is identical in both traditions is the prohibition against making formal acts. The Mūlasarvāstivādin recension is not only much fuller than its Sarvāstivādin counterpart with regard to the details of the penance, but many of these, as do those of the Dharmaguptakas, seem to have no parallel in any other tradition. This non-agreement of the details of the śikṣādattaka’s penance, however, is not unique to the Sthavira traditions—the Mahāsāṃghika text is equally discordant. Although one would perhaps expect divergence between the Sthavira and the Mahāsāṃghika recensions, this divergence is not overtly apparent in the first part of the text. So, what is going on here?

If we adopt the standard approach of “higher criticism” which basically states that “if all known sectarian versions of a text or passage agree, that text or passage must be very old; that is, it must come from a presectarian stage of the tradition,” then we find ourselves with a number of problems. Firstly, taking this approach we would be forced to conclude that the first part of the Nandika story is very old and comes from a presectarian stage of the tradition. The second part, however, shows very little agreement. Thus, we would be encouraged to conclude that this is not very old and does not come from a presectarian stage of the tradition. How is this possible? In all but the

Mahāsāṃghika tradition the first and second parts are one text—how can a single text both postdate and antedate the development of sectarianism? It would seem that the first and second parts may have originally been separate texts which have been subsequently joined as one. Accordingly, as the Mahāsāṃghika tradition treats this story in two parts (not to mention the fact that the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya is generally accepted to be the oldest of the extant traditions),¹⁰ it seems that this might warrant further investigation.

A partial answer to this problem may lie in the position of the texts within their respective Vinayas. Both the Sarvāstivādin and Dharmaguptaka traditions include two recensions of this text. The story of Nandika is to be found in the vibhaṅga and an appendix to the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins. Similarly, the Dharmaguptaka tradition includes the text in a Vinaya appendix and the Pravrajyāvastu. Although the vibhaṅga appears at first glance to be the most logical place for this text, this is not supported by any of the other Sthavira traditions—its only parallel is to be found in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya. The Mūlasarvāstivādins place the text in their Kṣudrakavastu—this is not supported by any other extant tradition. Finally the Mahīśāsaka text is to be found in an addendum to their Vinaya.

Similarly, the second part of our text is generally to be found as a continuation of the first, with the exception of the Mahāsāṃghika tradition which treats this matter in two separate texts, the second appearing in a skandhaka passage. Furthermore, in the Sarvāstivādin tradition the entire story—both parts one and two—appears twice, once in the vibhaṅga and once in a Vinaya appendix. In addition to which the second part of the story also appears in a separate appendix as a text dealing with a procedural matter, viz.

¹⁰ Nattier and Prebish state that Barel, Pachow, Hofinger, Frauwallner and Roth all agree that “the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya represents the most ancient of all the Vinaya traditions” (ibid., p. 267).
how to deal with a šikṣādattaka—a text in which the tale of Nandika is mentioned but not retold. Yamagiwa has suggested that the appendices and addendum of the aforementioned three Sthavira schools in which our texts are contained may be a comparatively new stratum of text, as these sections all appear to comment on the prātimokṣa.\textsuperscript{11} This, however, requires further investigation.

Above, with regard to the Theravādin tradition’s apparent silence on the matter of pārājika penance, the possibility of lateral or inter-traditional borrowing was raised. Evidence for this phenomenon—albeit with regard not to pārājika penance, but to other Vinaya sections—has been previously given by Schopen.\textsuperscript{12} What we seem to have here, however, is not inter-traditional, but intra-traditional borrowing within the Vinaya traditions. Evidence for this is found first and foremost in the Dharmaguptaka text dealing with the details of the šikṣādattaka’s penance. As shown in chapter six this tradition appears to have borrowed its rules from those propounded for the pārīvāsika. The fact that both sets prohibit the grantee from committing a more serious offence than that for which he has been granted either pārājika penance or the parivāsa suggests that the observances for pārājika penance were borrowed from the Pārīvāsikavastu and not vice versa. Indeed, as there cannot be an offence more serious than a pārājika, it seems that the rules for a pārīvāsika have been borrowed with very little thought as to the implications of their appearance in a text detailing pārājika penance. This is given further credence by the almost exact correspondence in the Mulasārvāstivādin Vinaya between the pārīvāsika and the šikṣādattaka. Furthermore, the Chinese translation of the

\textsuperscript{11} Yamagiwa Nobuyuki 山槇伸之, Ritsukitei no tenkai ni okeru Samantapāsādikā no igi 律規定の展開におけるサマンタバーサーディカーの意義, in IBK, vol. 45, no. 1, p. 116.

\textsuperscript{12} Schopen, 1985.
Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya samgraha (T. 1458) states that there is only one difference between the two penitents, viz. the śikṣādattaka is to give food to others. This I take as being the same as “he is to give food to the full bhikṣus”—an observance strangely not found in the Mūlasarvāstivādin śikṣādattaka text, but in the corresponding passages of the Mahīśāsakas, Sarvāstivādins and Mahāsāṃghikas.

Furthermore, the similarities between the observances for the śikṣādattaka and śikṣamāṇās in the Mahāsāṃghika tradition—observances which appear to have no parallel amongst the other traditions surveyed—also point to the possibility of intra-traditional borrowing. This, however, raises another significant question, which is the origin of the eighteen rules for śikṣamāṇās—rules which are considerably different from the standard six which appear to be relatively uniform amongst the other traditions.

The discordance amongst the traditions in their treatment of pārājika penance may well suggest that these procedures developed quite well into the sectarian era. On the other hand, the fact that the Sthavira traditions and the Mahāsāṃghikas provide such provisions in their Vinayas suggests that it antedates sectarianism. One possible answer is that the practice of pārājika penance itself dates to before the original schism, but that the actual details may have been a matter of disagreement. Indeed, this would seem to account for the fact that the notion of pārājika penance is known to both sides of the original schism even though the actual details are markedly divergent. This, however, is no more than a fleeting supposition. More research is needed in this area, and it should be borne in mind that this (and the whole development of Buddhist sectarianism) is by no means a major theme of the present thesis.

The similarities in a number of traditions between the observances for pārājika penance and those for one who has concealed a saṃghāvaśeṣa offence,
viz. a pārivāsika, can, I think, be explained. With the exception of pārajikas, samghāvaśeṣas are considered to be the most serious of all offences. If the situation was to arise that a monk or nun was to be punished for a pārajika and, owing to the fact that he or she had perhaps been misguided or even beguiled,13 it was necessary to show a certain degree of compassion in one’s ruling, it seems logical that the punishment would have to be less severe than the loss of communion or asamvāsa imposed for a normal pārajika and yet it would also have to be at least equally severe to the punishment arising from transgression against a samghāvaśeṣa. Thus, it seems probable that the punishments for a samghāvaśeṣa would be, at the very least, a reasonable starting point from which one could develop a set of rules for such a punishment or penance. Furthermore, the śikṣamāṇā or probationary nun which is after all a kind of limbo state between novice nuns and fully ordained nuns, similarly provides a good model for what is after all a limbo state between novice monks and fully ordained monks. The problem, however, is what happens if this tradition—the Mahāsāṃghika—allows (and we know that it most likely did) pārajika penance for nuns as well?

As noted in the introduction, Schopen’s work has highlighted an apparent disparity in the Theravādin Vinaya between precept and what we know about actual practice concerning stūpa worship. Given the Theravādin Vinaya’s apparent silence with regard to pārajika penance, it may be useful to briefly examine the mapping between precept and practice in this connection.

13 The fact that a monk may be tempted or even seduced appears to be an important precursor to the development of pārajika penance. Indeed, most of the Nandika stories seem to make some kind of mention of the fact that Nandika was either not responsible for his action or that his responsibility was somehow diminished. This situation—an awareness that monks are susceptible to temptation—appears to have been one of the contributing factors to the Buddha’s inclusion of the clause about ‘not disavowing one’s training’ in the first pārajika.
In 1998, Professor Bhikkhu Dhammavihari an eminent Vinaya scholar happened to visit the University of Canterbury.\textsuperscript{14} When I told him of the story of Nandika and pārājika penance, he informed me that there was no textual basis for this in the Theravādin tradition. When pressed, however, he did state that monks who commit pārājikas are sometimes allowed to remain within the Order as novices in modern day Sri Lanka. He stated that although this was the actual practice, he did not know of any specific term used for it and that there was no charter for it in the Theravādin Vinaya.

Furthermore, with regard to Buddhism in Burma, Melford E. Spiro makes the following observations:\textsuperscript{15}

"...it is probably fair to say that cases of unchastity—among village monks, at least—are extremely rare. I discovered only one in my investigations. This was a village monk who is said to have had an affair some years ago with a woman of the same village. It came to an end when the woman became pregnant, and had an abortion. The same monk is alleged to have later taken up with another woman, and only when his behaviour became flagrant did he terminate the affair. When I arrived in his monastery, he was carrying out a special penitential ceremony which (so some of the villagers informed me) was an attempted atonement, four or five years later, for his sexual derelictions."

Similarly, Kitsiri Malalgoda, in Buddhism in Sinhalese Society 1750-1900, states in relation to gāmakāśī (village-dwelling) monks that "individual monks violated their vows of celibacy and maintained wives and children out of monastic funds."\textsuperscript{16} Moreover, Martin Southwold states that in Sri Lanka "it is a common saying that every temple has a well worn footpath at the back leading to the house of the priest’s mistress,"\textsuperscript{17} and also recounts the story of

\textsuperscript{14} August 7, 1998.

\textsuperscript{15} Melford E. Spiro, Buddhism and Society, pp. 366-367.

Gunajoti who was “a most disagreeable man and an exceptionally bad priest: eventually his colleagues in the Sangha tried him on the charge of brazenly keeping a mistress, and withheld the penalty of expulsion from the Sangha out of deference to Silaratana—who now takes care of him in his old age.”

