

RULES OF CUSTOMARY BEHAVIOUR IN THE *MŪLASARVĀSTIVĀDA-VINAYA*

RULES OF CUSTOMARY BEHAVIOUR IN THE *MŪLASARVĀSTIVĀDA-VINAYA*

By GERJAN PIET ALTENBURG, B.A. (Honours), M.A.

A Thesis Prepared for the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University © by Gerjan Piet Altenburg, 2022

McMaster University DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (2022)
Hamilton, Ontario (Religious Studies)

TITLE: Rules of Customary Behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-*
vinaya

AUTHOR: Gerjan Piet Altenburg
B.A. (Honours, Dalhousie University)
M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Shayne Clarke

NUMBER OF PAGES: x, 252

ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a study of the rules of customary behaviour (*āsamudācārika-dharmas*) found in a North Indian Buddhist monastic law code, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Other than Gregory Schopen, few scholars have noted the significance of these rules. Schopen points out that according to this *vinaya*, adherence to rules of customary behaviour is foundational for achieving *nirvāṇa*. Yet, these rules have been practically ignored in contemporary scholarship. Building on Schopen's work, I approach this material with two main questions: 1) What are rules of customary behaviour? and 2) How do rules of customary behaviour function in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*?

In an attempt to answer these questions, I explore passages from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in which the Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour for specific monastics in response to a variety of narrative situations. I organize this material into three thematic chapters. First, I discuss rules of customary behaviour related to the administration of the monastic community (*saṃgha*). Next, I explore rules of customary behaviour relevant only in specific environments. Finally, I investigate rules of customary behaviour prescribed in response to illnesses in the *saṃgha*.

Through the above exploration, I demonstrate three main points:

- 1) that there are three ways that rules of customary behaviour appear in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*;

2) the adoption of rules of customary behaviour prescribed in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* does not necessarily signal the creation of a new monastic office or official duty; and

3) In the vast majority of cases, these rules seem to be designed to protect the integrity of the *saṃgha* and accommodate monks or nuns who are experiencing temporary challenges to their ecclesiastical status.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My doctoral studies were supported by various funding agencies. At the federal level, I received a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Doctoral Fellowship. At the provincial level, I held an Ontario Graduate Scholarship in Social Sciences, a Joyce Ontario Graduate Scholarship, and an Ontario Graduate Fellowship. At the institutional level, travel and writing were supported by: a scholarship from McMaster University's Centre for Buddhist Studies Research; numerous travel grants, including the Mary Margaret Scammell Travel Bursary, an entrance scholarship, and various other graduate scholarships from McMaster University.

This doctoral dissertation would not have been possible without the support of my supervisor, Dr. Shayne Clarke, as well as my committee members, Drs. James Benn and Mark Rowe. I wish to thank the external reviewer Dr. Rory Lindsay for his comments, and the defence's chair Dr. Eileen Schuller. Drs. Maxwell Kennel and Jeffrey Kotyk offered advice on early drafts of this dissertation's introductory chapter. My wife, Carly Ciufu, my brother-in-law, Dr. Dustin Ciufu, and my mother, Paula Altenburg, all commented on early drafts of the whole dissertation. Any remaining mistakes are my own.

ABBREVIATIONS

Derge	<i>The Facsimile Edition of the Sde-dge Bstan-'gyur (Bstod tshogs)</i> <i>reproduced from a clear set of prints from the 18th century Sde-dge blocks.</i>
SGSMT	Study Group of Manuscript in Tibetan <i>dBu med</i> Script at Taisho University
Skt.	Sanskrit
sTog	<i>The Tog Palace Manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur (1975–1980)</i>
Tib.	Tibetan

CONVENTIONS

I use square brackets to insert content into translations or quotations that is not found in the original text.

I use parentheses to clarify my translation choices or indicate my general understanding of, or confusions regarding, passages.

I use asterisks to indicate Sanskrit that is reconstructed on the basis of the Tibetan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Abbreviations	vi
Conventions	vii
Table of Contents	viii
List of Tables	x
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1: General Introduction	1
1.2: The <i>Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya</i>	11
1.3: The Term <i>Āsamudācārika-dharma</i>	20
1.4: The Scope of this Dissertation: Three Distinct Ways the Term <i>Āsamudācārika-dharma</i> Appears in the <i>Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya</i>	25
1.4.1: Prescribed Rules of Customary Behaviour	25
1.4.2: Rules of Customary Behaviour in the <i>Vinayamātrkā</i>	28
1.4.3: Rules of Customary Behaviour Taught to Ordinands	30
1.5: <i>Āsamudācārika-dharmas</i> and <i>Abhisamācārika-dharmas</i>	35
1.6: A Note on Pāli Parallels in the <i>Theravāda-vinaya</i>	38
1.7: Situating this Dissertation	44
1.8: Chapter Outlines	47
Chapter Two: Rules of Customary Behaviour & Management of the <i>Samgha</i> ...	51
2.1: Introduction	51
2.2: The Distributor of Lodgings	52
2.3: The Superintendent of Construction	70
2.4: The Monk in Charge of Meditation	77
2.5: Duties of the Elder of the Monastic Community	85
2.6: Rules of Customary Behaviour in Disputes	98
2.7: Chapter Conclusions	110

Chapter Three: Location-Specific Rules of Customary Behaviour	113
3.1: Introduction	113
3.2: Forest Monks	119
3.3: Travelling Monks	131
3.4: Visiting Monks	143
3.5: A Cemetery Monk	149
3.6: Chapter Conclusions	154
Chapter Four: Rules of Customary Behaviour Regarding Illness & Medicines .	156
4.1: Introduction	156
4.2: Begging on Behalf of Others	162
4.3: Redistributing or Storing Surplus Medicines	170
4.4: Exemptions for the Sick During Monastic Rituals	178
4.5: Ill Monks with Troublesome Ecclesiastical Statuses	182
4.6: A Monk with Leprosy	191
4.7: Chapter Conclusions	196
Chapter Five: Conclusions and Directions for Future Research	198
5.1: Conclusions	198
5.2: Directions for Future Research	207
Appendix One	211
Appendix Two	219
Appendix Three	228
Bibliography	233

LIST OF TABLES

Table One: Monastics Who are Prescribed Rules of Customary Behaviour in the <i>Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya</i>	212
Table Two: Monastics Who are Prescribed Rules of Customary Behaviour, Who Require a Formal Appointment, and Must Meet Certain Criteria	216
Table Three: Location of Prescribed Rules of Customary Behaviour in the <i>Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya</i>	220
Table Four: Items that Mention <i>Āsamudācārikas</i> in the <i>Vinayamāṭṛkā</i>	229
Table Five: Monks who are Taught their Rules of Customary Behaviour Two or Three days After Their Ordination	231

Chapter One: Introduction

Section 1.1 — General Introduction

Buddhist literature contains a plethora of rules. Anyone who commits one of the five sins of immediate retribution (*ānantarya-karmas*) theoretically takes their next birth in a hell realm.¹ In mainstream Buddhist traditions, male householders (*upāsakas*) adopt five lifelong vows.² Novices (*śrāmaṇeras*) are subject to ten precepts.³ Numerous rules for fully ordained monks (*bhikṣus*) and nuns (*bhikṣuṇīs*) are preserved in monastic law codes (*vinayas*).

Approximately 250 rules for monks and 350 rules for nuns are listed and classified according to the seriousness of the penalty associated with the offence in short texts called *prātimokṣa-sūtras*. Longer texts called *vibhaṅgas*, preserved in extant *vinayas*, contain further treatments of, and elaborations on, those rules.⁴ *Prātimokṣa* rules govern the individual conduct of monks and nuns. They include serious offences such as theft, as well as less serious offences like urinating while standing. These rules are well known and

^{1.} For a careful study of the *ānantarya-karmas* in Buddhist literature, see Silk 2007. The adoption of rules of conduct in the form of Bodhisattva vows may extend across numerous lifetimes, until one attains awakening (Sobisch 2002, 407).

^{2.} Sobisch 2002, 10n22.

^{3.} Sobisch 2002, 10n22.

^{4.} Clarke 2014a, 32.

have been studied extensively by scholars.⁵ In *vinayas*, rules regarding corporate matters are generally, although not always, treated in sections called *vastus* in Sanskrit or *khandhakas* in the Pāli language.⁶

Rules of customary behaviour (*āsamudācārika-dharmas*) are preserved in the largest of the six surviving Buddhist monastic law codes, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. These rules appear in all major sections of this *vinaya*, including both the *Vinayavibhaṅga* and the *Vinayavastu*. Although the Sanskrit term *āsamudācārika-dharma* has been translated into English several times since the 1950s, Gregory Schopen stands out as seemingly the only scholar to have noticed the significance of these rules.⁷ Schopen illustrates the importance of rules of customary behaviour in a passage found in the

⁵ Several English translations and full length studies of *Prātimokṣa-sūtras* exist. For only a few examples, see Pachow [1955] 2007, Prebish 1975, Tsomo 1996, and Vidyabhusana 1915.

⁶ Clarke 2014a, 30.

⁷ For example, when Anukul Chandra Banerjee (1957) refers to *āsamudācārika-dharmas* in his impressive treatment of the *Vinayavastu*, he calls them “rules of conduct” (169), “rules of moral conduct” (175), and “rules for the proper guidance of *bhikṣus*” (195). Schopen translates this term as “rules of customary behaviour” ([1996] 2004a, 227), “customary duties” (2000, 107), and “obligatory rules of behavior” ([2013] 2014, 133). I use the translation “rules of customary behaviour” for *āsamudācārika-dharmas* throughout this dissertation for the sake of internal consistency.

Śayanāsanavastu, the chapter of the *Vinayavastu* on bedding and seats.⁸ The Buddha explains seniority to the monks after teaching the past-life story (*jātaka*) of the partridge, in which a group of animal friends establish that the partridge is the most senior member of their group. The authors/redactors report that the Buddha said:

You, monks, must therefore live now with reverence, respect, and the mastery of apprehension in regard to fellow-monks, elders, those of middle rank and new monks. And why? It is not possible, monks, that a monk will fulfill the rules of customary behavior⁹ so long as he continues to live without reverence, respect, and the mastery of apprehension in regard to elders, those of middle rank, and new monks. It is not possible that he will fulfill the rules of training when he has not fulfilled the rules of customary behavior.¹⁰ It is not possible that he will fulfill the collections of moral action, of concentration, of wisdom, of the meditative releases, and of the knowledge and vision of the meditative releases, when he has not fulfilled the rules of training. And it is not possible that he, being free of attachment, will achieve final nirvāna (*sic*), when he has not fulfilled the collection of the knowledge and vision of the meditative releases. ...

^{8.} Schopen 2000, 107–108.

^{9.} My underline.

^{10.} My underline.

Therefore, monks, one must train now in this way: “We then will live with reverence, with respect and mastery of any apprehension in regard to fellow-monks, elders, those of middle rank, and new monks!”

In this way, monks, you must train!¹¹

This passage makes clear the importance of rules of customary behaviour according to the authors/redactors of the *Śayanāsanavastu*.¹² Final *nirvāṇa* depends on freedom from attachments. Freedom from attachments depends on “the collections of moral actions” (*śīla-skandhas*), etcetera, which depend on the fulfillment of the rules of training (*śaikṣā-dharmas*). The fulfillment of the rules of training is impossible without the fulfillment of the rules of customary behaviour. Thus, so says the Buddha in this story, monks must

¹¹ Translation from Schopen 2000, 107–108. I have elided a large section of Schopen’s translation with an ellipsis. In the elided section, the text repeats the same statement as above, only with the negatives made positive (Schopen 2000, 108).

¹² Peter Skilling, Saerji, and Prapod Assavavirulhakarn discuss this passage, mentioning also the parallel in the *Cullavagga* of the *Theravāda-vinaya* (Skilling et al. 2016, 180–182). They point out that “There is some variation in the terms, but the general structure of the development is the same” in the two versions of this passage (2016, 180). The Pāli text in the *Cullavagga* does not seem to contain a term corresponding to the Sanskrit *āsamudācārika-dharma*. For the Theravādin account, see Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 227 and Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 162.13–.23.

respect seniority amongst their fellow monastics. According to the authors/redactors of the above passage, the main goal of the Buddhist monastic project (escaping *saṃsāra* by way of final *nirvāṇa*), if not Buddhism more broadly, becomes impossible without the fulfillment of the rules of customary behaviour.

So, what are the rules of customary behaviour? Schopen unpacks his understanding of this term in a footnote appended to his edition and translation of the first part of the *Śāyanāsanavastu* (hence its emphasis below). Although lengthy, his exact words are worth providing in full here:

āsamudācārika with *dharma*, almost always plural, has a very specific referent. They are sets of rules—always delivered by the same stereotyped formula—that are required of a monk, in addition to the *prātimokṣa* rules, when he is fulfilling a specific, and often temporary, monastic office or function, or has undertaken a specific task or action. The *Śāyanāsanavastu* itself delivers two sets of such rules—the rules of customary behavior for the monk who is the keeper of the monastery’s dogs ..., and for the monk acting as “the giver of explanations” ... — and they represent something of the range and diversity of functions that such rules cover. These sets, moreover, occur in all parts of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, as some further examples will make clear: in the *Poṣadhavastu* ... there is a set governing the monk in charge of religious exertion (*prahāṇapratijāgrako bhikṣur*); in the *Pārivāsikavastu*, ... a set governing monks who are under probation ...; in the *Cīvaravastu*, ... they govern a monk with leprosy. In the

Vibhaṅga, we find such for monks who do construction work ..., for a monk who cuts down a tree when he is acting as a *navakarmika* ..., for how a monk who is traveling must deal with his baggage, ... or for the Elder of the Community in regard to preparations for a recitation of the Dharma ...; in the *Kṣudrakavastu* we find them for monks in charge of the monastery's orchards ..., for monks who wear perfume for medical reasons ..., etc. Such sets of rules are, in brief, extremely common, but our passage is one of the few which indicates the value placed on them: regardless of what modern scholars might make of these rules, monastic authors themselves—to judge by our passage—held that their fulfillment, and the fulfillment of the *śaikṣā* rules ..., were foundational to, and essential for, the achievement of final *nirvāṇa*, the highest religious goal. Without their fulfillment this simply was not possible. The fact that they are not commonly so valued by modern scholars may be a good indication of how far removed we are from the monastic authors we try to understand.¹³

Schopen emphasizes the importance that the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* placed on these rules. He also provides a sampling of passages about monks who must follow *āsamudācārika-dharmas* specific to their status in the monastic community, according to this *vinaya*. Although Schopen brought the importance of these rules to the

¹³ Schopen 2000, 150nII.31. I have elided only citations and references in this otherwise direct quotation.

attention of scholars more than twenty years ago, they still remain largely overlooked in contemporary scholarship. Building on the work of Schopen, I provide a detailed study of these rules in this dissertation. I elaborate on examples already discussed by Schopen, and provide new examples that, as far as I am aware, have also not caught the attention of contemporary scholars. I approach this material with two main questions: 1) What are rules of customary behaviour? and 2) How do rules of customary behaviour function in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*?

To my knowledge, the word *āsamudācārika* appears together with *dharma* in Sanskrit in only four texts. It appears frequently in the Gilgit Sanskrit *Vinayavastu* manuscript of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Apart from the *Vinayavastu*, three other texts available in Sanskrit preserve the word *āsamudācārika-dharma*:

- 1) A *Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācanā* records the rules of customary behaviour for the nun who cuts an ordinand's hair;¹⁴

¹⁴ This passage was already noticed by Edgerton in his entry on *āsamudācārika* ([1953] 1985, 111, s.v. “*āsamudācārika*”). The Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* preserves these rules in the *Kṣudrakavastu* (sTog 'dul ba tha 155a6–b2). For a recent translation of these rules of customary behaviour, from the *Kṣudrakavastu*, see Roloff 2021, II.iii.1.6–II.iii.1.7 (187–189). Roloff notes that the sentence that concludes the rules of customary behaviour appears in Tibetan at the end of II.iii.1.7 and in Sanskrit after II.iii.1.6 (2021, 187n58 and 189n67). Possibly then, there is a difference in the how

- 2) A manuscript fragment discovered in Central Asia, now belonging to the Hoernle collection, preserves the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who eats garlic,¹⁵ and;
- 3) The *Upasampadājñapti*, an ordination handbook for monks based on a manuscript preserved in Tibet, begins with an explanation of the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who questions the ordinand.¹⁶

the redactors of the Sanskrit recension, which circulated outside of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, understood the rules of customary behaviour of the nun who cuts an ordinand's hair. In Sanskrit, only the bathing of the ordinand is found in this nun's rules of customary behaviour. In Tibetan, the confirmation of sex and the providing of the robes and begging-bowl are also included.

¹⁵ Or.15009/271. A transcription of the Sanskrit is available in Karashima and Wille 2009, 273–274.

¹⁶ 1r1–2v1. A transliteration of this passage is available in the edition by Jin-il Chung (2011, 19 and 33). In his review of this edition, Oskar von Hinüber points out that Chung and an earlier editor of this text, Bhikkhu Jinānanda (1961), both seem to understand this term as synonymous with *antarāyika-dharma*. Von Hinüber remains skeptical (2014, 106). Chung provides a useful list of *antarāyika-dharmas* with their Tibetan and Chinese translations (2011, 149–151). Although there certainly is some overlap between topics, it is not enough, in my opinion, to view *antarāyika* and *āsamudācārika* as necessarily synonymous terms.

All three of these texts correspond to sections of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the main source of this dissertation. The agreement between the *Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācanā* and part of the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* has been well reported.¹⁷ The rules of customary behaviour for a monk who eats garlic found in the Hoernle fragment match the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, although the numbering of the section in which these rules are introduced may not align exactly between the Hoernle fragment and the Tibetan translation.¹⁸ The ordination procedure explained in the *Upasampadājñapti* seems to be extracted from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.¹⁹ If these Sanskrit texts all belong to the Mūlasarvāstivāda school, and if these are the only attested instances of the form *āsamudācārika* modifying *dharma* in reference to specific rules of

^{17.} For a succinct summary of the secondary literature on this agreement, see Chung 1998a, 420. Chung himself notes that although the *Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācanā* agrees with the Tibetan translation of the *Kṣudrakavastu* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the Sanskrit text that has been given the title *Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācanā* by scholars “has been handed down parallel as an independent one” (1998a, 421).

^{18.} Part of the Sanskrit preserved in this fragment, which is transliterated in Karashima and Wille 2009, 273–274, matches the definition of that which is connected to garlic (*sgog skya 'i rab tu ldan pa*) preserved in the *Vinayamātrkā* (sTog 'dul ba na 397b4–398b2).

^{19.} Schopen [2004] 2014, 175.

behaviour, then the Sanskrit compound *āsamudācārika-dharma* constitutes a uniquely Mūlasarvāstivādin technical term.

In the pages that follow, I will demonstrate that there are three distinct ways in which rules of customary behaviour appear in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. I focus only on one of the three in this dissertation: rules of customary behaviour prescribed by the Buddha in narratives. Most of the rules of customary behaviour provide monastics encountering temporary barriers with guidelines so that they may continue to participate within the monastic community (*saṃgha*). The adoption of and adherence to rules of customary behaviour prescribed in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* also protect the integrity of the *saṃgha* in these cases, both in terms of guarding the public's perception of the community and maintaining the ritual purity of the community. The rules of customary behaviour that the Buddha prescribes in narratives, which is by far the most common way that these rules appear, seem only to be assigned as part of the duties or obligations of a formal monastic office in ten of the more than fifty cases in which rules of customary behaviour are prescribed.²⁰

Before proceeding with my introduction of rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, I first offer some background on this *vinaya* in the section below in order to provide some general context regarding the primary sources consulted in this dissertation.

²⁰. See Appendix One.

Section 1.2 — The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*

Buddhist traditions consider *vinaya* to be—or at least contain—the actual speech of the Buddha (*buddhavacana*). One of the three baskets (*piṭakas*) of Indian Buddhist scripture, *vinaya* “refers to the body of teachings concerning monastic discipline or law attributed to the historical Buddha.”²¹

Six possibly complete *vinayas* have survived into the present day. Each in theory belongs to a different school (*nikāya*) of mainstream Buddhism. In this dissertation, I am only interested in one of these six surviving *vinayas*, the one belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivāda school of Buddhism: the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

According to Schopen, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* “may have been initially redacted around the 2nd Century CE.”²² By this period, Buddhist monastic communities had already settled into permanent, often wealthy institutions with sophisticated social hierarchies and established organizational structures. Narratives and rules extant in this *vinaya* provide us with insight into the assumptions and imaginations of Buddhist monastic authors/redactors active in North India in or around the 2nd Century CE.

Although I use the title *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in this dissertation for convenience, I do so with two caveats:

²¹ Clarke 2015, 60.

²² Schopen 2018, 376. For a more detailed discussion of the dating of this *vinaya*, see Schopen [2000] 2004a, 19–31.

- 1) this title denotes a collection of canonical monastic legal texts rather than a single text;²³ and
- 2) there are multiple textual traditions of the so-called *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and these traditions do not always preserve the exact same textual material.²⁴

Moreover, there are at least three separate versions of this *vinaya*. These versions are extant in varying degrees of preservation. They include:

- 1) the Sanskrit text partially preserved in manuscripts discovered in the Gilgit region of present-day Pakistan in 1931;

²³ Akira Hirakawa (1982, 11) attributes this feature of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* to its size: “Because of its size, it was not edited into one work, but consists of a number of independent works.” The other *vinayas* available in Chinese translation are presented each as a single text (Clarke 2015, 73).

²⁴ For example, Clarke has pointed out that there were at least three textual traditions of the *Mūlasarvāstivādin prātimokṣa* rules for nuns transmitted into Tibet (2015, 73–74). On the basis of their existence in Yijing’s incomplete Chinese translation and Sanskrit fragments of *Mūlasarvāstivādin* texts now found in the Schøyen collection, Clarke also notes some texts are missing in the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (2015, 73).

2) Yijing's incomplete eighth-century Chinese translation of the

Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya; and

3) a Tibetan translation included in the Tibetan Buddhist canon.²⁵

Other Sanskrit textual witnesses for parts of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* exist in several international collections.²⁶ Also, Sanskrit narrative anthologies/compilations such as the well-known *Divyāvadāna* largely overlap with the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.²⁷

²⁵ For more specific details on available textual witnesses for the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* currently known to scholars, including commentaries, additional translations, and fragments in various languages, see Clarke 2015, 73–81.

²⁶ Fragments of the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, *Vinayavastu*, and *Uttaragrantha* are preserved, in Sanskrit, in a private collection in the state of Virginia (Hartmann and Wille 2014, 146–147). Fragments of the *Uttaragrantha* have also been identified in the Schøyen collection (Hartmann and Wille 2014, 146–147). I list a fragment from the Hoernle collection (Or.15009/271) that might correspond to part of the *Uttaragrantha* above (pages 8–9). For another part of the *Uttaragrantha* in Sanskrit, see Masanori Shōno's recent edition of fragments containing *prātideśanikās* 2–4 in the *Upāliparipṛcchā* from the Virginia collection (2020).

²⁷ By Joel Tatelman's count, 21 of the 38 biographical narratives found in the *Divyāvadāna* are derived from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* ([2003] 2004, 235). This is up from 19 of 38, which was the commonly accepted count in the late 1990s (Hiraoka

Unfortunately, the Gilgit manuscript preserves only about one quarter of the entire *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.²⁸

The classical Tibetan translation is the largest and most complete version of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* known to have survived into the present day.²⁹ The general reliability of the classical Tibetan translation has been established by Schopen.³⁰ In this dissertation, I use as primary sources the Sanskrit text of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* preserved in the Gilgit manuscripts and the classical Tibetan translation preserved in the *bKa' gyur*, that half of the Tibetan Buddhist canon reserved for translations of scriptures considered *buddhavacana* by the Buddhist tradition.

When discussing the Sanskrit version of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, I refer first to Nalinaksha Dutt's edition of the *Vinayavastu*.³¹ I then cite the images of the manuscript

1998, 419). For a concordance between stories in the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, see Rotman 2008–2017, 1: 381–384 (*Appendix 3*).

²⁸ Clarke 2015, 73.

²⁹ One of the greatest scholars of Indian Buddhism, Étienne Lamotte, described the Chinese translation as mediocre and incomplete ([1958] 1988, 170). But as Schopen reminds us, “we do not actually know what a complete vinaya is” ([2003] 2004c, 887).

³⁰ Schopen [2008] 2014, 75.

³¹ Dutt [1942–1950] 1984. I have also benefitted from electronic searches of the *Vinayavastu* e-texts input by Chung, Karashima, and Wille available at <http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil.html>.

presented in the new facsimile edition,³² the first volume in a new series of colour facsimiles of the Gilgit manuscripts.³³ This facsimile edition has clear, full-colour images of the Gilgit *vinaya* manuscripts housed in the National Archives of India in a single volume. This edition was a much needed update to an earlier, black and white facsimile edition of the Gilgit manuscripts prepared by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra and first published in ten parts between 1959 and 1974 and reprinted in 1995.³⁴ Wherever available, I also draw upon editions and translations of the Sanskrit material to aid my own reading. I make clear when I am benefitting from existing editions or translations.

³² Clarke 2014b. I cite the plate number, then folio number, with an indication of the side of the folio: r for recto and v for verso, followed by line number(s).

³³ This first volume, *Vinaya Texts*, was followed by a second volume in five parts, *Mahāyāna Texts: Prajñāpāramitā Texts* (Part One) (Karashima, Lee, Nagashima, Shoji, Suzuki, Ye, and Zacchetti 2016), *Prajñāpāramitā Texts* (Part Two) (Karashima and Tamai 2019), *Samādhirājasūtra* (Part Three) (Kudo, Fukita, and Tanaka 2018), *Further Mahāyānasūtras* (Part Four) (Hirabayashi, Kudo, Mette, Sakuma, and Tudkeao 2017), and *Samghāṭasūtra* (Part Five) (von Hinüber and Kudo 2022). The third volume in the series is entitled *Avadānas and Miscellaneous Texts* (Kudo 2017).

³⁴ For a succinct summary of this earlier facsimile edition's publication history, see Oskar von Hinüber's general introduction (2014a, xi). Vira and Lokesh Chandra's facsimile edition was the standard resource for citing Sanskrit manuscripts from Gilgit, including the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, for forty years.

Throughout this dissertation, I compare these readings against the folio images in the new facsimile edition, providing citations where necessary.

There is no shortage of choice when it comes to selecting an edition of the Tibetan translation of this *vinaya*.³⁵ In this dissertation, I favour the (1975–1980) facsimile of the *Tog Palace Manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur* (hereafter referred to as sTog or sTog Palace).³⁶ The Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is preserved in the first 12 volumes (vols. *ka–na*) of this edition. I have selected this particular edition for three main reasons:

- 1) It has been convincingly argued that the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* preserved in sTog matches an otherwise unreported “Bhutanese recension” of the Tibetan translation of this monastic code.³⁷ This recension, which includes sTog, the Shey Palace manuscript, and four Bhutanese manuscripts, is “closer to the *Vinaya* known to Guṇaprabha” and is “less messy than the textual tradition that so troubled Bu sTon”,³⁸

³⁵ In a recent study, Clarke compared 27 textual witnesses of one section of this monastic code (2016–2017, 199).

³⁶ sTog is of course not perfect. Fumi Yao has noticed some peculiarities in the sTog Palace edition of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*’s chapter on medicine (2012, 1189).

³⁷ Clarke 2016–2017, 268–269.

³⁸ Clarke 2016–2017, 269. Here, referring to—and attempting to offer a partial solution

- 2) the quality of the images available of this *bKa' 'gyur* are far superior to those of any other facsimile edition at my disposal and thus I trust my own reading of sTog more than of other editions; and,
- 3) unlike other editions, this manuscript contains helpful numbering in itemized lists found in certain sections of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.³⁹

In cases where something seems unclear or out of place in the sTog edition, I have checked the reading in sTog against the sDe dge edition (hereafter Derge), which has been conveniently, but not always reliably, digitized into a searchable format. The Derge edition of the canon preserves not only the material considered by tradition to constitute the word of the Buddha, but also the even larger body of non-canonical commentaries and academic treatises in a section known as the *bsTan 'gyur*. When I cite material from the

to—a textual problem found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* that was first pointed out by the famous systematizer of the *bsTan 'gyur*, Bu sTon Rin Chen Grub (1290–1364 CE).

³⁹ Clarke discusses the helpful numbering in the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* and *Māṭṛkā* sections of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* found only in sTog, Shey Palace, and two Bhutanese manuscript editions of the *bKa' 'gyur* (2016–2017, 231–232). This numbering proves especially helpful for understanding the context for rules of customary behaviour included in definitions listed in the *Māṭṛkā*.

bsTan 'gyur, I refer to the Derge edition.⁴⁰ There is no sTog palace edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*.

Four major sections comprise the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*:

- 1) *Vinayavastu*;
- 2) *Vinayavibhaṅga*;
- 3) *Kṣudrakavastu*; and,
- 4) *Uttaragrantha*.⁴¹

The *Vinayavastu*, the section of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* dealing with monastic corporate concerns, contains 17 chapters (*vastus*). In theory, each *vastu* relates to a different topic, such as ordination (*Pravrajyāvastu*), or medicines (*Bhaiṣajyavastu*). The *Vinayavibhaṅga* explains rules pertinent to the conduct of individual monks (*bhikṣus*) in the *Bhikṣu-vibhaṅga* and nuns (*bhikṣuṅīs*) in the *Bhikṣuṅī-vibhaṅga*. The *Kṣudrakavastu* is a section on miscellaneous matters. The *Uttaragrantha*, the last section of the

⁴⁰ I actually refer to the Delhi reprint (1982–1985) of the Derge edition. Derge remains something like the industry standard edition of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon.

⁴¹ This is not the only order in which these sections are found. This order is recorded in a medieval Tibetan catalogue of Buddhist texts, the *'Phang thang ma*, and *vinayas* found in *bKa' 'gyurs* belonging to the *Tshal pa* group are also organized in this way (Eimer 1987, 221 and 226).

Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya, has often been mistakenly referred to as an appendix, but actually contains content not found elsewhere in this *vinaya*.⁴²

The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is massive. The 13-volume Tibetan translation preserved in the Derge edition of *bKa' 'gyur* totals 7,860 pages. Akira Hirakawa states, “Because it includes many Avadāna, it is about four times longer than other vinayas.”⁴³ This *vinaya* has had significant influence on Buddhist monastic history outside of India. Tibetan Buddhist traditions included this voluminous monastic code in their canon and preserved an impressive and “unprecedented 34 or so extant *Vinaya* commentaries, subcommentaries, digests, manuals, or treatises”⁴⁴ in the *bsTan 'gyur*. Contemporary

⁴² For more on the Tibetan translation of the *Uttaragrantha*, including its structure, see Clarke 2015, 77–80.

⁴³ Hirakawa 1982, 11. Comparing the Tibetan translation with available Chinese translations of various *vinayas*, Clarke calculates that, “the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* would have been approximately seven times longer than the *Mahīśāsaka-vinaya*, six times the length of the *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya*, and four times that of the *Dharmaguptaka-* and *Sarvāstivāda-vinayas*” (2016–2017, 204).

⁴⁴ Clarke 2016–2017, 205. Presumably, Clarke’s count includes the first 34 texts classified as *vinaya* in the index to the Derge edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*, texts we might consider *vinaya* commentaries proper. The number 34 likely does not take into account 12 other texts that appear in the *vinaya* section, including: histories of schisms, explanations of the *Upāsaka* precepts, and *avadānas*. For more details, see the *'dul ba* section of the

historians of Indian Buddhism have barely scratched the surface of the vast textual corpus available in the *bsTan 'gyur*.

Accordingly, in this dissertation, I use Indian commentaries preserved in the *bsTan 'gyur* to aid my understanding of terse passages from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. In particular, I consult Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* and its four major commentaries to shed light on technical terms or difficult passages.⁴⁵ Although I try not to shy away from the commentarial tradition, my use of the commentaries is less thorough than my use of the canonical *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* itself. This is a weakness of this study that I aim to remedy in future work, and I appeal to the reader to inform me of passages I may have missed in the *Mūlasarvāstivādin* commentarial literature.

Section 1.3 — The Term *Āsamudācārika-dharma*

The form *āsamudācārika* is found without *dharma* only once in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in Sanskrit: in a passage narrating the ordination of Udāyin in the

bsTan 'gyur in the Tōhoku catalogue (Ui et al. 1934, 625–632).

⁴⁵ The four major commentaries are (listed here in the order in which they appear in the Derge *bsTan 'gyur*): 1) Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhidāna-svavyākhyāna* (D4119); 2) Dharmamitra's *Vinayasūtra-ṭīkā* (D4120); 3) Prajñākara's *Vinayasūtra-vyākhyāna* (D4121), and; 4) Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra-vṛtṭi* (D4122).

Saṅghabhedavastu.⁴⁶ Other forms such as *āsamudācāra* or *samudācāra* (without *dharma*) are common in Sanskrit and simply mean behaviour or manner of conduct generally.⁴⁷

The Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit term *āsamudācārika-dharma* that most commonly appears in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is *kun tu spyad pa'i chos*.⁴⁸

Āsamudācārika-dharma can be broken down as: *ā* + *sam* + *ud* + *ācārika* + *dharma*, a string of three prefixes which the Tibetans rendered as *kun tu*, added to the word for habit or custom (*ācārika*), translated into Tibetan as *spyad pa*. *Dharma*, standardly expressed as *chos* in Tibetan, likely has the meaning of rule or obligation here. The translation *kun tu spyad pa'i chos* appears in the *Vinayavastu*, the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, and the *Kṣudrakavastu*, three of the four major sections of the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. The less common variant *kun tu spyad par bya ba'i chos* appears in the *Vinayavibhaṅga* and the *Kṣudrakavastu*. The *Kṣudrakavastu* also preserves the seemingly unique variant translation *mngon du spyad pa'i chos*, which is used in the context of a nun who cuts an ordinand's hair.⁴⁹ The translators⁵⁰ of the *Uttaragrantha*, however, favoured *mtshungs par*

^{46.} I discuss this usage of *āsamudācārika* later in this introduction (see pages 30–34). For the Sanskrit passage, see Gnoli 1977–1978, 1: 186.1–4.

^{47.} Edgerton [1953] 1985, 572, s.v. “*samudācāra*.”

^{48.} Slightly variant spellings include *kun du spyad pa'i chos*, *kun tu spyod pa'i chos*, and *kun du spyod pa'i chos*.

^{49.} sTog 'dul ba tha 155a6–b2.

^{50.} Unlike the other major sections of this *vinaya*, “[t]he names of the translators are not

over *kun tu*, translating *āsamudācārika-dharma* as *mtshungs par spyad pa'i chos* or *mtshungs par spyod pa'i chos*.⁵¹

recorded for either translation of the *Uttaragrantha*, although in the colophon to the incomplete text ..., it is recorded that both texts were translated in the time of the translator Klu'i rgyal mtshan, which places the translation in circa the first decade of the 9th century” (Clarke 2015, 77 [citations elided in this quotation]). If colophons are reliable, then the anonymous Tibetan translators of the *Uttaragrantha* were likely contemporaries of the Tibetan translators of the other major sections of this *vinaya*, which is currently dated to around the first decade of the ninth century.

⁵¹ Schopen already established that *mtshungs par spyad pa'i chos*, in the Tibetan translation of the *Uttaragrantha*, must be a rendering of *āsamudācārika-dharma* ([2001] 2004a, 139). These rules are introduced in the *Uttaragrantha* with the same formula with which the Buddha introduces *kun tu spyad pa'i chos* elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (Schopen [2001] 2004a, 139).

Although the *Uttaragrantha* unfortunately does not survive in Sanskrit as a complete text, manuscript fragments corresponding to some of its sections do exist (for examples, see Clarke 2015, 77). Further proof that Tib. *mtshungs par spyad pa'i chos* equates to *āsamudācārika-dharma* can be found by comparing the Sanskrit of a fragment from the Hoernle collection with the corresponding Tibetan translation. This Sanskrit fragment partially preserves the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who eats garlic, as defined in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinayamāṭṛkā* (Or.15009/271—transcription of the

Although *āsamudācārika* is commonly rendered into classical Tibetan as *kun tu spyad pa*, this is not the only Sanskrit lexical item that the Tibetans translated as *kun tu spyad pa*. In Negi’s entry on *kun tu spyad pa* in his 16 volume Tibetan-Sanskrit dictionary, *āsamudācārikaḥ* is listed alongside *ācaret* and *samudācaritam* for *kun tu spyad pa*.⁵² Sarat Chandra Das and Rai Bahadur define *kun tu spyad* as “an usual duty, habitual work” in *A Tibetan-English Dictionary (with Sanskrit synonyms)*.⁵³ In the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the Tibetan *kun tu spyod pa* not only translates *āsamudācārika* but also *ācarita* in sentences like the following from the *Cīvaravastu*: “It was the usual practice (*ācarita*) of king Bimbisāra when he saw a monk or nun to dismount from his elephant and to venerate their feet”⁵⁴ (Skt.: *ācaritam rajño bimbisārasya bhikṣuṃ vā bhikṣuṇīm vā drṣṭvā hastiskandhād avatūrya pādābhivandanam karoti*;⁵⁵ Tib.: *rgyal po gzugs can snying po ’i kun tu spyod pa ni dge slong ngam / dge slong ma mthong na glang po che las babs nas rkang pa la phyag byed pa yin no*).⁵⁶ A proper name with a genitive marker, followed by “*kun tu spyod pa ni*,” followed by an act, ending with “*yin no*,” is a

Sanskrit available in Karashima and Wille 2009, 273–274).

⁵² Negi 1993–2005, 1: 42, s.v. “*kun tu spyad pa*.”

⁵³ Chandra Das and Bahadur 1902, 24, s.v. “*kun tu spyad*.”

⁵⁴ Translation from Schopen 2007, 68.

⁵⁵ Dutt [1942–1950] 1984, 3(2): 49.1–2. For this passage in the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 145: 240v5.

⁵⁶ sTog ’dul ba ga 86b2–3.

common sentence construction in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* indicating the habits, regular customs, or usual practices of specific characters. In Sanskrit, the neuter, nominative, singular form of *ācarita* (*ācaritam*) appears directly before a name or title in the genitive form, followed by a description of the usual behaviour of that character (in the genitive), as in the example “*ācaritam rajño bimbisārasya*” (“It was the usual practice [*ācarita*] of king Bimbisāra”) provided above. Such sentences have little to do with formal rules of customary behaviour for monastics recorded in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

In this dissertation, I do not investigate every occurrence of the word *kun tu spyod pa* in the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Doing so would be a tall order to fill in a single dissertation and would likely prove to be a broad, unhelpful investigation.⁵⁷ Instead, I focus my study exclusively on instances in which a recognizable Tibetan translation of the form *āsamudācārika* clearly refers to a prescribed rule or set of rules in this *vinaya*.

⁵⁷ To give but one more example of a case in which *kun tu spyod pa* does not translate *āsamudācārika-dharma* in the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: “*gnas ngan len kun tu spyod pa*” (Skt. *duṣṭhulasamudācāra*) “seems to have just a general meaning” as ill behaved in a story from the *Vinayavibhaṅga* (Yao 2019–2020, 5n8).

Section 1.4 — Scope of this Dissertation: Three Distinct Ways the Term

Āsamudācārika-dharma* Appears in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya

There are three discernible ways that the term *āsamudācārika-dharma* appears in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. First, rules of customary behaviour are introduced in narratives in response to a specific situation. Second, they are found in definitions of items in the *Vinayamātrkā*. Third, rules of customary behaviour are taught to an ordinand two or three days after the ordination.

Section 1.4.1 — Prescribed Rules of Customary Behaviour

When rules of customary behaviour are introduced in narratives, they are usually introduced with the following formulaic phrase spoken by the Buddha: “I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a such-and-such monk,” or a slight variation of it depending on the context.⁵⁸ Schopen has more than once pointed out that this phrase

⁵⁸ Schopen has used at least two translations of this phrase: “I, monks, will designate the rule for a monk who ...” ([2001] 2004a, 139) and “I also will designate the obligatory rules of behavior for the monk who ...” ([2013] 2014, 134). He breaks down the Sanskrit behind this formula as follows: “the name of the office in the genitive + *ahaṃ bhikṣavo bhikṣor āsamudācārikāṃ dharmāṃ prajñāpayiṣyāmi*” ([2013] 2014, 134).

appears dozens of times in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.⁵⁹ More often than not, these rules conclude with the equally formulaic phrase “a such-and-such monk, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence” (title of monk in singular + *yathāprajñaptān āsamudācārikān dharmān na samādāya vartate / sātisāro bhavati*).⁶⁰ I refer to rules of customary behaviour introduced in narratives by the Buddha, marked by one or both of the introductory and concluding phrases discussed above, as prescribed rules of customary behaviour.

Usually, prescribed rules of customary behaviour appear when a monastic is tasked with settling a dispute, solving a problem, or looking after/using some commodity belonging to the monastic community. Most of these situations appear to be informal. Almost all are temporary. In less common instances, the Buddha first lists the qualities of a person not suited for the task and then the qualities of a person who is well suited for the task. The Buddha then explains the correct manner of appointing someone to this position. The Buddha specifies the formal motion (Skt. *jñapti*; Tib. *gsol ba*) before indicating the required formal procedure (Skt. *karman*; Tib. *las*). Then, the rules of customary behaviour of the role are listed. Prescribed rules of customary behaviour delivered without the Buddha first listing the qualities of a person suited for the task, describing the correct manner of appointing someone, or explaining the formal motion or

⁵⁹. Schopen [2001] 2004a, 139 and [2013] 2014, 134.

⁶⁰. In drawing attention here to this formulaic, concluding phrase, I am building on Schopen’s work ([2001] 2004a, 139 and [2013] 2014, 134).

procedure, appear to have a less formal and more practical function in the

Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya.

By my current count, fifty-three different Buddhist monastics are prescribed rules of customary behaviour in narratives found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.⁶¹ These monastics range from a co-residential student (*sārdhamvihārin*), whose rules of customary behaviour are introduced first in the *Pravrajyāvastu*⁶² and then later in the *Kṣudrakavastu*,⁶³ to the well-known superintendent of new construction (*navakarmika*), for whom rules of customary behaviour are prescribed in both the *Vinayavibhaṅga*⁶⁴ and the *Uttaragrantha*.⁶⁵ Rules of customary behaviour are introduced for administrators, monks undergoing some kind of ecclesiastical punishment, monks living in a variety of environments, and monks who are sick. These rules are also introduced for nuns. In the *Kṣudrakavastu*, for instance, we find rules for the nun who is responsible for cutting an

⁶¹ See Appendix One for details. Given the size of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, it is possible that I have not found all instances where prescribed rules of customary behaviour are introduced or listed. This is especially so since there are several different translations into Tibetan for the term.

⁶² sTog 'dul ba ka 97a5–99b7.

⁶³ sTog 'dul ba tha 337a2–338a5.

⁶⁴ sTog 'dul ba cha 281b7–282a5.

⁶⁵ sTog 'dul ba na 284a3–5: *Muktaka* 4.6.

ordinand's hair.⁶⁶ Rules of customary behaviour prescribed by the Buddha in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and the narratives attached to them are the main focus of this dissertation. Only ten of the fifty-three monastics who are assigned rules of customary behaviour are assigned these rules after the Buddha explains the five qualities a monk fulfilling the role must possess.⁶⁷

Section 1.4.2 — Rules of Customary Behaviour in the *Vinayamāṭṛkā*

In addition to narrative instances in which the Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour for specific monks, *āsamudācārika-dharmas* also appear in definitions in the *Vinayamāṭṛkā* of the *Uttaragrantha*. I count the appearance of rules of customary behaviour in the *Māṭṛkā* as the second of three common ways the term appears in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Unlike the rest of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, which is well known for preserving lengthy narratives “[t]he *Māṭṛkā* lacks any substantial narrative.”⁶⁸ Instead, this section of the *Uttaragrantha* contains itemized lists of definitions elaborating topics in the *vinaya* in three sections (*khaṇḍaka*; *phung po*):

^{66.} sTog 'dul ba tha 155a6–b2.

^{67.} See Appendix One for details.

^{68.} Clarke 2015, 80.

