TWO MŪLASARVĀSTIVĀDIN TRADITIONS IN THE GILGIT MANUSCRIPTS
EVIDENCE FOR TWO MŪLASARVĀSTIVĀDA VINAYA TRADITIONS IN THE
GILGIT PRĀTIMOKṢA-SŪTRAS

By

CHRISTOPHER EMMS, B.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Master of Arts

McMaster University © Christopher Emms September 2012
McMaster University MASTER OF ARTS (2012) Hamilton, Ontario (Religious Studies)

TITLE: Evidence for Two Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya Traditions in the Gilgit Prātimokṣa-Sūtras AUTHOR: Christopher Emms, B.A. (University of Western Ontario)
SUPERVISOR: Dr. Shayne Clarke NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 127
Abstract:

The Sanskrit prātimokṣa-sūtras contained in the Gilgit Buddhist manuscripts have been identified as belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivāda school. However, the identification of these manuscripts as Mūlasarvāstivādin texts is problematic. A key factor for determining the school affiliation of a prātimokṣa is the rule order. The Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras, however, differ in their rule order. In this thesis, I explore the relationship of these Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras to Mūlasarvāstivādin literature. In order to do so, I have conducted a comparative analysis of the Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras focusing on differences in rule order in Gilgit Serials 2, 3a, and 4b/4c. I have also compared the rule order contained within the Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras to known Mūlasarvāstivādin commentaries. I argue that we have evidence for two distinct Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya traditions within the Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras. The author(s)/redactor(s) of Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras 2 and 3a were aware of a tradition similar, if not identical, to that known to the author(s)/redactor(s) of the Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtra contained in the Tibetan canon. Serial 4b/4c contains a different Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya tradition, one that has close parallels to Mūlasarvāstivādin commentaries. The Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras, therefore, contain Sanskrit evidence for multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya traditions.
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INTRODUCTION

In the cache of Buddhist texts discovered in the 1930s at Gilgit, in modern day Pakistan, fragmentary manuscripts of three bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtras were found. Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra published facsimiles of these three prātimokṣa-sūtras, known as Serial 2, Serial 3a, and Serial 4b/4c, in the first two volumes of Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts in 1959 and 1960. These three bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra manuscript fragments from Gilgit have been identified as belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivāda school. However, the identification of the three prātimokṣa-sūtras as Mūlasarvāstivādin is not without problems, and it is these problems that the present thesis seeks to investigate.

A prātimokṣa-sūtra provides the canonical, textual basis for the regulation of an individual monastic’s behaviour. Each Buddhist school, or nikāya, is thought to have transmitted its own, unique prātimokṣa-sūtra, one for monks (bhikṣus) and another for nuns (bhikṣunīs). The Gilgit bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtras are thought to belong to the

---


2 In the present study, I have used Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, eds., Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition), Śāta-Piṭaka Series, vol. 10, Parts 1–10 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture 1959–1974). Therefore, all references to Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts refer to this edition. Two other editions of this work have been published, Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications 1984) and Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts: Revised and Enlarged Compact Facsimile Edition, 3 vols. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series No. 150–152 (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications 1995).

3 For convenience, see Akira Yuyama, Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur = A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, Erster Teil Vinaya-Texte (Göttingen: Akademie der Wissenschaften 1979), 12–13.
Mūlasarvāstivāda nikāya, one of the six⁴ Buddhist schools for which a complete bhikṣu and bhikṣunī prātimokṣa is extant. Tibetan Buddhists followed, and continue to follow, the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya (hereafter MSV) and a version of the Mūlasarvāstivādin bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra was translated into Tibetan. Another version of a Mūlasarvāstivādin bhikṣu prātimokṣa was translated into Chinese by Yijing (635–713 C.E.).⁵

Prātimokṣa-sūtras contain lists of monastic offenses in specific orders. A key factor for determining the school affiliation of a prātimokṣa is the order of its rules.⁶ Although there is little variation across the various prātimokṣas in the more serious offenses, the order and content of the rules of etiquette (śaikṣās) vary significantly between the different schools. Surprisingly, the prātimokṣa rules present in the three Gilgit manuscripts do not always follow the same order. Unfortunately, due to the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts, none of the Gilgit prātimokṣas contains complete śaikṣā sections. However, even given the limited amount of material to which we have access, it is evident that the śaikṣā rules of Serial 4b/4c are often present in a different order than the same rules in Serials 2 or 3a.

⁴ The six schools for which we have complete Vinayas are: Sarvāstivāda, Mūlasarvāstivāda, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, Mahāsāṃghika, and Theravāda. The Theravādin prātimokṣa-sūtras are embedded in the Kaṇkhavitaranī, without the introductory and concluding verses of the other prātimokṣas. See n.36.
Problems concerning the school affiliation of Mūlasarvāstivādin monastic literature are not new. In the fourteenth century, the great Tibetan Buddhist scholar BuṣTon deemed the Tibetan bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga, the canonical commentary on the nuns’ prātimokṣa, to be non-Mūlasarvāstivādin.7 Recent studies have suggested an alternative solution to this problem, arguing that there were multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya traditions.8 If Serial 4b/4c follows a different order than Serial 2, Serial 3a, or any other known Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtra, how, if at all, does this text fit into the Mūlasarvāstivādin corpus? The present study is a comparative analysis of the order of rules contained in the extant Sanskrit prātimokṣa-sūtras in light of this theory of multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya traditions.

Goals of the Present Study

The primary goal of this study is to determine the relationship, if any, between Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūstras Serial 2, Serial 3a and Serial 4b/4c. This will require a comparison of the rule order of the Gilgit prātimokṣas with known Mūlasarvāstivādin texts. As such, I will provide a survey of extant Sanskrit Mūlasarvāstivādin bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtras. I also aim to shed light on the issue of multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin

Vinaya traditions, and the impact that the current study may have on scholarship in that area. Finally, I will also consider why it is that Mūlasarvāstivādin literature, that is, literature of one nikāya, is capable of containing multiple Vinaya traditions.

Contents of the Thesis

Chapter One will provide a general introduction to prātimokṣa-sūtras, as well as a survey of relevant Mūlasarvāstivādin material. Section 1.1 contains information on the history, content, and use of prātimokṣa-sūtras. Since Serial 4b/4c contains a different ordering system than other known Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtras, in Section 1.2, I will provide a brief survey of known Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya literature relevant to the present study. The final part of Chapter One, Section 1.3, provides information on the discovery and publication of the prātimokṣa-sūtra fragments in the Gilgit Buddhist manuscripts. It will also detail issues surrounding Anukul Banerjee’s problematic editions of a Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtra from Gilgit, and Charles Prebish’s uncritical English translation of Banerjee’s text.

In order to establish the relationship between the Gilgit manuscripts and various Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya traditions, Chapter Two will focus on the instances in which two Gilgit manuscripts present the same rule in a different order. I will compare these different rule sequences to known Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya literature in five sample sets. In order to illustrate the similarities and differences between the various Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras, the first two sample sets will contain a minimum of ten śaikṣā rules. With this goal in mind, I will analyze śaikṣās 81 to 90 in Section 2.1 and, in Section 2.2,
śaikṣās 34 to 44. The subsequent sections contain smaller sample sets and focus specifically on the rules present in different orders in the Gilgit manuscripts. Section 2.3 contains an analysis of śaikṣā rules 99 to 104, Section 2.4 pāyattikas 42 to 43, and Section 2.5 śaikṣās 91 to 92. I will also compare the order of these rules with their counterparts found in the Tibetan and Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtras. I will also consult the order of the rules found in Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial literature, specifically the Tibetan bhikṣunī vibhaṅga, the Vinaya-sūtra of Guṇaprabha and its associated commentaries, and the Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣunī-prātimokṣa-sūtra-vṛtti (hereafter BPSV), a commentary on a nuns’ prātimokṣa-sūtra.

Chapter Two will document multiple cases in which Serial 4b/4c follows Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial literature in rule order against Serial 2 or Serial 3a, which almost always follow the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtra. In Chapter Three, I will investigate rules in Serial 4b/4c that do not match the rule order of the Tibetan prātimokṣa. In Section 3.1, I will analyze pāyattikas 24 to 25 and compare the rules with known Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya texts. Section 3.2 includes śaikṣā rules 58 to 69 of Serial 4b/4c, which differ substantially in rule order from the known Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtras. The majority of these rules in Serial 4b/4c are found in the same order as the commentarial literature of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. Section 3.2 will also deal with the problems of the śaikṣā rules in Guṇaprabha’s Vinaya-sūtra and its translations and commentaries, as will Appendix 1.

The present study will conclude with an analysis of all cases in which Serial 4b/4c differs in rule order from Serials 2 and 3a, and the Tibetan and Chinese
Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtras. The results of this analysis will indicate that Serial 2 and Serial 3a follow a tradition similar, or identical, to that of the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtra as contained in the Kanjur. Further, I will argue that Serial 4b/4c has a close relationship with the Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial literature of Guṇaprabha, and is particularly close to the BPSV. The study will conclude that the Gilgit manuscripts contain prātimokṣa-sūtras from two different Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya traditions. The Serial 4b/4c prātimokṣa-sūtra discovered at Gilgit represents a Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya tradition, preserved in an Indian language, that is similar to that known to the author(s)/redactor(s) of the Vinaya-sūtra, and, especially, the BPSV.
CHAPTER ONE: PRĀTIMOKṢA-SŪTRAS

Section 1.1: Introductory Remarks on Prātimokṣa-sūtras

History and Content of the Prātimokṣa

It is unclear exactly how prātimokṣa-sūtras developed and at what point they took their final shapes. Attempts at determining the origins of prātimokṣa-sūtras using an etymological analysis of the term prātimokṣa have not proved successful. It seems that there were two different etymological interpretations of the term prātimokṣa within the early Indian Buddhist traditions, one seeing the term meaning deliverance, and one as chief/principal. Such interpretations suggest that the prātimokṣa-sūtra was considered important in the history of Buddhist monasticisms, although to what extent this remained true is unclear.

It may be the case that the Mahāpadāna Suttanta of the Pāli canon preserves a hint as to what constituted a prātimokṣa at a very early date when it notes that monks should assemble every six years to recite the prātimokṣa. The prātimokṣa that the

---

10 Charles S. Prebish, Buddhist Monastic Discipline: The Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtras of the Mahāsāṃghikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins, 11 and 29 n.33.
12 Sukumar Dutt, Early Buddhist Monachism (Calcutta: Asia Publishing House 1960), 70.
Mahāpadāna Suttanta contains consists of verses extolling good behaviour,\textsuperscript{13} part of which are also found in the Dhammapada and are included in the concluding verses of the extant prātimokṣas:\textsuperscript{14}

Enduring patience is the highest austerity,  
Nirvāṇa is the highest say the Buddhas;

For he who injures others is not a monk,  
He who violates others is not a śramaṇa

Not to do any evil, to attain good,  
To purify one’s own mind; this is the Teaching  
Of the Buddhas\textsuperscript{15}

Excluding the final two lines, we find a similar verse preserved in the Udānavarga, a Sanskrit collection of verses purported to be uttered by the Buddha.\textsuperscript{16} We also see this same verse preserved in concluding verses of the Serial 3a manuscript from Gilgit.\textsuperscript{17} If this was, in fact, an earlier version of a prātimokṣa-sūtra, one that was recited once every six years, it does not appear to have remained long in this style and with this frequency.


\textsuperscript{16} Franz Bernhard, \textit{Udānavarga} (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1965), 102–103.

\textsuperscript{17} Plate 58 in Vira and Chandra, \textit{Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts}, 58. Prebish translates the Sanskrit verses as above (see n.16), excluding the final two verses, which are not present.
As it comes down to us, the bulk of the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* is a list of offenses for Buddhist monks and/or nuns. It appears that the text underwent a period of accretion in which new rules were added and older rules were altered as time went on.\(^{18}\) Even the traditional accounts suggest a gradual development, as rules were purportedly only promulgated after a monk or nun performed an action deemed to be rule-worthy. Although tradition holds that the Buddha composed the *prātimokṣa-sūtra*, and as such new rules were not to be added to it, the *sūtra* was certainly formulated by the *saṅgha* following the Buddha’s demise.\(^{19}\) The Dharmaguptaka *prātimokṣa-sūtra* includes *stūpa*-related rules, that is, rules concerning proper behaviour in locations where the deceased Buddha’s relics are enshrined, and the presence of these rules would seem to at least tacitly acknowledge the fact that some rules were added after the Buddha’s death.\(^{20}\) Since the *prātimokṣa-sūtras* of the different schools contain largely the same content,\(^{21}\) it seems probable that over time, this list grew into a more-or-less stable form. W. Pachow dates the composition of the earliest rules to circa 500 B.C.E. and the latest rules to no later than 250 B.C.E.,\(^{22}\) while Charles Prebish thinks it reached its “final root form by about

\(^{22}\) Ibid.
400 BC.” Both of these proposals pre-date the revised dating of the Buddha proposed by Heinz Bechert. Taking into account Bechert’s revision, the \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtras} possibly appeared, in the form in which we now have them, sometime around 400–150 B.C.E., although this dating is highly speculative. It is unclear at what point the \textit{prātimokṣas} took their present form, but there is consensus that they are among the older Buddhist texts.

According to the extant \textit{Vinayas}, \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtras} were to be recited at the bi-weekly \textit{poṣadha} ceremony. One skilled monk who had memorized the \textit{prātimokṣa} would recite the text, and all members of a specific area, that is, all the members contained within specific monastic boundaries (\textit{sīmās}) were required to attend, either in person or by proxy. At specific points in the recitation, members of the assembly would be asked if they were pure in regard to the recited offenses, and they would affirm this moral purity by remaining silent. It may be the case that, at some early point, monastics actually used this event as a means by which to confess any infractions that they had.

---

23 Prebish, \textit{Buddhist Monastic Discipline}, 23.
committed. Over time, the event, or at least the use of the *prātimokṣa-sūtra*, seems to have become less concerned with confession, and took on a more ritualized form.

We can see hints of an increasingly liturgical use of the text in both the *prātimokṣa-sūtras* themselves, as well as in other *Vinaya* literature. The *prātimokṣas* include breaks wherein the speaker of the texts prompts the members of the assembly three times to confess complete purity, *pariśuddhi*, in regard to the given section by remaining silent. These interrogations are present not only after the sections containing offenses, but also after the *adhikaraṇa* section, which lists legal procedures. Including a confessional opportunity for a section containing no offenses makes little sense outside of a ritual context. These prompts are also found in the Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin *prātimokṣa-sūtras* after the *nidāna*, the introductory section, in which no rules are contained or recited. We see further evidence for the liturgical use of the *sūtra* in the *uposathakhandaka* of the Pāli *Vinaya*, which contains a story in which the Buddha refuses to recite the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* because all of the monks present were not...

---

27 Note that to what extent monks were aware of the specific *prātimokṣa* requirements at any point in time is unclear. It seems, according to the MSV, that knowing the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* was rare. See, for example, what constituted a monk of “greater learning” in Gregory Schopen, “On Incompetent Monks and Able Urbane Nuns in a Buddhist Monastic Code,” in *Journal of Indian Philosophy* (2010) 38:111–118.


29 See, for example, Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 53. An example from the Gilgit *prātimokṣa-sūtras* can be found in Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 15.


pure in regard to the rules. In the *poṣadhasṭāpanavastu* of the MSV we find a similar account.

**Structure of the Prātimokṣa-sūtra**

The *bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtras* of the different Buddhist schools contain different numbers of rules, ranging from 218 in the Mahāsāṃghika tradition to 263 for the Sarvāstivādins. The *sūtra* content is divided into eight categories and the offenses are separated into seven sections. The offenses are organized according to the severity of the rules, ranging from the most severe, the *pārājikas*, to the least severe, the *śaiksās*. Amended to this list is an eighth category, the *adhikaraṇa-śamathas*, containing seven methods for resolving monastic legal matters. The order of the categories in the *prātimokṣa*, and the consequence for violating the rules is as follows:

1. *Pārājika* – loss of communion
2. *Samghāvaśesa* – suspension
3. *Aniyata* – *pārājika* or *samghāvaśesa*
4. *Naiśargikapāyattika* – forfeiture
5. *Pāyattika* – expiation
6. *Pratideśayaniya* – confession
7. *Śaiksā* – none
8. *Adhikaraṇa* – N/A

The *aniyata* is a special category dealing with monks accused of impropriety by a trusted laywoman (*upāsikā*), and the penalty corresponds to the severity of the accused offense.

---

33 Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, 87.
37 On the consequences of committing a *pārājika*, see Shayne Clarke, “When and Where is a Monk No Longer a Monk: On Communion and Communities in Indian Buddhist Monastic Law Codes,” in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52 (2009): 115–141.
The śaikṣās are rules of etiquette, the violation of which do not result in punishment, but a breach of good manners. Additionally, the category of śaikṣās contains the largest disparity in number and content of the prātimokṣa rules between the different schools, and, as such, the śaikṣās will be of primary importance to this study, given its focus on determining the sectarian affiliation of the extant Gilgit material.

The prātimokṣa-sūtras begin with a brief statement paying homage to the Buddha, followed by an introduction noting the benefits of the prātimokṣa.39 This is followed by introductory verses on the importance of moral discipline, and then instructions on how the ceremony will work. After the introduction, the seven categories of offenses and the adhikaraṇa-samathas are provided. Each section is briefly introduced, the rules are recited, and then the members of the assembly are asked of their moral purity. Following the adhikaraṇa section, the sūtra ends with another series of verses.40 In the case of the Dharmaguptaka, Sarvāstivāda, Mahāsāṃghika, Mahīśāsaka, and the Chinese version of the Mūlasarvāstivāda prātimokṣas, certain verses are attributed to the last seven Buddhas.41 The Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin text lists the seven Buddhas as responsible for the verses, but without attributing individual verses to specific Buddhas.42 It is in this

---

38 Prebish, Buddhist Monastic Discipline, 12.
39 The statements concerning the introduction and conclusion of the prātimokṣa exclude the Theravāda text, which is not found as a separate text in the Theravāda canon, although it was an independent text at some point in time. See von Hinüber, A Handbook of Pāli Literature, 9. The Therāvādin commentary on the pātimokkha, the Kaṁkhāvitaraṇī begins with a monks’ pātimokkha, but without introductory and concluding verses like those present in the prātimokṣas of other schools. See K.R. Norman trans. and William Pruitt ed., The Pātimokkha (Oxford: The Pali Text Society 2001), xxxvi.
42 Vidyabhusana, So-sor-tha-pa, 41–42.
section of concluding verses that we find the verse that was previously mentioned as possibly representing an original *prātimokṣa*.

As for the overall structure of the *prātimokṣa*-sūtras, we find them composed according to the following system:

- Homage to the Buddha
- Introduction in Prose and Introductory Verses
- *Pārājika* rules
- *Samghāvaśesa* rules
- *Aniyata* rules
- *Naihsargikapāyattika* rules
- *Pāyattika* rules
- *Pratideśayanīya* rules
- *Śaiksā* rules
- *Adhikaraṇa-samathas*
- Concluding Verses

This, then, is the basic structure of those *prātimokṣa*-sūtras that come down to us as separate texts.

Different schools have different numbers of *prātimokṣa* rules. This should not be surprising, since disputes over matters of monastic discipline were traditionally said to be the cause of the first schism of the previously harmonious Buddhist *samgha* into the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas at the council of Vaiśāli. In time, as Buddhist schools arose and were defined, it appears that they tailored the *prātimokṣa* to fit their specific needs. The table below illustrates the variety in the number of rules in the extant bhikṣu *prātimokṣa*-sūtras:

---

43 For a brief discussion on the issue of monastic discipline at this council, see Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 23–27.