If this in fact does happen, how do the monks remain within the Order? Is this not pārājika penance? Although one cannot say with certainty that all three cases are recording the same phenomenon, they appear, at least on the surface, to be essentially very similar. Of these three, Spiro’s observations are of particular import—if this is indeed pārājika penance it would represent a position more lax than any of the extant Vinayas as he states that it also applies to monks who have concealed their offences.

The *Theravādin Vinaya* as it exists today appears to contain no warrant for this practice; but has this always been the case? How do we account for what seems to be a modern-day Theravādin practice? If this is pārājika penance, then there would appear to be a discrepancy between practice and precept in the *Theravādin Vinaya* as we know it. If this is not pārājika penance one finds oneself asking the question, where did the monks first get the idea from? If, for the sake of argument, we rule out lateral borrowing\(^\text{19}\) we are left with what seems to be two possibilities. Either this is a vestige from a *Theravādin Vinaya* which is rather different from the Pāli text as we have it today\(^\text{20}\)—a

\(^{17}\) Martin Southwold, *Buddhism in life*, p. 27.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., p. 37.

\(^{19}\) On lateral borrowing, see Gregory Schopen, “Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit,” in *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, 10, 1985, pp. 9-47 (reprinted in Schopen, 1997). See esp. Schopen’s (1997, p. 29) re-interpretation of “higher criticism” and his comments as to the agreement of texts “not because they represent the old presectarian version, but because they almost certainly represent later, conflated, and fundamentally altered versions of an earlier tradition.”
vestige of practice which may have a common origin. Or a group, or groups, of monks have independently come up with a procedure for dealing with bhikkhus who have transgressed against pārājika dharmas but wish not to leave the Order, which coincidentally has been in place in, at the very least, the Vinayas of the Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas, Sarvāstivādins, Mūlasarvāstivādins and Mahāsāṃghikas since as early as the first decade of the fifth century C.E.

Thus we once again find ourselves asking whether or not the Vinaya really does regulate every aspect of monastic life. At least in the Theravādin tradition, it appears that the mapping of precept to practice is perhaps somewhat inexact. How then are we to understand the link between precept and Buddhist practice? Can we deduce from what appear to be essentially prescriptive precepts a descriptive sketch of Buddhist practice? If we are to tentatively

\[20\] Steven Collins (JPTS, 15, p. 89) suggests that we “reject the equation ‘the Pali Canon = Early Buddhism.’” Furthermore, he also states (ibid., p. 102) “It is well-known that Buddhism in South and Southeast Asia includes many more things than are described and prescribed in the Pali Canon; these are often seen as ‘later developments’, many of which are standardly but misleadingly referred to as ‘Mahāyāna elements’. Rather than see things in this way, I suggest, we should take this wider Buddhist culture as the contemporary context in which the move to an historicist ‘orthodoxy’ was made.”

\[21\] Yamagiwa Nobuyuki has pointed to a passage in the Pāli Samantapāsādikā which he states as evidence that the Theravādin tradition did in fact recognize pārājika penance (Yamagiwa, 1996, pp. 113-117). The phrase that Yamagiwa takes as such evidence is: so āgato na upasampādetabbo ti yadi hi evaṁ āgato upasampadaṁ labheyya sāsane agāravo bhaveyya sāmaṇerabhūmiyāṁ pana ṭhito sagāravo bhavissati atattaṁ ca karissatīti ńāvā anukampamāno ’va bhagavā āha: so āgato na upasampādetabbo ti (J. Takakusu and M. Nagai eds., Samantapāsādikā, vol. 1, p. 230). The passage in question deals with the Vajjins, the actions of whom prompted the Buddha to amend the wording of the first pārājika so as to allow for the declaration of weakness and disavowing of one’s training (see pp. 34-35 above). The major arguments of Yamagiwa’s article are complicated and will not be dealt with in any detail here. The text which Yamagiwa quotes may indeed be an indirect reference to the sīkkādatta. It is not, however, at least to me, totally certain. In any case, if indeed pārājika penance is mentioned in the Pāli Samantapāsādikā, this is further evidence that early commentators may have known a Pāli Canon vastly different from that which has reached us today.
accept that not every facet of monastic life is regulated by the Vinaya, this may help us to understand the above comments regarding the practices of Burmese and Sri Lankan monks. It is open to conjecture whether the Theravādin Vinaya originally contained procedures for pārājika penance or not. What seems certain, however, is that there appears to be a degree of discrepancy between Theravādin practice and the Theravādin Vinaya as we have it today.

Although our newly found knowledge of pārājika penance and the śīkṣādattaka does not definitively resolve these cases of contemporary Theravādin practice, it may be useful in re-examining a number of historical situations. It may, for example, in part explain details in the life of one of the great Buddhist translators—Kumārajīva 増摩羅什 (350?-409? C.E.).

According to Kumārajīva’s biography, he was forced to marry a Kuchan princess. Kumārajīva at first firmly declined and was told that his restraint did not exceed that of his late father who was also pressured into marriage. He was subsequently forced to drink wine and locked in a private room with the princess until he was compelled finally to lapse in chastity. Furthermore, at a later date the ruler Yao was apparently worried that as there was no one to match Kumārajīva in intellect, when he died the lineage of Dharma would be left without any heir. Accordingly, he forced Kumārajīva to accept ten courtesans. Thereafter, Kumārajīva no longer lived in the monastery but had separate quarters built and was richly provided for. Every time he delivered a

---

22 This is not to suggest that the Vinaya should necessarily be viewed as prescriptive rather than descriptive, nor should it be assumed to be reactive as opposed to pro-active.

lecture he would always begin by saying, "I may be compared with a lotus flower which comes forth from a stinking mire; take the lotus flower and not the stinking mire."24

We know from his biography that Kumārajīva received instruction in the Vinaya from Vimalākṣa.25 Furthermore, it is recorded that these two collaborated on the translation of the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya. Accordingly, if we assume that Kumārajīva was a monk of the Sarvāstivādin tradition, it is perhaps plausible to hypothesize that he may have been a sīkṣādattaka. Indeed, the fact that he did not dwell in the monks' quarters is perfectly in line with the Sarvāstivādin pārājika penance observances which state that a penitent may not spend more than two nights with bhikṣus, śrāmaṇeras or the laity. While this is merely speculation, it is nevertheless worth considering.

In trying to unravel the mysteries surrounding the development of pārājika penance—a challenge which I have not accepted in the present thesis—it seems reasonable that, as at least the concept of pārājika penance is common to both Mahāsāṃghika and Sthavira traditions, it may have roots in a pre-Buddhist Indian religious milieu.26 My reasons for suggesting such a link are not without a single shred of evidence: S. B. Deo in his History of Jaina Monachism, states that, "Under certain cases the punishment of the monk punished with pārāṇcika, was commuted."27 Although any connection


25 T. 2059, p. 332c16: 從卑摩羅叉律師受律。

26 Note Hirakawa (HC, vol. 14, p. 131) suggests that pārājika penance was most likely not an originally established procedure, but one which was introduced sometime within 100 years of the death of the historical Buddha, i.e. before the "fundamental schism (根本分裂)."
remains to be substantiated, it appears to perhaps be a good place to start looking.

In short, these questions cannot be answered here. A comprehensive comparative examination of the extant Pāṇḍulohitaka and Pārivāsikavastus, and the rules for śikṣamānas is needed. Such a study, however, is far outside the realm of the present thesis—a thesis which, one recalls, set out to clarify the fact that pārājika offences do not necessarily entail permanent and irrevocable expulsion from the samgha; which introduced the concepts of pārājika penance and the śikṣādattaka which have been sorely overlooked by Western Buddhological scholarship; and which stumbled across the hitherto unknown status of the female penitent, the śikṣādattā śrāmaneri. Although it appears that more questions may have been raised than answered, it is hoped that the present study may shed at least a couple of watts of light on the problem of pārājika penance in early Indian monastic Buddhism.

It is perhaps ironic that the bulk of this conclusion does not focus on pārājika penance per se, but on the development of sectarianism and Vinaya traditions and is quite a coincidental—although perhaps not unexpected—by-product of the present study. There is a train of thought emerging within some circles of scholarship which tends to view the Theravādin Vinaya as, so to speak, the odd one out; this, however, is by no means easy or perhaps even possible at the present time to prove. It is hoped, however, that the present thesis might stimulate academic discussion on this topic. Moreover, further

27 S. B. Deo, History of Jaina Monachism, p. 379. Note Deo’s transliterations appear to be rather inconsistent. Note also that Shatavadhani Jain Muni Shri Ratnachandraji Maharaj’s Ardha-Magadhi Dictionary, gives the following definition of pārāmciya (vol. 3, s.v.): “The 10th expiation so named which requires an ascetic to remain for a certain period in the garb of a householder.” It is worthy of note that this form of punishment for what appears to be roughly equivalent to a pārājika in Buddhism is only temporary. Indeed, the similarities between these two punishments have been pointed out by, inter alia, E. J. Thomas (Winternitz Festschrift, p. 163).
such studies may uncover additional evidence of intra-traditional borrowing or other patterns within the various Vinaya traditions which may indeed hold the key to unlocking the secrets of the development of Buddhist sectarianism.
Sarvāstivāda Appendix—
Chinese recension of the
Sarvāstivādin Nandika story

There are, as will be seen below, a number of minor lexical variations in the two recensions of the Nandika story as preserved in the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya. The first recension (T. 1435, pp. 2c29-3b7) is presumably a translation of the Nandika story as recited by Puṇyatara. As we know that the translation of all sixty-one fascicles of this text was interrupted by the death of Puṇyatara it seems fair to conjecture that the story found in fascicle fifty-seven is a translation of the text as recited by Dharmaruci. This may perhaps account for the minor lexical divergences found in the Chinese.

