

TWO MŪLASARVĀSTIVĀDIN TRADITIONS IN THE GILGIT MANUSCRIPTS

EVIDENCE FOR TWO MŪLASARVĀSTIVĀDIN *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 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.

Acknowledgments:

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Shayne Clarke, for all of his support and valuable feedback on this thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. James Benn and Dr. Mark Rowe for their helpful suggestions at my defense. Thanks also to the Ontario Graduate Scholarship, which funded my first year at McMaster University, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for funding for my second year. Thanks to my parents, Ron and Barb Emms, for supporting me continuously. Finally, thanks to my wife, Missy Costa for her patience and support during this endeavor.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: <i>Prātimokṣa-sūtras</i>	7
1.1: Introductory Remarks on <i>Prātimokṣa-sūtras</i>	7
1.2: Gilgit Mūlasarvāstivādin Sources.....	17
1.3: Gilgit <i>Prātimokṣa-sūtras</i>	27
Chapter Two: Overlapping Rules in the Gilgit <i>Prātimokṣa-sūtras</i>	38
2.1 Sample Set One: <i>Śaikṣā</i> rules 81–90 in Serial 3a and Serial 4b.....	38
2.2 Sample Set Two: <i>Śaikṣā</i> rules 34–44 in Serial 2 and Serial 4c	53
2.3 Sample Set Three: <i>Śaikṣā</i> rules 99–102/104 in Serial 3a and Serial 4b	69
2.4 Sample Set Four: <i>Pāyattika</i> rules 42–43 in Serial 2 and Serial 4b.....	72
2.5 Sample Set Five: <i>Śaikṣā</i> rules 91–92 in Serial 4b and Serial 3a.....	74
Chapter Three: The Relationship of Serial 4b/4c to Mūlasarvāstivādin <i>Vinaya</i> Traditions.....	78
3.1 <i>Pāyattika</i> rules 24–25 in Serial 4b.....	78
3.2 <i>Śaikṣā</i> rules 58–69 in Serial 4b/4c.....	81
Chapter Four: Conclusions	104
Appendix 1: <i>Śaikṣā</i> rules 55–66 in the <i>Vinaya-sūtra</i> and its Commentaries.....	114
Bibliography	116

INTRODUCTION

In the cache of Buddhist texts discovered in the 1930s at Gilgit, in modern day Pakistan,¹ 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 1960.² These three *bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtra* manuscript fragments from Gilgit have been identified as belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivāda school.³ 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 (*bhikṣuṇīs*). The Gilgit *bhikṣu prātimokṣa-sūtras* are thought to belong to the

¹ For a detailed catalogue of the Gilgit discoveries, see Oskar von Hinüber, *Die Erforschung der Gilgit-Handschriften* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1979), 338–354, and Oskar von Hinüber, “Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung aus Gilgit,” in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (1969) 119:102–104.

² In the present study, I have used Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, eds., *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Śata-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 *bhikṣuṇī 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 *Kaṅkhavitarāṇī*, without the introductory and concluding verses of the other *prātimokṣas*. See n.36.

⁵ Charles S. Prebish, *A Survey of Vinaya Literature*, vol. 1 (London: Routledge 1994), 87.

⁶ Klaus Wille, “Buddhist Sanskrit Sources from Khotan,” in *The British Library Sanskrit Fragments* Vol. II.1, edited by Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University 2009), 49.

Problems concerning the school affiliation of Mūlasarvāstivādin monastic literature are not new. In the fourteenth century, the great Tibetan Buddhist scholar Bu sTon 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-sūtras* 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

⁷ Claus Vogel, “Bu-ston on the Schism of the Buddhist Church and on the Doctrinal Tendencies of Buddhist Scriptures, translated from Tibetan,” in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, edited by Heinz Bechert (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1985), 110.

⁸ See Shayne Clarke, “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms: On the Affiliation of the Tibetan Nun’s Lineages and Beyond.” Paper presented at Oslo Buddhist Studies Forum, June 2012, and Shayne Clarke, “On the Mūlasarvāstivādin Affiliations of the *Bhikṣuṇī Vibhaṅga* and *Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa* Preserved in Tibetan.” Paper presented at The International Association of Buddhist Studies, Taiwan, 2011.

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 *bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga*, the *Vinaya-sūtra* of Guṇaprabha and its associated commentaries, and the *Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-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.⁹ Attempts at determining the origins of *prātimokṣa-sūtras* using an etymological analysis of the term *prātimokṣa* have not proved successful.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ 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*.¹² The *prātimokṣa* that the

⁹ For a discussion of the structure of the Pāli *pātimokkha*, see Oskar von Hinüber, *Das Pātimokkha: Seine Gestalt und seine Entstehungsgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Mainz 1999), 9–21.

¹⁰ Charles S. Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: The Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtras of the Mahāsāṃghikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins*, 11 and 29 n.33.

¹¹ W. Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa on the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pali Versions* (Santiniketan: Kalidas Chatterji Santiniketan Press 1955), 7.

¹² Sukumar Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism* (Calcutta: Asia Publishing House 1960), 70.

Mahāpadāna Suttanta contains consists of verses extolling good behaviour,¹³ part of which are also found in the *Dhammapada* and are included in the concluding verses of the extant *prātimokṣas*: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 Buddhas¹⁵

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.¹⁶ We also see this same verse preserved in concluding verses of the Serial 3a manuscript from Gilgit.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.

¹³ T.W. Rhys Davids and J. Estlin Carpenter eds., *The Dighā Nikāya*, vol. 2 (London: Oxford University Press 1947 [1903]), 49.

¹⁴ Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 18–19. For a discussion of the conclusion of the Sarvāstivādin *prātimokṣa*, in which he also looks at the Mūlasarvāstivādin verses, see Klaus Schmidt, *Der Schlußteil des Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins: Text in Sanskrit und Tocharisch A verglichen mit den Parallelversionen anderer Schulen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1989), 73–80 and 92–94.

¹⁵ *Digha-Nikāya* 3, 28. Translation by Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 19.

¹⁶ Franz Bernhard, *Udānavarga* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1965), 102–103.

¹⁷ Plate 58 in Vira and Chandra, *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 *saṃgha* 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

¹⁸ Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co. 1996), 11.

¹⁹ Oskar von Hinüber, "Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya: A Survey of Theory and Practice," in *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* (1995) 18/1 :14.

²⁰ Śaikṣā rules 60 to 85 in Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*. Cf., however, the Theravādin position given in the 4th–5th c. C.E. *Samantapāsādikā* attributed to Buddhaghosa in P.V. Bapat and A. Hirakawa, *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha: A Chinese version by Saṅghabhadra of Samantapāsādikā* (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 1970), 487–488.

²¹ Von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, 9.

²² Ibid.

400 BC.²³ Both of these proposals pre-date the revised dating of the Buddha proposed by Heinz Bechert.²⁴ Taking into account Bechert’s revision, the *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 *prātimokṣas* took their present form, but there is consensus that they are among the older Buddhist texts.²⁵

According to the extant *Vinayas*, *prātimokṣa-sūtras* were to be recited at the bi-weekly *poṣadha* ceremony.²⁶ One skilled monk who had memorized the *prātimokṣa* would recite the text, and all members of a specific area, that is, all the members contained within specific monastic boundaries (*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, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 23.

²⁴ Heinz Bechert, ed., *The Dating of the Historical Buddha/Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*, 3 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht 1991–1997).

²⁵ Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 18.

²⁶ For a survey of acceptable *poṣadha* dates for the different Buddhist schools, extracted from the extant *Vinayas*, see Jayeeta Gangopadhyay, *Uposatha Ceremony: the Earliest Tradition(s) and Later Developments (Mainly from Vinayic Traditions Preserved in Chinese)* (Delhi: Bhartiya Vidya Prakashan 1991), 2–3. See also Claus Vogel, “On the Date of the Poṣadha Ceremony as Taught by the Mūlasarvāstivādins, in *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag 1997), 673–688.

committed.²⁷ 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.²⁸

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, *pariśuddhī*, in regard to the given section by remaining silent.²⁹ 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.³⁰ These prompts are also found in the Sarvāstivādin³¹ and Mūlasarvāstivādin³² *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.

²⁸ Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 25.

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.

³⁰ Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 25.

³¹ Louis Finot, “Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādin avec la version chinoise de Kumārajīva traduite en français par M. Edouard Huber,” in *Journal Asiatique* (nov. to dec. 1913), 476.

³² Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa (khrims): Vol. 5 of the Dulwa portion of the Kangyur, leaves 1–29 and top line of leaf 30* (Calcutta: Asiatic Society 1915), 11–12.

pure in regard to the rules.³³ In the *poṣadhasthāpanavastu* of the MSV we find a similar account.³⁴

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.³⁵ 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 *śaikṣās*. Amended to this list is an eighth category, the *adhikaraṇa-śamathas*, containing seven methods for resolving monastic legal matters.³⁶ The order of the categories in the *prātimokṣa*, and the consequence for violating the rules is as follows:

1. *Pārājika* – loss of communion³⁷
2. *Samghāvaśeṣa* – suspension
3. *Aniyata* – *pārājika* or *samghāvaśeṣa*
4. *Naihsargikapāyattika* – forfeiture
5. *Pāyattika* – expiation
6. *Pratideśayanīya* – confession
7. *Śaikṣā* – 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.³⁸

³³ Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, 87.

³⁴ Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 25.

³⁵ Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 11.

³⁶ Von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, 11.

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-śamathas* 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 *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* 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.

⁴⁰ See Schmidt, *Der Schlußteil des Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*, 73–80.

⁴¹ Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 216–219.

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
Samghāvaśeṣa rules
Aniyata rules
Naihsargikapāyattika rules
Pāyattika rules
Pratideśayanīya rules
Śaikṣā rules
Adhikaraṇa-śamathas
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 *saṃgha* into the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas at the council of Vaiśālī.⁴³ 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 prātimokṣā-sūtras*:⁴⁴

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

Sarvāstivāda	Taishō 1436	263
Mūlasarvāstivāda	Taishō 1454	248
Dharmaguptaka	Taishō 1429	250
Mahīśāsaka	Taishō 1422	251
Mahāsāṃghika	Taishō 1426	218
Kāśyapīya	Taishō 1460	246
Theravāda	N/A	227 ⁴⁵

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), *saṃghavaśeṣa* (13), *aniyata* (2), *naiḥsargikapāyattika* (30), and *pratideśanīya* (4) rules across all of the extant schools, and they all have 7

adhikaraṇa-samathas.⁴⁷ The number of *pāyattika* rules is almost uniform as well, being 90 in all of the schools excluding the Mahīśāsaka 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*.

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

⁴⁵ See Norman and Pruitt, *The Pātimokkha*, xxxviii.

⁴⁶ See the table in Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 11.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ See Appendix V in Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 9–14.

⁵⁰ 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 *pāṭayantika*, the Mūlasarvāstivādins *pāyattika*, and the Mahāsāmghika-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-sūtras*, 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-sūtras* 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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*.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 *akṣaras* 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*⁵⁹ and Jampa Tsedroen, *A Brief Survey of the Vinaya*.⁶⁰

***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*.⁶¹ 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 *Upālipariṣcchā* (Taishō 1466)⁶² and the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 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*.