- 1) 133 items related to ordination (*bsnyen par rdzogs pa'i phung po*; *upasampadākhaṇḍaka*);
- 2) 98 items related to monastic conduct (*rab tu ldan pa'i phung po*; *pratisaṃyuktakhaṇḍaka*); and
- 3) 116 items regarding obligatory behaviour (*bya ba'i phung po*; *vṛttakhaṇḍaka*).⁶⁹

Definitions of fourteen items found in the *Māṭṛkā* mention customary behaviours.⁷⁰ At least six of those mentioned customary behaviours are prescribed elsewhere in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.⁷¹ When I discuss the rules of customary behaviour for the monk who eats garlic, for example, I refer to the prescribed rules of customary behaviour introduced in the story from the *Kṣudrakavastu*, as well as the conduct of one who has consumed garlic as defined in the *Māṭṛkā*.

^{69.} This outline of the *Māṭṛkā* is based on Clarke 2015, 80.

^{70.} For a list of these definitions from the *Māṭṛkā*, see Appendix Three.

^{71.} These six include customary behaviours found in definitions of: 1) the conduct of the superintendent of construction (sTog 'dul ba na 393a5–394a7); 2) the conduct of one who has consumed garlic (sTog 'dul ba na 397b4–398b2); 3) the obligations of a forest monk (sTog 'dul ba na 420b1–421b4); 4) the obligations of the elder who is travelling (sTog 'dul ba na 427a7–428b4); 5) the obligations of a preceptor (sTog 'dul ba na 441a1–5), and; 6) the obligations of local monks when a visiting monk arrives (sTog 'dul ba na 448a6–b5).

There is a third way that rules of customary behaviour appear in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. As part of a convention in this *vinaya*, rules of customary behaviour are taught to an ordinand shortly after ordination. Clarke discusses one such example, from the *Kṣudrakavastu*, in *Family Matters in Indian Buddhist Monasticisms*. He notes that the contents of the rules of customary behaviour are not stated.⁷² In this case, as in many such cases, a monk learns his rules of customary behaviour two or three days after his ordination.⁷³

Section 1.4.3 — Rules of Customary Behaviour Taught to Ordinands

Ordination (*upasampadā*) refers to the full ordination of a *bhikṣu*. Typically, in instances where full ordination is conferred in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the verb *upasampādayati*⁷⁴ is preceded by the verb *pravrajayati*.⁷⁵ *Pravrajyā* (going forth)⁷⁶ refers to the procedure through which a man or woman becomes a novice (*śrāmaṇera* or *śrāmaṇerī*). By my count, rules of customary behaviour are assigned after a monk's full

⁷² Clarke 2014a, 81.

⁷³ For specific examples, see note 77 below.

⁷⁴ Tib. *bsnyen par rdzogs pa*.

⁷⁵ For a discussion of the form *upasampādayati*, see Edgerton [1953] 1985, 143, s.v. “*upasampādayati*.”

⁷⁶ Tib. *rab tu phyung*.

ordination nine times in this *vinaya*, but the content of these rules are never listed in full.⁷⁷

⁷⁷ In the *Pravrajyāvastu*, rules of customary behaviour are assigned after the full ordinations of:

- 1) an escaped servant or slave (sTog 'dul ba ka 116b5–117b4; Eimer 1983, 2: 198.19–202.8; and Miller 2018, 3.7–.19);
- 2) a householder with debt (sTog 'dul ba ka 118b7–119b7; Eimer 1983, 2: 202.9–205.26; and Miller 2018, 3.20–.34);
- 3) Saṃgharakṣita (*dge 'dun 'tsho la*) (sTog 'dul ba ka 151b1–152a2; Eimer 1983, 2: 262.13–263.3; and Miller 2018, 4.185); and
- 4) a maimed servant without arms (sTog 'dul ba ka 193b5–195a4; Eimer 1983, 2: 334.18–337.2; and Miller 2018, 6.2–.10).

Rules of customary behaviour are also taught to:

- 5) Udāyin after his ordination in the *Saṅghabhedavastu* (sTog 'dul ba nga 119b2–120a2, and Gnoli 1977–1978, 1: 185.29–186.8); also recorded in the *Vinayavibhaṅga* (sTog 'dul ba ca 503b6–504a2).

Also in the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, rules of customary behaviour are taught to monks named:

- 6) Nanda (*mdzes dga'*) (sTog 'dul ba ca 60a3–b1); and
- 7) Upasena (*nye sde*) (sTog 'dul ba ca 171a5–b1).

In the *Kṣudrakavastu*, rules of customary behaviour are taught to:

- 8) a man who promises to return home to his wife (sTog 'dul ba ta 152a4–b1; this example is discussed in Clarke 2014a, 81); and

In every case of which I am currently aware, the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* provide little to no detail as to what exactly these rules entail. To my knowledge, rules of customary behaviour are learned after a novice goes forth only once in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. This occurs in a case from the *Pravrajyāvastu* where a father and son join the monastic community together as novices.⁷⁸ This is the only example I have come across where rules of customary behaviour might have applied to someone not fully ordained. Here too, the authors/redactors are silent as to what exactly is meant by rules of customary behaviour.

In the only instance available in the Sanskrit manuscript of the *Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinayavastu* where an ordinand learns his rules of customary behaviour two or three days after an ordination—the ordination of Udāyin in the *Saṅghabhedavastu*—the text does not read exactly as we might expect. Two examples of Udāyin’s ordination are preserved in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: one from the *Saṅghabhedavastu* and the other from the

9) a man with green hair (sTog 'dul ba tha 53b3–54b3).

Five of these nine monks who are taught rules of customary behaviour after their ordinations serve as narrative examples of the kinds of people who are not to be ordained according to the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

⁷⁸ sTog 'dul ba ka 113b2–114b4. The Tibetan text is also available in Helmut Eimer’s critical edition of the *Pravrajyāvastu* (1983, 2: 193.7–195.7). This story is now available in English in Bob Miller’s translation of the *Pravrajyāvastu* under the heading “Novices Not Yet Fifteen” (2018, 2.22–.34).

Vinayavibhaṅga. In the Tibetan *Saṅghabhedavastu*, the term for rules of customary behaviour has been rendered into Tibetan as *kun tu spyod pa 'i chos*, as expected.⁷⁹

In Sanskrit, the *Saṅghabhedavastu* preserves a singular form of *āsamudācārika* without the word *dharma*. Here, Śāriputra agrees to the Buddha's instruction to initiate Udāyin. Śāriputra ordains Udāyin and explains Udāyin's customary behaviour:

The Venerable Śāriputra, having assented “Yes Sir!” to the Blessed One, initiated and ordained Udāyin. And [the rule of] customary behaviour was declared for him (*asya; de la*) in full, saying, “This is your duty. From now on, Udāyin you are not to lay down in a house together with a woman!”

In his edition of the *Saṅghabhedavastu*, Raniero Gnoli gives the Sanskrit as follows:

*evam bhadanta ity āyuṣmān śāriputro bhagavataḥ pratiśrutya udāyinaṃ
pravrajitaḥ upasampāditaḥ; vistareṇa cāsya āsamudācārikam ārocitam idaṃ te*

⁷⁹ sTog 'dul ba nga 119b6–7: *tshe dang ldan pa sha 'ri 'i bus / bcom ldan 'das las mnyan nas 'char kha rab tu phyung / bsnyen par rdzogs par byas te / kun tu spyod pa 'i chos dag de la rgyas par smras nas / 'char kha 'di ni khyod kyi bya ba yin te / deng phan chad bud med dang lhan gcig khang pa gcig tu nyal bar mi bya 'o zhes bya ba dag go //*. The reading in Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba nga 92b3–4).

karaṇīyam iti; adyāgreṇa te udāyin⁸⁰ māṭṭrgrāmeṇa sārḍham ekāgāre śayyā na kalpayitavyeti;⁸¹

The Sanskrit mostly corresponds to the Tibetan translation, but the customary behaviour is singular rather than plural and the word *dharma* is missing. It is possible that so-called rules of customary behaviour typically learned shortly after ordination in the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* refer to customary behaviour but not *rules* of customary behaviour (*āsamudācārika* without *dharma*). The Sanskrit from the *Saṅghabhedavastu* seems to support this against the Tibetan reading. The omission of the word *dharma* could have been a scribal error in the surviving Sanskrit manuscript, as this is the only case of which I am aware where the surviving Sanskrit from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* preserves the word *āsamudācārika* without the word *dharma*. What exactly was intended by the authors/redactors of this monastic code when they state that an ordinand learned his rules of customary behaviour after his ordination must unfortunately remain unresolved in this dissertation.

To sum up this section, there are at least three discernible ways the term *āsamudācārika-dharma* appears in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. First, it denotes specialized rules prescribed by the Buddha to specific monastics as problems arise in

^{80.} Gnoli elides the repetition “*te udāyina te*” here with a footnote (1977–1978, 1: 186n2).

^{81.} Gnoli 1977–1978, 1: 186.1–4.

narratives. Second, *āsamudācārika-dharmas* are listed as conduct or obligations in definitions found in the *Māṭṛkā*. Third, rules of customary behaviour are taught to ordinands two or three days after their ordination ceremony. In this dissertation, I focus primarily on the first of these three usages, *viz.*, rules of customary behaviour prescribed by the Buddha in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Section 1.5 — *Āsamudācārika-dharmas* and *Abhisamācārika-dharmas*

The term *āsamudācārika-dharma* is likely unique to the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition. Prescribed rules of customary behaviour seem to be related to, if not synonymous with, a term found in monastic literature belonging to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. In the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin tradition, *abhisamācārika-dharmas* (rules of right conduct) are preserved in a single text (titled the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*) that likely formed part of their *vinaya*.⁸² Although these rules do not correspond exactly to the *āsamudācārika-dharmas* preserved in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, many topics covered by them do overlap.⁸³

⁸² Karashima 2014, 77–79.

⁸³ For example, both traditions describe a number of rules of conduct for the *saṃghasthāvira* (elder of the community). But, the rules of conduct for the *saṃghasthāvira* classified as *abhisamācārika-dharmas* do not correspond to the *āsamudācārika-dharmas* of the *saṃghasthāvira* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. The same is true for *āraṇyakas* (monks of the forest). Rules of behaviour might illustrate

These two terms are similar. Both are formed with the word *ācārika* “custom” modifying the word *dharmā*. A formulaic phrase, “*na pratipadyati, abhisamācārikān dharmmān atikramati*” (“if one does not behave [in this manner], one transgresses the rules of proper conduct”), marks the ending of sets of rules of right conduct in the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*.⁸⁴ This formula is similar and in many respects parallel to the phrase *āsamudācārikān dharmān na samādāya vartate / sātisāro bhavati* that concludes sets of prescribed rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Abhisamācārika-dharmas might function as the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin equivalents of prescribed *āsamudācārika-dharmas*.⁸⁵ Rather than being found throughout the *Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottaravāda-)-vinaya* like their Mūlasarvāstivādin counterparts, at some stage *abhisamācārika-dharmas* seem to have been recorded in a single text.

sectarian differences in extant *vinaya* traditions.

⁸⁴. Sanskrit and English translation from Karashima 2014, 78–79.

⁸⁵. In his study of monastic administrators, Silk points out that the same technical term can mean different things in varying Buddhist traditions and textual sources (2008, 15). This dissertation is not a comparative study of extant *vinaya* traditions, something Silk himself views as a necessary and yet “impossible task at the present” (2008, 15).

Similarities between the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* and the third section of *māṭṛkās* belonging to Sthavira schools have been noticed.⁸⁶ In the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the *Māṭṛkā* records a number of rules of customary behaviour. Clarke states that:

A full study of the relationship between the Sthavira *māṭṛkās* and both the *Abhisamācārika-Dharma* and the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin *Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka* is an urgent desideratum.⁸⁷

Although I do not attempt such a full study here, I include footnotes to *abhisamācārika-dharmas* when appropriate in this dissertation.

^{86.} Clarke 2004, 115. It may be important to note that, in his introduction to what was the first modern edition of the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*, Jinānanda writes: “In spite of our best efforts we could not trace any parallel text in any other source, viz. Pali, Buddhist Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan. Thus our scope of investigation had been very limited. No catalogue in the field of Buddhist Studies could give us a clue in this respect. We could hardly compare the contents of this text with those of any other source except the Vinaya of Theravāda or the Mūlasarvāstivāda school, where a line or a verse could be traced” (1969, iv). Jan Willem de Jong was characteristically critical of Jinānanda’s edition, stating “this edition is useless for any serious study of the text” (1974, 151).

^{87.} Clarke 2004, 82n18.

Section 1.6 — A Note on Pāli Parallels in the *Theravāda-vinaya*

In the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the phrase “I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for such-and-such a monk” signals the establishment of a new set of rules of customary behaviour. The *Theravāda-vinaya*, extant in Pāli, introduces sets of rules that sometimes parallel those of customary behaviour from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* with an almost identical phrase. To give but one example of the parallel phrasing in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, the Buddha introduces rules of behaviour for visiting monks by stating, in Isaline B. Horner’s translation: “Well then, monks, I will lay down an observance for incoming monks which should be observed by incoming monks”⁸⁸ (*tena hi bhikkhave āgantukānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ vattaṃ paññāpessāmi yathā āgantukehi bhikkhūhi vattitabbaṃ*).⁸⁹ In Pāli here, a certain type of monk is given in the genitive form (plural in this example) + “*vattaṃ paññāpessāmi*,” using the Pāli equivalent of the verb found in the Sanskrit formulaic introduction of rules of customary behaviour from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* together with the term *vatta* for “an observance.”⁹⁰ This set of rules for visiting monks in the *Theravāda-vinaya* concludes with the statement: “This,

⁸⁸. Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 292.

⁸⁹. Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 207.24–.26.

⁹⁰. Schopen breaks down the *Mūlasarvāstivādin* formula as “the name of the office in the genitive + *ahaṃ bhikṣavo bhikṣor āsamudācārikāṃ dharmāṃ prajñāpayiṣyāmi*” ([2013] 2014, 134).

monks, is the observance for incoming monks that is to be observed by incoming monks”⁹¹ (*idaṃ kho bhikkhave āgantukānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ vattaṃ yathā āgantukehi bhikkhūhi vattitabban ti*).⁹² This phrasing is also remarkably close to that which the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* use to signal the conclusion of a prescription of a set of rules of customary behaviour.

Parallel phrasing signals the prescription of certain rules of behaviour in the *Theravāda*- and *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinayas*. The Pāli word *vatta* (often *sammāvatta*), which Horner translates as “an observance,” likely corresponds at least loosely to the Sanskrit *āsamudācārika-dharma* in cases in which the Buddha introduces these rules formulaically in narratives.⁹³ Like the *abhisamācārika-dharmas* recorded in the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin tradition, issues covered by these behavioural rules do overlap at times with the *āsamudācārika-dharmas* recorded in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

But also like the behavioural rules preserved in the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin tradition, the *Theravāda*- and *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinayas* treat these rules differently. Unlike the prescribed rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, which are found in the *Vinayavastu*, the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, the *Kṣudrakavastu* and the

⁹¹. Translated in Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 295.

⁹². Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 210.8–.10.

⁹³. Horner notes that *vatta* means “custom, duty, habit” ([1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 292n1).

Uttaragrantha, rules of conduct are only prescribed in the *Theravāda-vinaya* in the *Mahāvagga* (which essentially corresponds to the first part of the *Vinayavastu*)⁹⁴ and the *Cullavagga* (which corresponds partly to the *Vinayavastu* and loosely to sections of the *Kṣudrakavastu*).⁹⁵ This organizational difference might be explained by the fact that all of the rules of customary behaviour recorded in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* of which I am aware are classified as *sātisāra* rules (rules which are not found in the *Prātimokṣa*). Therefore, parallel rules are unlikely to be found in the *Vinayavibhaṅga* of the Theravādins.⁹⁶

Some of the rules of conduct in the *Theravāda-vinaya* match almost exactly prescribed rules of customary behaviour found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Perhaps most notably, both *vinayas* contain prescribed rules of conduct for monks undergoing some kind of ecclesiastical punishment.⁹⁷ The rules of customary behaviour for a co-

⁹⁴ Banerjee 1957, 28.

⁹⁵ On the loose correspondence between the *Cullavagga* and sections of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, see Banerjee 1957, 28.

⁹⁶ In a recent publication, Clarke writes that Kieffer-Pülz informs him through personal communication that, “*sātisāra* rules are found only in the *Mahāvagga* and the *Parivāra*” in the *Theravāda-vinaya*. He further states in the same note that, “A survey of all *sātisāra* rules in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and their distribution may prove interesting” (2021, 78n80).

⁹⁷ The prescribed rules of conduct for a *tajjanīyakammakata* in the *Theravāda-vinaya*

residential student (*saddhivihārika*) towards the preceptor (*upajjhāya*) are given twice in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, as they are in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.⁹⁸ But unlike the *Mūlasarvāstivādin* account, the *Theravāda-vinaya* does not gloss the rules of conduct for a preceptor towards a co-residential student. The *Theravāda-vinaya* includes a separate, full discussion of the rules of conduct of a student (*antevāsika*) towards a teacher (*ācariya*) and vice versa.⁹⁹ In this way, the authors/redactors of the *Theravāda-vinaya*

closely correspond to the rules of customary behaviour for a *tarjanīyakarmakṛta* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, as one would expect. Similarly, the rules of conduct for a *paṭisāraṇīyakammakata* closely match a *pratisamharāṇīyakarmakṛta*. I discuss monks undergoing some kind of ecclesiastical punishment in more detail in Chapter Two.

⁹⁸ First in the *Mahāvagga* (Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 1: 46.3–50.24) and then in the *Cullavagga* (Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 223.3–227.27). These passages are translated in Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 1: 59–67 and Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 310–311.

⁹⁹ Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 231.4–.9 (translated in Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 321). The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* treats the rules of customary behaviour for a co-residential student towards a preceptor and teacher together (Miller 2018, 1.630–.640). The equivalent rules for preceptors and teachers towards students are glossed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: “As monk apprentices and monk journeymen treat preceptors and instructors, just so should preceptors and instructors treat monk apprentices and monk journeymen, except for the seeking of permission” (Miller 2018,

treat the prescribed rules of conduct for a co-residential student towards a teacher and preceptor just as the authors/redactors of the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* do. Unlike the Mūlasarvāstivādins, both the Theravādins and Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins give a full and separate treatment of the rules of proper conduct for a co-residential student towards his teacher and his preceptor rather than treating the teachers and preceptors together.¹⁰⁰

A few of the prescribed rules of conduct in the *Theravāda-vinaya* are not treated as rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, but are treated as *abhisamācārika-dharmas* in the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin tradition.¹⁰¹ Some of the

1.540).

^{100.} For the rules of proper conduct (*abhisamācārika-dharmas*) of a preceptor (*upādhyāya*) towards a co-residential student (*śrāddhevihārin*) in the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*, see Karashima 2012, 1: §7.3–7.8 (62–64). For the rules of proper conduct of a co-residential student towards a preceptor, see Karashima 2012, 1: §8.3–8.14 (65–77). For the rules of proper conduct of a teacher (*ācārya*) towards a student (*antevāsin*), see Karashima 2012, 1: §9.3–9.7 (78–79). For the rules of proper conduct of a student towards a teacher, see Karashima 2012, 1: §10.3–10.6 (80–81).

^{101.} Both the *Theravāda-vinaya* and the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* include prescribed rules of conduct that govern etiquette with regard to lodgings generally (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 305–308; Karashima 2012, 1: §17.4–17.12 [130–133]), bathrooms (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 308–309; Karashima 2012, 2: §42.6–42.32 [350–368]), and toilets (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 310–311; Karashima 2012, 1:

rules of conduct contained in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* do not seem to be found in the *Theravāda-vinaya* at all. Or, if such rules are found in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, they are not treated as rules of conduct.

Three *vinayas* available in Indic languages preserve prescribed rules of conduct. Rules of customary behaviour (*āsamudācārika-dharmas*) in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, rules of right conduct (*abhisamācārika-dharmas*) in the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*, and rules of conduct (*[sammā]vattas*) in the *Theravāda-vinaya* may all serve the same function in monastic literature belonging to different Buddhist monastic traditions. However, Buddhist monastic schools do not treat rules of conduct in precisely the same way in their monastic codes.

I remind the reader that this dissertation is not meant to be a comparative study of rules of conduct in multiple *vinayas*. In the chapters that follow, I focus primarily on rules of customary behaviour recorded by the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-*

§18.21–18.28 [146–149] and §19.7–19.43 [160–171]). In using the word toilet here, I intentionally conflate what Horner translates as a privy from the *Theravāda-vinaya* and the separate locations for bowel movements and urination discussed in the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*. For a more nuanced discussion of the terms used in various *vinayas* for what might be regarded as toilets, see Handy 2018–2019, 160–167 (especially 163–164). If there are parallel prescribed rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* for lodgings generally, bathrooms, and toilets, I have yet to locate them.

vinaya. Only when convenient, useful, or otherwise noteworthy do I discuss similarities or differences between rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and behavioural rules preserved in other *vinayas*. Such discussions are mostly treated in the footnotes of this dissertation.¹⁰²

Section 1.7 — Situating this Dissertation

Recent dissertations on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* take one of two approaches. One approach is to offer a translation or study of a significant subsection or chapter of this *vinaya* not yet translated into any Western language.¹⁰³ The other approach is a thematic exploration of a topic or issue in *vinaya*.¹⁰⁴ In this dissertation, I have opted for the second

^{102.} In no way do I claim to have been fully comprehensive in such comparative endeavours.

^{103.} See, for examples, Jens Borgland's (2014) study of the *Adhikaraṇavastu* (a chapter of the *Vinayavastu*) and Ryoji Kishino's (2013) study and translation of the *Nidāna* (a subsection of the *Uttaragrantha*).

^{104.} See, for instance, Bass's (2013) study of meditation in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and Finnegan's (2009) study of ethics and gender in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

I became aware of Susan Roach's recent (2020) dissertation on the *dhūtaguṇas* (ascetic practices) in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in the latter stages of writing this dissertation. Roach investigates several of the passages from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that I work through here. There is especially some overlap in our discussions of forest

approach. I focus on a Sanskrit term that seems important for premodern Buddhist authors, but remains largely overlooked in contemporary scholarship. To the best of my ability, I allow the textual sources to speak for themselves.

My work is partly inspired by recent studies of Indian Buddhist monastic management. In addition to the work of Schopen that I have referred to throughout this introduction, I have benefitted greatly from Jonathan Silk's pan-Buddhist investigation of monastic administrators, *Managing Monks* (2008). In this book, Silk explores descriptions of the duties and obligations of monastic administrators found in a variety of Buddhist textual sources. Silk defines technical terms and titles by surveying passages found in sources spanning various historical periods, cultural environments, and genres. Regarding his use of canonical sources, he writes:

One of the things I discovered is the wide range of usages of even seemingly identical titles. This, of course, is only to be expected. By their very nature, administrative terms are local and particular; we would expect that the ways a term is used in one time and place will not map perfectly or congruently onto the ways the same term is used in other circumstances.¹⁰⁵

monks. I spent a good deal of time folding her translations and analysis into my own work, with due attribution, at the proverbial last minute.

¹⁰⁵. Silk 2008, vi.

Silk reminds us that administrative terms do not carry the same meaning in English or in different contexts. We should expect no different of our Sanskrit or classical Tibetan sources.

By including textual evidence from all over the Buddhist world, Silk could not treat terms in detail in the context of any single genre, location, or time period. In her review of *Managing Monks*, Petra Kieffer-Pülz (2010) insists that, “in future studies each single term and its development from the canonical sources up to the younger commentarial layers will have to be examined first within one and the same school.”¹⁰⁶ In this dissertation, I heed Kieffer-Pülz’s advice and focus as much as possible on only one technical term (*āsamudācārika-dharma*) in literature belonging to one Buddhist school (the Mūlasarvāstivāda school).

In a recent study of Buddhist monastic organization, *The Monastery Rules: Buddhist Monastic Organization in Pre-Modern Tibet*, Silk’s student Berthe Jansen (2018) provides the first detailed study of Tibetan *bca’yigs*, a highly valuable but often overlooked source for the study of local Buddhist monastic organization.¹⁰⁷ Jansen draws not only upon *bca’yigs* authored and redacted in premodern Tibetan monasteries, but also on oral histories from Tibetan monastics. Unlike Silk’s *Managing Monks*, Jansen’s *The Monastery Rules* focuses on one particular genre of Buddhist literature (*bca’yig*) in one specific region (Tibet).

¹⁰⁶. Kieffer-Pülz 2010, 87.

¹⁰⁷. Jansen 2018.

By focusing on only one technical term in one seemingly formulaic context, in one school's monastic literature, I narrow the scope even further. I hope this study of rules of customary behaviour will illuminate the meaning and function of these rules in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Any gains in our understanding of Indian Buddhist monastic organization or administration developed herein might best be considered an agreeable side effect.

Section 1.8 — Chapter Outlines

As I located and attempted to make sense of the rules of customary behaviour prescribed for monastics in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, some patterns emerged. Roughly half of these narratives in some way relate to administrative procedures in the monastic community. Others govern conduct specific to certain environments or social settings. Finally, a number of rules of customary behaviour govern the conduct of monks who are ill. I have arranged this dissertation into three thematic chapters, each investigating rules of customary behaviour fitting one of these three patterns.

In Chapter Two, I discuss rules of customary behaviour related to administrative procedures. First, I explore rules of customary behaviour assigned to monastic offices related to the annual rain retreat (*varṣā*).¹⁰⁸ Then, I investigate rules of customary

¹⁰⁸ I discuss the monk who assigns quarters for the rain retreat (*śayanāsanagrahaka*), the host of the ceremony for ending the retreat (*pravāraka*), and the spreader of the *kaṭhina* cloth at the end of the retreat (*kaṭhināstāraka*).

behaviour related to construction.¹⁰⁹ Next, I explore rules of customary behaviour required of the most senior monk (*saṃghasthavira*) in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Afterwards, I discuss the rules governing the conduct of different roles in dispute procedures in this *vinaya*.¹¹⁰ Lastly, I explore the rules governing the conduct of categories of monks undergoing some kind of ecclesiastical punishment.¹¹¹

^{109.} I explore the rules of customary behaviour for the superintendent of construction (*navakarmika*), a monk who does construction work (*dge slong mkhar lan byed*), the monk in charge of meditation (*prahāṇapratijāgraka*), the monk in charge of the monastery's dogs (*kukkurapoṣaka*), and the monk in charge of growing trees (*dge slong shing skyed par byes pa*).

^{110.} I discuss rules of customary behaviour for monks who perform a suspension procedure (*utkṣepaka*); act as the plaintiff or defendant in a dispute (*arthikapratyarthika*); perform the *saṃghasāmagrī* procedure (*saṃghasāmagrīdattaka*); must bring disputing parties to a *saṃgha* that can settle the dispute (*adhikaraṇasaṃcāraka*); distribute the voting sticks (*śalākācāraka*); and are appointed to criticize misbehaving monks (*gleng ba pa*).

^{111.} I explore the conduct of monks who have been suspended (*utkṣiptaka*); are to be restored (*osāraṇīya*); have been given the *tarjanīya*, *nigarhaṇīya*, or *pratisaṃharaṇīya* penal procedures (*tarjanīkarmakṛta*, *nigarhaṇīyakarmakṛta*, or *pratisaṃharaṇīyakarmakṛta*); are on probation for committing a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* offence (*pārivāsikamānāpyacārika*); have been given the seeking-the-nature-of-that procedure

In Chapter Three, I explore rules of customary behaviour specific to various environmental and social settings. First, I investigate rules for forest monks (*āraṇyakas*). Then, I discuss the rules of customary behaviour of monks who are travelling. Next, I explore rules governing the conduct of those who are visiting a *vihāra*. Finally, I investigate rules for a monk who has been dwelling in a cemetery (*śmāśanika*).

In Chapter Four, I investigate rules of customary behaviour related to illness and medicines in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. I begin by discussing the rules for one who distributes curative water from a begging-bowl to a layperson (*lhung bzed kyi chu sbyin par byes pa*). Next, I explore the rules requiring certain monks to support other monastics when they are ill.¹¹² Then, I investigate rules surrounding the redistribution or storage of medicines.¹¹³ Afterwards, I discuss the rules in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* governing procedures around illness in religious ceremonies.¹¹⁴ I then explore rules imposed on

(*tatsvabhāvaiṣṭyadattaka*); and, have committed a *pārājika* but remain in the monastic community (*śikṣādattaka*).

¹¹². In particular, I include here the responsibilities that co-residential pupils and disciples (*sārdhamvihārins* and *antevāsins*) have toward their preceptors (*upādhyāyas*) and teachers (*ācāryas*) in times of illness.

¹¹³. Included here are the rules for dealing with excess medicines for a monk who keeps fat (*vasādhāraka*), a monk who keeps an astringent (*kaṣāyadhāraka*), and a monk who keeps collyrium (*añjanadhāraka*).

¹¹⁴. I investigate the procedures by which sick monks must declare their purity and offer

monks who have an unpleasant odour because of their medicines.¹¹⁵ Lastly, I discuss rules governing the behaviour of a monk who has contracted leprosy (*kuṣṭharogābhibhūta*).

Chapter Five contains general conclusions and notes for further research.

To sum up this chapter, I demonstrated that there are at least three distinct usages of the term *āsamudācārika-dharma* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. In the chapters that follow, I focus primarily on rules of customary behaviour prescribed by the Buddha in narratives. *Āsamudācārika-dharma* appears to be a uniquely Mūlasarvāstivādin term. By investigating these rules along with the narrative contexts in which they appear in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in thematically arranged chapters, I will shed light on this Mūlasarvāstivādin technical term. I will show that rules of customary behaviour seem only to be assigned as part of the duties or obligations of a formal monastic office in ten cases.¹¹⁶ Most of the time, rules of customary behaviour appear as guidelines for accommodating the continued participation in the monastic community of monks who are encountering temporary barriers.

consent for the commencement of the *poṣadha* and *pravāraṇā* ceremonies via a proxy. I also discuss the rules of customary behaviour for those proxies.

^{115.} I explore rules designated for a monk who keeps perfume (*dge slong dri 'chang ba*) and the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who has consumed garlic (*dge slong sgog skya za ba*).

^{116.} See Appendix One.

Chapter Two: Rules of Customary Behaviour and the Management of the *Samgha*

Section 2.1 — Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss rules of customary behaviour related to the administration or management of the Buddhist monastic community. I begin with the rules of customary behaviour prescribed for the monk who distributes lodgings (*śayanāsanagrāhaka*). This monk assigns lodgings to participants in the annual rain retreat (*varṣā*). Rules for the monk who assigns lodgings at the beginning of the rain retreat are listed in three *vinaya* traditions available in Indic languages. These rules appear as:

- 1) *āsamudācārika-dharmas* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* for the *śayanāsanagrāhaka*;
- 2) *abhisamacārikā-dharmas* in the *Abhisamacārikā Dharmāḥ* for the *śayyāsanaprajñāpaka*;¹¹⁷ and,
- 3) *dukkatas* (offences of wrong doing) in the *Theravāda-vinaya* for the *senāsanagāhāpaka*.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ For a Sanskrit edition and German translation of these rules, see Karashima 2012, 1: §12.10–12.19 (99–104).

¹¹⁸ For an English translation, see Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 233–235. The Pāli is available in Oldenberg's edition ([1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 167.13–167.38). These

In the previous chapter, I explored the possibility that the term *āsamudācārika-dharma* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* might be synonymous with *abhisamācārika-dharma* in the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*. Although the topics do seem to overlap, the actual rules that the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* contains as *abhisamācārika-dharmas* do not correspond to the *āsamudācārika-dharmas* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.¹¹⁹ In the following section, I focus on the Mūlasarvāstivādin account of these rules only. I proceed with the caveat that although I am interested in the Mūlasarvāstivādin account, I do not take it as representative of all forms of Indian Buddhist monasticism.¹²⁰

Section 2.2 — The Distributor of Lodgings

The Buddhist monastic community settled into permanent or semi-permanent residences for the duration of the rainy season early in its institutional history.¹²¹ The close co-

are not treated as prescribed rules of conduct (neither *vattas* nor *sammāvattas*) in the *Theravāda-vinaya*. Rather, they are offences (*dukkaṭas*) as opposed to rules or regulations about what one should do.

¹¹⁹ See note 83.

¹²⁰ Clarke points out the problem with relying on only one *vinaya*'s account of an issue: “it is premature to accept one of six traditions as representative of Indian Buddhist monasticism without first studying—reading, editing, translating, and rereading—the textual traditions of the other five” (2014a, 18).

¹²¹ In doing so, the Buddhist monastic community likely emulated the behaviour of other

habitation of monastics required during this period necessarily brought about administrative challenges. The authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* address such challenges at length in the *Varṣāvastu*, the chapter of the *Vinayavastu* concerning the annual rain retreat.

The folio that should open this chapter in Sanskrit is missing from the Gilgit manuscript.¹²² Judging from the Tibetan parallel, this missing folio included the Buddha’s instruction to appoint a distributor of lodgings at the beginning of the rain retreat. Other folios belonging to the *Varṣāvastu* are extensively damaged.¹²³ The bulk of the text that is missing in Sanskrit has been reconstructed, most recently by Masanori Shōno.¹²⁴ Shōno reconstructs the Sanskrit text from the classical Tibetan translation, parallel Sanskrit passages from other sections of the Sanskrit *Vinayavastu*, and parallel passages found in Guṇaprabha’s *Vinayasūtra*.

renunciatory groups in order to appease lay donors. On the implementation of the rain retreat for the purposes of appeasing the laity as opposed to a concern for living beings, see Schopen 2012, 285–286.

¹²² Details on the condition and availability of the Sanskrit folios from Gilgit belonging to, and an overview of scholarship on, this *vastu* are provided in Clarke 2014b, 20.

¹²³ As Schopen puts it: “Neither time nor the vagaries of transmission have been kind to the Sanskrit text of the *Varṣāvastu* that we have” ([2002] 2014, 194).

¹²⁴ Shōno 2010 improves upon Dutt [1942–1950] 1984, 3(4): 133–155 and Bagchi [1967–1970] 2000, 2: 140–153.

Much of the *Varṣāvastu* describes the responsibilities of a monk appointed to act as distributor of lodgings (*śayanāsanagrāhaka*). The Buddha introduces the rules of customary behaviour for the *śayanāsanagrāhaka* with the clearly marked statement, “I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who distributes lodgings.” This statement is preserved in Tibetan, but not Sanskrit (*gnas mal stobs pa'i dge slong gi kun tu spyod pa'i chos bca' bar bya ste*).¹²⁵

The conclusion of the Buddha's prescription of the rules of customary behaviour of the monk who distributes lodgings is not marked with the expected phrase, “[a such-and-such monk,] having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence” (*yathāprajñaptān āsamudācārikān dharmān na samādāya vartate / sātisāro bhavati*).¹²⁶ Since the Buddha's exposition is open ended, it is unclear where the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who distributes the dwellings end and where more general tasks assigned to this office begin. In this particular case, it is possible that the general tasks assigned to this office *are* his rules of customary behaviour. In this discussion of the rules of customary behaviour assigned to the monk who distributes lodgings, I refer to rules from the *Varṣāvastu* that are prescribed towards the beginning of this *vastu*. This does not exclude the possibility

¹²⁵ Shōno 2010, 1.2.5 (26).

¹²⁶ For a discussion of this phrase and its use in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, see pages 25–26, above.

that the authors/redactors would consider other duties assigned to this monastic office also to be rules of customary behaviour.

Immediately after declaring that a monk must be appointed to act as the distributor of lodgings, the Buddha indicates five necessary qualities one must have in order to be appointed to this position.¹²⁷ Then, the Buddha lists five undesirable qualities that disqualify a monk from serving in this role.¹²⁸ The discussion of the qualifications of an ideal candidate appears just before the Buddha's explanation of the formal appointment procedure for this monastic office. As is well known, in such cases the first four qualifications are always stock, and the fifth specific to the position. Silk, for example, writes:

The first four of these are standard and general: one must not be prone to lust, hatred, delusion, or fear. The fifth item is particular to the type of post to which the individual in question might be appointed.¹²⁹

¹²⁷. Shōno 2010, 1.2.2.a (23). For a detailed discussion of “the lists of five qualifications, possession of which permits one to be appointed to an administrative post,” see Silk 2008, 170–174 (quote from 170).

¹²⁸. Shōno 2010, 1.2.2.b (23).

¹²⁹. Silk 2008, 170.

In the case of the *śayanāsanagrāhaka*, the fifth qualification, the one which is specific to the position, is that he “must know when bedding and seats have been (correctly) provided, and when not.”¹³⁰ The appointment procedure includes a formal request made amongst the assembled *saṃgha*¹³¹ coupled with a formal ecclesiastical act to appoint a monk to the position of *śayanāsanagrāhaka*.¹³²

In the first part of her influential study of *vinaya* technical terms, Édith Nolot describes the “four types of procedures, by which various agreements, decisions or actions are to be officially and legally sanctioned.”¹³³ The appointment of a monk or a nun to a position in the monastic community is usually a twofold procedure (*jñapti-dvīṭya-karman*; Pāli: *ñatti-dutiya-kamma*) consisting of a motion (*jñapti*) followed by “the passing of a resolution.”¹³⁴ Nolot tells us that an unspecified act of consultation (*avalokanā karman*; Pāli: *apalokanā kamma*) “is valid as an alternative to a twofold procedure ... only in minor proceedings.”¹³⁵

^{130.} Silk 2008, 173.

^{131.} Shōno 2010, 1.2.4.1 (24–25).

^{132.} Shōno 2010, 1.2.4.2 (25–26).

^{133.} Nolot 1996, 74.

^{134.} Nolot 1996, 83.

^{135.} The quote continues: “, e.g., turning a building into a storage place, or appointing a monk/nun to some office” (Nolot 1996, 80).

Only after discussing the qualities of a good candidate and the formal twofold procedure for appointing a monk as the distributor of lodgings does the Buddha then introduce the rules of customary behaviour for a monk fulfilling this role. The preamble of the necessary qualifications of a proper candidate, coupled with a twofold appointment procedure for the one filling this role, likely indicates that the rules of customary behaviour assigned to a monk acting as the distributor of lodgings function as a list of required administrative duties.

The monk who is the distributor of lodgings is one of only ten monastics I have found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* with a clearly stated list of five qualifications and for whom rules of customary behaviour are also prescribed.¹³⁶ Nine of these ten positions are prescribed for monks, one for nuns. They include, in the order that they first appear in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the monk who:

- 1) supervises meditation (*prahāṇapratijāgraka*; *spong ba'i zhal ta byed pa*);¹³⁷
- 2) hosts the *pravāraṇā* ceremony (*pravāraka*; *dgag dbye byed pa*);¹³⁸

^{136.} The rules of customary behaviour for some, but not all, of these ten positions are also listed in the commentarial tradition in the *Ekottarakarmaśataka* and the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-vinaya-samuccaya*.

^{137.} *Poṣadhavastu*, Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §18 (288 and 290) and Clarke 2014b, Plates 14: 55v1–9; sTog 'dul ba ka 201b3–202b7.

^{138.} *Pravāraṇāvastu*, sTog 'dul ba ka 320a7–322a1.

- 3) distributes lodgings for the rain retreat (*śayanāsanagrāhaka; gnas mal stobs pa*);¹³⁹
- 4) prepares and spreads the *kaṭhina* cloth (*kaṭhināstāraka; sra brkyang 'dings pa*);¹⁴⁰
- 5) must bring disputing parties to a *saṃgha* equipped to deal with their dispute (*adhikaraṇasaṃcāraka; rtsod pa sbed pa*);¹⁴¹
- 6) criticizes misbehaving monks (*gleng ba po*);¹⁴²
- 7) distributes confiscated begging-bowls (*lhung bzed 'brel pa med pa 'drim pa*);¹⁴³

¹³⁹ Rules of customary behaviour for this monk are introduced towards the beginning of the *Varṣāvastu*, Shōno 2010, 1.2.5 (26).

¹⁴⁰ In the *Kaṭhinavastu* in Skt., see Chang 1957, 11–15 (54–55) and Clarke 2014b, Plates 172: 277r3–9. In Tib., see sTog 'dul ba ga 156b5–157b3.

¹⁴¹ In the *Adhikaraṇavastu* in Skt., see Borgland 2014, *Appendix* (Draft Diplomatic Edition of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Adhikaraṇavastu – a new reading of the manuscript) §97 341r1–2 (56). In Tib., see sTog 'dul ba ga 325a6–b7.

¹⁴² In the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, see sTog 'dul ba ca 436a3–b1. The *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-vinaya-samuccaya* also preserves these rules of customary behaviour (sde dge 'dul ba pu 136b2–6).

¹⁴³ In the *Vinayavibhaṅga* (following the word analysis for *naiḥsargika-pāyantikā* 22, which makes it an offence for a monk to obtain a new bowl unless his own bowl has been patched up in at least five places), see sTog 'dul ba cha 124a5–125b2.

8) informs households (*kulapratisaṃvedaka*; *khyim rnams su so sor go bar byed pa*);¹⁴⁴

9) acts as a kind of forest-ranger (*vanapratisaṃvedaka*; *nags nyul ba*);¹⁴⁵ and

10) a nun who keeps a confiscated begging-bowl (*lhung bzed 'brel ba med pa 'chang ba'i dge slong ma*).

The tenth position, found in the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga*, is held by a nun. This role seems to combine the job of distributing confiscated begging-bowls, outlined in the rules of customary behaviour prescribed for what seems to be a formal position in the parallel text

¹⁴⁴. Rules of customary behaviour for this monk are introduced in the *Vinayavibhaṅga*'s treatment of *pāyantikā* 7 (sTog 'dul ba cha 260a1). In the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-tīkā-vinaya-samuccaya*, these rules are introduced at sde dge 'dul ba phu 38b5. In the *Ekottarakarmaśataka*, see sde dge 'dul ba wu 157b4. Although this passage from the *Vinayavibhaṅga* is not available in Sanskrit, *kulapratisaṃvedaka* does appear in the *Vinayasūtra*: “*saṃmanyeraṇ pāpayor bhikṣubhikṣuṇyoḥ kulapratisaṃvedakam*” (SGSMT, 42 [*Posadhavastu: sūtra* 971]). In the Tibetan translation of this *sūtra*, the translators render *kulapratisaṃvedaka* as *khyim rnams su so sor go bar* (sde dge 'dul ba wu 29b3–4). Also, see Negi 1993–2005, 1: 385–386, s.v. “*khyim so sor bsgo ba*.” Edgerton's entry for “*pratisaṃvedaka*” includes *kulapratisaṃvedaka* as an example ([1953] 1985, 370–371, s.v. “*pratisaṃvedaka*”).

¹⁴⁵. *Vinayavibhaṅga*, sTog 'dul ba ja 507a2–6.

from the *Bhikṣu-vibhaṅga*—the monk who distributes confiscated begging-bowls (*lhung bzed 'brel pa med pa 'drim pa*), with the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who keeps a confiscated begging-bowl (*lhung bzed 'brel pa med pa 'chang ba*).¹⁴⁶ The rules of customary behaviour for the distributor of confiscated begging-bowls and for one who keeps a confiscated begging-bowl are collapsed into one officer in the *Bhikṣuṅī-vibhaṅga*.

For all ten of these positions, the first four qualifications are stock and the fifth is specific to the task associated with the role.¹⁴⁷ The authors/redactors of this *vinaya* most likely considered at least these ten offices that are prescribed rules of customary behaviour to be formal positions held in the *saṃgha*. Other monks or nuns—those whose status in the *saṃgha* does not hinge on formal qualifications and who are not appointed by way of a twofold procedure—probably do not fulfill the assigned duties of a formal office when following their prescribed rules of customary behaviour. Rather, they follow the appropriate protocols for reacting to some kind of ad hoc situation on a case by case basis as prescribed by the Buddha in their *vinaya*: protocols that are necessary but informal. This point will be made clear later in this dissertation. In this chapter, I am concerned with the rules of customary behaviour related to formal administration and

^{146.} *Bhikṣuṅī-vibhaṅga*, sTog 'dul ba nya 231a4–b5 (following the word analysis for *naiḥsargika-pāyantikā* 13 for nuns, which corresponds to *naiḥsargika-pāyantikā* 22 for monks). For these rules in the commentarial tradition, see the *Ekottarakarmaśataka* (beginning at sde dge 'dul ba wu 187a5).