In the following pages I have presented the two different recensions of the Nandika story found in the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya. The text is based on that of fascicle one as it appears in the Taishō edition. For simplicity I will refer to the text in fascicle one as “A” and the text in fascicle fifty-seven (T. 1435, p. 425a14-b21) as “B.” I have made little attempt to edit the text except in that I have repunctuated freely. Where I have suggested a particular variant should be adopted I have included the variant in the main text and noted this in the footnotes. I have included in my apparatus all the variants as noted in the two recensions (A and B) of the Taishō. The sigla I have adopted in the footnotes are as explained in the introduction (pp. 17-18).¹

In all instances the first characters in the footnotes are those as they appear in the Taishō’s own apparatus. Where I have simply noted a variant reading with “A” or “B” it is to be understood that all witnesses are in

¹ Although there seems to be no mention of the Shōsōin edition in either recension A or B, the Shōsōin edition, and others for that matter, have clearly been used in the collation of the Chinese translation of the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya. Such evidence is noted in the Taishō’s own apparatus which includes variants from the Shōsōin edition. Accordingly, the variants noted are only those which are noted to appear in the fascicle in question.
agreement. Where there is disagreement within a single text I have noted the variants individually.

The text reads as follows:

佛在舍衛國。有一乞食比丘。名曰難提。晨朝時到著衣持鉢入城乞食。食已持尼師塗著左肩上入安桓林。在樹下敷尼師塗端坐。有魔天神欲破是比丘三昧故。化作端政女身在其前立。比丘從三昧起。見此女身即生著心。世俗禪定不能堅固。尋時退失欲摩女身。女人即却漸漸遠去。便起隨逐欲捉其身。時彼林中有一死馬。女到馬所則隱身不現。是比丘婬欲燒身故。便共死馬

---

2 Recension A (T. 1435, pp. 2c29-3b7); Recension B (T. 1435, p. 425a14-b21).
3 一 A: om. B
4 曰 A: om. B
5 晨朝時到 A: 中前 B
6 鉢 A\(^K\) M S Y, B: 盂 A\(^G\)
7 已 A: 竟 B
8 栓 A: 陀 B
9 在 A: om. B
10 端身 A: om. B
11 正 A: 大 B
12 魔天神 A: 魔天神來 B
13 故 A: om. B
14 政 A\(^K\): 正 A\(^G\) M S Y, B
15 身 A: 人 B
16 其 A: 比丘 B
17 見 A: 開眼見 B
18 身 A: 人 B
19 即 A: 即時 B
20 生 A: 起 B
21 著 A: 單著 B
22 能 A: om. B
23 尋時退失 A: 發婬心失禪定 B
24 遠 A\(^G\) M S Y, B: 連 A\(^Y\)
25 便 A: 是比丘即 B
26 欲捉其身 A\(^K\): 欲捉其女 A\(^G\) M S Y, om. B
27 彼 A: om. B
28 一 A: om. B
29 女 A: om. B
行^{35}姪。既^{36}行^{37}姪已欲熱小止。即^{38}生悔言。我已退^{39}鹽。非是比丘非^{40}釋種子。今^{41}諸比丘必捨遠^{42}我不復共^{43}住。我不應以^{44}不清^{45}淨身著此法衣^{46}。即脫袈裟袋^{47}著囊中以^{48}置肩上往^{49}詣佛所。爾時佛與百千萬衆^{50}恭敬圍邊^{51}而爲^{52}說法。佛遙見來^{53}即^{54}作是念。若我不以^{55}軟語勞問者^{56}。其心必破沸血^{57}當^{58}從面孔出。是比丘來^{59}到佛所。佛言。善來^{60}難提。汝更^{61}欲^{62}學^{63}比丘所^{64}學耶。聞^{65}佛所^{66}言善來^{67}難提。心大歡欣^{68}便^{69}作是

47 脫袈裟袋 A K: 脫袈裟袋 (in the Taiwanese reprint of the Taishō I am using the text is hard to read; the last character could be either 儲 or 禾) A^GMSY: 裝袈裟 B^K: 攝袈裟 B^GMSY

48 以 A: om. B
49 往 A: om. B
50 衆 A: 大衆 B
51 恭敬圍邊 A: 圍邊恭敬 B
52 而爲 A: om. B
53 來 A: 是比丘來 B
54 即 A: om. B
55 以 A: om. B
56 者 A: om. B
57 其心必破沸血 A: 是人必破心肝熱血 B
58 當 A: om. B
59 來 A: om. B
60 來 B: 截 A
念。我當得共諸比丘住必不壞我。如是思惟已答。世尊。我更欲學比丘學法。爾時佛語諸比丘。汝等還與難提比丘學法。若有如難提比丘者亦與學法。應一心和合僧。難提比丘偏袒右肩脫革屣胡跪合掌作如是言。大德僧聽。我難提比丘。不捨戒戒不羸不出作姦法。我今從僧還乞學法。僧憐愍我故。還與我學法。第二第三亦如是說。是中一一比丘於僧中唱。大德僧聽。難提比丘不還戒戒不羸作姦法。今僧憐愍故還與學法。若僧時到僧忍聽。還與難提

61 更 A: 能 B
62 欲 A: 還 B
63 學 A<sup>KMSY</sup>, B: 覺 A<sup>9</sup>
64 所 A, B<sup>K</sup>: om. B<sup>GMSY</sup>
65 間 A: 是比丘聞 B
66 所 A: om. B
67 來 B: 靡 A
68 欽 A<sup>K</sup>: 喜 A<sup>GMSY</sup>, B
69 便 A: om. B
70 答 A: 答佛 B
71 更 A: 能 B
72 欲 A: 還 B
73 學法 A: 所學 B<sup>K</sup>: 學 B<sup>GMSY</sup>
74 語 A, B<sup>GMSY</sup>: 告 B<sup>K</sup>
75 者 A, B<sup>K</sup>: om. B<sup>GMSY</sup>
76 趣 A: 趣 B
77 如 A: om. B
78 聽 A, B<sup>GMSY</sup>, 憶念 B<sup>K</sup>
79 捨 A: 還 B
80 不出 A: om. B
81 法 A: 欲 B
82 我 A: 我難提 B
83 今 A: om. B
84 還乞 A: 乞還 B
85 我 A: 難提 B
86 說 A: 乞 B
87 是 A, B<sup>GMSY</sup>: 衆 B<sup>K</sup>
88 於 A: 應 B
89 唱 A: 唱説 B
90 法 A: 欲 B
91 是 A: om. B
比丘學法。白如是。如是用白四羯磨還與難提比丘學法竟。僧忍默然故是事如是持。與學沙彌行法者。佛所結一切戒盡應受行。在諸比丘下坐。應授與大比丘飲食湯藥。自從沙彌白衣受飲食。不得與大比丘同室過二宿。自不得與白衣沙彌過二宿。得與具戒比丘作布薩自恣二羯磨。與學沙彌不得足數作布薩自恣羯磨。一切羯磨不得作婬事竟。
—Mahāsāṃghika Appendix—
Chinese recensions of the Mahāsāṃghika Nandika story

The Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghikas or Mohosengqi lü 摩訶僧祗律 (T. 1425), we recall, appears to have been translated into Chinese sometime between the years 416-418 C.E. by Buddhahadra 佛陀跋陀羅 (359-429 C.E.) and Faxian 法顯 (ca. 340?-420? C.E.).\(^1\) The text of the Nandika story is to be found in fascicle one (vibhaṅga) of this Vinaya. There is, however, another extant recension of this story. It appears in fascicle nineteen of the Jinglīyixiang 經律異相 (T. 2121).

The colophon of the first fascicle of the Jinglīyixiang tells us that it was compiled by śramaṇa Sengmin 僧旻 (467-527 C.E.) and Baochang 寶唱 (ca. fl. 495-516 C.E.) under Imperial decree in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tianjian 天覲 (516 C.E.) during the Liang Dynasty [502-557 C.E.].\(^2\) The preface to this text contains the following information as to its compilation:\(^3\)

勃寶唱鈔經律要事。皆使以類相從。令覓者易了。又勃新安寺釋僧豪。興皇寺釋法生等。相助檢讞。於是博綜經籍擇揵採祕要。上畧神慮取則成規。凡各五十卷。又目録五卷。分為五秩。名為經律異相。將來學者。可不勞而博矣。

Baochang was ordered by Imperial decree to summarize the main points of the Sūtras and Vinaya, arranging them in a logical order to make it easier to understand for the reader. Furthermore, Shi Senghao of Xin’an Temple, Shi Fasheng of Xinghuang Temple and others were ordered by Imperial decree to assist in proof-reading. Here, from a vast collection of

---

\(^1\) Cf. p. 106 above.

\(^2\) 梁沙門僧旻寶唱等集 K: 梁天覲十五年沙門寶唱等奉勅撰 SY: 梁沙門寶唱撰 M: 梁天覲十五年奉勅撰 G


\(^4\) 擇 K: 搜 GMSY

\(^5\) It is hard to tell whether the Taishō edition has 詢 or 詢. Latter understood.

\(^6\) 神 K: 宵 GMSY

\(^7\) 凡 KM: 已 SY
scriptures they have synthesized the subtle essence. Having consulted Imperial opinion on high, they have selected and completed rules and regulations. Altogether it totals fifty fascicles, as well as five fascicles of catalogues. It is divided into five sections and called the Jinglùyìxiàng “Differences and Similarities of the Sūtras and Vinaya.” Those who study it in the future will be able to become well informed without toil.

It is worthy of note that the Nandika story was obviously considered important enough to warrant its inclusion here in the Jinglùyìxiàng. The text of our story in the Jinglùyìxiàng appears to be extremely divergent among the various recensions collated by the redactors of the Taishō. This divergence is perhaps best explained with reference to the original source, viz. the Mahāsāṃghika vibhaṅga. For the purposes of the present discussion I will divide the Mahāsāṃghika recension of the Nandika story into five sections—T. 1425, p. 232a13-b19 (which I will call “A”) represents the story of Nandika up to the point where the Buddha explains to the bhikṣus that Nandika was also beguiled by this goddess in a previous age, p. 232b19-c18 (“B”) is the story of Nandika’s past life up to the first gāthās, p. 232c19-22 (“C”) is the first set of gāthās, p. 232c23-29 (“D”) tells of Indra’s arrival, p. 233a1-2 (“E”) is the second set of gāthās, and p. 233a3-26 (“F”) concludes the story of Nandika.

