

**Zeitschrift:** Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

**Band:** 53 (1999)

**Heft:** 4

**Artikel:** Vinaya : perpetuum mobile

**Autor:** Heirman, Ann

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147483>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 26.04.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## VINAYA: PERPETUUM MOBILE

Ann Heirman, Ghent National University

Basing themselves on existing scholarly research of the various sub-groups of Sarvāstivāda philosophical thought, Willemen, C., Dessein, B. and Cox, C. (1998) proposed an innovative theory on the philosophical relationship and interdependence of these various Sarvāstivāda sub-groups. With the growth of and the subsequent schism of the Buddhist community in the first centuries after the death of the Buddha, the Buddhist order spread to the West of the Indian subcontinent to such regions as Mathurā and Vidiśā.<sup>1</sup> From this ancient Buddhist zone, the doctrine was further brought to the Northwest and to the South. It has been argued by Willemen, C., Dessein, B. and Cox, C. (1998, pp.123-125) that it is because of the political dominance of the Kuṣāṇa empire in the second century AD that the philosophical interpretation peculiar to the Vaibhāṣika Sarvāstivādins who were centered in Kaśmīra, i.e. in the Kuṣāṇa empire, became the dominant interpretation. It is this dominance that explains why modern scholarship until recently recognized the Vaibhāṣika viewpoints as the orthodox Sarvāstivāda viewpoints. In fact, the Vaibhāṣika development is only one of two main streams of doctrinal development. The second line of development was situated in Gandhāra and in Bactria. While the Vaibhāṣikas laid special emphasis on the authority of philosophical treatises (*śāstras*), the Gandhāran and Bactrian Sarvāstivādins compiled philosophical texts that have the textual format of *sūtras*, i.e. their texts consist of stanzas which are explained in an auto-commentary. These Gandhāran and Bactrian masters refer to themselves as Sautrāntikas, thus pointing to their dependence upon *sūtra*-like literature. The same Gandhāran and Bactrian Sarvāstivāda masters are referred to as Dārṣṭāntika by their Vaibhāṣika opponents. Dārṣṭāntika, which is derived from *drṣṭānta*, means ‘illustration’.<sup>2</sup> It here refers to the passages that serve to illustrate doctrinal

\* We would like to express our gratitude to Dr. B. Dessein for his constructive advice in writing the *abhidharma* sections of the present article.

1 Hirakawa, A., 1991, pp.266-276; Willemen, C., Dessein, B. and Cox, C., 1998, pp.88-89.

2 Przulski, J., 1923, pp.246-250.

issues. A first compendium of the Gandhāran and Bactrian doctrine was made by the Bactrian Dharmaśreṣṭhin. This work is entitled *Abhidharma-hṛdaya*, *Heart of Scholasticism*. Based on this work, other compendia, also called *hṛdaya*, were composed. The last work in this series is the *Samyuktābhidharmahrdaya* by Dharmatrāta. It is significant that these Gandhāran and Bactrian works show an increasing Vaibhāṣika influence. After the wane of the Kuṣāṇa power (starting from the fourth century AD), the Sautrāntikas of Gandhāra and Bactria became the dominant doctrinal stream. The famous Sautrāntika Vasubandhu (400-480 AD) criticizes the Vaibhāṣikas in his major work, the *Abhidharmakośa*. Later, the work has been translated into Tibetan. After the final decline of the Kāśmīra ‘orthodoxy’ in the seventh century AD, the Sautrāntikas rename themselves as Mūlasarvāstivādins, i.e. the original Sarvāstivādins. It is the Mūlasarvāstivāda interpretation of doctrinal texts that is brought to Tibet starting from the seventh century AD. Also the translations into Chinese of Sarvāstivāda texts in the seventh century by Hsüan-tsang shows Mūlasarvāstivāda influence.<sup>3</sup> This interpretation even became the recognized interpretation in regions which traditionally had been Vaibhāṣika.<sup>4</sup>

\*\*\*

The above scheme of philosophical development also seems to be valid for the development of Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya* literature. After the split between the Mahāsāṃghikas and the Sthaviravādins, Sthaviravāda Buddhism spread to the West of India. These Sthaviravādins later gave rise to the Pali, Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka and Sarvāstivāda Schools.<sup>5</sup>

According to E. Frauwallner<sup>6</sup>, these schools owe their rise to missionary activities during the reign of the Maurya King Aśoka, as mentioned

3 Willemsen, C, Dessein, B. and Cox, C., 1998, pp.74-80 and pp.89-92.

4 Willemsen, C, Dessein, B. and Cox, C., 1998, p.85.

5 Of the other Sthaviravāda Schools, such as the Kāśyāpiya and Haimavata Schools, a *vinaya* has not been passed down.

6 Frauwallner, E., 1956, p.12ff..

in the Singhalese chronicles. The missions are said to have started in the region of Vidiśā.