^{147.} For details on the fifth qualification required for each position, see Appendix One.

management of the *saṃgha*. The authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* likely considered the *śayanāsanagrāhaka* to be a monastic office that was a formal position in the *saṃgha*.

So what are the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who distributes lodgings for the rain retreat? These rules begin with the responsibility of distributing the counting sticks (*śalākās*).¹⁴⁸ My translation is based on the Tibetan *Varṣāvastu* since the Sanskrit is not extant for this passage.¹⁴⁹

I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for the monk who distributes lodgings. The monk who distributes lodgings must prepare counting sticks for the *saṃgha* that are not crooked (*yon po ma yin pa*), not bent (*'khyor po ma yin pa*),

¹⁴⁸ This procedure is well known. Hubert Durt authored an extremely valuable entry on *śalākās*, including the standard procedure for distributing them according to different *vinayas*, in the *Hōbōgirin*—the French encyclopedia of Buddhism based on Chinese and Japanese sources (1979). Durt's exhaustive entry runs for 25 pages. For a history of the *Hōbōgirin* itself, an extremely valuable reference work for Buddhist Studies, see Iyanaga 2017.

¹⁴⁹ I have consulted Shōno's reconstruction of part of the missing Sanskrit text from this passage (2010, 1.5.5.2 [26]).

not curved (*kyar kyor ma yin pa*),¹⁵⁰ which are sweet smelling (*dri zhim po*), and pleasant to the touch (*reg na bde ba*).

After that, having arisen at daybreak, having arranged the cushions, having struck the *ganḍī*, having put the [respective] questions to the monks, and once the whole *saṃgha* is assembled and seated,¹⁵¹ the monk who distributes lodgings,

¹⁵⁰. “*Kyar kyor*,” which normally means “still feeble, as convalescents after a disease” (Jäschke [1881] 2014, 6, s.v. “*kyar kyor*”), is possibly a variant here for “*kyog kyog*,” or something similar, which would make a third, related adjective that essentially means “straight” (Jäschke [1881] 2014, 7, s.v. “*kyog*”). “*Kyar kyor can*” is defined in the *Wörterbuch der tibetischen Schriftsprache* as “taumelnd, schwankend” (Maurer et. al 2007, 131, s.v. “*kyar kyor can*”).

¹⁵¹. Shōno reconstructs the Sanskrit behind the beginning of this paragraph as “*tataḥ paścāt kālyam evotthāya śayanāsanaprajñaptim kṛtvā ganḍīm ākoṭya prṣṭavācīkayā bhikṣūn samanuyujya sarvasaṃghe sanniṣaṇṇe sannipatite*” (2010, 1.2.5.2 [26]). Hu-von Hinüber tells us that, according to the *Posadhavastu*, there is a four-part, prescribed preparation that precedes a (two-fold) procedure (1994, 212). This four-part preparation includes: a) *śayanāsanaprajñaptim* (the arrangement of cushions), b) *ganḍīm ākoṭya* (the striking of the *ganḍī*), c) *prṣṭavācīkayā bhikṣūn samanuyujya* (the questioning of the monks), and d) *sarvasaṃghe sanniṣaṇṇe sannipatite* (the assembling and seating of the whole *saṃgha*) (1994, 212). She provides two pages of explanation of the difficulties with the phrase “*prṣṭavācīkayā bhikṣūn samanuyujya*” in both the Sanskrit manuscript of

having anointed the counting sticks with sweet fragrance (*tshul shing dri zhim pos bskus te*), must place them at the senior's end [of the assembly] (*rgan rims kyi mthar*), inside the case (*sprog ma'i nang du*), having arranged [them] on top of a spread, white cloth (*ras dkar po bting ba'i steng du bzhag nas*).

*ngas gnas mal stobs pa'i dge slong gi kun tu spyod pa'i chos bca' bar bya ste /
gnas mal stobs pa'i dge slong gis dge 'dun gyi ched du tshul shing rnams yon po
ma yin pa dang / 'khyor po ma yin pa dang / kyar kyor ma yin pa dang / dri zhim
po dang reg na bde bar 'gyur ba bstar bar bya'o //*

*de'i 'og tu nang par sngar langs te gnas mal bshams pa byas la / ganḍī
brdungs nas / dge slong rnams la dris pa'i tshig gis yang dag par bsgo la / dge
'dun thams cad 'dug cing mthun par gyur pa dang / dge slong gnas mal stobs pas
tshul shing dri zhim pos bskus te / sprog ma'i nang du ras dkar po bting ba'i steng
du bzhag nas rgan rims kyi mthar gzhag par bya'o //*¹⁵²

the *Vinayavastu* and its translations (1994, 212–214). For one example of the formulaic, four-part preparation from the *Poṣadhavastu*, see Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §30.2 (300 in Skt. and 301 in German). My translation “having put the (respective) questions to the monks” is influenced by her German translation “und sind den Mönchen die (jeweiligen) Fragen vorgelegt worden” for “*prṣṭavācīkayā bhikṣūn samanuyujya*” (Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §30.2 [301]).

¹⁵² Shōno 2010, 1.2.5–1.2.5.2 (26–27). In his article “Counting the Buddha and the Local

The *śayanāsanagrāhaka* announces the local rules before permitting monks to accept a counting stick. The taking of a counting stick signals a monastic's participation in the rain retreat at a particular residence and acceptance of the local rules.¹⁵³

The next several sentences clarify that the monks joining the rain retreat must not admonish other monks for infractions nor conduct the procedure for remembering faults during the *varṣā*.¹⁵⁴ These protocols were likely designed to avoid conflict during a period of close co-habitation. Infractions are instead dealt with during the *pravāraṇā*, a ceremony that concludes the rain retreat. This ceremony formally lifts the temporary rules agreed upon at the beginning of the retreat.

Schopen continues his translation of this section of the *Varṣāvastu* after reconstructing several sentences on the basis of what Sanskrit is available, the Tibetan

Spirits in a Monastic Ritual of Inclusion for the Rain Retreat,” Schopen discusses at length the damaged Sanskrit manuscript behind the next section of this passage from the *Varṣāvastu* (Schopen [2002] 2014, 194–196). He translates the next section of the text, which is available in Sanskrit, as follows: “After that the local ordinance(s) must be announced: ‘Reverend Ones, the Community must hear! In this place of residence the local ordinance is this and this. Who among you is willing to undertake the rain retreat with this and this local ordinance must take a counting stick! ...’” ([2002] 2014, 196).

^{153.} This procedure is well known. For two recent examples of studies that mention this procedure, see Schopen 2014 [2002], 196, and Shōno 2017, 61.

^{154.} Shōno 2010, 1.2.5.3 (27).

translation, parallel Sanskrit passages elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, parallel Sanskrit passages from other sections of the *Vinayasūtra*, and the *Vinayasūtra*'s commentarial tradition:

After that counting sticks must be carried around by the monk who is the Holder-of-Bedding-and-Seats. First a counting stick must be taken by the Instructor (*deśaka*). After that by just the Elder-of-the-Community, having risen from his seat, having taken a counting stick, it must be carefully put aside. Just so (it must be done by all) up to the Junior-of-the-Community. For novices a counting stick must be taken by (their) teachers and preceptors. After that they (i.e., the counting sticks) must be counted, saying, “In this place of residences so many monks have taken a counting stick.”¹⁵⁵

These prescribed rules of customary behaviour govern the conduct of the monk in charge of distributing lodgings at the commencement of the rain retreat. After making local ordinances known to all of the participants, he must count the participants according to their ecclesiastical statuses.

¹⁵⁵. Translation from Schopen [2002] 2014, 213. For an edition of the available Sanskrit and its Tibetan translation, see Shōno 2010, 1.2.5.4 (28).

He must assign lodgings to participating monastics by distributing room keys (*tāḍakas* and *kuṃcikas*).¹⁵⁶ Choice of room is offered according to seniority, similar to how begging-bowls are distributed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.¹⁵⁷ Although the ending of the rules of customary behaviour is not clearly marked after the assignment of lodgings, the narrative does seem to move on from this topic with a story about visiting monks arriving during the rain retreat.¹⁵⁸ I suspect the prescription of the rules of

¹⁵⁶ Edgerton [1953] 1985, 251, s.v. “*tāḍaka*” and Monier-Williams [1899] 2003, 287–288, s.v. “*kuṃcikā*.”

¹⁵⁷ Shōno points out that this procedure is similar to the distribution of begging-bowls (2010, 30n52). For the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts outlining the procedure for distributing locks and keys, see Shōno 2010, 1.2.5.5.a–1.2.5.5.b (29–30).

Rules for the distribution of confiscated begging-bowls are introduced as *āsamudācārika-dharmas* in the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, following the word analysis for *naiḥsargika-pāyantikā* 22 (sTog ’dul ba cha 124a5–125b2). These rules are also included in various commentaries. In the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīka-samuccaya*, see sde dge ’dul ba pu 304b1–305a7. For parallel rules for nuns, see sTog ’dul ba nya 231a4–b5 and in the commentarial tradition, see the *Ekottarakarmaśataka* (sde dge ’dul ba wu 186a7–187a5).

¹⁵⁸ Shōno 2010, 1.3.1 (31). See also Silk 2008, 255–256. The rules for handling guest monks who arrive during the rain retreat are prescribed as rules of conduct in the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* (Karashima 2012 1: §15.4–15.11 [123–125]).

customary behaviour for a *śayanāsanagrāhaka* (at the beginning of the rain retreat) concludes here after lodgings are assigned.

The distributor of lodgings is not the only administrative role in ceremonies related to the rain retreat for which rules of customary behaviour are prescribed in the *Vinayavastu*. The authors/redactors of the *Pravāraṇāvastu* present the Buddha as establishing rules of customary behaviour for a monk who is appointed to host the *pravāraṇā* ceremony (*pravāraka*).¹⁵⁹ The *pravāraṇā* ceremony officially ends the rain retreat. The host of the *pravāraṇā* is responsible for convening and concluding the ceremony.¹⁶⁰ At the beginning of the *pravāraṇā*, this monk distributes counting sticks according to seniority. This procedure is reminiscent of the role of the distributor of lodgings at the commencement of the *varṣā*. The Buddha introduces the *pravāraka*'s rules of customary behaviour with the usual formula. As in the case of the *śayanāsanagrāhaka*, the conclusion of the prescription of his rules of customary behaviour is not clearly indicated in the text.

¹⁵⁹. For a discussion of the establishment of the rules of customary behaviour for a *pravāraka*, see Chung 1998b, 118. For a German translation of the passage in question, see Chung 1998b, 2.3.3.1–2.3.4 (231–233).

¹⁶⁰. For the Tibetan text of the procedure for beginning this ceremony, see Chung 1998b, 2.3.3.1 (182; German translation on 231). For the Sanskrit text of the procedure for ending this ceremony, see Chung 1998b, 2.3.3.4–2.3.4 (149–150; German translation on 232–233).

According to tradition, following the rain retreat the Buddha temporarily eased restrictions related to the possession of robes, robe materials, and travel.¹⁶¹ During a ceremony following the rain retreat, cloth accepted by the *saṃgha* was prepared, divided, and then made into robes for those monks who had completed the rain retreat. The rules for handling, preparing, and distributing the *kaṭhina* cloth (the cloth from which these robes are made) are preserved in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, in a chapter of the *Vinayavastu* called the *Kaṭhinavastu*.¹⁶² Here, the Buddha describes the procedure for appointing a monk responsible for preparing and apportioning the *kaṭhina* cloth amongst the *saṃgha* (*kaṭhināstāraka*).¹⁶³

Like the distributor of lodgings, this monk must possess five good qualities and must not have five bad qualities.¹⁶⁴ He is appointed by way of a twofold procedure consisting of a motion, followed by an act.¹⁶⁵ He must follow precise rules for handling,

¹⁶¹ Skt. in Chang 1957, 3 (52; English on 66).

¹⁶² The *Kaṭhinakhandhaka*, the seventh chapter of the *Mahāvagga* in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, corresponds to this *vastu*. The Theravādin rules regarding the *kaṭhina* begin at Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 4: 353 (Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 1: 253 in Pāli). For the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin account, see Karashima 2012, 1: §21.1–21.10 (185–189).

¹⁶³ Skt. in Chang 1957, 7 (53–54; English on 68–69).

¹⁶⁴ Skt. in Chang 1957, 7 (53–54; English on 68–69).

¹⁶⁵ Skt. in Chang 1957, 8–10 (54; English on 69).

preparing, and distributing the *kaṭhina* amongst the *saṃgha*.¹⁶⁶ The Buddha prescribes these rules as rules of customary behaviour.¹⁶⁷

Rules of customary behaviour are assigned to holders of no less than three monastic offices who are responsible, in part, for the successful administration of the annual rain retreat. These officers include:

- 1) the monk in charge of distributing lodgings (*śayanāsanagrāhaka*),
- 2) the monk who hosts the *pravāraṇā* ceremony (*pravāraka*), and
- 3) the monk who spreads the *kaṭhina* cloth (*kaṭhināstāraka*).

These appear to be formal, albeit temporary, positions held within the *saṃgha*. In the section that follows, I move on from the management of the annual rain retreat. I discuss rules of customary behaviour assigned to the superintendent of construction (*navakarmika*). I also explore the rules of customary behaviour of a number of monks tasked with other jobs related to construction in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

¹⁶⁶ Skt. in Chang 1957, 11–15 (54–55; English on 69–70).

¹⁶⁷ Skt. in Chang 1957, 11 (54; English on 69).

Section 2.3 — The Superintendent of Construction

The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* records the title *navakarmika-bhikṣu*, the monk (*bhikṣu*) of new-construction (*nava-karmika*).¹⁶⁸ This monk oversees construction work. He is also in charge of construction-related finances. In a story from the *Muktaka* section of the *Uttaragrantha*, when a monastic service manager dies after borrowing money on behalf of the *saṃgha*, the community of monks is left on the hook for the loan.¹⁶⁹ The Buddha then makes it a rule of customary behaviour for the *navakarmika* to request loans on behalf of the *saṃgha* only after asking the most senior monks (*saṃghasthavirus*) for permission. This passage reads:

I, monks, will designate the rule for a monk who is like the Monk-in-Charge-of-Construction: the Monk-in-Charge-of-Construction will borrow. And he must ask

¹⁶⁸. Obligations connected to (*pratisaṃyukta, rab tu ldan pa*) the *navakarmika* (*las gsar*) are defined in the *Vinayamātrkā* (sTog 'dul ba na 393a5–394a7). This passage deals mostly with the appointment of a *navakarmika* for the construction of a monastery in a forest. The actual rules of customary behaviour of a *navakarmika* do not seem to be stated here in full, but are referred to towards the end of this definition (sTog 'dul ba na 394a6–7).

¹⁶⁹. Schopen [2000] 2004a, 30 and [2001] 2004a, 137.

all Seniors and then obtain a loan! If the Monk-in-Charge-of-Construction¹⁷⁰ does not act in accordance with the designated rule of customary behavior, he comes to be guilty of an offense.¹⁷¹

*dge slong rnams ngas las gsar du byed pa'i tshungs pa'i dge slong gi chos bca'o //
las gsar du byed pa'i dge slong gis bskyis pa dag / rgan zhing rgan pa dag la dris
la long shig / las gsar du byed pa'i rnams kyis mtshungs par spyad pa'i chos bcas
pa bzhin du ma byas na 'das pa dang bcas par 'gyur ro //*¹⁷²

The construction manager does not have *carte blanche* to borrow money on the community's behalf. He is subject to the authority of the senior monks.¹⁷³ This rule regarding the borrowing of money is just one of his rules of customary behaviour recorded in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

A longer set of rules, preserved in the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, speaks to some of the non-financial challenges a monk acting as a foreman of construction may encounter. In the

¹⁷⁰. This term is actually plural in Tibetan (*las gsar du byed pa'i rnams*) and is read as such in Schopen's other translation of this passage ([2000] 2004a, 30).

¹⁷¹. Translation from Schopen [2001] 2004a, 138. For a slightly different translation, see Schopen [2000] 2004a, 30.

¹⁷². sTog 'dul ba na 284a3–5: *Muktaka* 4.6.

¹⁷³. For more on *saṃghasthaviras*, see *Section 2.5* below.

Vibhaṅga's handling of *pāyantikā* 11 (the rule that makes it an offence to destroy seeds and vegetables), monks face a lumber shortage after the Buddha makes felling trees an offence.¹⁷⁴ Here, the Buddha allows the *navakarmika* to have trees cut down with certain caveats. Addressing his assistant (Ānanda), the Buddha states:

Ānanda, I will state the rules of customary behavior. When a *navakarmika* monk is going to cut a tree, for seven or eight days [before] he must construct a *maṅḍala* at the base of that tree, offer incense, flowers, food offerings, recite the *Tridaṇḍaka*, express the transfer of merit, devote himself to the paths of the ten good activities, state the disrepute of the paths of the ten bad actions, and having said so, he must proclaim: “Whatever divinity is dwelling in this tree, please look for another location. This tree will be used by the stūpa, or the dharma, or the monastic community.” After that, in seven or eight days he shall have that tree cut down. If [the deity] shows distress, you shall not have it cut down; if not, you shall have it cut. If the *navakarmika* monk acts without adopting the statement of the rules of customary behavior, he becomes guilty of a sin.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁴. For a translation of this story, see Silk 2008, 80–81.

¹⁷⁵. Translation from Silk 2008, 80–81. I have omitted Sanskrit words in this quotation, which Silk supplies in parentheses in the original. This passage is also discussed in Schopen [2009] 2014, 20n22 and 2000, 150nII.31.

It may be worth noting that the Buddha rebukes the monk Channa for having “a tree

*kun dga'bo ngas dge slong lag gi bla'i kun tu spyod pa'i chos dag bca' bar bya
ste / dge slong lag gi blas zhag bdun rnam brgyad kyis shing ljon pa gcod par
'gyur ba na / shing ljon pa de'i drung du dkyil 'khor bya zhing / spos dang / me
tog dang / gtor ma yang sbyin par bya / rgyud chags gsum pa yang bklag par bya /
yon bshad pa yang bya zhing / dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam dag nye bar gzhas pa yang
bya / mi dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam dag gi bsngags pa ma yin pa dag kyang brjod
par bya'o // 'di skad ces shing ljon pa 'di la lha gang gnas pa de gnas gzhan tshol
cig / shing ljon pa 'dis mchod rten gyi'am / chos kyi'am / dge 'dun gyi bya ba
byed par 'gyur ro zhes kyang brjod par bya'o // de'i 'og tu nyi ma bdun nam
brgyad kyis shing ljon pa de gcad par bya'o // gal te 'gyur ba ston na gcad par mi
bya'o // 'on te mi ston na gcad par bya'o // dge slong lag gi blas kun tu spyod pa'i
chos ji ltar bcas pa yang dag par blangs te 'jug par mi byed na 'gal tshabs cad du
'gyur ro // ¹⁷⁶*

Following the above protocols, a *navakarmika* could have trees cut down for the benefit of the monastic community. The *navakarmika* must proceed carefully, however, according

cut down that was used as a shrine” in the treatment of *saṅghādisesa* 7 in the *Theravāda-vinaya* (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 1: 267).

¹⁷⁶ sTog 'dul ba cha 281b7–282a5. These rules of customary behaviour are also available in the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīka-samuccaya* (sde dge 'dul ba phu 48a2–6).

to specified rules of conduct. In doing so, he avoids antagonizing local deities.¹⁷⁷ Having a tree cut for the benefit of the community will still constitute an offence for the *navakarmika* if he does not follow the correct procedure.¹⁷⁸

In India, the clearing of trees has continued to be an obstacle for members of the Buddhist monastic community, at least as recently as the 20th century. In the 1960s, for example, refugee monks from Tibet's Sera monastery arrived in Bylakuppe, India and cleared trees from the jungle to create farmland for a new monastery.¹⁷⁹ José Cabezón and Penpa Dorjee report that an elder monk from Sera remembers the Dalai Lama saying, "Although it may be difficult for monks to work as common people do, there is no alternative if we are to preserve our precious tradition."¹⁸⁰ By taking on such work, one

^{177.} The close proximity of Buddhist monasteries to places inhabited by spirits could have facilitated Buddhism's expansion in South Asia (DeCaroli 2004, 56).

^{178.} The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* also preserves rules of customary behaviour for a monk who looks after trees owned by the *saṃgha* (sTog 'dul ba ta 350b1–5). This monastic office is mentioned in Schopen 2000, 150nII.31. Schopen elsewhere discusses the introductory narrative ([1995b] 2004a, 180–181). Schopen also explores further the creation of this position and the establishment of his rules of customary behaviour ([2003] 2014, 366).

^{179.} Cabezón and Dorjee 2019, 470.

^{180.} Cabezón and Dorjee 2019, 471.

could argue that these Tibetan monks were reviving strategies recorded in their tradition's *vinaya*.

In his article “On Monks and Menial Laborers,” Schopen draws attention to a passage from the *Vinayavibhāṅga* in which monks do construction work. This passage is found in an exception clause for *pārājika* 3, the rule making it an offence for monks to commit murder. After day labourers (*bhṛtakas*) refuse to work on a holiday, the Buddha orders the monks to “help in the construction work!”¹⁸¹ In response to lay criticism about these monks working all day, the Buddha tells them: “You must not work the entire day, but do so at only one period!”¹⁸² Then, the monks rush to their alms-rounds in the village, “still covered with clay and mud” from the construction site.¹⁸³ The Buddha instructs the monks to cease work, leaving enough time to wash their hands, feet, and bowls before meals.¹⁸⁴ Moreover, the Buddha establishes rules of customary behaviour for monks who help with construction. The Buddha states:

¹⁸¹. Schopen [2006] 2014, 266–267 (quotation from 267).

¹⁸². Translation from Schopen [2006] 2014, 267.

¹⁸³. Schopen [2006] 2014, 267.

¹⁸⁴. Schopen [2006] 2014, 267–268. Similarly, in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, the Buddha excuses monks who are making repairs (*bhikkhū navakammaṃ katvā*) from the restrictions of the 57th *pācittiya* rule, which makes excessive bathing a monastic offence (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 2: 403; Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 4: 118.15–23).

Furthermore, I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for monks who do construction work. A monk who does construction work, in accordance with the time, in the morning, must have the morning meals (*khye 'u sus dag*) prepared.¹⁸⁵ As for the late afternoon, he must have the drinks and ointments for hands and feet prepared. A monk who does construction work, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.

*gghan yang ngas dge slong mkhar lan byed pa dag gi kun tu spyod pa 'i chos dag
bca' bar bya ste / dge slong mkhar lan byed pas dus ji lta ba bzhin du snga dro ni
khye 'u sus dag sbyor du gzhug par bya 'o // phyi dro ni skom dang / lag pa dang /
rkang pa 'i bsku mnye rgyu dag sbyor du gzhug par bya 'o // dge slong mkhar lan
byed pas kun tu spyod pa 'i chos ji ltar bcas pa dag yang dag par blangs te 'jug
par mi byed na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro //*¹⁸⁶

^{185.} Negi gives *purobhaktikā* as the Skt. behind Tib. *khye 'u sus* (1993–2005, 1: 390, s.v. “*khye 'u sus*”). *Purobhaktakā* refers to breakfast (Edgerton [1953] 1985, 349, s.v. “*Purobhaktakā*”).

^{186.} sTog *'dul ba* ca 212a5–7. Other than a slight difference in the spelling of *mkhar lan byed pa* as *mkhar len byed pa*, the reading in Derge matches sTog (sde dge *'dul ba* ca 147b6–7).

The above rules of customary behaviour of a monk who does construction work distinguish him further from common labourers. He should bracket his workday with soft labour: having the morning meal prepared in the mornings and drinks and ointment in the late afternoon. The rules preserved in the *Vinayavibhāṅga* make it clear that such monks should not do heavy construction work all day, like common labourers. The authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* specify clear protocols that allow monks' participation in construction work under extenuating circumstances. Premodern monastic lawyers likely would have been sympathetic to, if not already familiar with, the plight of modern Tibetan monks constructing a monastery in an Indian jungle, like those monks from Sera who worked on construction projects in the 1960s.

Section 2.4 — The Monk in Charge of Meditation

In the previous section, I discussed rules of customary behaviour related to construction in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Similarly, in the *Poṣadhavastu*, the chapter of the *Vinayavastu* on the fortnightly recitation of *Prātimokṣa* rules, the Buddha authorizes the creation of a meditation hall.¹⁸⁷ After ordering the monks to install a carpet, the Buddha

¹⁸⁷. For the authorization to establish a meditation hall in Skt., see Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §7 (266; German translation 267).

prescribes a rule of customary behaviour for meditator monks (*prāhāṇikas*).¹⁸⁸ Jeffrey Wayne Bass translates this passage:

Oh monks, I will make known the rules of customary behavior regarding a *prahāṇika* monk.¹⁸⁹ A *prahāṇika* monk must wash his feet every three days. A *prahāṇika* monk who does not follow the rule is guilty of an offense.¹⁹⁰

*(prāhāṇikasyāhaṃ bhikṣavo bhikṣor āsamudācārikāṃ dharmāṃ prajñāpayiṣyāmi
/ prāhāṇikena bhikṣuṇā tṛtīye tṛtīye divase pādau prakṣālayitavyau / prāhāṇiko*

^{188.} Whether the practice of *prahāṇa* associated with these monks refers to something like meditation as we understand it in the present day is unclear. For more on this term, see Bass 2013, 243–244 and Schopen [2006] 2014, 265.

^{189.} Bass uses the form *prahāṇika* monk in his English translation here, though the *Poṣadhavastu* reads *prāhāṇika*. Bass explains that *prahāṇika* “is formed in the same way as the Sanskrit term *sūtrāntika*, and indicates a monk’s field of religious specialization. In the case of the *sūtrāntika*, this specialization is the field of *sūtra* literature. In the case of the *prahāṇika*, this field is the practice of *prahāṇa*” (Bass 2013, 242).

^{190.} Translation from Bass 2013, 242. For an earlier translation into German, see Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §12.5 (281). Schopen has highlighted the seemingly low regard the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* had for *prāhāṇika* monks. For one example of this discussion, see Schopen [2008] 2014, 45n30.

*bhikṣuḥ yathāprajñaptān āsamudācārikāṃ dharmāṃ na samādāya varttate /
sātisāro bhavati /*¹⁹¹

This rule directly follows the narrative about the installation of a carpet. Likely then, the intent here is to protect a new carpet, which would be the property of the *saṃgha*.

As the story continues, monks wander away from the hall. The Buddha then declares that a meditation supervisor (*prahāṇapratijāgraka*) should be appointed.¹⁹² Five qualities disqualify a monk from serving in this role.¹⁹³ He must instead possess five good qualities.¹⁹⁴ As discussed earlier, the stipulation of five qualifications of one who is to be

¹⁹¹. Hu-von Hinüber reconstructs the text in parentheses since it is not extant in the manuscript. For the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 13: 54v7. Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §12.5 (280). The Tibetan translation is available in sTog 'dul ba ka 200a3–5.

¹⁹². Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §15 (282).

¹⁹³. Skt. available in Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §16.1 (282 and 284). The first four qualities are stock: lust (*chanda*), hatred (*dveṣa*), delusion (*moha*) and fear (*bhaya*). The last quality, not knowing about meditation nor the watches of the night (“und er weiß nicht Bescheid über den Meditation[szustand] der Wachenden und der Nicht-Wachenden” [Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §16.1 (283)]), is particular to this position. For a general discussion of the four stock qualifications required for appointment to administrative positions in the *saṃgha*, see Silk 2008, 170.

¹⁹⁴. Skt. available in Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §16.2 (284). These five qualifications are the

appointed to this role, coupled with a description of a formal appointment procedure, likely indicates that the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* considered the supervisor of meditation to be a formal position held in the *saṃgha*.

The Buddha prescribes the rules of customary behaviour of a meditation supervisor as follows:

I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who supervises meditation. The meditation hall (*prahāṇasālā*) is to be sprinkled [with water] by the monk who supervises meditation. It is to be swept. Fresh cow dung is to be applied. A privy-for-feces (*varcakuṭī*) and a privy-for-urine (*prasāvakuṭī*) are to be prepared, sprinkled [with water], [and] swept.¹⁹⁵ Fresh cow dung is to be applied. Leaves (*patravaibhaṅgukā*) are to be set out (*sthāpayitavyā*). Earth and water (*mṛttikāpānīyaṃ*) are to be set out.¹⁹⁶

inverse of those which disqualify him from the position, listed above in note 186.

¹⁹⁵. For a detailed discussion of terminology related to toilets in Buddhist literature, see Handy 2018–2019, 160–167 (especially 163–164).

¹⁹⁶. Hu-von Hinüber translates this passage into German as:

Ich lege die (folgenden) Verhaltensregeln für den die Meditation beobachtenden Mönch fest (*prajñāpayiṣyāmi*).

Von dem die Meditation beobachtenden Mönch soll der Meditationsraum besprengt und gereinigt werden; frischer Kuhdung soll (auf Wände und Boden)

*prahāṇapratijāgrahakasyāhaṃ bhikṣor āsamudācārikān dharmān
prajñāpayiṣyāmi / prahāṇapratijāgrakena bhikṣuṇā prahāṇasālā sektavyā /
saṃmārjitavyā / sukumārī gomayakārṣī{m} anupradātavyā / varcakuṭī
prasāvakuṭī ca (saṃskaravitavyā sektavyā saṃmārjitavyā / sukumārī
gomaya)[k](ār)[ṣ]ī anupradātavyā / patravaibhaṅgukā sthāpayitavyā{h} </>
mṛttikāpānīyaṃ sthāpayitavyaṃ / ¹⁹⁷*

The monk in charge of supervising meditation is tasked not only with cleaning the meditation hall, but also setting up lavatories, cleaning those facilities, and keeping the toilets fully stocked.

aufgetragen werden. Die Räume zum Entleeren Darmes (*varcakuṭī*) und zum Urinieren (*prasāvakuṭī*) sollen eingerichtet, besprengt und gereinigt werden. Frischer Kuhdung soll (auf Wände und Boden) aufgetragen werden. Zerkleinerte Blätter (*patravaibhaṅgukā*) sollen hingelegt werden. Tonerde und Wasser sollen hingestellt werden (1994, §18 [289 and 291]).

My English translation has drawn upon both her reading of the Sanskrit and her German translation of the text. I have also consulted the Tibetan translation available in sTog (*'dul ba ka 201b3–6*).

¹⁹⁷. Skt. from Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §18 (288 and 290). For the full set of rules of customary behaviour in the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 14: 55v1–9. In Tib., see sTog *'dul ba ka 201b3–202b7*.

This is not the only monk assigned janitorial duties as part of their prescribed rules of customary behaviour. Schopen translates the rules of customary behaviour for a monk on probation preserved in the *Pārivāsikavastu*.¹⁹⁸ Those rules of customary behaviour also state that, “The *vihāra* must be watered down, swept, and a coat of fresh cow dung applied. The privy must be cleaned. Earth and leaves must be set out, or cool water, depending on the season.”¹⁹⁹

The authors/redactors of the *Poṣadhavastu* continue to present the Buddha’s prescription of the rules of customary behaviour for the meditation supervisor. We see that the meditation supervisor is required to wake the meditator monks, collectively, with the *gaṇḍī*.²⁰⁰ The meditation supervisor strikes the *gaṇḍī* so long that laypeople, fearing the

¹⁹⁸. Schopen [1998] 2004a, 261–262.

¹⁹⁹. Schopen [1998] 2004a, 261.

²⁰⁰. Edgerton calls the *gaṇḍī* a gong ([1953] 1985, 208, s.v. “*gaṇḍī*”). Schopen refers to it as a wooden-clapper ([2006] 2014, 265). In a recent study on the history of the *gaṇḍī*, Ekaterina Sobkovyik notes that this instrument is “known to scholars to have been made in the form of a wooden beam” (2015, 686). She cites accounts from three premodern Buddhist texts that describe the trees that are suitable for creating a *gaṇḍī* (Sobkovyik 2015, 694–695).

The meditation supervisor is not the only monk whose rules of customary behaviour require him to strike the *gaṇḍī*. A monk on probation is required to strike the *gaṇḍī* after the meal is prepared (Schopen [1998] 2004a, 261). For more information on the use of the

monastery was being attacked, arrive dressed for battle.²⁰¹ That laypersons thought the monastery had come under attack speaks to the potential vulnerability of monasteries and the possibility that they may have had significant resources and thus reason to fear and protect themselves from such attacks, at least in the literary world presented in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.²⁰²

In the *Śāyanāsanavastu*, the section of the *Vinayavastu* concerned with furnishings owned by the *saṃgha*, the Buddha permits monks who live in forests to keep a (guard) dog.²⁰³ The dog scratches up the area around the *stūpa* and the *vihāra*, and its feces and urine are not cleaned up.²⁰⁴ This leads to the establishment of rules of customary behaviour for a monk who handles the dogs (*kukkurapoṣaka*).²⁰⁵ Susan Roach translates these rules of customary behaviour, established by the Buddha in the narrative, as follows:

gaṇḍī, see Sobkovyak 2015, especially pages 706–709.

^{201.} Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §19.2 (290). After this incident, the Buddha explains to the monks, in detail, the five ways of striking the *gaṇḍī* (Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §19.3 [290 and 292]).

^{202.} For a discussion of monasteries as “frequent and attractive targets” for burglaries and the like in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, see Schopen [1998] 2004a, 267–268.

^{203.} Gnoli 1978, 38.27–.28 (mentioned in Schopen [1998] 2004a, 267).

^{204.} Gnoli 1978, 38.29–.30. See also Roach 2020, 180.

^{205.} Schopen mentions this officer in a number of places ([1998] 2004a, 267; 2000, 150n31; and [2001] 2004a, 139).

Monks, I shall establish formal rules of customary behaviour for the monk in charge of guard-dogs. The monk in charge of guard-dogs should get up early in the morning and inspect the path around the *stūpa* and the *vihāra*. He should level off what has been dug up by paws and sweep away the excrement and urine. If the monk in charge of the guard-dogs proceeds without adopting the rules which I have established he will be guilty of an offence.²⁰⁶

*kukkurapoṣakaysāhaṃ bhikṣavo bhikṣor āsamudācārikān dharmān prajñāpayāmi,
kukkurapoṣakena bhikṣunā kālyam evotthāya stūpāṅgaṇaṃ vihāraś ca
pratyavekṣitavyaḥ yan nakharikābhir upalikhitaṃ tat samaṃ kartavyam;
uccāraprasrāvaś chorayitavyaḥ, kukkurapoṣako bhikṣur yathāprajñaptān
āsamudācārikān dharmān asamādāya vartate, sātisāro vartate*²⁰⁷

The rules of customary behaviour assigned to this monk clarify exactly who is responsible for cleaning up after the monastery's dogs. These rules also state that the mess must be cleaned in the mornings. The dog handler is not introduced as a formal monastic office, requiring the appointment of a person with five specific qualities. It seems possible that any monk could fill this role. Perhaps this job was not seen as important enough to warrant a formal twofold appointment.

²⁰⁶. Roach 2020, 180.

²⁰⁷. Skt. from Gnoli 1978, 38.30–39.5. Tib. available in sTog 'dul ba ga 288a3–5.

According to the accounts preserved in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, a monk who looks after dogs is responsible for cleaning up dogs' droppings in the morning and repairing damage.²⁰⁸ His monastery requires dogs for protection against threats in the forest. If his monastery had a meditation hall, the supervisor of meditation seems to also perform basic janitorial tasks.

Section 2.5 — Duties of the Elder of the Monastic Community

Monks tasked with construction work or cleaning up dogs' droppings probably were not at the top of the pecking order in the Mūlasarvāstivādin *saṃgha*. In contrast, the elder of the monastic community (*saṃghasthavira*) sits at the top of the social hierarchy in Buddhist monastic communities, at least in theory. The most senior member of the *saṃgha*, the *saṃghasthavira*, is assigned more rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* than any other monk. In this section, I explore the *āsamudācārika-dharmas* prescribed for elder monks.

The *Kṣudrakavastu* preserves a rule regarding the distribution of meat amongst members of the monastic community. The Buddha states:

²⁰⁸ As Schopen puts it, “one of the main duties of the monk in charge of the monastery’s dogs, which appear to have roamed freely at night, was to each morning clean up the droppings” (2015, 21).

Monks, furthermore, I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for the elder of the community. When meat is distributed, the monk who is the elder of the community must ask, “What is this meat? Is it not a tiger’s leftovers?” If he accepts it without asking, he will become guilty of an offence.

*dge slong dag gzhan yang ngas dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyi kun tu spyad pa'i chos
bca' bar bya te / dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyi dge slong gis sha 'drim pa'i tshe 'di
ci'i sha [/] stag gi god ma ma yin nam zhes dri bar bya'o // ma dris par len na 'gal
tshabs can du 'gyur ro //*²⁰⁹

This rule comes about in response to an episode in which Upananda uncovers the leftovers of a tiger. He brings the leftovers back to the monastery. The tiger follows him and remains at the gate of the Jetavana monastic complex, screeching. The Buddha asks his attendant Ānanda: “Why is this tiger screeching?”²¹⁰ Ānanda answers: “Venerable One, it is on account of the fact that leftover food was concealed by him, and Venerable Upananda brought it [here].”²¹¹ The Buddha then asks if the monks ate the leftovers. Ānanda confirms that they did so. The Buddha then proclaims:

^{209.} sTog 'dul ba ta 390b3–5. Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba tha 261a7–b1).

^{210.} sTog 'dul ba ta 390a7: *stag 'o ni ci ste skad 'byin.*

^{211.} sTog 'dul ba ta 390a7–b1: *btsun pa des god ma sbas pa de btsun pa nye dags 'tshal te mchis pa'i slad du'o //.*

Ānanda, although the lion, the king of animals, having killed very fine animals, eating fine meats and having drunk fine blood, abandons [the leftovers] and leaves, since a tiger conceals leftovers, for that reason, a monk should not eat the leftovers of a tiger. If one eats [a tiger’s leftovers], one becomes guilty of an offence.²¹²

*kun dga’bo ri dags kyi rgyal po seng ge ni ri dags bzang po bzang po dag bsad
nas / sha bzang po dag zos shing khrag bzang po dag ’thungs nas bor te ’gro’i /
stag ni god ma sbed par byed pas / de lta bas na dge slong gis stag gi god ma bza’
bar mi bya ste / za na ’gal tshabs can du ’gyur ro //*²¹³

The authors/redactors of this law code appear to have understood that tigers, unlike lions, store their leftovers for later.²¹⁴ Consuming meat left over by a tiger endangers the

^{212.} In the *Theravāda-vinaya*, taking the remains of a tiger’s kill is an exception to the second *pārājika* rule that makes it an offence for a monk to take what is not given.

Referring, amongst other examples, to “the remains of a tiger’s kill,” the Buddha in the Pāli *vinaya* states, “Monks, there is no offence in taking what belongs to animals” (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 1: 98).

^{213.} sTog ’dul ba ta 390b2–3.

^{214.} This habit of tigers has been observed in nature. In *Mammalia*, from the late, 19th

century zoological series *The Fauna of British India: Including Ceylon and Burma*, series editor William Blanford describes this habit as follows:

As a rule he remains near the kill, sometimes rushing out upon any intruder and driving away jackals, vultures, and other carrion-feeders; but more often he hides the carcass under bushes or leaves, and retires to a neighbouring thicket beside water. If very hungry, a tiger will devour both hindquarters the first night. If undisturbed, he generally remains about three days near the carcass, feeding at intervals (1888–1891, 1: 64).

This behaviour, described above by Blanford, was apparently known to the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. In *Tibetan Tales, Derived from Indian Sources*, Anton Schiefner translates a story from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* of a tiger and a lion:

Now the young lion was wont to kill gazelles, and to devour their good flesh and lap their good blood, and then, having done this, to betake himself at once to his lair. But the young tiger, when he went out, underwent great fatigue in killing gazelles, and having devoured their flesh and lapped their blood, returned home after a long absence. One day the tiger devoured the remains of a meal which he had hidden away, and then returned quickly home. The lion asked, “How is it that you, who never came back before till after a long time, have returned to-day so soon?” The tiger replied, “I have eaten the stores which I set aside.” The lion asked, “Do you lay up stores, then?” The tiger said that it did. The lion said, “When I have slain gazelles and eaten their good flesh and lapped their good blood, I am wont to go away without troubling

community by potentially attracting predators. It also deprives that animal of a meal. Moreover, the above passage also claims that a lion (unlike a tiger) “eating fine meats and having drunk fine blood, abandons [the leftovers] and leaves.” Another implication may be that a tiger’s leftovers, not of the same quality as a lion’s, are not fit for human consumption—much less consumption by members of the Buddhist monastic community.

The rule requiring the elder to ask if meat was taken from a tiger is a rule of customary behaviour. This rule makes it clear that the responsibility of inquiring after the provenance of meat before its distribution amongst the community rests on the shoulders of the most senior monk. This is not the only moment in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in which the Buddha announces a rule of customary behaviour requiring the elder of the community to ask where meat comes from.

The *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, the chapter of the *Vinayavastu* dealing primarily with medicines, contains a story in which a doctor prescribes a seriously ill monk a meat broth (*sha khu*).²¹⁵ The householder Mahāsenā (*khyim bdag sde chen*) asks his wife (Mahāsenā)

myself further.” The tiger replied, “You are strong. I cannot do like that.” The lion said, “Let us go together.” So they took to going out together ([1882] 1906, 329). A tiger storing leftovers and a lion eating fine meats and drinking fine blood immediately after a hunt appear to be literary motifs in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Silk and Panglung confirm that this story is from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and specifically from the *Vinayavibhaṅga* (Silk 2010, 68 and Panglung 1981, 134–135).

²¹⁵. This narrative is preserved in Tibetan translation (sTog 'dul ba ka 404b5–407b5). The

to prepare the meat broth for the monk.²¹⁶ She sends a girl to market to purchase meat for the broth.²¹⁷ Slaughter of animals was prohibited on that day because of the birth of the king's son.²¹⁸ So, Mahāsenā cuts flesh from her own thigh and has it made into a broth and given to the monk, who eats it.²¹⁹ Afterwards, the Buddha makes it a grave offence

entire story is now available in English in Yao's recent translation of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* (2021, 2.2–.25).

²¹⁶. Yao 2021, 2.7.

²¹⁷. Yao 2021, 2.8.

²¹⁸. Yao 2021, 2.8.

²¹⁹. Yao 2021, 2.9–.10. Although this story about the wife of Mahāsenā is not a past-life narrative, it is followed by a past-life narrative in which Mahāsenā offers her flesh to an ill sage in just the same way (Yao 2021, 2.18–.25). See also the summary of this story in Panglung 1981, 17. A woman offering her flesh as a meal seems to be a common literary device in stories of past lives. In one example from the *Divyāvadāna*, an anthology of stories closely related to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the Buddha-to-be Rūpāvātī cuts off both of her breasts and feeds them to a starving woman, saving that woman from eating her own newborn (Rotman 2008–2017, 2: 184).

Andy Rotman explains the utility of past-life narratives found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. He writes: “In the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and in the *Divyāvadāna*, rules are also determined from stories, but then secondary stories are used to explain the phenomena and karmic connections within those primary stories. These

(*sthūlātyaya; ltung ba sbom po*) for monks to eat human flesh.²²⁰ The Buddha also establishes the following rule of customary behaviour for the elder of the community:

I will now establish rules of customary behavior for an elder monk of the community. If flesh is offered, an elder monk of the community should ask, ‘What flesh is this?’ If the elder monk of the community cannot, the second elder monk should ask. If the elder monk of the community does not act in accordance with

layered stories allow one to view the process of how rules are taught, through stories of origin and stories of explanation, and to see how the intertwining of stories and rules can allow stories to embody rules and, perhaps, even supplant them” (2008–2017, 1: 27). The first story about Mahāsenā, which takes place in the narrative present, leads to the creation of the rule against monks’ eating human flesh. The second story starring Mahāsenā, a past-life narrative in which she feeds her flesh to an ill sage, further elucidates the karmic connections at play in the first narrative.