From the footnotes in the Taishō it appears that—and this is only tentative as the notes in the Taiwanese reprint of the Taishō are often illegible—the Ming edition of the Jinglùyìxiàng radically abridges A and B (approx. 64 vertical columns in the Mahāsāṃghikā vibhaṅga is abridged to only 27), whereas the editions of G, S and Y only slightly condense them (59 columns). It is these two sections in which the Nandika story as found in the Jinglùyìxiàng exhibits extreme compression. Due to the difficulties of collating such divergent texts the editors of the Taishō present the Ming recension of A and B at T. 2121, p. 103b28-c25 and the recensions of G, S and Y at pp.
Recensions G, M, S and Y of sections “C,” “D” and “F” are all collated together at pp. 103c26-104a20. Note, however, that the second set of gāthās (“E”) has no parallel in the text of the Jinglūyixiang. As for recension K nothing is specifically mentioned and although further investigation is needed, I am assuming that it reads with GMSY. I cannot overemphasize the fact that this is extremely tentative and requires much more work.

The relationship between the texts can perhaps be best explained by way of a diagram. The diagram below shows three blocks representing the Nandika story found in the Mahāsāṃghika vibhaṅga (all recensions), recensions G, S and Y of the Jinglūyixiang, and that of the Ming edition respectively. Each block is roughly to scale and proportionally represents the length of its Nandika story (approx. 2mm per vertical line of text).

In collating the texts I have followed the lead of the editors of the Taishō insofar as I have treated the Ming recension of A and B as a separate text and have accordingly presented it on pages 243-244 below. As A and B of the G, S and Y recensions of the Jinglūyixiang agree—excepting minor variants—with the Mahāsāṃghika vibhaṅga, these have been collated below with the vibhaṅga text (“V” = vibhaṅga, “J” = Jinglūyixiang; minor variations amongst the witness texts of each are given in superscript letters). Where I have used “J” without any superscript letters it is to be understood that G, S and Y agree.
復次佛住舍衛城。廣說如上。時舍衛城有長老名難提。信家非家捨家出家。於舍衛城衆所知識。能致供養四事具足。餘多名難提者。但是長老行時亦禪。住時亦禪。坐時亦禪。作時亦禪。時人名之為禪難提。時難提於開眼林中作草庵舍。彼於其中初中後夜修行自業。得世世正受乃至經七年。過七年已退失禪定。復依一樹下遷習正受乃求本定。時魔眷屬常作方便。於行正法人伺求其短。變為人形端正無比。種種花香璎珞以嚴其身。於難提前住。謂難提言。比丘共相娛樂行姦事來。時難提言。惡邪速滅惡邪速滅。口作此言而目不視。天女復第二第三所說如上。時難提第二第三亦如是說。惡邪速滅惡邪速滅。而不觀

---

8 Section A begins here.
9 復次 V: om. J
10 廣說如上。時舍衛城 V: om. J
11 老 V: om. J
12 名 V: 名曰 J
13 信家非家 V: om. J
14 家 V: 俗 J
15 於舍衛城衆所知識…但是長老 V: om. J
16 行時亦禪 V: 行 J
17 住時亦禪 V: 住 J
18 坐時亦禪 V: 坐 J
20 時人名之 V: 名 J
21 時 V: 是時 J
22 過七年 V: om. J
24 於行正法人 V: om. J
25 短 V, J: 便 J: 短
27 花 V: 華 J
29 以嚴其身 V: om. J
30 於難提前住 V: 住難提前 J
31 難提 V: om. J
32 作 V, J: 難 J: 作
視35。時天女便脫璎珞36之服露其形體。立難前語難提言。共行姦來。時
難提見其37形相而生欲心。答言可。爾時天女漸漸却行。難提喚言。汝可小
住共相娛樂。難提往就。天女疾疾而38去。難提追逐到祇洹塪39。塔中有王
家死馬。天女到死40馬所隱形不現41。時難提欲心熾盛即姦死馬。欲心息已
便作是念。我甚不善非沙門法。以信出家而犯波羅夷罪。用著法服食人信
施為。即脫法服42著右手中。左手掩形而趣43祇洹44語比丘言。長老我犯波
羅夷我犯波羅夷45。時諸比丘在祇洹門間。經行仿佯思惟自業46。共相謂
言。此是坐禪難提修梵行人。不應犯波羅夷。難提復言。諸長者不爾。我實
犯波羅夷。諸比丘即47問其48因49緣。難提具說上事50。諸比丘以是事具白世
尊。佛告諸比丘。是難提善男子自說。所犯重罪。應當驅51出。時諸比丘如
教驅出。諸比丘白佛言。世尊云何長老難提久修梵行。而為此天女之所誘
惑。佛告諸52比丘。是難提比丘53不但今日為天女所惑退失梵行。過去世時
亦為54彼所55惑失於梵行。諸比丘白佛言。已56曾爾耶57。佛言如是。58

34 亦 V: 亦復 J
35 懚 V: 亦復 V KMSY, J: 亦復 V N
36 璎珞 V KMSY, J: 高珞 V N
37 其 V, J: om. J G
38 疾而 V: om. J
39 蠕 V: om. J
40 死 V: om. J
41 現 V: 見 J
42 服 V: 衣 V GMSY, J
43 趋 V KMSY, J: 起 V G, 起 V N
44 灘 V, J: 桓 J GS
45 我犯波羅夷 V: om. J
46 仿佯思惟自業 V: om. J
47 即 V: om. J
48 其 V KMSY, J: om. V N
49 因 V J: om. V GMSY
50 具說上事 V: 即具說之 J
51 當驅 V: 驅當 J
52 諸 V: om. J
53 比丘 V K, om. V GMSY, J
54 亦為…阿槃提國 V: om. J G
55 所 V: text illegible in J (om.?)
56 已 V KM, 以 V GNSY
佛告諸比丘⁵⁹。過去世時有城名波羅奈。國名迦尸。時⁶⁰南方阿槃提國。有⁶¹
迦葉氏外道出家。聰明博識綜練群籍⁶²。衆技能妙術⁶³靡不開⁶⁴達。彼外道者
助王治國。時彼國王執持姦賊種種治罪。或截手足髡其⁶⁵耳鼻治之甚
苦。時彼外道深自憤⁶⁶怒。我已出家云何與王共參此事。便白王言聽我出
家。王即答⁶⁷言。師已出家。云何方言復⁶⁸欲出家。答言。大王。我今豫⁶⁹此
種種刑罰。苦惱眾生。何名出家。王即問言。師今欲於何道⁷⁰出家。答
言。大王。欲學仙人出家。王言可爾。隨意出家。去城不遙⁷¹有百巖山。有
流泉浴⁷²池花⁷³果茂盛。即造彼山起⁷⁴立精⁷⁵舍。彼於山中修習外道。得世俗
定起五神通。於春後月⁷⁶食諸果蓏四大不適。因其小行不浄流出。時鹿⁷⁷爰
群共相騫逐⁷⁸。渴乏求⁷⁹水飲此小便。不浄著舌舐其產道。衆生行報不可思
議因是受胎。常在廬⁸⁰側食草飲水。至期⁸¹月滿産一小兒。爾時仙人出行採

⁵⁷ 耶[V]: 也[V⁴⁶⁵⁷]
⁵⁸ Section A ends and B begins.
⁵⁹ 諸比丘白佛…佛告諸比丘 V: om. J
⁶⁰ 有城名波羅奈國名迦尸時 V: om. J

⁶¹ 有[V]: there is an asterisk in the text denoting a repeated footnote but I cannot locate the original.
⁶² 綜練群籍 V: 博綜典籍 J
⁶³ 衆技能妙術 V: om. J
⁶⁴ 開[V⁴⁶⁵⁷]: 關[V⁴]
⁶⁵ 或截手足髡其[V⁴]: 或截手足髡其[V⁴⁶⁵⁷]: 割截 J
⁶⁶ 惟[V, J⁴]: 唯 J⁴
⁶⁷ 答[V, J⁴]: 答曰 J⁴
⁶⁸ 復[V]: 我 J
⁶⁹ 豫[V]: 預 J
⁷⁰ 道[V]: om. J
⁷¹ 遠[V⁴⁶⁵]: 遠[V⁴⁶⁵]: J
⁷² 浴[V, J⁴]: 玉 J⁴⁶⁵
⁷³ 花[V]: 華 J
⁷⁴ 起[V]: 而 J
⁷⁵ 精[V]: 靜處 J
⁷⁶ 月[V]: 日 J
⁷⁷ 鹿[V, J⁴]: 有牝鹿 J⁴⁶⁵
⁷⁹ 求[V⁴⁶⁵]: 求[V⁴⁶⁵]: 须 V⁴⁶⁵
⁸⁰ 廬[V⁴⁶⁵]: 廬[V⁴⁶⁵]: 阿字
果。鹿産難故即大悲鳴。仙人聞鹿鳴急謂為惡虫所害。欲往救之。遂見生一見小兒。仙人見已怪而念曰。云何畜生而生於人。尋入定思惟見本因縁。即是我子。於彼小兒便生愛心。裹以皮衣持歸養之。仙人抱舉鹿母乳之。漸漸長大名為鹿斑。依母生故體斑似母。故作字名曰鹿斑。是童子漸漸長大至年七歲。遜弟尊長仁愛孝慈。採取水果供養仙人。是時仙人念言。天下可畏無過女人。即便教誡子言。可畏之甚無過女人。敗正殺德靡不由之。於是教以禪定化以五通。如所說一切衆生類。靡不歸於死。隨其業所趣。自受其果報。為善者生天。惡行入地獄。
行道修梵行 漏盡得泥洹
爾時仙人即命終。於時童子淨修梵行得外道四禪。起五神通有大神力。能移山住流揭摸日月。爾時釋提桓因乘白龍象來行世間。誰有孝順父母供養沙門婆羅門。有能布施持戒修梵行者。案行世界時見是仙人童子。天帝念言。若是童子欲求帝釋梵王。皆悉能得宜應早壞。如所說
諸天及世人 一切衆生類
莫不為結縛  命終墮惡道
皆為憍嫉二結所縛。諸天有三時鼓。諸天阿修羅共戰時打第一鼓。俱毘羅園衆花開敷時打第二鼓。集善法講堂聽善法時打第三鼓。釋提桓因説法鼓。無數百千天子皆悉來集。俱白帝釋何所説勥。帝釋告言。闍浮提有仙人童子。名曰鹿斑。有大功德欲方便壞之。時無數天子聞此不樂。便自念言壞此人者。將滅損諸天衆增益阿修羅。中有平心無當成敗無在。又復歡喜助欲壞之。有一子而唱是言。誰應行者。時有答言是天女應行。是諸天人遊觀諸園。在歡喜園者。在雜色園者。在鬱遜園者。天女應行。而便召之。應時百千天女皆悉來集。有一天女名阿藍浮。其髮雜色。髪有四色青黃赤白。故名雜色。差此天女往闍浮提壞鹿斑童子。時彼天女白帝釋言。我自昔以來數壞人梵行令失神通。願更遣餘天女端正嚴好令人樂者。時天帝釋復於衆中種種説偈勸喻天女。阿藍浮。汝可使行壞俱舍頻頭。如生經中説。於是天女即壞仙人童子。佛告諸比丘。爾時仙人童子俱舍頻頭者豈異人乎。即今禪難提是。天女阿藍浮者。今此天女是。而難提曾已為其所壞。今作比丘復為其所壞。爾時世尊。語諸比丘。乃至非人中亦犯波羅夷。不應共住。
T. 2121, pp. 103b26-104a20 reads:

佛在舍衛城。有比丘名難提。行住坐臥心常念定。過七年已退失禪定。復依樹下還習正受欲求本定。魔伺其便變為女人端正無比。於其前住而語之曰。比丘共我行婬來。難提言。惡邪速滅。惡邪速滅。口雖發言而目不視。第二第三皆亦如是。天女即脫衣露形立難提前。難提見其形相欲心染著。爾時天女漸次却行。難提喚言。汝可小住。天女疾至祇洹僧中。甄有死馬。天女於此隱形不現。難提欲心熾盛即妊此死馬。欲心息已自念不善。即脫法衣而往祇洹。語比丘言。我犯重罪。比丘即問因緣。難提具說。比丘以事白佛。佛令驅出。比丘白佛言。難提久修梵行。云何為女所惑。佛言。難提不但今為女所惑。過去亦然。

過去世時南方阿槃提國。有迦葉氏外道出家。聰明博識。助王理國。王執國法拷治姦賊。外道念言。我已出家云何共王詳斷此事。即白王言。我欲出家。王言。師已出家。云何方言我欲出家。答言。我今預此種種刑法。何名出家。我今欲依仙法出家。王言可爾。即於百巖山造立精舍。修習仙法。得五神通。忽因小行不淨流出。時有牝鹿。飲此小便。舐其產門。即便有胎產一小兒。仙人往見鹿生兒。怪而念曰。云何畜生而生於人。入定觀之。知是其子收而養之。依母生故體斑似鹿。故名鹿斑。仙人念言。敗正毀德莫過女子。於是教以禪定。化以五通。為説偈言

一切衆生類 麽不歸於死
隨其業所趣 自受其果報
為善者生天 惡行入地獄
行道修梵行 漏盡得泥洹

爾時仙人即便命終。於是童子淨修梵行。獲五神通。釋提桓因。乘白龍

---

109 As explained above, sections A and B of this text only represent the Ming text.

110 Section A begins here.

111 Section A ends; B begins.

112 Section B ends; C begins.

113 惡行 GK: 行惡 MSY

114 一切…泥洹 KMSY: om. G

115 即便 K: 便即 GMSY
象案行世間。誰有孝順父母供養沙門婆羅門。又能布施持戒修梵行者。案行世界時見是仙人童子。天帝念言。若其童子欲求帝釋梵王。皆悉能得。宜應早壞。乃設方便乃扣法鼓。百千天子皆悉來集。帝釋告言。聞浮提中有一仙人童子。名曰鹿斑。有大功德。欲便壞之。時諸天子聞此不樂。便自念言。壞此人者。將滅損諸天衆。增益阿修羅。有一天子而唱是言。誰應行者。時有答言。是天女應行。即便召之。應時百千天女皆悉來集。有一天女名阿藍浮。其髮雜色。髮有四色青黃赤白。故名雜色。差此天女往聞浮提。壞鹿斑童子。時彼天女白帝釋言。我自昔已來。數壞人梵行令失神通。願更遣餘天女端正嚴好令人樂者。時帝釋復於衆中種種誡勸喻天女。於是天女即壞仙人童子。佛告諸比丘。爾時仙人童子豈異人乎。即今禪難提是。天女阿藍浮者。今此天女是。

T. 1425, p. 441a28-c7 (the details of Nandika’s penance):

佛住舍衛城。廣說如上。爾時舍衛城中。有難提不樂在家。捨家出家。行亦禪。住亦禪。坐亦禪。臥亦禪。時亦有衆多難提即名此禪難提。如波羅夷中廣說。諸比丘即驅出。出已在祗桓門間立啼。作是言。長老。我犯波羅夷。無一念覆藏心。我樂袈裟。不欲捨離佛法。時難提母來復啼。作是言。我兒樂出家而世尊驅出。難提姊復來亦啼。作是言。我弟樂作沙門。而

110 獲五神通 K: 得外道四禪起 (?) character illegible in Taishō reprint; assume 五神通有大神力。能移山駐流捲捲日月爾時 GMSY
111 順 KMSY: 從 G
118 時見...童子欲 KMSY: om. G
119 Section D ends here; note section E is omitted—F begins.
120 斑 KMY: 斑 GS
121 斑 KMY: 斑 GS
122 阿 K: 阿盧 GMSY
123 諸 K: om. GMSY
124 桓 K: 桓 GMSY
世尊驅出。諸比丘以是因緣。往白世尊。佛告諸比丘。是難提犯波羅夷。無一念覆藏心。僧應與波羅夷學悔羯磨。此人應從僧乞。偏袒右肩胡跪合掌。作是說。大德僧聽。我難提犯波羅夷。無一念覆藏心。今從僧乞波羅夷學悔羯磨。如是三乞。羯磨人應作是說。大德僧聽。難提比丘犯波羅夷。無一念覆藏心。已從僧乞波羅夷學悔羯磨。若僧時到。僧應與難提波羅夷學悔羯磨。白如是。大德僧聽。難提比丘犯波羅夷。無一念覆藏心。已從僧乞波羅夷學悔羯磨。僧今與難提比丘波羅夷學悔羯磨。諸大德忍僧與難提比丘波羅夷學悔羯磨者。若不忍者便說。是第一羯磨。第二第三亦如是說。僧已與難提比丘波羅夷學悔羯磨竟。僧忍默然故。是事如是持。此人應在一切比丘下坐一切沙彌上。不得與比丘同屋過三宿。復不得與沙彌過三宿。比丘不淨食彼亦不淨。彼不淨食比丘亦不淨。得與比丘授食。除火淨五生種及金銀。彼應從沙彌受食。比丘不得向說波羅提木叉。波羅夷罪。僧伽婆尸沙乃至越毘尼罪。得語言不得作非梵行。不得殺。不得盜。不得妄語。不得飲酒。如是一一得教授。若本誦波羅提木叉者。不得高聲誦。若敬法者。得心誦。不得聽布薩受自恣。布薩。受自恣。到僧中作如是言。我清淨僧應還。如是三說已應還。四波羅夷中。若有犯者。應驅出十三僧伽婆尸沙已下一切作突吉羅悔。是名與波羅夷學悔羯磨隨順行。
Dharmaguptaka Appendix
Chinese recension of the
Dharmaguptaka Nandika Story

The Nandika story as preserved in the Dharmaguptaka tradition exists in two recensions of their Vinaya. The first text is to be found in fascicle thirty-four at T. 1428, p. 809a8-c2 (Pravrajyāvastu). The second recension is in an appendix (diabu 調部) in fascicle fifty-five at T. 1428, pp. 972c11-973a3. Both recensions are virtually identical and thus allow us to collate them together indicating lexical variants in the footnotes. The text of fascicle 34 is referred to as “A,” and fascicle 55 as “B.” I have generally used recension A as the base text and give B in the footnotes except where otherwise noted. The texts read as follows:

爾時佛1在羅閱2城。城中3有一比丘。字難提4。常樂5坐禪得世俗定6心解脫。彼7從第四禪8起9。時魔女10來11在前立。彼12比丘捉欲犯。魔13即14出外。比丘亦隨出外。彼魔15出屋欄16外。比丘亦隨出屋17欄18外。彼出中庭。比丘亦至19中庭。魔復20出至21寺外。比丘亦至22寺外。寺外有死