According to É. Lamotte<sup>7</sup>, however, the significance of the individual missionaries has been widely overestimated. He points to the fact that the expansion of Buddhism already initiated at the time of the historical Buddha himself, and reached its peak during the reign of King Aśoka in the third century BC.

Furthermore, A. Hirakawa<sup>8</sup> argues that already before the reign of King Aśoka, Buddhism had spread to the West of India, as far as the region of Mathurā, and that during Aśoka's reign the Buddhist *saṃgha* also spread to other regions. With this geographical spread of Buddhism over the Indian subcontinent, different Buddhist communities encountered practical difficulties related to the different regions: the specific environment, the language, the climate as well as contacts with lay people gave rise to a particular monastic life with particular habits.<sup>9</sup> These own habits were integrated in the rules of the communities and gave them a proper identity and a proper discipline, as the natural result of which they split up. The rise of early Buddhist schools is thus most likely the result of divergences regarding discipline rather than regarding doctrinal positions.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, as clearly stated by H. Bechert (1985, p.44): "In der Geschichte des alten Buddhismus stellt die Herausbildung von unterschiedlichen Lehrmeinungen eine jüngere, gegenüber den Vinaya-Kontroversen sekundäre Differenzierungsschicht dar, die sie jedoch als außerordentlich wichtig für die weitere Entwicklung der buddhistischen Religion erwiesen hat", doctrinal movements rise after the development of communities organized according to the Buddhist disciplinary rules.

R. Gombrich (1993<sup>3</sup> [1984], pp.84-85), further underlines that coincidence between discipline and doctrine within a community is the result of the fact that monks live in groups—monks sharing an ordination tradition

7 Lamotte, É., 1958, p.320ff..

8 Hirakawa, A., 1991, pp.266-276.

9 Pachow, W., 1955, p.28; Lamotte, É., 1958, pp.573-574; Gombrich, R., 1993<sup>3</sup> [1984], p.82; Hirakawa, A., 1991, p.280.

10 See also Nattier, J.J. and Prebish, C.S., 1977, pp.266-270; Prebish, C.S., 1979, pp.298-299; Gombrich, R., 1993<sup>3</sup> [1984], p.82.

also often share doctrinal views—rather than the result of a conscious opposition between different monasteries.

To us it seems that the dogmatic positions of the different schools, later, were made more explicit, were emphasized and were further developed as the result of the need of these already separated schools to gain a clear identity. In this way, they affirmed themselves as opposed to other schools once the split in different groups was a fact. Thus, in the third century BC, different communities, all having peculiar disciplinary rules, came into being. They laid the basis for the early Buddhist schools. Among these communities was the Kāśmīra<sup>11</sup> community that later gave rise to the (Vaibhāṣika) Sarvāstivāda School<sup>12</sup>, and the Gandhāran and Bactrian communities giving rise to the Dharmaguptaka School. The groups that later referred to themselves as Mūlasarvāstivādins were at first based in Mathurā.<sup>13</sup> This explains why later, two *vinayas* called ‘Sarvāstivāda *vinayas*’ came into being: one consisting of eighty sections in Mathurā (*Mūlasarvāstivādivinaya*) and one consisting of ten sections in Kāśmīra (*Sarvāstivādivinaya*), as noted in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* (T.1509, p.756c2-6 (second or third century AD))<sup>14</sup>. According to T.1509—

11 Gradually converted from the South (Lamotte, É., 1958, p.327; Hirakawa, A., 1991, pp.274-276; Willemen, C., Dessein, B. and Cox, C., 1998, p.46).

12 Following Bechert, H., 1985, p.44 (see above), the Vaibhāṣika philosophy is most likely introduced and further developed in Kāśmīra, after the Kāśmīra (see note 11) Buddhist community, organized according to the Buddhist disciplinary rules, already existed for some time.

13 Willemen, C., Dessein, B. and Cox, C., 1998, pp.88-89.

14 See also Frauwallner, E., 1956, pp.24-41. According to E. Frauwallner (1956, pp.37-41), the community of Kāśmīra owes its rise to the missions of Aśoka and was founded from Vidiśā. The old community of Mathurā, much older than Aśoka, had nothing to do with these missions, but was an independent early community. This explains the differences between the *vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and the *vinayas* of the Pali, the Mahīśāsaka, the Dharmaguptaka and the Sarvāstivāda traditions. Since, however, the *vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins also displays many similarities with the before mentioned *vinayas*, they all must have a common older origin.