44 I give here the total number of rules for the Theravādins, and the location in the Taishō canon and rule number of the *prātimokṣa*-sūtras translated into Chinese. I will go into detail about the Tibetan *prātimokṣa* below in Section 1.2. For the number of rules I
None of the prātimokṣa-sūtras from these schools contains the same number of rules.\(^{46}\)

That being said, the majority of the rules are held in common between them. There is an equal number of pārājika (4), saṃghavaśēsa (13), aniyata (2), naiḥsargikapāyattika (30), and pratideśanīya (4) rules across all of the extant schools, and they all have 7 adhikaraṇa-śamathas.\(^{47}\) The number of pāyattika rules is almost uniform as well, being 90 in all of the schools excluding the Mahiśasaka at 91, and the Theravāda with 92.\(^{48}\)

However, there is considerable difference in the pāyattika rules in terms of order between the different schools.\(^{49}\) The greatest variance in the prātimokṣas lies in the śaikṣā category. Here we see as few as 66 for the Mahāsāṃghikas, and as many as 108 in the Sarvāstivādin and Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin sūtras.\(^{50}\) Also, this section has the greatest variety in the content of these rules.\(^{51}\) The great variety in the ordering and content of the śaikṣā rules makes them useful places to start identifying the affiliation of previously unidentified prātimokṣa-sūtras.

None of the prātimokṣa-sūtras from these schools contains the same number of rules.\(^{46}\)

That being said, the majority of the rules are held in common between them. There is an equal number of pārājika (4), saṃghavaśēsa (13), aniyata (2), naiḥsargikapāyattika (30), and pratideśanīya (4) rules across all of the extant schools, and they all have 7 adhikaraṇa-śamathas.\(^{47}\) The number of pāyattika rules is almost uniform as well, being 90 in all of the schools excluding the Mahiśasaka at 91, and the Theravāda with 92.\(^{48}\)

However, there is considerable difference in the pāyattika rules in terms of order between the different schools.\(^{49}\) The greatest variance in the prātimokṣas lies in the śaikṣā category. Here we see as few as 66 for the Mahāsāṃghikas, and as many as 108 in the Sarvāstivādin and Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin sūtras.\(^{50}\) Also, this section has the greatest variety in the content of these rules.\(^{51}\) The great variety in the ordering and content of the śaikṣā rules makes them useful places to start identifying the affiliation of previously unidentified prātimokṣa-sūtras.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
School & Taishō & Count \\
\hline
Sarvāstivāda & 1436 & 263 \\
Mūlasarvāstivāda & 1454 & 248 \\
Dharmaguptaka & 1429 & 250 \\
Mahiśāsaka & 1422 & 251 \\
Mahāsāṃghika & 1426 & 218 \\
Kāśyapīya & 1460 & 246 \\
Theravāda & N/A & 227\(^{45}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

have consulted the table in Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 11, unless otherwise noted.


\(^{46}\) See the table in Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 11.

\(^{47}\) Ibid.

\(^{48}\) Ibid.

\(^{49}\) Ibid.

\(^{50}\) See Appendix V in Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 9–14.

\(^{51}\) See the table in Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 11.

\(^{51}\) Ibid., 50–59.
Section 1.2: Mūlasarvāstivādin Sources

The two main criteria for determining the scholastic affiliation of a prātimokṣa-sūtra are the order of the rules, and the specific terminology used within those rules.52 While, in general, the content of the prātimokṣa-sūtras is largely the same, the order of certain rules differs in each school. This is particularly so with regard to the final group of rules, the śaikṣās. Unlike the other categories, the śaikṣās are not usually given a set number, but instead are referred to as ‘‘Bahu Śaikṣā Dharmas’ or ‘many rules that should be learnt.’’53 This lack of specificity in the number of rules may have allowed for such divergence in the different schools. Regardless of the origins of these differences, however, the variation in the many śaikṣā rules in part allows for the attribution of a prātimokṣa to a specific school.

Technical vocabulary, such as specific variants of Sanskrit pāyattika is often a key indicator of sectarian affiliation: the Theravādins use pācittiya, the Sarvāstivādins pātayantika, the Mūlasarvāstivādins pāyattika, and the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins pācattika.54 However, it should be kept in mind that these differences are more pronounced in later texts, and that different geographical areas may use different versions (or alternatively, different schools in the same area may use the same term).55 The Gilgit

52 Klaus Wille, “Buddhist Sanskrit Sources from Khotan,” 49.
53 Pachow, Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa, 9
54 Ingo Strauch, The Bajaur collection: A new collection of Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts – A preliminary catalogue and survey –, Online version 1.1 (2008) 26. I have excluded from Strauch’s list the Dharmaguptakas since we have only one confirmed Dharmaguptaka fragment.
55 For a discussion of the issues surrounding the use of versions of Skt. pāyattika, and its role in sectarian affiliation, see Strauch, The Bajaur collection, 26–27.
manuscript fragments contain the term *pāyattika*.\(^{56}\)

In order to determine the affiliation of the Gilgit *prātimokṣa*-śūtras, it is necessary to compare the terminology and ordering system of these texts with the extant Mūlasarvāstivādin *prātimokṣa* material. Section 1.2 includes the textual material that I will compare with the Gilgit manuscripts in order to determine affiliation, while Section 1.3 will catalogue the Gilgit *prātimokṣa* manuscripts and the published materials based upon them. Since the Gilgit *prātimokṣa*-śūtras are composed in Sanskrit, specific emphasis will be placed upon those Sanskrit texts. As such, in addition to utilizing complete Chinese or Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin *prātimokṣas*, I will also consult Sanskrit *prātimokṣa* fragments identified as Mūlasarvāstivādin. As rule order is a determining factor, and the primary concern of this study, I have listed which specific rules are found in the manuscript fragments. For the terminology concerning the different categories of rules, I have followed Sakaki’s edition of the *Mahāvyutpatti*.\(^{57}\)

**Vinaya Surveys**

I have consulted four *Vinaya* surveys for the present study. The primary survey I have used is Akira Yuyama’s 1979 work, *Vinaya-Texte*, an incredibly thorough bibliography.\(^{58}\) I have also consulted Yamagiwa’s 2007 work “Vinaya Manuscripts: State

---

\(^{56}\) The *aksaras* for “tt” and “nt” are very close in the Gilgit *prātimokṣas*. It is, therefore, also possible that one or more of the manuscripts contain the term *pāyantika* instead of *pāyattika*.

\(^{57}\) Ryōzaburō Sakaki, *Bon-zō-kan-wa shiyaku taikō hon’yaku myōgi taishū*, with vol. 2 being an index (bon-zō sakuin) compiled by Sakaki and Nishio Kyōo (Kyoto: Rinsen shoten 1998 [1916]).

\(^{58}\) Yuyama, *Vinaya-Texte*. 
of the Field,” which updates the work of Yuyama with recent publications. Though not of the same quality or scope of the works of Yuyama and Yamagiwa, I have also consulted Charles Prebish’s *A Survey of Vinaya Literature* and Jampa Tsedroen, *A Brief Survey of the Vinaya.*

**Prātimokṣa Studies**

I have consulted two comprehensive studies on the extant prātimokṣa-sūtras of different Buddhist schools. The first is W. Pachow’s *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa.* Pachow’s work analyzes the different extant bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtras and notes differences and similarities between these texts. His analysis also utilizes the Chinese translation of a text known as the *Upālipariprcchā* (Taishō 1466) and the *Mahāvyutpatti,* since these texts both include prātimokṣa rules. Pachow’s work contains comparative tables, which note the differences in the rules and their order, using the Sarvāstivādin prātimokṣa as its basis. Pachow’s study will be used as a reference point for analyzing the rule order found in the Gilgit material. Also, his study often contains translations of the rules as found in the different schools. I will use Pachow’s study as my primary resource for the rules of the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivāda bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra.

---


The second major work is Chatsumarn Kabilsingh’s publication of a translation of the extant bhikṣunī prātimokṣa-sūtras in *The Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*. Of particular use to this study are the prātimokṣas that exist only in Chinese, those of the Mahīśāsaka and the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivāda, which will be used as the principal sources for the content and order of the rules of these schools. Although this text is almost entirely a translation of primary sources, Kabilsingh has also published *A Comparative Study of Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha*, which also includes useful comparative tables.

**Mūlasarvāstivāda Bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtras**

Among a collection of manuscripts found in Tibet and transferred to the “Palace of Culture of the Nationalities” in Peking was a complete Sanskrit manuscript of a Mūlasarvāstivāda bhikṣu prātimokṣa. To my knowledge, no published edition of the text exists, although Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber has produced a comparative concordance of Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣas that gives a breakdown of which sections appear on which folios and has promised her forthcoming edition. Additionally, she has included a photocopy of folios 2a and 3a in Appendix 3, which includes part of the introduction and the beginning of the pārājika uddāna.

---

63 Kabilsingh, *The Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*.
66 Ibid., 335.
67 Ibid., 337.
In addition to the Gilgit material and the Peking manuscript, individual fragments of Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣas have been identified from various collections. Three fragments from the Pelliot collection have been identified:

- Pāyattika rules 27 to 28
- Naihsargikapāyattika rules 8 or 9, and 10

Four fragments from Turfan have been identified as Mūlasarvāstivādin:

- End of the introduction and pārājika rule
- Pratideśayanīya rule 3 up to ākṣā rules 2–33
- Ākṣā rule 107 or 108 up to the beginning of the adhikaraṇa-śamathas

Concluding verses 3–10

Also, from among the Gilgit material discovered by Auriel Stein, Sylvain Lévi published a Mūlasarvāstivādin fragment containing:

- Ākṣā rules 79–95

In addition to the material from the Chinese translation of Mūlasarvāstivāda prātimokṣa from Pachow’s study, I will use a Tibetan translation of the prātimokṣa-sūtra,

---

69 No. 213 in von Simson, Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins, Teil 2, 150.
70 No. 1106. in von Simson, Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins, Teil 2, 150.
71 SHT 100 in von Simson, Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins, Teil 2, 152.
72 SHT 41, in von Simson, Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins, Teil 2, 151–2. The numbering here follows Banerjee and not von Simson.
73 SHT 355 in von Simson, Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins, Teil 2, 152. The numbering here follows Banerjee and not von Simson, although I am unsure about the beginning of V.1.
74 SHT 2, in von Simson, Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins, Teil 2, 151.
75 Yuyama, Vinaya-Text, 13. On the Mahāvyutpatti, see below.
the *So-sor-thar-pa*. The study will use the *So-sor-thar-pa* found in the sTog Palace and Derge editions of the Tibetan canon. In addition to these Tibetan canonical sources, I will consult Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana’s edition of the *So-sor-thar-pa*, which includes the text in Tibetan, as well as an English translation.

**Mūlasarvāstivāda Bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa**

It has already been noted that an English translation of the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin nuns’ *prātimokṣa* is found in Kabilsingh. A translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda bhikṣuṇī *prātimokṣa-sūtra* is also extant in the various Tibetan canons (Tib. *So-sor-thar-pa dge-slong-ma’i mdo*). As is the case with the monks’ *prātimokṣa-sūtra*, this study will use the sTog palace and Derge editions. An English translation of the Tibetan text can be found in Karma Lekshe Tsomo’s *Sisters in Solitude*, and I have also consulted the French translation by William Rockhill. Since, as noted previously, the *vibhaṅga*, the commentary on the *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa-sūtra*, lists the

---

76 Tohōku No. 2.
77 The *Tog Palace manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur*, vol. 5 (Leh: Smanrtsis Shesrig Dpemzod 1975).
79 Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*.
80 Kabilsingh, *The Bhikkunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*.
81 Tohōku No.
82 *Tog Palace manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur*, vol. 8 (=Nya).
83 *Sde-dge mtshal-par bka’*, vol. 9 (=Ta).
rules in a different order than the prātimokṣa itself, I will also use this canonical commentary. For the bhikṣunī vibhaṅga I have consulted the Derge and sTog palace editions.

### Non-prātimokṣa Texts

We have already noted that the ordering of the rules, and the specific terminology used to put forth the rules are the key factors for determining the affiliation of a prātimokṣa. As such, in addition to comparing the Gilgit material with the known prātimokṣa material of all the schools, it is important to compare them with other known Mūlasarvāstivāda material that is similar in both terminology and structure to the Gilgit prātimokṣas. Within the Mūlasarvāstivāda traditions, the BPSV, the Vinaya-sūtra of Guṇaprabha, and to a lesser extent the Mahāvyutpatti, fit these criteria.

**BPSV (Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣunī-prātimokṣa-sūtra-vṛtti)**

The Tibetan canon includes a commentary on a nuns’ prātimokṣa, the BPSV (Tib. ’phags-pa thams-cad yod-par smra-ba ’i dge slong ma ’i so-sor thar-pa ’i mdo ’i ’grel pa). This commentary will be of primary importance to this study. About the text, we

---

86 Dge slong ma ’i ‘dul ba rnam par ’byed. Tohōku No. 5.
87 Sde-dge mtshal-par bka’, vol. 9. (=Ta).
88 Ibid.
90 As no critical editions of the BPSV have been published, I use my own numbering system for the text. Following the first seven śaikṣās, which are concerned with the lower-garment (sham thabs), the BPSV seems to indicate that the rules given in
actually know very little, and little scholarly attention has been paid to it.\textsuperscript{91} It is contained in the Tibetan Tanjur, the portion of the Tibetan canon containing Indian commentaries, and at some point in time it was deemed important enough to canonize. Based on the name, it is a commentary (vr\text{\textscript{tti}}) on an Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣunī prātimokṣa-sūtra.

**Mahāvyutpatti**

The *Mahāvyutpatti* is a ninth century C.E. Sanskrit-Tibetan dictionary.\textsuperscript{92} This dictionary contains the Tibetan equivalents to Sanskrit terminology and included in it are abridged formulations of the monastic rules for monks.\textsuperscript{93} Given that the *Mahāvyutpatti* contains Mūlasarvāstivādin Sanskrit vocabulary, it is an important tool for determining the affiliation of the Gilgit material. Additionally, since the Gilgit *prātimokṣas* contain *uddānas*, or verse summaries, which in this case provide abbreviated forms of monastic

---


\textsuperscript{93} Sakaki, *Mahāvyutpatti*, 530–555.
rules, it will be useful to compare them to the *Mahāvyutpatti* entries. It has been proposed that some of the Vinaya entries in the *Mahāvyutpatti* come from the *Vinaya-sūtra* of Guṇaprabha and its commentaries.\(^94\) The relationship between the *Mahāvyutpatti* and the *Vinaya-sūtra* and its commentaries will be dealt with in greater detail below.\(^95\)

**Vinaya-sūtra**

The writings of *Vinaya* master Guṇaprabha were an important source for the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* tradition, as evidenced by the inclusion of Tibetan translations of his Sanskrit commentary on the *Vinaya*, the *Vinaya-sūtra*, as well as four commentaries upon it, in the Tibetan canon.\(^96\) In fact, it seems that in Tibet, the *Vinaya-sūtra* took precedence over the canonical *Vinaya* itself.\(^97\) We can probably date Guṇaprabha to some time between the 5th–7th c. C.E., and place him at Mathura.\(^98\) Guṇaprabha’s *Vinaya-sūtra* is, essentially, a digest of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. The aforementioned great


\(^95\) See Section 3.2 and Appendix 1.


Tibetan scholar Bu sTon described the *Vinaya-sūtra* as a treatise “condensing excessively large (portions of) scripture.” As such, like the *Mahāvyutpatti*, the *Vinaya-sūtra* provides Mūlasarvāstivādin Sanskrit terminology and rule order, criteria that will be useful for determining the Gilgit material’s affiliation. I will consult Rahula Sāṅkrityāyana’s Sanskrit edition of the text, and the Tibetan translation from the Derge canon. Relevant to this study are two commentaries on the *Vinaya-sūtra* both preserved in Tibetan. The first is Guṇaprabha’s autocommentary, the *Vinayasūtra-rājyabhidhānasvavvyākhya-nāma*, as well Dharmamitra’s *Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā*. Both commentaries contain the prātimokṣa rules that the present study deals with and are particularly relevant for the rules dealt with in Chapter Three.

Section 1.3: Gilgit Prātimokṣa-sūtras

Fragmentary manuscripts of three bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtras were found in the cache of texts discovered at Gilgit. The manuscripts, which were discovered by M.A.

---

99 Translated by Schopen, “Ritual Rights,” 63.
100 Rahula Sāṅkrityāyana ed., *Vinayasūtra of Bhadanta Gunaprabha* (Bombay: Baratiya Vidyā Bhavan 1981). The rules numbers I have provided are based on my own count, unless otherwise noted. I also provide the rules with labels, following the reference system used by Yoshiyasu Yonezawa et al., as input into Gretil: Vin_n.n=vastu.line; Vin_n,n,n=vastu.chapter,section. http://fiindolo.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1_sanskr/4_rellit/buddh/vinsutru.htm. Accessed August 12, 2012.
Stein in 1931, are presently in the possession of the National Archives of India.  

A 10-part Facsimile Edition of the Gilgit Manuscripts was edited by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, and contains facsimiles of the manuscript folios, which are contained in four serials. The manuscripts were written on birch bark in Gilgit/Bamiyan scripts. Klaus Wille has noted that Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II, one of the scripts used in the texts of the Gilgit manuscripts was used during the 6th–10th c. C.E. Anukul Banerjee dates the manuscript he used for his edition of the prātimokṣa-sūtra to the 5th–6th c. C.E., and therefore a dating of sometime around the 6th c. C.E. for the Gilgit prātimokṣa material seems plausible. I will refer to the sūtras by the designations that Oskar von Hinüber used in his cataloguing of Gilgit material, which is based on the serial numbers of the Facsimile Edition. The present study will analyze three prātimokṣa-sūtras from Serial 2, Serial 3a, Serial 4b/4c.

The Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtra manuscripts all contain uddānas. These uddānas are keywords that operate as structural devices noting upcoming material. Uddānas are

---

106 Klaus Wille, Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag 1990), 25.
107 Ibid., 5.
found in the majority of extant Mūlasarvāstivādin literature on monastic regulations.\textsuperscript{110} Also, they are found only in the \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtras} of the Mahāsaṃghika and the Mūlasarvāstivādins. In the case of the Mahāsaṃghikas \textit{prātimokṣa}, the \textit{uddānas} follow groups of rules, acting as a sort of keyword-based summary, whereas in the Mūlasarvāstivādin \textit{prātimokṣas}, the \textit{uddānas} come before the rules. The Gilgit \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtra} manuscripts have \textit{uddānas} located before the upcoming rules, as would be expected of Mūlasarvāstivādin texts.

In this section I have followed the rule numbering system for the different Gilgit \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtras} used by Banerjee in his editions. The use of rule numbers is problematic for various reasons, especially in the case of the \textit{sāikṣā} rules. Since this section contains the greatest variance between the different schools, the rule numbers very rarely correspond. Additionally, it appears that Banerjee has rearranged rules to fit the numbering found in the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtra},\textsuperscript{111} and changed the wording in some cases as well. Also, since the beginning of the \textit{sāikṣā} section of Serial 3a is missing, we have no base from which to start. For the sake of convenience, I have followed Banerjee, but the issue of rule numbering in regard to the \textit{sāikṣā} rules will be dealt with in greater detail later.

\textsuperscript{110} Shayne Clarke, “Towards a Comparative Study of the \textit{Sarvāstivāda-} and Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinayas: A Preliminary Survey of the \textit{Kathāvastu} embedded in the \textit{Uttaragrantha}.” Paper presented at The International Association of Buddhist Studies, Taiwan (June 2011), 2.