These stories about Mahāsenā fit nicely into the “gift-of-the-body-genre” of Buddhist stories proposed by Reiko Ohnuma (2007, 35). Ohnuma’s corpus of stories constitutes a sub-genre of two kinds of past-life narratives: *jātakas* and *avadānas*. But here we see the genre slipping between a past-life story—the *avadāna* about Mahāsenā in which she feeds her flesh to an ill sage—and the narrative present in which she feeds her flesh to an ill *bhikṣu*.

²²⁰ Yao 2021, 2.15.

the established rules of customary behavior, he becomes guilty of an offense.²²¹

*ngas dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyi dge slong gi kun tu spyod pa'i chos bca' bar bya
ste / dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyis dge slong gis sha 'drim par byed na / 'di ci'i sha
zhes dri bar bya'o // gal te dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyis ma spobs na / gnas brtan
gnyis pas dri bar bya'o // dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyis kun tu spyod pa'i chos ji
ltar bcas pa bzhin yang dag par blangs te 'jug par mi byed na 'gal tshabs can du
'gyur ro //*²²²

Thus, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* contains not one, but two rules requiring the elder of the community to ask about the origins of meat before it may be consumed by members of the *saṃgha*. The second most senior monk serves as a failsafe, stepping in if the most senior monk does not or cannot fulfill this duty.²²³

The authors/redactors also include cases in which the elder of the community must oversee the distribution of food among the monks. The *Kṣudrakavastu* records a story in which the elder must tell a patron to distribute alms-food fairly amongst the monastic community.²²⁴ In this narrative, a householder wants to host a meal for the monks of the

²²¹. Translation from Yao 2021, 2.15.

²²². sTog 'dul ba ka 407b3–5.

²²³. On the second elder (*dvitīya-sthavira*), see Schopen [2010] 2014, 68n24.

²²⁴. sTog 'dul ba ta 382b6–385b1.

Jetavana. He asks a local monk how many monks are residing in the area and prepares food for them. Then, visiting monks show up for the meal and throw off the numbers. In order to navigate this awkward situation, the Buddha makes the following rule of customary behaviour:

Furthermore, I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who is the elder of the *samgha*. A monk who is the elder of the *samgha* should survey the *samgha* and, if the monk[s] are many [and] food is short, then he should say to the patron, “Good sir, since the food is short [and] monk[s] are many, [the food] must be distributed equally.” But, if the food is plentiful [and] the monk[s] are few, he should say, “Good sir, because the food is plentiful, it must be distributed however you would like.” A monk who is the elder of the *samgha*, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.²²⁵

*gzhan yang ngas dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyi dge slong gi kun tu spyad pa'i chos
bca' bar bya ste / dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyis dge slong gis dge 'dun blta bar bya
zhing / gal te dge slong ni mang / zan ni nyung na / sbyin bdag la bzhin bzangs
gzan ni nyung / dge slong ni mang gis snyoms par brims shig ces brjod par bya'o*

²²⁵. This passage is discussed in Schopen [2010] 2014, 69n27. The narrative is also mentioned briefly in Schopen [2002] 2014, 195.

// 'on te zan ni mang / dge slong ni nyung na / des bzhin bzangs zan ni mang gis ci
'byor pa bzhin brims shig ces brjod par bya'o // dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyi dge
slong gis kun tu spyad pa'i chos ji ltar bcas pa rnams yang dag par blangs te mi
'jug na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro / ²²⁶

The senior-most monk is required to guide the donor through the appropriate distribution of food for the number of monks present. Another version of this rule, this time found in the *Muktaka* section of the *Uttaragrantha*, responds to a situation in which a patron favours senior monks to the detriment of the then starving and sickly junior monks.²²⁷ The Buddha requires the *samghasthavira* to announce that food collected on alms-rounds must be distributed equally (*snyoms par brims*).²²⁸ A rule of customary behaviour recorded

^{226.} sTog 'dul ba ta 385a5–b1. Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba tha 257b7–258a3).

^{227.} For the narrative leading up to this rule, see sTog 'dul ba na 241b1–242b3: *Muktaka* 2.4.

^{228.} This rule of customary behaviour reads (sTog 'dul ba na 242a7–b3: *Muktaka* 2.4): *dge slong dag dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan dge slong gis mtshangs par spyad pa'i chos ngas bca' ste // dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan dge slong gis zas 'grim pa'i tshe / snyoms par brims shig ces sgo zhig // des tshod ma sna re re la'ang smras pa dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / lan tshwa'am dang por gang brims pa de'i tshe smros shig // thams cad la ni ma yin no // dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan dge slong gis ji lta bur mtshungs par spyad pa'i chos bzhin ma byas na 'das pa dang bcas pa 'gyur ro //*.

elsewhere in the *Muktaka* makes it clear that the elder of the community must tell the monks to accept food according to their seniority.²²⁹

In addition to rules related to the distribution of food, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* records other administrative duties assigned to the elder of the *saṃgha*. In one of the exception cases in the *Vinayavibhaṅga*'s treatment of *pārājika* 3 (the rule concerning murder), the elder of the community is required to ask another kind of monastic administrator, the *upadhivāraka* (*dge sko*), some questions when it is time to listen to *dharma*. This passage reads:

Furthermore, I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for the monk who is the elder of the *saṃgha*. When the time arises for listening to *dharma*, the monk who is the elder of the *saṃgha* must ask the *upadhivāraka*, “Venerable One, have you closed the gate of the *vihāra*? Done an inspection? Asked the *dharma* reciter to recite? Swept the privy-for-feces and the privy-for-urine?” A monk who is the elder of the *saṃgha*, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.

²²⁹ This passage in the *Uttaragrantha* reads (sTog 'dul ba na 251b3–4: *Muktaka* 2.4): *de bas na dge 'dun gyi gnas pa brtan gyi dge slong la mtshungs par spyod pa 'i chos bca 'o // dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan dge slong gi rgan rims su 'dug nas / kha zas dag shoms te 'ongs pa dang / sngar chung du na lan tshwa tsam yang ma blang zhig // nam rgan rims su 'byor tshogs zhes skad ma phung bar blangs na 'das pa dang bcas par 'gyur ro //*.

*gzhan yang ngas dge slong dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyi kun tu spyod pa'i chos dag
bca' bar bya ste / dge slong dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyis chos mnyan pa la bab
pa'i tshe / dge skos la tshe dang ldan pa khyod kyis gtsug lag khang gi sgo bcad
dam / so sor brtags sam / chos smra ba la gsol ba btab bam / bshang ba dang gci
ba'i skyabs byi dor byas sam zhes dri bar bya'o // dge slong dge 'dun gyi gnas
brtan gyis kun tu spyod pa'i chos ji ltar bcas pa dag yang dag par blangs te 'jug
par mi byed na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro //*²³⁰

This rule of customary behaviour says more about the office of the *upadhivāraka* than it does of the *saṃghasthavira*. Schopen notes that the exact status of the office of the *upadhivāraka* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is unclear. At times, says Schopen, “The *upadhivāraka* appears as a monk of some status and sometimes as almost a janitor.”²³¹ The questions that the *saṃghasthavira* must ask the *upadhivāraka* may imply that the *upadhivāraka* was something of a general custodian. Regardless of his exact status, the

²³⁰. sTog 'dul ba ca 225a3–6. Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba ca 257a5–7). This rule of customary behaviour is mentioned in Schopen [2010] 2014, 68n27.

²³¹. Schopen [1996] 2004a, 251n35. It might be important to reiterate here that both can be true. As I discussed earlier in this chapter, even a supervisor of meditation is responsible for cleaning and stocking toilets, at least according to the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

above passage makes it clear that the *upadhivāraka* answers to the *saṃghasthavira*, the head honcho of the Buddhist monastic community.²³²

The *Adhikaraṇavastu*, the chapter of the *Vinayavastu* that deals with legal procedures related to disputes in the monastic community, contains another set of rules of customary behaviour for the most senior monk. These rules of customary behaviour govern the conduct of the elder of the community after he takes charge of resolving a dispute. He only takes on such proceedings if no other monk can resolve the conflict.²³³ The most senior monk must bring an unresolved dispute to rest according to Buddhist monastic law, without showing favouritism to either party. He cannot accept any items from either side of the dispute, nor should he speak with the opposing parties except to calm things down.²³⁴ If he fails to resolve the dispute, the community must vote on the issue.²³⁵ Thus, the *saṃghasthavira* has an important role to play in dispute procedures in this *vinaya*. His rules of customary behaviour specify the decorum he must uphold while serving in this role. In the section that follows, I explore other rules of customary

^{232.} On the overall importance of the *saṃghasthavira*, including an overview of many of his administrative duties, see Schopen [2010] 2014, 68–69n27.

^{233.} This process is discussed in Borgland 2014, 218.

^{234.} Skt. in Borgland 2014, *Appendix* (Draft Diplomatic Edition of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Adhikaraṇavastu* – a new reading of the manuscript) §105 342r5–9 (60–61). Tib. in sTog *'dul ba ga* 328a3–b1.

^{235.} On this procedure, see Nolot 1996, 104–110.

behaviour assigned to various kinds of monks during disputes described in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Section 2.6 — Rules of Customary Behaviour in Disputes

Disputes regularly occur in workplaces. *Samghas* are no exception. It should come as no surprise then that the monastic lawyers who authored/redacted the *Vinayavastu* had a lot to say about conflict resolution in the monastic community.

An entire chapter of the *Vinayavastu*, the *Kauśāmbakavastu*, records the story of a twelve-year dispute between local monks from Kauśāmbī and visiting monks from Vaiśālī. The chapter begins with one monk from each group arguing about the contents of Buddhist scripture.²³⁶ Later, one of the visiting monks breaks a local monastic ordinance (*kriyākāra*; *khriṃs su bca'ba*) about refilling the water jar at the toilet.²³⁷ The local monks quickly use this infraction as an opportunity to perform a suspension procedure

²³⁶ For an English summary of this section of the *Kauśāmbakavastu*, see Jinānanda 1953, 179–180.

²³⁷ This local rule is translated in Shōno 2017, 54.

(*utkṣepaṇīya karman*) on him.²³⁸ The locals do not consult the visitors. Upset by this, the monks from Vaiśālī begin to feud with the local monks of Kauśāmbī.²³⁹

The authors/redactors of the *Kauśāmbakavastu* depict the Buddha as assigning rules of customary behaviour for the suspended monk (*utkṣiptaka*) and the monk who carried out the suspension procedure (*utkṣepaka*). These rules appear to be an early attempt at quelling the hostilities before the feud gets out of hand. The Buddha states:

Furthermore (*api tu*), I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour of the monk who is suspended (*utkṣiptaka*). A thought like this is to be produced by the suspended monk: “This monk who performs the suspension (*utkṣepaka*) is troublesome (*vyāḍa*), mighty (*vikrānta*), a holder of the *sūtra*[s] (*sūtradhara*), holder of the *vinaya* (*vinayadhara*), [and] holder of the *māṭṛkā*[s] (*māṭṛkādhara*). And, he has many monks as companions who are troublesome, mighty, holders of the *sūtra*[s], holders of the *vinaya*, [and] holders of the *māṭṛkā*[s]. Were I not to rectify the fault (*āpattiṃ*) according to *dharma* (*yathādharmam na pratikuryām*), on account of that (*tena*) the *saṃgha* would spend time (*vihaṛet*) fighting

²³⁸. This is not the only time in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* where the monks from Vaiśālī use such a tactic. For another example, see Borgland’s discussion of the story of the monk Kāla (2014, 45).

²³⁹. For an English summary of this section of the *Kauśāmbakavastu*, see Jinānanda 1953, 181–182.

(*kalahajāto*), quarreling (*bhaṇḍanajāto*), in a disagreement (*vigṛhīto*), [and] in an argument (*vivādam āpannaḥ*).²⁴⁰ So, I should rectify the fault according to *dharma*.” A monk who is suspended, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.

*api tūtkṣipta[ka]syāhaṃ bhikṣor āsamudācārikān dharmān prajñāpayāmi*²⁴¹ /
utkṣiptakena bhikṣuṇā evaṃ cittam utpādayitavyam / ayam utkṣepako bhikṣur*
vyādo vikrāntaḥ sūtradharo vinayadharo māṭṛkādharaḥ / bahavaś cāsya
bhikṣavaḥ sahāyakā vyāḍā vikrāntāḥ sūtradharā vinayadharā māṭṛkādharaḥ /
ahaṃ ced āpattiṃ yathādharmam na pratikuryām tena saṃghaḥ sa kalahajāto*
vihared bhaṇḍanajāto vigṛhīto vivādam āpannaḥ / yanv aham āpattiṃ
yathādharmam pratikuryām iti / utkṣiptako bhikṣur yathāprajñaptān
*āsamudācārikān dharmān na samādāya vartate / sātisāro bhavati /*²⁴²

²⁴⁰ I loosely follow here Rotman’s translation of a similar passage from the *Divyāvadāna* describing a doctrinal dispute: “Like this, they fought and quarreled, disagreed and argued” (2008–2017, 1: 283).

²⁴¹ *prajñāpayāmi* is likely a scribal error here for *prajñāpayiṣyāmi*. Dutt’s reading of the actual manuscript seems correct, but the manuscript should be amended here to read *prajñāpa[yiṣ]yāmi* (Clarke 2014b, Plates 176: 281r7).

²⁴² Dutt [1942–1950] 1984, 3(2): 176.14–177.4. Dutt freely adds or amends punctuation and resolves *sandhi* in his reading of this passage. For this passage in the manuscript, see

Here, the Buddha requires the suspended monk to consider abandoning his position out of respect for the status of his opponent and to avoid prolonged quarreling in the *samgha*.

The Buddha then establishes virtually identical rules of customary behaviour for the monk who performed the suspension procedure. Only this time, the monk who performed the suspension is asked to reflect upon the status of his opponent and the potential damage such a dispute could cause to the community.²⁴³ Essentially, the Buddha makes a rule requiring both parties to consider dropping the issue before matters become more serious.

This solution fails. The Buddha then prescribes rules of customary behaviour for plaintiffs (*arthins*) and defendants (*pratyarthins*) who still live together. The Buddha tells the monks that plaintiffs and defendants can sit together, but customary behaviour related

Clarke 2014b, Plates 176: 281r6–8. For the Tibetan translation, see sTog 'dul ba ga 168a6–b3.

²⁴³ In Dutt's edition, see [1942–1950] 1984, 3(2): 177.10–178.1. For this passage in the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 176: 281r10–v2. For the Tibetan translation, see sTog 'dul ba ga 169a1–5.

to the body may not be done together.²⁴⁴ This rule might be a nod to the infraction that led to the suspension of the monk from Vaiśālī, the incident which took place at the toilet.²⁴⁵

Ultimately, rules of customary behaviour do not quell the hostilities between the two groups. The Buddha does not settle the dispute. The monks living in Kauśambī continue their feud. The Buddha establishes additional rules of customary behaviour to be

²⁴⁴. Dutt [1942–1950] 1984, 3[2]: 181.10–.16: “*api tv arthi[ka]pratyarthikānām ahaṃ bhikṣūṇām antargṛhe praviṣṭānām āsamudācārikān dharmān prajñapayisyāmi / arthikapratyarthikair bhikṣubhir antargṛhe praviṣṭair āsanāntaritair niṣattavyaṃ yatraivamrūpasyā[na]nulomikasya kāyasamudācārikasyāvakāśo na bhavati / arthi[ka]pratyarthikā bhikṣavo ’ntargṛhe praviṣṭā yathāprajñaptān āsamudācārikān dharmān na samādāya vartante / sātisārā bhavanti /*” For this passage in the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 177: 282r9–v1. For Tib., see sTog ’*dul ba ga* 171b4–7. How exactly to understand this passage is still unclear to me. Dutt’s summary reads: “On another occasion, a householder invited the monks to his house but there too these monks quarrelled and even came to grips. On hearing this Buddha enjoined that monks while sitting in a householder’s house must keep their seats apart ...” ([1942–1950] 1984, 3[2]: xxi). Banerjee’s paraphrase reads: “He asked the bhikṣus not to quarrel with one another while taking their meals in the house of a householder and directed them to occupy separate seats” (1957, 221).

²⁴⁵. Dutt and Banerjee both take it to mean that these monks must keep their seats apart (see note 244 above).

observed by the suspended monk.²⁴⁶ These rules list restrictions imposed on the suspended monk. These restrictions closely resemble *āsamudācārika-dharmas* assigned to monks who undergo similar procedures that are prescribed elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Several sets of rules of customary behaviour comparable to those introduced in the *Kauśāmbakavastu* are found in the *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu*, a chapter of the *Vinayavastu* that deals with another set of quarrelsome monks. In this *vastu*, the Buddha establishes rules of customary behaviour for monks who have undergone three types of penal procedures:

- 1) a monk upon whom a formal censure (*tarjanīya karman*) has been performed (*tarjanīyakarmakṛta*);²⁴⁷

^{246.} In Dutt's edition, these rules begin at [1942–1950] 1984, 3(2): 192.4. For the beginning of these rules in the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 179: 284v2. In Tib., see sTog 'dul ba ga 177b1.

^{247.} For the rules of customary behaviour of a *tarjanīyakarmakṛta*, see Yamagiwa 2001, §1.6 (German translation on 145–146). These rules are not unique to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. They are introduced as prescribed rules of conduct (*sammāvattas*) in the *Theravāda-vinaya* (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 7–8; Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 5.5–5.15).

- 2) a monk upon whom an “action of [*severe*] condemnation [*more serious than tarjanīya*]” (*nigarhaṇīya karman*) has been performed (*nigarhaṇīyakarmakṛta*),²⁴⁸ and
- 3) a monk upon whom a procedure that requires the offender to apologize to a layperson (*pratisaṃharaṇīya karman*) has been performed (*pratisaṃharaṇīyakarmakṛta*).²⁴⁹

The *tarjanīya* procedure is imposed especially on quarrelsome monks.²⁵⁰ A *nigarhaṇīya karman* is for more serious infractions.²⁵¹ The *pratisaṃharaṇīya* procedure is for monks who cause trouble with lay donors.²⁵² Monks who undergo such procedures are

^{248.} Edgerton [1953] 1985, 295, s.v. “*nigarhaṇīya*” (square brackets are Edgerton’s). For the rules of customary behaviour of a *nigarhaṇīyakarmakṛta*, see Yamagiwa 2001, §2.6 (German translation on 152). A parallel procedure to the *nigarhaṇīyakarma*, the *nissayakamma*, is outlined in the *Theravāda-vinaya* (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 10–11; Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 8.20–8.23).

^{249.} For the rules of customary behaviour of a *pratisaṃharaṇīyakarmakṛta*, see Yamagiwa 2001, §4.10 (German translation on 162). For this procedure in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, see Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 27.

^{250.} Edgerton [1953] 1985, 250, s.v. “*tarjanīya*.” See also Nolot 1999, 9.

^{251.} Edgerton [1953] 1985, 295, s.v. “*nigarhaṇīya*.”

^{252.} Edgerton [1953] 1985, 371, s.v. “*pratisaṃharaṇīya*.” See also Nolot 1999, 10.

temporarily barred from participating in ecclesiastical ceremonies. They are also barred from performing certain roles in the *saṃgha*.

Another chapter of the *Vinayavastu*, the *Pārivāsikavastu*, contains rules of customary behaviour for a monk who is on probation for committing a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* offence (*pārivāsikamānāpyacārika*). A monk who has concealed a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* offence must complete a penance called a *parivāsa*, which lasts for as long as the offence was concealed.²⁵³ This *parivāsa* probationary period is followed by the *mānāpya* penance, the standard, six day-and-night penalty required of a monk who commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* offence regardless of whether it has been concealed.²⁵⁴ The rules of customary behaviour established for these monks read as a list of restrictions followed by a lengthy list of chores.²⁵⁵ The prescribed rules of customary behaviour of a monk undergoing the

^{253.} Buswell and Lopez 2014, 631, s.v. “*parivāsa*.” Parallel rules to those of customary behaviour for a monk undergoing the *parivāsa* are included as prescribed rules of conduct (*sammāvatta*) in the *Theravāda-vinaya* (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 45–48; Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 31.26–33.30).

^{254.} Buswell and Lopez 2014, 523, s.v. “*mānatva*.” Rules corresponding to the rules of customary behaviour for one who is undergoing the *mānāpya* are found in the *Theravāda-vinaya* (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 50). For reference, see Nolot’s extremely useful discussion of the parallel procedure in the *Theravāda-vinaya* (1996, 117–124).

^{255.} This text is mentioned in Schopen 2000, 150nII.31. The restrictions are listed in Borgland 2014, 164–165 (Table 10). Schopen ([1998] 2004a) translates the list of chores

parivāsa or the *mānāpya* are treated together in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. The restrictions for a monk undergoing the *mānāpya* are listed separately from those for a monk undergoing the *parivāsa* in the *Theravāda-vinaya*.²⁵⁶

The *Adhikaraṇavastu* records rules of behaviour for a monk who, having committed an offence but not remembering the details, is given “the seeking the nature of that” (*tatsvabhāvaiṣīya*) procedure.²⁵⁷ This monk is asked questions to determine the exact nature of an offence.²⁵⁸ This monk’s rules of customary behaviour are also found in the *Vinayavibhaṅga*.²⁵⁹ His rules of customary behaviour are essentially a list of restrictions, like those of a suspended monk and monks who undergo penal procedures in the

for a monk on probation (261–262).

^{256.} See notes 253 and 254, above. One commentary on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīka-samuccaya*, contains a lengthy discussion of rules of customary behaviour for monks undergoing some kind of ecclesiastical punishment. The commentators include separately the rules of customary behaviour for a monk undergoing a *parivāsa* and one undergoing a *mānāpya*. See sde dge ’dul ba pu 161a6–172a6 (at least).

^{257.} For a detailed list of restrictions imposed upon this monk, see Borgland (2014) Table 10 (164–165).

^{258.} Nolot 1996, 111.

^{259.} For an English translation of this passage from the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, see Borgland 2016–2017, 35.

Pāṇḍulohitakavastu. Sets of rules of customary behaviour not only clarify administrative duties, but also list restrictions imposed on certain monks.

After twelve years of fighting, the suspended monk from Vaiśālī finally admits that the initial dispute was his fault. The Buddha then authorizes a restitution procedure (*osāraṇīya karman*) for him.²⁶⁰ The Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour for a monk who undergoes this procedure (*osāraṇīyakarmakṛta*).²⁶¹ A suspended monk must explain the circumstances surrounding his infraction and then formally request a restitution procedure (*osāraṇīya karman*) from the *saṃgha*.

The *saṃgha* then restores the monk who requested the restitution procedure. Afterwards, the monastic community performs a *saṃgha* restoration procedure

²⁶⁰. Edgerton ([1953] 1985) offers “(rite) of restitution” as a translation of *osāraṇīya* with *karman* (160, s.v. “*osāraṇīya*”).

²⁶¹. These rules begin in Dutt’s edition at [1942–1950] 1984, 3(2): 193.17. For the beginning of these rules in the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 179: 284v9. The conclusion of the prescription of these rules of customary behaviour is not clearly marked in the text. Rules of customary behaviour for a monk who conducts a *saṃgha* restoration procedure (*saṃghasāmagrī*) follow.

Nolot explains in great detail the procedures around the parallel Pāli term from the *Theravāda-vinaya*, the *osāraṇā*, in her studies of *vinaya* technical terms (1996, 110 and 1999, 39–56).

(*saṃghasāmagrī karman*). The Buddha prescribes the rules of customary behaviour for the monk who leads the *saṃgha* restoration procedure (*saṃghasāmagrīdattaka*).²⁶²

The authors/redactors of the *Kausāmbakavastu* had a lot to say on the topic of disputes in the *saṃgha*. Some sets of rules of customary behaviour take the form of instructions for initially bringing about a truce. Others function as restrictions placed on monks undergoing some kind of ecclesiastical punishment. There are also rules of customary behaviour that indicate ecclesiastical acts that must be performed in conflict resolution procedures.

The *Kausāmbakavastu* is by no means the only chapter of the *Vinayavastu* that contains rules of customary behaviour prescribed for resolving disputes. The *Adhikaraṇavastu* preserves the responsibilities of the monk in charge of delivering disputing parties to a monastic community equipped to deal with the dispute (*adhikaraṇasaṃcāraka*).²⁶³ As mentioned in the previous section, the dispute must be

^{262.} In Dutt's edition, the rules of customary behaviour for the monk who leads the *saṃgha* restoration procedure are introduced at [1942–1950] 1984, 3(2): 195.1. For the beginning of these rules in the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 180: 285r4. The ending of his prescribed rules of customary behaviour are not formally marked. The discussion of the *saṃghasāmagrī karman* continues until the end of the *Kausāmbakavastu*. Borgland brings attention to an explanation of this procedure found elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (2014, 442n852).

^{263.} For a thorough investigation of the duties of this monastic role, see Borgland 2014,

brought to the most senior monk (*saṃghasthavira*) if no other monk can settle the issue. If a disagreement absolutely cannot be settled, even by the monastic community's elder, the *saṃgha* must vote on the issue. The *Adhikaraṇavastu* also contains rules of customary behaviour for the monk in charge of distributing the voting sticks (*śalākācāraka*) in such situations.²⁶⁴

At least according to the Mūlasarvāstivādin monastic code, rules of customary behaviour play a crucial role in resolving conflicts in the Buddhist monastic community. Monks involved in various roles in disputes are prescribed rules of customary behaviour in this *vinaya*'s narratives. *Āsamudācārika-dharmas* govern the conduct of monks acting as arbiters and monks who perform restoration ceremonies. Rules of customary behaviour do not always take the form of tasks or chores. They may also include restrictions imposed on monastics, such as those placed upon monks undergoing penal procedures.

95–99.

²⁶⁴. For a discussion of this voting procedure, including the rules of customary behaviour of the *śalākācāraka*, see Borgland 2014, 220–226. See also Nolot 1996, 106–108.

The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*'s commentarial tradition mentions rules of customary behaviour for the distributor of counting sticks and one who accepts a counting stick. In the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-paddhati*, see sde dge 'dul ba nu 68a4. Also, there is a lengthy discussion of these roles in the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīka-samuccaya* (sde dge 'dul ba bu 111a4–112b1).

Section 2.7 — Chapter Conclusions

In this chapter, I explored rules of customary behaviour related to the administration or management of the monastic community prescribed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. I began with the rules of customary behaviour belonging to the *śayanāsanagrāhaka*, the monk responsible for distributing lodgings at the commencement of the annual rain retreat. In addition to prescribing rules of customary behaviour for the monk fulfilling this role, the Buddha also lays out the formal procedure for appointing him, as well as five qualities this monk must possess. The same is true for two other administrative roles associated with the rain retreat: the monk who hosts the ceremony that formally ends the rain retreat and the monk who spreads the *kāṭhina* cloth at the end of the rain retreat. I noted that there are at least ten monastics who are prescribed rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, monastics who are appointed by way of a formal, twofold procedure. These ten monastics may be appointed only if they possess five good qualities associated with the role. These roles appear to be more formal than other monastic vocations that the Buddha assigns rules of customary behaviour for in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Next, I looked at rules of customary behaviour related to construction. These rules appear to be designed to provide guidelines through which monks may actively participate in construction projects under certain circumstances. Drawing on the recent work of Cabezón and Dorjee on Sera monastery, I pointed out that at least as late as the 1960s, monks in the *Mūlasarvāstivādin* tradition continued to accommodate the

participation of certain *saṃgha* members in construction projects.²⁶⁵ The rules of customary behaviour for a monk assisting in construction work clarify that he must not work as though he is a common labourer.²⁶⁶ Also, he still needs to show up for his alms-rounds on time and be presentable in appearance.²⁶⁷

Over the course of this chapter, I also paid considerable attention to rules of customary behaviour assigned to the elder of the monastic community. The *saṃghasthavira* is prescribed rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* more frequently than any other monastic. This makes sense given the well-known importance of this role in the administration of the monastic community.²⁶⁸ Among his various responsibilities, the elder of the community is required to play a part in the settlement of disputes amongst members of the monastic community. In fact, many of the

^{265.} Cabezón and Dorjee 2019, 470–471.

^{266.} See pages 74–77 above for details.

^{267.} Schopen points out that “the additional rules governing the behavior of monks when they do” the work of common labourers underscores “the preoccupation of the compilers of Buddhist *Vinayas* with their public image. In effect these rules say that whereas Buddhist monks must do the work of *bhṛtakas*, they also must fastidiously avoid appearing in public as if they did so” ([2006] 2014, 268).

^{268.} For example, Schopen writes: “the *saṃghasthavira* was certainly an important figure—perhaps even the most important—in Mūlasarvāstivādin monasticism” ([2010] 2014, 69n27).

rules discussed in this chapter relate to procedures around the settling of disputes.

Procedures surrounding disputes become increasingly more formal as disputes worsen and more actors are brought in to resolve the issue. Rules of customary behaviour govern the actions of monastics involved in these disputes. They also govern the behaviour of monks upon whom formal penalties are imposed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Monks undergoing some kind of ecclesiastical punishment might have chores or responsibilities included in their rules of customary behaviour. But these rules also include temporary restrictions imposed on a monastic for as long as a penance, probation, or other penalty lasts. Therefore, not all of the rules of customary behaviour prescribed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* refer to administrative duties, tasks, or other work that must be done by a specific monastic. Instead, some of these rules are primarily restrictive.

Several of the stories discussed in this chapter mention rules that seem to be location-specific. For example, the monk in charge of looking after the monastery's dogs resides in a forest monastery, since the Buddha permits dogs to be kept only in forest *vihāras*. In the chapter that follows, I discuss other location-dependent rules of customary behaviour prescribed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Chapter Three: Location-Specific Rules of Customary Behaviour

Section 3.1 — Introduction

In treatments of the first *pārājika*, the rule making it an offence for monks or nuns to engage in sexual intercourse, *Vinayavibhaṅgas* contain several stories that illustrate situations in which a monk is deemed not guilty. The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinayavibhaṅga* contains a pair of such stories in which a monk is sexually assaulted while sleeping. The first story involves a village monk (*grāmāntika*; *grong mtha'pa*).

In the episode in question, a sick monk sleeps during the daytime with the door open. An elderly prostitute peaks in on him. She gives rise to desire, spreads herself on top of him, and satisfies herself.²⁶⁹ The monk does not wake up.²⁷⁰ The elderly prostitute

^{269.} sTog 'dul ba ca 64a1–2. As John Powers notes, “Indian Buddhist literature depicts the male members of the *saṃgha* as sexually irresistible to women” (2009, 74). Women forcing themselves upon monks and/or attempting to seduce them is a well-known literary motif in *vinaya*. For a remarkable example of a sex worker attempting to seduce a Buddhist monk from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, see the story of the conversion of Utpalavarṇā by Maudgalyāyana discussed in Silk 2009, 150–152.

^{270.} sTog 'dul ba ca 64a2. A similar case is found in the *Theravāda-vinaya*: “Now at that time a certain monk, in the Gabled Hall in the Great Wood at Vesālī for his day-sojourn, was lying down having opened the door. All his limbs were stiff with pains. Now at that time a large company of women, bringing scents and garlands, came to the park looking

thinks to herself that she knows sixty-four techniques (of lovemaking) but that this renunciant knows sixty-five.²⁷¹ She then invites him to come home with her.²⁷² He declines, but wonders whether he committed a *pārājika* offence in his sleep, and tells the other monks what happened.²⁷³ The monks ask the Buddha, and the Buddha rules that this monk is not guilty of a *pārājika* offence since he was asleep.²⁷⁴ The Buddha then establishes the following rule of customary behaviour for a village monk:

However, I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a village monk (*grāmāntika*; *grong mtha'pa*). A village monk, having laid down to sleep during the day, must secure the door with a door-bolt (*sgo gtan*), or he must set up a

at the vihāra. Then these women seeing that monk, sat down on him, and having taken their pleasure and saying: ‘Isn’t he a bull of a man?’ departed, piling up their scents and garlands” (translation from Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 1: 60).

²⁷¹. sTog 'dul ba ca 64a2–64a3.

²⁷². sTog 'dul ba ca 64a3–64a4.

²⁷³. sTog 'dul ba ca 64a4–64a6.

²⁷⁴. sTog 'dul ba ca 64a6–64b1. In the *Theravāda-vinaya*, the Buddha also rules that the sleeping monk is not guilty of a *pārājika* offence (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 1: 60). The Buddha goes on to state “I allow you, monks, when you are in seclusion for meditation during the day, to meditate in seclusion, having closed the door” (translation from Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 1: 60).

monk as a guard, or he must tie his robe. If he lays down to sleep during the day without securing the door with a door-bolt, or without establishing a monk as a guard, or without tying his robe, he becomes guilty of an offence.

*'on kyang ngas dge slong grong mtha' pa'i kun tu spyod pa'i chos dag bca' bar
bya ste / dge slong grong mtha' pa nyin par glos phab ste gnyid log pas sgo sgo
gtan gyis bcad par bya ba 'am / srungs ma dge slong gzhas par bya ba 'am / gos
bcing bar bya'o // sgo sgo gtan gyis gcod par mi byed dam / srungs ma dge slong
'jog par mi byed dam / gos 'ching bar mi by[e]d par nyin par de bzhin du glos
phab ste gnyid log par byed na / 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro // ²⁷⁵*

A likely implication of this rule is that village monks required protections should they choose to sleep during the daytime, while sick.²⁷⁶

This episode is immediately followed by a story in which a forest monk

²⁷⁵. sTog *'dul ba ca* 64b1–4. Derge matches sTog (sde dge *'dul ba ca* 46b4–6).

²⁷⁶. Both physical and textual evidence suggests that unlike monasteries, Buddhist nunneries were located in urban locations. In fact, a rule from the *Kṣudrakavastu* requires that nunneries be built in cities (Schopen [2009] 2014, 4). Schopen writes that this difference in location, “may in fact turn out to be the single most important difference between Buddhist nuns and Buddhist monks, and it alone may best account for many of the significant differences in the rules governing both” ([2009] 2014, 6).

(*āraṇyaka*; *dgon pa pa*), afflicted by an illness causing him to itch (*g.yan pa'i nad*), receives mustard oil (*yungs mar*) from a householder as a remedy. This narrative is succinctly and accurately summarized as follows by Roach in her dissertation on ascetic practices (*dhūtaguṇas*) in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*:

The *āraṇyaka* contracts an itching condition. He goes to a physician who prescribes mustard oil (to be rubbed on the body), but is unwilling to dispense it himself. He suggests that the *āraṇyaka* approach a particular householder who has the same condition. The householder hands over some lotion. The *āraṇyaka* then retires to his forest, where he applies the oil. He spends the day in the open air, where he falls asleep. While he is sleeping, an insect seizes his male member, which becomes erect.²⁷⁷ This causes his robe to spread open. A young woman collecting cow-dung arrives on the scene; the sight of the monk in that state arouses her so greatly that she commences intercourse on top of him. When he wakes up, the monk is too weak to fend her off. However, when she has finished

²⁷⁷. “Itching bites from vermin” are included in a list of five things that “make a penis ready to ejaculate” in the *Theravāda-vinaya* (Powers 2009, 266n3). The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* also includes this list of five, which the Buddha explains after establishing rules of customary behaviour for forest monks in response to this case (sTog *'dul ba ca* 66b5–67a2).

and invites him to her house, he declines resolutely.²⁷⁸

Again, the Buddha determines that this monk has not committed a *pārājika*. These two narratives are a pair. In the first case, the monk does not awaken. In the second case, he awakens but is unable to stop the act. The locations of the assaults differ. One takes place in a village. The other occurs in the forest.

After the second case, the Buddha lays down the following rule of customary behaviour for a forest monk (*āranyaka*; *dgon pa pa*):

Nevertheless, I shall establish rules of conduct for the *āranyaka* monk. If an *āranyaka* monk has lain down during the day, when he goes to sleep he must cover that part [of himself] with branches or small stones or sack-cloth, or he must appoint a monk to stand guard, or he must bind his robe [around himself]. If he has lain down and goes to sleep without covering that part with branches or small stones or sack-cloth, or appointing a monk to stand guard, or binding his robe [around himself], he will commit a serious offence.²⁷⁹

*'on kyang ngas dge slong dgon pa pa'i kun tu spyod pa'i chos dag bca' bar bya
ste / dge slong dgon pa pa nyin par glos phab ste gnyid log pas phyogs de yal ga*

²⁷⁸. Roach 2020, 172.

²⁷⁹. Translation from Roach 2020, 172–173.

*dag gam / seg dag gam / re lde dag gis bskor bar bya ba'am / srungs ma dge slong
gzhag par bya ba'am / gos bcing bya'o // phyogs de yal ga dag gam / seg dag gam
/ re lde dag gis bskor bar mi byed dam / srungs ma dge slong 'jog par mi byed
dam / gos 'ching bar mi byed pa de bzhin du glos phab ste gnyid log par byed na /
'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro //*²⁸⁰

The authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* made allowances for sick monks who need to sleep during the day. The narratives shed light on the culpability of monks who are sexually assaulted while sleeping. The rules of customary behaviour make clear the correct precautions monks must take in order to protect themselves in the compromised position of sleeping during the day, presumably also while sick.

As we have seen, the settings of the incidents in these two cases differ. One incident happens in a village and the other in a forest.²⁸¹ In the remaining sections of this chapter, I explore rules of customary behaviour pertaining to a range of situations in

^{280.} Roach's translation is based on the Derge edition, which matches sTog here (sde dge 'dul ba ca 48a2–4; sTog 'dul ba ca 66b1–3).

^{281.} It may be useful to note here that a section of the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* is dedicated to dwellings in the wilderness and in the village (Karashima 2012, 2: §39.1–39.30 [294.1–309]). In German, Karashima titles this section, “Über Wohnstätten in der Wildnis und im Dorf” (2012, 2: 294). Karashima previously summarized this section in English (2001, 153–155).

which monks might find themselves when they venture out of the safety of the standard monastic setting, the monastery. I demonstrate that rules of customary behaviour serve two functions in such environments:

- 1) they protect monks from danger; and
- 2) they normalize monastic practice in a variety social situations.

In section 3.2, I examine rules of customary behaviour governing forest monks. Then, in section 3.3, I explore the rules of customary behaviour for travelling monks. In section 3.4 I survey the rules of customary behaviour for a visiting monk who arrives at a *vihāra*. Finally, in section 3.5, I look at the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who has been dwelling in a cemetery.

Section 3.2 — Forest Monks

The dichotomy of Buddhist monastics who live in forests and those who reside in urban environments is well documented. The relationship between monks of the forest and their counterparts in cities or towns in contemporary Theravādin countries like Myanmar (Burma), Sri Lanka, and Thailand, for instance, is discussed by anthropologists of Southeast Asia, perhaps most notably by Stanley Tambiah.²⁸² In terms of textual studies,

²⁸². Tambiah observes triadic relations between: 1) the ruler and *saṃghas* living in towns; 2) the ruler and monks dwelling in the forest; and, 3) monks living in forests with

Paul Harrison suggests “that some of the impetus for the early development of the Mahāyāna came from forest dwelling monks.”²⁸³ Harrison points to an ascetic and forest-dwelling bias in Mahāyāna *sūtras* coupled with the rhetoric of a “return to the original inspiration of Buddhism” as evidence that this reform movement owes its origins at least in part to forest-dwelling monastic communities.²⁸⁴ That said, early mainstream and Mahāyāna Buddhisms were not mutually exclusive movements.²⁸⁵ Nor, it seems, are the

saṃghas found in villages and towns (1984, 72).

In the Theravādin world, ascetic monks of the forest intervene occasionally in the affairs of the ruler or the affairs of their village- or town-dwelling counterparts in times of social crisis. As Tambiah puts it, monks of the forest act “as a vitalizing force and as a countervailing agent to the religious establishment during periods of religious purification and cultural renaissance” (1984, 77).

²⁸³. Harrison 1995, 65.

²⁸⁴. Harrison 1995, 65. He also notes that a forest-dwelling context for the early emergence of Mahāyāna Buddhism might “explain the absence of references to the Mahāyāna in the earlier inscriptions” (1995, 66). In an article exploring the compositional history of the *Lotus Sūtra*—one of the most influential Mahāyāna *sūtras*—Karashima writes that, “each Mahāyāna text must have its own complex background and history” (2001, 175). Karashima’s study opens up the possibility that village monks also composed Mahāyāna *sūtras*.

²⁸⁵. Harrison reminds us that Mahāyāna Buddhist monastics had *Nikāya* affiliations (1995,

vocations of a forest monk and an urban monk exclusive in contemporary Theravādin contexts.²⁸⁶

In *Buddhist Saints in India: A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations*, Reginald Ray shifts from the standard two-tiered model of understanding Buddhism as a relationship between settled monastics and the laity to a three-tiered model that takes the role of forest ascetics seriously.²⁸⁷ On the importance of forest asceticism in the history of Buddhism, Ray concludes:

The evidence cited in this study reveals the existence of forest Buddhism in the formative history of both Nikāya and Mahāyāna traditions. It is also clear that forest Buddhism has existed and played a significant role in Buddhism in subsequent history right down to the present day, in both the Theravāda and Mahāyāna.²⁸⁸

56).

^{286.} Tambiah writes: “While these dualities or oppositions may seem sharply defined and mutually exclusive, it is important to realize that ideally the *bhikkhu* should combine both vocations and that in actuality one vocation does not necessarily exclude the other” (1984, 53).

^{287.} Ray 1994, 434.

^{288.} Ray 1994, 433.

Forest monks have certainly played a crucial, though largely anonymous, role in early Buddhist history.

Ray's three-tiered model, however, has drawn criticism. Shizuka Sasaki notes that according to Buddhist sources, forest monks still observed *vinaya* rules, and therefore “[i]f we consider both types of renunciants to be observers of the Vinaya, there is no need for us to rigidly distinguish them into two classes as Ray did.”²⁸⁹ Of course, much can lurk in the shadows cast by terms such as “forest dwelling” or “forest asceticism.” Harrison raises questions “about our notion of what this so-called ‘forest dwelling’ actually means.”²⁹⁰ The following treatment of rules of customary behaviour prescribed for forest monks in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* adds to our understanding of forest monasticism in early Buddhism, at least according to the authors/redactors of this monastic code, and how these forest monks might differ, or perhaps not differ, from other Buddhist monastics.

Much of what the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* had to say about behaviour appropriate for forest monks comes down to us in the *Vinayavibhaṅga*. For example, *pratideśanīya* 4 makes it an offence for monks to accept alms in dangerous

²⁸⁹. Sasaki 2004, 6.

²⁹⁰. Harrison continues: “Making progress here would entail sorting out with greater precision the range of meanings and connotations the word *araṇya* carries in the broader Indian cultural context, and then combing the relevant Buddhist sources for evidence of particular Buddhist understandings and uses of the term” (2018, 11).

forests. A group of laywomen were left naked after being attacked by robbers while bringing donations to the monks in the forest.²⁹¹ The situation is reported to the Buddha, who declares “Therefore, a *vanapratisaṃvedaka* (Forest-Ranger) monk must be appointed” (*de lta bas na dge slong nags nyul ba bsko bar bya ste*).²⁹² The Buddha also establishes rules of customary behaviour for this monk, who appears to act as a kind of forest ranger.²⁹³

To my knowledge, this passage does not survive in Sanskrit in a canonical text. A section of Guṇaprabha’s summary of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the *Vinayasūtra*, however, outlines the responsibilities of this monastic officer in Sanskrit.²⁹⁴ There Tibetan *nags nyul ba* translates Sanskrit *vanapratisaṃvedaka*.²⁹⁵

²⁹¹. Members of the group of six monks find the women hiding and attempting to cover their bodies with foliage. The six insist on receiving a meal from the women anyway, even though the women no longer have clothes (sTog ’dul ba ja 505a2–3). They take a good look at, and comment on, the women’s bodies in the process (sTog ’dul ba ja 505a1–5).

²⁹². sTog ’dul ba ja 506a4–5.

²⁹³. sTog ’dul ba ja 507a2–6.

²⁹⁴. *Sūtras* 2043–2053 of the *Vinayasūtra*—essentially the entire discussion of *pratideśanīya* 4 in the *Poṣadhavastu* section—summarize the responsibilities of the *vanapratisaṃvedaka* (SGSMT, 71 [*Poṣadhavastu: sūtras* 2043–2053]).