Frauwallner’s statement is strongly dependent on the importance of Aśoka’s missions. As shown above, however, the missions may not be overestimated.

followed by Willemen, C., Dessein, B. and Cox, C., 1998, pp.88-89<sup>15</sup>—the (later) Kāśmīra *vinaya* reduced the *vinaya* of Mathurā by leaving out

---

Moreover, as studied by A. Hirakawa (1991, pp.266-276), both Vidiśā and Mathurā belong to the same ‘ancient Buddhist zone’. It seems very unlikely that in this zone two totally independent communities (the old community of Mathurā and the community of Vidiśā, starting point of the missions) coexisted. Therefore, the similarities and the dissimilarities of the *vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins with the *vinayas* of the Pali, the Mahīśāsaka, the Dharmaguptaka and the Sarvāstivāda traditions cannot be the result of these two independent communities having a common origin. Nevertheless, this does not change Frauwallner’s conclusion that “... we notice again and again that just the two schools of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and of the Mahāsāṃghikas have introduced great modifications in their Vinaya, but at the same time have preserved a good deal of ancient material.”

Lamotte, É., 1958, pp.195-196 (≅ 1988, p.178) contests that the *vinaya* of Mathurā, mentioned in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*, refers to the *Mūlasarvāstivādivinaya*: “As for the *Mūlasarv. Vin.* [...], it did not originate from an old Buddhist community established in Mathurā from the first century of Buddhism—as E. Frauwallner claims (p.37)—but from an immense compendium of discipline which was closed very much later and was probably compiled in Kāśmīr in order to complete the *Sarvāstivādin Vinaya*. When, in the passage studied above, Kumārajīva [the translator into Chinese of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*] speaks of a ‘Vinaya in 80 sections from the land of Mathurā’ he has in mind, not the *Mūlasarv. Vin.*, but the ancient Vinaya of Upāli which was finally preserved by Upagapta in Mathurā.” As we will show further, there is, however, a very close link between ‘the ancient *vinaya*’, or maybe better ‘the immense compendium of discipline of the ancient Buddhist zone (Vidiśā and Mathurā)’ and the *vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, the latter being the natural continuation of the former. Consequently, the *vinaya* of Mathurā referred to by Kumārajīva, is related both to ‘the ancient *vinaya* compendium’ and to the *Mūlasarvāstivādivinaya*. The *vinaya* of Kāśmīra refers to the *vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins. See also note 36.

Furthermore, the number 80 does not necessarily imply that, initially, the *vinaya* of Mathurā was composed of exactly 80 sections. The number 80 could simply refer to it that the *vinaya* of Mathurā had many more sections than the one of Kāśmīra. Maybe we have to consider 80 to be a symbolic number.

15 See also Willemen, C., 1998 (forthcoming).

numerous stories. However, since also the other *vinayas* do not contain these stories, this implies that they too—as the Kāśmīra *vinaya* originating from the ancient Buddhist zone (Vidiśā and Mathurā)—carried out a reduction, possibly in imitation of the Kāśmīra *vinaya*. To us it seems more likely that with the spread of Buddhism over the Indian subcontinent, in an initial phase only the essentials were transmitted, i.e. omitting the heavily laden narrative structure. In this way, many stories were left behind in the central area and were possibly not yet integrated in the *vinaya*. Their number might have increased.

\*\*\*

In Mathurā and in Kaśmīra, along with the growth of the order, the Buddhist monks also engaged in philosophical contemplations. In the course of time, doctrinal treatises (*śāstras*) were compiled. In early Buddhism, it was mainly the group that gave rise to the later labeled Sarvāstivādins and Mūlasarvāstivādins that was engaged in philosophical discussions. This group compiled six major texts. An exact chronology and location of these texts is hard to determine. Nevertheless, a study of these works reveals that they are not of Kāśmīra origin and have to be dated before the rise of the Kuṣāṇa empire (second century AD). As the main stream of Northern Buddhist expansion went to Gandhāra and Bactria<sup>16</sup>, this makes a Gandhāran or Bactrian affiliation for these six major texts most probable. Consequently, it is not surprising that a first comprehensive, systematic text was made by the Bactrian Dharmasreṣṭhin, probably in the first century BC<sup>17</sup>: *Abhidharmahrdaya*, *Heart of Scholasticism*. Later, also the Kāśmīris compiled a comprehensive work, entitled the *Jñānaprasthāna*, or *Source of Knowledge*. They promoted this work as the summary of their teaching. A study of the content of this work—as compared to Dharmasreṣṭhin's *Abhidharmahrdaya*—shows that the *Jñānaprasthāna* is younger than Dharmasreṣṭhin's work. In this context, it is significant to recall that Kaśmīra was a much more isolated region than Gandhāra and Bactria were. Monasteries in Kaśmīra thus developed an