Serial 2

The Serial 2 *prātimokṣa-sūtra* is located on pages 3 to 13 in Part 2 of the Facsimile Edition.¹¹² Lokesh Chandra published an edition of this *prātimokṣa* in his article “Unpublished Gilgit Fragment of the Prātimokṣa-Sūtra.”¹¹³ In addition to transliterating the manuscript, Chandra has rearranged the folios in the proper order in his edition, whilst giving the corresponding plate numbers from the Facsimile Edition. The Gilgit manuscript of Serial 2 contains eight folios of a *prātimokṣa-sūtra*.¹¹⁴ The fragments are 39.5x8cm with a stringhole 12.8cm from the left edge.¹¹⁵ The Serial 2 *prātimokṣa-sūtra* contains the following material, presented as rearranged from the Facsimile Edition (FE below) by Chandra:

FE 1: *Pārājika* 2–4

FE 2: *Pārājika* 4, *Samghāvaśeṣa uddāna* (covering 4–13)¹¹⁶ and *samghāvaśeṣa* 1–2

FE 3: *Pāyattika* 33–40

FE 4: *Pāyattika* 40, *uddāna* (covering 41–50), *pāyattika* 41–46


FE 6: *Pāyattika* 53–55

FE 8: *Pāyattika* 55–57

¹¹⁶ Presumably, the missing section of the folio contains the *uddānas* covering *Samghāvaśeṣa* rules 1–3.
FE 7: Pāyattika 57, 63–66
FE 10: Pāyattika 66, 67–69, Pāyattika 57
FE 9: Pāyattika 57, 58–59, 69, 70
FE 11: Pāyattika 70, uddāna (covering 71–80), pāyattika 71–75
FE 12: Pāyattika 76–80, uddāna (covering 81–90), pāyattika 81–82
FE 13: Pāyattika Ending, Pratideśayanīya uddāna (covering 1–4),
Pratideśayanīya 1–2
FE 14: Pratideśayanīya 2–4
FE 15: Pratideśayanīya 4, śaikṣā uddāna (covering 1–30), śaikṣā 1–15
FE 16: Śaikṣā 16–30, śaikṣā uddāna (covering 31–60), śaikṣā 31–43

In total, the fragment contains the following sections of a prātimokṣa-sūtra, in whole or in part:

Pārājika rules 2–4
Samghāvaśeṣa rules 1–2 and uddānas covering 4–13
Pāyattika rules 33–57, 57–59, 63–82, with uddānas covering 41–60, 71–90
Pratideśayanīya rules 1–4 and uddānas covering 1–4
Śaikṣā rules 1–43 and uddānas covering 1–60

Because of the fragmentary nature of the manuscript, there are some rules for which we have uddānas but not the actual rule itself. This, in conjunction with comparisons to other sources, allows for a tentative reconstruction of the missing rules. The missing rules that are mentioned in the uddānas are pāyattikas 60 and 83 to 90, as well as śaikṣās 44 to 60.

---

117 This rule appears twice, presumably, due to scribal error. See Chandra, “Unpublished Gilgit Fragment,” 1.
Serial 3a

In three separate publications, Anukul Banerjee has provided an edition of a Mūlasarvāstivāda prātimokṣa-sūtra written in Devanāgarī: in 1953 as “The Prātimokṣa Sūtra” in Indian Historical Quarterly, in 1954 as Prātimokṣa-sūtram (Mūlasarvāstivāda), and in 1977 he included it in his work Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit. Prātimokṣa-sūtram (Mūlasarvāstivāda) is a reproduction of “The Prātimokṣa Sūtra,” and Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit contains minimal differences in the text and an expanded introduction. Banerjee himself never mentions what manuscript he used for the composition of his edition. When he introduces his prātimokṣa, he explains that “the present text is based on the manuscript discovered at Gilgit in Kashmir.” He does not, however, note which specific manuscript he has used.

The only details that Banerjee provides are that his manuscript belongs to the collection of Vinaya material found at Gilgit and that it was “written on birchbark in Gupta characters of the 5th or 6th century A.D.” According to Lokesh Chandra, Banerjee used the manuscript contained in Serial 3a as the basis for his editions.

The manuscript that Banerjee used is not complete and he placed square brackets around those sections of the text that were missing, but not consistently if he actually used

---

122 Banerjee, Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts, 1.
123 Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 1, 2, as well as Chandra, “Unpublished Gilgit Fragment,” 1.
Serial 3a. For these missing sections, Banerjee has used Finot’s edition of the Sarvāstivāda *prātimokṣa-sūtra* to reconstruct the text.\textsuperscript{124} He also notes that he consulted Sakaki’s edition of the *Mahāvyutpatti*.\textsuperscript{125} Banerjee, however, also included material that is missing in Serial 3a, without using square brackets, which suggests that an actual Gilgit manuscript was consulted. Hisashi Matsumura suggests that Banerjee used Serial 4.\textsuperscript{126} Also, for some reason Banerjee has excluded from his editions the *uddānas*, which are clearly visible in the manuscript.

Charles Prebish used Banerjee’s editions as the basis for the Mūlasarvāstivāda *prātimokṣa-sūtra* in his *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*.\textsuperscript{127} He also consulted Lokesh Chandra’s publication of Serial 2 for those sections contained in square brackets in Banerjee’s editions.\textsuperscript{128} Unfortunately, Prebish relied entirely on these editions without consulting the manuscripts themselves. Prebish’s uncritical use of Banerjee’s uncritical editions is problematic.\textsuperscript{129} Banerjee’s work gives the illusion of a singular, extant, Mūlasarvāstivāda *prātimokṣa-sūtra*, when, in fact, he has essentially constructed his own. Prebish’s work furthers the illusion, as it is an English translation of Banerjee’s created

\textsuperscript{124} Banerjee, *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts*, 7.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{126} Matsumura, “Arrangement of the Gilgit Manuscripts,” 153. Note that Matsumura uses “Serial 4,” and not 4b and 4c, as I have classified them, following von Hinüber.
\textsuperscript{127} Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 37.
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid., 38.
\textsuperscript{129} For this criticism, as well as others, see Heinz Bechert’s review of Prebish, in Heinz Bechert, “*Buddhist Monastic Discipline: The Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtras of the Mahāsāṃghikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins* by Charles Prebish,” in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (Apr.–Jun., 1978) 98 no. 2: 203–204.
text, and not of an actual Sanskrit original. Rather, it is a piecemeal compilation of what was already a piecemeal compilation created by Banerjee.

The Serial 3a manuscript encompasses 22 folios, measuring 28.7x7 cm with a stringhole 9.2cm from the left edge.\textsuperscript{130} It is found on pages 14 to 35 and constitutes leaf numbers 17 to 60 according to the numbering system of the Facsimile Edition.\textsuperscript{131} The manuscript is missing what appears to be 16 folios, those that would be numbered 8 to 11 and 24 to 35.\textsuperscript{132} The contents of the different folios are as follows:

1a–3a: Introduction
4a (=FE 23): Heavily fragmented, Pārājika 1 and 2
4b (=FE 24): Pārājika 3 and 4
5a (=FE 25): Pārājika 4
5b (=FE 26): End of Pārājikas, samghāvaśeṣa uddāna covering 1–13,

\begin{center}
\textit{samghāvaśeṣa} 1–3
\end{center}

6a (=FE 27): Samghāvaśeṣa 3–6
6b (=FE 28): Samghāvaśeṣa 7–9
7a (=FE 29): Samghāvaśeṣa 9
7b (=FE 30) Samghāvaśeṣa 9–10
3b (=FE 22) Samghāvaśeṣa 10–11
12a (=FE 31): Samghāvaśeṣa ending, aniyata 1
12b (=FE 32): Aniyata 1–2

\textsuperscript{130} Von Hinüber, “Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung,” 102.
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid.

13b (=FE 34): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 1–3

14a (=FE 35): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 3–7

14b (=FE 36): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 7–8

15a (= FE 37): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 9

15b (=FE 38): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 9–10

16a (=FE 39): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 10

16b (=FE 40): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 10

17a (=FE 41): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 10

17b (=FE 42): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 10, *uddāna* covering 11–20,

*naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 11–14

18a (=FE 43): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 14–17

18b (=FE 44): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 18–20, *uddāna* covering 21–30,

*naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 21

19a (=FE 45): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 21–24

19b (=FE 46): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 24–25

20a (=FE 47): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 25–27

20b (=FE 48): *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* 28–30, *naiḥsargikāpāyattika* ending

21a (=FE 49) *Naiḥsargikāpāyattika* ending, *pāyattika pīṇḍoddāna, pāyattika uddāna* covering 1–10, *pāyattika* 1–4

21b (=FE 50) *Pāyattika* 4–10
22a (=FE 51) Pāyattikā 10, pāyattika uddāna covering 11–20, pāyattika 11–14
22b (=FE 52) Pāyattikā 14–18
23a (=FE 53) Pāyattikā 18–20, pāyattika uddāna covering 21–30, pāyattika 21–23
23b (=FE 54) Blank
36a (=FE 55) Śaikṣā 80?, 81–99\textsuperscript{133}
36b (=FE 56) Śaikṣā 99–108, adhikaraṇa uddāna covering 1–7
37a (=FE 57) Adhikaraṇa 1–7 and adhikaraṇa ending
37b (=FE 58) Concluding Verses
38a (=FE 59) Concluding Verses
38b (=FE 60) Concluding Verses, Conclusion of text: “prātimokṣas samāptah”

In summary, Serial 3a contains the following sections and rules:

- Homage to the Buddha
- All Introductory verses,
- The beginning of the prose introduction
  - Pārājika rules 1–4
  - Saṃghāvaśeṣa rules 1–11 and uddānas covering 1–13
  - Aniyata rules 1–2
  - Naiḥṣargikapāyattikā rules 1–30 and uddānas covering 1–30
  - Pāyattikā rules 1–23 and uddānas covering 1–30
  - Śaikṣā rules 80?–108
  - Adhikaraṇas 1–7
- All Concluding verses
- End

As was the case with Serial 2, the inclusion of uddānas allows for the possibility of
reconstruction. For Serial 3a we have uddānas for the missing saṃghāvaśeṣas 12 and 13,
as well as pāyattikas 24–30. Also, 21a contains a piṇḍoddāna, that is, an uddāna of

\textsuperscript{133} 36a begins with the end of a śaikṣā but not enough to conclude what the
specific rule is. Since it precedes Banerjee’s 81, here I have given it the number 80.  
Note that Serial 3a has no prior śaikṣās by which to definitively number this rule
uddānas. The piṇḍoddāna contains the first word of each uddāna that will follow in a given section. This means that, in theory, we also have access to pāyattikas 31, 41, 51, 61, 71, and 81. It should be noted that Banerjee’s transliteration of the śaiksā rules differs in rule order and content from the prātimokṣa-sūtra preserved in Serial 3a.\textsuperscript{134}

**Serial 4b/4c**

**Serial 4b**

According to von Hinüber, the 4\textsuperscript{th} Serial of the Gilgit manuscripts contains prātimokṣa fragments from two manuscripts. The fragments in Serial 4b/4c are 29.2x5 cm and have a stringhole 9.5 cm from the left edge.\textsuperscript{135} Only two folios of Serial 4b have visible folio numbers: 26 and 28. Serial 4b contains the following material, rearranged (from the Facsimile Edition) to match the proper prātimokṣa order:

\begin{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{=FE 141}]: Pāyattika 4–10, pāyattika uddāna covering 11–20
\item [\textsuperscript{=FE 142}]: Pāyattika 11–17
\item [\textsuperscript{=FE 139}]: Pāyattika 17–20, pāyattika uddāna covering 21–30,
\begin{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{=FE 136}]: pāyattika 21–25
\end{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{=FE 140}]: Pāyattika 24–30, pāyattika uddāna covering 31–40, pāyattika 31
\item [\textsuperscript{=FE 144}]: Pāyattika 31–37
\item [\textsuperscript{=FE 143}]: Pāyattika 37–40, pāyattika uddāna covering 41–50, pāyattika 41–45
\item [\textsuperscript{=FE 138}]: Pāyattika 46–50, pāyattika uddāna covering 51–60, pāyattika 51
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{134} See Section 2.3.
\textsuperscript{135} Von Hinüber, “Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung,” 103.
\textsuperscript{136} Note that the rules normally 24 and 25 in Banerjee and the Tibetan prātimokṣa are found in the opposite order (i.e. 25, 24). See Section 3.1.
Serial 4b contains much less material than Serials 2 and 3a. The rules found in Serial 4b are:

- Pāyatti{{k}}a rules 4–57 and uddānas covering 11–60
- Pratideśayanīya rules 2–4
- Śaikṣā rules 1–8, 58–101, and uddānas covering 1–30, and 69–end

**Serial 4c**

Von Hinüber had identified this fragment as belonging to a different serial than the text that surrounds it, prātimokṣa Serial 4b.\(^{137}\) Both folios 135/136 and 131/132 of the Facsimile Edition contain the handwritten number 26. Von Hinüber previously noted that No. 26 of folio 131/132 belonged to one manuscript, Serial 4b, and No. 26 of folio 135/136 belonged to a different manuscript.\(^{138}\) The content of Serial 4c fits perfectly into the surrounding Serial 4b in terms of the rules it contains, and so it seems likely that Serial 4b and Serial 4c are fragments of the same manuscript. The folios contain:


\(^{137}\) Von Hinüber, “Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung,” 103 n. 15.

\(^{138}\) Ibid., 103.
26b (=FE 136): Śaikṣa 39–58

Having noted the contents of the Gilgit *prātimokṣa-sūtras*, as well as the material to which Serial 2, 3a, and 4b/4c will be compared, we are now ready to undergo a comparative analysis of the *prātimokṣa-sūtras*. Chapter Two will note all of the instances in which a rule is shared by two manuscripts in an attempt to determine the relationship between the Gilgit *prātimokṣa-sūtras* themselves, and with Mulasarvāstivādin *Vinaya* literature.
Chapter 2: Shared Rules in the Gilgit Prātimokṣa-sūtras

Due to the large amount of prātimokṣa material contained in the Gilgit corpus, an in-depth study of each of the individual manuscripts is beyond the scope of this project. While analyzing individual prātimokṣa-sūtras would no doubt provide useful information about the Gilgit texts, a comparative analysis will illuminate the differences present in the sūtras themselves, as well as provide the opportunity for a more nuanced understanding of the Mūlasarvāstivādin traditions that produced these texts. As such, I will focus upon the order and vocabulary of the šaikṣā rules of the prātimokṣa-sūtras in Section 2.1 and Section 2.2.

In Sample Set One and Two, I will analyze sample sets of a minimum of ten rules since this will provide enough data to investigate the necessary criteria for determining school affiliation, terminology and rule order, as well as keep the study manageable in size. Sample Sets One and Two will provide a sufficient example of how similar the rule content and terminology is between the different manuscripts. Sample Sets Three, Four, and Five will focus only upon small groups of rules in which the same rule is found in a different rule order in two manuscripts.

Section 2.1: Test Case 1—Šaikṣā rules 81 to 90 in Serial 3a and Serial 4b

The first decade that I will analyze is the section including the šaikṣā rules 81 to 90. This selection includes the first ten complete rules that are shared in Serial 3a and
Serial 4b. Rules 81 to 90 of Serial 3a are contained on folio 36a (=FE 55), and the Serial 4b rules are found in folio 28b (=FE 134). The majority of the śaikṣā rules 81 to 90 of Serials 3a and 4b are presented in the same order. Also, the terminology present in the two manuscripts is largely identical. The rules themselves are not numbered in any of the Gilgit prātimokṣas. In order to illustrate the difference in rule order I have numbered the rules, although in the manuscripts themselves, no such numbering is present. I have utilized the numbering system provided by Banerjee, which, it seems, follows the order found in the Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra. Therefore, discrepancies in the numerical ordering of the rules represents differences in the rule ordering in Serial 3a and 4b and not any perceived error on the part of the scribe.

As is evident from Table 2.1.1 below, there is a great deal of similarity in the terms of the content and order of the rules. I have presented those rules that differ in order in bold.

---

139 Throughout the different sample sets, I use Serial 4b or Serial 4c, depending upon which manuscript fragment contains the relevant rules, or Serial 4b/4c if the sample set includes rules from both fragments. When referring to the prātimokṣa contained in these two manuscript fragments as a whole, I refer to it as Serial 4b/4c.
140 Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 1, Plate 55.
141 Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 2, Plate 134.
### Table 2.1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Gilgit prātimokṣa Serial 4b&lt;sup&gt;142&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Gilgit prātimokṣa Serial 3a&lt;sup&gt;143&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not teaching the dharma sitting on a low seat to one sitting on a higher seat</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not teaching the dharma to one going in front</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not preaching the dharma from the side to one on the road</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not teaching the dharma to one whose head is covered</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not teaching the dharma to one whose head is thrown back&lt;sup&gt;144&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not teaching the dharma to one whose head is not stiff&lt;sup&gt;145&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not teaching the dharma to one whose hands are folded together on the back of the neck</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not teaching the dharma to one sitting on his/her heels&lt;sup&gt;146&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not teach the dharma to one wearing a turban&lt;sup&gt;147&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not teach the dharma to one wearing a hat</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>142</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.
<sup>143</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.
All ten rules in this section are concerned with the etiquette of preaching. The rules
require the monks to avoid teaching the dharma in specific circumstances, unless the one
that is being preached to is ill.

Before detailing the differences in the terminology and rule order, one general
observation should be noted. The verbs used in the śaiksās in Serial 3a and 4b are often
conjugated differently. The śaiksā rules in Serial 4b use the first person plural form, so
that each rule follows the basic pattern of “We will not teach the dharma to ….” In Serial
3a, however, the rules are often in the first person singular, and follow the pattern, “I will
not teach the dharma to ….” Unlike Serial 4b, which uses only the plural throughout the
śaiksās, Serial 3a is not consistent. Six out of the ten śaiksā rules that contain verbs
found in Serial 3a are in the plural, and four are conjugated in the singular. It should be
noted that Banerjee’s editions present all of the śaiksā rules conjugated in the first person
plural, unlike Serial 3a.

In order to illustrate the degree of similarity in content and vocabulary in the two
manuscripts, I have provided a transliteration of Sample Set One below, in Table 2.1.2.
Although the manuscript contains no word breaks, I have separated words except in the
cases where external vowel sandhi has resulted in the coalescence of vowels.
Table 2.1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit $prātimokṣa$ Serial 4b(^{148})</th>
<th>Gilgit $prātimokṣa$ Serial 3a(^{149})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81. na niṣṭarahake āsane niṣanāne uccatārahe āsane niṣanānāya</td>
<td>81. na niṣṭarahake āsane niṣanāne uccatārahe āsane niṣanānāyāglānāya dharmaṁ desaṁjīyāti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. na pṛṣṭhata gacchantaḥ purato gacchate aglānāya dharmaṁ desaṁjīyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</td>
<td>82. na pṛṣṭhato gacchate purato gacchate aglānāya dharmaṁ desaṁjīyāti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. nonmārgeṇa gacchante mārgeṇa gacchate</td>
<td>83. notpathena gacchate pathā gacchate aglānāya dharmaṁ desaṁjīyāti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. nodguṇthikākṛtāya</td>
<td>84. nodguṇthikākṛtāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. notkṛṣṭhikākṛtāya</td>
<td>85. notkṛṣṭhikākṛtāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. notsaktikākṛtāya</td>
<td>86. notsaktikākṛtāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. na vyastikākṛtāya</td>
<td>87. na vyastikākṛtāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. na paryastikākṛtāyāgānlāya dharmaṁ desaṁjīyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</td>
<td>88. na paryastikākṛtāyāgānlāya dharmaṁ desaṁjīyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. noṣṭiṣaśārāse</td>
<td>89. noṣṭiṣaśārāse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. na kholāśārāse</td>
<td>90. na kholāśārāse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the rules contained in this sample set are identical. Šaikṣā rules 84 to 90 are remarkably similar in both manuscripts. Excluding a slight variation in number 84,\(^{150}\) Šaikṣās 84 to 90 are exactly the same in both vocabulary and rule order. This similarity

\(^{149}\) Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.
\(^{150}\) It seems likely that *nodguṇthikākṛtāya* is the result of scribal error, since it deviates from the form of the rest of the *saikṣā* rules 84–88, and the *Mahāvyutpatti* (Sakaki 552).
suggests that the author(s)/redactor(s) of both texts were aware of a tradition that included these specific śaikṣa rules in this specific order. As the focus of this sample set is on the differences found between Serial 3a and 4b, emphasis will be placed upon those rules which vary in content and order: śaikṣa rules 81–83.