⁵⁹ Charles S. Prebish, *A Survey of Vinaya Literature*.

⁶⁰ Jampa Tsedroen, *A Brief Survey of the Vinaya: Its origin, transmission and arrangement from the Tibetan point of view with comparisons to the Theravāda and Dharmaguptaka traditions* (Hamburg: Dharma Edition 1992).

⁶¹ Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*.

⁶² For a study and translation of the Chinese *Upālipariṣcchā*, see Valentina Stache-Rosen, *Upālipariṣcchāsūtra: Ein Text zur buddhistischen Ordensdisziplin* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1984).

The second major work is Chatsumarn Kabilsingh's publication of a translation of the extant *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa-sūtras* in *The Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*.⁶³ 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.⁶⁴

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*.⁶⁵ 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.⁶⁶ 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*.⁶⁷

⁶³ Kabilsingh, *The Bhikkunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*.

⁶⁴ Chatsumarn Kabilsingh, *A Comparative Study of Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha*, (Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia 1984).

⁶⁵ Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, “Some Remarks on the Sanskrit Manuscript of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Prātimokṣasūtra found in Tibet,” in *Jaina-Itihāsa-Ratna: Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90*, edited by Ute Hüsken, Petra Kieffer-Pülz, and Anne Peters (Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag 2006), 283–338.

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 28⁶⁸

Naiḥsargikapāyattika rules 8 or 9,⁶⁹ and 10⁷⁰

Four fragments from Turfan have been identified as Mūlasarvāstivādin:

End of the introduction and *pārājika* rule 1⁷¹

Pratideśayanīya rule 3 up to *śaikṣā* rules 2–33,⁷²

Śaikṣā rule 107 or 108 up to the beginning of the *adhikaraṇa-samathas*,⁷³

Concluding verses 3–10⁷⁴

Also, from among the Gilgit material discovered by Auriel Stein, Sylvain Lévi published a Mūlasarvāstivādin fragment containing:⁷⁵

Śaikṣā 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*,

⁶⁸ No. Bleu 271 in von Simson, *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*, Teil 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2000), 150.

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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*, see below.

the *So-sor-thar-pa*.⁷⁶ This study will use the *So-sor-thar-pa* found in the sTog Palace⁷⁷ and Derge⁷⁸ 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.⁷⁹

Mūlasarvāstivāda *Bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa*

It has already been noted that an English translation of the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin nuns' *prātimokṣa* is found in Kabilsingh.⁸⁰ 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*⁸¹). As is the case with the monks' *prātimokṣa-sūtra*, this study will use the sTog palace⁸² and Derge⁸³ editions. An English translation of the Tibetan text can be found in Karma Lekshe Tsomo's *Sisters in Solitude*,⁸⁴ and I have also consulted the French translation by William Rockhill.⁸⁵ 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: Smarntsis Shesrig Dpemzod 1975).

⁷⁸ *The sde-dge mtshal-par bka'-'gyur: a facsimile edition of the 18th century redaction of si-tu chos-kyi-'byun-gnas prepared under the direction of h.h. the 16th rgyal-dban karma-pa*, Vol. 5, (Delhi: Karmapae Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang 1976).

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).

⁸⁴ Tsomo, *Sisters in Solitude*, 75–130.

⁸⁵ William Woodward Rockhill trans., *Prātimoksha Sutra ou le Traité D'Émanicipation selon la Version Tibétaine avec notes et Extraits du Dulva (Vinaya)* (Paris: Libraire de la Société Asiatique 1884).

rules in a different order than the *prātimokṣa* itself, I will also use this canonical commentary. For the *bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga*⁸⁶ I have consulted the Derge⁸⁷ and sTog palace⁸⁸ 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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*, fit these criteria.

BPSV (Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-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).⁸⁹ This commentary will be of primary importance to this study.⁹⁰ 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.

⁸⁹ Tshul Khrims Rin Chen ed., *Bstan 'gyur (sde dge)*, vol. 156 (Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Choedhey, gyalwae sungrab partun khang 1982–1985), 4–355. Tohōku No. 4112.

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.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 (*vr̥tti*) on an *Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa-sūtra*.

Mahāvvyutpatti

The *Mahāvvyutpatti* is a ninth century C.E. Sanskrit-Tibetan dictionary.⁹² This dictionary contains the Tibetan equivalents to Sanskrit terminology and included in it are abridged formulations of the monastic rules for monks.⁹³ Given that the *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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

the *nidāna* (=śaikṣās 1–3), also apply to the upper robe (*chos gos*) (Derge Tsu 148a6–7). This is consistent with the *bhikṣu* (see Vidyabhusana, 35 and 100) and the *bhikṣuṇī* (see Tsomo, 120) *prātimokṣas*. Therefore, I take this statement on applying *śaikṣās* 1–3 to the upper robe as *śaikṣā* rules 8–10, although the rules are not given individually in the *BPSV*. Counting these *śaikṣās* as rules 8–10, I have come to a total of 112 *śaikṣā* rules.

⁹¹ The *BPSV* is briefly described in Gregory Schopen, “On Emptying Chamber Pots Without Looking and the Urban location of Buddhist Nunneries in Early India again,” in *Journal Asiatique* 296.2 (2008): 232–233, 244. See also Gregory Schopen, “On Buddhist Monks and Dreadful Deities: Some Monastic Devices for Updating the Dharma,” in *Gedenkschrift J.W. de Jong*, edited by H.W. Bodewitz and M. Hara (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies 2004), 180–181; F. Enomoto, “‘Mūlasarvāstivādin’ and ‘Sarvāstivādin’” in *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka. Festgabe für Adelheid Mette* (Indica et Tibetica Bd. 37) Hrsg. C. Chojnacki et al. (Indica et Tibetica Verlag: Swisttal-Odenforf 2000) 245–246; Shayne Clarke “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms,” and “Mūlasarvāstivādin Affiliations of the *Bhikṣuṇī Vibhaṅga*.”

⁹² Yumiko Ishihama and Fukuda Yōichi, *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvvyutpatti: Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology* (Studia Tibetica, 16. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko 1989), 10.

⁹³ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 530–555.

rules, it will be useful to compare them to the *Mahāvvyutpatti* entries. It has been proposed that some of the Vinaya entries in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* come from the *Vinaya-sūtra* of Guṇaprabha and its commentaries.⁹⁴ The relationship between the *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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 Mathurā.⁹⁸ Guṇaprabha’s *Vinaya-sūtra* is, essentially, a digest of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. The aforementioned great

⁹⁴ See Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, “The 17 Titles of the *Vinayavastu* in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* – Contributions to Indo-Tibetan Lexicography II –,” in *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Indica et Tibetica, 30, edited by Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica 1997), 339–345; Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, “On the Sources of Some Entries in the *Mahāvvyutpatti*: Contributions to Indo-Tibetan Lexicography I,” in *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1997), 183–199; and Ulrich Pagel, “The *Dhāraṇīs* of *Mahāvvyutpatti* #748: Origin and Formation,” in *Buddhist Studies Review* 24/2 (2007): 154.

⁹⁵ See Section 3.2 and Appendix 1.

⁹⁶ P. V. Bapat and V. V. Gokhale, *Vinaya-Sūtra and Auto-Commentary on the Same by Guṇaprabha* (Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute 1982).

⁹⁷ George B. J. Dreyfus, *The Sound of Two Hands Clapping: The Education of a Tibetan Buddhist Monk* (Berkeley: University of California Press 2003), 116.

⁹⁸ Gregory Schopen, “Rituals Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*,” in *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 22 (1994): 63–64.

Tibetan scholar Bu sTon described the *Vinaya-sūtra* as a treatise “condensing excessively large (portions of) scripture.”⁹⁹ As such, like the *Mahāvvyūtpatti*, 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,¹⁰⁰ and the Tibetan translation from the Derge canon.¹⁰¹ Relevant to this study are two commentaries on the *Vinaya-sūtra* both preserved in Tibetan. The first is Guṇaprabha’s autocommentary, the *Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhīdhānasvavyākhyāna-nāma*,¹⁰² as well Dharmamitra’s *Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā*.¹⁰³ 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 Guṇaprabha* (Bombay: Baratiya Vidya 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 Greta:

Vin_n,n=n=vastu.line; Vin_n,n,n=vastu,chapter,section. http://fiindolo.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretal/1_sanskr/4_rellit/buddh/vinsutru.htm. Accessed August 12, 2012.

¹⁰¹ Tohōku No. 4117. Tshul Khriṃs Rin Chen ed., *Bstan ‘gyur (sde dge)*, vol. 159, 3–201.

¹⁰² ‘dul ba’i mdo’i ‘grel ba mngon par brjod pa rang gi rnam par bshad pa zhes pya ba, in Tshul Khriṃs Rin Chen ed., *Bstan ‘gyur (sde dge)*, vol. 161, 4–549. Derge Zu and Zhu. Tohōku No. 4119.

¹⁰³ ‘dul ba’i mdo’i rgya cher ‘grel pa, in Tshul Khriṃs Rin Chen ed., *Bstan ‘gyur (sde dge)*, vol. 163, 4–781. Derge Yu. Tohōku No. 4120.

Stein in 1931, are presently in the possession of the National Archives of India.¹⁰⁴ 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.¹⁰⁵ 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..¹⁰⁶ Anukul Banerjee dates the manuscript he used for his edition of the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* to the 5th–6th c. C.E.,¹⁰⁷ 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.¹⁰⁸ 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.¹⁰⁹ *Uddānas* are

¹⁰⁴ Oskar von Hinüber, “Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung aus Gilgit,” 102.

¹⁰⁵ Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, eds., *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Śata-Piṭaka Series, Vol. 10. Parts 1–10 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture 1959–1973).

¹⁰⁶ Klaus Wille, *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag 1990), 25.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹⁰⁸ Oskar Von Hinüber, *Die Erforschung der Gilgit-Handschriften*, 341. He makes the same identification in “Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung,” 102.

¹⁰⁹ For a brief discussion concerning *uddānas* in the *Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya*, see Jampa Losang Panglung, “Preliminary remarks on the Uddānas in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin,” in *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson* edited by Michael Aris and Aung San Suu Kyi (Warminster England: Aris & Phillips Ltd. 1979), 226–232.

found in the majority of extant Mūlasarvāstivādin literature on monastic regulations.¹¹⁰ Also, they are found only in the *prātimokṣa-sūtras* of the Mahāsāṃghika and the Mūlasarvāstivādins. In the case of the Mahāsāṃghikas *prātimokṣa*, the *uddānas* follow groups of rules, acting as a sort of keyword-based summary, whereas in the Mūlasarvāstivādin *prātimokṣas*, the *uddānas* come before the rules. The Gilgit *prātimokṣa-sūtra* manuscripts have *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 *prātimokṣa-sūtras* used by Banerjee in his editions. The use of rule numbers is problematic for various reasons, especially in the case of the *śaikṣā* 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 *prātimokṣa-sūtra*,¹¹¹ and changed the wording in some cases as well. Also, since the beginning of the *śaikṣā* 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 *śaikṣā* rules will be dealt with in greater detail later.