---

1 佛 A: 世尊 B
2 羅閱 A: 王舍 B
3 城中 A: om. B
4 有一比丘字難提 A: 有難提比丘 B
5 常樂 A: om. B
6 定 A: om. B
7 彼 AKN, om. A GMSY, B
8 第四禪 B: 四禪 A
9 起 A: 覺已 B
10 魔女 A: 魔天女 B
11 來 A: 即 B
12 彼 A: om. B
13 魔 A: 魔女 B
14 即 A: 便 B
15 魔 A: om. B
16 欄 AKN, B : 蘭 A GSY, B : 鬧 A M
17 屋 A, B GMSY, om. B N
18 欄 AKN, B GMSY, 蘭 A GSY, B : 鬧 A M
驛\textsuperscript{23}馬。時\textsuperscript{24}魔\textsuperscript{25}至\textsuperscript{26}死馬所即\textsuperscript{27}滅。天身\textsuperscript{28}不現。時難提比丘。即\textsuperscript{29}於此\textsuperscript{30}死馬所\textsuperscript{31}作\textsuperscript{32}不淨行。行不淨\textsuperscript{33}已。都無\textsuperscript{34}覆藏心。便\textsuperscript{35}作是念。世尊與\textsuperscript{36}比丘\textsuperscript{37}制戒。若比丘作不淨行\textsuperscript{38}。波羅夷不共住。我\textsuperscript{39}今犯\textsuperscript{40}不淨行\textsuperscript{41}。無\textsuperscript{42}有覆藏心。將\textsuperscript{43}不\textsuperscript{44}犯波羅夷耶。我今\textsuperscript{45}當云何。即語親友\textsuperscript{46}比丘言\textsuperscript{47}。世尊與\textsuperscript{48}比丘\textsuperscript{49}結\textsuperscript{50}戒。若犯\textsuperscript{51}不淨行者\textsuperscript{52}。得波羅夷不共住。今我\textsuperscript{53}犯姦\textsuperscript{54}不淨行\textsuperscript{55}。都
無覆藏心。將^{56}無犯波羅夷耶。善哉長老。為我往^{57}白世尊^{58}。若有教
勅^{59}。我當奉行。時諸比丘。以^{60}此因緣具白世尊。世尊以^{61}此因緣。集比丘
僧告言。僧今^{62}與難提比丘^{63}波羅夷戒白四羯磨。作^{64}如是與。使^{65}難提^{66}比
丘到^{67}僧中偏露右臂脫革履^{68}禮僧足^{69}右膝著地合掌作如是白。大德僧
聽。我難提比丘。犯不浄行^{70}無覆藏心。今從僧乞波羅夷戒。願僧與我波
羅夷戒。慈愍故^{71}。如是第二第三說。衆中應差堪能羯磨者^{72}如上作如是
白。大德僧聽。此難提比丘。犯不浄行^{73}無覆藏心。今從僧乞波羅夷
戒。若僧時到僧忍聽。僧今與難提比丘波羅夷戒。白如是。大德僧聽。此難
提比丘。犯不浄行^{75}無覆藏心。今從僧乞波羅夷戒。僧今與難提比丘波羅
夷戒。誰諸長老^{77}忍僧與難提比丘波羅夷戒者默然。誰不忍者^{78}說。是初羯

53 今我 A: 而我今 B
54 姪 A: om. B
55 行 A: om. B
56 將 A^{KN}, B: 我將 A^{GMSY}
57 爲我往 A^{GMSY}; 與我 A^{KN}; 爲我 B
58 世尊 A^{KN}; 世尊世尊 A^{GMSY}; 佛 B
59 若有教勅 A: 隨佛所教 B
60 以 A: 即 (即 B^{N}; om. B^{GKMSY}) 往佛所頭面作禮却坐一面以 B^{GKMSY}
61 以 A^{KN}, 竽時以 A^{GMSY}, B
62 僧今 A: 今僧 B
63 比丘 A^{GKMSY}, B: om. A^{N}
64 作 A: om. B
65 使 A^{KN}, 教 A^{GMSY}, om. B
66 難提 A: 彼 B
67 到 A: 應往 B
68 偏露右臂脫革履 A: 脫革履偏露右肩 B
69 禮僧足 A: om. B
70 不浄行 A: 姪欲法 B^{K}; 姪法 B^{GMNSY}
71 與我波羅夷戒慈愍故 A: 慈愍故與我波羅夷戒 B
72 者 A: 人 B
73 不浄行 A: 姪欲法 B^{K}; 姪法 B^{GMNSY}
74 無 A^{KN}; 都無 A^{GMSY}, B
75 不浄行 A: 姪欲法 B^{K}; 姪法 B^{GMNSY}
76 無 A: 都無 B
77 長老 A^{GKMSY}, B: 大德 A^{N}
78 者 A, B^{K}: om. B^{GMNSY}
磨。第二第三亦如是說。僧已忍。與難提比丘波羅夷戒竟。僧忍默然故是事如是持。與波羅夷戒已。當事事隨順行之。隨順行法者。不得授人具足戒。不得與人依止。不得畜沙彌。若差教誡比丘尼不得受設差不應往教誡。不應為僧說戒。不應在僧中問答毘尼。不應受僧差使作知事人。不應受僧差別處斷事。不應受僧差使命。不應早入聚落暮還。當親近比丘。不得親近外道白衣。當順從比丘法。不得説餘俗語。不得衆中誦律若無能誦者聽。不得更犯此罪。餘亦不應。若相似若從此生若惡於此者。不得非僧羯磨及作羯磨

---

79 亦 A: om. B
80 忍 A: om. A, B
81 忍 A, B: 已忍 B
82 默然故 A, B: 故默然 A
83 是事 A, B: om. A, B
84 應 A: 應 B
85 事事 A: om. B
86 之 A: om. B
87 隨順 A: 是中隨順 B
88 得 A: 應 B
89 具足 A: 大 B
90 不得 A: 及 B
91 得 A: 應 B
92 若差教誡（誡 A, 按 A, 按 A）比丘尼不得受 A: 不應受教授比丘尼 B
93 誠 A: om. A, B
94 處 A: 處平 B
95 毘 A, B: 逼毗 B
96 應 A: 應 B
97 近 A: 附 B
98 得 A: 應 B
99 近 A: 附 B
100 應 A: 應 B
101 順從 A: 隨順 B
102 得 A: 應 B
103 不得衆中誦律若無能誦者聽 A: om. B
104 得 A: 應 B
105 生 A, B: 坐 A
106 惡 A, B: 重 B
107 得 A: 應 B
108 僧 A: om. B
者。不得\textsuperscript{111}受清淨比丘敷座洗足水\textsuperscript{112}拭革屣揩摩身及禮拜迎逆\textsuperscript{113}問訊。不應受清淨比丘捉\textsuperscript{114}衣鉢。不得\textsuperscript{115}舉清淨比丘為作懺念作自言治\textsuperscript{116}。不應證正人事\textsuperscript{117}。不得\textsuperscript{118}遮清淨比丘\textsuperscript{119}説戒自恣。不得\textsuperscript{120}與清淨比丘共\textsuperscript{121}諛。與波羅夷戒\textsuperscript{122}比丘。僧説戒及羯磨時。來與\textsuperscript{123}不來。衆僧\textsuperscript{124}無犯。諸比丘作\textsuperscript{125}是言\textsuperscript{126}。若\textsuperscript{127}與波羅夷戒比丘\textsuperscript{128}。彼比丘\textsuperscript{129}重\textsuperscript{130}犯姦不淨行\textsuperscript{131}。復\textsuperscript{132}得更\textsuperscript{133}與波\textsuperscript{134}羅夷戒不。佛言。不應爾。應滅蕃。
Below I have reproduced the text of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Nandika story in its Chinese and Tibetan recensions along with a Sanskrit text from the Pārvīsikavastu which provides a close parallel to the details of the śikṣādattaka’s penance. The Chinese text—Genbenschuoyiqieyoubu pinaye zashi—是 the text of the Mūlasarvāstivādin vinaya kṣudrakavastu as found in the Taishō edition (T. 1451, pp. 245a21-246a11); the Tibetan—Dul ba phran tshegs kyi gzhi—is that of the sTog Palace edition (sTog Ta 154b3-158a3); and the Sanskrit is that as found in the Pārvīsikavastu of Bagchi’s edition of the Mūlasarvāstivādavinayavastu (pp. 49-50) with corrections in light of Schopen’s notes in the Yuyama Festschrift.1 The texts read as follows:

緣在室羅伐城，有一苾芻名曰歡喜。住居蘭若寂靜之處。常樂坐禪。由習定故時人稱為住定歡喜。將欲入定。魔女來請共行欲事。歡喜不受。後於異時復欲入定。魔女還來坐其膝上。如是當知女人之境。是為大毒觸即害人。染心既生便共行欲。干時歡喜共行婬行。如毒箭入胸。心懷憂念。云我愚癡毀清淨行。作姦染事即可還俗。復作是念。我實無有覆藏之心。宜往佛所具說斯事。若有軌式。仍得出家者當如法行。若其不然後當還俗。即以右手持法衣。左手遮形醜。流淚悲泣往詣佛所。

sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das mnyan yod na rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba na bzhugs so // mnyan yod na dge slong dga' ba can zhes bya ba zhig gnas pa de / rtag tu dgon pa nags mtha'i gnas mal dag na bsam gan byed pa zhig pas / de'i ming bsam gan pa dga' ba can zhes bya bar chags so // de gang gi tshe skyl mokrung bcas nas bsam gan byed pa'i tshe bdud kyi ris kyi lha dag gis gteses so // de dus gzhlan zhig na

---

skyil mo krung bcas te 'dug pa dang / bduk kyi ris kyi lha mo zhiq gis / de'i skyil mo krung gi steng du 'dug pa dang / bdu med ni reg pa'i dug yin pas / des de dang lhun cig log par spyad do // log par spyad mthag tu zug rngus zug pa bzhin du gnod nas / sems bskyed ba / bdag gis mi tshangs par spyod pa 'khrig pa'i chos bsten² pas / bdag song la 'babs so snyam mo // yang bsams pa / bdag gis bcb pa'i sems gcig gis kyang ma bcbas pas / re zhih bcom ldan 'das kyi spyan sngar song ste / gal te skal ba yod pa zhiq tu gyur na ni gnas so // 'on te med na ni dga' mgur³ spyad par bya'o snyam du bsams nas / lag pa g.yas pas ni chos gos rnams khyer / lag pa g.yon pas ni yan lag skyes⁴ bgab nas / ngom zung gnag cing mchi ma dang bcas bzhin bcom ldan 'das ga la ba der song ngo //