Śaikṣa Rule 81

The first shared śaikṣa rule in prātimokṣa Serial 3a and Serial 4b, which I tentatively number as 81, is presented in a different form in the two texts. In that this rule makes it an offense for a monk sitting on a low seat to preach the dharma to an individual who sits on a higher seat than him, the meaning is similar in both Serial 3a and Serial 4b. However, Serial 4b abbreviates the full form of the rule. A brief glance at the two versions of this rule with the identical portions presented in bold, illustrates the degree of similarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit prātimokṣa Serial 4b&lt;sup&gt;151&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Gilgit prātimokṣa Serial 3a&lt;sup&gt;152&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na nīcatarake āsane niṣaṇṇe uccatarake āsane niṣaṇṇīyāya</td>
<td>na nīcatarake āsane niṣaṇṇe uccatarake āsane niṣaṇṇīyā/āgglānāya dharmam deśavisyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first portion of the rule is identical in the two texts. Although present in Serial 3a, Serial 4b has omitted the portion of the rule which details what action ought not be done,

---

<sup>151</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.
<sup>152</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.
in this case teach the dharma: \textit{dharman} de\textit{\=s}ayisy\={a}mi. Serial 4b has also excluded the declaration that this is a rule that ought to be followed: \textit{iti śikṣā} karaṇīyā. While this material is absent in rule 81 in Serial 4b, the manuscript does provide this information two rules later, in śaikṣā 83. The śaikṣā rules of all the Gilgit \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtras} often follow this method of abbreviation. Regularly, in the case of rules that require the same verb, the specific circumstances of the rules are provided separately, and the appropriate verb and \textit{iti śikṣā} karaṇīyā are present only in the final member of this small group.\textsuperscript{153} Excluding this matter, the specific śaikṣā ruling is identical in both Serial 3a and 4b. The slight differences in the presentation of the rules illustrates the minor differences that may be found throughout the Gilgit \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtras}, but that do not necessarily provide us with evidence that will illuminate the matter of affiliation.

\textbf{Śaikṣā rules 82 and 83}

Out of the ten rules included in this sample set, eight rules are in identical order. The śaikṣā rules 82 and 83 are present in alternating order in the two manuscripts. Not only are they found in a different order, but they also contain different vocabulary, as seen in Table 2.1.2 below. Both of these rules are present in all of the schools for which a \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtra} is extant.\textsuperscript{154}

\textsuperscript{153} While beyond the scope of this present study, an investigation into which groups of rules are provided with a shared verb and \textit{iti śikṣā} karaṇīyā at the end may prove interesting.\textsuperscript{154} See Appendix VII in Pachow, \textit{Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa}, 20.
Vocabulary in Śaikṣā rules 82 and 83

The rule that is numbered 82 in the ordering system of Banerjee and the Tibetan translation declares that a monk who is going behind should not preach the dharma to one going in front of him. There is little difference in the actual content of the rule between Serial 3a and Serial 4b, with the differences in bold below.

Table 2.1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Śaikṣā Rule 82 in Serial 3a / Rule 83 in Serial 4b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilgit prātimokṣa Serial 4b&lt;sup&gt;155&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na prṣṭhato gacchantaḥ purato gacchate aglānāya dharmman deśayisyā́ma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest amount of variation in the content of rule 82 in the manuscripts is the result of the differences in number. This rule is one of the Serial 3a śaikṣās that is conjugated in the first person singular, and, as such, the verb does not match the first person plural conjugation present in Serial 4b. This difference in verb conjugation means that the present active participle gacchant, “going,” is declined to match the verb in number in both rules, and therefore we find the plural gacchantaḥ in Serial 4b and the single gacchat in Serial 3a. Also, we find one instance of a final dental nasal in Serial 4b (dharmman) but an anusvāra (dharmmaṁ) in Serial 3a. Excluding these differences in śaikṣā 82/83,

---

<sup>155</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.
<sup>156</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.
the rules themselves are identical. The differences do not alter the basic meaning of the rule: no bhikṣu should preach from behind to one moving in front of him.

Rule number 83 requires that monks not preach from the side of the road to one who is travelling on the road. It is the only case in this set of ten rules in which the two manuscripts use different vocabulary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Šaikṣa Rule 83 in Serial 3a / Rule 82 in Serial 4b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gilgit prātimokṣa Serial 4b</strong>&lt;sup&gt;157&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonmārgeṇa gacchanto mārgeṇa gacchate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was the case with rule 82, here again the difference in number results in a minor difference in the declension of gacchant as gacchantah and gacchat. There is a small difference in the form of the rule, as Serial 4b excludes the ending of the rule, as was the case with the form of Serial 4b’s Šaikṣa 81.

In addition to these minor differences, the vocabulary used differs in the two prātimokṣas. The variation involves the term used for “road.” Serial 4b uses an instrumental form of mārga, while Serial 3a uses an instrumental declension of pathin, both of which mean road/path/way.<sup>159</sup> The rule also includes a prefixed form of the term

---

<sup>157</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.
<sup>158</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.
<sup>159</sup> For mārga, see Monier Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, 812; for patha, see 582.
for road, which differs in the two prātimokṣas. The terms used to signify deviation from the road are declensions of unmārga in Serial 3a and utpatha in Serial 4b. It seems probable that both mārga and patha are being used synonymously in this case, simply to indicate a road/path. Both unmārga and utpatha seem to be operating in the same sense as well. As such, this rule appears to have the same meaning in both Serial 3a and Serial 4b.

In comparing the term used for road to the other extant prātimokṣa material, we find both terms used in various Indic sources. The Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin prātimokṣa also uses patha and utpatha, as does the Theravādin, which uses the Pāli equivalents. Although the relevant section is missing in Finot’s edition, von Simson has found mārga in various Sarvāstivādin sources. The Sarvāstivādin bhikṣuṇī fragments edited by Ernst Waldschmidt also use mārga. From the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition, Guṇaprabha’s Vinaya-sūtra uses pathin and utpatha, as does the Mahāvyutpatti. So too does the fragment published by Sylvain Lévi. Unfortunately given the closeness of the two Sanskrit originals, it is unclear which term would be

---

160 For unmārga, see Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, 194; for utpatha, see 180.
161 Nathmal Tatia, Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādīmahāsaṅghika (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute 1975), 34.
162 Norman and Pruitt, The Pātimokkha, 106.
163 Von Simson, Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins, Teil 2, 251.
164 Ernst Waldschmidt ed., Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins: Mit einer Barstellung der Überlieferung des Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa in den verschiedenen Schulen (Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft in Kommission Bei F. A. Brockhaus), 36, Pa14 Kat.-Nr.44 V.3. The forms found in the manuscript are mārrge and amārrgeṇa.
165 Vin_2.2127. See Sāṅkrityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 63.
166 Sakaki, Mahāvyutpatti, 552.
underlying the Tibetan translations; the Tibetan lam is an attested translation for both mārga and pathin. Although differences in specific terminology can often be a key indicator of affiliation, given the closeness of these two terms, and the inability to determine the Sanskrit term underlying lam, it is challenging to make any definitive claims about the vocabulary used in rule 82. At this point, it should simply be noted that the use of mārga and unmārga in Serial 4b differs from the vocabulary of Serial 3a, the Vinaya-sūtra, and the Mahāvyutpatti. It is not only in vocabulary that Serial 4b differs from these other texts.

**Rule Order in Śaikṣā rules 82 and 83**

The two śaikṣā rules 82 and 83 are found in the opposite order in the two manuscripts. As was the case with the use of mārga, in terms of rule order, Serial 4b again differs from Serial 2, and again, from the majority of Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya sources. Serial 3a follows the order of (82) preaching from behind, (83) preaching from the side of the road, while Serial 4b follows the opposite order (See Table 2.1.1). In order to determine why it is that the two manuscripts present the rules in different orders, and to rule out the possibility of scribal error on the part of one of the scribes, we will compare the order to that present in known Mūlasarvāstivādin sources. Table 2.1.5 below

---

illustrates the order in which these two rules are found in the Gilgit \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtras}, and the Chinese and Tibetan \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtras}.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & \textbf{Gilgit \textit{prātimokṣa}} & \textbf{Gilgit \textit{prātimokṣa}} & \textbf{Tibetan \textit{bhikṣu \textit{prātimokṣa}}} & \textbf{Tibetan \textit{bhikṣuṇī \textit{prātimokṣa}}} & \textbf{Chinese \textit{bhikṣu \textit{prātimokṣa}}} \\
 & \textbf{Serial 4b} & \textbf{Serial 3a} & \textbf{172} & \textbf{173} & \textbf{174} \\
\hline
Teaching dharma from behind to one in front & 83 & 82 & 82 & 87 & 76 \\
\hline
Teaching dharma from the side of the road to one on the road & 82 & 83 & 83 & 88 & 77 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Table 2.1.5}
\end{table}

The order of the rules present in Serial 3a matches the order found in the Tibetan and Chinese \textit{prātimokṣa-sūtras}. The Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin \textit{bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga}, which does not always match the \textit{bhikṣuṇī \textit{prātimokṣa}} in rule order, does so here, and the rules are present in the same order as in Serial 3a.\footnote{175 In Serial 4b, on the other hand, the rules are found in a different order than known Mūlasarvāstivādin \textit{prātimokṣas}.} In Serial 4b, on the other hand, the rules are found in a different order than known Mūlasarvāstivādin \textit{prātimokṣas}.\footnote{169 I have included the Tibetan \textit{bhikṣuṇī \textit{prātimokṣa}}, but not the Chinese translation of this text in the tables of this study, due to complexity of the relationship of the Tibetan \textit{bhikṣu} and \textit{bhikṣuṇī} texts in the Tibetan canon.}

\footnotetext{169}{Vira and Chandra, \textit{Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts}, Part 2, Plate 134.}
\footnotetext{170}{Vira and Chandra, \textit{Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts}, Part 1, Plate 55.}
\footnotetext{171}{sTog Ca 57a5–6; Derge Ca 27b6.}
\footnotetext{172}{sTog Nya 32a6–32b1; Derge Ta 32b6.}
\footnotetext{173}{sTog Nya 438a5–6; Derge 455b3.}
\footnotetext{174}{Pachow, \textit{Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa}, Appendix VII, 20.}
When we take into account the Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial sources and the *Mahāvyutpatti*, we see that Serial 4b is not alone in its presentation of these two śaikṣā rules.

Table 2.1.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gilgit prātimokṣa</strong></td>
<td><strong>BPSV</strong>&lt;sup&gt;177&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>Gilgit prātimokṣa</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial 4b&lt;sup&gt;176&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching dharma from behind to one in front</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching dharma from the side of the road to one on the road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guṇaprabha’s *Vinaya-Sūtra* follows the order of Serial 3a as well as the Chinese and Tibetan *prātimokṣas*.<sup>181</sup> So too does the *Mahāvyutpatti*.<sup>182</sup> The Stein manuscript published by Lévi also follows this order.<sup>183</sup> There is, however, one Tibetan text associated with the Mūlasarvāstivādins that does follow the order of Serial 4b. The

---

<sup>176</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.
<sup>177</sup> Derge Tsu 154a6–154b1.
<sup>178</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.
<sup>179</sup> Vin__2.2126 (82) and 2.2127 (83). See Sāṅkrityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.
<sup>180</sup> Sakaki, *Mahāvyutpatti*, 552.
<sup>181</sup> Vin__2.2126 (82) and 2.2127 (83). See Sāṅkrityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.
<sup>182</sup> Sakaki, *Mahāvyutpatti*, 552.
<sup>183</sup> Lévi, “Notes sur des manuscrits sanscrits,” 20.
Tibetan translation of the bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa commentary, the BPSV, includes the rules in the same order as Serial 4b. The BPSV provides us with an example of a Mūlasarvāstivādin text that follows the order of the two rules on preaching from the side of the road and on preaching from behind, found in Serial 4b. The fact that the rules are present in the same order in both of these texts suggests the possibility that the rule order of Serial 4b is, in fact, an alternate, but still Mūlasarvāstivādin, order and not a scribal error.

Section 2.1 Conclusions

In śaikṣā rules 81 to 90 of the prātimokṣa-sūtras of Serial 4b and Serial 3a, major differences are found only in rules 82 and 83. The order of the remaining rules is identical in the two texts. Excluding śaikṣās 82 and 83 in Serial 4b, the same rules are found in the same order in Serial 3a, Serial 4b, the Tibetan translation of the Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtra, as well as the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtra.\textsuperscript{184} While Serial 4b does share vocabulary with the Sarvāstivādin texts, the close adherence to the rule content, and order, of the śaikṣās in this Sample Set, strongly suggests that Serial 3a and Serial 4b are both Mūlasarvāstivādin.

The difference in the rule order between the two manuscripts suggests diversity in regard to Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtras. Despite the disagreement in the rule ordering of śaikṣā rules 82 and 83 of Serial 3a and 4b, in both cases, the order can be independently corroborated by other Mūlasarvāstivādin literature. The content and rules

\textsuperscript{184} Pachow, Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa, Appendix VII, 20.
of Serial 3a match the Tibetan and Chinese bhikṣu and bhikṣunī prātimokṣa-sūtras, the Vinaya-sūtra, the Mahāvyutpatti, as well as the Tibetan bhikṣunī vibhaṅga. These Mūlasarvāstivādin sources, at least in terms of the ordering of śaikṣā rules 81 to 90, all seem to reflect a similar Vinaya tradition. Serial 4b and the BPSV also preserve a similar tradition in regard to the order of these rules. However, at this early stage, we have only two texts sharing the rule order of two rules in one small sample set.

The fact that there is similarity in the ordering between these two texts, both of which may very well be Mūlasarvāstivādin, implies that the difference is substantial, and not simply scribal error. The shared ordering tentatively suggests the possibility of two Mūlasarvāstivādin traditions in the Gilgit manuscripts that know a different ordering system of śaikṣā rules 82 and 83: one following Serial 4b and one following Serial 3a.

There is nothing in the rule content in the śaikṣās of Sample Set One to suggest that Serial 4b is non-Mūlasarvāstivādin. Nor are the differences in vocabulary significant enough to suggest this. We do, however, see that Serial 4b follows a different order than Serial 3a and the other Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtras, and follows the order as present in the BPSV. Similarities in the rule order of Serial 4b and the BPSV, are not limited to śaikṣā rules 82 and 83.
Section 2.2: Sample Set Two

Śaikṣā rules 34 to 44 in Serial 2 and Serial 4c

As was the case with the case with the śaikṣā rules of Serial 3a and Serial 4b, there is also variation between the śaikṣā rules found in Serial 2 and Serial 4c. Serial 2 and Serial 4b/4c both contain the text of the first 44 śaikṣā rules. Since the beginning of the śaikṣā section is clear, the first rule is clearly identifiable. Here we can number the rules, something that was impossible with Serial 3a. Therefore, we do not need to employ the system used by Banerjee and the Tibetan translation. It should be kept in mind, however, that no rule numbers are actually present in either manuscript. Despite the fact that almost half of the śaikṣā rules are extant in both prātimokṣa-sūtras, there is very little actual difference in the first 44 śaikṣā rules of Serial 2 and Serial 4b/4c. It is only with śaikṣā 44 that we witness major variation between the texts. Unfortunately, śaikṣā 44 is also the final rule of the Serial 2 Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtra. Since we do not have access to any śaikṣās after rule 44, in this section I will focus upon the śaikṣā rules 34 to 44 in order to illustrate the similarities and differences between Serials 2 and 4b/4c.185

Sample Set Two will include śaikṣā rules 34 to 44 of the Serial 2 and Serial 4c prātimokṣa-sūtras. Rule 34 in both Serial 2 and Serial 4c makes it an offense to place one foot over top of the other. The text of this rule is exactly the same in both manuscripts:

---

185 Serial 4c is found on Plates 135–136 in Vira and Chanjdra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, 74. Serial 2 is found on plate 16 in Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, 13.
“na pāde pādam adhāya,”186 “not having placed (one’s) foot on (the other) foot [we will sit].” This uniformity is found throughout this sample set. The minor differences of the first person singular and plural conjugations that were present in Serials 3a and 4b are not found in Serials 4c and Serial 2; the verbs of Serial 2 and Serial 4b/4c are all conjugated in the first person plural. This is the case not only in this sample set, but also throughout the śaikṣā section. Six out of the ten rules are exactly the same in both Serial 2 and Serial 4c: śaikṣās 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, and 40.187

Two of the rules that differ between the two manuscripts contain only minor differences. Śaikṣā rule 36, which makes it an offense to place one thigh on top of the other thigh, may contain one small difference. The manuscript is partially damaged in Serial 2, and if Lokesh Chandra’s reconstruction is correct, then there is an application of sandhi in Serial 4c that is not present in Serial 2.188 A more substantial difference is found in śaikṣā 41. Śaikṣā 41 in Serial 2, na samattitikam begins with the negating particle na,189 which is absent in Serial 4c, samatittikam.190 The lack of na in Serial 4c seems to be the result of scribal error, as the Vinaya-sūtra,191 Tibetan prātimokṣa,192 Mahāvyutpatti,193 and BPSV all have a negative rule.

---

186 Serial 2 Plate 16, and Serial 4c Plate 135.
187 Serial 2 Plate 16, and Serial 4c Plate 135–136.
189 Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 1, Plate 16.
190 Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 2, Plate 136.
191 Vin_2.2087. See Sānkṛityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 63.
192 Vidyabhusana, So-sor-thar-pa, 36 and 101.
193 Sakaki, Mahāvyutpatti, 548.
194 Derge Tsu 150b6.
Rule(s) 43/44 of Serial 2 and Serial 4b

It is unclear whether the final folio of Serial 2 contains one or two rules, that is, šaiksā 43 or šaiksās 43 and 44. The relevant section of Serial 2 reads “sāvadānam pātrasamjñinam piṇḍapātam pratigraḥśyāma iti śiksā karaṇīyā. //”¹⁹⁵ Lokesh Chandra seems to read this as one rule.¹⁹⁶ Although his edition of Serial 2 contains some rule numbers, he does not number the rules individually. For each line in his edition he only provides the numbers of the rules that are found on that line. Chandra has given “Šaiks. 41–43” for this line.¹⁹⁷ Since what precedes the section in question, “na samatittikam samasūpikam” is almost certainly two rules, this section contains either:

A: One rule, 43, with pātrasamjñinam applying specifically to this rule, and piṇḍapātam pratigraḥśyāma iti śiksā karaṇīyā applying to all the items in this section: rules 41–43.

Or:

B: Two rules, rule 43, sāvadānam, and rule 44 pātrasamjñinam, with piṇḍapātam pratigraḥśyāma iti śiksā karaṇīyā applying to all the items in this section: rules 41–44.

Chandra, it seems, reads the text as one rule (A). Vidyabhusana reads the Tibetan as one rule, šaiksā 43, in his edition and translation of the Tibetan prātimokṣa.¹⁹⁸ There is, however, reason to think that this section should be read as two individual rules.