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

¹¹¹ Hisashi Matsumura, “Two Notes on the Arrangement of the Gilgit Manuscripts,” in *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Sept. 1986–June 1987) 36:151.

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 5: *Pāyattika* 47–50, *uddāna* (covering 51–60), *pāyattika* 51–52

FE 6: *Pāyattika* 53–55

FE 8: *Pāyattika* 55–57

¹¹² Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, 3–13.

¹¹³ Lokesh Chandra, 1960, “Unpublished Gilgit Fragment of the Prātimokṣa-Sūtra,” in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd-und Ostasiens* 4:1–13.

¹¹⁴ Von Hinüber, *Die Erforschung der Gilgit-Handschriften*, 341.

¹¹⁵ Von Hinüber, “Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung aus Gilgit,” 102.

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* 57¹¹⁷

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*,¹¹⁸ in 1954 as *Prātimokṣa-sūtram* (*Mūlasarvāstivāda*),¹¹⁹ and in 1977 he included it in his work *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit*.¹²⁰ *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.¹²¹ 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.”¹²² 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.¹²³

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

¹¹⁸ Anukul Chandra Banerjee, “The Prātimokṣa Sūtra,” in *Indian Historical Quarterly* (1953) 29:162–174, 266–275, 363–377.

¹¹⁹ Anukul Chandra Banerjee, *Prātimokṣa-sūtram* (*Mūlasarvāstivāda*) (Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Press 1954).

¹²⁰ Anukul Chandra Banerjee, *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit: Prātimokṣa Sūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākya* (Calcutta: The World Press Private Limited 1977), 1–56.

¹²¹ Matsumura, “Arrangement of the Gilgit Manuscripts,” 146–154.

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.¹²⁴ He also notes that he consulted Sakaki’s edition of the *Mahāvvyutpatti*.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 4.¹²⁶ 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*.¹²⁷ He also consulted Lokesh Chandra’s publication of Serial 2 for those sections contained in square brackets in Banerjee’s editions.¹²⁸ Unfortunately, Prebish relied entirely on these editions without consulting the manuscripts themselves. Prebish’s uncritical use of Banerjee’s uncritical editions is problematic.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

¹²⁴ Banerjee, *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts*, 7.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

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.

¹²⁷ Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 37.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 38.

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.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.¹³¹ The manuscript is missing what appears to be 16 folios, those that would be numbered 8 to 11 and 24 to 35.¹³² 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*, *saṃghāvaśeṣa uddāna* covering 1–13,
saṃghāvaśeṣa 1–3

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

¹³⁰ Von Hinüber, “Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung,” 102.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Ibid.

- 13a (=FE 33): *Aniyata* 2, *aniyata* ending, *naihsargikapāyattika uddāna* covering
1–10, *naihsargikapāyattika* 1
- 13b (=FE 34): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 1–3
- 14a (=FE 35): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 3–7
- 14b (=FE 36): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 7–8
- 15a (=FE 37): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 9
- 15b (=FE 38): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 9–10
- 16a (=FE 39): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 10
- 16b (=FE 40): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 10
- 17a (=FE 41): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 10
- 17b (=FE 42): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 10, *uddāna* covering 11–20,
naihsargikapāyattika 11–14
- 18a (=FE 43): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 14–17
- 18b (=FE 44): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 18–20, *uddāna* covering 21–30,
naihsargikapāyattika 21
- 19a (=FE 45): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 21–24
- 19b (=FE 46): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 24–25
- 20a (=FE 47): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 25–27
- 20b (=FE 48): *Naihsargikapāyattika* 28–30, *naihsargikapāyattika* ending
- 21a (=FE 49) *Naihsargikapāyattika* ending, *pāyattika piṇḍoddāna*, *pāyattika*
uddāna covering 1–10, *pāyattika* 1–4
- 21b (=FE 50) *Pāyattika* 4–10

22a (=FE 51) *Pāyattika* 10, *pāyattika uddāna* covering 11–20, *pāyattika* 11–14

22b (=FE 52) *Pāyattika* 14–18

23a (=FE 53) *Pāyattika* 18–20, *pāyattika uddāna* covering 21–30, *pāyattika* 21–23

23b (=FE 54) Blank

36a (=FE 55) *Śaikṣā* 80?, 81–99¹³³

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 samāptaḥ*”

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

Samghāvaśeṣa rules 1–11 and *uddānas* covering 1–13

Aniyata rules 1–2

Naihsargikapāyattika rules 1–30 and *uddānas* covering 1–30

Pāyattika 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 *samghāvaśeṣas* 12 and 13, as well as *pāyattikas* 24–30. Also, 21a contains a *piṇḍoddāna*, that is, an *uddāna* of

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 *śaikṣā* rules differs in rule order and content from the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* preserved in Serial 3a.¹³⁴

Serial 4b/4c

Serial 4b

According to von Hinüber, the 4th 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.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:

(=FE 141): *Pāyattika* 4–10, *pāyattika uddāna* covering 11–20

(=FE 142): *Pāyattika* 11–17

(=FE 139): *Pāyattika* 17–20, *pāyattika uddāna* covering 21–30,

pāyattika 21–25¹³⁶

(=FE 140): *Pāyattika* 24–30, *pāyattika uddāna* covering 31–40, *pāyattika* 31

(=FE 144): *Pāyattika* 31–37

(=FE 143): *Pāyattika* 37–40, *pāyattika uddāna* covering 41–50, *pāyattika* 41–45

(=FE 138): *Pāyattika* 46–50, *pāyattika uddāna* covering 51–60, *pāyattika* 51

¹³⁴ See Section 2.3.

¹³⁵ Von Hinüber, “Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung,” 103.

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.

(=FE 137): *Pāyattika* 51–55

(=FE 149): *Pāyattika* 55–57

(=FE 150): *Pāyattika* 57

26a (=FE 131): *Pratideśayanīya* 2–4

26b (=FE 132): *Pratideśayanīya* 4, *śaikṣā uddāna* covering 1–30, *śaikṣā* 1–8

28a (=FE 133): *Śaikṣā* 58–75 *śaikṣā uddāna* covering 69–end

28b (=FE 134): *Śaikṣā* 75–101

Serial 4b contains much less material than Serials 2 and 3a. The rules found in Serial 4b are:

Pāyattika 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:

26a (=FE 135): *Śaikṣā* 9–30, *śaikṣā uddāna* covering 31–68, *śaikṣā* 31–38

¹³⁷ Von Hinüber, “Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung,” 103 n. 15.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 103.

26b (=FE 136): *Śaikṣā* 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 Mūlasarvāstivādin *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 *śaikṣā* 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—*Śaikṣā* rules 81 to 90 in Serial 3a and Serial 4b

The first decade that I will analyze is the section including the *śaikṣā* rules 81 to 90. This selection includes the first ten complete rules that are shared in Serial 3a and

Serial 4b.¹³⁹ Rules 81 to 90 of Serial 3a are contained on folio 36a (=FE 55),¹⁴⁰ and the Serial 4b rules are found in folio 28b (=FE 134).¹⁴¹ 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

	Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 4b¹⁴²	Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 3a¹⁴³
Not teaching the dharma sitting on a low seat to one sitting on a higher seat	81	81
Not teaching the dharma to one going in front	83	82
Not preaching the dharma from the side to one on the road	82	83
Not teaching the dharma to one whose head is covered	84	84
Not teaching the dharma to one whose head is thrown back ¹⁴⁴	85	85
Not teaching the dharma to one whose head is not stiff ¹⁴⁵	86	86
Not teaching the dharma to one whose hands are folded together on the back of the neck	87	87
Not teaching the dharma to one sitting on his/her heels ¹⁴⁶	88	88
Not teach the dharma to one wearing a turban ¹⁴⁷	89	89
Not teach the dharma to one wearing a hat	90	90

¹⁴² Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.

¹⁴³ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.

¹⁴⁴ I follow here Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, Vol. II: Dictionary (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 2004[1953]), 121. Cf. Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 105, and Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*, 38.

¹⁴⁵ I follow here Edgerton *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* 126. Cf. Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*, 38.

¹⁴⁶ I follow here Monier Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 2003 [1899])607. Cf. Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*, 38.

¹⁴⁷ I follow here Edgerton *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* 149. Cf. Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 105 and Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*, 38.

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 *śaikṣās* in Serial 3a and 4b are often conjugated differently. The *śaikṣā* 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 *śaikṣās*, Serial 3a is not consistent. Six out of the ten *śaikṣā* 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 *śaikṣā* 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

Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 4b ¹⁴⁸	Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 3a ¹⁴⁹
81. <i>na nīcatarake āsane niṣaṇṇe uccatarake āsane niṣaṇṇāyā</i>	81. <i>na nīcatarake āsane niṣaṇṇe uccatarake āsane niṣaṇṇāyāglānāya dharmmaṃ deśayisyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>
83. <i>na prṣṭhato gacchantah purato gacchate aglānāya dharmman deśayisyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>	82. <i>na prṣṭhato gacchat purato gacchate aglānāya dharmmaṃ deśayisyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>
82. <i>nonmārgeṇa gacchante mārgeṇa gacchate</i>	83. <i>notpathena gacchat pathā gacchate aglānāya dharmmaṃ deśayisyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>
84. <i>nodguṇṭhikākr̥tāya</i>	84. <i>nodguṇṭhikayākr̥tāya</i>
85. <i>notkr̥ṣṭhikākr̥tāya</i>	85. <i>notkr̥ṣṭhikākr̥tāya</i>
86. <i>notsaktikākr̥tāya</i>	86. <i>notsaktikākr̥tāya</i>
87. <i>na vyastikākr̥tāya</i>	87. <i>na vyastikākr̥tāya</i>
88. <i>na paryastikākr̥tāyāglānāya dharmmaṃ deśayisyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>	88. <i>na paryastikākr̥tāyāglānāya dharmmaṃ deśayisyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>
89. <i>noṣṇīśasīrase</i>	89. <i>noṣṇīśasīrase</i>
90. <i>na kholāsīrase</i>	90. <i>na kholāsīrase</i>

Many of the rules contained in this sample set are identical. *Śaikṣā* rules 84 to 90 are remarkably similar in both manuscripts. Excluding a slight variation in number 84,¹⁵⁰ *Śaikṣās* 84 to 90 are exactly the same in both vocabulary and rule order. This similarity

¹⁴⁸ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.

¹⁴⁹ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.

¹⁵⁰ It seems likely that *nodguṇṭhikayākr̥tāya* is the result of scribal error, since it deviates from the form of the rest of the *śaikṣā* rules 84–88, and the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (Sakaki 552).

suggests that the author(s)/redactor(s) of both texts were aware of a tradition that included these specific *śaikṣā* 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: *śaikṣā* rules 81–83.

***Śaikṣā* Rule 81**

The first shared *śaikṣā* rule in *prātimokṣas* 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.

Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 4b ¹⁵¹	Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 3a ¹⁵²
<i>na nīcatarake āsane niṣaṇṇe</i> <i>uccatarake āsane niṣaṇṇāyā</i>	<i>na nīcatarake āsane niṣaṇṇe</i> <i>uccatarake āsane niṣaṇṇāyāglānāya</i> <i>dharmmaṃ deśayiṣyāmīti śikṣā</i> <i>karaṇīyā //</i>

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,

¹⁵¹ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.

¹⁵² Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.

in this case teach the dharma: *dharmmaṃ deśayiṣyāmi*. Serial 4b has also excluded the declaration that this is a rule that ought to be followed: *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 *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 *iti śikṣā karaṇīyā* are present only in the final member of this small group.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 *prātimokṣa-sūtras*, but that do not necessarily provide us with evidence that will illuminate the matter of affiliation.

***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 *prātimokṣa-sūtra* is extant.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³ While beyond the scope of this present study, an investigation into which groups of rules are provided with a shared verb and *iti śikṣā karaṇīyā* at the end may prove interesting.

¹⁵⁴ See Appendix VII in Pachow, *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

<i>Śaikṣā</i> Rule 82 in Serial 3a / Rule 83 in Serial 4b	
Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 4b¹⁵⁵	Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 3a¹⁵⁶
<i>na prṣṭhato gacchantāḥ purato gacchate aglānāya dharmman deśayiṣyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>	<i>na prṣṭhato gacchat purato gacchate aglānāya dharmmaṃ deśayiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>

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 *gacchantāḥ* 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* (*dharmmaṃ*) in Serial 3a. Excluding these differences in *śaikṣā* 82/83,

¹⁵⁵ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.

¹⁵⁶ 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 2.1.4

Śaikṣā Rule 83 in Serial 3a / Rule 82 in Serial 4b	
Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 4b¹⁵⁷	Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 3a¹⁵⁸
<i>nonmārgeṇa gacchanto māreṇa gacchate</i>	<i>notpathena gacchat pathā gacchate aglānāya dharmam deśayiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>

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 *śaikṣā* 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.¹⁵⁹ The rule also includes a prefixed form of the term

¹⁵⁷ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.

¹⁵⁸ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.

¹⁵⁹ 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.¹⁶⁰ 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*,¹⁶¹ as does the Theravādin, which uses the Pāli equivalents.¹⁶² Although the relevant section is missing in Finot's edition, von Simson has found *mārga* in various Sarvāstivādin sources.¹⁶³ The Sarvāstivādin *bhikṣuṇī* fragments edited by Ernst Waldschmidt also use *mārga*.¹⁶⁴ From the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition, Guṇaprabha's *Vinaya-sūtra* uses *pathin* and *utpatha*,¹⁶⁵ as does the *Mahāvvyutpatti*.¹⁶⁶ So too does the fragment published by Sylvain Lévi.¹⁶⁷ 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 Lokottāravādimahāsaṅghika* (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 Sāṅkriyāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

¹⁶⁶ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 552.

¹⁶⁷ Lévi, "Notes sur des manuscrits sanscrits," 20.

underlying the Tibetan translations; the Tibetan *lam* is an attested translation for both *mārga* and *pathin*.¹⁶⁸ 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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*. 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

¹⁶⁸ Lokesh Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan 2001 [1959–1961]), 766.

illustrates the order in which these two rules are found in the Gilgit *prātimokṣa-sūtras*, and the Chinese and Tibetan *prātimokṣa-sūtras*.¹⁶⁹

Table 2.1.5

	Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 4b¹⁷⁰	Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 3a¹⁷¹	Tibetan <i>bhikṣu</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i> 172	Tibetan <i>bhikṣuṇī</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i> 173	Chinese <i>bhikṣu</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i> 174
Teaching dharma from behind to one in front	83	82	82	87	76
Teaching dharma from the side of the road to one on the road	82	83	83	88	77

The order of the rules present in Serial 3a matches the order found in the Tibetan and Chinese *prātimokṣa-sūtras*. The Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin *bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga*, which does not always match the *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa* in rule order, does so here, and the rules are present in the same order as in Serial 3a.¹⁷⁵ In Serial 4b, on the other hand, the rules are found in a different order than known Mūlasarvāstivādin *prātimokṣas*.

¹⁶⁹ I have included the Tibetan *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa*, but not the Chinese translation of this text in the tables of this study, due to complexity of the relationship of the Tibetan *bhikṣu* and *bhikṣuṇī* texts in the Tibetan canon.

¹⁷⁰ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.

¹⁷¹ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.

¹⁷² sTog Ca 57a5–6; Derge Ca 27b6.

¹⁷³ sTog Nya 32a6–32b1; Derge Ta 32b6.

¹⁷⁴ Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, Appendix VII, 20.

¹⁷⁵ sTog Nya 438a5–6; Derge 455b3.

When we take into account the Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial sources and the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, we see that Serial 4b is not alone in its presentation of these two *śaikṣā* rules.

Table 2.1.6

	A		B		
	Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 4b ¹⁷⁶	<i>BPSV</i> ¹⁷⁷	Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 3a ¹⁷⁸	<i>Vinaya-</i> <i>sūtra</i> ¹⁷⁹	<i>Mahā-</i> <i>vyutpatti</i> ¹⁸⁰
Teaching dharma from behind to one in front	83	88	82	82	80
Teaching dharma from the side of the road to one on the road	82	87	83	83	81

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

¹⁷⁶ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.

¹⁷⁷ Derge Tsu 154a6–154b1.

¹⁷⁸ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.

¹⁷⁹ Vin_2.2126 (82) and 2.2127 (83). See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

¹⁸⁰ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 552.

¹⁸¹ Vin_2.2126 (82) and 2.2127 (83). See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

¹⁸² Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 552.

¹⁸³ 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*.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

¹⁸⁴ Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, Appendix VII, 20.

of Serial 3a match the Tibetan and Chinese *bhikṣu* and *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa-sūtras*, the *Vinaya-sūtra*, the *Mahāvīyūtpatti*, as well as the Tibetan *bhikṣuṇī 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 pādādhāya,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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*,¹⁹³ and *BPSV*¹⁹⁴ 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.

¹⁸⁸ Chandra, “Unpublished Gilgit Fragment of the Prātimokṣa-sūtra,” 12, and Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, 13.

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 Sāṅkriyāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

¹⁹² Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*, 36 and 101.

¹⁹³ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 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, *śaikṣā* 43 or *śaikṣās* 43 and 44. The relevant section of Serial 2 reads “*sāvadānaṃ pātrasamjñinaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ pratigrahīṣyāma iti śikṣā 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 “Śaikṣ. 41–43” for this line.¹⁹⁷ Since what precedes the section in question, “*na samatittikaṃ samasūpikaṃ*” is almost certainly two rules, this section contains either:

A: One rule, 43, with *pātrasamjñinaṃ* applying specifically to this rule, and *piṇḍapātaṃ pratigrahīṣyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā* applying to all the items in this section: rules 41–43.

Or:

B: Two rules, rule 43, *sāvadānaṃ*, and rule 44 *pātrasamjñinaṃ*, with *piṇḍapātaṃ pratigrahīṣyāma iti śikṣā 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, *śaikṣā* 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.

¹⁹⁶ Chandra, “Unpublished Gilgit Fragment of the Prātimokṣa-sūtra,” 12.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁹⁸ Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*, 36 and 101.

The Tibetan *prātimokṣa* separates the Tibetan translations of *sāvadānam* and *pātrasaṃjñīnam* by the conjunctive *dang* (“and”) as well as a *shad* punctuation mark,¹⁹⁹ 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*.²⁰⁰ 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.²⁰¹

The equivalent rule for nuns is present in the Tibetan *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa* in the same form as it is found in the monks’ *prātimokṣa*.²⁰² 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.²⁰³

Unlike Vidyabhusana’s translation, Tsomo’s translation matches the Sanskrit of Serial 2, *sāvadānam*, “in regular order” (i.e., begging without skipping houses),²⁰⁴ and *pātrasaṃjñīnam*, “looking attentively into the bowl.” It seems plausible that

¹⁹⁹ Derge Ca 26b6 and Vidyabhusana 101.

²⁰⁰ Rules 75, 77, 106, 107, and 108 in the sTog Palace, Ca 25b4–26b4.

²⁰¹ Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*, 36.

²⁰² Derge Ta 31b5; sTog Nya 31b1.

²⁰³ Tsomo, *Sisters in Solitude*, 123.

²⁰⁴ On this interpretation of *sāvadānam*, see Jonathan Silk, *The Origins and early history of the Mahāratnakūta tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism with a study of the Ratnarāśisūtra and related materials*, PhD Diss. (1994), 347 n.4.

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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*, in which *sāvadānaṃ* and *pātrasamjñinaṃ* are two separate entries:²⁰⁶

8567 *sāvadānaṃ* – *mthar chags / 'thar chags*

8568 *pātrasamjñinaṃ* – *lhung gzed la blta ba / lhung bzed la blta ba*

Matsumura reads *pātrasamjñinaṃ* as a separate rule in Serial 2, when he notes that the rule corresponding to *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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 *pātrasamjñinaṃ* 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 *pātrasamjñinaṃ*, 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 *śaikṣā* 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, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 548. I have changed Sakaki’s transliteration of the Tibetan terms to match the more common Wylie system.

²⁰⁷ Matsumura, “Arrangement of the Gilgit Manuscripts,” 151.

²⁰⁸ Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 202–203.

Theravāda, and the Dharmaguptaka—have two separate rules.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 *pātrasamjñinaṃ* is found as a separate rule in other Mūlasarvāstivādin texts.

Sāṅkṛityāyana’s edition of the Sanskrit *Vinaya-sūtra*²¹⁰ contains a *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 *BPSV*.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 *BPSV* and 21 in the *Vinaya-sūtra*.²¹² The existence of the *śaikṣā* requiring *pātrasamjñinaṃ* as a rule separate from *sāvadānam* 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.²¹³ Despite Matsumura’s claim, *pātrasamjñinaṃ* is found in Serial 4b/4c, albeit as rule 69. The fact that Serial 2 contains these two separate *śaikṣā* rules, and that these rules are present as nonsequential, separate rules in Serial 4b/4c, allows for a more complete

²⁰⁹ For the Sarvāstivādins, see von Simson, *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins* Teil 2, 250. For the rest of the relevant schools, see Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 203.

²¹⁰ Vin_2.2088–2.2108. See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

²¹¹ Derge Tsu 153a3.

²¹² See Table 3.2.11.

²¹³ Vira and Chandra, *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:

Table 2.2.1

Gilgit Serial 4c <i>prātimokṣa-sūtra</i> ²¹⁴		Gilgit Serial 2 <i>prātimokṣa-sūtra</i> ²¹⁵	
42. Equal amounts of soup	<i>samasūpikaṃ</i>	42. Equal amounts of soup	<i>samasūpikaṃ</i>
43. Begging food orderly	<i>sāvadānaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ pratigrahīṣyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>	43. Begging food orderly	<i>sāvadānaṃ</i>
44. Not holding out the bowl before the food arrives	<i>na anāgate khādanīyabhojanīye pāttram upanāmayiṣyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>	44. Looking attentively into the bowl	<i>pātrasaṃjñīnaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ pratigrahīṣyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>
69. Looking attentively into the bowl	<i>pātrasaṃjñānaḥ pi[ṇḍapā]taṃ paribhokṣyāma iti śikṣakaraṇīyā </i>	--	--

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 *śaikṣā* rule ordering systems, both of which have parallels in Mūlasarvāstivādin literature.