爾時世尊。與無量百千苾芻大衆演說正法。遙見彼來便作是念。我若不先告彼苾芻。言善來善來者。彼嘔熱血便即命終。作是念已告歡喜言。善來善來何故悲泣。答言。大德世尊。我先^3歡喜今非歡喜。佛言汝有何過作此語^6耶。答言。世尊。我不捨學處。毀禁濫行作姦欲事。雖造此過。乃至無有少覆藏心。佛言。歡喜汝能終身受學處不。答言大德。我能受持。爾時世尊告諸苾芻曰。汝等當知歡喜苾芻。雖犯滅罪無覆藏心。非波羅蜜迦。汝等應與歡喜終身學處。更有此類亦當授與。應如是與。敷座席鳴犍槌^8。言白。復周衆衆既集已。令歡喜苾芻遍禮僧已。於上座前踊躍合掌應如是乞。

de'i tshe bcom ldan 'das 'khor dge slong brgya stong du ma'i gung la gdan bshams pa la bzhugs te chos ston to // bcom ldan 'das kyis tshe dang ldan pa dga' ba can rgyang ring po kho na nas gzigs so gzigs nas kyang dgongs pa / gal te dga' ba can la ma smras na / gang khrag dron por skyugs nas dus byed par 'gyur ba'i gnas de yod do snyam du dgongs nas / tshe dang ldan pa dga' ba can la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to // dga' ba can 'ongs pa legs so // khyod ji ste ngom zung gnag / des gsol pa / btsun pa bdag sngon ni dga' ba can lags

² bsten Phug brag, sDe dge: bstan sTog
³ dga' mgur Phug brag, sDe dge: dga' dgur sTog
⁴ yan lag skyes Phug brag, sDe dge: lag skyes sTog
⁵ 先 K: 先是 GMNSY
⁶ 語 KN: 說 GMSY
⁷ 續 K: 續 GNSY: 級 M
⁸ 級 GKNSY: 級 M
kyis / da ni mi dga’ ba can lags so / dga’ ba can ci ste de skad smra / khyod
kyis ci zhig byas / btsun pa bdag gis bslab pa ma phul bar mi tshangs bar
spyod pa ‘khrig pa’i chos bsten te / de ni bcab pa’i sems gcig gis kyang ma
bcabs lags so // dga’ ba can khyod ji srid ‘tsho’i bar du bslab pa la slob par
spro ‘am / bcom ldan ‘das spro lags so // de na bcom ldan ‘das kyis / dge
slong rnam la bka’ stsal ba / dge slong dag dge slong dga’ ba can gcig spyd
par bya ba ma yin pa spyad kyang sems gcig gis kyang ma bcabs bas / ‘di
phas pham par ma gyur gcig / dge slong dga’ ba can dang / gshan yang rung
/ ‘di lta bu gang yin pa la ji srid ‘tsho’i bar du bslab pa’i sdom pa sbyin cig //
sbyin pa yang ‘di ltar bya ste / gnas mal bshams nas / ’ganḍi brdzungs te / dris
pa’i tshig gis dge slong rnam la bsgo nas / dge ‘dun thams cad ‘dus te ‘dug
pa dang / dge slong dga’ ba can gcig rgaṅ rims ji lta ba bzhin du ‘dug pa
byas la / rgaṅ pa’i mthar tsog tsog pur ‘dug ste / thal mo sbyar nas ‘di skad
ces brjod par bya’o //

大德僧伽聴。我不受佇欲事。不捨學處毀清淨行作佇欲事。乃至無有少覆藏
心。我不受佇欲。今從僧伽乞終身學處。願大德僧伽。與我歡喜苾芚終身
學處。願此故。第二第三亦如是乞僧伽。可令歡喜在眼見耳不聞處住。差
一苾芚為作羯磨。大德僧伽聴。彼歡喜苾芚。不捨學處毀清淨行作佇欲
事。乃至無有少覆藏心。今從僧伽乞終身學處。若僧伽時至。聼者。僧伽應
許。僧伽今與歡喜苾芚終身學處。白如是。

dge ‘dun btsun pa rnam gsan du gsol / bdag dge slong dga’ ba can zhes bgyi
bas / bslab pa ma phul bar mi tshangs par spyod pa ‘khrig pa’i chos bsten te /
de ni bcab pa’i sems gcig gis kyang ma bcabs nas / bdag dge slong dga’ ba
can dge ‘dun las ji srid ‘tsho’i bar du bslab pa gsol na / dge ‘dun thugs brtse
ba can btsun pa rnam gsis thugs brtse ba nye bar bzung ste / bdag dge slong
dga’ ba can la ji srid ‘tsho’i bar du bslab pa stsal du gsol / de bzhin du lan
gnyis lan gsum gyi bar du’o // de’i ‘og tu dge slong dga’ ba can thos pa’i nye
’khor nas bkar te / mthong ba’i nye ’khor du bzhag la / dge slong gcig gis
gsOl ba byas nas las bya ste / dge ‘dun btsun pa rnam gsan du gsol / dge
slong dga’ ba can ‘dis bslab pa ma phul bar mi tshangs par spyod pa ‘khrig
pa’i chos bsten te / de na ‘dis bcab pa’i sems gcig gis kyang ma bcabs nas /
dge slong dga’ ba can ‘di dge ‘dun las ji srid ‘tsho’i bar du bslab pa gsol na /
gal te dge ‘dun gyi dus la bab cing bzod na dge ‘dun gcig gnang bar mdzod

9彼KN: 此 GMSY

10 許僧伽今 KN: om. GMSY
次作羯磨。大德僧伽聰。彼⑪歓喜苾芺。不捨學處毀清淨行作姦欲事。乃至無有少覆藏心。此歓喜苾芺。今從僧伽乞終身學處。僧伽今⑫與歓喜苾芺終身學處。若諸具縂聰與歓喜苾芺終身學處⑬者默然。若不許者說。第二第三亦如是說。僧伽已與歓喜苾芺終身學處。僧伽已聰許⑭由其默然故。我今如是持。

**las ni 'di ltar bya ste / dge 'dun btsun pa rnams gsan du gsol / dge slong dga' ba can 'dis bslab pa ma phul bar mi tshangs par spyod pa 'khrig pa'i chos bsten te / de ni 'dis bcab pa'i sems gcig gis kyang ma bcabs nas / dge slong dga' ba can 'di dge 'dun las ji srid 'tsho'i bar du bslab pa gsol te / de'i slad du dge 'dun gyis dge slong dga' ba can la ji srid 'tsho'i bar du bslab pa gsol na / dge slong dga' ba can la ji srid 'tsho'i bar du bslab pa stsal bar / tshe dang ldan pa gang dag bzod pa de dag ni cang ma gsung zhig / gang dag mi bzod pa de dag ni gsungs shig // 'di ni las brjod pa dang po ste / las brjod pa gnyis pa dang dam la yang de bzhin du bya'o // dge 'dun gyis bzod cing gnang nas / dge 'dun gyis dge slong dga' ba can la ji srid 'tsho'i bar du bslab pa stsal lags te / 'di ltar cang mi gsung bas de de bzhin du 'dzin to //**

佛告諸苾芺授⑮學之人所有行法我今當說。授⑮學苾芺不應受住本性善苾芺恭敬禮拜逢迎合掌。不同一坐凡坐之時應在卑座。不同經行。設有同行應退一步。若向長者婆羅門家。不應將住本性苾芺為伴。設同去者令彼前行。不同室宿。

**ngas bslab pa byin pa'i dge slong gi kun tu spyad pa'i chos bca' bar bya ste / bslab pa byin pa'i dge slong gis rang bzhin du gnas pa'i dge slong gi gus par smra ba dang / phyag 'tshal ba dang / mngon du ldang ba dang / thal mo sbyor ba dang / 'dud pa'i las bdag gir mi bya / stan gcig la 'dud par mi bya / gal te 'dug na yang stan ches dma' ba long zhig / 'chag sa gcig tu bcag par**

⑪彼KN: 此 GMSY
⑫今 KN: om. GMSY
⑬若諸具縂聰與歓喜苾芺終身學處 KN: om. GMSY
⑭僧伽已聰許 KN: om. GMSY
⑮授 GKNSY: 受 M. This footnote appears in the Taishô's apparatus but not in the main text (at least not in the Taiwanese reprint). There is, however, a hiatus and I am thus assuming that this footnote is to appear here.
mi bya / gal te 'chag na yang gom pa bsri'o / phyi bzhin 'brang ba'i dge sbyong rang bzhin du gnas pa'i dge slong dang / bram ze dang khyim bdag gi khyim dag tu 'gro bar mi bya / gal te 'gro na dge sbyong mdun tu btang bar bya / steng g.yogs gcig par nyal par mi bya /

bhagavân āha / pārīvāśikamānāpyacārikānām aham bhikṣavo bhikṣūnām āsamudācārikān dharmān prajñāpayāmi / pārīvāśikamānāpyacārikār bhikṣubhiḥ prakṛtistharānām bhikṣūnām antikād abhivādāna-vandana-pratypuṭhānām jalisāṃcikārma [na] svāktaṃ vam / naikāsane niṣattavāṃ / nāpi samāsate / sacen niṣidanti nīcataram āsanāṃ gṛhītvā niṣattavāṃ / na caṃkrame yugapac caṃkramitavāṃ / nāpy agrataḥ / sa cec caṃkrame caṃkramanti padaparīhānīkāyā / na brāhmaṇakulāṃ16 upasamkramitavāṃ / sa ced upasamkramanti paścācchhramaṇaṇayāyena / naikac chadane vastavyāṃ /

不與他出家并受17近圓。不受他依止。不畜求寂。不作單白白二白四羯磨。不應差作乗羯磨人。亦不差教誨苾芻尼。設差不應去。見他苾芻。破戒破見破戒儀非正命皆不應舉。亦復不得作諸制令。不同長淨及隨意事。

rab tu dbyung bar mi bya / bsnyen par rdzogs par mi bya / gnas sbyin par mi bya / dge sbyong gi ched du gzhag par mi bya / gsol ba'i las mi bya / gsol ba dang gnyis ma yin / gsol ba dang bzhin ma bya'o / las byed par bsgo bar mi bya / dge slong ma'i ston pa mi bya / sngon bsgos pa zhig na yang des dge slong ma la gnams par mi bya / dge slong la tshul khrims nyams pa dang / lta ba nyams pa dang / spyod pa nyams pa dang / 'tsho ba nyams pas gleng bar mi bya / des gdamsg ngag dbog18 par mi bya / gso sbyong ma yin / dgag dbye ma yin / gsol ba'i las ma yin / gsol ba dang gnyis ma yin / gsol ba dang bzhin ma yin /

na pravṛjājātavyāṃ / nopasampādayātavyāṃ / na niśrayo devah / na śramaṇoddēṣī upaṣṭhāpāyātavyāḥ19 / na karma kartavyāṃ / na karmakārakah sammanṭavyāḥ / na bhikṣunyo 'vavadiṭavyāḥ / na bhikṣunyavavādakah sammanṭavyāḥ / na pūrva sāmmatena bhikṣunyo 'vavadiṭavyāḥ / na bhikṣuś

---

16 The *samādhi* in this text is not always reliable. No effort, however, has been made to amend this.

17 受 GKMNSY: perhaps 授 (?)