²⁹⁵. For Tib., see sde dge ’dul ba wu 48b4. For Skt., refer to the source provided in note

In addition to appearing in the *Vinayasūtra*'s summary of *pratideśanīya* 4, this monk's rules of customary behaviour are recorded in other monastic commentaries, including the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-samuccaya* and the *Ekottarakarmaśataka*.²⁹⁶ That the rules of customary behaviour assigned to this monk are included in the *Ekottarakarmaśataka* indicates that the *vanapratisaṃvedaka* was likely a formal monastic officer in the Mūlasarvāstivādin *saṃgha*. According to the authors/redactors of the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, a monk appointed to this role must possess five good qualities and must not possess five bad ones.²⁹⁷ This statement is repeated in the commentarial literature.²⁹⁸ The *vanapratisaṃvedaka* is one of only ten monastics who are assigned rules of customary behaviour, who are appointed by means of a twofold procedure, and whose appointment requires them to possess certain qualities.²⁹⁹ The attention paid to this position in both the *Vinayavibhaṅga* and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*'s commentarial

294 above.

²⁹⁶. See sde dge 'dul ba bu 50b2–4 (*Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-samuccaya*) and wu 168b6–169a1 (*Ekottarakarmaśataka*).

²⁹⁷. sTog 'dul ba ja 506a4.

²⁹⁸. See sde dge 'dul ba nu 9b1–2 (*Prātimokṣa-sūtra-paddhati*), nu 255a5 (*Vinayasamgraha*), bu 49b7 (*Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-samuccaya*), and wu 168a6 (*Ekottarakarmaśataka*).

²⁹⁹. For more on these monastics, see the list provided on pages 57–60 above. See also Appendix One.

tradition implies that the *vanapratisaṃvedaka* played a significant role in the Mūlasarvāstivādin *saṃgha*, at least according to the voices preserved in the textual tradition.

So what are the responsibilities of this monk? The rules of customary behaviour established in the *Vinayavibhaṅga* require him to patrol a perimeter no less than half a *yojana* in circumference (*samantata*).³⁰⁰ A *yojana* is either four or eight *krośas*—one *krośa* being the distance a shout can audibly carry.³⁰¹ The circumference of the perimeter that the *vanapratisaṃvedaka* must patrol is at least two (or possibly four) times the distance a shout can audibly carry in the forest.

In the narrative from the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, the *vanapratisaṃvedaka* becomes fatigued from his patrolling of the path and afraid, being alone.³⁰² The Buddha says that if he wants, he must be given the morning meal (*purobhaktika*; *khye 'u sus*)³⁰³ and provided

^{300.} His rules of customary behaviour begin (sTog 'dul ba ja 507a2–3): *ngas dge slong nags nyul ba 'i kun tu spyod pa 'i chos dag bca' bar bya ste / dge slong nags nyul bas dpag tshad phyed nas bzung ste khor khor yug tu nags byul bar bya 'o //*. The *Vinayasūtra* records “*ardhayojanam asau samantataḥ pratyavekṣet*” (SGSMT, 71 [*Poṣadhavastu: sūtra* 2044]). For Tib., see sde dge 'dul ba wu 48b4–5.

^{301.} Monier-Williams [1899] 2003, 322, s.v. “*krośa*” and 858, s.v. “*yojana*.”

^{302.} sTog 'dul ba ja 507a3–4: “*de lam gyis dub cing gcig bu 'jigs par gyur nas.*”

^{303.} sTog 'dul ba ja 507a4. The *Vinayasūtra* reads “*dadyur asmai satyārthikatve purobhaktikāṃ // sahāyakañ ca / vrta*” (SGSMT, 71 [*Poṣadhavastu: sūtra* 2048–2049]).

with a companion (*sahāyaka*; *grogs*).³⁰⁴ The Buddha then states what to do if the forest is dangerous:

If the forest is dangerous, he must make a smoke signal (*des dud brda gtul bar bya 'o*).³⁰⁵ He must raise a blue flag (*patāka*; *ba dan*).³⁰⁶ He must cover the path (to the *vihāra*) with leaves (*patravaibhaṅgukas*; *'dab ma 'i chang bu dag*).³⁰⁷ If the forest is not dangerous, then he must raise a white flag. A Forest-Ranger monk, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.

gal te nags 'jigs pa dang bcas pa nyid yin na / des dud brda gtul bar bya 'o // ba dan sngon po bsgreng bar bya 'o // 'dab ma 'i chang bu dag lam gar gzhag par bya 'o // gal te nags 'jigs pa med pa nyid yin na ba dan dkar po bsgreng bar bya 'o

For Tib., see sde dge *'dul ba* wu 48b5–6.

³⁰⁴. sTog *'dul ba* ja 507a4.

³⁰⁵. The *Vinayasūtra* reads “*sabhayaṭāyāṃ dhūmaṃ kuryāt**” (SGSMT, 71 [Poṣadhavastu: sūtra 2045]). For Tib., see sde dge *'dul ba* wu 48b5.

³⁰⁶. The *Vinayasūtra* does not specify colour: “*patāka utsrayeta*” (SGSMT, 71 [Poṣadhavastu: sūtra 2046]). For Tib., see sde dge *'dul ba* wu 48b5.

³⁰⁷. The *Vinayasūtra* reads “*patravaibhaṅgukāni māрге sthāpayeta*” (SGSMT, 71 [Poṣadhavastu: sūtra 2047]). For Tib., see sde dge *'dul ba* wu 48b5.

// dge slong nags nyul bas kun tu spyod pa'i chos ji ltar bcas pa dag yang dag par
blangs te 'jug par mi byed na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro // ³⁰⁸

In the event that a *vanapratisaṃvedaka* discovers danger in the forest, he should alert others that this is the case with a smoke signal. He must put out a warning for other travellers by using a blue (*sngon po*) flag and camouflage the path to the *vihāra* with leaves.³⁰⁹

This monk seemingly acts as a kind of forest ranger or warden. The Tibetan translation of the title of this monk, *nags nyul ba* for Sanskrit *vanapratisaṃvedaka*, implies that the translators understood this monk's role in this way. *Nags* is a standard translation for the Sanskrit word *vana* (forest). *Nyul ba* has the verbal connotation of

^{308.} sTog 'dul ba ja 507a4–6. Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba nya 238b2–3). These rules of customary behaviour are also available in the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-samuccaya* (sde dge 'dul ba bu 50b2–4) and in the *Ekottarakarmaśataka* (sde dge 'dul ba wu 168b6–169a1).

^{309.} In the word commentary on the parallel rule in the *Theravāda-vinaya (pāṭidesanīya* 4 in Pāli), the authors/redactors explain that “if it becomes dangerous it should be pointed out that it is dangerous, if it becomes frightening it should be pointed out that it is frightening” (translation from Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 3: 117). There is no mention of flags or smoke signals, and formal rules of customary behaviour are not introduced.

moving about stealthily or sneaking around, and makes little sense for the Sanskrit *pratisaṃvedaka* without the narrative context (at least to me).³¹⁰ The procedures established in this monk's rules of customary behaviour presumably protect donors from coming to harm while seeking out their beneficiaries in the forest. This also seems to be the intent behind *pratideśanīya* 4 itself. In patrolling the forest, marking safe and unsafe areas, and hiding the path to the *vihāra* when the woods are dangerous, the *vanapratisaṃvedaka* monk protects the local monastic population as well as potential donors.

Life in the forest is not for every monk. A passage from the *Kṣudrakavastu* clarifies that monks who live in forests should possess skills necessary for life in the forest.³¹¹ In her discussion of forest-dwelling monks, Roach translates this passage as follows:

The Blessed One declared: “I shall establish a code of conduct for *āraṇyaka* monks. An *āraṇyaka* monk must always set fires. He must keep a little powder

³¹⁰ Chandra Das and Bahadur define *nyul ba* as “to wander or rove about, to step gently or steal through, to creep” (1902, 484, s.v. “*nyul ba*”). This definition is almost identical to the one found in Jäschke's dictionary ([1881] 2014, 189, s.v. “*nyul ba*”).

³¹¹ Roach discusses the narrative introducing this rule of customary behaviour in detail (2020, 173–175). Essentially, a forest monk who is ill equipped for life in the forest is badly beaten by robbers who consider him a fraud.

[for wounds]. He must put out small pieces of cotton. He must put out whatever is left over from the cooked rice and meals he has eaten. He must be versed in the stars, the dates and the days, the locality and its customs. He must set out water, he must keep a little butter and a little oil. He must be knowledgeable about the *sūtras*, the *vinaya*, the *mātrkāś* and also the art of speaking well.³¹² A forest monk, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.”³¹³

*bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / dgon pa pa rnam kyis dge slong gi kun tu spyod
pa'i chos bca' bar bya ste / dgon pa pa'i dge slong gis rtag tu me dag gzhas par
bya / phye nyung zad tsam bcang bar bya / ras ma dag gzhas par bya / gang 'bras
chan dang zan dag zos pa'i lhag ma yang gzhas par bya / rgyu skar dang / tshes
grangs dang / nyi ma dag la mkhas par bya ste / phyogs la mkhas par bya / spyod
yul la mkhas par bya / chu dag gzhas par bya / mar dang 'bru mar cung zad
bcang bar bya / mdo sde 'dzin pa dang / 'dul ba 'dzin pa dang / ma mo 'dzin pa
dang / tha na snyan par smra ba tsam la yang mkhas par bya ste / dgon pa pa'i
dge slong gis ji ltar kun tu spyad pa'i chos bcas pa la yang dag par mi 'dzin cing
mi bsgrub na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro //*³¹⁴

^{312.} Roach 2020, 175.

^{313.} Roach does not translate this final sentence; I have appended my own translation.

^{314.} sTog 'dul ba tha 294b5–295a2. Roach translates this passage on the basis of the

The above passage reads as a sort of curriculum for forest-dwelling monks. A forest monk must be well supplied. He should possess survival skills, like knowing how to set a fire and knowing the stars.³¹⁵ A much lengthier passage from the *Vinayamāṭṛkā* further outlines the qualifications of a forest monk.³¹⁶ According to the passage from the *Māṭṛkā*, these monks must be literate and able to maintain appropriate monastic decorum while roughing it in a potentially hostile environment. As Roach puts it, “In effect, the *āranyaka* is part of the *saṅgha*’s elite; those who want to live ‘off camera’ need to be highly trained.”³¹⁷ The issue certainly seems to be one of quality control amongst the *saṅgha*’s membership. The passage from the *Kṣudrakavastu* clearly makes it an offence for uneducated or incompetent monks to live in the forest unsupervised. In fact, many of the rules of customary behaviour surveyed in this dissertation seem designed to standardize or

Derge edition. sTog and Derge match almost identically here (sde dge *’dul ba* da 198b1–4). For internal consistency, I present the text from sTog.

^{315.} The *Cullavagga* of the *Theravāda-vinaya* contains a story in which the Buddha prescribes a rule of conduct (*vatta*) for monks who live in the forest (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 304–305). This rule of conduct is not exactly the same as the rules of customary behaviour prescribed for forest monks in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

However, there is some overlap.

^{316.} sTog *’dul ba* na 420b1–421b4.

^{317.} Roach 2020, 176–177.

normalize Buddhist monastic practice in a variety of situations, perhaps as a way of keeping up the standards of the *saṃgha* across a spectrum of geographic locations.

Section 3.3 — Travelling Monks

The *Kṣudrakavastu*, the section of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* dealing with miscellaneous matters, contains a story in which a senior and a junior monk set out on the road together. They travel, making unwholesome conversation (*gtam bzang po ma yin pa zer zhing*).³¹⁸ Since they are making unwholesome conversation, a *yakṣa* (*gnod sbyin*) who is not a follower of the Buddha (literally one who has no faith: *ma dad pa*) plans to steal their vitality (*'di dag gi mdangs dbrog pa*).³¹⁹ He is joined by another *yakṣa*, who is a follower of the Buddha (literally one who has faith: *dad pa can*).³²⁰ When the two monks split up, the senior monk goes for water. The first *yakṣa* follows him and plans to steal his vitality as soon as he is alone by the water.³²¹

^{318.} sTog *'dul ba* ta 296a7. Schopen's otherwise unpublished translation of this passage appears in DeCaroli 2004, 124.

^{319.} sTog *'dul ba* ta 296a7–b2. See also Schopen's translation in DeCaroli 2004, 124.

^{320.} sTog *'dul ba* ta 296b2–5. See also Schopen's translation in DeCaroli 2004, 124.

^{321.} sTog *'dul ba* ta 297a2.

The second *yakṣa* convinces the first *yakṣa* to leave the monks alone.³²² The second *yakṣa* then complains to the Buddha.³²³ The Buddha then tells the monks:

Monks, I have heard from a *yakṣa* that while monks were going along on the road talking about the repulsive, unbelieving *yakṣas* were trying to get at them and looking for a chance.³²⁴

The Buddha then establishes the following rules of customary behaviour for monks on the road:

Therefore, I now prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who has set out on the road. A monk who has set out on the road must travel having set out on the road in two ways: [either] speaking of *dharma*, [or] practicing noble silence.³²⁵ At a resting place a verse of the Sage must be recited. When taking

³²². sTog 'dul ba ta 297a2–4. See also the summary in DeCaroli 2004, 124.

³²³. Part of this *yakṣa*'s conversation is translated by Schopen and presented in DeCaroli 2004, 125. DeCaroli summarizes what Schopen has not provided in translation (2004, 125).

³²⁴. Schopen's translation as presented in DeCaroli 2004, 125.

³²⁵. The *Vinayasūtra* reads: “*dharmyayā vā kathayādhvani gacched āryeṇa vā tūṣṇīmbhāvena*” (SGSMT, 103 [*Cīvaravastu: sūtra* 235]). For Tib., see sde dge 'dul ba

water, a verse must be recited for him to whom it belongs and for its deva.³²⁶

Where a resting place is prepared, there the *Tridaṇḍaka* must be recited.³²⁷ A monk who has set out on the road, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.

*de lta bas na ngas dge slong lam du 'jug pa'i kun tu spyod pa'i chos dag bca' bar
bya ste / lam du 'jugs³²⁸ pa'i dge slong gis chos kyi gtam dang / 'phags pa'i mi*

wu 70b7–71a1. DeCaroli presents another example from the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the Buddha telling monks to proceed with either talk of *Dharma* or in noble silence in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Again the example comes from an otherwise unpublished (at least to my knowledge) translation by Schopen. In this case, monks were “talking of repulsive things” while sweeping the monastery. The Buddha declares that: “The sweeping must be done with considered talk conforming to the Dharma or with the silence of the Noble One!” (DeCaroli 2004, 125–126).

³²⁶. These two sentences are Schopen’s translation ([1998] 2004a, 265).

³²⁷. This instruction is summarized in the *Vinayasūtra*: “*vāsasya tridaṇḍakam*” (SGSMT, 103 [*Cīvaravastu: sūtra* 240]). For Tib., see sde dge 'dul ba wu 70a2. Whether or not the *Tridaṇḍaka* here, or mentioned elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, refers to a specific scripture remains unclear. For a brief summary of recent scholarship on the *Tridaṇḍaka*, see Yao 2019–2020, 3n4.

³²⁸. Derge reads *jug* (sde dge 'dul ba tha 198a7).

*smra ba dang / rnam pa gnyis kyis lam du zhugs nas 'gro bar bya'o*³²⁹ // *ngal bso*
ba'i gnas kyis phyogs su gtsug lag gi tshigs su bcad pa gdon par bya'o // *chu chu*
*ba na de gang*³³⁰ *gi yin pa dang / de'i lha la tshigs su bcad pa gdon par bya'o* //
gang du gnas 'cha' ba der rgyud chags gsum pa gdon par bya'o // *lam du zhugs*
pa'i dge slong gis kun tu spyod pa'i chos ji ltar bcas pa dag yang dag par blangs
*te '[j]ug*³³¹ *par mi byed na / 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro* // ³³²

This passage clarifies the decorum of monks who are travelling. When not performing recitations associated with specific actions, a travelling monk must speak of *dharma* or remain silent.³³³

This passage also states that monks must recite verses for the owner of a water source when drawing water. Schopen understands this rule as “an extension of the final recitative obligations found in the daily schedule on the road: whether in the *vihāra* or

³²⁹. Derge reads 'gro'o for 'gro bar bya'o (sde dge 'dul ba tha 198b1).

³³⁰. Derge reads 'chu chu ba na chu de gang (sde dge 'dul ba tha 198b1).

³³¹. sTog reads 'dug (sTog 'dul ba ta 298a5). Derge reads 'jug (sde dge 'dul ba tha 198b2).

³³². sTog 'dul ba ta 298a2–5. Except for some minor differences noted above, Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba tha 198a7–b2).

³³³. Actually the silence of the Noble(s) (*'phags pa'i mi smra ba*): possibly a reference to the noble silence of the Buddha. Again, for another example of this phrase's appearance in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, see DeCaroli 2004, 125–126.

traveling, the monk must recite verses for those who provide for his needs.”³³⁴ In the story, a *yakṣa* attacks the more senior monk only when the more senior of the two monks is alone by the water. Schopen elsewhere describes the protective effects of reciting verses in two examples from the *Kṣudrakavastu* in which such verses protect travelling monks from “fierce nonhumans and *yakṣas*.”³³⁵ The rules of customary behaviour for travelling monks likely serve three purposes. First, they protect travelling monks. Second, they formalize procedures on the road. Third, they reaffirm normative monastic behaviour while travelling.

In addition to supernatural perils such as angry *yakṣas* described in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, monks and nuns in India were subject to the more mundane pitfalls of travel. Schopen notes that more than 20 pages of the *Vinayavibhaṅga* deal with tolls that monks had to pay while travelling.³³⁶ This extensive discussion of what appear to be import taxes is found in the section of the *Vinayavibhaṅga* dealing with the second *pārājika* rule, the rule that makes theft an offence.³³⁷ Many passages from this section of

³³⁴. Schopen [1998] 2004a, 266. This rule is also mentioned in Schopen [2002] 2014, 215.

³³⁵. Schopen [2004] 2014, 341–342.

³³⁶. Schopen [2001] 2004a, 160n8.

³³⁷. In the *Theravāda-vinaya*, evasion of import taxes is dealt with in the narrative that introduces *pācittiya* 66—the rule against travelling “together with a caravan (set on) theft” (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 3: 16). The context from the *Theravāda-vinaya* might also make sense for the episode from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* I discuss here

the *Vinayavibhaṅga* feature prominently in Ulrich Pagel’s monograph *Buddhist Monks in Tax Disputes*.³³⁸ But one narrative from this section of the *Vinayavibhaṅga* not discussed in Pagel’s otherwise useful survey contains rules of customary behaviour for a monk who has set out on the road. In the episode in question, a monk and a caravan leader are travelling together on the way to Śrāvastī. The caravan leader tries to convince the monk to avoid the import taxes on a large cotton cloth (*ras yug chen*) that the monk received as a donation in Rājagrha. When the monk refuses to do so, the caravan leader hides the cloth in his own baggage (*snod*) while the monk is away collecting alms.³³⁹ The monk declares to the customs officer (*sho gam pa*), “Good man, I have a large cotton cloth.”³⁴⁰ The customs officer asks to see it. The monk looks into his bag (*gtur bu*), sees that the cloth is missing, and says that it was stolen by thieves.³⁴¹ The customs officer replies, “Noble One, although it was not stolen from you, in this way it was stolen from me because I cannot collect the tax!”³⁴²

since the monk is travelling with a caravan leader who encourages him to avoid paying import taxes.

³³⁸. Pagel 2014. See also Pagel 2017.

³³⁹. sTog ’dul ba ca 110a2–3.

³⁴⁰. sTog ’dul ba ca 110a4.

³⁴¹. sTog ’dul ba ca 110a6.

³⁴². sTog ’dul ba ca 110a6–7: *’phags pa de ni khyod kyi ma brkus kyi / ’di ltar bdag gi brkus pa lags te / des bdag gis sho gam ma thob bo //*.

Later, the caravan leader admits to the monk that he took the cloth in order to avoid the tax. The monk, thinking he has committed an offence, becomes upset. When the monk arrives in Śrāvastī, other monks report the situation to the Buddha. The Buddha states that the monk has not committed an offence and then establishes the following rule of customary behaviour for monks on the road:

However, I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who has set out on the road. A monk who has set out on the road, entering into a village for alms, must go (for alms) having placed a mark on the baggage (*snod*). Having returned again, he must inspect it. A monk who has set out on the road, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.

*'on kyang ngas dge slong lam du zhugs pa'i kun tu spyad pa'i chos dag bca' bar
bya ste / dge slong lam du zhugs pa grong du bsod snyoms la 'jug pas / snod la
mtshan ma btab ste 'gro bar bya zhing / phyir 'ongs nas kyang so sor brtag par
bya'o // dge slong lam du zhugs pas kun tu spyad pa'i chos [ji] ltar bcas pa dag
yang dag par blangs te 'jug par mi byed na / 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro //*³⁴³

It is unclear in the above passage what exactly is to be inspected when a travelling monk

³⁴³. sTog *'dul ba ca* 110b7–111a2. Derge matches sTog (sde dge *'dul ba ca* 79b2–3).

returns after his alms-round, whether the mark on his bag or its contents. In either case, the implication is that a travelling monk must store and mark his possessions when they are not with him. He must inspect them after he has been separated from them for any length of time.

A modern traveller can easily see oneself in this story from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, as this rule seems like wise travel advice even today. In contemporary airports, for example, we are constantly reminded not to leave our luggage unattended. When checking in a bag with an airline, one clearly marks it with a luggage tag first. And, one should probably inspect it carefully before going through customs.

Elsewhere, the *Vinayavibhaṅga* preserves a story about a father and son who undertake the *pravrajyā* ceremony together, going forth as novices. This story is found in the *Vinayavibhaṅga*'s discussion of *pārājika* three, the rule against murder. While the father and son are travelling together, the son pushes the father and the father dies.³⁴⁴ Arriving at the Jetavana, he sobs and tells the monks he has killed the old man.³⁴⁵ The Buddha rules that the son has not committed an offence, and thus has not violated the

^{344.} The old man fell face first towards the ground, and when his face connected with the ground, he died (*rgan zhugs de sa la kha bub tu sgyel nas / de'i kha phang los glogs pa'i sas gang ste dus la bab bo* [sTog 'dul ba ca 228b2–3]). This episode seems similar to a case from the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* discussed in Clarke 2014a, 71.

^{345.} sTog 'dul ba ca 228b3–6.

third *pārājika* rule.³⁴⁶ The Buddha then establishes the following rule of customary behaviour for a monk who has set out on the road:

I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who has set out on the road. A monk who has set out on the road must restore a monk who has become fatigued (by his travels) on the road. He must take [his] three robes, begging-bowl, water-strainer, bag for the begging-bowl and his other baggage (*bar bur snod kyi rdzas*).³⁴⁷ He must know the time, and if he (the fatigued monk) is able to travel, then it is good. If he (the fatigued monk) is unable to travel, then, going on ahead, he must wash the begging-bowl[s]. He must arrange his robe. Having made the containers properly received, he must examine [the food]. If he (the fatigued monk) cannot come, then taking the food, he (the monk who has set out on the road) should go to meet [the fatigued monk]. If it is not the correct time (for a meal), he should go to meet [the fatigued monk] with drinks. A monk who has set out on the road, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.

³⁴⁶. sTog 'dul ba ca 229a1–2.

³⁴⁷. “*bar bur snod dag*” is defined in the *Vinayavibhaṅga-pada-vyākhyāna* as “*rdzas du ma'i snod dag go*” (sde dge 'dul ba tshu 46a3). Maybe this means something along the lines of general baggage.

*ngas dge slong lam du zhugs pa'i kun tu spyod pa'i chos dag bca' bar bya ste /
dge slong lam du zhugs pas dge slong lam gyis dub pa ngal sor gzhug par bya /
chos gos gsum dang / lhung bzed dang / chu tshags dang / lhung bzed kyi snod
dang / bar bur snod kyi rdzas blang bar bya'o // dus shes par bya ste / gal te 'gro
nus na de lta na legs / gal te 'gro mi nus na ches sngar song ste / lhung bzed bkru
bar bya / go[s] gzhag par bya /³⁴⁸ snod dag byin len byed du bcug nas so sor brtag
par bya'o // gal te³⁴⁹ 'ong mi nus na zas³⁵⁰ mnos te bsu bar bya'o // dus ma yin na
skom gyis bsu bar bya'o // dge slong lam du zhugs pas kun tu spyod pa'i chos ji
ltar bcas pa dag yang dag par blangs te 'jug par mi byed na 'gal tshabs can du
'gyur ro // ³⁵¹*

Monks who travel need to look out for each other. Tired monks should be helped along by their fellow monastic travelers. Moreover, if a monk notices another monk becoming exhausted, he is required to tend to that monk's needs while the fatigued monk rests.

The *Muktaka* in the *Uttaragrantha* contains more information on etiquette or

^{348.} Both sTog and Derge read *go gzhag par bya* (sTog 'dul ba ca 229a4 and sde dge 'dul ba ca 160a4). But *gos gzhag par bya* is found in the lha sa edition (lha sa 'dul ba ca 224b6).

^{349.} Derge reads *'on te* rather than *gal te* (sde dge 'dul ba ca 160a4).

^{350.} Derge reads *zan* rather than *zas* (sde dge 'dul ba ca 160a5).

^{351.} sTog 'dul ba ca 229a2–6. Derge mostly matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba ca 160a3–5).

manners for travelling monastics. In one such narrative, monks went to a *vihāra* carrying a pot (presumably a wash-pot). One monk trips while prostrating with the pot, and another collides with the head of a householder.³⁵² Word gets back to the Buddha, who then introduces the following rules of customary behaviour for monks who are travelling:

I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who has set out on the road. When a monk who has set out on the road sees water, having beaten his bowl and robes (to remove the dirt and dust), he must set them to one side. Then, having also shaken out his robes, he must wash. Then, having washed his feet and hands, having collected water with the water-strainer, he should wipe his sandals with a damp cloth. After that, having cleaned his hands, correctly putting on his upper and lower garments, he must go to the *vihāra* in a manner in conformity with calm deportment (*spyod lam*).³⁵³ If he does otherwise, he becomes guilty of an offence.

ngas dge slong lam du 'jug pa'i mtshungs par spyad pa'i chos bca'o // dge slong lam du 'jug pas chu mthong na / lhung bzed dang chos gos phog ste phyogs gcig

³⁵² sTog 'dul ba na 268a6–7: *Muktaka* 3.7.

³⁵³ Negi tells us that *spyod lam* is the Tibetan translation of Skt. *īryāpathāḥ* (1993–2005, 8: 3433, s.v. “*spyod lam*”). For more on this term, see its unusually long definition in Edgerton [1953] 1985, 116–117, s.v. “*īryāpatha*.”

*tu zhog la / de nas gos dag kyang sprugs te khrus byos la / de nas rkang pa dang
lag pa khrus la / chu yang chu tshags kyis tshogs te rad³⁵⁴ gsher bas lham phyis la
/ de'i 'og tu lag pa bsnyal nas / bla 'og gi bgo ba legs par gyon la / spyod lam zhi
bzhin du gtsug lag khang du 'gro bar bya'o // de las gzhan du na 'das pa dang
bcas par 'gyur ro // ³⁵⁵*

This rule indicates the required procedures a travelling monk must follow in order to clean himself up before arriving at a *vihāra*.³⁵⁶ The narrative is comedic.³⁵⁷ The audience

^{354.} Both sTog and Derge read *rad* (sTog 'dul ba na 268b2 and sde dge 'dul ba pa 185b7).

But *ras* is found in the lha sa edition (lha sa 'dul ba pa 270a5). Presumably *rad* is a variant spelling for *ras*.

^{355.} sTog 'dul ba na 268a7–b3 (*Muktaka* 3.7). Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba pa 185b6–7). This passage is also found in the *Vinayasūtra-ṭīkā* (sde dge 'dul ba yu 191b2–4). It may also be helpful to note that in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, monks who are travelling are excused from *pācittiya* 57, the rule against excessive bathing (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 2: 403).

^{356.} In his extremely helpful outline of the contents of the *Muktaka*, Kishino refers to this episode as “The regulation regarding travelling monks’ manners when entering the *vihāra*” (2016, 248).

^{357.} As Clarke points out, “it is with a dash of humour that some Indian Buddhists seem to have chosen to transmit their monastic law codes” (2009, 328). On the use of humour in

is left picturing Buddhist monks arriving in a new monastery with their washing-water and tripping and falling all over the place. Allowing monks to wash up before arriving at a *vihāra* takes some of the pressure off the visiting monks, giving them one less thing to do when they arrive. This procedure also ensures that monks arrive looking presentable. In the next section, I explore the rules of customary behaviour for visiting monks who arrive at a *vihāra*.

Section 3.4 — Visiting Monks

The third section of the *Mātrkā* in the *Uttaragrantha* contains an explanation of the obligations incumbent upon local monks to ensure that travelling monks receive appropriate hospitality when they arrive at a *vihāra*.³⁵⁸ The *Mātrkā* states that local monks must welcome a weary guest in accordance with the prescribed rules of customary behaviour.³⁵⁹ When they see a visiting monk with whom they are familiar, the local monks must relieve his fatigue. But if the monk is a stranger, they must first ask who his

Indian Buddhist monastic law codes, see also Schopen and Yao (Schopen [2007] 2014, and Yao 2019–2020).

³⁵⁸. sTog 'dul ba na 448a6–b5.

³⁵⁹. sTog 'dul ba na 448b1–2: *gzhin gnas pa'i dge slong dag gis / dge slong glo bur du lhags par mthong na / de ste ngo shes na ngal bso bar bya / ji ltar mtshungs par spyod pa'i chos bcas pa bzhin du mtshungs par spyad par bya /*.

associates are and what his character is like.³⁶⁰ A visitor must not be allowed to access areas of the *vihāra* used for storing goods belonging to the *saṃgha* on his own (*gcig pu la*).³⁶¹

This logic seems straightforward. If the local monks are familiar with a visiting monk, perhaps a repeat visitor, they need not adhere to the same etiquette as if the visitor were a stranger. Moreover, a travelling stranger being hosted for a rest should not be permitted in sensitive areas where goods are stored. Nor should visitors sneak about in unfamiliar monasteries.

Rules of customary behaviour prescribed elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* make it clear that a visiting monk must immediately familiarize himself with the rules and protocols of the monastery in which he is staying. In the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, the monk Upasena violates a local monastic ordinance against going to see the Buddha during the rain retreat.³⁶² The Buddha declares:

^{360.} sTog 'dul ba na 448b2–3: *de st ngo mi shes na bab bab tu ngal bso bar mi bya / dge slong dag la'ang tshe dang ldan pa 'di su'i lhan cig spyod pa yin / 'di'i spyod pa ji lta bu zhes dri bar bya'o //*. A similar procedure is found in the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* (Karashima 2012, 2: §31.1 [241]).

^{361.} sTog 'dul ba na 448b4–5: *de gcig pu la gtsug lag khang gtad par mi bya / dge 'dun gyi mdzod dang / bang ba dang / dge 'dun gyi mal la dbang du gzhus par mi bya /*.

^{362.} For a summary, discussion, and partial translation of this story, see Shōno 2017, 58–60. For the parallel account in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, see Horner [1938–1966] 2001–

O *Upasena, I will in this way establish rules for the proper behaviour of visiting monks: a visiting monk, having entered a monastery, should ask monks: “What kind of agreement (*khirms su bya ba*) is there in this residence (**āvāsa*)?” If (he) asks (them), that is good. If (he) does not ask (them), (he) becomes guilty of a violation.³⁶³

*nye sde 'di ltar ngas dge slong blo bur du lhags pa rnams kyi kun tu spyod pa 'i
chos dag bca' bar bya ste / dge slong glo bur du 'ongs pas gtsug lag khang du
zhugs nas / dge slong dag la gnas 'di na khirms su bya ba ji lta bu yod ces dri bar
bya'o // gal te 'dri na de lta na legs / gal te mi 'dri na 'gal tshabs can 'gyur ro //*

³⁶⁴

This rule, requiring a visiting monk to ask about the local rules when he arrives at a *vihāra*, means that a visiting monk cannot plead ignorance of local monastic ordinances.³⁶⁵ The authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* make it abundantly

2012, 2: 83–87.

^{363.} This translation is from Shōno 2017, 59. Note that this rule for visiting monks is absent in the Theravādin account (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 2: 83–87).

^{364.} sTog *'dul ba* cha 13a2–4.

^{365.} Shōno points out that this rule does not apply to forest monks or monks on alms-rounds (2017, 59n34).

clear that a visiting monk must learn the local rules as soon as possible upon his arrival.

A story from the *Kṣudrakavastu* sheds even further light on the rules of customary behaviour for a visiting monk. After the Buddha tells the monks not to rest at a *vihāra* without knowing the (local) rules for monks (*dge slong rnams dge slong gi tshul khrims ma rig par ngal bso bar mi bya'o*),³⁶⁶ monks travel to prostrate to a *stūpa*. Afterward they rest in the courtyard, the gatehouse, the stairs, the courtyard of the gatehouse, and under trees since no one offered them hospitality, specifically a place to rest.³⁶⁷ A brahmin and householder without faith sees the visiting monks, and asks if they were driven out from the *vihāra*.³⁶⁸ They respond “No, we are just visitors.” The Buddha then establishes a new rule of customary behaviour for a visiting monk, which requires a visiting monk to salute the four most senior monks and remain in their presence.³⁶⁹

^{366.} sTog 'dul ba tha 334b7–335a1.

^{367.} sTog 'dul ba tha 335a1–3: *yul so so na gnas pa'i dge slong dag grong dang / grong khyer dang / yul 'khor dang / rgyal po'i pho brang 'khor de dang de dag nas / mchod rten la phyag byed du lhags pa de dag la gang gis kyang ngal ma bsos te / bskrad nas khyams dang / sgo khang dang / them skas dang / sgo khang gi khyams dang / shing drung dag tu de dag gnas pa dang /*

^{368.} sTog 'dul ba tha 335a3: *bram ze dang khyim bdag ma dad pa gcig gis mthong nas / 'phags pa khyed cag gtsug lag khang nas bskrad dam ci na 'di bzhin du 'dug /*

^{369.} sTog 'dul ba tha 335b1–3: *dge slong glo bur du 'ongs pa'i kun tu spyad pa'i chos ngas bca' bar bya ste / dge slong glo bur du 'ongs pas rgan pa bzhi la phyag byos la de'i*

Another story picks up where this one leaves off. A monk visits a *vihāra* where the local *saṃgha*'s four most senior monks are not present. The visitor then travels around looking for the four elders whom he is required to salute, starting with *Kauṇḍinya (*ko 'u di nya*) who he is told is now at the *Veṇuvana (*od ma 'i tshal na*).³⁷⁰ By the time he locates the fourth elder, *Daśabala-Kāśyapa (*stobs bcu 'od srung*), who welcomes him into his cell to rest, as did all of the other elders, a new day has dawned. The visiting monk replies “It is now daybreak. How can I rest when I must now go out for alms?” The visiting monk, presumably already tired from travelling, and then forced to travel more in search of the elders, gets no rest.³⁷¹ The Buddha then clarifies that visiting monks may salute whomever has seniority amongst the monks who *are* present at the *vihāra*.³⁷²

The rules of customary behaviour prescribed for visiting monks in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* seem designed to prevent monks from avoiding the local rules and from dodging responsibilities to local *saṃghas* while travelling. Narratives from the

mdun du 'dug par bya'o // de dag gis kyang de la gus par gyis la ngal sor gzhus par bya zhing / gnas khang dang mal stan gyi zhal ta bas kyang mal stan sbyin par bya'o //. Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba da 224b7–225a2).

³⁷⁰. sTog 'dul ba tha 335b4–5.

³⁷¹. sTog 'dul ba tha 335b4–336b2.

³⁷². sTog 'dul ba tha 336b3–4: *bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / dge slong dag gnas sa la 'dug go cog gi gnas brtan la ma gsungs mod kyi / 'on kyang gtsug lag khang na gnas pa de nyid kyi gnas brtan la phyag bya'o*.

Vinayavibhaṅga and the *Kṣudrakavastu* make it clear that a visitor must ask about the local rules as soon as he arrives and must salute the most senior (local) monks, essentially reporting in before resting.

In a set of passages from another monastic code, the *Theravāda-vinaya*, the Buddha prescribes the rules of conduct (*vattas*) to be followed by a visiting monk (*āgantuka*),³⁷³ a resident monk (*āvāsika*),³⁷⁴ and a monk who is departing from the *vihāra* (*gamika*).³⁷⁵ This cluster of passages is preserved in the *Cullavagga*, and so one might expect them to correspond to the prescribed rules of customary behaviour from the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. At present, I am not aware of a parallel *Mūlasarvāstivādin* cluster of passages outlining the prescribed rules of customary behaviour for monks in these three roles. Rather, the prescribed rules of conduct for monastic visitors, residents, or travellers are spread out in various places in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Once again, the structural differences in how behaviour rules

³⁷³. Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 292–295; Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 207.24–210.10.

³⁷⁴. Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 295–296; Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 210.21–211.9.

³⁷⁵. Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 296–297; Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 211.19–212.8. This case is followed by one that includes the rules of conduct for a monk in a refectory (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 299–301; Oldenberg [1879–1883] 1969–1995, 2: 213.11–215.4).

are preserved and presented in various extant *vinayas* requires further investigation.

In this section, I looked at the rules of customary behaviour for visiting monks as prescribed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. If the local monks are already familiar with a visitor, then the locals are required to relieve the visitor's exhaustion. However, if the visiting monk is a stranger, the local monks do a kind of background check, asking who his companions are and what his character is like. A visiting monk is required to learn the rules of the local *vihāra* immediately upon his arrival and he must report to whomever has seniority before resting. In the section that follows, I explore rules for a monk who lives in a setting less conventional than a local *vihāra*: the rules of customary behaviour prescribed for a monk who dwells in a cemetery.

Section 3.5 — A Monk Who Dwells in the Cemetery

The *Kṣudrakavastu* contains rules of customary behaviour for a monk who dwells in a cemetery (**śmāśanika*). These rules are introduced following a narrative in which the son of a perfume seller was reborn as a hungry ghost due to his obsessive attachment to a blanket.³⁷⁶ The monk Kālananda, a cemetery dweller, takes the discarded blanket.³⁷⁷ Then, much like the tiger who followed Upananda back to the Jetavana when Upananda took its leftovers,³⁷⁸ the ghost of the perfume seller's son follows Kālananda back to the Jetavana

³⁷⁶. For a complete translation of this narrative, see Schopen 2007, 87–90.

³⁷⁷. Schopen 2007, 88.

³⁷⁸. For my discussion of this story, see pages 85–89 above.

and “sat howling at the door.”³⁷⁹

The Buddha orders Kālananda to return the blanket and establishes protocols for obtaining, returning, and wearing shrouds from the cemetery.³⁸⁰ After monks “entered the vihāra and worshipped the stūpas”³⁸¹ while wearing robes made from funerary shrouds, the Buddha established rules of customary behaviour for a monk who is a cemetery dweller.³⁸²

Schopen produced a full translation of the story preceding these rules and the rules of customary behaviour assigned to this monk.³⁸³ The passage containing the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who dwells in a cemetery reads:

The Blessed One said, “I will designate the rules of customary behavior for a cemetery-dwelling monk: a cemetery-dwelling monk wearing a shroud must not

³⁷⁹ Schopen 2007, 88. Stories about animals, ghosts, etc., following a monk back to the gate of the Jetavana seems to be a trope used in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. In another example from the *Carmavastu*, the mother of a calf whose hide was obtained by Upananda follows him back to the gate of the Jetavana (Roach 2020, 204).

³⁸⁰ Schopen 2007, 88–89.

³⁸¹ Schopen 2007, 90.

³⁸² Schopen 2007, 90.

³⁸³ Schopen 2007, 87–90. Schopen also produced a partial translation of the rules of customary behaviour for a cemetery dwelling monk ([1995] 2004a, 92).

go to the monastery (*vihāra*). He must not venerate a stūpa or, if he does, he must stay a fathom (*vyāma*) away from it. He must not use a cell (*layana*). He must not sit on seats and bedding. He must not sit among the community. When brahmins and householders have come and assembled, he must not teach the dharma to them. He must not go to the houses of brahmins and householders. If he does he must stay at the door. If they say, ‘Come in Noble One!,’ he must say, ‘I am a cemetery-dwelling monk.’ However, if they say, ‘Noble One, if those like you who have taken up and entered into the ascetic practices (*dhūtaguṇa*) come into our house, have we not obtained what is well obtained?’, then he should go in, but he must not sit on a seat. If they say, ‘Noble One, sit on this seat!’ he should say, ‘I am a cemetery dwelling monk.’ However, if they say, ‘Noble One, if those like you who have taken up and entered into the ascetic practices use our seats and house, have we not obtained what is well obtained?’, then he should sit down there. In this there is no cause for remorse. But if a cemetery-dwelling monk who has taken up these rules of customary behaviour as they were designated were not to enter into them, he would come to be guilty of an offense.”³⁸⁴

*bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / ngas dge slong dur khrod pa'i kun tu spyod
pa'i chos bca' bar bya ste / dge slong dur khrod pas ro'i gos pa gos te gtsug lag
khang du 'gro bar mi bya / mchod rten la phyag 'tshal bar mi bya / de ste phyag*

³⁸⁴. This translation is from Schopen 2007, 90.

*byed na yang 'dom gang khor yug las nye bar 'gro bar mi bya / gnas khang la
 longs spyad par mi bya / gnas mal la yang 'dug par mi bya / dge 'dun gyi nang du
 'dug par mi bya / bram ze dang khyim bdag 'ong zhing lhags pa rnam la chos
 bstan par mi bya / bram ze dang khyim bdag gi khyim dag tu 'gro bar mi bya / gal
 te 'gro na yang sgor bsdad par bya'o // gal te 'phags pa nang du gshegs shes zer
 na / bdag ni dur khrod pa'o zhes smra bar bya'o // ji ste 'phags pa gal te khyod lta
 bu sbyangs pa'i yon tan yang dag par blangs te 'jug pa dag khyim gyi nang du
 byon na / bdag gis rnyed pa dag legs par rnyed ma lags sam zhes zer na nang du
 'gro bar bya zhing / stan la ni 'dug par mi bya'o // gal te 'phags pa gdan la
 bzhugs shig ces zer na / bdag ni dur khrod pa'o zhes brjod par bya'o // ji ste
 'phags pa gal te khyod lta bu sbyangs pa'i yon tan yang dag par blangs te 'dug pa
 dag stan dang khyim la yongs su longs spyod na / bdag gis rnyed pa dag legs par
 rnyed ma lags sam zhes zer na / der 'dug par bya ste / 'di la 'gyod par mi bya'o //
 dge slong dur khrod pas kun tu spyad pa'i chos ji ltar bcas pa bzhin yang dag par
 blangs te mi 'jug na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro // ³⁸⁵*

Schopen notes that these rules allow a cemetery-dwelling monk to enter into houses of the laity upon invitation and use a layperson's property provided that he discloses his identity at “each phase” of the interaction.³⁸⁶ He cites Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra*, which states

^{385.} sTog 'dul ba ta 334b1–335a1. Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba tha 224a3–b1).

^{386.} Schopen 2007, 92.

“beddings and seats of the *saṃgha* are not to be used” (*na sāmghikaṃ śayanāsanam paribhuñjīta*)³⁸⁷ as evidence that this “monk is absolutely forbidden to go to a *vihāra* or use anything that belongs to the monastic community.”³⁸⁸ Cemetery monks, as Schopen puts it, “are more welcome in lay houses than in monasteries.”³⁸⁹

Roach picks up Schopen’s discussion of this passage in her dissertation on ascetic practices in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. She points out that the lay people in the story “are not put off” by this monk’s status as a cemetery dweller and rather “[t]hey value all those who have taken up *dhūtaguṇa* practices for their merit and are eager to partake in it.”³⁹⁰ Both Schopen and Roach interpret this narrative as a situation in which the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* appear more conservative about the level of access that cemetery monks ought to be granted in *vihāras* than in the homes of lay donors.