Serial 2 Rule Order of *Śaikṣās* 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 *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa-sūtra* also presents these *śaikṣās* 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 *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa* according to Kabilsingh.²²⁰ The *Mahāvvyutpatti* does contain both rules in the same order, and in the same numbering as that present in Gilgit Serial 2, *śaikṣās* 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.

²¹⁹ Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 202–203.

²²⁰ Kabilsingh, *The Bhikkunī Pātimokkha*, 322.

²²¹ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 548.

Table 2.2.2

	Gilgit Serial 2 <i>prātimokṣa</i>²²²	Tibetan <i>bhikṣu</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i> and <i>vibhaṅga</i>²²³	Tibetan <i>bhikṣuṅī</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i>²²⁴	<i>Mahāvvyutpatti</i>²²⁵
Equal amounts of soup	42	42	43	42
Begging food orderly	43	43	44	43
Looking attentively into the bowl	44	44	45	44

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.

²²² Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 16.

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.

²²⁴ sTog Nya 31b1; Derge Ta 31b5.

²²⁵ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 548.

Rule Order of *Śaikṣās* 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 *śaikṣā* order with Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial texts once again reveals similarities, as illustrated below in Table 2.2.3.

Table 2.2.3

	Gilgit <i>prātimokṣa</i> Serial 4c²²⁶	<i>Vinaya-sūtra</i> ²²⁷	<i>BPSV</i> ²²⁸
Equal amounts of soup	42	42	42
Begging food orderly	43	43	43
Not holding out the bowl before the food arrives	44	44	44

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 *BSPV*. 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 Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 62.

²²⁸ Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2.

Table 2.2.4

	Group A			Group B			
	Gilgit Serial 4c <i>prātimokṣa</i> 229	<i>Vinaya- sūtra</i> ²³⁰	<i>BPSV</i> ²³¹	Gilgit Serial 2 <i>prātimokṣa</i> 232	Tibetan <i>bhikṣu prātimokṣa</i> 233	Tibetan <i>bhikṣuṅṅī prātimokṣa</i> 234	<i>Mahā- vyutpatti</i> ²³⁵
Equal amounts of soup	42	42	42	42	42	43	42
Begging food orderly	43	43	43	43	43	44	43
Looking attentively into the bowl	69	66	69	44	44	45	44
Not holding out the bowl before the food arrives	44	44	44	--	45	46	45

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 *śaikṣā* rule order.

²²⁹ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 136.

²³⁰ Vin_2.2088–2.2090, and 2.2108 (Rule 66). See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 62–63.

²³¹ Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2. For rule 69, see Tsu 153a3.

²³² Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 16.

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.

²³⁵ Sakaki, *Mahāvutpatti*, 548.

Rule Order of *Śaikṣās* 45 to 47 in Serial 4c

If we proceed past *śaikṣā* 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 2.2.5

Gilgit Serial 4c <i>prātimokṣa-sūtra</i>²³⁶	
45. “We will not holding the bowl above the hard and soft food,” is a training to be followed	<i>nopari khādanīyabhojanīyasya pātraṃ dhārayiṣyāmaḥ iti śikṣā karanīyā //</i>
46. Not covering up soup with rice out of greed	<i>nodanena sūpikaṃ praticchādayiṣyāma //</i>
47. “We will not cover up rice with soup out of greed,” is a training to be followed	<i>sūpikena vā odanaṃ bhūyaskāmatām upādāyeti śikṣā karanīyā //</i>

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

²³⁶ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 136.

Table 2.2.6

	Gilgit Serial 4c <i>prātimokṣa-</i> <i>sūtra</i>²³⁷	Tibetan <i>prātimokṣa-</i> <i>sūtra</i>²³⁸ and <i>vibhaṅga</i>²³⁹	Tibetan <i>bhikṣuṇī</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i>²⁴⁰
Not holding the bowl above the hard and soft food	45	48	48
Not covering up soup with rice out of greed	46	47	47
Not covering up rice with soup out of greed	47	46	46

In this case the *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 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

²³⁷ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 136.

²³⁸ sTog Ca 26b1–2; Derge Ca 27a1–2.

²³⁹ Derge Nya 362b6–7.

²⁴⁰ Derge Ta 31b6–7; sTog Nya 31b2–3.

²⁴¹ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 548.

²⁴² Vin_2.2096. See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63. The rule is “*na bhūyaskāmatayaudanena sūpikaṃ 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 2.2.7

	Gilgit Serial 4c <i>prātimokṣa-sūtra</i>²⁴⁴	<i>BPSV</i>²⁴⁵	<i>Vinaya-sūtra</i>²⁴⁶
Not hold the bowl above the hard and soft food	45	45	49
Not cover up soup with rice out of greed	46	46	50*
Not cover up rice with soup out of greed	47	47	50*

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*.

odanam), Guṇaprabha has separated the components with “*ca*” instead of combining them together as he does with his digests of other *śaikṣā* rules. However, this is largely speculative. In the Tibetan translation of the *Vinaya-sūtra* and its commentaries, this also appears to be only one rule. For the *Vinaya-sūtra*, see Derge Wu 49a5–6;

Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhidhāna Derge Zu 9b3; *Vinaya-sūtra-tīkā*, Derge Yu 16a3–4.

²⁴³ Vin_2.2096. See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

²⁴⁴ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 136.

²⁴⁵ Derge 151a2–5.

²⁴⁶ Vin_2.2091 and 2.2096. See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *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 *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa*, as well as the *Mahāvvyutpatti*. 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 *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa*.

Table 2.2.8

	Gilgit Serial 4c <i>prātimokṣa- sūtra</i> ²⁴⁷	<i>BPSV</i> ²⁴⁸	<i>Vinaya- sūtra</i> ²⁴⁹	Tibetan <i>prātimokṣa- sūtra</i> ²⁵⁰ and <i>vibhaṅga</i> ²⁵¹	Tibetan <i>bhikṣuṅī prātimokṣa</i> ²⁵²
Not holding the bowl above food	45	45	49	48	48
Not covering up soup with rice	46	46	50*	47	47
Not covering up rice with soup	47	47	50*	46	46

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, Sāṅkriyāyana's edition of the *Vinaya-sūtra* and the *Mahāvvyutpatti* differ in order (Table 2.2.4). Although Hu-von Hinüber has postulated that the *Mahāvvyutpatti* is based upon the *Vinaya-sūtra* and its commentaries for the *vastu* titles,²⁵³ and some technical vocabulary from the

²⁴⁷ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 136.

²⁴⁸ Derge 151a2–5.

²⁴⁹ Vin_2.2091 and 2.2096. See Sāṅkriyāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 62.

²⁵⁰ sTog Ca 26b1–2; Derge Ca 27a1–2.

²⁵¹ Derge Nya 362b6–7.

²⁵² Derge Ta 31b6–7; sTog Nya 31b2–3.

²⁵³ Hu-von Hinüber, “The 17 Titles of the Vinayavastu,” 339–345.

poṣadha-vastu,²⁵⁴ this does not seem to be the case here. Further evidence suggesting that the *śaikṣā* entries in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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.²⁵⁵ 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.²⁵⁶ While Serial 3a contains all of the rules of this group, as evidenced by the summary of the group in the *uddāna*,²⁵⁷ Serial 4b/4c is missing two rules since the

²⁵⁴ Hu-von Hinüber, “On the Sources of Some Entries in the Mahāvvyutpatti,” 191–195.

²⁵⁵ For one explanation on why it is inappropriate to teach someone holding one of these items, see Ñāṇamoli 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.

manuscript ends at this point.²⁵⁸ 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

	Gilgit Serial 3a <i>prātimokṣa-</i> <i>sūtra</i> ²⁵⁹	Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa-</i> <i>sūtra</i> ²⁶⁰
Not to one holding a stick <i>na daṇḍapāṇaye</i>	99	99
Not to one holding a sword <i>na śastrapāṇaye</i>	100	102
Not to one holding an umbrella <i>na cchatrapāṇaye</i>	101	100
Not to one holding a dagger <i>na khaḍgapāṇaye</i>	102	--
Not to one holding a weapon <i>nāyudhapāṇaye</i>	103	101
“We will not teach the Dharma to one holding armour,” is a training to be followed. <i>na sannaddhāyāglānāya dharmam deśayisyāma iti</i> <i>śikṣakaraṇīyā</i>	104	--

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.

²⁵⁹ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 56.

²⁶⁰ 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*,²⁶¹ *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa*,²⁶² and the *Mahāvvyutpatti*,²⁶³ all follow the same order.²⁶⁴ According to Pachow, the Chinese Mūlasarvāstivādin texts only contain one rule, that prohibiting preaching to one holding an umbrella.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.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.²⁶⁷ The *BPSV*²⁶⁸ and the Tibetan *bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga*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

²⁶¹ sTog Ca 27b1–2; Derge Ca 28a3–4.

²⁶² sTog Nya 32b4–5; Derge Ta 33a1–2.

²⁶³ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 553–554.

²⁶⁴ The order of these rules is: stick, umbrella, sword, dagger, weapon, armour.

²⁶⁵ According to Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, Appendix I, 25 and Kabilsingh, *Bhikkunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*, 325.

²⁶⁶ Vin_2.2131. See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

²⁶⁷ *Vinaya-sūtra* Derge Wu 50a1–2; *Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhidhāna* Derge Zu 10b4; *Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā*, Derge Yu 17a6–7.

²⁶⁸ Derge Tsu 155a4–6.

²⁶⁹ Derge Ta 457a5–457b3.

such variation in regard to these rules in the Gilgit manuscripts, and also with the Tibetan *bhikṣuṇī 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

Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa-sūtra</i> ²⁷¹		Gilgit Serial 2 <i>prātimokṣa-sūtra</i> ²⁷²	
42	Not standing	42	Not sitting on a couch
43	Not sitting on a couch	43	Not standing

The sequence of rules in Serial 2 is also the same in the Tibetan and Chinese *prātimokṣa-sūtras*.²⁷³ Although these rules are not included in the Tibetan *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa*, the Chinese *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa*, or the *BPSV*, they are found in the *bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga*, in which they follow the order of Serial 2.²⁷⁴ The rules also are present in the same order as Serial 2 in both the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the *Vinaya-sūtra*²⁷⁵ and the *Vinaya-sūtra* commentaries.²⁷⁶ Serial 4b preserves a unique ordering of these rules in comparison to other known Mūlasarvāstivādin texts, which all follow exactly the same order with respect to these two rules.²⁷⁷

²⁷¹ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 143.

²⁷² Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 4, and Chandra, “Unpublished Gilgit Fragment,” 4.

²⁷³ Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 144 and Appendix II, 4.

²⁷⁴ Derge Ta 315b1–4.