¹⁹⁵ Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 1, Plate 16.
¹⁹⁷ Ibid.
¹⁹⁸ Vidyabhusana, So-sor-thar-pa, 36 and 101.
The Tibetan prātimokṣa separates the Tibetan translations of sāvadānam and pātrasamjñinam by the conjunctive dang (“and”) as well as a shad punctuation mark, a practice that is regularly, but perhaps not always, followed for the separation of the rules. The presence of a shad mid-rule, while not unprecedented, is rare, happening only five other times in the prātimokṣa śaikṣās. There is also the fact that Vidyabhusana’s translation of śaikṣā 43 does not seem to take into account sāvadānam (Tib. mthar chags su), eating in order, at all:

43. I shall look into the bowl and its borders.

The equivalent rule for nuns is present in the Tibetan bhikṣuṇi prātimokṣa in the same form as it is found in the monks’ prātimokṣa. Karma Lekshe Tsomo has translated this as two separate rules:

43. [Train in] going to households in sequence.

44. [Train in] looking [mindfully] at the alms bowl.

Unlike Vidyabhusana’s translation, Tsomo’s translation matches the Sanskrit of Serial 2, sāvadānam, “in regular order” (i.e., begging without skipping houses), and pātrasamjñinam, “looking attentively into the bowl.” It seems plausible that

---

199 Derge Ca 26b6 and Vidyabhusana 101.
201 Vidyabhusana, So-sor-thar-pa, 36.
202 Derge Ta 31b5; sTog Nya 31b1.
203 Tsomo, Sisters in Solitude, 123.
Vidyabhusana’s translation mistakenly combines what were originally two individual rules into one.\(^{205}\)

Further evidence for interpreting this selection as two separate rules is found in the *Mahāvyutpatti*, in which *sāvadānam* and *pātrasaṃjñinam* are two separate entries:\(^{206}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
8567 & \text{ sāvadānam – } \text{mthar chags / 'thar chags} \\
8568 & \text{ pātrasaṃjñinah – lhung gzed la blta ba / lhung bzed la blta ba}
\end{align*}
\]

Matsumura reads *pātrasaṃjñinam* as a separate rule in Serial 2, when he notes that the rule corresponding to *Mahāvyutpatti* 8568, which is missing in Serial 4, is found in Chandra’s edition of Serial 2.\(^{207}\) I will return to Matsumura’s claim that the rule is missing in Serial 4 shortly. Additionally, the extant *prātimokṣas* of the other Buddhist schools all include a rule on looking into the begging bowl.\(^{208}\) Those schools that have both a rule on proper begging order and one on looking into the bowl—the Sarvāstivāda,

\(^{205}\) This lack of a translation of *pātrasaṃjñinam* in Vidyabhusana’s text may give further credence to the possibility that Banerjee altered his text to match the Tibetan. Banerjee notes Vidyabhusana’s translation in his introductions (1954, 2). Banerjee’s editions do not contain a rule on *pātrasaṃjñinam*, and the portion of Serial 3 that would contain this section is missing from the *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*. Were Banerjee using Vidyabhusana to help with his interpretation of the manuscript, this may explain the absence of the rule. Alternatively, as Banerjee does not have square brackets around the many *śaikṣa* rules that are absent from Serial 3a, it is not impossible that he used folios that were lost at some point in time before the edition was published, but this seems unlikely. Finally, there is always the possibility that Banerjee did not base his edition on Serial 3a at all, and whatever lost manuscript he used did not contain this rule.

\(^{206}\) Sakaki, *Mahāvyutpatti*, 548. I have changed Sakaki’s transliteration of the Tibetan terms to match the more common Wylie system.


\(^{208}\) Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 202–203.
Theravāda, and the Dharmaguptaka—have two separate rules.\textsuperscript{209} All of these factors suggest that the final section of Serial 2 contains two different rules: one requiring monks beg food in the proper order, and one requiring the attentive looking into the begging bowl. Further evidence of this is provided by the fact that \textit{pātrasamjñinam} is found as a separate rule in other Mūlasarvāstivādin texts.

Sānkṛityāyana’s edition of the Sanskrit \textit{Vinaya-sūtra}\textsuperscript{210} contains a \textit{śaikṣā} rule requiring that monks look attentively into their alms bowls, in addition to a rule that requires eating in the proper order. The equivalent rule for nuns is present in the \textit{BPSV}.\textsuperscript{211} The difference in the case of these two Mūlasarvāstivādin texts is that these rules are not found side by side. Rather, in both cases there are multiple rules in between these two rules: 25 in the \textit{BPSV} and 21 in the \textit{Vinaya-sūtra}.\textsuperscript{212} The existence of the \textit{śaikṣā} requiring \textit{pātrasamjñinam} as a rule separate from \textit{sā vadānam} in these two texts strongly suggests that the two should, in fact, be read as two separate rules in Serial 2. Not only are these individual rules found in these two texts, but this is also the case with Serial 4c.\textsuperscript{213} Despite Matsumura’s claim, \textit{pātrasamjñinam} is found in Serial 4b/4c, albeit as rule 69. The fact that Serial 2 contains these two separate \textit{śaikṣā} rules, and that these rules are present as nonsequential, separate rules in Serial 4b/4c, allows for a more complete

\textsuperscript{209} For the Sarvāstivādins, see von Simson, \textit{Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins} Teil 2, 250. For the rest of the relevant schools, see Pachow, \textit{Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa}, 203.

\textsuperscript{210} \textit{Vin} 2.2088–2.2108. See Sānkṛityāyana, \textit{Vinayasūtra}, 63.

\textsuperscript{211} Derge Tsu 153a3.

\textsuperscript{212} See Table 3.2.11.

\textsuperscript{213} Vira and Chandra, \textit{Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts}, Part 2, Plate 136.
comparison of the śaikṣā rules of Sample Set Two and further illustrates the different traditions behind the two manuscripts. The final rules from our sample set are as follows:

First, it should be noted that this table begins with rules in both manuscripts that do not have any verbs attached to them; the verb is included as the final member of a small list apparently applying to all the rules in said list. This results in a minor difference in the rules as presented in the manuscripts, but not in meaning.

As was mentioned previously, the most obvious difference is that the rule 44 in Serial 4c is not a rule about looking into the almsbowl, which is found later on in the manuscript (69), but a rule making it an offense to hold out the almsbowl before the food arrives. We have, then, in Serial 4c, a prātimokṣa that separates this rule from the rule

---

214 Ibid.
215 Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 1, Plate 16.
requiring orderly begging. The two manuscript fragments represent two differing Āvikā rule ordering systems, both of which have parallels in Mūlasarvāstivādin literature.

**Serial 2 Rule Order of Āvikās 43 to 44**

The order of rules 43 to 44, as present in Serial 2, matches the order of both the monks’ and nuns’ prātimokṣa-sūtras in Tibetan translation. The Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra orders the rules in the same manner as Serial 2,\(^{216}\) as does the bhikṣu vibhaṅga.\(^{217}\) The bhikṣunī prātimokṣa-sūtra also presents these āvikās in this order.\(^{218}\) According to Pachow, the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin bhikṣu prātimokṣa has a rule requiring looking at the bowl, but not one on going on an orderly alms round.\(^{219}\) The same is the case with the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin bhikṣunī prātimokṣa according to Kabilsingh.\(^{220}\) The Mahāvyutpatti does contain both rules in the same order, and in the same numbering as that present in Gilgit Serial 2, āvikās 43 and 44.\(^{221}\) Table 2.2.2 below gives the texts that present these rules in the same order as Serial 2’s prātimokṣa.

---

\(^{216}\) sTog 26a6, Derge Ca 26b6.
\(^{217}\) For rule 43, see Derge Nya 360a5, for rule 44, see Derge Nya 362b5.
\(^{218}\) sTog Nya 31b1; Derge Ta 31b5.
\(^{220}\) Kabilsingh, *The Bhikkunī Pātimokkha*, 322.
\(^{221}\) Sakaki, *Mahāvyutpatti*, 548.
Table 2.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 2 prātimokṣa\textsuperscript{222}</th>
<th>Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa and vibhaṅga\textsuperscript{223}</th>
<th>Tibetan bhikṣunī prātimokṣa\textsuperscript{224}</th>
<th>Mahāvyutpatti\textsuperscript{225}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal amounts of soup</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging food orderly</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking attentively into the bowl</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *prātimokṣa-sūtras* in Tibetan translation follow the same order as the one present in Serial 2, which is not surprising. It seems that the translators of the Tibetan *prātimokṣas* were translating from a text whose author(s)/redactor(s) were aware of a textual tradition that knew the *śaikṣā* rules in the same order present in Serial 2. However, this means that Serial 4b is a *prātimokṣa-sūtra* that does not match the ordering found in any of the Tibetan or Chinese canonical Mūlasarvāstivādin *prātimokṣa-sūtras*. This was something that was witnessed also in Sample Set One—the Serial 4b *śaikṣā* rule order did not match known *prātimokṣas*, but matched a Mūlasarvāstivādin commentary. This is a trend that will continue with Serial 4c in Sample Set Two.

\textsuperscript{222} Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 16.
\textsuperscript{223} For the *prātimokṣa*, see sTog 26a6, Derge Ca 26b6. For *vibhaṅga* rule 43, see Derge Nya 360a. For rule 44 see Derge Nya 362b5.
\textsuperscript{224} sTog Nya 31b1; Derge Ta 31b5.
\textsuperscript{225} Sakaki, *Mahāvyutpatti*, 548.
Rule Order of śaiksās 43 to 44 in Serial 4c

Once again Serial 4b/4c differs from both another Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtra and the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtras. In Sample Set One, we saw that the variance in Serial 4b actually matched the order found in the BPSV. A comparison of the Serial 4c śaiksā order with Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial texts once again reveals similarities, as illustrated below in Table 2.2.3.

Table 2.2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit prātimokṣa Serial 4c²²⁶</th>
<th>Vinaya-sūtra²²⁷</th>
<th>BPSV²²⁸</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal amounts of soup</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging food orderly</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not holding out the bowl before the food arrives</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an exact correspondence between the rule order present in Serial 4c and the order as found in both the Vinaya-sūtra and the BPSV. The presence of other texts following the same order as Serial 4c suggests that the differences between it and Serial 2 are not the result of some sort of error on the part of the author(s)/redactor(s) or scribe of Serial 4b, but an awareness of a different tradition than the one followed by Serial 2 and the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtras, as illustrated in the table below.

²²⁶ Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 2, Plate 136.
²²⁷ Vin_2.2088–2.2090. See Sāṅkrityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 62.
²²⁸ Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2.
If we continue on past rule 44 in Serial 4c and take into consideration the next few rules, we see further evidence that the author(s)/redactor(s) of Serial 4b/4c, the Vinaya-sūtra, and the BPSV were aware of a similar tradition involving śāikṣā rule order.

---

231 Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2. For rule 69, see Tsu 153a3.
233 For the prātimokṣa, sTog 26a6; Derge Ca 26b6. For vibhaṅga rule 43, see Derge Nya 360a. For rule 44, see Derge Nya 362b5.
234 sTog Nya 31b1; Derge Ta 31b5.
Rule Order of Śāikṣās 45 to 47 in Serial 4c

If we proceed past śai̊kṣā rule 44 into rules that are only present in Serial 4c of the Gilgit manuscripts, we encounter further evidence of a different tradition than Serial 2 and the Tibetan prātimokṣa. Rules 45 to 47 of Serial 4c, which are unfortunately not extant in Serial 2, appear in an order foreign to the numbering of the Tibetan prātimokṣas. Rules 45 to 47, as found in Serial 4c, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gilgit Serial 4c prātimokṣa-sūtra</strong>¹³⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. “We will not holding the bowl above the hard and soft food,” is a training to be followed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Not covering up soup with rice out of greed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. “We will not cover up rice with soup out of greed,” is a training to be followed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison with the Tibetan bhikṣunī and bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtras reveals that the Tibetan sources are in agreement with each other, but not with Serial 4c (Table 2.2.6).

Table 2.2.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4c</th>
<th>Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtra(^{237})</th>
<th>Tibetan bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa(^{240})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not holding the bowl above the hard and soft food</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not covering up soup with rice out of greed</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not covering up rice with soup out of greed</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case the *Mahāvyutpatti* is not overly useful for the sake of comparison, in that it combines the rules on covering up rice with soup, and vice versa, into rule 46,\(^{241}\) and there is no equivalent to the rule making it an offense to hold the almsbowl above the food.

As was the case with the *Mahāvyutpatti*, there is a coalescence of the two rules on greedily covering up rice/soup in the *Vinaya-sūtra*. Due to the style of the *Vinaya-sūtra*, this combining of rules is not uncommon. However, it also makes it challenging to determine 1) if this is one rule or an abbreviation of two rules, and 2) if there are two rules, in what order would their prātimokṣa counterparts occur.\(^{242}\) What is clear is that...

\(^{238}\) sTog Ca 26b1–2; Derge Ca 27a1–2.
\(^{239}\) Derge Nya 362b6–7.
\(^{240}\) Derge Ta 31b6–7; sTog Nya 31b2–3.
\(^{242}\) Vin_2.2096. See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63. The rule is “na bhūyaskāmatayaudanena sūpikam sūpikena caudanam pratichādayeta.” It seems probable to me that this is only one rule, since, removing the sandhi from caudanam (= ca
the *Vinaya-sūtra* has a rule against holding the bowl above food, followed by a rule on covering rice with soup and soup with rice, closely matching the order of Serial 4c (Table 2.2.6).\(^{243}\)

While the relationship between these *śaikṣā* rules is hampered by the style of the *Vinaya-sūtra*, there are no such problems with the *BPSV*. The *BPSV*, as was the case with Sample Set One and Sample Set Two, follows the exact same order as Serial 4b/4c on the occasion that it differs from the textual traditions of the Tibetan *prātimokṣa*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.2.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gilgit Serial 4c prātimokṣa-sūtra(^{244})</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not hold the bowl above the hard and soft food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not cover up soup with rice out of greed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not cover up rice with soup out of greed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Śaikṣā* rules 45 to 47 of Serial 4c are present at least partially, if not entirely, in the same order in the *Vinaya-sūtra*, and exactly the same order in the *BPSV*.

---

\(^{243}\) See [Vin_2.2096](#). See [Sāñkrityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 63](#).

\(^{244}\) Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 136.

\(^{245}\) Derge 151a2–5.

\(^{246}\) See [Vin_2.2091 and 2.2096](#). See [Sāñkrityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 62](#).
Conclusion of Sample Set Two

The major difference between the śaikṣā rules 43 to 44 of Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtra Serial 4c and those of Serial 2 is that śaikṣā 44 of Serial 4c is a rule against putting out the almsbowl before the food, while in Serial 2 śaikṣā 44 requires the attentive looking into the bowl. The order of the Serial 2 rules matches the order of the Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa, bhikṣu vibhaṅga, and bhikṣunī prātimokṣa, as well as the Mahāvyutpatti. The Serial 4c rules match the order present in Guṇaprabha’s Vinaya-sūtra and the BPSV. It seems, then, that we have evidence of two different Mūlasarvāstivādin traditions in regard to what order these śaikṣā rules should follow (Table 2.2.4).

If we continue past rule 44 of Serial 4c it is evident that śaikṣās 45 to 47 also follow an order that differs from the Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa, bhikṣu vibhaṅga, and bhikṣunī prātimokṣa.
Table 2.2.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4c</th>
<th>BPSV</th>
<th>Vinaya-sūtra</th>
<th>Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtra and vibhaṅga</th>
<th>Tibetan bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not holding the bowl above food</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not covering up soup with rice</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not covering up rice with soup</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is evident from Table 2.2.8, the order of Serial 4c matches, to some extent, the Vinaya-sūtra, and, is parallel with the BPSV. The order also differs from the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtras.

It should be noted that concerning the rules of Sample Set Two, Sāṇkrityāyana’s edition of the Vinaya-sūtra and the Mahāvyutpatti differ in order (Table 2.2.4). Although Hu-von Hinüber has postulated that the Mahāvyutpatti is based upon the Vinaya-sūtra and its commentaries for the vastu titles, and some technical vocabulary from the

---

248 Derge 151a2–5.
250 sTog Ca 26b1–2; Derge Ca 27a1–2.
251 Derge Nya 362b6–7.
252 Derge Ta 31b6–7; sTog Nya 31b2–3.
This does not seem to be the case here. Further evidence suggesting that the śaikṣā entries in the Mahāvyutpati are not taken from the Vinaya-sūtra or its commentaries is provided in Appendix 1.

Section 2.3: Sample Set Three

Śaikṣā rules 99 to 102/104 in Serial 3a and Serial 4b

In the previous examples illustrating the differences in rule sequence among the Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras in Sample Sets One and Two, Serial 4b/4c differed from known Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣas. Also, the rules that differed in Serial 4b/4c were found in a parallel sequence either in the BPSV and/or the Vinaya-sūtra. This is not the case for every ordering discrepancy. The Serial 3a and Serial 4b/4c prātimokṣa-sūtras both contain śaikṣā rules against preaching the dharma to individuals holding certain items. In the case of both these manuscripts, the sequence of rules is unique. Even Serial 3a, which otherwise matches the Tibetan prātimokṣa in every rule order, contains a unique sequence. While Serial 3a contains all of the rules of this group, as evidenced by the summary of the group in the uddāna, Serial 4b/4c is missing two rules since the

---

255 For one explanation on why it is inappropriate to teach someone holding one of these items, see Nāṇamoli Thera, The Pātimokkha (Bangkok: The Social Science Association Press of Thailand 1966), 117.
256 Note that Banerjee has rearranged the order of these rules to match the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtra. See Banerjee, Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts, 53.
257 See Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 1, Plate 56.
The rules in question make it an offense to preach the dharma to healthy individuals holding various items. The contents from this section are given below in Table 2.3. Since those rules present in both Serial 2 and Serial 4b are the same in terminology, and all six rules of the group are extant in Serial 2, I have provided the Sanskrit from Serial 2 for all the rules.

### Table 2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule Description</th>
<th>Gilgit Serial 3a</th>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not to one holding a stick</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na danḍapāṇaye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to one holding a sword</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na śastrastraṇay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to one holding an umbrella</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na cchatrapāṇaye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to one holding a dagger</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na khaḍgapāṇaye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to one holding a weapon</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāyudhapāṇaye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We will not teach the Dharma to one holding armour,”</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a training to be followed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na sannaddhāyāglāṇāya dharmam desāvisyāma iti śikṣakaraṇīyā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table illustrates, excluding the first rule in the series, the prohibition against teaching the dharma to one who is holding a stick, there is no continuity in the rule order.

---

258 Unfortunately the *uddāna* in Serial 4b/4c does not illuminate what order the missing rules may follow, in that it simply notes the presence of six rules on holding (an item) in the hand. See Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 133.


The two rules missing from Serial 4b are presumably one on holding a weapon, and one on holding armour, but the order of these two rules, if they existed, is unclear.

Unlike all of the other cases that have been noted so far, there is not only a considerable discrepancy with regard to the rule order in the Gilgit manuscripts, but also in multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin sources. The Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa,\textsuperscript{261} bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa,\textsuperscript{262} and the Mahāvyutpatti,\textsuperscript{263} all follow the same order.\textsuperscript{264} According to Pachow, the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin texts only contain one rule, that prohibiting preaching to one holding an umbrella.\textsuperscript{265} The Sanskrit manuscript of the Vinaya-sūtra combines all of these rules together, and as such is no help in determining any underlying order.\textsuperscript{266} The Tibetan translation of the Vinaya-sūtra lists the rules in the same order as the bhikṣu prātimokṣa, as do the Vinaya-sūtra commentaries.\textsuperscript{267} The BPSV\textsuperscript{268} and the Tibetan bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga\textsuperscript{269} both follow different orders than any of our other texts.