The monk who lives in a cemetery is far from the only monk whose rules of customary behaviour prevent him from certain levels of access in a *vihāra* or from the use of property belonging to the *saṃgha*. It is possible that the authors/redactors were not passing judgement on ascetic practices at all here, but rather were dealing with a more immediate and practical matter in this narrative.

³⁸⁷. Skt. from Schopen 2007, 102n50.

³⁸⁸. Schopen 2007, 92.

³⁸⁹. Schopen 2007, 92.

³⁹⁰. Roach 2020, 189.

The issue at hand in this story about a monk who lives in a cemetery from the *Kṣudrakavastu* might be related to smell rather than to purity. In the chapter that follows, I discuss a number of monks who are temporarily barred from certain places in the monastic community because of bad odours related to illness or medicines. After these monks heal and clean themselves or their robes up, they are permitted to rejoin the community without restrictions as long as they no longer stink. The monk who dwells in a cemetery could possibly clean himself up and rejoin the community as a normal monk if he washed or removed his robes.³⁹¹ Far from excluding “any monk who engages in such practices from any meaningful place in normal monastic life,”³⁹² rules of customary behaviour may actually accommodate cemetery-dwelling monks. These rules offer the cemetery dweller protocols to follow should he find himself invited into the home of a householder, allowing both himself and the householder to continue to participate in one of the main religious activities in Buddhism: the offering and acceptance of alms.

Section 3.6 — Chapter Conclusions

In this chapter, I explored rules of customary behaviour for monks staying in non-normative environments. I began with rules for forest monks. The rules of customary

³⁹¹. I admit this is conjecture. It is based on my understanding of how smell operates in related rules of customary behaviour. Almost of the statuses for which monks are assigned rules of customary behaviour, moreover, seem to be temporary.

³⁹². Schopen [1995] 2004a, 92–93.

behaviour for forest monks demonstrate the unique skillset required in the wilderness. Monks who are travelling, who are visitors to a *vihāra*, or who have been living in a cemetery must follow their prescribed rules of customary behaviour in order to continue to participate in their communities. Ultimately, the rules included in this chapter make allowances for monastics who live in various settings. They indicate the correct protocols whereby these monks may navigate potentially awkward or even dangerous social situations. The rules of customary behaviour in this *vinaya* standardize monastic practice across a variety of geographic or social situations.

Some of the stories discussed in this chapter mention illness in the monastic community. In the next chapter, I focus on rules of customary behaviour that are specifically prescribed when Buddhist monastics are confronted by illness.

Chapter Four: Rules of Customary Behaviour Regarding Illnesses and Medicines

Section 4.1 — Introduction

Much ink has been spilled regarding the role that Buddhist monastic communities have played in the history of Indian medicine.³⁹³ Evidence of non-magical treatments of illness in Indian Buddhist monastic communities has consisted mostly of references to Aśokan inscriptions, textual references to something which might refer to a monastic infirmary or “sick house,”³⁹⁴ and readings of stories related to the Medicine Buddha and the famous, somewhat magical, physician Jīvaka.³⁹⁵

In this chapter, I approach the issues of illnesses and medicines in Indian Buddhist monastic communities from a slightly different angle than previous scholarship has on these topics. Using some of the rules of customary behaviour and associated narratives extant in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* as case studies, I discern certain Mūlasarvāstivādin “orders of operations” or “best practices” for dealing with illness in their monastic communities. Uncovering the protocols embedded in their legal literature for navigating illness in the *saṅgha* provides a window into the everyday concerns of some Indian Buddhist monastic authors/redactors regarding health and healing.

³⁹³. For one well-known example, see Zysk 1991.

³⁹⁴. Chakravarti and Ray 2011, 16.

³⁹⁵. See, most recently, Schopen 2017a and 2017b.

For example, the *Kṣudrakavastu* contains a story in which a physician tells a brahmin with an ill son to “go to the Noble Ones and ask for water from their bowls, bathe him with that and he will be cured!”³⁹⁶ The brahmin goes to Upananda and requests water from his bowl. Upananda offers him water in which “bits of meat and fish bones and crumbs of boiled rice and flour and greens and baked bread were floating.”³⁹⁷ The layman becomes angry and the Buddha makes a proclamation that, “a monk must not push to the side the scraps in his bowl!”³⁹⁸ The Buddha then goes on to introduce the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who distributes the water from the bowls (*dge slong lhung bzed kyi chu sbyin par byed pa*). Schopen translates these rules of customary behaviour, laid down by the Buddha in the narrative, as follows:

But I also will designate the obligatory rules of behavior for the-monk-who-distributes-the-water-from-the-bowls: The-monk-who-distributes-the-water-from-the-bowls must wash the bowls three times, and after he has recited a Verse of the Sage over the water from the bowls, he should distribute it. If the-monk-who-distributes-the-water-from-the-bowls proceeds without adopting the obligatory rules of behavior as designated, he comes to be guilty of an offense.³⁹⁹

³⁹⁶. Translation from Schopen [2013] 2014, 133.

³⁹⁷. Translation from Schopen [2013] 2014, 133.

³⁹⁸. Translation from Schopen [2013] 2014, 133.

³⁹⁹. Translation from Schopen [2013] 2014, 133–134.

*'on kyang ngas dge slong gis lhung bzed kyi sbyin par byed pa'i kun tu spyod pa'i
chos bca' bar bya ste / dge slong lhung bzed kyi chu sbyin par byed pas lhung
bzed lan gsum bkrus te / lhung bzed kyi chu la gtsug lag gi tshigs su bcad pas
mngon par bsngags nas sbyin par bya'o // dge slong lhung bzed kyi chu sbyin par
byed pas kun tu spyod pa'i chos ji ltar bcas pa bzhin yang dag par bslangs te mi
'jug na 'gal tshabs cad du 'gyur ro //*⁴⁰⁰

Schopen makes two points regarding the above passage. The first is that this passage is “yet another example in this *Vinaya* of a Buddhist monastic practice that has been carefully crafted to accommodate core brahmanical values.”⁴⁰¹ Here, Schopen refers to the act of cleaning the bowl three times before offering water so as not to offend brahmanical sensibilities regarding the impurity of leftover food.

Schopen also tells us that because the practice of offering water from a begging-bowl is introduced with the formula “I also will designate the obligatory rules of behavior for the monk who ...”⁴⁰² that “the distribution of the curative water used to wash the monks’ bowls was, apparently, considered important enough to be made into a monastic office or official duty to which a monk had to be specifically assigned.”⁴⁰³

^{400.} sTog *'dul ba* ta 338b3–5. Derge matches sTog (sde dge *'dul ba* tha 227a1–3).

^{401.} Schopen [2006] 2014, 134.

^{402.} Schopen [2006] 2014, 134.

^{403.} Schopen [2006] 2014, 134.

In other works, Schopen translates the Sanskrit term *āsamudācārika-dharmas* as rules of customary behavior, the same translation that I favour in this dissertation.⁴⁰⁴ Here, Schopen uses the translation “obligatory rules of behavior.” Regardless of this minor translation choice, Schopen takes the Buddha’s prescription of rules of customary behaviour for this monk as evidence that a formal monastic office or duty associated with distributing water from begging-bowls existed according to the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Although many rules of customary behaviour seem to be assigned to formal monastic offices, I am not sure that a monk who distributes water from the begging-bowls was a formal position in the *saṃgha*, nor am I convinced that the distribution of water was necessarily a formal duty.⁴⁰⁵ In the narrative attached to the rules about the distribution of water from a begging-bowl, Upananda alone is asked for water from his bowl and Upananda alone gives water to the Brahmin who had requested it. Upananda is not appointed by way of a twofold procedure to this position, nor does the text specify that he must possess specific qualities in order to fulfill this role. The authors/redactors of

⁴⁰⁴. For other translations of this term, refer to note 7 provided in *Chapter One* on page 2.

⁴⁰⁵. The significance of a monk’s alms-water even makes an appearance in contemporary Indian cinema. In Santoosh Sivan’s film *Aśoka*, Buddhist monks run through the battlefield in the aftermath of Aśoka’s brutal conquest of Kaliṅga. The monks pour water from their begging-bowls over the dead or injured left behind after the battle ([2001] 2004, 2:36.26).

the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* probably present the Buddha here as providing guidelines for how to act if a layperson asks for water from their begging-bowl. As Schopen argues with his first point, this is very likely done in an effort not to offend brahmins. Other examples tied to medicine included in this chapter, such as a monk who eats garlic and a monk who is afflicted by leprosy (*kuṣṭharoga*), make it clear that the introduction of rules of customary behaviour by the Buddha does not necessarily signal the creation of a new monastic office or duty.

I separate this chapter into five thematic sections, based on separate issues related to illness. In Section 4.2, I discuss the obligations of co-residential pupils towards their preceptor or teachers. When the teacher falls ill, students must care for their teacher (and vice versa). These texts go into some detail regarding how this should be done. In Section 4.3, moving towards administrative concerns, I introduce rules of customary behaviour required for the storage of certain types of medicines found in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*. In Section 4.4, I provide an overview of the rules of customary behaviour for accommodating ill monastics related to religious ceremonies such as the *Poṣadha* and the *Pravāraṇā*. In Section 4.5, shifting my focus to rules of customary behaviour for monks who are themselves ill, I discuss two exemptions made for sick monks in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: in one, a monk is allowed to eat garlic; in the other a monk is permitted to smear his body with perfume. I use the rules of customary behaviour attributed to these monks to demonstrate how some medical treatments negatively affect a monk's ecclesiastical status, resulting in a sort of semi-quarantine from the community. The rules of customary behaviour in both of these examples are first introduced by

narratives in which a Buddhist monk consults a lay-physician.⁴⁰⁶ These narratives provide evidence for the attitudes and assumptions of the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* towards consultation with physicians by monastics.

Finally, in Section 4.6, I discuss the rules of customary behaviour prescribed for a monk afflicted by leprosy. Rules of customary behaviour for this monk are recorded in the *Cīvaravastu*. Like a monk who has consumed garlic and a monk who has applied perfume, a monk suffering from leprosy ought to sequester himself from the rest of the monastic community. The narrative framing for these rules of customary behaviour indicates that illness and impurity were intimately connected with foul odours in the imagination of Indian Buddhist monastic authors/redactors.

I conclude this chapter with a summary of the orders of operations for dealing with illness in the *saṃgha* discussed throughout the chapter. I argue that the introductions of rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* surveyed in this chapter do not signal the creation of new monastic offices. Rather, I demonstrate that they explain how monks should navigate temporary complications that arise in times of illness.

⁴⁰⁶ This is not unique to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Paul Demiéville already noted in 1937 that, “The treatises of monastic discipline show us the clergy consulting secular physicians frequently” (1937 [Tatz’s translation 1985], 36).

Section 4.2 — Begging on Behalf of Others

The authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* seemingly imagined themselves as operating in a community that looks after its own in times of illness.⁴⁰⁷ The welfare of Buddhist monastics depended heavily upon donations from the laity, at least in theory. It is therefore unsurprising that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* records a number of rules of customary behaviour related to the procurement of medicines and food for sick monastics. In particular, the authors/redactors supplied their audience with some guidelines for seeking alms on behalf of ill members of their community. Here, I discuss some protocols for begging on behalf of others contained in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Specifically, I discuss rules of customary behaviour for co-residential pupils and disciples (*sārdhaṃvihārins* and *antevāsins*; *lhan cig gnas pa dang nye gnas rnams*) towards their preceptor or teachers (*upādhyāya* and *ācāryas*; *mkhan po* and *slob dpons*).⁴⁰⁸

^{407.} Demiéville wrote: “The *Msv* T 1451:25:327c authorizes monks who are competent in medicine to administer sedatives, at least, to their confreres, in cases where those confreres are stricken with acute pain and no physician is at hand [sic] for emergency relief. This treatment should be effected in secret, without the knowledge of laics; the monk who publicly administered a medicament to another monks [sic] would render himself guilty of a misdeed” (1937 [Tatz’s translation 1985], 38).

^{408.} A student depends on his preceptor for instruction. If his preceptor leaves, loses his status as a Buddhist monk, or dies, the student can enter into a relationship of dependence

Rules of customary behaviour for co-residential pupils and disciples towards their preceptor or teacher are found in two locations in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: in the *Pravrajyāvastu* and in the *Kṣudrakavastu*.⁴⁰⁹ The passage from the *Pravrajyāvastu* makes it clear that a co-residential pupil or disciple must care for his preceptor or teachers when his preceptor or teachers are ill. In addition to a number of other tasks that a co-residential pupil or disciple should complete for his preceptor or teachers, the Buddha states:

When, for instance, a preceptor or instructor falls ill, monk apprentices and monk journeymen should think with great vigor, “Oh! We shall nurse the preceptor or

(*niśraya*) on a teacher. For a more detailed explanation of this dynamic, see Upasak’s definition of the Pāli word for *ācārya* (1975, 26–27, s.v. “Ācariya”).

⁴⁰⁹ sTog ’dul ba ka 98a3–b6 (*Pravrajyāvastu*) and tha 337a2–338a5 (*Kṣudrakavastu*).

Parallel rules are included as prescribed rules of conduct in the *Mahāvagga* and the *Cullavagga* in the *Theravāda-vinaya*. The authors/redactors of the *Theravāda-vinaya* treat the rules of conduct for a co-residential student towards a teacher as separate albeit virtually identical to those towards a preceptor. For the prescribed rules of conduct of a co-residential student towards a preceptor in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, see Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 4: 59–67 and 5: 311–317. For those towards a teacher, see Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 4: 79 and 5: 321 (prescribed rules of conduct abbreviated in Horner).

instructor or have another do so.” If they should exert themselves, then all is well.

A breach occurs if they should not exert themselves.⁴¹⁰

*'di lta ste / mkhan po dang slob dpon dag na par gyur na / de la dge slong lhan
cig gnas pa dang / nye gnas rnams kyis e ma 'o // bdag cag gis mkhan po dang
slob dpon dag gi nad g.yod bya 'o zhe'am / byed du gzhug go zhes brtson pa shas
chen po bsgrub par bya 'o // gal te brtson par byed na de lta na legs / gal te brtson
par mi byed na 'gal tshabs cad du 'gyur ro //*⁴¹¹

The above quotation is but part of a lengthy list of rules of customary behaviour for a co-residential pupil or disciple from the *Pravrajyāvastu*.⁴¹² These rules are not specific to the

^{410.} Translation from Miller 2018, 1.633. This passage is paraphrased in Banerjee: “If they (the upādhyāyas and the ācāryas) fall ill, the saddhivihārika as well as the antevāsika should say, ‘Oh, let us nurse them or take utmost care to get them nursed properly.’ If they take care, it is good. But if they do not, they commit an offence” (1957, 144).

^{411.} sTog *'dul ba ka* 98a1–3. Derge matches sTog (sde dge *'dul ba ka* 64b2–4).

^{412.} The full set of rules of customary behaviour for a co-residential student or disciple that are prescribed in the *Pravrajyāvastu* are summarized in eight *sūtras* in Guṇaprabha’s digest of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the *Vinayasūtra*. 1.630–.640 in Miller (2018) correspond to *sūtras* 70–77 in the *Vinayasūtra* and its *Vṛtti*. See *Vinayasūtra*’s Pravrajyāvastu Study Group 2007, 37.1–39.16. The passage on procuring medicines for

Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition.⁴¹³ In the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, they are introduced with the phrase “Monks, I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for co-residential pupils or disciples” (*dge slong dag ngas lhan cig gnas pa dang / nye gnas rnams kyi kun tu spyod pa'i chos dag bca' bar bya ste /*).⁴¹⁴ The list ends with the statement “As monk apprentices and monk journeymen treat preceptors and instructors, just so should preceptors and instructors treat monk apprentices and journeymen, except for the seeking of permission.”⁴¹⁵ Thus, the rule of customary behaviour requiring a co-residential pupil

an ill preceptor or teacher from the *Pravrajyāvastu* is summarized in *sūtra* 73. For Skt., see Vinayasūtra's Pravrajyāvastu Study Group 2007, 38.23–39.2 (*sūtra* 73). For Tib., see sde dge 'dul ba wu 9b7–10a1. There is a Japanese translation in the same article. The author of the *Vinayasūtra-vṛtti* unpacks this *sūtra* in some detail. But his commentary adds little to our understanding of the actual care for an ill teacher or preceptor in the monastic community. For the *Vinayasūtra-vṛtti*'s treatment of this *sūtra*, see the commentary beginning at sde dge 'dul ba lu 7b7.

⁴¹³. For parallels in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, see note 409 above.

⁴¹⁴. sTog 'dul ba ka 97a5–6.

⁴¹⁵. Translation from Miller 2018, 1.640. Note that instead of abbreviating these rules, the *Theravāda-vinaya* preserves, in full, complementary lists of duties that the preceptor and teacher owe to a co-residential student (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 4: 67–69 and 79–80 or 5: 317–321).

or disciple to look after an ill preceptor or instructor also requires the preceptor or instructor to look after his student in times of illness, if asked to do so.

When rules of customary behaviour for a co-residential pupil or disciple come up in the *Kṣudrakavastu*, more details are added regarding the care of an ill preceptor or teacher. The authors/redactors of the *Kṣudrakavastu* present the Buddha as explaining a series of protocols for procuring medicines for one's preceptor or teacher. The story from the *Kṣudrakavastu* begins:

The Buddha, the Blessed One, was staying in the Jetavana, in the pleasure park of Anāthapiṇḍada. Then, at night, the Venerable *Bhadrika (*ngag ldan*), having emerged from meditation, went to where the Blessed One was staying and, having arrived, he touched his head to the feet of the Blessed One, and sat to one side. Having sat to one side, the Venerable *Bhadrika spoke the following words to the Blessed One: “Reverend One, how should monks who are co-residential pupils and disciples act towards the preceptor or teacher?”

[The Blessed One replied,] “*Bhadrika, I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for monks who are co-residential pupils and disciples. Rising early in the morning, co-residential pupils and disciples should ask the preceptor and teacher: ‘Are you well?’ If the preceptor says ‘[I am] not well,’ having asked about his illness he should ask a doctor: ‘Good Sir, my preceptor has become sick with such symptoms; you must prescribe a medicine!’ He must do whatever [the

doctor] orders. If [the medicine] is obtained like that (from the doctor), then it is well. If it is not obtained, then he should beg for it amongst his relatives.

If there are many relatives, he asks ‘From which of the preceptor’s relatives should I beg for the medicine?’ He must beg from whom [the preceptor] instructs. If there are no relatives, it should be begged from which brahmin or householder [the preceptor] instructs. If even then he still cannot [acquire the medicine], then it should be begged from the infirmary (*sman khang*). If it is still not obtained even from there, he should look to his own action, and he should subsist (*gnas pa*) on only a little (*tsam la*) food, drink, and savories.”

*sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi
kun dga'ra ba na bzhugs so // de nas tshe dang ldan pa ngag ldan dgongs ka nang
du yang dag 'jog las langs nas / bcom ldan 'das gang na ba der song ste⁴¹⁶ phyin
nas / bcom ldan 'das kyi zhabs gnyis la mgo bos phyag 'tshal te / phyogs gcig tu
'dug go // phyogs gcig tu 'dug nas / bcom ldan 'das la / tshe dang ldan pa ngag
ldan gyis 'di skad ces gsol to // btsun pa dge slong lhan cig gnas pa dang nye gnas
rnams kyis / mkhan po dang slob dpon la ji ltar bsgrub par bgyi /*

*ngag ldan dge slong lhan cig gnas pa dang nye gnas rnams kyis kun tu
spyad pa'i chos ngas yang dag par bca'bar bya'o // dge slong lhan cig gnas pa
dang nye gnas rnams kyis nang par sngar langs te / mkhan po dang slob dpon la*

⁴¹⁶ Derge reads *gal der song ste* for *gang na ba der song ste* (sde dge 'dul ba da 225b5).

*khams mnyam mam zhes dri bar bya'o // gal te mkhan po khams mi mnyam mo
zhes zer na / de'i nad dris te sman pa la bzhin bzangs bdag gi mkhan po 'di 'dra
bar na bar gyur na / sman ston cig ces dris la / ji ltar bsgo ba de ltar bya'o // de
ltar 'byor na legs / gal te ma 'byor na de'i nye du dag la bslang bar bya'o //
gal te nye du mang por gyur na / des mkhan po'i nye du gang las sman
bslang bar bgyi zhes dri zhing gang la bstan pa de'i drung nas bslang bar bya'o //
nye du med na bram ze dang khyim bdag gang la bstan pa de las bslang bar bya'o
// gal te de lta bu yang med na sman khang nas bslang bar bya'o // gal te de nas
kyang ma rnyed na rang gi las la blta zhing bza'ba dang / btung ba dang / myang
ba tsam la gnas par bya'o //*⁴¹⁷

The authors of the above passage indicate the procedure through which a pupil must procure medicines for his preceptor.⁴¹⁸ If the student is required to procure medicines for his co-residential teacher, the first place he should look is amongst his teacher's relatives.

⁴¹⁷. sTog 'dul ba tha 336b5–337a7. Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba da 225b5–226a3).

⁴¹⁸. Demiéville already summarized parts of the above passage on the basis of the Chinese version of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: “The *Msv* T1451:32:382a enjoins disciples to deliver their master to a physician when he is ill, describing to him the circumstances of the illness and consulting him on the mode of treatment they are to procure and prepare by themselves” (1937 [Tatz's translation 1985], 36).

Only if there is no available relative to provide medicine for a co-residential teacher should a student beg for the ingredients amongst householders. And, only after these first two options fail should he look for medicines in the community's stores. Procuring medicines for his teacher through his own actions is a last resort.

The order of operations that emerges from the *Kṣudrakavastu* seems to imply that in times of illness, a sick monk's family ought to provide his medicine first, if possible. Only if the family cannot provide for the ill monk does it become the monastic community's responsibility to provide him with medicine.

Following the instruction to beg for medicines for an ill preceptor or teacher, the text from the *Kṣudrakavastu* goes on to explain how the student should prepare different medicines.⁴¹⁹ Collyrium is the only type of medicine mentioned that should be prepared by a physician and not prepared by the attendant monk himself.⁴²⁰

Collyrium requires additional care beyond that for ordinary medicines. Rules of customary behaviour recorded in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, the chapter of the *Vinayavastu* on medicines, explain the procedure for properly storing surplus collyrium. In the section that follows, I discuss these rules and other rules of customary behaviour related to the handling of surplus medicines.

⁴¹⁹. sTog 'dul ba tha 337a7–338a3.

⁴²⁰. sTog 'dul ba tha 337b2–3: gal te mig nad can zhig na / sman pas bsgo ba'i mig sman sbyar bar bya ste / mig sman sbyar nas sbyin par bya zhing de slar yang blang bar bya 'o.

Section 4.3 — Redistributing or Storing Surplus Medicines

The authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* record rules of customary behaviour for monks involved in the redistribution or storage of medicines. These rules apply to monks left with a surplus of medicine after they have healed. The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* contains rules of customary behaviour related to the redistribution and storage of three

different types of medicines: fat (*vasā*; *tshil*),⁴²¹ an astringent (*kaṣāya*; *bska ba*),⁴²² and

⁴²¹ In his dictionary of Pāli monastic terms, Upasak defines *vasā* as: “The animal fat, to be used as a medicine by the monks. The fat may be of bear, fish, porpoise (*susu*. *Suṣa* in Hindi), pig or of ass. It is laid down that the *vasā* should be prepared and used as medicine before noon after its acceptance. It should never be left to be prepared in the afternoon. If one prepared it and used it in the afternoon, he committed the offence of *Dukkaṭa* ...” (1975, 197, s.v. “*Vasā*” [I have elided a citation in this definition]). The authors/redactors of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* list crocodile fat instead of the fat of an ass (Yao 2021, 1.28).

⁴²² *Kaṣāya* in Skt. corresponds to the Pāli word *Kasāva*. Upasak defines “*kasāva-bhesajja*” (Skt. *kaṣāya-bhaiṣajya*) as: “An astringent prepared out of the bark of a tree or plant or creeper, like *Nimba*, *Kuṭaja*, *Paṭola*, *Paggava*, *Nattamāla* or any such plant or tree or creeper which is not used as food by the people. This is allowed by the Buddha for the monks. ... The monks can keep it for the whole life; but can use it only when sick. If they use it when they are not sick, the offence of *Dukkaṭa* is committed” (1975, 68, s.v. “*Kasāva-Bhesajja*” [I have elided a citation in this definition]).

The authors/redactors of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* list five kinds of astringents: “What are the five kinds of astringents? They are āmra astringent, nimba astringent, jambū astringent, śirīṣa astringent, and kośambaka astringent” (Yao 2021, 1.18).

collyrium (*añjana*; *mig sman*).⁴²³ The rules of customary behaviour related to storing and redistributing medicines are introduced in a set of three stories.

These three stories, all from the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, contain the same basic narrative pattern. A monk is afflicted by an illness. A physician then prescribes a medicine for that monk. That monk uses the medicine and is healed. He then throws out the excess medicine. Afterwards, another monk develops the same illness and asks for the left-over medicine only to discover the first monk threw it away. Then, the Buddha establishes rules of customary behaviour for properly storing and redistributing the medicine.

In the first such story, a monk is prescribed fat (*vasā*) on account of a wind illness.⁴²⁴ When another monk becomes ill with the same illness after the first monk has thrown away the remaining fat, the Buddha declares that “Monks should not throw away the remains of fat but should keep them.”⁴²⁵ The Buddha states:

I will now establish rules of customary behavior for a monk who keeps fat. A monk who keeps fat should give the remains of the fat to another monk. If the first monk does not give the remains to another monk, the first monk should put the remains in the infirmary. Anyone who needs fat should take it. If a monk who

⁴²³. Upasak defines *añjana* as: “Eye-ointment; such as *Kālañjana*, *Rasañjana*, *Sotañjana*, *Gerukaṃ*, *Kapallam*” (1975, 4, s.v. “*Āñjana*”).

⁴²⁴. Yao 2021, 1.24–36.

⁴²⁵. Translation from Yao 2021, 1.36.

keeps the remains of fat does not act in accordance with the established rules of customary behavior, he becomes guilty of an offense.⁴²⁶

*ngas dge slong tshil 'chang ba'i kun tu spyod pa'i chos bca' bar bya ste / tshil
'chang ba'i dge slong gis tshil spyad pa'i lhag ma dge slong gzhan la sbyin par
bya'o // gal te ma byin na sman khang du gzhag par bya ste / su 'dod pa des blang
bar bya'o // tshil 'chang ba'i dge slong gis kun tu spyod pa'i chos ji ltar bcas pa⁴²⁷
yang dag par blangs nas 'jug par mi byed na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro // ⁴²⁸*

This set of rules of customary behaviour stipulate the caveats required of a monk who keeps fat as medicine. The redistribution of his leftovers prescribed in the above passage does not require the creation of a formal administrative office. In fact, the rules for who may use the leftover fat (allowed as medicine) do not seem particularly strict. In a case

⁴²⁶ Translation from Yao 2021, 1.36.

⁴²⁷ Derge reads *bcas par* (sde dge 'dul ba ka 280a7).

⁴²⁸ sTog 'dul ba ka 399b5–7. Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba ka 280a6–7). The pagination is based on the Tibetan numbering that actually appears on this folio. At some stage, the pagination in volume ka gets thrown off. We might instead expect 400b for this page, as the Arabic numbering reads 800. Skt. available in Dutt [1942–1950] 1984, 3(1): vi.9–14. For the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 47: 92v7–9.

where fat is left over, it should first be given to a monk who asks for it. Otherwise, it should be stored in the infirmary for later. Whoever needs it may take it.

This episode is immediately followed by an almost identical one in which a monk with scabies is prescribed an astringent (*kaṣāya*).⁴²⁹ The same situation occurs. The monk tosses the excess astringent only to have another scabies-afflicted monk ask him for it later on. The Buddha then states:

I will now establish rules of customary behavior for a monk who keeps astringents. A monk who keeps astringents should give the remains of the astringent to another monk who needs them. If the first monk does not give the remains to another monk, he should put the remains of the astringent in the infirmary. If a monk who keeps astringents does not act in accordance with the established rules of customary behavior, he becomes guilty of an offense.⁴³⁰

*ngas bska ba 'chang ba'i dge slong gi kun tu spyod pa'i chos bca'bar bya ste /
bska ba 'chang ba'i dge slong gis bska ba spyad pa'i lhag ma dge slong su slong
ba de la sbyin bar bya'o // gal te ma byin na sman khang du gzhas bar bya'o //*

⁴²⁹. Yao 2021, 1.37–51.

⁴³⁰. Translation from Yao 2021, 1.51.

*bska ba bcang ba'i dge slong gis kun tu spyod pa'i chos ji ltar bcas pa yang dag
par blangs te 'jug par mi byed na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro //*⁴³¹

The only difference between the storage of an astringent and the storage of fat is that the authors/redactors state that whoever needs fat may take it from the infirmary. Here, the text is silent regarding the procurement of an astringent from the infirmary.

The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* contains much more complicated guidelines for the storage of leftover collyrium (Skt. *añjana*; Tib. literally eye-medicine [*mig sman*]). The Buddha establishes the rules of customary behaviour for the storage and redistribution of collyrium after a monk tosses out the excess once he has recovered from an illness of the eye.⁴³² The Sanskrit folio from Gilgit that preserves the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who keeps collyrium (*añjanadhāraka-bhikṣu*) is severely damaged.⁴³³ At the end of this third story from the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* related to the storage of medicines, the Buddha states:

⁴³¹. sTog 'dul ba ka 400b3–4. Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba ka 281a1–2). Skt. available in Dutt [1942–1950] 1984, 3(1): vii.15–viii.3. For the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 48: 93r4–6.

⁴³². Translation from Yao 2021, 1.52–.59.

⁴³³. Dutt reconstructs the Sanskrit passage ([1942–1950] 1984, 3[1]: ix.3–.9). For the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 48: 93r10–v2.

I will now establish rules of customary behavior for a monk who keeps collyrium. A monk who keeps collyrium should store the collyrium according to its kind.⁴³⁴ He should keep collyrium derived from flowers in a vessel, collyrium in a liquid state in a bottle, and collyrium in powder form in a tubular vessel. He should put collyrium in pill form and collyrium derived from red ocher into bags, and he should bind and hang them on a peg in the wall. If a monk who keeps collyrium does not act in accordance with the established rules of customary behavior, he becomes guilty of an offense.⁴³⁵

*ngas mig sman 'chang ba'i dge slong gi kun tu spyod pa'i chos bca' bar bya ste /
mig sman 'chang ba'i dge slong gis mig sman rnams so sor phye la gzhas par bya
ste / me tog gi mig sman ni snod kyi nang du'o // khu ba'i mig sman ni gab tse'i
nang du'o // phye ma'i mig sman ni dong bu'i nang du'o // ri lu'i mig sman dang
btsag g.yug snam gyi sman ni sgye'u 'am thum por skud pas bcings la zung nga la
gdags par bya'o // mig sman 'chang ba'i dge slong gis kun tu spyod pa'i chos ji*

⁴³⁴. Yao elsewhere provides the list of five *añjanas* in Skt. as: 1) *puṣpāñjana*; 2) *rasāñjana*; 3) *cūrṇāñjana*; 4) *guḍikāñjana*, and; 5) *sauvīrakāñjana* (2013, 14n4). She translates these as, “collyrium derived from flowers, collyrium in a liquid state, collyrium in powder form, collyrium in pill form, and collyrium derived from red ocher” (Yao 2021, 1.56).

⁴³⁵. Translation from Yao 2021, 1.59.

*ltar bcas pa bzhin yang dag par blangs nas 'jug par mi byed na 'gal tshabs can du
'gyur ro //*⁴³⁶

Unlike the rules of customary behaviour prescribed for one who keeps fat or astringents, this passage does not state that collyrium should be given to a monk who asks for it or collected from the infirmary by one who wants it. The authors/redactors instead describe in detail the appropriate means of storing collyrium of various types (such as that derived from flowers or red ocher) and states (viz., liquid, pill, powder). Ordinary or common medicines may simply be redistributed after the ill monk is finished using the medicine. However, collyrium seemingly requires more care in their preparation, use, and storage than do other medicines. They should not be redistributed by a monk after he is cured. Rather, they must be stored with care.

In this section, I discussed rules of customary behaviour for storing or redistributing medicines according to the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. None of these rules required the creation of a new monastic office. These rules prescribe the necessary protocols to be followed after a monk has finished using a medicine and has some left over.⁴³⁷ Monks should store surplus medicines in the monastic community's infirmary, or redistribute them according to the prescribed rules of

^{436.} sTog *'dul ba ka* 401a6–b2. Derge matches sTog (sde dge *'dul ba ka* 281b2–4).

^{437.} Nolot tells us that “the distribution to monks/nuns of extra medicines” is an unspecified act of formal consultation (*avalokanā*) (1996, 80).

customary behaviour for a monk who keeps that medicine. In the section that follows, I discuss protocols for sick monks who are absent for communal ceremonies.

Section 4.4 — Exemptions for the Sick During Monastic Rituals

Ceremonies break up the Indian Buddhist monastic calendar. Two of the most important rituals, the *poṣadha* and the *pravāraṇā*, require the participation of monastics dwelling inside the ritual boundaries (*sīmās*) set by the local monastic community. Problematic situations, including but not limited to hostage situations, illness, and the death of *saṃgha* members could hinder these rituals and threaten the integrity of the *saṃgha* as a whole. Not surprisingly, the lawyers who authored/redacted the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* included procedures to be followed in the event that a monk must be absent during the ceremony.⁴³⁸ Here, I discuss the rules of customary behaviour recorded in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* for accommodating sick monks during the *poṣadha* and *pravāraṇā* ceremonies. Using passages in which the rules of customary behaviour are prescribed in the *Poṣadhavastu* and the *Pravāraṇāvastu*, I parse out the protocols that

⁴³⁸. This is not unique to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. For example, at the outset of his study of illness and healing in Buddhist monastic literature, Demiéville notes that: “Allusions to illness abound in the monastic discipline (*vinaya*) of the Lesser Vehicle. Some affections prevent admission to the community; some on the other hand furnish grounds for exemptions from the code” (1937 [Tatz’s translation 1985], 3).

Mūlasarvāstivādin monastic lawyers recorded in their *vinaya* to be followed when members of the monastic community are sick during these rituals.

Early in the development of Buddhist monasticism, the monastic community adopted the practice of gathering fortnightly for a ritualized recitation of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* in a ceremony called the *poṣadha*. During the *poṣadha* ceremony, monks and nuns are invited to confess any breaches of *prātimokṣa* rules, as the liturgy is recited. At the end of the *poṣadha* ceremony, the purity of the monastic community was considered to be restored. The guidelines for properly running the *poṣadha* are preserved in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in the *Poṣadhavastu*, the second chapter of the *Vinayavastu*.

In her extensive study, with a Sanskrit edition and German translation of the *Poṣadhavastu*, Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber tells us that because the *saṃgha* gathered together on the day of the *poṣadha*, other formal ecclesiastic acts were often held after the *poṣadha* ceremony was finished.⁴³⁹ Monks were required to remain in the assembly until the final ecclesiastical act (*saṃgha-karman*) was completed.⁴⁴⁰ However, an absent monk could offer his consent (*chanda*) for the performance of ecclesiastical acts and his statement of purity (*pāriśuddhi*) for the *poṣadha* ceremony via a proxy. The rules of customary behaviour for both the monk offering his consent and/or statement of purity as well as the monk who acts as his proxy are prescribed in the *Poṣadhavastu*.⁴⁴¹

⁴³⁹. Hu-von Hinüber 1994, 12.

⁴⁴⁰. Hu-von Hinüber 1994, 12.

⁴⁴¹. Hu-von Hinüber 1994, 12–13.

The monk who offers his statement of purity to a proxy must do so three times, either with bodily motions or audible speech.⁴⁴² Otherwise, the entire *saṃgha* must go to the sick monk, or he must be brought into the assembly.⁴⁴³ If the *saṃgha* performs the *poṣadha* ceremony without quorum, i.e. without the sick monk's declaration via a proxy, without going to see the sick monk, or without having the sick monk brought in for the assembly, they become guilty of an offence.⁴⁴⁴

As for the proxy, a monk who accepts a declaration of purity on behalf of another monk should immediately and very carefully report to the *poṣadha* ceremony without leaving the ritual boundary (*sīmā*).⁴⁴⁵ When the elder of the community asks the participants to announce the consent, and make known the declaration of purity, for any members absent, the proxy must do so, standing in front of a nearby monk.⁴⁴⁶

The authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* went into considerable detail clarifying that the monk should not jump, nor take two steps in a single step, nor otherwise recklessly hurry. But, the monk must not dilly-dally either: neither napping nor meditating. These prescribed rules of customary behaviour have seemingly nothing to do with the establishment of a formal monastic office. They are also not established to

^{442.} Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §66.2–3 (358 and 360).

^{443.} Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §66.4 (360).

^{444.} Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §66.5 (360).

^{445.} Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §67.2 (362).

^{446.} Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §67.4 (364).

penalize the ill monk, but rather to accommodate him and to protect the integrity of the *saṃgha* as a whole.⁴⁴⁷

Later in the *Poṣadhavastu*, the Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour for an ill monk to declare his consent for the *saṃgha* to perform an ecclesiastical act via a proxy.⁴⁴⁸ The Buddha also prescribes rules of customary behaviour for the proxy who delivers an ill monk's consent to the *saṃgha*.⁴⁴⁹ These rules are virtually identical to those for the ill monk who declares his purity for the *poṣadha* ceremony. Moreover, the *Pravāraṇāvastu* preserves an almost identical presentation of the rules of customary behaviour for an ill monk who offers his consent for the *pravāraṇā* ceremony via a proxy as well as the rules of customary behaviour for the proxy who, in turn, reports to the *saṃgha*.⁴⁵⁰ The rules for declaring one's purity and/or consent for ecclesiastical acts in a religious ceremony are extremely similar in the *Poṣadhavastu* and the *Pravāraṇāvastu*.

⁴⁴⁷. The procedure allowing for participation by proxy permits the community to complete the ceremony in a legally-valid manner, since all monks dwelling within the ritual boundary are required to participate. One caveat, though, is that participation by proxy does not meet the requirements of a legally-valid ceremony if the minimum number of monks required for quorum depends on the participation of the absent monk (Nolot 1996, 77).

⁴⁴⁸. Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §73.1–73.6 (376 in Tib.; 377 in German).

⁴⁴⁹. Hu-von Hinüber 1994, §74.1–74.6 (378 and 380 in Tibetan; 379 and 381 in German).

⁴⁵⁰. Chung 1998b, 4.2–4.5 (234–236).

The procedure allowing an ill monk to participate in a ceremony via a proxy is therefore formulaic. These rules are not unique to the *Mūlasarvāstivādin* tradition and are well known.⁴⁵¹ In the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* the Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour for an absent monk and his proxy in no less than three places.

Prescribed rules of customary behaviour like these offer monks who are experiencing temporary barriers to their full participation in monastic life a way to continue to engage with their monastic community. Monks immobilized through illness can participate in the *poṣadha* and the *pravāraṇā* ceremonies via a proxy. Allowing access by way of proxy also protects the integrity of the monastic community as a whole, accommodating the participation of all monks dwelling in the ritual boundaries as long as both the absent monk and the proxy adhere to the prescribed rules of customary behaviour. In the section that follows, I discuss more rules of customary behaviour prescribed for ill monks in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Section 4.5 — Ill Monks with Troublesome Ecclesiastical Statuses

In this section, I investigate some examples of rules of customary behaviour for sick monks whose illnesses or medicines cause problems for the monastic community. I

⁴⁵¹. For the process by which an ill monk declares his purity for the *poṣadha* ceremony in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, see Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 4: 158–160. For the Theravādin account of the process by which an ill monk declares his consent, see Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 4: 161–162.

demonstrate that, when medicine causes a monk to smell, that monk must undergo a period of self-imposed semi-quarantine. The prescribed procedure is not unlike procedures for monastics who have other troublesome ecclesiastical statuses, like those on probation or those who have been dwelling in cemeteries.⁴⁵²

The *Kṣudrakavastu* contains the following:⁴⁵³

The Blessed One had said “Monks must not apply perfume.” And a monk who was sick went to the doctor. [The sick monk said:] “Good sir, prescribe a medicine for me.” He said: “Noble one, if you apply perfume, you will become healthy.” [The sick monk asked:] “Good sir, what am I, a fornicator?” [The doctor replied:] “Noble One, this is your medicine. By means of another [medicine] you will not be able to get healthy.” The monks reported that matter to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One said: “Henceforth, with authorization, you should carry perfume in accordance with a doctor’s orders.”

Monks, having applied perfume, sat down among the monastic assembly and taught *dharma* to visiting brahmins and householders. They even went

⁴⁵² For more discussion of monks on probation, see pages 103–107 above. On the rules of customary behaviour prescribed for a cemetery dweller, see *Section 3.5 — A Monk Who Dwells in the Cemetery* above.

⁴⁵³ This story is discussed by Schopen (2015, 18 and 18n11).

amongst the houses of brahmins and householders. The monks reported that matter to the Blessed One and the Blessed One said:

“I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who keeps perfume. A monk who keeps perfume, having applied perfume, must not sit among the monastic assembly. He must not teach *dharma* to brahmins and householders who are visiting, and he should not go into the houses of brahmins and householders. When he is cured, then having bathed, and when he is spotless (*dri ma med par gyur ba*),⁴⁵⁴ he can sit among the monastic assembly. He can teach *dharma* to the visiting brahmins and householders. A monk who keeps perfume, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.”

*bcom ldan 'das kyis / dge slong rnams kyis dri byug par mi bya'o zhes bka' stsal
pa dang / dge slong nad pa zhig sman pa'i drung du song ste / bzhin bzangs bdag
la sman ston cig / des smras pa / 'phags pa dris byugs na khyod 'tsho bar 'gyur ro
// bzhin bzangs ci kho bo 'dod pa spyod dam / 'phags pa khyod kyis sman ni 'di yin
te / gzhan gyis ni 'tsho bar mi nus so // skabs de dge slong rnams kyis / bcom ldan
'das la gsol pa dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / de lta bas na gnang gis /
sman pa'i lung gis dri bcang bar bya'o //*

⁴⁵⁴. That is, when he is no longer fragrant.

*dge slong dag dris byugs nas dge 'dun gyi nang na 'dug cing / bram ze
dang khyim bdag 'ongs shing lhags pa rnams la / chos ston par byed / bram ze
dang khyim bdag gi khyim rnams su yang 'gro bar byed pa'i skabs de / dge slong
rnams kyis / bcom ldan 'das la gsol pa dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa /
ngas dge slong dri 'chang ba'i kun tu spyad pa'i chos bca' bar bya ste /
dge slong dri 'chang bas dris byugs nas dge 'dun gyi nang du 'dug par mi bya /
bram ze dang khyim bdag 'ongs shing lhag<s> pa rnams la chos bstan par mi bya
/ bram ze dang khyim bdag gi khyims rnams su 'gro bar mi bya'i / nam sos par
gyur pa de'i tshe khru byas nas dri ma med par gyur ba dang / dge 'dun gyi nang
du 'dug par bya / bram ze dang khyim bdag 'ongs shing lhags pa rnams la chos
bstan par bya / bram ze dang khyim bdag gi khyim rnams su 'gro bar bya'o // dge
slong dri 'chang bas kun tu spyad pa'i chos ji ltar bcas pa bzhin yang dag par
blangs te / mi 'dug na / 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro // ⁴⁵⁵*

The above narrative demonstrates three points regarding Mūlasarvāstivādin legal specialists' attitudes towards medicine. First, the narrative takes seemingly no issue with the fact that a sick monk would consult a doctor regarding his treatment. Second, when the Buddha is consulted regarding the treatment that was prescribed by a doctor, the Buddha reminds the monks that exceptions can be made to the rule against the use of

⁴⁵⁵. sTog 'dul ba ta 6a6–7a4. Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba tha 4a7–5a2).

perfume when the health of the body is at stake.⁴⁵⁶ Third, a monk who applies perfume should avoid contact with the laity and also the larger monastic assembly, until he no longer smells.