²⁷⁵ Vin_2,4,39–2,4,40. See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 50. *Vinaya-sūtra* Derge Wu 50a1–2.

²⁷⁶ *Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhīdhāna* Derge Zu 62a2–3, *Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā*, Derge Yu 162a3–4.

²⁷⁷ There is a possible exception to this in the *uddāna* of Serial 2. The keywords used for these two rules are “standing, couch (*sthānaṃ 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

Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa-sūtra</i> ²⁷⁸		Gilgit Serial 3a <i>prātimokṣa-sūtra</i> ²⁷⁹	
91. Not to one wearing a garland	<i>na mālāsīrase</i>	91. Not to one wearing a crown	<i>na maulīsīrase</i>
92. Not to one wearing a crown	<i>na maulīsīrase</i>	92. Not to one wearing a garland	<i>na mālāsīrase</i>

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.²⁸⁰ The Tibetan *bhikṣu prātimokṣa*,²⁸¹ *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa*, the *Mahāvvyutpatti*,²⁸² the Stein manuscript,²⁸³ and the *BPSV*²⁸⁴ all follow the order present in Serial 3a. The Sanskrit

²⁷⁸ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 134.

²⁷⁹ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 1, Plate 55.

²⁸⁰ Pachow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, Appendix IV, 10. For the nuns, see Kabilsingh *Bhikkunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*, 324.

²⁸¹ sTog Ca 27a7; Derge Ca 27b7–28a1.

²⁸² Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 553.

²⁸³ Lévi, “Notes sur des manuscrits sanscrits,” 20.

²⁸⁴ Derge Tsu 154b6.

Vinaya-sūtra manuscript combines both rules,²⁸⁵ and the Tibetan translation and the commentaries all follow Serial 3a and the other Tibetan texts.²⁸⁶ However, in the *bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga*,²⁸⁷ 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,²⁸⁸ 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; *Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhidhāna*, 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 *bhikṣuṇī 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 *bhikṣuṇī 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*,²⁸⁹ as are they in the Tibetan *prātimokṣa*.²⁹⁰ The *Mahāvvyutpatti* also follows the order of the Chinese and Tibetan *sūtras*.²⁹¹

Table 3.1.1

	Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa</i> ²⁹²	Tibetan <i>bhikṣu</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i> and <i>vibhaṅga</i> ²⁹³	Chinese <i>bhikṣu</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i> ²⁹⁴	<i>Mahāvvyutpatti</i> ²⁹⁵
Making a robe for an unrelated nun	24	25	25	25
Giving a robe to an unrelated nun	25	24	24	24

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 sTog Ca 17b5; Derge Ca 18a2–3.

²⁹¹ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 539.

²⁹² Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 139.

²⁹³ For the *prātimokṣa*, sTog 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.

²⁹⁵ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 549.

Table 3.1.2

	Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa</i>²⁹⁶	<i>Vinaya-sūtra</i>²⁹⁷	<i>Upālipariṣcchā</i> 2²⁹⁸
Making a robe for an unrelated nun	24	24	24
Giving a robe to an unrelated nun	25	25	25

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 *Upālipariṣcchā*. 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 *Upālipariṣcchā*.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 *Upālipariṣcchā*.

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; *Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhidhāna*, Derge Zhu 204a7–b2; *Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā*, 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 Sāṅkriyāyana, 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 Sāṅkriyāyana. 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 Śaikṣā 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

Gilgit Serial 4b/4c Prātimokṣa³⁰⁶	
Not separating the lumps of rice ³⁰⁷ <i>na sitthapṛthakkāraṇam</i>	58
Not making complaints ³⁰⁸ <i>nāvarṇakāraṇam*</i>	59
Not sticking-out the tongue <i>na jihvānīś cāraṇam</i>	60
Not making smacking noises with the tongue <i>na jihvāspḥoṭaṇam</i>	61

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 *śaikṣā* rule 64 (see Table 3.2.6). These rules involve the proper way of eating almsfood (*piṇḍapātam*), as do all the *śaikṣā* 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.

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

³⁰⁷ I follow here Edgerton’s translation. See Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, 353.

³⁰⁸ Again, I follow Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit*, 178. Cf. Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 103 and 128.

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 *bhikṣuṅī prātimokṣa*, which in this case follows the monks' text.

Table 3.2.2

	Gilgit Serial 4b/4c <i>prātimokṣa</i>³⁰⁹	Tibetan <i>bhikṣu prātimokṣa and vibhaṅga</i>³¹⁰	Tibetan <i>bhikṣuṅī prātimokṣa</i>³¹¹	<i>Mahāvvyutpatti</i>³¹²
Not separating the lumps of rice	58	60	60	58
Not making complaints	59	61	61	59
Not sticking-out the tongue	60	59	59	57
Not making smacking noises with the tongue	61	63	63	62

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).³¹³ The *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 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 3.2.3

	Gilgit Serial 4b/4c <i>prātimokṣa</i>³¹⁴	<i>BPSV</i>³¹⁵	<i>Vinaya-sūtra</i>³¹⁶
Not separating the lumps of rice	58	59	59
Not making complaints	59	58	60
Not sticking-out the tongue	60	60	63–64
Not making smacking noises with the tongue	61	61	63–64

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,³¹⁷ 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 Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

³¹⁷ *na jihvāsphoṭaniścāraṃ*.

Vinaya-sūtra follows the Tibetan *prātimokṣa-sūtra*,³¹⁸ and, as such, the two rules on tongues are not sequential—nor are they in the *Vinaya-sūtra-tīkā*.³¹⁹ The *Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhīdhāna* 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.³²⁰ 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 Śaikṣā Rules 58 to 61

The order of śaikṣā 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 *Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhīdhānā* 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 *Mahāvīyutpatti*, 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 items³²¹ in

³²¹ See Section 2.3.

Mūlasarvāstivādin monastic texts;³²² perhaps *prātimokṣa-sūtras* were composed following these rule digests, or rearranged to match them.

Serial 4b *Śaikṣā* Rules 62 to 64

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

Table 3.2.4

Gilgit Serial 4b <i>Prātimokṣa</i> ³²³	
Not divide into morsels <i>na kavaḍacchedakaṃ</i>	62
Not seize in the cheeks <i>na gallāpahāraṃ</i>	63
Not eat food crushing a stūpa-shape <i>na stūpākṛtim avamṛdya piṇḍapātaṃ paribhokṣyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā //</i>	64

Śaikṣā 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.”³²⁴

The Tibetan *bhikṣu prātimokṣa*, *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa*, and the *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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

	Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa</i>³²⁵	Tibetan <i>bhikṣu</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i> and <i>vibhaṅga</i>³²⁶	Tibetan <i>bhikṣuṅī</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i>³²⁷	<i>Mahāvvyutpatti</i>³²⁸
Not divide into morsels	62	64	64	61
Not seize in the cheeks	63	62	62	60
Not eat food crushing a <i>stūpa</i> -shape	64	69	69	67

The *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*. 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, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 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-*stūpa*, absent in Serial 4b, is less pronounced in the Sanskrit *Vinaya-sūtra*, and absent in the *BPSV*.

Table 3.2.6

	Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa</i>³³⁰	<i>Vinaya-sūtra</i> ³³¹	<i>BPSV</i> ³³²
Not divide into morsels	62	58	62
Not seize in the cheeks	63	57	63
Not eat food crushing a <i>stūpa</i> -shape	64	61	64

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 *Mahāvvyutpatti* (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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*, which present the rule against crushing *stūpa*-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 Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

³³² Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2.

³³³ Sāṅkṛityāyana, *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 *prātimokṣas* or the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 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

	Group A		Group B			
	Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa</i> ³³⁴	<i>BPSV</i> ³³⁵	<i>Vinaya- sūtra</i> ³³⁶	Tibetan <i>bhikṣu prātimokṣa and vibhaṅga</i> ³³⁷	Tibetan <i>bhikṣuṅī prātimokṣa</i> ³³⁸	<i>Mahā- vyutpatti</i> ³³⁹
Not divide into morsels	62	62	58	64	64	61
Not seize in the cheeks	63	63	57	62	62	60
Not eat food crushing a <i>stūpa</i> -shape	64	64	61	69	69	67

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 Sāṅkṛityāyana, *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.

³³⁹ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 549–550.

³⁴⁰ See Section 2.2.

Table 3.2.8

Gilgit Serial 4b <i>Prātimokṣa</i>³⁴¹	
Not shaking hand(s) <i>na hastasaṃdhūnakam</i>	65
Not shaking bowl <i>na pātrasaṃdhūnakam</i>	66
Not licking hand(s) <i>na hastāvalehakam</i>	67
Not licking bowl <i>na pātrāvalehakam</i>	68
Looking attentively at the bowl <i>pātrasaṃjñanaḥ pi[ṇḍapā]taṃ paribhokṣyāma iti śikṣākaraṇīyā </i>	69

As was previously mentioned, the greatest variance between these rules and the Tibetan *prātimokṣas* and the *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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).

³⁴¹ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 133.

Table 3.2.9

	Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa</i>³⁴²	Tibetan <i>bhikṣu</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i> and <i>vibhaṅga</i>³⁴³	Tibetan <i>bhikṣuṅī</i> <i>prātimokṣa</i>³⁴⁴	<i>Mahāvvyutpatti</i>³⁴⁵
Not shaking hand(s)	65	67	67	65
Not shaking bowl	66	68	68	66
Not licking hand(s)	67	65	65	63
Not licking bowl	68	66	66	64
Looking attentively at the bowl	69	44	45	44

There is a similar gap between the rules with respect to the *bhikṣuṅī prātimokṣa* and the *Mahāvvyutpatti*. A smaller variation in rule order is present in *śaikṣās* 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

³⁴² Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 133.

³⁴³ 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.

³⁴⁴ sTog Nya 31b6–7; Derge Ta 32a3–4. For *śaikṣā* 45, see sTog Nya 31b1; Derge Ta 31b5.

³⁴⁵ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 550.

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.³⁴⁶ In the rules presented by Guṇaprabha, *na hastapātrāvalehasan dhūnasamtolam*, the order in the sentence itself is licking first, followed by shaking.³⁴⁷ 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 *Mahāvīyūtpatti*,³⁴⁸ 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 Sāṅkriyāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

³⁴⁷ Ibid.

³⁴⁸ *Vinaya-sūtra* Derge Wu 49b2; *Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhidhāna* Derge Zu 9b5–6; *Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā*, Derge Yu 16b5.

Table 3.2.10

	Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa</i> ³⁴⁹	<i>Vinaya-sūtra</i> ³⁵⁰	<i>BPSV</i> ³⁵¹
Not shaking hand(s)	65	62–65	65
Not shaking bowl	66	62–65	67
Not licking hand(s)	67	62–65	68
Not licking bowl	68	62–65	66
Looking attentively at the bowl	69	66	69

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 *śaikṣā* 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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*. 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.

³⁵⁰ Vin_2.2129 (62–65) and Vin_2.2130 (66). See Sāṅkriyāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

³⁵¹ Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2.