Concerning the Gilgit prātimokṣas, we have a unique circumstance in respect to the rules of this section. Serial 3a always follows the Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa, except in this case. Also, Serial 4b/4c, while differing from another Gilgit prātimokṣa, does not follow an order present in either the Vinaya-sūtra, or the BPSV. The fact that there is

\textsuperscript{261} sTog Ca 27b1–2; Derge Ca 28a3–4.
\textsuperscript{262} sTog Nya 32b4–5; Derge Ta 33a1–2.
\textsuperscript{263} Sakaki, Mahāvyutpatti, 553–554.
\textsuperscript{264} The order of these rules is: stick, umbrella, sword, dagger, weapon, armour.
\textsuperscript{265} According to Pachow, Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa, Appendix I, 25 and Kabilsingh, Bhikkunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools, 325.
\textsuperscript{266} Vin_2.2131. See Sāṅkrityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 63.
\textsuperscript{267} Vinaya-sūtra Derge Wu 50a1–2; Vinayasūtraṛṣṭyabhidhāna Derge Zu 10b4; Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā, Derge Yu 17a6–7.
\textsuperscript{268} Derge Tsu 155a4–6.
\textsuperscript{269} Derge Ta 457a5–457b3.
such variation in regard to these rules in the Gilgit manuscripts, and also with the Tibetan bhikṣunī vibhaṅga and the BPSV suggests that this section of rules may have been more fluid in its sequence than other rules in Mūlasarvāstivādin texts. Regardless, in this case both Serial 3a and Serial 4b follow a unique order.

Section 2.4: Sample Set Four

Pāyattikas 42–43 Rule Order in Serial 2 and Serial 4b

Pāyattikas 43 and 44 of Serial 2 and Serial 4b both contain restrictions against being in a house in which a man and woman are preparing to have sex.\(^{270}\) One of the rules involves sitting in the house while the other involves standing. The rules occur in the opposite order in the two Gilgit manuscripts, as illustrated below in Table 2.4.1. Due to the substantially greater length of the pāyattika rules, as compared to the terse śaikṣā rules, and the lack of any substantial differences in terminology in the manuscripts, only a summary has been provided in the table below.

\(^{270}\) For this meaning of these two rules, see Clarke, “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms,” 23, in which he quotes Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary, 421.
Table 2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b prātimokṣa-sūtra(^\text{271})</th>
<th>Gilgit Serial 2 prātimokṣa-sūtra(^\text{272})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Not standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Not sitting on a couch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sequence of rules in Serial 2 is also the same in the Tibetan and Chinese prātimokṣa-sūtras.\(^\text{273}\) Although these rules are not included in the Tibetan bhikṣunī prātimokṣa, the Chinese bhikṣunī prātimokṣa, or the BPSV, they are found in the bhikṣunī vibhaṅga, in which they follow the order of Serial 2.\(^\text{274}\) The rules also are present in the same order as Serial 2 in both the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the Vinaya-sūtra\(^\text{275}\) and the Vinaya-sūtra commentaries.\(^\text{276}\) Serial 4b preserves a unique ordering of these rules in comparison to other known Mūlasarvāśṭivādin texts, which all follow exactly the same order with respect to these two rules.\(^\text{277}\)

\(^{271}\) Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 143.
\(^{273}\) Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 144 and Appendix II, 4.
\(^{274}\) Derge Ta 315b1–4.
\(^{277}\) There is a possible exception to this in the uddāna of Serial 2. The keywords used for these two rules are “standing, couch (sthānaṁ niṣadyā)” which would follow the order of the rules in Serial 4b. The same order is present in the uddāna of Serial 4b, allowing for the possibility that the order of Serial 4b was an error resulting from the use of the uddāna as the basis for the sequence of the rules.
Section 2.5: Sample Set Five

Śaikṣās 91 to 92 in Serial 4b and Serial 3a

Śaikṣā rules 91 and 92 of Serial 4b and Serial 3a are both concerned with preaching the dharma to one donning headgear. The two rules are found in the opposite order in Serial 3a and Serial 4b.

Table 2.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b prātimokṣa-sūtra</th>
<th>Gilgit Serial 3a prātimokṣa-sūtra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91. Not to one wearing a garland</td>
<td>na mālāśirase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Not to one wearing a crown</td>
<td>na mauliśirase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91. Not to one wearing a crown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92. Not to one wearing a garland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of these two rules, nearly all the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin texts follow the rule sequence present in Serial 3a. According to Pachow, the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin bhikṣu prātimokṣa only has a rule on wearing a garland, which is also the case for nuns.\textsuperscript{280} The Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa,\textsuperscript{281} bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa, the Mahāvyutpatti,\textsuperscript{282} the Stein manuscript,\textsuperscript{283} and the BPSI\textsuperscript{284} all follow the order present in Serial 3a. The Sanskrit

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{278} Vira and Chandra, \textit{Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts}, Part 2, Plate 134.
\item \textsuperscript{279} Vira and Chandra, \textit{Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts}, Part 1, Plate 55.
\item \textsuperscript{280} Pachow, \textit{Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa}, Appendix IV, 10. For the nuns, see Kabilsingh \textit{Bhikkunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools}, 324.
\item \textsuperscript{281} STog Ca 27a7; Derge Ca 27b7–28a1.
\item \textsuperscript{282} Sakaki, \textit{Mahāvyutpatti}, 553.
\item \textsuperscript{283} Lévi, “Notes sur des manuscrits sanscrits,” 20.
\item \textsuperscript{284} Derge Tsu 154b6.
\end{itemize}
Vinaya-sūtra manuscript combines both rules, and the Tibetan translation and the commentaries all follow Serial 3a and the other Tibetan texts. However, in the bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga, the rules are found in the order as presented in Serial 4b. Therefore, at least one Mūlasarvāstivādin commentary matches Serial 4b in the order of these rules. Since, in addition to the abundance of Mūlasarvāstivādin material that follows the alternate sequence, the scribe has resorted to using the left margin in the middle of these rules, there is also the possibility that the order in Serial 4b is the result of a scribal error. Regardless, once again we find Serial 4b/4c following a rule order foreign to the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtras, but which matches a Mūlasarvāstivādin commentary.

Chapter Two Conclusions

Having compared the śaikṣā rules that are shared between the different Gilgit manuscripts, and having touched upon differences in Serial 2, Serial 3a, and Serial 4b, it is possible to make some tentative conclusions. The data from the five Sample Sets of Chapter Two suggest that differences in the rule order of the Gilgit prātimokṣa fragments is the result of Serial 2 and Serial 3a matching the order of the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtras, and Serial 4b matching specific Mūlasarvāstivādin commentaries. Where there are differences between the manuscripts in terms of rule order, the order found in Serial 3a matches the known Tibetan versions in all cases excluding Sample Set Three, while Serial

---

285 Vin_2.2130. See Sāṅkṛityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 63.
286 Vinaya-sūtra, Derge Wu 49b2; Vinayasūtraṃvṛttyabhidhāna, Derge Zu 9b5–6; Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā, Derge Yu 17a5.
287 Derge Ta 456b6–7.
288 Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 2, Plate 134.
4b does not. The same is the case for those shared rules with differing orders in Serial 4b and Serial 2. Serial 4b is, so to speak, perpetually the odd one out.

In the case of Serial 4b, we have here a bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra that, it seems, often coincides with Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial literature. In Sample Sets Three and Four, Serial 4b/4c preserves a unique order. However, in Sample Set Five, Serial 4b and the Tibetan bhikṣunī vibhaṅga share a common rule order. We have also seen that the Serial 4b/4c prātimokṣa matches the BPSV for Sample Set One, and the BPSV and the Vinaya-sūtra for Sample Set Two. Similar agreement is found in śaikṣā rules 45 to 47 of Serial 4b, which closely match the Vinaya-sūtra and exactly match the BPSV. If the commentarial literature is based upon the prātimokṣa-sūtra and the vibhaṅga, the vibhaṅgas themselves being commentaries on the prātimokṣas, then one would assume that the Vinaya-sūtra is based upon a Mūlasarvāstivādin bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra and the BPSV based upon a Mūlasarvāstivādin bhikṣunī prātimokṣa-sūtra. Such prātimokṣa-sūtras, unfortunately, have yet to be discovered. Serial 4b/4c, however, seems to represent a prātimokṣa that follows, at least on the basis of the material analyzed so far, a tradition, or traditions, aware of the rules in an order similar to that which would be found in a prātimokṣa-sūtra underlying these Mūlasarvāstivādin commentaries.

Given the results of the comparative analysis of the Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras in Chapter Two, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Serial 4b/4c belongs to a different tradition than that behind Serials 2 and 3a, which almost certainly follow the monastic tradition of the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtra. In Chapter Three, I will investigate those rules contained only in Serial 4b/4c that differ in order from the Tibetan bhikṣu
prātimokṣa-sūtra, and compare that order to known Mūlasarvāstivādin commentaries. This will provide further evidence of a connection between the bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra of Serial 4b/4c and the commentarial traditions of the Vinaya-sūtra and the BPSV, contra the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtras.
Chapter 3: The Relationship of Serial 4b/4c to Mūlasarvāstivādin

Vinaya Traditions

The previous chapter looked at those rules shared by multiple Gilgit prātimokṣa manuscripts but found in a different order in two manuscripts. In addition to these rules extant in multiple manuscripts, there are a number of prātimokṣa rules that are extant in only one manuscript. In Chapter Three, I consider the instances in which rules extant only in Serial 4b/4c are present in a different order than in the Tibetan prātimokṣa. I will compare the order of Serial 4b/4c to known Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial literature, especially the BPSV and the Vinaya-sūtra, as the Sample Sets analyzed in Chapter Two strongly suggest that Serial 4b/4c follows a Vinaya tradition close to one known to the author(s)/redactor(s) of those commentaries. Below, I present all of the remaining rules of Serial 4b/4c that differ from the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtra in rule order in two sections. Section 3.1 details the issues surrounding pāyattikas 24 to 25. In Section 3.2, I focus upon śaikṣā rules 58 to 69, which follow a vastly different order in Serial 4b/4c than any other known Mūlasarvāstivāda prātimokṣa.

Section 3.1: Pāyattikas 24 to 25 in Serial 4b

Amongst the Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras, pāyattikas 24 to 25 are only contained in Serial 4b. These rules make it an offense for a monk to make or give a robe to an unrelated nun. As this rule very specifically applies to monks, the rules are absent from those texts concerned with the behaviour of nuns. These rules are present in the opposite
order in the Chinese *prātimokṣa*, as are they in the Tibetan *prātimokṣa*. The *Mahāvyutpatti* also follows the order of the Chinese and Tibetan sūtras.

Table 3.1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b <em>prātimokṣa</em></th>
<th>Tibetan <em>bhikṣu prātimokṣa</em> and <em>vibhaṅga</em></th>
<th>Chinese <em>bhikṣu prātimokṣa</em></th>
<th><em>Mahāvyutpatti</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making a robe for an unrelated nun</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving a robe to an unrelated nun</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, Serial 4b follows a different sequence than that of the known Mūlasarvāstivādin *prātimokṣas*. Because of the monk-specific nature of this rule, the *BPSV* provides no assistance in determining any parallels between Serial 4b/4c to the Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial traditions in this case. However, these rules are present in the *Vinaya-sūtra*.

---

289 Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, Appendix IV, 10.
290 S Tog Ca 17b5; Derge Ca 18a2–3.
293 For the *prātimokṣa*, S Tog Ca 17b5–6; Derge Ca 18a2–3. For *vibhaṅga* 24, see Derge Ja 135b5; for 25, see Derge 139a5.
294 Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, Appendix IV, 10.
Table 3.1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b prātimokṣa296</th>
<th>Vinaya-sūtra297</th>
<th>Upāliparipṛcchā 2298</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making a robe for an unrelated nun</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving a robe to an unrelated nun</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sanskrit and Tibetan Vinaya-sūtras both follow the order present in Serial 4, as do the commentaries translated into Tibetan.299 In this case, the rules are also present in this sequence in the Upāliparipṛcchā. Two versions of this text, which consists of a collection of Vinaya related questions posed to the Buddha by Upāli, are included in the Tibetan canon, in the two Uttaragranthas.300 There is one full and one incomplete Uttaragrantha, containing one full and one incomplete Upāliparipṛcchā.301 We have, with pāyattikas 24 to 25, further evidence to support the claim that the author(s)/redactor(s) of Serial 4b/4c prātimokṣa-sūtra was aware of a different Vinaya tradition than that behind the Tibetan prātimokṣa. In this case, we see evidence of a similar tradition, once again, with the Vinaya-sūtra, and also with the author(s)/redactor(s) of the Upāliparipṛcchā.

296 Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 2, Plate 139.
297 Vin_2,4,21–2,4,22. See Sāṅkṛityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 42. I follow here the numbering used by Clarke, in Clarke, “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms,” 23.
298 For 24, see Derge Na 251a1; for 25, 252b5. Again, I follow the numbering used by Clarke in “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms,” 23.
299 Vinaya-sūtra, Derge Wu 33b6–7; Vinayasūtraṛṣṭyabhidhāna, Derge Zhu 204a7–b2; Vinaya-sūtra-tikā, Derge Yu 294a4–6.
300 Clarke, “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms,” 22.
301 Ibid.
Section 3.2: Serial 4b/4c Śaikṣā Rules 58 to 69

Up to this point, the diversity in rule order that has made possible the suggestion that the bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra of Serial 4b/4c follows a different Vinaya tradition than Serial 2 and Serial 3a and the Tibetan prātimokṣa was gleaned from small groups of rules. Even in Sample Sets One and Two, which looked at larger groups of rules, the actual number of rules in these sections that were present in differing orders was small. In order to substantiate the claim that Serial 4b/4c belongs to a Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition that is somehow linked to the Vinaya-sūtra of Guṇaprabha or the BPSV, further evidence is necessary. This evidence is present in śaikṣā rules 58 to 69 of Serial 4b/4c.302

Beginning with rule 58, the śaikṣā rule order that is followed in Serial 4b/4c differs significantly from the order of the Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra. These rules, which constitute roughly ten percent of the śaikṣās in Serial 4b/4c, do not agree in order with other known Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣas, making this the most unique section of the Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras. Because of the relatively large number of rules, in this chapter I will examine these twelve rules in three sections: rules 58 to 61, 62 to 64, and 65 to 69. I will note the dissimilarity in the rule order between Serial 4b/4c and the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtras, and any similarity between Serial 4b/4c and the Vinaya-sūtra and the BPSV. I have organized the groups of rules (i.e., 58 to 61) not by topic, but rather by size, with the intention of presenting the material in a more digestible manner.

---

302 Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 2, Plate 136 and 133.
A Note on the Vinaya-sūtra and its Commentaries

With respect to śaikṣās 58 to 69 of Serial 4b/4c, there are some differences in the ordering of the equivalent śaikṣā rules in the Vinaya-sūtra as preserved in the Sanskrit manuscript edited by Sāṅkrityāyana, and the Tibetan translation of the Vinaya-sūtra.³⁰³ Two commentaries on the Vinaya-sūtra extant in Tibetan translations contain these śaikṣā rules: Guṇaprabha’s autocommentary, the Vinayasūtravṛttyabhidhānasvavyākhyānānāma (hereafter Vinayasūtravṛttyabhidhāna),³⁰⁴ and Dharmamitra’s Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā.³⁰⁵ A comparative table containing the rule order for the relevant śaikṣās in these four texts can be found in Appendix 1. For the purposes of this chapter, it is sufficient to summarize the results of this appendix. The rule order found in the Tibetan Vinaya-sūtra exactly matches the order of the Tibetan prātimokṣa, as does the Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā. The Vinayasūtravṛttyabhidhāna, although not an exact match, closely follows the order of the Sanskrit manuscript used by Sāṅkrityāyana. In this chapter I will use primarily the Sanskrit text, but for instances in which the Sanskrit Vinaya-sūtra is unclear, the Tibetan translation and commentaries will be consulted, especially in the case of the Vinayasūtravṛttyabhidhāna, since for these rules it follows a closer order to the Vinaya-sūtra than do the other Tibetan texts.

³⁰³ Tib. ‘dul ba ‘i mdo. For the relevant śaikṣās, see Derge Wu 49b1–2.
³⁰⁴ Tib. ‘dul ba'[i] mdo’o ’grel ba mngon par brjed pa rang gi rnam par bshad pa zhes bya ba. See Derge Zu 9b1–10a1.
³⁰⁵ Tib. ‘dul ba’i mdo’i rgya cher ’grel pa. See Derge Yu 16b2–7.
Section 3.2: Serial 4b/4c Šaikṣā Rules 58 to 61

The first section, containing rules 58 to 61 of Serial 4b/4c, deals with proper behaviour in regard to food preferences and the tongue. The four rules are as follows:

Table 3.2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b/4c Prātimokṣa&lt;sup&gt;306&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not separating the lumps of rice&lt;sup&gt;307&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>na sitthapṛthakkāram</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not making complaints&lt;sup&gt;308&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nāvarṇakāram</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sticking-out the tongue</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>na jihvāniś cārakām</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not making smacking noises with the tongue</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>na jihvāsphoṭakām</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These rules are divided into a group of six rules in the text itself; the verb *paribhokṣyāmaḥ* (“we will eat”) is found only at the end of šaikṣā rule 64 (see Table 3.2.6). These rules involve the proper way of eating almsfood (*piṇḍapātam*), as do all the šaikṣā rules 58 to 69. Rules 58 to 59 deal with polite ways of interacting with received food, while rules 60 to 61 include improper etiquette on using the tongue while eating.

---

<sup>306</sup> For rules 58–59 see Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 136; for 60–61 see Plate 133.


The rule order in Serial 4b/4c does not match the sequence of the Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra. Nor does it match the order of the bhikṣunī prātimokṣa, which in this case follows the monks’ text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not separating the lumps of rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not making complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sticking-out the tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not making smacking noises with the tongue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the Tibetan prātimokṣas begin with the rule against sticking out the tongue (59), followed by the two rules on food preference (60 to 61). Then, before the rule against making smacking noises with the tongue (63) another rule is present, the rule against stuffing food in the cheeks (62). The Mahāvyutpatti follows a similar order to the

---

309 For rules 58–59 see Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 2, Plate 136; for 60–61, see Plate 133.
310 For the prātimokṣa, sTog Ca 26b3–4; Derge Ca 27a3–4. For vibhaṅga rule 59, see Derge Nya 365b5; for 60 Nya 366b1; for 61 Nya 366b5; for 63 Nya 367a5.
311 sTog Nya 31b5–6; Derge Ta 32a2–3.
312 Sakaki, Mahāvyutpatti, 549.
313 See Table 3.2.5.
Tibetan prātimokṣas, although it contains two śaikṣās in between the rules against making complaints and on protruding the tongue (see Table 3.2.5).

The Vinaya-sūtra and the BPSV both follow an order close to that of Serial 4b/4c, but neither text matches this order exactly, as is illustrated below in Table 3.2.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b/4c prātimokṣa</th>
<th>BPSV</th>
<th>Vinaya-sūtra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not separating the lumps of rice</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not making complaints</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sticking-out the tongue</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not making smacking noises with the tongue</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the first two rules of this section, the Vinaya-sūtra begins in complete accord with Serial 4b/4c. However, unlike in Serial 4b/4c, in the Vinaya-sūtra the two rules on tongues (59 to 60) do not follow the rule on making complaints (56). Guṇaprabha also combines the rules on tongues into one rule, making it unclear what order the rules may have been found in any underlying prātimokṣa-sūtra. The Tibetan translation of the

---

314 For rules 58–59, see Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 2, Plate 136; for 60–61, see Plate 133.
315 Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2.
316 Vin_2.2101 (55), Vin_2.2102 (56), and Vin_2.2105 (59–60). See Sāṅkrityāyana, Vinayasaśtra, 63. 
317 na jihvāśphoṭaniścāraṃ.
Vinaya-sūtra follows the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtra, and, as such, the two rules on tongues are not sequential—nor are they in the Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā. The Vinayasūtravṛttyabhidhāna follows Serial 4b/4c and the BPSV in that the rules on tongues (60 to 61) are present after the rule on cutting food into morsels, although, unlike the BPSV and Serial 4b/4c, they are not ordered sequentially. While the Vinaya-sūtra does not follow Serial 4b/4c with regard to the rules on tongues, both texts do have the rules on tongues in sequential order, unlike the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtra(s).