These three points also apply in another narrative from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in which the Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour to an ill monk who uses a medicine that causes him to smell. In this story from the *Kṣudrakavastu*, the Buddha prescribes a similar albeit lengthier list of rules of customary behaviour for an ill monk who eats garlic as a medicine. In this case, Śāriputra has eaten garlic—a medical exemption to the general rule against monks' consumption of garlic.⁴⁵⁷ The Buddha then prescribes the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who eats garlic as follows:

I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who eats garlic. A monk who eats garlic must not enjoy use of the *vihāra* while eating garlic, nor the bedding and seating. He must not enter into the privy-for-urine, nor the privy-for-feces. He is not to go among the monastic assembly. He is not to teach *dharma* to visiting brahmins and householders. He must not prostrate at *stūpas*. He must not

⁴⁵⁶. This narrative is in line with a number of other stories from the *Theravāda*- and *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinayas* in which monks consult doctors, as discussed by Phyllis Granoff (2011, 10–11).

⁴⁵⁷. This exemption is also found in the *Theravāda-vinaya* (Horner [1938–1966] 2001–2012, 5: 196).

go near the homes of brahmins and householders. As for pleasure parks, assemblies, and temples, he must not stay where other people are, but rather he should eat in an isolated place where if others see him there will not be an arising of unfaithfulness.

When the act (eating garlic) is completed, then he must remain at that very place for seven days. If an onion, three days. If a leek, one day.⁴⁵⁸ Then, after he bathes, he must also wash his robes and he must fumigate [himself] with incense. Then, [when] he no longer stinks (*dri nga ba med pa*), he may enter the *vihāra*. In this manner, he must again refrain [from eating garlic]. A monk who eats garlic, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.⁴⁵⁹

*ngas dge slong sgog skya za ba'i kun tu spyod pa'i chos bca' bar bya ste / dge
slong sgog skya za bas sgog skya za bzhin du gtsug lag khang la yongs su longs
spyod par mi bya / gnas mal la ma yin / snam phyi sar 'jug par mi bya / chab
khung sar ma yin / dge 'dun gyi nang du 'gro bar mi bya / bram ze dang khyim*

^{458.} Ann Heirman and Tom de Rauw discuss this distinction between garlic, onions, and leeks on the basis of the Chinese translation of this passage (2006, 62).

^{459.} This passage is discussed in Schopen 2015, 21. The parallel passage from the Chinese translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* has very recently been translated into English by Heirman (2021, 74).

*bdag 'ongs shing lhags pa rnam la chos bstan par mi bya / mchod rten la phyag
mi bya / bram ze dang khyim bdag rnam kyi khyim du nye bar 'gro bar mi bya /
skyed mol⁴⁶⁰ tshal dang / 'dun sa dang / lha khang dang / skye bos gang ba gzhan
dag tu gnas par mi bya'i / phyogs dben pa gang du gzhan dag gis mthong na / ma
dad pa skye bar mi 'gyur bar bza' bar bya'o //*

*gang gi tshe bya ba zin par gyur pa de'i tshe phyogs de nyid du zhag bdun
'dug par bya'o // sku 'dong⁴⁶¹ na ni zhag gsum / ki'u na ni zhag gcig go / de nas
khrus byas la / chos gos dag kyang bkru bar bya zhing / bdug pa dag gis bdug par
bya'o // de nas dri nga ba med pa dang / gtsug lag khang du 'jug par bya zhing / ji
ltar bgag pa yang bya'o // sgog skya za ba'i dge slong gis kun tu spyad pa'i chos
ji ltar bcas pa rnam yang dag par blangs te mi gnas na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur
ro // ⁴⁶²*

Both the case of a monk who used perfume and the case of a monk who has eaten garlic refer to medical exemptions, allowing for the use of a pungent substance.⁴⁶³ The

^{460.} Derge reads *mos* (sde dge 'dul ba tha 65a7).

^{461.} Derge reads *kun dong* for *sku 'dong* (sde dge 'dul ba tha 65a7).

^{462.} sTog 'dul ba ta 97a2–7. Except for some minor differences noted above, Derge matches sTog (sde dge 'dul ba tha 65a5–b2).

^{463.} Regarding the rule against eating garlic in *vinayas* extant in Chinese, Heirman and Mathieu Torck note that: “The resulting bad smell has the potential to annoy fellow

prescribed rules of customary behaviour for these monastics require them to physically distance themselves from the community until the odour dissipates.

A passage from the *Māṭṛkā* also discusses the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who eats garlic.⁴⁶⁴ The passage defines rules connected to garlic.⁴⁶⁵ The definition ends with the formulaic statement that “A monk who eats garlic, having accepted the

monks and lay people alike” (2012, 111). This certainly seems to be the case here. See also Heirman and de Rauw 2006, 61.

^{464.} sTog 'dul ba na 397b4–398b2. A Sanskrit manuscript fragment discovered in Central Asia, now belonging to the Hoernle collection and preserved in the British Library, closely corresponds to this Tibetan passage from the *Māṭṛkā* (Or.15009/271; a transcription of the Sanskrit available in Karashima and Wille 2009, 273–274). This fragment preserves probably less than half of a folio of the manuscript to which it belonged. The Sanskrit text that we have access to in this fragment seems remarkably close to the passage found in the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Amazingly, the verso side of the fragment contains numbering that corresponds exactly to the numbers in sTog. Or, perhaps the numbering is off by one number depending on whether items in the list are counted at the beginning or at the end of an item. Likely then, the organizational structure of the *Vinayamāṭṛkā* as preserved in the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and annotated by handwritten Tibetan numerals in sTog has remained relatively stable through the translation process from Sanskrit to Tibetan.

^{465.} sTog 'dul ba na 397b4.

prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence” (*sgog skya za ba’i dge slong gis ji ltar mtshungs par spyad pa’i chos bcas pa bzhin mtshungs par ma spyad na / ’das pa dang bcas par ’gyur te*).⁴⁶⁶ Preserved in the second section of the *Vinayamāṭṛkā*, the section on monastic conduct, this definition includes the restrictions imposed on a monk who is eating garlic as a medicine (an otherwise prohibited substance). The main issue at hand continues to be related to smell. As in the *Kṣudrakavastu*, a monk who eats garlic is prohibited from entering designated places. These restrictions are lifted after seven days if he has properly cleaned his robes and any spaces he commonly came into contact with.

Indian Buddhist monastic authors were quite concerned with garlic and other pungent substances that have medicinal value. The authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* provided an ample description of, and further commentary on, the rules of customary behaviour for one who consumes garlic. Smell was a serious issue for Mūlasarvāstivādin Buddhist monastic lawyers. Elsewhere, I discussed similar concerns regarding a monk who dwells in a cemetery.⁴⁶⁷ The above examples point to a prescribed strategy of social distancing for monks who use medicines that cause an odour. Although the issue at hand seems related to smell more than some premodern

^{466.} sTog *’dul ba* na 398b1.

^{467.} See *Section 3.5 — A Monk Who Dwells in the Cemetery*. The connection between the rules of customary behaviour of a cemetery dwelling monk and one who eats garlic has already been pointed out by Schopen (2015, 21).

understanding of germ theory, the procedures discussed in this section ought to seem remarkably familiar to anyone who closely adheres to the widespread public health guidelines put in place during the global pandemic caused by COVID-19.⁴⁶⁸

In the section that follows, I discuss one final example of rules of customary behaviour related to illness. This time the narrative comes from the *Cīvaravastu*, the chapter of the *Vinayavastu* concerned with clothing.

Section 4.6 — A Monk with Leprosy

The *Cīvaravastu* contains rules of customary behaviour for a monk with leprosy (*kuṣṭharoga*).⁴⁶⁹ The account from the *Cīvaravastu* reads:

^{468.} I wrote the first several drafts of this chapter well before the global outbreak of COVID-19. I then revised this chapter under Ontario’s subsequent lockdowns. Remaining isolated, physically distanced, and constantly washing my hands and clothing gave me a greater appreciation for Śāriputra’s position in the monastic community after he consumed garlic, regardless of whether Śāriputra was an actual historical figure or merely a literary character.

^{469.} The existence of these rules has been pointed out before. In his summary of the *Cīvaravastu*, Banerjee refers to “rules of segregation in case of contagious and infectious diseases, such as, itch, leprosy and the like” (1957, 212). A monk afflicted with leprosy is mentioned in a list of monks prescribed rules of customary behaviour in Schopen 2000, 150 nII.31. The Pāli word *kuṭṭha* has elsewhere been understood to refer to leprosy. For

Monks were afflicted by leprosy. They used bedding and seats belonging to the *saṃgha*. They remained in the courtyards, the reservoir, the gate, the steps, the walking path, and in the resting spots under trees. Brahmins and householders, having seen them stinking and circled by flies, looked down upon, reviled, and criticized them. The monks reported this matter to the Blessed One.

The Blessed One said, “Monks, I will prescribe the rules of customary behaviour for a monk who is afflicted by leprosy. Bedding and seats and a cell belonging to the *saṃgha* must not be used by a monk who is afflicted by leprosy. He is not to remain in places previously mentioned such as the courtyard, etc. He is not to enter the *saṃgha*’s privy-for-urine and the privy-for-feces. He is to be given a dwelling by the *saṃgha* in an isolated place, and he is to be attended to. A monk who is afflicted by leprosy, having accepted the prescribed rules of customary behaviour, who does not act accordingly becomes guilty of an offence.”

*bhikṣavaḥ kuṣṭharogeṇa bādhyante / te sāmghikāni śayanāsanāni paribhujate /
prāsādeṣu puṣkarinyāṃ dvārakoṣṭhake pariṣaṇḍāyāṃ caṃkrameṣu
saṃsthānavṛkṣeṣu tiṣṭhanti / durgandhān makṣikābhir ākīrṇān*⁴⁷⁰ tān dṛṣṭvā*

one example of the translation of *kuṭṭha* as “leprosy,” see Mitra 1974, 14.

⁴⁷⁰ Dutt adds punctuation to the text here ([1942–1950] 1984, 3(2): 90.20). I have removed it. Like most of the punctuation supplied by Dutt, it does not appear in the manuscript (Clarke 2014b, Plates 155: 260v3).

*brāhmaṇagr̥hapatayo 'vadhyāyanti kṣipanti vivācayanti / etat prakaraṇam
bhikṣavo bhagavata ārocayanti /*

*bhagavān āha / kuṣṭharogābhībhūtasāyāham bhikṣavo bhikṣor
āsamudācārikān dharmān prajñāpayisyāmi / kuṣṭharogābhībhūtena bhikṣuṇā
sāṃghikam śayanāsanam layanam ca na paribhoktavyam* / prāsādādiṣu ca⁴⁷¹
yathāparikīrtiteṣu sthāneṣu na⁴⁷² sthātavyam* / sāṃghikī prasrāvakuṭī varcaḥkuṭī
ca na praveṣṭavyā / pratigupte sthāne saṃghena tasya vāso deyaḥ / upasthānam
ca kartavyam* / kuṣṭharogābhībhūto bhikṣur yathāprajñaptān āsamudācārikān
dharmān na samādāya vartate saṃgho vā sātisāro bhavati /⁴⁷³*

⁴⁷¹. (Clarke 2014b, Plates 155: 260v4).

⁴⁷². Neither Dutt nor Bagchi include this *na* in their readings. But this *na* is found in the manuscript (Clarke 2014b, Plates 155: 260v4). This reading is also supported by the Tibetan translation, which, as expected, reads: *khyams rnamṣ dang ji skad du bsgrags pa'i khyams la sogs par gnas par mi bya /* (sTog 'dul ba ga 114b2).

⁴⁷³. The reading of the manuscript provided here is from Dutt [1942–1950] 1984, 3(2): 90.18–91.9. Dutt freely adds or amends punctuation and resolves *sandhi* in his reading of this passage. Bagchi closely follows Dutt's reading [1967–1970] 2000, 1: 217.12–20. For the manuscript, see Clarke 2014b, Plates 155: 260v2–5. For Tib., see sTog 'dul ba ga 114a5–b4.

Taken alone, one might think that these rules of customary behaviour were only intended to serve the practical purpose of quarantining a monk with leprosy, because he is contagious. However, the event that causes the Buddha to introduce these rules of customary behaviour in the narrative is linked to smell, just like other examples surveyed in this chapter. It is possible that this narrative speaks to an early example of the stigmatization of people who have contracted leprosy. But this is not necessarily the case. What actually draws the criticism of the householders in the story is that the monks who are afflicted by leprosy stank and were circled by flies, not necessarily the fact that those monks had contracted leprosy, albeit the smell is likely a side effect of rotting flesh.

Regardless of these other potential concerns in the narrative, the above passage makes clear that a monk who has contracted leprosy was not to use the community's privies, just like a sick monk who applies perfume or one who eats garlic, under a medical exemption. Ann Heirman and Mathieu Torck argue that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is the only *vinaya* that shifts from issues of embarrassment to issues of purity with regard to toilets.⁴⁷⁴ Regarding toilets in Buddhist monastic literature, they write:

The principal concerns of the *vinaya* guidelines, then, relate to decorum, respect and purity. By contrast, health is much less important to the authors. Monks are instructed to take care when cleaning themselves to avoid injury, but this is mentioned only briefly, so it is safe to say that health and hygiene were not major

⁴⁷⁴. Heirman and Torck 2012, 71.

motivations behind the promotion of good toilet practice. Nevertheless, if followed closely, many of the detailed stipulations outlined in the *vinaya* texts will surely have helped monastics to maintain good health.⁴⁷⁵

The evidence surveyed in this chapter seems to at least tentatively support this claim. Regarding rules of customary behaviour for ill monks, the issue at hand often seems to be mitigating smell more than the spread of disease. The rules of customary behaviour for monks who consume garlic, use perfumes, or have contracted leprosy all seem similar to the rules of customary behaviour prescribed for a monk who has been dwelling in a cemetery.

In the other cases related to illness or impurity surveyed in this chapter, the issue at hand seems to be offensive odours. The monastic lawyers behind the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* claim that the monk in question may rejoin the community once the foul odour has dissipated. It seems that in the literary imagination of Mūlasarvāstivādin monastic authors/redactors, illness, purity, and odour were all intimately connected. Monks who smell bad must undergo a period of physical distancing until the odour subsides. Once the odour has subsided, they were presumably considered healthy enough, or maybe rather pure enough, to rejoin the larger monastic community.

⁴⁷⁵. Heirman and Torck 2012, 73.

In this case though, the authors/redactors are silent about the possibility of a monk who has contracted leprosy rejoining the community. Rather, the voices behind the *Cīvaravastu* claim that he is to be isolated. He is still to be provided for by the *saṃgha*.

Section 4.7 — Chapter Conclusions

The monastic community portrayed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is well equipped to deal with illness. This *vinaya* records rules of customary behaviour for gathering alms on behalf of sick co-residents. It contains rules of customary behaviour pertinent to the storage and distribution of medicines. Rules of customary behaviour also exempt sick monastics from religious ceremonies, allowing them instead to participate via proxy.

Amongst the rules of customary behaviour related to illness that are surveyed in this chapter, the following best practices emerge. If a monk needs to consult a physician for medical advice, the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* considered seeking the advice of a lay-physician as acceptable. Monks are required to ask the ill monk's family to provide medicine. If there is no family, then providing medicines becomes the responsibility of members of the monastic community. Once a monk is finished with his medicine, if the medicine is common, he should redistribute the remainder among the monks. Otherwise, he should follow the correct procedures for storing that medicine in the community's infirmary. An ill monk may be excused from the *poṣadha* and the *pravāraṇā* ceremonies provided he offers his statement of purity and consent for formal ecclesiastical acts via a proxy. Both the ill monk and his proxy must

correctly follow their prescribed rules of customary behaviour. If medicines or illnesses cause a monk to smell, that monk must undergo a period of semi-quarantine until the odour (and by extension the monk's illness or impurity) has subsided. Once the monk no longer smells, he may return to his regular monastic duties. But this does not seem to be the case for a monk who has contracted leprosy.

The rules of customary behaviour discussed in this chapter specify protocols or restrictions for solving problems that arise in times of illness. None of the rules of customary behaviour surveyed in this chapter seem at all connected to the creation of new or temporary monastic offices in the *saṃgha*. Instead, these rules offer practical solutions to problems as they arise in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Rules of customary behaviour related to illness govern the conduct of monks who must use an otherwise prohibited substance in emergency situations. These rules also include restrictions imposed on a monk whose participation in certain areas or events in the monastic community must be temporarily suspended.

In the chapter that follows, I bring the evidence used in this chapter into conversation with passages investigated in the earlier chapters of this dissertation in order to present some overall conclusions and notes for further research.

Chapter Five: Conclusions and Directions for Future Research

Section 5.1 — Conclusions

This dissertation is the first detailed study of rules of customary behaviour belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivādin school of Indian Buddhism. To date, these rules have been largely overlooked, even in scholarship on Buddhist monastic law (*vinaya*). Perhaps the lone exception is the pioneering work of Gregory Schopen, who has already shown that these rules:

- 1) were considered of foundational importance for the authors/redactors of at least one chapter of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the chapter on bedding and seats (*Śayanāsanavastu*);⁴⁷⁶
- 2) often appear in sets, and are introduced by a formulaic pronouncement made by the Buddha in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*;⁴⁷⁷
- 3) appear dozens of times and “occur in all parts” of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*;⁴⁷⁸
- 4) are required when a monk “is fulfilling a specific, and often temporary,

⁴⁷⁶. Schopen 2000, 107–108.

⁴⁷⁷. Schopen 2000, 150nII.31.

⁴⁷⁸. Schopen 2000, 150nII.31; [2001] 2004a, 139; and [2013] 2014, 134.

monastic office or function, or has undertaken a specific task or action.”⁴⁷⁹

Schopen’s work on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* largely served as the backdrop for this investigation into rules of customary behaviour. Throughout the research and writing processes of this dissertation, often after I thought I had made a new discovery in the voluminous *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, I would reread one of Schopen’s articles for the umpteenth time and find him *still* several steps ahead of me.⁴⁸⁰ I did, however, manage to build on Schopen’s work in a number of areas.

In Chapter One, I noted that the Sanskrit term *āsamudācārika* modifying *dharma* and referring to a specific set of rules seems to be a uniquely Mūlasarvāstivādin construction. I also explained that this technical term appears in at least three distinct ways in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. First, the term denotes a particular class of rules prescribed in narratives in response to often temporary situations, as Schopen has already indicated. Second, rules of customary behaviour appear in some definitions listed in the *Vinayamātrkā*, essentially at the very end of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. In some but not all cases, rules of customary behaviour found in the *Mātrkā* match those prescribed

⁴⁷⁹. Schopen 2000, 150nII.31.

⁴⁸⁰. Anyone who wants to work seriously on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* should be aware of Rein Ende’s *Index Locorum* (2016). Ende presents an index of passages from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that are cited in Schopen’s body of work. It has helped me immensely over the last few years.

elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Third, the term appears in a common literary motif where a new ordinand learns his rules of customary behaviour two or three days after his ordination. The exact contents of the rules of customary behaviour that are taught to an ordinand two or three days after his ordination seem never to be provided in full.⁴⁸¹ In this dissertation, I focused on the first of these three ways in which the term *āsamudācārika-dharma* appears in this *vinaya*: rules of customary behaviour prescribed in narratives.

In Chapter One, I also explored possible parallel terms for rules of customary behaviour in other *vinayas* extant in Indic languages. I briefly introduced the possibility that the term rule of right conduct (*abhisamācārika-dharma*) preserved in a Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin *vinaya* text entitled the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* might be synonymous in terms of usage with the prescribed rules of customary behaviour found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. As the many footnotes to Karashima's extremely valuable German translation of the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*⁴⁸² demonstrate throughout this dissertation, there is some overlap between the rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and the rules of right conduct in the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*. Although these rules seem to be performing a similar function in these two *vinaya* traditions, in my opinion the overlap is not significant enough to consider the terms *abhisamācārika-dharma* and *āsamudācārika-dharma* to be synonymous in usage.

⁴⁸¹. See note 77 found above in *Chapter One*.

⁴⁸². Karashima 2012.

Buddhist monastic schools probably developed prescribed rules of behaviour in their *vinayas* that were parallel in terms of the issues that require such behavioural rules for Buddhist monastics. The exact content of these prescribed rules of behaviour appears to be different in these traditions. More comparative work needs to be done in the future on the rules of behaviour prescribed by the Buddha and recorded in literature that belongs to early Indian Buddhist monastic traditions. Such work will certainly shed light on some of the similarities and differences found in competing, early Indian Buddhist monasticisms.

Similarly, as my footnotes to Theravādin accounts in this dissertation make clear, sometimes prescribed behavioural rules are introduced in the *Theravāda-vinaya* in ways that are similar to the formulaic introduction of rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. In other cases, the *Theravāda-vinaya* introduces parallel rules differently or may not even preserve a parallel rule at all. The overlap between behavioural rules preserved in at least three different *vinaya* traditions, extant in Indic languages, is inconsistent to say the least. Further study on this topic is a desideratum.

Moving on from such introductory concerns, as outlined in the first chapter, I organized the rest of this dissertation around three main themes that emerged in my investigation of the rules of customary behaviour introduced in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. I discussed rules of customary behaviour related to:

- 1) administration and/or management in Chapter Two;
- 2) specific locations in Chapter Three; and

3) illnesses and/or medicines in Chapter Four.

This etic arrangement places similar narrative instances in which the Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour for monastics in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* alongside each other for analysis, in order to shed some light on a difficult, emic technical term used in this *vinaya*.

In Chapter Two, I discussed rules of customary behaviour related to the administration or management of the monastic community. I began with a discussion of the rules of customary behaviour prescribed for the monk who distributes lodgings at the beginning of the annual monastic rain retreat (*śayanāsanagrāhaka*). In the narrative in which his rules of customary behaviour are prescribed, the Buddha also describes the procedure for appointing a monk to this role. He also explains the five qualities that make a monk well suited for this role and five qualities that disqualify a monk from serving in this position.

Building on Jonathan Silk's work on Buddhist monastic managers⁴⁸³ and Édith Nolot's studies of *vinaya* technical terms,⁴⁸⁴ I observed that the Buddha indicates the five qualities a candidate should possess if one is to be appointed to one of the ten roles for which rules of customary behaviour are prescribed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.⁴⁸⁵ In

⁴⁸³. Silk 2008.

⁴⁸⁴. Nolot 1996 and 1999.

⁴⁸⁵. For further details, see the list on pages 57–60 of this dissertation.

such cases, a monastic is appointed to an office by way of a twofold ecclesiastical procedure (*jñapti-dvītīya-karman*).

That the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* include the qualities of a good candidate and the twofold appointment procedure for at least these ten monastic officers might indicate that these officers are formal positions in the *saṃgha*. But occurrences of this formal procedure are much less common than the forty or so cases in which the Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour in what appears to be a less formal manner. The question of whether or not the formulaic prescription of rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* necessarily signals the creation of a monastic office or official duty runs throughout this dissertation. It seems likely that only cases in which a candidate's qualifications are enumerated prior to the Buddha's prescription of the rules of customary behaviour for the role could be considered instances of the creation of a formal office or duty. Of course, there are many monastic offices for which no rules of customary behaviour are ever prescribed.

Next, I looked at rules of customary behaviour that govern the participation of Buddhist monastics in construction projects. One need only to look to the modern example of refugee monks from Sera monastery, who worked on construction projects while establishing a new monastery for themselves in an Indian Jungle in the 1960s,⁴⁸⁶ to see a remarkable continuity in attitudes towards construction work in the *Mūlasarvāstivādin* tradition that stretches out over approximately 2000 years.

⁴⁸⁶ Cabezón and Dorjee 2019, 470–471.

The rules of customary behaviour for a monk assisting in construction work clearly distinguish him from a common labourer. Still, these rules and further rules of customary behaviour offer an unromantic glimpse into the lives of everyday monks according to the authors/redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. A monk in charge of meditation might also perform janitorial duties. A monk who lives in a forest may have to clean up after the monastery's dog every morning, a dog that is needed for the protection of the monastery.

In Chapter Two, I also investigated rules of customary behaviour assigned to participants in disputes in the monastic community. In particular, I explored rules of customary behaviour for suspended monks and for monks who perform a suspension. The Buddha is presented as prescribing rules of customary behaviour for parties in a dispute that initially appear to be informal attempts at conflict resolution. The rules of customary behaviour around disputes become more formal as disputes worsen. Additional actors—like the monk who is required to bring the disputing parties to a *saṃgha* equipped to deal with the dispute, the elder of the community, and the monk who distributes voting sticks—are brought in to resolve the dispute.

The examples included in Chapter Two indicate that rules of customary behaviour can specify the responsibilities of monastics who fulfill either formal or informal roles in the monastic community. These specific roles, either formal or informal, are not the only situations in which the Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Monks undergoing various types of ecclesiastical punishments are also prescribed rules of customary behaviour that include temporary restrictions these

monks must adhere to for as long as the penalty lasts. Thus, not all rules of customary behaviour take the form of responsibilities or administrative duties. In Chapters Three and Four, I explored rules of customary behaviour prescribed in seemingly informal and non-administrative cases.

In Chapter Three, I investigated location-specific rules of customary behaviour. I began with a rule of customary behaviour prescribed for a village monk. Then, I discussed sets of rules of customary behaviour for monks in forests, those who are travelling, those who visit a *vihāra*, and those who dwell in a cemetery. The examples of rules of customary behaviour presented in Chapter Three indicate another function of some of the prescribed rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. These rules outline special observances for location-specific monastic vocations, like forest or cemetery dwellers, and govern the conduct of monks temporarily living in those environments. These rules seem to be designed to serve two main purposes: 1) to indicate protocols for navigating potentially dangerous or awkward situations, and 2) to standardize monastic practice in a variety of locations and situations.

In Chapter Four, I used examples of rules of customary behaviour prescribed for ill monks to show further that the introduction of these rules in a narrative does not necessarily signal the establishment of a formal monastic office or even a formal duty. To give but one example here, the Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour for a monk who has eaten garlic (a substance only allowed in times of illness). This monk must remain apart from the monastic community in a temporary kind of physical distancing until the smell caused by his medicine completely subsides. A monk who has eaten garlic

neither fulfills a specific administrative function in the monastic community nor is he necessarily in any serious danger. He is, however, a nuisance, and a threat to the public's positive perception of the monastic community as a whole. The rules of customary behaviour that are prescribed for him outline the extent to which a monk who has eaten garlic may participate in the monastic community, and the additional rules that he must follow while he is temporarily eating garlic for medicinal purposes.

Using this and other examples of rules of customary behaviour related to illness, I discerned some of the Mūlasarvāstivādin best practices for confronting illness in the monastic community. If a preceptor, teacher, co-residential student, or disciple is sick, medicines ought to be provided by a family member or other lay-patron before being taken from the *saṃgha*'s own stores. Rules of customary behaviour prescribed for three monks who have used particular types of medicines in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* indicate the correct protocols that must be followed for either redistributing unused medicines or storing excess medicines in the monastic community's stores. If a medicine or illness causes a monk to smell, that monk must adhere to rules of customary behaviour specific to his situation, which require him to remain apart from the rest of the monastic community and from lay persons, until he no longer smells. However, sick monks are permitted to participate in certain religious ceremonies via a proxy. In such cases, both the sick monk and his proxy must adhere to the prescribed rules of customary behaviour that explain precisely how a declaration of purity regarding, or consent for, certain ceremonies must be delivered to the *saṃgha*.

Examples from Chapters Three and Four show that some, if not most, prescribed

rules of customary behaviour provide guidelines to monastics encountering temporary barriers so that they may continue to participate in their local *saṃgha*. The adoption of and adherence to rules of customary behaviour prescribed in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* also protect the integrity of the *saṃgha* in these cases: both in terms of guarding the public's perception of the community and maintaining the ritual purity of the community. Overall, these rules outline the behaviour to be followed in very specific and temporary social situations.

I now leave the reader with some thoughts on directions for future research on rules of customary behaviour.

Section 5.2— Directions for Future Research

In this dissertation, I primarily focused on two research questions:

- 1) What are rules of customary behaviour? and
- 2) How do rules of customary behaviour function in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*?

In an attempt to answer these questions, I explored passages from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in which the Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour for specific monastics in response to a variety of narrative situations. By focusing exclusively on one school's literature and by investigating a single term, I sought to avoid the pitfalls of

larger comparative investigations of Indian Buddhist monasticism. In proceeding carefully, I admit to leaving a number of stones intentionally unturned.

I occasionally refer to rules in the *Theravāda-* and *Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda-* *vinayas* that parallel rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. The organization of behavioural rules seem to be inconsistent across these three *vinayas*. The study of rules of behaviour extant in *vinayas* other than the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and in particular those available only in Chinese translation that I have not explored here at all, will no doubt prove useful for unpacking the similarities and differences between the mainstream Buddhist monastic schools. Future work on this topic should be comparative, and preferably completed by someone who is also research proficient in classical Chinese.

One section of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that I drew upon frequently in this dissertation is the *Vinayamāṭṛkā*. It is now relatively well known that rather than containing narratives, the *Māṭṛkā* preserves definitions of terms. This section of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is therefore an extremely fruitful source for understanding Mūlasarvāstivādin authors/redactors' own perspectives on difficult concepts and technical terms. Unfortunately, passages from the *Vinayamāṭṛkā* are terse and therefore difficult to translate on the basis of the classical Tibetan translation alone. Although I have cited, referred to, and in some cases summarized a number of relevant passages from the *Māṭṛkā*, I intentionally shied away from presenting full translations of passages from the *Māṭṛkā* in this dissertation. Such translation work should be done by someone who has not only a strong command of classical Tibetan, but who can also confidently consult

surviving Chinese parallels for reference.⁴⁸⁷

I have no doubt that future investigations of the *Vinayamāṭṛkā*(s) will shed further light on our understanding of the rules of customary behaviour preserved in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. As I stated in Chapter One, the authors/redactors of the *Māṭṛkā* treat rules of customary behaviour in a number of definitions. The similarities between the third and final section of the *Māṭṛkā* and the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*, a *vinaya* text belonging to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin tradition, were already noticed years ago.⁴⁸⁸ Beyond simply elucidating our understanding of Mūlasarvāstivādin perspectives on technical terms like *āsamudācārika-dharma*, further study of this section of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* will no doubt further enrich our understanding of how Buddhist monastic schools organized and understood behavioural rules in their *vinayas*.

In addition to the above directions for future research left unexplored in this dissertation in large part due to my lack of knowledge in classical Chinese, my use of *Vinaya* commentaries in this dissertation has been admittedly sparse. The amount of commentarial material available on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in Tibetan is daunting. For example, the *vinaya* (*'dul ba*) section of the Derge *bsTan 'gyur* is 18 volumes long. Like my use of the *Māṭṛkā*, I regularly refer to sections of commentaries available in Tibetan such as the *Ekottarakarmaśataka* and the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-vinaya-*

^{487.} For a discussion of one such parallel, the *Sapoduobu pini modeleqie* (T. 1441), see Clarke 2015, 80–81.

^{488.} Clarke 2004, 115.

samuccaya in the footnotes of this dissertation, without attempting translations.

I used the *Vinayasūtra* and its commentaries to check the Sanskrit wording behind classical Tibetan translations of canonical passages in only a couple of cases. The difficulty with reading the *Vinayasūtra* lies in the fact that it remains almost incomprehensible unless one already understands the canonical passages behind the individual *sūtras*. This creates a bit of a “Catch 22” for contemporary researchers. The *Vinayasūtra* and its commentaries may be useful for elucidating difficult vocabulary in a canonical passage. However, it might be impossible to recognize a summary of that passage in the commentarial tradition if one has not already understood that difficult vocabulary in the unabridged, canonical passage in the first place. Future work on rules of customary behaviour preserved in the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition needs to treat the commentarial tradition with care.

I sincerely hope that this dissertation provides a jumping off point for future investigations into rules of customary behaviour, and perhaps behavioural rules more broadly, in Buddhist monastic literature.

Appendix One

This appendix contains two tables. Table One lists all of the monastics I have found who are prescribed rules of customary behaviour by the Buddha in narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. The reader will recall that in Chapter One, Section 1.4, I distinguished three distinct ways in which *āsamudācārika-dharmas* are found in this *vinaya*. Table One presents monastics for whom rules of customary behaviour are presented in the first of these three ways only. The rules of customary behaviour assigned to the monastics listed in Table One are the main focus of this dissertation.

Table Two lists only those monastics who are prescribed rules of customary behaviour, and whose roles appear to be formal positions in the monastic community. These are cases in which a monk or nun is prescribed rules of customary behaviour and the Buddha also indicates five necessary qualities one must possess in order to be appointed to this position. The first four stock qualities are not listed here (see note 193 above); only the fifth quality is specific to the role, and that is what is listed in Table Two.

Examples where rules of customary behaviour are prescribed for two monks at once, such as plaintiffs and defendants in disputes (*arthins* and *pratyarthins*), are counted as two items. Monks for whom rules of customary behaviour are prescribed more than once in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, like the *saṃghasthavira* who is prescribed rules of customary behaviour no less than seven different times, are only counted once. The purpose of this table is to list the full range of monks and nuns for

whom these rules are prescribed by the Buddha in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. In this table, I have simplified the English titles. The items in this list are presented in English alphabetical order, based on their Sanskrit titles.

Table One: A list of Monastics Who are Prescribed Rules of Customary Behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*

	Sanskrit	Tibetan	English
1	<i>adhikaraṇasaṃcāraka</i>	<i>rtsod pa sbed pa</i>	dispute bringer
2	<i>añjanadhāraka</i>	<i>mig sman 'chang ba</i>	collyrium keeper
3	<i>āraṇyaka</i>	<i>dgon pa pa</i>	forest dweller
4 & 5	<i>arthin & pratyarthin</i>	<i>rgol ba dang phyir rgol ba</i>	plaintiff & defendant
6	<i>grāmāntika</i>	<i>grong mtha' pa</i>	village dweller
7	<i>kaṣāyadhāraka</i>	<i>bska ba 'chang ba</i>	astringent keeper
8	<i>kaṭhināstāraka</i>	<i>sra brkyang 'dings pa</i>	<i>kaṭhina</i> cloth spreader
9	<i>keśāvatārikā</i> ♀	<i>skra 'dreg pa</i> ♀	[ordinand's] hair cutter ♀
10	<i>kukkurapoṣaka</i>	<i>khri srel ba</i>	dog attendant
11	<i>kulapratisaṃvedaka</i>	<i>khyim rnams su so sor go bar byed pa</i>	household informer
12	<i>kuṣṭharogābhībhūta</i>	<i>mdze nad kyis thebs pa</i>	leper
	Sanskrit	Tibetan	English

13	<i>laśunakhādaka</i>	<i>sgog skya za ba</i>	garlic eater
14	<i>navakarmika</i>	<i>lag gi bla or las gсар du byed pa</i>	superintendent of construction
15	<i>nigarhaṇīyakarmakṛta</i>	<i>smad pa 'i las byas pa</i>	one who is condemned
16	<i>osāraṇīyakarmakṛta</i>	<i>dbyung ba 'i las byas pa</i>	one who is reinstated
17	<i>pāriśuddhidāyaka</i>	<i>yongs su dag pa 'bul bar byed pa</i>	[declaration of] purity [for the <i>pośadha</i>] giver
18	<i>pāriśuddhigrāhaka</i>	<i>yongs su dag pa len pa</i>	[declaration of] purity [for the <i>pośadha</i>] acceptor
19	<i>pārivāsikamānāpyacārikā</i>	<i>spos dang mgu bar bya ba spyod pa</i>	probationer
20	<i>prahāṇapratijāgraka</i>	<i>spong ba 'i zhal ta byed pa</i>	supervisor of meditation
21	<i>prāhāṇika</i>	<i>spong pa pa</i>	meditator
22	<i>pratisaṃharaṇīyakarmakṛta</i>	<i>phyir 'gyed pa 'i las byas pa</i>	one who must apologize [to a layperson]
23	<i>pravāraka</i>	<i>dgag dbye byed pa</i>	<i>pravāraṇā</i> ceremony host
24	<i>pravāraṇādāyaka</i>	<i>dgag dbye 'bul ba</i>	[consent for] the <i>pravāraṇā</i> giver
25	<i>pravāraṇāgrāhaka</i>	<i>dgag dbye len pa</i>	[consent for] the <i>pravāraṇā</i> acceptor
26	<i>śalākācāraka</i>	<i>tshul shing 'drim pa</i>	voting stick distributor
27	<i>saṃghasāmagrīdattaka</i>	<i>dge 'dun gyis mthun pa byin pa</i>	leader of a <i>saṃgha</i> restoration procedure
	Sanskrit	Tibetan	English
28	<i>saṃghasthavira</i>	<i>dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan</i>	elder of the community
29 & 30	<i>sārdhaṃvihārin & antevāsin</i>	<i>lhan cig gnas pa dang nye gnas pa</i>	co-residential student & pupil

31	<i>śayanāsanagrāhaka</i>	<i>gnas mal stobs pa</i>	assigner of lodgings
32	<i>śikṣādattaka</i>	<i>bslab pa byin pa</i>	<i>pārājika</i> penitent
33	<i>śmāśanika</i>	<i>dur khrod pa</i>	cemetery dweller
34	<i>tarjanīyakarmakṛta</i>	<i>bsdigs pa 'i las byas pa</i>	one who is censured
35	<i>tatsvabhāvavaiṣṭyadattaka</i>	<i>de 'i ngo bo nyid tshol du gzhug par</i> <i>'os pa byin pa</i>	one who is under investigation
36	<i>uddeśadāyaka</i>	<i>lung 'bogs ba</i>	giver of explanations
37	<i>utkṣepaka</i>	<i>gnas nas 'byin pa</i>	one who performs a suspension
38	<i>utkṣiptaka</i>	<i>gnas nas phyung ba</i>	one who is suspended
39	<i>vanapratisaṃvedaka</i>	<i>nags nyul ba</i>	forest ranger
40	<i>vasādhāraka</i>	<i>tshil 'chang ba</i>	fat keeper
41	(Skt. not extant)	<i>'dun pa 'bul bar byed pa</i>	consent [for the <i>poṣadha</i>] giver
42	(Skt. not extant)	<i>'dun pa len pa</i>	consent [for the <i>poṣadha</i>] acceptor
43	(Skt. not extant)	<i>lhung bzed kyi chu sbyin par byes pa</i>	begging-bowl water distributor
	Sanskrit	Tibetan	English
44	(Skt. not extant)	<i>dri 'chang ba</i>	perfume keeper
45	(Skt. not extant)	<i>glo (or blo) bur du 'ongs pa</i>	visitor
46	(Skt. not extant)	<i>gleng ba po</i>	[misbehaving monk] criticizer
47	(Skt. not extant)	<i>gzhin gnas pa</i>	local

48	(Skt. not extant)	<i>lam du zhugs (or 'jug) pa</i>	traveller
49	(Skt. not extant) ♀	<i>lhung bzed 'brel ba med pa 'chang ba</i> ♀	confiscated begging-bowl keeper ♀
50	(Skt. not extant)	<i>lhung bzed 'brel pa med pa 'drim pa</i>	confiscated begging-bowl distributor
51	(Skt. not extant)	<i>lhung bzed 'brel pa med pa chang ba</i>	confiscated begging-bowl keeper
52	(Skt. not extant)	<i>mkhar lan byed pa</i>	construction worker
53	(Skt. not extant)	<i>shing skyed par byed pa</i>	tree attendant

Table Two lists the ten monastics found in Table One who appear to be holding a formal office in the *saṃgha*. The Buddha not only prescribes rules of customary behaviour for these monastics, but also indicates five qualities which must not be possessed by one who is fulfilling the role, and five that are necessary for one to be appointed to the position. In these cases, the five good qualities are always the inverse of the five bad qualities. The first four qualities are always the same. Only the fifth is unique to the office. I present these offices here in the order in which their rules of customary behaviour are prescribed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. In the table, I include only the fifth quality, which qualifies the monk or nun to fulfill the role. Five of these offices are already discussed by Silk. In those five cases, I include Silk’s translation or description of the fifth quality. For the other five, I offer my own tentative translation.

Table Two: Monastics Who are Prescribed Rules of Customary Behaviour, Who Require a Formal Appointment, and Must Meet Certain Criteria

	Position	The Fifth Qualification
1	Supervisor of Meditation (<i>prahāṇapratijāgraka</i> ; <i>spong ba’i zhal ta byed pa</i>)	“he knows what has been attended to for the sake of meditative practice, and what has not” (Silk 2008, 173).

2	Host of the <i>Pravāraṇā</i> (<i>pravāraka; dgag dbye byed pa</i>)	he “is required to distinguish between a correctly held <i>pravāraṇā</i> ritual at the end of the rain retreat, and one which is incorrect” (Silk 2008, 173).
	Position	The Fifth Qualification
3	Distributor of Lodgings (<i>śayanāsanagrāhaka; gnas mal stobs pa</i>)	he “must know when bedding and seats have been (correctly) provided, and when not” (Silk 2008, 173).
4	Spreader of <i>Kaṭhina</i> Cloth (<i>kaṭhināstāraka; sra brkyang 'dings pa</i>)	“he knows when the <i>kaṭhina</i> cloth has been [properly] spread, and when not” (Silk 2008, 174).
5	Bringer of Disputes (<i>adhikaraṇasamcāraka; rtsod pa sbed pa</i>)	“he knows which disputes have been [properly] brought about, and which not” (Silk 2008, 172).
6	Criticizer of a Misbehaving Monk (<i>gleng ba po</i>)	he knows [when] to criticize and [when] to not criticize (sTog <i>'dul ba ca 335b1: glengs pa dang ma glengs pa shes pa ste</i>).
7	Distributor of Confiscated Begging-bowls (<i>lhung bzed 'brel pa med pa 'drim pa</i>)	he knows [which] confiscated begging-bowls have been distributed and [which] have not been distributed (sTog <i>'dul ba cha 123b2: lhung bzed 'brel pa med pa brims pa dang ma brims pa shes ba 'o</i>).

8	Informer of Households <i>(kulapratisaṃvedaka; khyim rnams su so sor go bar byed pa)</i>	he knows [which] household[s] have been informed and [which] have not been informed (sTog 'dul ba cha 259a4: <i>go bar byas pa dang ma byas pa 'i khyim shes pa 'o</i>).
9	Forest Ranger <i>(vanapratisaṃvedaka; nags nyul ba)</i>	he knows [when] to patrol a forest and [when] not to patrol (sTog 'dul ba ja 506b1: <i>nags byul pa dang ma byul pa shes pa 'o</i>).

	Position	The Fifth Qualification
10	Keeper of a Confiscated Begging-bowl ♀ <i>(lhung bzed 'brel ba med pa 'chang ba)</i>	The five qualities seem to be given in the negative form only. This nun is disqualified from the position if “she does not know [which] begging-bowl[s] have been distributed and [which] have not been distributed” (“sTog 'dul ba ja 230a1: <i>lhung bzed brims pa dang ma brims par mi shes pa 'o</i> ”).

Appendix Two

Above, in Appendix One, I listed the full range of monastics for whom the Buddha prescribes rules of customary behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. I presented the items in Table One in alphabetical order. Table One does not list monastics who are prescribed rules of customary behaviour in more than location in this *vinaya*.

Appendix Two contains just one table (Table Three). In Table Three, I list all of the passages from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, of which I am currently aware, in which a monk or nun is prescribed rules of customary behaviour by the Buddha. I present these passages in the order in which they appear in the text. This table is designed to show specialists exactly where rules of customary behaviour are prescribed by the Buddha in this *vinaya*. Unlike Table One, where I tried to simplify a translation of the title of the monk or nun for whom the rules of customary behaviour are prescribed, in this table, I include a more descriptive translation. Also unlike Table One, where the *saṃghasthavira* is listed only once, in the following table the *saṃghasthavira* appears seven times, since I am counting the passages in which rules of customary behaviour are prescribed, not the monastics for whom those rules are prescribed. In cases where I am aware of the rules of customary behaviour in the commentarial tradition, I provide footnotes.