Table 3.2.11

	Group A			Group B		
	Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa</i> ³⁵²	<i>Vinaya- sūtra</i> ³⁵³	<i>BPSV</i> ³⁵⁴	Tibetan <i>bhikṣu prātimokṣa and vibhaṅga</i> ³⁵⁵	Tibetan <i>bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa</i> ³⁵⁶	<i>Mahā- vyutpatti</i> ³⁵⁷
Not shaking hands	65	62–65	65	67	67	65
Not shaking bowl	66	62–65	67	68	68	66
Not licking hands	67	62–65	68	65	65	63
Not licking bowl	68	62–65	66	66	66	64
Looking attentively at the bowl	69	66	69	44	45	44

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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 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.

³⁵³ Vin_2.2129 (62–65) and Vin_2.2130 (66). See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

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.

³⁵⁷ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 550.

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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*. 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 *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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 3.2.12

	Gilgit Serial 4 <i>prātimokṣa</i>³⁵⁸	<i>Vinaya-sūtra</i> ³⁵⁹	<i>BPSV</i>³⁶⁰
Not separating the lumps of rice	<u>58</u>	<u>55</u>	59
Not making complaints	<u>59</u>	<u>56</u>	58
Not sticking-out the tongue	<u>60</u>	59–60	<u>60</u>
Not making smacking noises with the tongue	<u>61</u>	59–60	<u>61</u>
Not divide morsels	<u>62</u>	58	<u>62</u>
Not seize in the cheeks	<u>63</u>	57	<u>63</u>
Not eat food crushing a <i>stūpa</i> -shape	<u>64</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>64</u>
Not shaking hands	<u>65</u>	62–65	<u>65</u>
Not shaking bowl	66	62–65	67
Not licking hands	67	62–65	68
Not licking bowl	68	62–65	66
Looking attentively at the bowl	<u>69</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>69</u>

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.

³⁵⁹ Vin_2.2101–2.2108. See Sāṅkriyāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

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

	Gilgit Serial 4b <i>prātimokṣa</i>³⁶¹	<i>Vinaya- sūtra</i>³⁶²	<i>BPSV</i>³⁶³	Chinese <i>bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa</i>³⁶⁴
Not eat food crushing a <i>stūpa</i> -shape	64	61	64	55
Not shaking hands	65	62-65	65	58
Not shaking bowl	66	62-65	67	59
Not licking hands	67	62-65	68	56
Not licking bowl	68	62-65	66	57
Looking attentively at the bowl	69	66	69	60

³⁶¹ Vira and Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 2, Plate 133.

³⁶² Vin_2.2128–2.2130. See Sāṅkṛityāyana, *Vinayasūtra*, 63.

³⁶³ Derge Tsu 150b6–151a2.

³⁶⁴ Kabilsingh, *Bhikkhūnī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*, 322.

As illustrated by Table 3.2.13, it appears that there were two major³⁶⁵ 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*, *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa-sūtra*, the *Mahāvīyūtpatti*,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 *BPSV*, 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 *BPSV*.

In terms of the similarities between the *BPSV*, 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 *BPSV*, 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 *BPSV* exactly. However, based on what definitive information is available, Serial

³⁶⁵ I say major here because the Tibetan *bhikṣuṇī 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, *BPSV*, 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).

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 *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa*, the Tibetan *bhikṣuṇī 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 – 102,³⁶⁷ 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 *bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga*, as well as Serial 4b.³⁶⁸ 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 *bhikṣuṇī 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 Sāṅkṛityāyana.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 *śaikṣā* 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

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,³⁷⁵ Serial 4b/4c follows a unique order. In one instance, totaling two rules,³⁷⁶ Serial 4b/4c follows the Tibetan translation of the *bhikṣuṇī vibhaṅga*. In four instances, totaling eight rules³⁷⁷ 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.³⁷⁸

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.³⁷⁹ 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 *Śaikṣā* 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 *Śaikṣā* 44 of Section 2.2, *śaikṣā* 45 of Section 2.2, *pāyattikas* 24–25 of Section 3.1, and *śaikṣā* rules 58, 59, 64 and 69 of Section 3.2.

³⁷⁸ *Śaikṣā* 82–83 of Section 2.1, *śaikṣā* 44 of Section 2.2, *śaikṣā* rules 45–47 of Section 2.2, and *śaikṣā* rules 60–65 and 69 of Section 3.2.

³⁷⁹ *Pāyattikas* 24–25, 43–44 and *śaikṣās* 45–47, 58–69, 91–92, and 100–102.

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 *prātimokṣa-sūtra*, are not present in either the Tibetan *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa* 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 *prātimokṣa-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 *prātimokṣa-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 *bhikṣuṇī 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 *bhikṣuṇī* 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 *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa* and *bhikṣuṇī 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.

³⁸² Gregory Schopen, “On Emptying Chamber Pots Without Looking and the Urban location of Buddhist Nunneries in Early India again” in *Journal Asiatique* 296.2 (2008):232.

³⁸³ See Shayne Clarke, “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms,” and “On the Mūlasarvāstivādin Affiliations of the *Bhikṣuṇī 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.³⁸⁴ 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*.³⁸⁵ 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,³⁸⁶ are not made based on Sanskrit texts themselves, but the Tibetan translations.³⁸⁷ There is, in these cases, always the possibility of mistakes on the part of the translator(s).

³⁸⁴ 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.

³⁸⁵ For problems with this categorization in respect to Yijing’s *Vinaya* translations, see Clarke “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms,” 4.

³⁸⁶ See Clarke, “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms,” and “Mūlasarvāstivādin Affiliations of the *Bhikṣuṇī Vibhaṅga* and *Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa*.”

³⁸⁷ 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.

BPSV. 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.³⁸⁹ 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 Sāṅkriyāyana, 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

	<i>Vinaya-sūtra Group A</i>		<i>Vinaya-sūtra Group B</i>		<i>Prātimokṣa Tib.</i> ³⁹⁴	<i>Mahāvvyutpatti</i> ³⁹⁵
	<i>Vinaya-sūtra Skt.</i> ³⁹⁰	<i>Vinayasūtr-avṛṭṭy-abhidhāna</i> ³⁹¹	<i>Vinaya-sūtra Tib.</i> ³⁹²	<i>Vinaya-sūtra-ṭīkā</i> ³⁹³		
Not separating the lumps of rice	55	58	60	59	60	58
Not making complaints	56	59	61	60	61	59
Not seize in the cheeks	57	60	62	61	62	60
Not divide into morsels	58	61	64	63	64	61
Not sticking-out the tongue	59–60	62	59	58	59	57
Not making smacking noises with the tongue	59–60	69	63	62	63	62

³⁹⁰ Vin_2.2101–2.2108. See Sāṅkriyāyana, *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.

³⁹⁵ Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 548–550.

Not eat food crushing a <i>stūpa</i> -shape	61	63	69	68	69	--
Not licking hands	62–65	64	65	64	65	63
Not licking bowl	62–65	65	66	65	66	64
Not shaking hands	62–65	67	67	66	67	65
Not shaking bowl	62–65	68	68	67	68	66
Looking attentively at the bowl	66	45	45	45	44	44

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 *Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhidhāna*, although not identical, are very similar.³⁹⁶ 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 *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 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 *Mahāvvyutpatti* and the *Vinaya-sūtra* and its commentaries strongly suggests that the underlying source of the *Mahāvvyutpatti 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.

BIBIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

'dul ba'i mdo'i. 1982–1985. *Bstan 'gyur (sde dge)*. Vol. 159. 3–201. Delhi: Karmapae Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang.

'dul ba'i mdo'i 'grel ba mngon par brjod pa rang gi rnam par bshad pa zhes pya ba. 1982–1985. *Bstan 'gyur (sde dge)*. Vol. 161. 4–549. Delhi: Karmapae Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang.

'dul ba'i mdo'i rgya cher 'grel pa. 1982–1985. *Bstan 'gyur (sde dge)*. Vol. 163. 4–781. Delhi: Karmapae Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang.

'dul ba rnam 'byed. 1975–1980. *The Tog Palace manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur*. Vol. 5–7. Leh: Smarntsis Shesrig Dpemzod.

'dul ba rnam 'byed. 1976–1979. *The sde-dge mtshal-par bka'-'gyur : a facsimile edition of the 18th century redaction of si-tu chos-kyi-'byun-gnas prepared under the direction of h.h. the 16th rgyal-dban karma-pa*. Vol. 5–7. Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Choedhey, gyalwae sungrab partun khang.

'phags-pa thams-cad yod-par smra-ba'i dge slong ma'i so-sor thar-pa'i mdo'i 'grel pa. 1982–1985. *Bstan 'gyur (sde dge)*. Vol. 156. 4–355. Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Choedhey, gyalwae sungrab partun khang.

Dge slong ma'i dul ba rnam par 'byed pa. 1975–1980. *The Tog Palace manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur*. Vol. 8. 69–883. Leh: Smarntsis Shesrig Dpemzod.

Dge slong ma'i dul ba rnam par 'byed pa. 1976–1979. *The sde-dge mtshal-par bka'-'gyur : a facsimile edition of the 18th century redaction of si-tu chos-kyi-'byun-gnas prepared under the direction of h.h. the 16th rgyal-dban karma-pa.* Vol. 9. 52–657. Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Choedhey, gyalwae sungrab partun khang.

Dge slong ma'i so sor thar pa'i mdo. 1975–1980. *The Tog Palace manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur.* Vol. 8. 2–68. Leh: Smanrtsis Shesrig Dpemzod.

Dge slong ma'i so sor thar pa'i mdo. 1976–1979. *The sde-dge mtshal-par bka'-'gyur : a facsimile edition of the 18th century redaction of si-tu chos-kyi-'byun-gnas prepared under the direction of h.h. the 16th rgyal-dban karma-pa.* Vol. 9. 3–51. Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Choedhey, gyalwae sungrab partun khang.

So sor thar pa'i mdo. 1975–1980. *The Tog Palace manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur.* Vol. 5. 1–29. Leh: Smanrtsis Shesrig Dpemzod.

So sor thar pa'i mdo. 1976–1979. *The sde-dge mtshal-par bka'-'gyur : a facsimile edition of the 18th century redaction of si-tu chos-kyi-'byun-gnas prepared under the direction of h.h. the 16th rgyal-dban karma-pa.* Vol. 5. 3–42. Delhi: Karmapae Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang.