The BPSV is arguably the closest in order to Serial 4b/4c with respect to rules 58 to 61. The first two rules of Table 3.3 are reversed in the BPSV. Not only are the rules found in the reverse order in comparison to Serial 4b/4c, but, as far as I am aware, they also differ from all of the other Mūlasarvāstivādin texts. However, the rules on tongues are both found in the same order and occur immediately following the two rules on food preference, just as in Serial 4b/4c.

Conclusions about Śaïkṣā Rules 58 to 61

The order of śaïkṣā rules 58 to 61 in Serial 4b/4c definitely differ from the rule order of the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtras. The order of Serial 4b/4c is not exactly the same as either the Vinaya-sūtra or the BPSV, although it is clearly closer to these two texts than

---

318 Derge Wu 49b1.
319 Derge Yu 16b4–7.
320 Derge Zu 9b5–6. Although in the Vinayasūtravṛttyabhidhāna the rule on not sticking out the tongue is before the rule on making smacking noises with the tongue, as in the Serial 4b/4c and the BPSV, the rules on tongues are not back-to-back. The rule on making smacking noises is located after the four rules on licking/shaking the hands and bowls (Table 3.2.8). See Appendix 1.
any other Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtra or commentary of which I am aware. Unlike the Tibetan prātimokṣas and the Mahāvyutpatti, the Vinaya-sūtra, BPSV, and Serial 4b/4c follow a tradition that places the rules on proper tongue etiquette together. Additionally, both Serial 4b/4c and BPSV know of a tradition that places these rules immediately following the rules on food preference (58 and 59 of Serial 4b/4c).

One final note on the order of the śaikṣā rules of Section 3.2 as found in the Vinaya-sūtra, the BPSV, and Serial 4b/4c: the placement of the rules involving the tongue together is probably not a coincidence. It seems likely that the sequential ordering of two rules both involving the tongue is the result of strategic planning. The fact that the rules are found in an alternate order in other texts makes it even more likely that the Vinaya-sūtra, the BPSV, and Serial 4b/4c follow a tradition that sought to organize these rules according to topic. The apparent systemization of the śaikṣā rules may tell us something about the development of the Serial 4b/4c prātimokṣa-sūtra. It is possible that the placing of rules that share a topic together represents a later organizational system applied to the Mūlasarvāstivādin śaikṣā rules. Alternatively, there is also the possibility that the opposite is true, and with Serial 4b/4c we have evidence of an earlier, oral tradition that organized the rules in a way to best suit memorization. Finally, there is the possibility that the combination of similar rules could be the result of the success of digests like the Vinaya-sūtra. This may also explain why we see such diversity in the rule order of the śaikṣās making it an offense to preach the dharma to people holding various items\textsuperscript{321}.

\textsuperscript{321} See Section 2.3.
Mūlasarvāstivādin monastic texts; perhaps prātimokṣa-sūtras were composed following these rule digests, or rearranged to match them.

**Serial 4b Śāikṣā Rules 62 to 64**

Śāikṣā rules 62 to 64 detail certain behaviours that one ought not do with one’s food. These three rules are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gilgit Serial 4b Prātimokṣa</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Śāikṣā 64, the final rule of this group, contains the information missing from the preceding rules, “‘We will eat almsfood …’ is a training to be followed.”

The Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa, bhikṣunī prātimokṣa, and the Mahāvyutpatti all contain the order of the rules against dividing food into morsels and seizing food in the cheeks in the opposite order to Serial 4b.

---

322 Although beyond the scope of this project, a study on such matters may prove interesting.
323 Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 133.
324 Ibid.
Table 3.2.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b prātimokṣa 325</th>
<th>Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa and vibhaṅga 326</th>
<th>Tibetan bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa 327</th>
<th>Mahāvyutpatti 328</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not divide into morsels</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not seize in the cheeks</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not eat food crushing a stūpa-shape</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mahāvyutpatti has these two rules back-to-back, though in the opposite order to the rules in Serial 4b, while the Tibetan prātimokṣas have a rule in between them—the previously mentioned rule against making smacking noises with the tongue (bhikṣu prātimokṣa #63). There is even greater difference with regard to the regulation against crushing stūpa-shaped food when eating.329 In the Tibetan prātimokṣas there are four rules in between rules 63 and 64 of Serial 4b, and five rules in between them in the Mahāvyutpatti. This gap between the rule against putting food in the cheeks and crushing

---

325 Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 2, Plate 133.
326 For the prātimokṣa, sTog Ca 26b3–5; Derge Ca 27a4–5. For vibhaṅga rule 64, see Derge Nya 367b.3; for 62 Nya 367a.1; for 69 Nya 368b.5.
327 sTog Nya 31b5–6; Derge Ta 32a2–3.
328 Sakaki, Mahāvyutpatti, 549–550.
329 For a discussion of this rule, see Gregory Schopen, “The Suppression of Nuns and the ritual Murder of their Special Dead in Two Buddhist Monastic Texts,” in Journal of Indian Philosophy (1996) 24:570–571.
a food-Śūpa, absent in Serial 4b, is less pronounced in the Sanskrit Vinaya-sūtra, and absent in the BPSV.

Table 3.2.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b prātimokṣa</th>
<th>Vinaya-sūtra</th>
<th>BPSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not divide into morsels</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not seize in the cheeks</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not eat food crushing a śūpa-shape</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Vinaya-sūtra is less close to Serial 4b with respect to the śaikṣā order of these rules than the BPSV. The order of the rules against dividing food into morsels and stuffing food in the cheeks does not follow Serial 4b, but rather, the order found in the Tibetan prātimokṣa and the Mahāvyutpatti (Table 3.2.7). Śaikṣā 63 of the Vinaya-sūtra, equivalent to śaikṣā 64 of Serial 4b, is found in a similar place in Guṇaprabha’s work to its location in Serial 4b. Starting from rule 55 and up until 61, the Vinaya-sūtra contains all, and only, those rules found in Serial 4b.333 The two texts do not always present the rules in the same order, but all of the same rules are present. This is not the case with the Tibetan prātimokṣas and the Mahāvyutpatti, which present the rule against crushing śūpa-shaped later on in the text (after rules that will be addressed in Table 3.2.8).

---

330 Vira and Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, Part 2, Plate 133.
331 Vin_2.2103 (57), 2.2104 (56), 2.2106 (61). See Śaṅkrityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 63.
332 Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2.
333 Śaṅkrityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 63. Vin_2.2101–2.2106 = śaikṣā rules 59–70.
Despite some differences in the order of individual rules, śaikṣās 62 to 64 of Serial 4b are much closer the Vinaya-sūtra than to the Tibetan prātimokṣa or the Mahāvyutpatti, suggesting again the possibility that the author(s)/redactor(s) of Serial 4b/4c and the Vinaya-sūtra were aware of similar Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya traditions.

As for the BPSV, it follows exactly the same order as śaikṣās 62 to 64 of Serial 4b. In fact, both Serial 4b and the BPSV follow an identical order for śaikṣās 60 to 64. Not only is this order identical, but there is also only a slight variation with the order of rules 58 to 59. Once again the author(s)/redactor(s) of the BPSV seem to be aware of a Vinaya tradition similar to that of the one present in the Serial 4b/4c prātimokṣa-sūtra. The closeness of these texts in rule order to the BPSV, and against other known Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya texts is illustrated in the table below.
Table 3.2.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Group A</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group B</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilgit Serial 4b (prātimokṣa)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPSV(^{335})</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vinayāsūtra)(^{336})</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibetan (bhikṣu) (prātimokṣa) and (vibhaṅga)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibetan (bhikṣuṇī) (prātimokṣa)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mahāvyutpatti)(^{339})</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not divide into morsels**

**Not seize in the cheeks**

**Not eat food crushing a \(stūpa\)-shape**

Sections 3.2.3: Serial 4b \(Śaikṣā\) Rules 65 to 69

\(Śaikṣā\) rules 65 to 69 contain four rules concerning the shaking and licking of one’s hand(s) and the alms bowl. Additionally, rule 69 of Serial 4b is the rule on requiring attentive looking at the alms bowl, rule 44 of Serial 2 and the Tibetan \(prātimokṣa-sūtra\), as noted in Chapter Two.\(^{340}\)

\(^{334}\) Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 133.

\(^{335}\) Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2.

\(^{336}\) \(Vin\)_2.2103 (57), 2.2104 (56), 2.2106 (61). See Sāṅkrityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

\(^{337}\) For the \(prātimokṣa\), \(sTog\) Ca 26b3–5; Derge Ca 27a4–5. For \(vibhaṅga\) rule 64, see Derge Nya 367b3; for 62 Nya 367a1; for 69 Nya 368b5.

\(^{338}\) \(sTog\) Nya 31b5–6; Derge Ta 32a2–3.


\(^{340}\) See Section 2.2.
As was previously mentioned, the greatest variance between these rules and the Tibetan *prātimokṣas* and the *Mahāvyutpatti* concerns the rule 69 of Serial 4b. In Serial 4b, this rule is found twenty-five rules later than it is in Serial 2 and the Tibetan *bhikṣu* *prātimokṣa* (see Table 2.2.1 and Table 3.2.9).

---

Table 3.2.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b prātimokṣa&lt;sup&gt;342&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Tibetan bhikṣų prātimokṣa and vibhaṅga&lt;sup&gt;343&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Tibetan bhikṣunī prātimokṣa&lt;sup&gt;344&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Mahāvyutpatti&lt;sup&gt;345&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not shaking hand(s)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not shaking bowl</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not licking hand(s)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not licking bowl</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking attentively at the bowl</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a similar gap between the rules with respect to the bhikṣunī prātimokṣa and the Mahāvyutpatti. A smaller variation in rule order is present in śaiksās 65 to 68. With respect to these rules, Serial 4b follows a unique sequence. All four texts analyzed in Table 3.2.9 have two rules on shaking and two rules on licking, and they all organize the rules based on the action being taken (shaking and licking) as opposed to what it is being

<sup>342</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 133.
<sup>343</sup> For the prātimokṣa rules 65–68, see sTog Ca 26b3–5; Derge Ca 27a4–5. For 44, see sTog 26a6; Derge Ca 26b6. For vibhaṅga rule 65, see Derge Nya 367b7; for 66 Nya 368a4; for 67 Nya 368a6; for 68 368b3; for rule 44, see Derge Nya 362b5.
<sup>344</sup> sTog Nya 31b6–7; Derge Ta 32a3–4. For śaiksā 45, see sTog Nya 31b1; Derge Ta 31b5.
shaken or licked (hand[s] and bowls). However, only Serial 4b lists the rules on shaking before the rules on licking.

It should not be surprising that, once again, Guṇaprabha combines these similar rules together. In this case, there is a substantial reduction of the rules, as all four are combined into one. In the rules presented by Guṇaprabha, na hastapātrāvālehasan dhūnasamtolam, the order in the sentence itself is licking first, followed by shaking. Since these rules are combined here, it is unclear in what order the tradition Guṇaprabha was familiar with listed these rules, although it does not seem unreasonable that he would present them in the correct order. The Tibetan translation and commentaries all follow the same order presented in the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtras and the Mahāvyutpatti, and this suggests that this was the order with which Guṇaprabha was familiar. The rule requiring the attentive looking at the alms bowl, just as is the case in Serial 4b, immediately follows the rules prohibiting the licking and shaking of bowls and hands.

---

346 Vin_2.2129. See Sāṅkṛityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 63.
347 Ibid.
348 Vinaya-sūtra Derge Wu 49b2; Vinayasūtraavyabhidhāna Derge Zu 9b5–6; Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā, Derge Yu 16b5.
Table 3.2.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b prātimokṣa</th>
<th>Vinaya-sūtra</th>
<th>BPSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not shaking hand(s)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62–65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not shaking bowl</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62–65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not licking hand(s)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62–65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not licking bowl</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62–65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking attentively at the bowl</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *BPSV* follows a similar tradition to the *Vinaya-sūtra* and Serial 4b in placing the rule on attentive looking after the rules on licking and shaking. However, the *BPSV* follows an unique order in the presentation of these four rules. Although the order of śaiksā rules 65 to 68 in the *BPSV* begins with the rule against shaking hand(s), therefore matching Serial 4b, afterwards the *BPSV* follows a different sequence than that of Serial 4b, the Tibetan prātimokṣas, or the Mahāvyutpatti. Unlike these other sources, the rules are not organized by shaking and licking, but rather the two rules on bowls are located between the two rules on hands.

---

349 Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 133.
351 Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2.
Table 3.2.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Tibetān bhikṣu prātimokṣa and vibhaṅga</th>
<th>Tibetān bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa</th>
<th>Mahāvyutpatti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilgit Serial 4b prātimokṣa 352</td>
<td>Vinayasūtra 353</td>
<td>BPSV 354</td>
<td>Tibetān bhikṣu prātimokṣa and vibhaṅga 355</td>
<td>Tibetān bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa 356</td>
<td>Mahāvyutpatti 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not shaking hands</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62–65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not shaking bowl</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62–65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not licking hands</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62–65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not licking bowl</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62–65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking attentively at the bowl</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serial 4b preserves an order of śaikṣā rules 65 to 69 that is not matched by any sources of which I am aware. It certainly does not belong to a tradition that follows the ordering found in the Tibetan prātimokṣas or the Mahāvyutpatti, as evidenced by the vast difference between the placement of the rule on attentive looking into the alms bowl.

---

352 Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 133.
354 Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2.
355 For the prātimokṣa rules 65–68, see sTog Ca 26b3–5; Derge Ca 27a4–5. For 44, see sTog 26a6; Derge Ca 26b6. For vibhaṅga rule 65, see Derge Nya 367b7; for 66 Nya 368a4; for 67 Nya 368a6; for 68 368b3; for rule 44, see Derge Nya 362b5.
356 sTog Nya 31b6–7; Derge Ta 32a3–4. For śaikṣā 45, see sTog Nya 31b1; Derge Ta 31b5.
However, both the *Vinaya-sūtra* and the *BPSV* roughly follow the order of Serial 4b/4c by placing this rule on attentive looking following the four rules on licking/shaking the hands and bowl. However, the sequence of this section of rules only partially matches the *BPSV*, and the exact order of the rules in the *Vinaya-sūtra* is unclear. Despite the rule sequence not being an exact match, or only possibly matching, the tradition that Serial 4b follows regarding rules 65 to 69 is more closely aligned to the commentarial traditions of the *Vinaya-sūtra* and the *BPSV* than to any other known traditions.

**Section 3.2 Conclusions**

The sequence of *śaikṣā* rules 58 to 69 in Serial 4b/4c, of which there are no parallel fragments amongst the other Gilgit *prātimokṣa-sūtras*, never matches the order of rules present in the Tibetan *bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra*, the *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa-sūtra*, or the *Mahāvyutpatti*. While there are occasions in which two rules are found in the same sequential order, for example the rules on not licking the hands (see Table 3.8), the agreement is never larger than this. Even when the rules are back-to-back in both texts, the rule order present in the Tibetan *prātimokṣa-sūtras* or the *Mahāvyutpatti* never actually matches that of Serial 4b/4c. Clearly, the author(s)/redactor(s) of Serial 4b/4c followed a different tradition than these three texts.

A comparison to the commentarial traditions of the *BPSV* and the *Vinaya-sūtra* illustrates that, once again, the *Vinaya* traditions that underlie these two commentaries are in close alignment to the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* of Serial 4b/4c. Excluding *śaikṣās* 66 to 68, the remaining nine rules, which never match the order of the Tibetan *prātimokṣas*, match
the *Vinaya-sūtra*, the *BPSV*, or both. A comparison of the order of all the Serial 4b/4c śaikṣā rules 58 to 69 with the *BPSV* and the *Vinaya-sūtra* is given below in Table 3.10. The rule numbers of those rules that definitively share the same order are underlined. If agreement in order is possible, the rule numbers are given in italics. Where all three texts follow the same order, the rule numbers are given in bold.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule Description</th>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4 prātimokṣa\textsuperscript{358}</th>
<th>Vinaya-sūtra\textsuperscript{359}</th>
<th>BPS\textsuperscript{360}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not separating the lumps of rice</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not making complaints</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sticking-out the tongue</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59–60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not making smacking noises with the tongue</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59–60</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not divide morsels</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not seize in the cheeks</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not eat food crushing a stūpa-shape</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not shaking hands</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62–65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not shaking bowl</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62–65</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not licking hands</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62–65</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not licking bowl</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62–65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking attentively at the bowl</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{358} For rules 58 and 59 see Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 136. For the remainder, see Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 133.

\textsuperscript{359} Vin 2.2101–2.2108. See Sāṅkrityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

\textsuperscript{360} Derge Tsu 150b6–152b6
While a study of the order of the individual rules illustrates various levels of similarity and difference between the Vinaya-sūtra, BPSV, and Serial 4b/4c, looking at what rules are shared between all three of the texts is also productive. Only two rules are shared between the three texts: the rule against crushing stūpa-shaped food (Serial 4b #64) and the rule requiring looking attentively at the alms bowl (Serial 4b #69). However, in all three cases, the four rules on not licking and shaking bowls and hands are encompassed by these two rules. This general order, absent from the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtras, is also found in the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa.

Table 3.2.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilgit Serial 4b prātimokṣa&lt;sup&gt;361&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Vinaya-sūtra&lt;sup&gt;362&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>BPSV&lt;sup&gt;363&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Chinese bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa&lt;sup&gt;364&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not eat food crushing a stūpa-shape</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not shaking hands</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62-65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not shaking bowl</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62-65</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not licking hands</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62-65</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not licking bowl</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62-65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking attentively at the bowl</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>361</sup> Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 133.
<sup>362</sup> Vin_2.2128–2.2130. See Sāṅkrityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.
<sup>363</sup> Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2.
<sup>364</sup> Kabilsingh, *Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*, 322.
As illustrated by Table 3.2.13, it appears that there were two major\textsuperscript{365} rule sequences known to the Mūlasarvāstivādins about the placement of the rule on looking attentively at the alms bowl. One sequence of rules is that found in the Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra, bhikṣunī prātimokṣa-sūtra, the Mahāvyutpatti,\textsuperscript{366} and—although we only have access to the rule on looking attentively—presumably Serial 2 (See Tables 2.2.1 and 3.2.10). The other ordering system is that which is present in Serial 4b/4c, the Vinaya-sūtra, the BSPV, and the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa (Table 3.10). Within this larger ordering system, different sequences of rules are then present, as seen in the ordering of the rules on licking/shaking in Serial 4b/4c, the Chinese prātimokṣa, and the BSPV.

In terms of the similarities between the BSPV, the Vinaya-sūtra and Serial 4b/4c, nine out of the twelve rules of Serial 4b/4c match the order of the Vinaya-sūtra, the BSPV, or both. It is also possible that śaikṣās 66 to 68 in Serial 4b/4c match the order of the tradition known to Guṇaprabha, in which case all of the rules of Serial 4b/4c would have parallels with these Mūlasarvāstivādin commentaries. Of course, it must be noted that even if this were the case, there would not be an exact correspondence of rules in Serial 4b/4c and the Vinaya-sūtra. Serial 4b/4c does not match either the Vinaya-sūtra or the BSPV exactly. However, based on what definitive information is available, Serial

\textsuperscript{365} I say major here because the Tibetan bhikṣunī vibhaṅga follows a different ordering system in regard to these rules, although it is closer to the second group I have listed (i.e. Serial 4b, BSPV, etc). The rule against crushing stūpa-shaped food is immediately before the prohibition against separating the lumps of rice (Derge Ta 451b4) with the five rules on shaking/licking and looking attentively following the order of the Tibetan prātimokṣas as in Table 3.2.9 (Derge Ta 452a6–7).