Table Three: Location of Prescribed Rules of Customary Behaviour in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*

	Location in <i>MSV</i>: (Clarke 2014b, Plates, if available, and sTog 'dul ba)	Rules of Customary Behaviour are Prescribed for
	<i>Pravrajyāvastu</i>	
1	ka 97a5	a monk who is a co-residential student (<i>sārdhamvihārin</i> ; <i>lhan cig gnas pa</i>) &/or a pupil (<i>antevāsin</i> ; <i>nye gnas pa</i>)
	<i>Poṣadhavastu</i>	
2	14: 55r1 ka 200a3	a monk who practices meditation (<i>prāhāṇika</i> ; <i>spong pa pa</i>)
3	14: 55v1 ka 201b3 ⁴⁸⁹	a monk who supervises meditation (<i>prahāṇapratijāgraka</i> ; <i>spong ba'i zhal ta byed pa</i>)
4	19: 60r8 ka 220a1	a monk who gives his declaration of purity for the <i>poṣadha</i> ceremony via a proxy (<i>pārisuddhidāyaka</i> ; <i>yongs su dag pa 'bul bar byed pa</i>)
5	19: 60v2 ka 220b4	a monk who accepts another's declaration of purity for the <i>poṣadha</i> ceremony as a proxy (<i>pārisuddhigrāhaka</i> ; <i>yongs su dag pa len pa</i>)
6	ka 224a5 ⁴⁹⁰	a monk who offers his consent for the commencement of the <i>poṣadha</i> ceremony via a proxy (<i>'dun pa 'bul bar byed pa</i>)

⁴⁸⁹. See also *Vinayavastu-ṭīkā* (sde dge 'dul ba tsu 311b1–312a6); *Ekottarakarmaśataka* (sde dge 'dul ba wu 196a4–b3).

⁴⁹⁰. See also *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-paddhati* (sde dge 'dul ba du 24a2–b2); *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-samuccaya* (sde dge 'dul ba pu

	Location in MSV: (Clarke 2014b, Plates, if available, and sTog 'dul ba)	Rules of Customary Behaviour are Prescribed for
7	ka 224b7 ⁴⁹¹	a monk who accepts another's consent for the commencement of the <i>poṣadha</i> ceremony as a proxy (<i>dge slong 'dun pa len pa</i>)
	<i>Pravāraṇāvastu</i>	
8	ka 320a7	a monk who hosts the <i>pravāraṇā</i> ceremony (<i>pravāraka; dgag dbye byed pa</i>)
9	23: 69r1 ka 322a1	a monk who gives his consent for the commencement of the <i>pravāraṇā</i> ceremony via a proxy (<i>pravāraṇādāyaka; dgag dbye 'bul ba</i>)
10	ka 322b1	a monk who accepts another's consent for the commencement of the <i>pravāraṇā</i> ceremony as a proxy (<i>pravāraṇāgrāhaka; dgag dbye len pa</i>)
	<i>Varṣāvastu</i>	
11	ka 340b7	a monk who assigns lodgings for the rain retreat (<i>śayanāsanagrāhaka; gnas mal stobs pa</i>)
	<i>Bhaiṣajyavastu</i>	
12	47: 92v7 ka 399b5	a monk who keeps fat (<i>vasādhāraka; tshil 'chang ba</i>)

27a5–b5); *Prātimokṣābhismaraṇapada* (sde dge 'dul ba mu 181a5–b3).

⁴⁹¹. See also *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-paddhati* (sde dge 'dul ba du 24v2); *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-samuccaya* (sde dge 'dul ba pu 27b5); *Prātimokṣābhismaraṇapada* (sde dge 'dul ba mu 181a5).

	Location in MSV: (Clarke 2014b, Plates, if available, and sTog 'dul ba)	Rules of Customary Behaviour are Prescribed for
13	48: 93r4 ka 400b3	a monk who keeps an astringent (<i>kaṣāyadhāraka; bska ba 'chang ba</i>)
14	48: 93r10 ka 401a6	a monk who keeps collyrium (<i>añjanadhāraka; mig sman 'chang ba</i>)
15	ka 407b3	a monk who is the elder of the monastic community (<i>saṃghasthavira; dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan</i>)
	<i>Cīvaravastu</i>	
16	155: 260v3 ga 114a7	a monk who is afflicted by leprosy (<i>kuṣṭharogābhībhūta; mdze nad kyis thebs pa</i>)
	<i>Kaṭhinavastu</i>	
17	172: 277r3 ga 156b5	a monk who prepares and spreads the <i>kaṭhina</i> cloth (<i>kaṭhināstāraka; sra brkyang 'dings pa</i>)
	<i>Kauśāmbakavastu</i>	
18	176: 281r6 ga 168a6	a monk who is given a suspension procedure (<i>utkṣiptaka; gnas nas phyung ba</i>)
19	176: 281r10 ga 169a1	a monk who performs a suspension procedure (<i>utkṣepaka; gnas nas 'byin pa</i>)
20	177: 282r9 ga 171b4	a monk who is a plaintiff (<i>arthin; rgol ba</i>) and one who is a defendant (<i>pratyarthin; phyir rgyal ba</i>) in a dispute
21	179: 284v2 ga 177b1	a monk who is given a suspension procedure (<i>utkṣiptaka; gnas nas phyung ba</i>)

	Location in MSV: (Clarke 2014b, Plates, if available, and sTog 'dul ba)	Rules of Customary Behaviour are Prescribed for
22	179: 284v9 ga 178b2	a monk who requests a restitution procedure (<i>osāraṇīyakarmakṛta</i> ; <i>dbyung ba'i las byas pa</i>)
23	180: 285r4 ga 179a6	a monk who leads a <i>saṃgha</i> restoration procedure (<i>saṃghasāmagrīdattaka</i> ; <i>dge 'dun gyis mthun pa byin pa</i>)
	<i>Pāṇḍulohitakavastu</i>	
24	184: 289r2 ga 190a4	a monk who is given a <i>tarjanīya</i> penal procedure (<i>tarjanīyakarmakṛta</i> ; <i>bsdigs pa'i las byas pa</i>)
25	185: 290v1 ga 194a6	a monk who is given a <i>nigarhaṇīya</i> penal procedure (<i>nigarhaṇīyakarmakṛta</i> ; <i>smad pa'i las byas pa</i>)
26	188: 293r8 ga 201b2	a monk who is given a <i>pratisaṃharaṇīya</i> penal procedure (<i>pratisaṃharaṇīyakarmakṛta</i> ; <i>phyir 'gyed pa'i las byas pa</i>)
	<i>Pārivāsikavastu</i>	
27	205: 310r8 ga 240a5	a monk who is on probation for committing a <i>saṃghāvaśeṣa</i> offence (<i>parivāsika</i>) and must complete a <i>mānāpya</i> probation (<i>pārivāsikamānāpyacārikā</i> ; <i>spo ba dang mgu bar bya ba spyod pa</i>)
	<i>Śayanāsanavastu</i>	
28	(Skt. in Gnoli 1978, 38.30) ga 288a3	a monk who cleans up after the monastery's dogs (<i>kukkurapoṣaka</i> ; <i>khri srel ba</i>)

	Location in MSV: (Clarke 2014b, Plates, if available, and sTog 'dul ba)	Rules of Customary Behaviour are Prescribed for
29	(Skt. in Gnoli 1978, 47.18) ga 294a6	a monk who acts as the giver of explanations (<i>uddeśadāyaka; lung 'bos ba</i>)
	<i>Adhikaraṇavastu</i>	
30	(Skt. in Borgland 2014, <i>Appendix</i> §97, 341r1 [page 56]) ga 325a6	a monk who must bring disputing parties to a <i>saṃgha</i> equipped to deal with their dispute (<i>adhikaraṇasaṃcāraka; rtsod pa sbed pa</i>)
31	(Skt. in Borgland 2014, <i>Appendix</i> §106, 342r5 [page 60]) ga 328a3	a monk who is the elder of the monastic community (<i>saṃghasthavira; dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan</i>)
32	(Skt. in Borgland 2014, <i>Appendix</i> §136, 344r10 [page 68]) ga 333b4	a monk who distributes the voting sticks (here the context is that of an unresolved dispute) (<i>śalākācāraka; tshul shing 'drim pa</i>)
33	(Skt. in Borgland 2014, <i>Appendix</i> §182, 349r3 [page 85]) ga 346a6	a monk who is given a seeking the nature of that (offence) procedure (<i>tatsvabhāvaiṣīyadattaka; de 'i ngo bo nyid tshol du gzhug par 'os pa byin pa</i>)
	<i>Vinayavibhaṅga</i>	
34	ca 64b1	a village monk (<i>grāmāntika; grong mtha 'pa</i>)

	Location in <i>MSV</i> : (sTog 'dul ba)	Rules of Customary Behaviour are Prescribed for
35	ca 66b1	a forest monk (<i>āraṇyaka</i> ; <i>dgon pa pa</i>)
36	ca 110b7	a monk who is travelling (<i>lam du zhugs pa</i>)
37	ca 212a5	a monk who does construction work (<i>mkhar lan byed pa</i>)
38	ca 225a3	a monk who is the elder of the monastic community (<i>saṃghasthavira</i> ; <i>dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan</i>)
39	ca 229a2	a monk who is travelling (<i>lam du zhugs pa</i>)
40	ca 459b7	a monk who is given a seeking the nature of that (offence) procedure (<i>tatsvabhāvaiṣṭyadattaka</i> ; <i>de'i ngo bo nyid tshol du gzhug par 'os pa byin pa</i>)
41	ca 436a3 ⁴⁹²	a monk who criticizes misbehaving monks (<i>gleng ba po</i>)
42	cha 13a2	a monk who is visiting [a <i>vihāra</i>] (<i>blo bur du 'ongs pa</i>)
43	cha 124a5	a monk who distributes confiscated begging-bowls (<i>lhung bzed 'brel pa med pa 'drim pa</i>)
44	cha 125b3 ⁴⁹³	a monk who keeps a confiscated begging-bowl (<i>lhung bzed 'brel pa med pa chang ba</i>)
45	cha 260a1 ⁴⁹⁴	a monk who informs households (<i>kulapratisaṃvedaka</i> ; <i>khyim rnams su so sor go bar byed pa</i>)
46	cha 281b7	a monk who is the superintendent of construction (<i>navakarmika</i> ; <i>lag gi bla</i>)

⁴⁹². See also *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-vinaya-samuccaya* (sde dge 'dul ba pu 136b2–6).

⁴⁹³. See also *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-vinaya-samuccaya* (sde dge 'dul ba pu 307b1–308a5).

⁴⁹⁴. See also *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīkā-vinaya-samuccaya* (sde dge 'dul ba phu 38b5) and *Ekottarakarmaśataka* (sde dge 'dul ba wu 157b4).

	Location in <i>MSV</i> : (sTog 'dul ba)	Rules of Customary Behaviour are Prescribed for
47	ja 507a2	a monk who is a forest ranger (<i>vanapratisaṃvedaka</i> ; <i>nags nyul ba</i>)
48	nya 231a4 ⁴⁹⁵	a nun who keeps a confiscated begging-bowl (<i>lhung bzed 'brel ba med pa 'chang ba</i>)
	<i>Kṣudrakavastu</i>	
49	ta 6b7	a monk who keeps perfume (<i>dri 'chang ba</i>)
50	ta 97a2	a monk who has eaten garlic (<i>laśunakhādaka</i> ; <i>sgog skya za ba</i>)
51	ta 156b1	a monk who has committed a <i>pārājika</i> but remains in the monastic community (<i>śikṣādattaka</i> ; <i>bslab pa byin pa</i>)
52	ta 298a2	a monk who is travelling (<i>lam du zhugs pa</i>)
53	ta 334b1	a monk who dwells in a cemetery (<i>śmāsanika</i> ; <i>dur khrod pa</i>)
54	ta 338b3	a monk who offers (curative) water from begging-bowl(s) (<i>lhung bzed kyi chu sbyin par byes pa</i>)
55	ta 350b1	a monk who is in charge of the monastery's trees (<i>shing skyed par byed pa</i>)
56	ta 385a5	a monk who is the elder of the monastic community (<i>saṃghasthavira</i> ; <i>dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan</i>)
57	ta 390b3	a monk who is the elder of the monastic community (<i>saṃghasthavira</i> ; <i>dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan</i>)
58	tha 155a6	a nun who cuts [an ordinand's] hair (<i>keśāvatārikā</i> ; <i>skra 'dreg pa</i>)
59	tha 294b5	a monk who is a forest dweller (<i>āraṇyaka</i> ; <i>dgon pa pa</i>)

⁴⁹⁵. See also *Ekottarakarmaśataka* (sde dge 'dul ba wu 187a5).

	Rules Prescribed in <i>MSV</i> at: (Clarke 2014b, Plates): (sTog 'dul ba):	Rules of Customary Behaviour are Prescribed for
60	tha 335b1	a monk who is visiting [a <i>vihāra</i>] (<i>glo bur du 'ongs pa</i>)
61	tha 337a2	a monk who is a co-residential student (<i>sārdhamvihārin</i> ; <i>lhan cig gnas pa</i>) &/or a pupil (<i>antevāsin</i> ; <i>nye gnas pa</i>)
	<i>Uttaragrantha</i>	
62	na 242a7 (<i>Muktaka</i> 2.4)	a monk who is the elder of the monastic community (<i>saṃghasthavira</i> ; <i>dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan</i>)
63	na 251b3 (<i>Muktaka</i> 2.4)	a monk who is the elder of the monastic community (<i>saṃghasthavira</i> ; <i>dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan</i>)
64	na 268a7 (<i>Muktaka</i> 3.7)	a monk who is travelling (<i>lam du zhugs pa</i>)
65	na 284a3 (<i>Muktaka</i> 4.6)	a monk who is the superintendent of construction (<i>navakarmika</i> ; <i>las gsar du byed pa</i>)

Appendix Three

The tables provided in Appendices One and Two present examples of the first of three ways that the term rules of customary behaviour appears in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. The tables provided in this Appendix focuses on the other two ways that the term *āsamudācārika-dharma* appears.

The following table (Table Four) lists items that mention rules of customary behaviour in definitions found in the *Māṭṛkā*. This is the second of the three ways in which the term appears in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Where *āsamudācārikas* do not explicitly appear as a rule or set of rules, the item in English is marked with an inverted exclamation mark (!).

Table Four: Items that Mention *Āsamudācārikas* in the *Vinayamāṭṛkā*

	Definition of	Location in <i>Māṭṛkā</i> (sTog 'dul ba na):
1	the conduct of one who has abandoned the training (<i>bslab pa phul ba</i>)	section 1 (on ordination) 344b6–345a6 ⁴⁹⁶
2	the conduct of the superintendent of construction (<i>navakarmika; las gsar</i>)	section 2 (on monastic conduct) 393a5–394a7
3	the conduct of one who has consumed garlic (<i>laśunakhādaka; sgog skya</i>)	397b4–398b2
4	the obligations of one who lives apart (<i>nānāsamvāsika; so sor gnas pa</i>)	section 3 (on obligatory behaviour) 406a6–407a7
5	the obligations of an elder [in an area in which] the boundary (<i>sīmā</i>) has not been determined (<i>mtshams ma bcad pa'i gnas brtan</i>)	409b1–7
6	the obligations of one who lives in the vicinity of a town (<i>khang pa 'khor du bcas pa</i>)	412a4–b1
7	the obligations of a forest dweller (<i>āraṇyaka; dgon pa pa</i>)	420b1–421b4
8	the obligations of the elder who travels (<i>'gro ba'i gnas brtan</i>)	427a7–428b4

⁴⁹⁶. See also *Prātimokṣa-sūtra-ṭīka-samuccaya* (sde dge 'dul ba pu 180b4–181a3).

	Definition of	Location in <i>Māṭrkā</i> (sTog 'dul ba na):
9	the obligations of one with seniority in regard to foot baths (<i>rkang pa bkru ba'i gnas brtan</i>)	429a2–5
10	the obligations of a junior (<i>navaka; gsar bu</i>)	439b3–440a1
11	the obligations of the elder, a middling, and junior (<i>sthavira; madhyama; and navaka; gnas brtan dang bar ma dang gsar bu</i>)	440a1–4
12	the obligations of a preceptor (<i>upādhyāya; mkhan po</i>)	441a1–5
13	the obligations of the elder in a village (<i>grong du nye bar song ba'i gnas brtan</i>)	447b5–7
14	the obligations of one who relieves [a travelling monk's] exhaustion (<i>ngal bso ba</i>)	448a6–b5

As mentioned in Chapter One of this dissertation, in at least nine cases, ordinands in this *vinaya* are also said to be taught their rules of customary behaviour two or three days after their ordination. This is the third way that the term *āsamudācārika-dharma* appears in this *vinaya*. What exactly these rules entail is not explicitly stated. In Table Five, I present these nine cases, in the order in which they appear in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Table Five: Monks who are Taught their Rules of Customary Behaviour Two or Three days After Their Ordination

	Ordination of	Location in the <i>Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya</i>
		<i>Pravrajyāvastu</i>
1	an escaped servant or slave	sTog 'dul ba ka 116b5–117b4; Eimer 1983, 2: 198.19–202.8; & Miller 2018, 3.7–.19
2	a householder with debt	sTog 'dul ba ka 118b7–119b7; Eimer 1983, 2: 202.9–205.26; & Miller 2018, 3.20–.34
3	Samgharakṣita (<i>dge 'dun 'tsho la</i>)	sTog 'dul ba ka 151b1–152a2; Eimer 1983, 2: 262.13–263.3; & Miller 2018, 4.185
4	a maimed servant without arms	sTog 'dul ba ka 193b5–195a4; Eimer 1983, 2: 334.18–337.2; & Miller 2018, 6.2–.10
		<i>Saṅghabhedavastu</i>
5a	Udāyin	sTog 'dul ba nga 119b2–120a2, and Gnoli 1977–1978, 1: 185.29–186.8
		<i>Vinayavibhaṅga</i>
6	Nanda (<i>mdzes dga'</i>)	sTog 'dul ba ca 60a3–b1
7	Upasena (<i>nye sde</i>)	sTog 'dul ba ca 171a5–b1
5b	Udāyin (<i>'char kha</i>)	sTog 'dul ba ca 503b6–504a2
		<i>Kṣudrakavastu</i>
8	a man who promises to return home to his wife	sTog 'dul ba ta 152a4–b1
9	a man with green hair	sTog 'dul ba tha 53b3–54b3

The above table does not list the one case in which novices are taught their rules of customary behaviour two or three days after their ordination. As stated in Chapter One of this dissertation, to my knowledge this occurs only in this one case from the *Pravrajyāvastu*, where a father and son join the monastic community together as novices.⁴⁹⁷

⁴⁹⁷. sTog 'dul ba ka 113b2–114b4; Eimer 1983, 2: 193.7–195.7; Miller 2018, 2.22–.34.

Bibliography

The Facsimile Edition of the Sde-dge Bstan-'gyur (Bstod tshogs) reproduced from a clear set of prints from the 18th century Sde-dge blocks. Vols. ka(1)–pa (13) and du (252)–su (269). Delhi: Karmapae Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang, 1982–1985.

The Lha sa Bka' 'gyur. Vols. ka (1)–pa (13). Lha sa: Zhol Bka' 'gyur Par Khang, 194-?.

The Tog Palace Manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur. Vols. ka (1)–na (12). Leh: Smarntsis Shesrig Dpemzod, 1975–1980.

Bagchi, S[itansusekhar]. [1967–1970] 2000. *Mūlasarvāstivādinayavastu*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 16. 2 vols. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

Banerjee, Anukul Chandra. 1957. *Sarvastivada Literature*. Calcutta: K. L. Mukhopadhyay.

Bass, Jeffrey Wayne. 2013. “Meditation in an Indian Buddhist Monastic Code.” PhD diss., University of California Los Angeles.

Blanford, William Thomas. 1888–1891. *Mammalia The Fauna of British India, Including Ceylon and Burma*. Issued in 2 Parts. London: Taylor and Francis.

Borgland, Jens. 2014. “A Study of the *Adhikaraṇavastu*: Legal Settlement Procedures of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.” PhD diss., University of Oslo.

Borgland, Jens. 2016–2017. “Undetermined Matters: On the Use of Lay Witnesses in Buddhist Monastic Procedural Law.” *Buddhism, Law & Society* 2: 1–56.

Buswell, Robert, and Donald Lopez, Jr. 2014. *The Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism*.

Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cabezón, José, and Penpa Dorjee. 2019. *Sera Monastery*. Somerville: Wisdom

Publications.

Chakravarti, Ranabir, and Krishnendu Ray. 2011. “Healing and Healers Inscribed:

Epigraphic Bearing on Healing-Houses in Early India.” *Occasional Paper 30*: 1–

31. Kolkata: Institute of Development Studies Kolkata.

Chandra Das, Sarat, and Rai Bahadur. 1902. *A Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary (with Sanskrit*

Synonyms). Edited by Graham Sandberg and A. William Heyde. Calcutta: The

Bengal Secretariat Book Depôt.

Chang, Kun, ed. and trans. 1957. *A Comparative Study of the Kaṭhinavastu*. Indo-Iranian

Monographs 1. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Chung, Jin-il. 1998a. “‘Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācanā’ of the Mūlasarvāstivādins.” In *Facets of*

Indian Culture, Gustav Roth Felicitation Volume, Published on the Occasion of his

82nd Birthday, edited by Chitta Ranjan Prasad Sinha, 420–423. Patna: Bihar

Puravid Parishad.

Chung, Jin-il, ed. and trans. 1998b. *Die Pravāraṇā in den kanonischen Vinaya-Texte der*

Mūlasarvāstivādin und der Sarvāstivādin. Sanskrit Wörterbuch der buddhistischen

Texte aus den Turfan-Funden 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Chung, Jin-il, ed. 2011. *Handbuch für die buddhistische Mönchsordination bei den*

Mūlasarvāstivādins. Gimpo: Institute for Buddhist Scriptures in Korean

Translation.

- Clarke, Shayne. 2004. “*Vinaya Mātrkā*—Mother of the Monastic Codes, or Just Another Set of Lists? A Response to Frauwallner’s Handling of the Mahāsāṃghika *Vinaya*.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47: 77–120.
- Clarke, Shayne. 2009. “Locating Humour in Indian Buddhist Monastic Law Codes: A Comparative Approach.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 37(4): 311–330.
- Clarke, Shayne. 2014a. *Family Matters in Indian Buddhist Monasticisms*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Clarke, Shayne, ed. 2014b. *Vinaya Texts*. Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India Facsimile Edition 1. New Delhi and Tokyo: The National Archives of India and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Clarke, Shayne. 2015. “*Vinayas*.” In *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism* 1, edited by Jonathan Silk, 60–87. Leiden: Brill.
- Clarke, Shayne. 2016–2017. “Lost in Tibet, Found in Bhutan: The Unique Nature of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Law Code for Nuns.” *Buddhism, Law & Society* 2: 199–292.
- Clarke, Shayne. 2021. “On Some Curious Cases Where the Buddha Did *Not* Make a Rule: Palliative Care, Assisted Suicide, and Abortion in an Indian Buddhist Monastic Law Code.” *International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture* 31(1): 13–113.
- DeCaroli, Robert. 2004. *Haunting the Buddha: Indian Popular Religions and the Formation of Buddhism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Demiéville, Paul. [1937] 1985. *Buddhism and Healing: Demiéville’s Article “Byō” from Hōbōgirin*. Translated by Mark Tatz. Lanham: University Press of America.

- Durt, Hubert. 1979. “Chū.” In *Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d’après les sources chinoises et japonaises 5*, edited by Sylvain Levi, Junjirō Takakusu, Paul Demiéville, Jacques Gernet, Jacques May, Hubert Durt, Anna Seidel, and Antonino Forte, 431–456. Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha, ed. [1942–1950] 1984. *Gilgit Manuscripts*. Volume 3 in 4 parts. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica 16–19. 2nd edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Edgerton, Franklin. [1953] 1985. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary* (Volume II: Dictionary). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Eimer, Helmut, ed. 1983. *Rab tu ’byuñ ba’i gzi: die tibetische Übersetzung des Pravrajyāvastu im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Asiatische Forschungen 82. 2 vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Eimer, Helmut. 1987. “Zur Reihenfolge der Texte in der Abteilung Vinaya des tibetischen Kanjur.” *Zentralasiatische Studien* 20: 219–227.
- Ende, Rein. 2016. “The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: an Attempt at an *Index Locurum*.” MA Project, McMaster University.
- Finnegan, Damchö Diana. 2009. “‘For the Sake of Women Too’: Ethics and Gender in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.” PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Fukuda, Yōichi, and Yumiko Ishihama, ed. 1989. *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvvyutpatti: Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology*. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko.

Gnoli, Raniero, ed. 1977–1978. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu*. Serie Orientale Roma 49. 2 vols. (in 2 parts). Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

Gnoli, Raniero, ed. 1978. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu. Being the 15th and 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Serie Orientale Roma 50. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

Granoff, Phyllis. 2011. “The Buddha as the Greatest Healer: the Complexities of a Comparison.” *Journal Asiatique* 299(1): 5–22.

Handy, Chris. 2018–2019. “Indian Buddhist Bathrooms: Politeness, Disgust and Monastic Law.” *Buddhism, Law & Society* 4: 145–196.

Harrison, Paul. 1995. “Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What Are We Looking For?” *Eastern Buddhist* 28(1): 48–69.

Harrison, Paul. 2018. “Early Mahāyāna: Laying out the Field.” In *Setting Out on the Great Way: Essays on Early Mahāyāna Buddhism*, edited by Paul Harrison, 7–32. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe and Klaus Wille. 2014. “The Manuscript of the *Dīrghāgama* and the Private Collection in Virginia.” In *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research. Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: The State of the Field, Stanford, June 15–19 2009*, edited by Paul Harrison, and Jens Uwe Hartmann, 137–155. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Heirman, Ann. 2019. “The Consumption of Garlic: Vinaya Rules.” *Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies* 34: 63–89.

Heirman, Ann. 2021. “How to Deal with Dangerous and Annoying Animals: A Vinaya Perspective.” *Religions* 10(2): 1–17.

Heirman, Ann, and Mathieu Torck. 2012. *A Pure Mind in a Clean Body: Bodily Care in the Buddhist Monasteries of Ancient India and China*. Ghent: Academia Press.

Heirman, Ann, and Tom de Rauw. 2006. “Offenders, Sinners and Criminals: The Consumption of Forbidden Food.” *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 59(1): 57–83.

von Hinüber, Oskar. 2014a. “General Introduction: Preface to the New Series.” In *Vinaya Texts*, xi–xiv. Ed. Shayne Clarke. New Delhi and Tokyo: The National Archives of India and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

von Hinüber, Oskar. 2014b. Review of *Hanbuch für die buddhistische Mönchsordination bei den Mūlasarvāstivādins*, by Jin-il Chung. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 57(1–2): 105–107.

von Hinüber, Oskar, and Noriyuki Kudo, eds. 2022. *Mahāyāna Texts: Saṃghāṭasūtra*. Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India Facsimile Edition 2(5). New Delhi and Tokyo: The National Archives of India and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

Hirabayashi, Jirō, Noriyuki Kudo, Adelheid Mette, Ruriko Sakuma, and Chanwit Tudkeao, eds. 2017. *Mahāyāna Texts: Further Mahāyānasūtras*. Gilgit

Manuscripts in the National Archives of India Facsimile Edition 2(4). New Delhi and Tokyo: The National Archives of India and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

Hirakawa, Akira, trans. 1982. *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns: An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṅghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

Hiraoka, Satoshi. 1998. “The Relation Between the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 26(5): 419–434.

Horner, Isaline Blew, trans. [1938–1966] 2001–2012. *The Book of Discipline (Vinaya-Piṭaka)*. 6 vols. London: Luzac and Company Ltd.

Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan, ed. and trans. 1994. *Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins: Aufgrund des Sanskrit-Texts der Gilgit-Handschrift und der tibetischen Version sowie unter Berücksichtigung der Sanskrit-Fragmente des Poṣadhavastu aus zentralasiatischen Handschriftenfunden herausgegeben, mit den Parallelversionen verglichen, übersetzt und kommentiert*. Reinbek: Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen.

Iyanaga, Nobumi. 2017. “A History of the *Hōbōgin*: *Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d’après les sources chinoises et japonaises*.” *The Eastern Buddhist* 48(1): 7–21.

Jansen, Berthe. 2018. *The Monastery Rules: Buddhist Monastic Organization in Pre-Modern Tibet*. Oakland: University of California Press.

- Jäschke, Heinrich. [1881] 2014. *A Tibetan-English Dictionary (Compact Edition)*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Jinānanda, Bhikkhu. 1953. “A study of the Pāli *Vinaya Mahāvagga* in comparison with the corresponding sections of the Gilgit manuscripts.” PhD diss., School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Jinānanda, B[hikkhu], ed. 1961. *Upasampadājñaptiḥ (Critically Edited with Notes and Introduction)*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 6. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Jinānanda, B[hikkhu], ed. 1969. *Abhisamācārikā [Bhikṣuprakīrnaka]*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 9. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- de Jong, Jan Willem. 1974. Review of *Abhisamācārikā [Bhikṣuprakīrnaka]*, by B. Jinānanda. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 16(2): 150–152.
- Karashima, Seishi. 2001. “Who Composed the Lotus Sutra? — Antagonism Between Wilderness and Village Monks. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology* 4: 143–179.
- Karashima, Seishi, ed. and trans. 2012. *Die Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 13. 3 vols. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Karashima, Seishi. 2014. “The Language of the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* — The Oldest Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Text.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology* 17: 77–88.

- Karashima, Seishi, Youngjin Lee, Jundo Nagashima, Fumio Shoji, Kenta Suzuki, Ye Shaoyong, and Stefano Zacchetti, eds. 2016. *Mahāyāna Texts: Prajñāpāramitā Texts*. Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India Facsimile Edition 2(1). New Delhi and Tokyo: The National Archives of India and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Karashima, Seishi, and Tatsushi Tamai, eds. 2019. *Mahāyāna Texts: Prajñāpāramitā Texts*. Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India Facsimile Edition 2(2). New Delhi and Tokyo: The National Archives of India and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Karashima, Seishi, and Klaus Wille, ed. 2009. *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments*. Volume 2. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 2010. Review of *Managing Monks: Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*, by Jonathan Silk. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 53(1): 71–88.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 2015. Review of *The Rules of Proper Conduct of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda Tradition*, by Seishi Karashima. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 58(4): 376–393.
- Kishino, Ryoji. 2013. “A Study of the *Nidāna*: An Underrated Canonical Text of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*.” PhD diss., University of California Los Angeles.

- Kishino, Ryoji. 2016. “A Further Study of the *Muktaka* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: A Table of Contents and Parallels.” *Bukkyō Daigaku Bukkyōgakkai kiyō* 21: 227–283.
- Kishino, Ryohji. 2021. “A Translation of the Story of an Angry Monk Who Became a Poisonous Snake in the *Muktaka* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Part One: Two Clichés.” *Buddhist Seminar* (of the Society of Buddhist Studies, Otani University) 113: 1–39.
- Kudo, Noriyuki, ed. 2017. *Avadānas and Miscellaneous Texts*. Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India Facsimile Edition 3. New Delhi and Tokyo: The National Archives of India and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Kudo, Noriyuki, Takanori Fukita, and Hironori Tanaka, eds. 2018. *Mahāyāna Texts: Samādhirājasūtra*. Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India Facsimile Edition 2(3). New Delhi and Tokyo: The National Archives of India and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Lamotte, Étienne. [1958] 1988. *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śāka Era*. Translated by Sara Webb-Boin. Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 36. Louvain-Paris: Peeters Press.
- Maurer, Petra, and Johannes Schneider, eds. (*herausgegeben von* Herbert Franke, Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Thomas Höllmann). 2007. *Wörterbuch der tibetischen Schriftsprache*. Band 1 (Lieferung 3). München: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- Miller, Robert, trans. 2018. “*The Chapter on Going Forth*” from *The Chapters on Monastic Discipline* (*Vinayavastu Pravrajyāvastu*, ’dul ba gzhi las / rab tu ’byung ba’i gzhi). 84000: Translating the Words of the Buddha: <https://read.84000.co/translation/toh1-1.html?id=&part=>.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. [1899] 2003. *Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Negi, J.S. 1993–2005. *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*. 16 vols. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.
- Nolot, Édith. 1996. “Studies in Vinaya technical terms I–III.” *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 22: 73–150.
- Nolot, Édith. 1999. “Studies in Vinaya technical terms IV–X.” *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 25: 1–111.
- Ohnuma, Reiko. 2007. *Head, Eyes, Flesh, Blood: Giving Away the Body in Indian Buddhist Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Oldenberg, Hermann, ed. [1879–1883] 1969–1995. *The Vinaya-piṭakaṃ*. 5 vols. London: Luzac and Co.
- Pachow, W. [1955] 2007. *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa: On the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pāli Versions*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Pagel, Ulrich. 2014. *Buddhist Monks in Tax Disputes: Monastic Attitudes towards Revenue Collection in Ancient India*. Buddhist Asia 3. Napoli: Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale” Centro di Studi sul Buddhismo.

- Pagel, Ulrich. 2017. “Nothing to Declare: Status, Power and Religious Aspiration in the Policies of Taxation in Ancient India.” *Medieval Worlds* 6: 101–117.
- Panglung, Losang Jampa. 1981. *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya: analysiert auf Grund der tibetischen Übersetzung*. Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library.
- Powers, John. 2009. *A Bull of a Man: Images of Masculinity, Sex, and the Body in Indian Buddhism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Prebish, Charles, trans. 1975. *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: The Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtras of the Mahāsāṃghikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins*. University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Ray, Reginald. 1994. *Buddhist Saints in India: A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Roach, Susan. 2020. “‘The Qualities of the Purified’: Attitudes Towards the *Dhūtaguṇas* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.” PhD diss., SOAS, University of London.
- Roloff, Carola. 2021. *The Buddhist Nuns’ Ordination in the Tibetan Canon: Possibilities of the Revival of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Bhikṣuṇī Lineage*. Bochum/Freiburg: Projekt Verlag.
- Rotman, Andy, trans. 2008–2017. *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna* (in 2 parts). Somerville: Wisdom Publications.
- Sakaki, Ryōzaburō, ed. [1916] 1962. *Mahāvīyūtpatti*. 2 vols. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation.
- Sasaki, Shizuka. 2004. “*Araṇya* Dwellers in Buddhism.” *Bukkyō kenkyū* 32: 1–13.

Santosh, Sivan, dir. [2001] 2004. *Ashoka the Great* (Aśoka). First Look International.

DVD.

Schiefner, Anton. [1882] 1906. *Tibetan Tales: Derived from Indian Sources*. Translated from the Tibetan of the *Kah-gyur* by Anton von Schiefner. Done into English by W.R.S. Ralston. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.

Schopen, Gregory. 2000. “Hierarchy and Housing in a Buddhist Monastic Code. A Translation of the Sanskrit Text of the *Śāyanāsanavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādin* vinaya. Part One.” *Buddhist Literature* 2: 92–96.

Schopen, Gregory. 2004a. *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Schopen, Gregory. [1995a] 2004a. “Deaths, Funerals, and the Division of Property in a Monastic Code.” In *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2004a), 91–121.

Schopen, Gregory. [1995b] 2004a. “Monastic Law Meets the Real World: A Monk’s Continuing Right to Inherit Family Property in Classical India.” In *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2004a), 170–192.

Schopen, Gregory. [1996] 2004a. “The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism.” In *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2004a), 219–259.

- Schopen, Gregory. [1998] 2004a. “Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries: On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices.” In *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2004a), 260–284.
- Schopen, Gregory. [2000] 2004a. “Art, Beauty, and the Business of Running a Buddhist Monastery in Early Northwest India.” In *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2004a), 19–44.
- Schopen, Gregory. [2001] 2004a. “Dead Monks and Bad Debts: Some Provisions of a Buddhist Monastic Inheritance Law.” In *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2004a), 122–169.
- Schopen, Gregory. [2003] 2004b. “*Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.” In *Encyclopedia of Buddhism 2*, edited by Robert Buswell, 572–573. New York: MacMillan Reference.
- Schopen, Gregory. [2003] 2004c. “*Vinaya*.” In *Encyclopedia of Buddhism 2*, edited by Robert Buswell, 885–889. New York: MacMillan Reference.
- Schopen, Gregory. 2007. “Cross-Dressing with the Dead: Asceticism, Ambivalence, and Institutional Values in an Indian Buddhist Monastic Code.” In *The Buddhist Dead: Practices, Discourses, Representations*, edited by Bryan Cuevas, and Jacqueline Stone, 60–104. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Schopen, Gregory. 2009. “On the Absence of Ur-texts and Otiose Ācāryas: Buildings, Books, and Lay Buddhist Ritual at Gilgit.” In *Écrire et transmettre en Inde classique*, edited by Gérard Colas and Gerdi Gerschheimer, 189–219. Paris: École française d’Extrême-Orient.

Schopen, Gregory. 2012. “Redeeming Bugs, Birds, and Really Bad Sinners in Some Medieval *Mahāyāna Sūtras* and *Dhāraṇīs*.” In *Sins and Sinners: Perspectives from Asian Religions*, edited by Phyllis Granoff, and Koichi Shinohara, 276–294. Leiden: Brill.

Schopen, Gregory. 2014. *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Wordly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Schopen, Gregory. [2002] 2014. “Counting the Buddha and Local Spirits in a Monastic Ritual of Inclusion for the Rain Retreat.” In *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Wordly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2014), 194–223.

Schopen, Gregory. [2003] 2014. “Celebrating Odd Moments: The Biography of the Buddha in Some Mūlasarvāstivādin Cycles of Religious Festivals.” In *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Wordly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2014), 361–389.

Schopen, Gregory. [2004] 2014. “Making Men into Monks.” In *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Wordly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2014), 175–193.

Schopen, Gregory. [2006] 2014. “On Monks and Menial Laborers: Some Monastic Accounts of Building Buddhist Monasteries.” In *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Wordly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2014), 251–275.

- Schopen, Gregory. [2007] 2014. “The Learned Monk as a Comic Figure: On Reading a Buddhist *Vinaya* as Indian Literature.” In *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Wordly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2014), 404–431.
- Schopen, Gregory. [2008] 2014. “Separate but Equal: Property Rights and the Legal Independence of Buddhist Nuns and Monks in Early India.” In *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Wordly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2014), 73–94.
- Schopen, Gregory. [2009] 2014. “The Urban Buddhist Nun and a Protective Rite for Children in Early North India.” In *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Wordly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2014), 3–22.
- Schopen, Gregory. [2010] 2014. “On Incompetent Monks and Able Urbane Nuns in a Buddhist Monastic Code.” In *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Wordly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2014), 47–72.
- Schopen, Gregory. [2013] 2014. “A New Hat for Hārītī: On ‘Giving’ Children for Their Protection to Buddhist Nuns and Monks in Early India.” In *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Wordly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Schopen 2014), 131–156.
- Schopen, Gregory. 2015. “The Fragrance of the Buddha, the Scent of Monuments, and the Odor of Images in Early India.” *Bulletin de l’Ecole française d’Extrême-Orient* 101: 11–30.

- Schopen, Gregory. 2017a. “Help for the Sick, the Dying, and the Misbegotten: A Sanskrit Version of the *Sūtra of Bhaiṣajyaguru*.” In *Buddhism and Medicine: an Anthology of Premodern Sources*, edited by Pierce Salguero, 235–251. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schopen, Gregory. 2017b. “The Training and Treatments of an Indian Doctor in a Buddhist Text: A Sanskrit Biography of Jīvaka.” In *Buddhism and Medicine: an Anthology of Premodern Sources*, edited by Pierce Salguero, 184–204. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schopen, Gregory. 2018. “On Monks and Emergencies: The Brahmanical Principle of *Āpad* in a Buddhist Monastic Code.” In *Reading Slowly: A Festschrift for Jens E. Braavig*, edited by Lutz Edzard, Jens Borgland, and Ute Hüsken, 376–391. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Shōno, Masanori, ed. 2010. “A Re-edited Text of the *Varṣāvastu* in the *Vinayavastu* and a Tentative Re-edited Text of the *Vārṣikavastu* in the *Vinayasūtra*.” *Acta Tibetica et Buddhica* 3: 1–128.
- Shōno, Masanori. 2017. “Local Buddhist Monastic Agreements among the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins.” *Buddhist Studies Review* 34(1): 53–66.
- Shōno, Masanori. 2020. “Sanskrit Fragments from Prātideśanikā 2–4 of the *Upālipariṣcchā* in the *Vinaya-uttaragrantha*.” *Bulletin of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies* 3(2020): 91–120.
- Silk, Jonathan. 2007. “Good and Evil in Indian Buddhism: The Five Sins of Immediate Retribution.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 35(3): 253–286.

- Silk, Jonathan. 2008. *Managing Monks: Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silk, Jonathan. 2009. *Riven by Lust: Incest and Schism in Indian Buddhist Legend and Historiography*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Silk, Jonathan. 2010. “Review of Anton Schiefner’s *Übersetzungen aus dem tibetischen Kanjur: Beiträge zur Buddhismuskunde und zur zentralasiatischen Märchenforschung*.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 53(1): 65–70.
- Skilling, Peter, Saerji, and Prapod Assavavirulhakarn. 2016. “A Possible Sanskrit Parallel to the Pali *Uruvelasutta*.” In *Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 4*, edited by Jens Braarvig, 159–182. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- Sobisch, Jan-Ulrich. 2002. *Three-Vow Theories in Tibetan Buddhism: A Comparative Study of the Major Traditions from the Twelfth through Nineteenth Centuries*. Contributions to Tibetan Studies 1. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Sobkovyak, Ekaterina. 2015. “Religious History of the *Gaṇḍī* Beam: Testimonies of Texts, Images and Ritual Practices.” *Asiatische Studien-Études Asiatiques* 69(3): 685–722.
- Study Group of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Tibetan *dBu med* Script at Taishō University. 2015. “The Preliminary Transliteration of the Vinayasūtra.” PDF available here: http://www.tais.ac.jp/wp/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/vinayasutra_trlt.pdf. PDF accessed in 2021.

- Tambiah, Stanley Jeyaraja. 1984. *The Buddhist Saints of the Forest and the Cult of Amulets: A Study of Charisma, Hagiography, Sectarianism, and Millennial Buddhism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tatelman, Joel. [2003] 2004. “*Divyāvādāna*.” In *Encyclopedia of Buddhism* 1, edited by Robert Buswell, 235. New York: MacMillan Reference.
- Tsomo, Karma Lekshe. 1996. *Sisters in Solitude: Two Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Ethics for Women; a Comparative Analysis of the Chinese Dharmagupta and Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda Bhikṣuṇī Pratimokṣa Sūtras*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ui, Hakuju, Munetada Suzuki, Yenshō Kanakura, and Tōkan Tada, eds. 1934. *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkash-hgyur and Bstan hgyur)*. Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University.
- Upasak, C.S. 1975. *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms*. Varanasi: Bharati Prakashan.
- Vidyabhusana, Satis Chandra, trans. 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.
- Vinayasūtra’s Pravrajyāvastu Study Group. 2007. “The *Pravrajyāvastu* of the *Vinayasūtra* and its *Vṛtti* (4), Ritsukyō ‘shukkeji’ no kenkyū (4) 『律經』 「出家事」 の研究 (4).” *Annual of the Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism Taisho University* 29: 26–65.

- Yamagiwa, Nobuyuki, ed. and trans. 2001. *Das Pāṇḍulohitakavastu: Über die verschieden Verfahrensweisen der Bestrafung in der buddhistischen Gemeinde*. Indica et Tibetica 41. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Yao, Fumi. 2012. “Problems in the sTog Palace Manuscript of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 60: 1189–1193.
- Yao, Fumi. 2013. *Konpon-setsuissaiubu-ritsu Yakuji* [The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (An Annotated Japanese translation)]. Tokyo: Rengō shuppan.
- Yao, Fumi. 2019–2020. “Talking Wittily with an Ill-Behaved Monk: On a Reference to the *Jetavanasūtra* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.” *Buddhism, Law & Society* 5: 1–30.
- Yao, Fumi, trans. 2021. “*The Chapter on Medicines*” from *The Chapters on Monastic Discipline (Vinayavastuni Bhaiṣajyavastu)*. 84000: Translating the Words of the Buddha: <https://read.84000.co/translation/toh1-6.html>.
- Zysk, Kenneth. 1991. *Asceticism and Healing in Ancient India*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (Note: I have benefitted from electronic searches of the *Vinayavastu* e-texts input by Jin-il Chung, Seishi Karashima, and Klaus Wille available at <http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil.html>)