Secondary Sources

Bapat, P.V., and A. Hirakawa. 1970. *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha: A Chinese version by Saṅghabhadra of Samantapāsādikā.* Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

- Bapat P.V., and V. V. Gokhale. 1982. *Vinaya-Sūtra and Auto-Commentary on the Same by Guṇaprabha*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute 1982.
- Banerjee, Anukul Chandra. 1977. *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit: Prātimokṣa Sūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākya*. Calcutta: The World Press Private Limited.
- . 1954. *Prātimokṣa-sūtram (Mūlasarvāstivāda)*. Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Press.
- . 1953. “The Prātimokṣa Sūtra.” In *Indian Historical Quarterly* 29:162–174, 266–275, 363–377.
- Bechert, Heinz, ed. 1991–1997. *The Dating of the Historical Buddha/Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*, 3 Vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- . 1978. “Review: Buddhist Monastic Discipline: The Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtras of the Mahāsāṃghikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins. In *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 98/2:203–204.
- Bernhard, Franz. 1965. *Udānavarga*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Chandra, Lokesh. 2001 [1959–1961]. *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture and Aditya Prakashan.
- . 1960. “Unpublished Gilgit Fragment of the Prātimokṣa-Sūtra.” In *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd-und Ostasiens* 4:1–13.
- Clarke, Shayne. June 2012. “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms: On the Affiliation of the Tibetan Nun’s Lineages and Beyond.” Paper presented at Oslo.
- . June 2011a. “Towards a Comparative Study of the *Sarvāstivāda*- and *Mūlasarvāstivāda*-vinayas: A Preliminary Survey of the Kathāvastu embedded in

the *Uttaragrantha*.” Paper presented at The International Association of Buddhist Studies, Taiwan.

———. June 2011b. “On the Mūlasarvāstivādin Affiliations of the *Bhikṣuṇī Vibhaṅga* and *Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa* Preserved in Tibetan.” Paper presented at The International Association of Buddhist Studies, Taiwan.

———. 2009a. “When and Where is a Monk No Longer a Monk: On Communion and Communities in Indian Buddhist Monastic Law Codes.” In *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52:115–141.

———. 2009b. “Monks Who Have Sex: *Pārājika* Penance in Indian Buddhist Monasticisms.” In *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 37:1–43.

Csoma de Kőrös, Alexander. 1984 [1910–1944]. *Sanskrit-Tibetan-English Vocabulary: Being an Edition and Translation of the Mahavyutpatti*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Davids, T.W. Rhys and J. Estlin Carpenter eds. 1947 [1903]. *The Dighā Nikāya* Vol. 2. London: Oxford University Press.

Dreyfus, George B.J.. 2003. *The Sound of Two Hands Clapping: The Education of a Tibetan Buddhist Monk*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dutt, Sukumar. *Early Buddhist Monachism*. Calcutta: Asia Publishing House 1960.

Edgerton, Franklin. 2004 [1953]. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

- Enomoto, F. 2000. “‘Mūlasarvāstivādin’ and ‘Sarvāstivādin.’” In *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka. Festgabe für Adelheid Mette* (Indica et Tibetica Bd. 37. Hrsg. C. Chojnacki et al. 239–250. Indica et Tibetica Verlag: Swisttal-Odenforf.
- Finot, Louis. 1913. “Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādin avec la version chinoise de Kumārajīva traduite en français par M. Edouard Huber.” In *Journal Asiastique* (nov.–déc.): 465–558.
- Gangopadhyay, Jayeeta. 1991. *Uposatha Ceremony: The Earliest Tradition(s) and Later Developments (Mainly From Vinayic Traditions Preserved in Chinese)*. Delhi: Baratiya Veda Prakashan.
- Heirmann, Ann. 2002. *‘The Discipline in Four Parts’ Rules for Nuns according to the Dharmaguptakavinaya*. 3 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.
- von Hinüber, Oskar. 1996. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- . “Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya: A Survey of Theory and Practice.” In *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* (1995)18/1:7–45.
- . 1979. *Die Erforschung der Gilgit-Handschriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1969. “Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung aus Gilgit.” In *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 119: 102–132.

- Hirakawa, Akira. 1982. *Monastic Discipline for The Buddhist Nuns: An English translation of the Chinese texts of the Mahāsāṃghika Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya*. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Horner, I.B. trans. 1966. *The Book of Discipline (Vinaya-Piṭaka)*. 6 vols. London: Luzac & Company Ltd.
- Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. 2006. “Some Remarks on the Sanskrit Manuscript of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Prātimokṣasūtra found in Tibet.” In *Jaina-Itihāsa-Ratna: Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90*, 283–338. Edited by Ute Hüsken, Petra Kieffer-Pülz und Anne Peters. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- . 1997. “On the Sources of Some Entries in the *Mahāvvyutpatti*: Contributions to Indo-Tibetan Lexicography I.” In *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, 183–199. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1997. “The 17 Titles of the Vinayavastu in the *Mahāvvyutpatti*: Contributions to Indo-Tibetan Lexicography II.” In *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Indica et Tibetica, 30, 339–345. Edited by Petra Kieffer-Pülz, and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica.
- Ishihama, Yumiko and Fukuda Yōichi. 1989. *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvvyutpatti: Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology*. Studia Tibetica, 16. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko.
- Kabilsingh, Chatsumarn, trans. 1991. *The Bhikkunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*. Bangkok: Thammasat University Press.

- . 1984. *A Comparative Study of Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha*. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia.
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1988. *History of Indian Buddhism: from the origins to the Śāka era*. Translated by Sara Webb-Boin. Louvain-la-Neuve : Université catholique de Louvain, Institut orientaliste.
- Matsumura, Hisashi. 1989. “A Lexical Note on the Vinaya Literature.” In *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für Indische Philosophie*. Leiden: Kommissionsverlag E Brill. 33: 45–92.
- . 1986–1987. “Two notes on the Arrangement of the Gilgit Manuscripts.” In *Journal of the Oriental Institute* 36 (1–4): 145–154.
- Mohr, Thea and Jampa Tsedroen, eds. 2010. *Dignity and Discipline: Reviving Full Ordination for Buddhist Nuns*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Norman, K.R. trans. *The Pātimokkha*. 2001. Edited by William Pruitt. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Pachow, W. 1955. *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa on the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pali Versions*. Santiniketan: Kalidas Chatterji, Santiniketan Press.
- Pachow, W. and Ramakanta Mishra. 1954. “The Prātimokṣa Sūtra of the Mahāsāṅghikas.” In *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute* X: 243–248.
- Pagel, Ulrich. 2007. “The *Dhāraṇīs* of *Mahāvvyutpatti* #748: Origin and Formation.” *Buddhist Studies Review* 24/2: 151–191.

Panglung, Jampa Losang. 1979. “Preliminary remarks on the Uddānas in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin.” In *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson*. Edited by Michael Aris and Aung San Suu Kyi. 226–232. Warminster England: Aris & Phillips Ltd.

Prebish, Charles S. *A Survey of Vinaya Literature* Vol. 1. London: Routledge 1994.

———. 1975. *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: The Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtras of the Mahāsāṃghikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins*. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Rockhill, William Woodward trans. 1884. *Prātimoksha Sutra ou le Traité D’Émanicipation selon la Version Tibétaine avec notes et Extraits du Dulva (Vinaya)* (Paris: Libraire de la Société Asiatique).

Roth, Gustav. 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī vinaya: Including Bhikṣuṇī prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-mahāsāṃghika-lokottaravādin*. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

Sakaki, Ryōzaburō, ed. 1998 [1916]. *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.

Sāṅkṛityāyana, Rahul, ed. 1981. *Vinayasūtra of Bhadanta Gunaprabha*. Bombay: Baratiya Vidya Bhavan.

Schopen, Gregory. 2010. “On Incompetent Monks and Able Urbane Nuns in a Buddhist Monastic Code,” in *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 38:107–131.

- . 2008. “On Emptying Chamber Pots Without Looking and the Urban location of Buddhist Nunneries in Early India again,” in *Journal Asiatique* 296.2: 229–256.
- . 2006. “The Buddhist ‘Monastery’ and the Indian Garden: Aesthetics, Assimilations, and the Siting of Monastic Establishments.” In *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. 126/4:487–505.
- . 2004a. “On Buddhist Monks and Dreadful Deities: Some Monastic Devices for Updating the Dharma.” In *Gedenkschrift J.W. de Jong*, edited by H.W Bodewitz and M. Hara. 161–184. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- . 2004b. *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- . 1996. “The Suppression of Nuns and the Ritual Murder of Their Special Dead in Two Buddhist Monastic Texts. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 24: 563–592.
- . 1994. “Rituals Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*,” in *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 22: 31–80.
- Schmidt, Klaus. 1989. *Der Schlußteil des Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins: Text in Sanskrit und Tocharisch A verglichen mit den Parallelversionen anderer Schulen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1989.
- Silk, Jonathan. 1994. *The Origins and early history of the Mahāratnakūta tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism with a study of the Ratnarāsisūtra and related materials*, PhD Diss.

Thera, Nāṇamoli. 1966. *The Pāṭimokkha*. Bangkok: The Social Science Association Press of Thailand.

The sde-dge mtshal-par bka'-'gyur : a facsimile edition of the 18th century redaction of si-tu chos-kyi-'byun-gnas prepared under the direction of h.h. the 16th rgyal-dban karma-pa. 1976. Delhi: Karmapae Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang.

von Simson, Georg. 2000. *Pratimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Teil 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1986. *Pratimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Teil 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Stache-Rosen, Valentina. 1984. *Upālipariṣcchāsūtra: Ein Text zur buddhistischen Ordensdisziplin*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Strauch, Ingo. May 2008. *The Bajaur collection: A new collection of Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts – A preliminary catalogue and survey –*, Online version 1.1. http://www.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/e/indologie/bajaur/publication/strauch_2008_1_1.pdf. Accessed July 23, 2012.

Tatia, Nathmal. 1975. *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottāravādimahāsaṅghika*. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

The Tibetan Tripiṭaka. 1955–1962. Tokyo-Kyoto: Tibetan Tripiṭaka Research Foundation.

The Tog Palace manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur. 1975. Leh: Smanrtsis Shesrig Dpemzod.

- Tsedroen, Jampa. 1992. *A Brief Survey of the Vinaya: Its origin, transmission and arrangement from the Tibetan point of view with comparisons to the Theravāda and Dharmaguptaka traditions*. Hamburg: Dharma Edition.
- Tsomo, Karma Lekshe. 1996. *Sisters in Solitude: Two Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Ethics for Women*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Vira, Raghu and Lokesh Chandra, eds. 1995. *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts: Revised and Enlarged Compact Facsimile Edition, 3 Vols*. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series No. 150–152. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- . 1984. *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- . 1959–1974. *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*. Śata-Piṭaka Series, Vol. 10. Parts 1–10. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- Vidyabhusana, Satis Chandra. 1915. *So-sor-thar-pa (khrims): Vol. 5 of the Dulwa portion of the Kangyur, leaves 1–29 and top line of leaf 30*. Calcutta: Asiatic Society.
- Vogel, Claus. 1997. “On the Date of the Poṣadha Ceremony as Taught by the Mūlasarvāstivādins, in *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. 673–688. Edited by Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- . 1985. “Bu-ston on the Schism of the Buddhist Church and on the Doctrinal Tendencies of Buddhist Scriptures, translated from Tibetan.” In *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*. 104–110. Edited by Heinz Bechert. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Wille, Klaus. “Buddhist Sanskrit Sources from Khotan,” in *The British Library Sanskrit Fragments* Vol. II.1, edited by Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille. 25–72. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University 2009.
- . 1990. *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Williams, Monier. 2003 [1899]. *Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 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.
- Yuyama, Akira. 1979. *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur = A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*, Erster Teil Vinaya-Texte. Göttingen: Akademie der Wissenschaften.