\textsuperscript{366} See Table 3.2.9.
4b/4c’s rule order is closest to the BPSV. Seven out of the twelve rules follow the same order in the BPSV, compared to only three out of twelve definitely matching in the Vinaya-sūtra. In terms of śaikṣās 58 to 69, although both the Vinaya-sūtra and the BPSV are closer to Serial 4b/4c, the similarity is even greater between Serial 4b/4c and the BPSV.

The rule order of śaikṣā rules 58 to 69 of the Serial 4b/4c Gilgit bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra seems to preserve a tradition that is somewhere between that of Guṇaprabha and that of the BPSV. And while the order is never identical among these three texts, the BPSV and Serial 4b/4c are remarkably close. The similarity in the śaikṣās of these three texts, coupled with the fact that they obviously differ from the tradition used by the translators of the Tibetan prātimokṣas, suggests that Serial 4b/4c represents a Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition distinct from that of Serial 2, Serial 3a and the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtras. This tradition, while not identical, is very close to the Vinaya-traditions known to Guṇaprabha and the author(s)/redactor(s) of the BPSV.
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS

Serial 2 and Serial 3a Prātimokṣa-sūtras

Since rule order is a determining factor in the association of a prātimokṣa-sūtra with a specific Buddhist school, and the three Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras have been identified as Mūlasarvāstivādin despite containing differing rule orders, I compared instances in which two manuscripts presented the same rule in a different order. The Gilgit prātimokṣa manuscripts were compared to extant Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya literature: the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtra, the Chinese prātimokṣa-sūtra, the Tibetan bhikṣunī prātimokṣa, the Tibetan bhikṣunī vibhaṅga, the BPSV, as well as a Sanskrit Vinaya-sūtra, a Tibetan Vinaya-sūtra, and Tibetan translations of Vinaya-sūtra commentaries. While there were discrepancies present in the order found in Serial 4b/4c when compared to the order in known Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtras, this was not the case with Serial 2. In terms of rule order, Serial 2 follows the order of the prātimokṣa preserved in Tibetan translation. Although only a fragment of the sūtra is extant, based on the evidence available, Serial 2 seems to belong to the tradition that was known to the author(s)/redactor(s) of the Sanskrit text of which the Tibetan prātimokṣa-sūtra is a translation.

Serial 3a seems to follow a Vinaya tradition similar, but not identical, to that known to the Tibetan prātimokṣa traditions. The rules in Serial 3a are not present in exactly the same order as the Tibetan prātimokṣa, but the correspondence is exceptionally close, especially when we consider that we have a significantly more complete
prātimokṣa-sūtra in Serial 3a. The small exception in rule sequence involves śaikṣās 99 – 102, in which the rules on preaching the dharma to one holding various items follows a unique order. There appears to be greater diversity in the sequence for this section of rules in Mūlasarvāstivādin literature, as we see unique sequences in not only Serial 3a, but also in the BPSV, the Tibetan bhikṣunī vibhaṅga, as well as Serial 4b. Excluding this case, the remaining rules follow the order of the Tibetan translation. It appears likely that both Serial 2 and Serial 3a represent texts whose author(s)/redactor(s) were aware of a similar, if not identical, tradition to that behind the Sanskrit prātimokṣa that was translated into Tibetan.

Serial 4b/4c Prātimokṣa-sūtra

The order of prātimokṣa rules is unique in Serial 4b/4c; the rule order in no other prātimokṣa-sūtra or Mūlasarvāstivādin commentary is an exact match. That being said, it does appear to be a Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtra, albeit one that differs from the Tibetan and Chinese translations, Gilgit Serial 2, and Gilgit Serial 3a prātimokṣas. Where Serial 4b/4c does not match the other Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣas in rule order, it often matches Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya commentaries such as the BPSV and the Vinaya-sūtra.

---

367 See Chapter Two, Table 2.3.1.
368 See Section 2.3.1.
Sample Set Conclusions: Chapter Two

As was illustrated in Chapter Two, there are five instances in which the rules in two Gilgit *prātimokṣa-sūtras* follow a different order. In two of the five overlapping cases, Sample Set Three (śaikṣā rules 99 to 104)\(^{369}\) and Sample Set Four (pāyattikas 43 to 44),\(^{370}\) Serial 4b followed an order not present in other texts. In three of the five cases, the rule sequence present in Serial 4b/4c was also found in a Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya* commentary. In Sample Set Five (śaikṣās 91 to 92), Serial 4b contained the rules in the same sequence as present in the Tibetan *bhikṣunī vibhaṅga*.\(^{371}\) In Sample Set One (śaikṣās 81–90), Serial 4b contained a sequence of rules that was also found in the *BPSV*.\(^{372}\) Finally, in Sample Set Two (śaikṣās 34 to 44), the rules followed a sequence that was also found in the *BPSV*, as well as the Sanskrit manuscript of the *Vinaya-sūtra* edited by Śaṅkrityāyana.\(^{373}\) As a final note, excluding Sample Set Three, in all of these cases, the order present in the Serial 2 and Serial 3a *prātimokṣa-sūtras* was the same as the Tibetan *prātimokṣa*.

While there were some instances of unique rule order in the sample sets, there were also multiple instances in which the rule order was found in a parallel order to Mūlasarvāstivādin commentaries. This relationship was especially evident in the case of the *BPSV*, which, taking into account that the *BPSV* is a nuns’ text and therefore does not contain certain monk-specific rules, followed Serial 4b/4c in two out of a possible four

\(^{369}\) See Sample Set Three, Section 2.3.1.
\(^{370}\) See Sample Set Four, Section 2.4.1
\(^{371}\) See Sample Set Five, Section 2.5.1
\(^{372}\) See Sample Set One, Section 2.1.
\(^{373}\) See Sample Set Two, Section 2.1 and Table 2.2.8
cases in Chapter Two. The shared rule sequences between Serial 4b/4c and the Vinaya commentary traditions provided enough evidence to allow for the possibility that the order present in Serial 4b/4c was representative of an alternative Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition. As such, in order to determine any further similarities between Serial 4b/4c and the Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial literature, Chapter Three took into account rules present in only Serial 4b/4c, which contained different rule sequences than known Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtras.

Sample Set Conclusions: Chapter Three

Chapter Three detailed two instances in which the rule sequence in Serial 4b/4c differed from Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣas. Section 3.1 involved pāyattikas 24 to 25, a set of rules that is found only in the bhikṣu texts and therefore has no parallel in the BPSV. In this case, the two rules are presented in Serial 4b in a different order than the Tibetan or Chinese prātimokṣa-sūtras. However, the rule order of Serial 4b matches the order of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Vinaya-sūtras, as well as the Tibetan Vinaya-sūtra commentaries. Section 3.2 involved šaiksā rules 58 to 69, a series of rules that contains great variance in rule-sequence in Serial 4b/4c in comparison to other Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣas. The order of these twelve rules does not match any known text, but is very close to the sequence present in the BPSV, with considerable overlap with the Sanskrit Vinaya-sūtra and the Tibetan translation of Guṇaprabha’s autocommentary. 

374 See Table 3.2.12.
General Conclusions

This study has considered all the cases in which Serial 4b/4c deviates from the order of known Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtras. I have separated those sections containing variance in rule order into eight sections of various length, contained in Chapters Two and Three. Out of these eight sections, in two cases, totaling six rules, Serial 4b/4c follows a unique order. In one instance, totaling two rules, Serial 4b/4c follows the Tibetan translation of the bhikṣunī vibhaṅga. In four instances, totaling eight rules Serial 4b/4c exactly matches the order of the Sanskrit Vinaya-sūtra. Finally, in four instances, totaling thirteen rules, the BPSV and Serial 4b/4c follow the same order.

The total number of rules present in Serial 4b/4c that are found in a different order than that present in other prātimokṣa-sūtras is twenty-five. Out of these, six rules are organized in a unique manner in Serial 4b/4c and, in nineteen cases, parallels are present in Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya commentaries. A significant amount of parallel rule order can be seen between Serial 4b/4c and the Vinaya-sūtra and the BPSV. In eight out of the twenty-five instances, or 32% of those rules from Serial 4b/4c that differ in order from known Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣas, there are parallels between the Vinaya-sūtra and Serial 4b/4c. There is the possibility that in instances in which Guṇaprabha has given the

---

375 Šaiksā rules 100–102 of Sample Set Three and 66–68 of Section 3.2.
376 Pāyattikas 43–44, found in Sample Set Four, Section 2.4.
377 Šaiksā 44 of Section 2.2, Šaiksā 45 of Section 2.2, pāyattikas 24–25 of Section 3.1, and Šaiksā rules 58, 59, 64 and 69 of Section 3.2.
378 Šaiksā 82–83 of Section 2.1, Šaiksā 44 of Section 2.2, Šaiksā rules 45–47 of Section 2.2, and Šaiksā rules 60–65 and 69 of Section 3.2.
rules in abbreviated form, they may follow Serial 4b/4c, although based on the Tibetan
Vinaya-sūtra and its Tibetan commentaries, this is unlikely.

The degree of similarity is even greater when taking into account the relationship
of Serial 4b/4c to the BPSV. Four rules that are contained in Serial 4b/4c, and differ in
the ordering from the Tibetan prätimokṣa-sūtra, are not present in either the Tibetan
bhikṣuṇī prätimokṣa or the BPSV, as they deal specifically with rules for monks.380
Therefore, there are twenty-one cases in which Serial 4b/4c differs from the Tibetan
prätimokṣa-sūtra and there could be a correspondence between the rule order present in
Serial 4b/4c and the BPSV. In thirteen out of the possible twenty-one instances, 62% of
the time, the rule sequence of Serial 4b/4c and the BPSV match. In total, out of the
twenty-one possible instances, the rule order present in Serial 4b/4c matches that found in
the BPSV and/or the Sanskrit Vinaya-sūtra fifteen times, or 71%. Therefore, in the
majority of instances in which the rule order of Serial 4b/4c differs from Gilgit Serial 2,
Serial 3a, and the Tibetan and Chinese prätimokṣa-sūtras, there is a parallel rule order
found in the Vinaya-sūtra and/or the BPSV. The amount of similarity in these instances is
too great to be coincidence. The traditions known to the author(s)/redactor(s) of the
BPSV and Serial 4b/4c are exceptionally close. The fact that thirteen out of the possible
twenty-one instances in which these two texts share the same rule order strongly suggests
that the Vinaya tradition known author(s)/redactor(s) of the BPSV was particularly close
to the tradition of Serial 4b/4c.

380 Pāyattikas 24–25 and 42–43. Despite the fact that the rules deal specifically
with the relationship of monks with unrelated nuns, pāyattikas 42–43 are present in the
Tibetan bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga.
Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Traditions

When discussing the works contained in the Vinaya in the 14th c. C.E., Bu ston noted that the bhikṣunī vibhaṅga “does not seem to be a vibhaṅga of the present [i.e. Mūlasarvāstivāda] sect.”³⁸¹ In a 2008 publication, Gregory Schopen suggested that the issues surrounding the Mūlasarvāstivādin affiliation of the bhikṣunī texts were the result of “the fact that the Prātimokṣa and the Vibhaṅga for nuns of the Mūlasarvāstivādins circulated in more than one version or redaction, that, in effect, they were not so carefully edited, systematized, and transmitted as the versions for monks.”³⁸² However, very recently Shayne Clarke has suggested the possibility that differences in the presentation of rules in different Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya texts is the result of multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin traditions.³⁸³

The evidence used to make the argument for multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin traditions relies on two categories of sources, the Vinaya (including the prātimokṣas and vibhaṅgas) and commentaries on the Vinaya (such as the Vinaya-sūtra and the BPSV). The problems surrounding prātimokṣa-sūtras involves differences in the rules and rule order of the Chinese and Tibetan prātimokṣas, as well as differences in the Tibetan bhikṣunī prātimokṣa and bhikṣunī vibhaṅga. In the case of the differences between the Chinese and Tibetan bhikṣu prātimokṣa one could always suspect deficiencies in the skills of the

³⁸¹ Claus Vogel, “Bu-ston on the Schism of the Buddhist Church,” 110. Square brackets in the original.
³⁸³ See Shayne Clarke, “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms,” and “On the Mūlasarvāstivādin Affiliations of the Bhikṣunī Vibhaṅga.”
translator(s) as the reason for the discrepancies. These criticisms have been leveled at the translation work of Yijing, the translator of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya into Chinese.\footnote{Étienne Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism: from the origins to the Śaka era*, translated by Sara Webb-Boin (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université catholique de Louvain, Institut orientaliste), 170.} The fact that in the vast majority of cases Serial 2 and Serial 3a of the Gilgit prātimokṣa-sūtras parallel the Tibetan in terms of rule order could be seen as further evidence of inferior translation work done on the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtra. However, recent work by Shayne Clarke on multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin traditions has illustrated that such charges against Yijing may be misguided, as Yijing was most likely aware of a different Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition than that which is present in the Tibetan Vinaya.\footnote{For problems with this categorization in respect to Yijing’s Vinaya translations, see Clarke “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms,” 4.} This conclusion rests on the closeness of the Chinese MSV and the BPSV, and also that between Yijing’s translation of the bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga and the Tibetan.

As for the Tibetan translations of the nuns’ prātimokṣa and vibhaṅga, we have already seen the response of Bu sTon, categorizing the vibhaṅga as belonging to a non-Mūlasarvāstivādin school. However, at least for now, no Indian originals for either of these two nuns’ texts are extant. Claims disputing Bu sTon’s categorization, arguing that the Tibetan bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga is a Mūlasarvāstivādin text, while compelling,\footnote{See Clarke, “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms,” and “Mūlasarvāstivādin Affiliations of the Bhikṣuṇī Vibhaṅga and Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa.”} are not made based on Sanskrit texts themselves, but the Tibetan translations.\footnote{This is not to say that Sanskrit sources have not been used, as the Sanskrit Vinaya-sūtra has been utilized, but that we have no Sanskrit bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa or}
In terms of Vinaya commentaries like the BPSV and the Vinaya-sūtra, it must be kept in mind that these are not prātimokṣa-sūtras, but commentaries. Regardless of the fact that at some point in time the compilers of the Tibetan canon thought these commentaries important enough to canonize, and regardless of whether or not the use of commentaries like those by Guṇaprabha were utilized in lieu of the older (and less useful?) prātimokṣa-sūtra and vibhaṅga, these are still not prātimokṣa-sūtras, or even vibhaṅgas. The prātimokṣa-sūtra is thought to guide monastic behaviour and be the word of the Buddha. If there were multiple traditions under the Mūlasarvāstivādin mantle, then one would suspect that there would be multiple prātimokṣa-sūtras, and that these sūtras would differ in regard to rule order, especially in the case of the śaikṣā rules.\(^{388}\)

From the Gilgit material, we have three prātimokṣas that constitute documents of two different Mūlasarvāstivādin traditions, and Sanskrit language documents at that. Were the rule order as seen in Serial 4b/4c unique, with no parallels in other literature identified as Mūlasarvāstivādin, the differences could be posited as the result of transposition on the part of a/the scribe. However, the fact that in its rule order Gilgit Serial 4b/4c prātimokṣa both differs from other known Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa-sūtras, and yet have parallels in Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial literature, suggests that Serial 4b/4c actually represents a Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya tradition that has close parallels to the traditions known to the author(s)/redactor(s) of the Vinaya-sūtra and the vibhaṅga, which means no possibility of confirming this based on Indian language originals. Warranted, the possibility of translation errors need not be removed exclusively with the use of Sanskrit texts, but the more Sanskrit evidence we have, the less probable scribal error becomes.\(^{388}\) On the usefulness of śaikṣā rules as tools for illuminating the individuality of different orders, see Schopen “The Suppression of Nuns,” 591 n.62.
Serial 4b/4c is a Sanskrit *prātimokṣa-sūtra* that represents a *Vinaya* tradition with definite parallels to these Mūlasarvāstivādin commentaries, against other known Mūlasarvāstivādin *prātimokṣa-sūtras*. The Sanskrit Serial 4b/4c *prātimokṣa-sūtra* discovered at Gilgit, then, provides us with evidence of multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin traditions within India.

In the Mūlasarvāstivādin literature of the Tibetan canon alone, there is significant incongruity in the rule order, and in some cases, content. The difference is even greater when one takes into account the Sanskrit texts from Gilgit as well as the Chinese translations. Despite the discrepancies, there has been little work done exploring these differences and trying to understand the relationship between different Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya* texts. Studies on the diversity of Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya* content would no doubt benefit our understanding of Buddhist monastic literature as a whole, as well as the rich body of literature that is the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. Such work could also shed light on the need for *Vinaya* digests like Guṇaprabha’s *Vinaya-sūtra*. Gregory Schopen has already convincingly argued that the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* never underwent the process of systemization that took place with the Theravādin canon. Given this vast body of work, which it seems was never systematized, it is not surprising that we should see evidence of multiple traditions preserved in Mūlasarvāstivādin literature. Hopefully future work done on the topic of different traditions will provide an even greater understanding of the multiplicity of diversity in Mūlasarvāstivādin traditions and literature.

---

389 Gregory Schopen, “Ritual Rights,” 316.
APPENDIX 1: ŚAIKṢĀ RULES 55–66 IN THE VINAYA-SŪTRA AND ITS COMMENTARIES

There is variation in the śaikṣā rule order of the Sanskrit Vinaya-sūtra edited by Śāṅkṛityāyana, and the Tibetan translation and the two commentaries that contain the śaikṣā rules. The śaikṣā rules 55 to 66 of the Sanskrit edition, the rules analyzed in Section 3.2, differ significantly in order, as is clear from the table below.

Table A1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vinaya-sūtra Group A</th>
<th>Vinaya-sūtra Group B</th>
<th>Pratimokṣa Tib.</th>
<th>Mahāvyutpatti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vinaya-sūtra Skt.390</td>
<td>Vinayasūtra-avydhāna391</td>
<td>Vinaya-sūtra Tib.392</td>
<td>Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not separating the lumps of rice</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not making complaints</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not seize in the cheeks</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not divide into morsels</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sticking-out the tongue</td>
<td>59–60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not making smacking noises with the tongue</td>
<td>59–60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

390 Vin _2.2101–2.2108. See Śāṅkṛityāyana, Vinayasūtra, 63.
391 See Derge Zu 9b1–10a1.
392 See Derge 49a6–49b2.
393 Derge Yu 16a1–16b6.
394 sTog Ca 26b3–6; Derge Ca 27a3–5.
As illustrated above, there appears to be essentially two orders present for these śaikṣā rules in the *Vinaya-sūtra* texts. The Sanskrit *Vinaya-sūtra* and the Tibetan *Vinayasūtraāryābhidhāna*, although not identical, are very similar. The Tibetan *Vinaya-sūtra* and the *Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā* follow an identical order, and also match the order present in the Tibetan *bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra*. Finally, it should be noted that the *Mahāvyutpatti*, although closer in rule order to the texts of *Vinaya-sūtra* Group B, does not match any of the *Vinaya-sūtra* texts. In fact, it does not contain the rule prohibiting crushing *stūpa*-shaped food at all. The difference in the śaikṣā rule order and content between the *Mahāvyutpatti* and the *Vinaya-sūtra* and its commentaries strongly suggests that the underlying source of the *Mahāvyutpatti* śaikṣā entries is not the *Vinaya-sūtra* or its commentaries.

---

396 They are also closer to Serial 4b/4c and the *BPSV*. Cf. Section 3.2.
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