18 *ngag dbog* sDe dge : *ngag dag* sTog. Phug brag

19 *upaṭṭhāpāyātavyāḥ* (?)
codayitavyah smārayitavyah śīlavipattyā ċrṣtivipattyā ācāravipattyā ājīvavipattyā / nānenāvavādah [upa]20 sthāpayitavyah / na poṣadho na pravāraṇā na jñāptir na jñāptidvitiyaḥ na jñāpticaturtham karma /

每至晨朝常須早起。開諸門戶收舉燈臺。灑掃房院。以新牛糞隨處塗拭。可於廁上亦塗令淨。咸可安置水土及葉勿令闌事。所須之水可適寒溫。於水竇處洗令淨潔。鳴犍21 稚22 敷座席。可備衆花燒香供養。若自能者。隨時說頌讚歎佛德。若不能者。可請餘人。若是夏月應須持扇扇諸苾芻。凡欲座時於大苾芻下在求寂。每受食時令心安靜。食若了時為收餉席。所有食器置於本處。掃灑食處。

nang par sngar langs te sgo dbye bar bya / mar me'i snod bsal bar bya / gtsug lag khang chag chag gdab par bya / phyag bdar bya / ba lang gi lci ba sar pa bzang pos byug par bya / bshang gci khang phyag bdar bya / sa dang / lo ma dag dang / chu grang mo 'am / dron mo dus dang mthun par gzhag par bya / de nas wa'i kha phyag par bya / dus shes par bya ste / stan bsham par bya / bdug pa'i snod dang bdug pa nye bar gzhag par bya / gal te ston pa'i yon tan sgrog par nus na / bdag nyid kyis bya / ci ste mi nus na smra ba po la gsol bar bya'o // zas kyi skos sa la brtag par bya zhing / zas bskos zin nas khang steng du song ste / 'ganḍī brdung bar bya / tsha ba'i dus su dge slong rnams la bsil yab kyis g.yab par bya / de nas bsnyen par rdzogs pa thams cad kyi ni 'og / bsnyen par ma rdzogs pa rnams kyi ni gong du spyod lam zhi bas dge slong gi 'du shes nye bar bzhag ste23 zas bza' bar bya / zas kyi bya ba byas nas gnas mal phug tu brtal bar bya / lhung bzed kyi gzhi dor bar bya /
kālyam evotthāya dvāraṇa moktavyam / dīpāsthālaka uddhartavyah24 / vihāraḥ sektavyah / sammārstravyah25 / sukumārī gomayakārṣi anupradātavyā / prasrāvoccarakūṭi dhāvavātavyā / mrṛtikā upsthāpayitavyā patrāṇī26 pāṇīyaṃ27

---

20 Understand upa+sthāpayitavyah (?)
21 健 K: 健 GNSY: 健 M
22 稚 GKNSY: 稚 M

23 See Schopen, ibid., notes 12 and 22, on what appears to be an incorrect resolution of the samādhi in *-vartinābhikṣusamajñānām.

24 Read with Schopen (ibid., note 4) contra Bagchi’s udvartavyah.
25 Understand sammārstravyah (?)

26 Read with Schopen (ibid., note 5) contra Bagchi’s pāṭrāṇi.
śītalaṁ vā kālānurūpataḥ / pranāḍikāmuḥkāṁ
28 dhāvayitavyāni / kālam jñātvāvānprajñaptiṁ
29 kṛtvā dhūpakaṭacchukāṁ dhūpaś copasthāpayitavyaḥ
sa cet pratibalo bhavati śāstur guṇasaṃkārtanaṁ kartum svayam eva
kartaṇam / no ced bhāṣaṇakāḥ adhyeṣṭavyaḥ / upanvāḥāraṁ pratyaśekṣyam
upanvāhṛtaṁ / cec charanaprṣṭham abhiruhyā ganḍir dātavyā / nidāγhakāle
bhikṣūnāṁ vyajanaṁ grahaṇitavyaṁ / tataḥ sarvopasaṃpannānāṁ copariṣṭāc
[anupaṃpannānāṁ ca purastāt] chāntenaryāpavartiniṁ abhiṣusamjñāṁ
upasthāpya
33 bhaktavyaṁ / kriabhaktakṛtyena śayanāsanaṁ channe
gopayitavyaṁ / pātrādhiṣṭhānaṁ chorayitavyaṁ
34

恒於衆中告知日數。作如是白。大德僧伽聴。今是月一日。大衆人人咸可
用心。為造寺施主及護寺天神國王大臣師僧父母十方施主。應說經中福施
妙願。若自不能請餘人作。餘日准知。

dus shes par byas nas / de bzhin gshegs pa'i dbu skra dang sen mo'i mchod
rten dag phyag bdar bya zhing / ba lang gi lci ba sar pa bzang pos byug par
bya / 'du ba'i dus su gnas mal bsham par bya zhing / bdug pa dang bdug pa'i
snod gzhag par bya / ston pa'i yon tan bsgrags par bya / dge 'dun btsun pa
rnamgs gsan du gsal / deng dge 'dun gyi tshes gcig lags te / gtsug lag khang gi
bdag po dang / gtsug lag khang gi lha rnamgs kyi don du tshigs su bced pa
gsungs shig ces nyi ma brjod par bya / ci ste mi nus na dge slong la bcol bar
bya'o //

kālām jñātva tathāgatakeśanakhatūpāh samṃārṣṭravyāḥ
35 sukumāri

---

27 Bagchi reads pāṇiyam. Schopen reads pāṇiyam.
28 Read with Schopen (ibid., note 6) contra Bagchi’s pranāḍikā-.
29 Bagchi reads jñātvāvānprajñaptiṁ contra Schopen’s jñātvāvānprajñaptiṁ.
30 Read with Schopen (ibid., note 7) contra Bagchi’s dhūpakaṭacchuke.
31 Read with Schopen (ibid., note 9) contra Bagchi’s prastavyaḥ.
32 Read with Schopen (ibid., note 10) contra Bagchi’s upānvāhāraṁ
pratyaśekṣyopānvāhṛtaṁ.
33 Read with Schopen (ibid., note 12) contra Bagchi’s tataḥ sarvopasaṃpannānāṁ
copariṣṭāc chāntenaryāpavartiniṁ abhiṣusamgham upasthāpya.
34 See Schopen, ibid., pp. 158-160, for a translation of this section.
35 Understand samṃārṣṭrayaḥ (?)
時諸苾芻共分房舍。不與授學人。佛言應與。不與利養。佛言應與。其授學苾芻不修善品。佛言應修。此之行法乃至斷盡煩惱以來。常應順行不行得罪。于時苾芻如佛所說。次第作已。歡喜苾芻至念懺惻策勸無倦。便斷五趣縛縛煩惱。誌阿羅漢果三明六通具八解脫。得如實知。我生已盡梵行已立。所作已辦。不受後有。心無障礙。如手據空刀割香塗。愛憎不起。観金與土等無有異。於諸名利無不棄捨釋梵諸天悉皆恭敬。是時歡喜證得果已。仍依前制。所有行法不敢虧違。佛言。不應更行。應隨大小次第而坐。與住本性人而為共住。

dge slong rnams de'i gnas khang sko bar mi byed nas / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / gnas khang bsko bar bya'o // rnyed pa yang mi ster nas / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / rnyed pa sbyin par bya'o // de dge ba'i phyogs la brtson par mi byed nas / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / dge ba'i phyogs la brtson par bya'o // de'i sbyad pa ni 'di yin te / ji srid lam du ma zhugs kyi bar du'o // de la lam du zhugs pa ni 'di yin te / zag pa zad pa'o // des 'bad / brtsal / bsgrims pas 'khor ba'i 'khor lo g.yo ba dang mi g.yo ba cha lnga pa 'di nyid rtogs nas / 'dus byas kyi rnam pa thams cad chos nyid kyis 'jig pa / ltung ba / 'gyis pa / rnam par 'jig par bsgrms te nyon mongs pa thams cad spangs nas dgra bcom pa nyid mngon sum du byas te / khams gsum gyi 'dod chags dang bral ba / gser dang bong bar mnyam pa / nam mkha' dang lag mthil du mtshungs pa / tsan dan dang ste'u 'dra ba / ma rig

36 Read with Schopen (ibid., note 16) contra Bagchi’s dhūpakaṭacchuke [dhūpa].

37 See Schopen, ibid., note 17, on what he states “certainly does not say daśamity.”

38 Bagchi reads parivāsa contra Schopen’s pārivāsa.

39 See Schopen, ibid., pp. 160-161, for a translation of this section up to here.

40 知 KN: 擬 GMSY
pa'i sgo nga'i sbubs bcom pa / rig pa dang / mngon par shes pa dang / so so yang dag par rig pa thob pa / srīd pa'i rnyed pa la chags pa dang bkur sti la rgyab kyis phyogs pa / dbang po dang nye dbang du bcas pa'i lta rnams kyis mchod pa dang / brjed pa dang / gus par smra par bya ba'i dgra bcom par gyur to // dgra bcom pa nyid thob kyang de bzhin du 'dug cing las kyang byed nas / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / de rgan rims bzhin 'dug par bya zhing / ji ltar bkag pa yang rang bzhin du gnas pa'i dge slong rnams kyis bya'o//
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