16 See Willemen, C., Dessein, B. and Cox, C., 1998, p.xi.

17 See Willemen, C., 1998 (forthcoming).

own *abhidharma* position. Their closest contacts were the monasteries situated in Gandhāra. It is therefore obvious that Kāśmīra monks doctrinally positioned themselves as opposed to the Gandhāran monks. They referred to themselves as Vaibhāṣika (named after the *Mahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, a Kāśmīra commentary on the *Jñānaprasthāna*) or as Sarvāstivādins (referring to their doctrinal position that everything exists in the three periods of time).

In the second to fourth centuries AD, the Kuṣāṇa empire was the most powerful political power in the Northern and Northwestern regions of the Indian subcontinent. It is undoubtedly this political power that is responsible for the dominance of the Kāśmīra Sarvāstivādins. With the decline of the Kuṣāṇa empire, the Gandhāra region regained influence and the monks of Gandhāra reaffirm themselves as Mūlasarvāstivādins, thus reclaiming their position as orthodox. When starting from the seventh century AD, Buddhism spread to Tibet, it were the Mūlasarvāstivāda interpretations of *abhidharma* texts that were translated into Tibetan.

\*\*\*

A parallel development can be discerned for the *vinayas* of the Vaibhāṣika and Sautrāntika monks. During King Aśoka's reign, monks started to go to Kāśmīra where they established monasteries.<sup>11\*</sup> On the one hand, their disciplinary rules were based on the rules that were observed in the ancient Buddhist zone, Vidiśā and Mathurā. On the other hand, conditions particular to the Kāśmīra region and its monasteries influenced the discipline of the Kāśmīra monks. In the course of time, the *vinaya* of Kāśmīra was finalized.<sup>18</sup> It was later called the *Sarvāstivādivinaya*. During the Kuṣāṇa empire, it acquired a high status due to the dominance of the political power of the Kuṣāṇas. In the ancient Buddhist zone, the 'ancient' disciplinary rules continued to be observed. As can be seen in the philosophical development of the Buddhist schools, this central area gradually expanded to Gandhāra. The monks of this region started to compose doctrinal texts in the form of *sūtras*. This explains why, later, they refer to themselves as

18 When exactly the *vinaya* has been finalized is hard to say. According to Nakamura, H., 1980, p.51, the finalization has to be situated in the first century AD.



Sautrāntikas. It seems not at all unlikely that the same monks used stories to also illustrate disciplinary rules, thus integrating these stories into the *vinaya*. In this way, a *vinaya* in eighty sections, the *vinaya* of Mathurā, came into being. Exactly when this *vinaya* has been finalized is hard to say.<sup>19</sup> It is, however, most probable that it continued to grow longer than the other extant *vinayas* of the ancient Buddhist zone.<sup>20</sup> We will return to this later. As shown in the doctrinal development of the Vaibhāṣika and Sautrāntika communities, both groups constantly stayed in contact. This explains the many similarities found in both *vinayas*.<sup>21</sup> After the wane of the Kuṣāṇa empire, the dominance of the Sarvāstivādins vanished. The Sautrāntikas renamed themselves as Mūlasarvāstivādins. Their *vinaya* is hence referred to as the *Mūlasarvāstivādivinaya*. It is this *vinaya* that is introduced in Tibet in the eighth century AD<sup>22</sup>.

19 According to Nakamura, H., 1980, p.52, the finalization has to be situated in the fourth century AD.

20 It does not seem unlikely that this later finalization is related to the fact that the monks of the ancient Buddhist zone did not feel the need to determine exactly what is and what is not to be part of a well circumscribed *vinaya*, since they were not, unlike the monks of the other schools, involved in missionary activities. Only in a later stage, when they started to occupy a more self-conscious position as opposed to the Sarvāstivādins, and certainly once they reaffirmed themselves as Mūlasarvāstivādins, their *vinaya* was finalized and positioned as their own (Mūlasarvāstivāda) *vinaya*. In this way, they later brought a completed *vinaya* to Tibet.

21 For these similarities, see Waldschmidt, E., 1926, p.187; Pachow, W., 1955, pp.42-44. Pachow, W., 1955, pp.42-44, notes the many similarities between the *Sarvāstivādivinaya* and the *Mūlasarvāstivādivinaya* and concludes that the latter tradition, in a later period, must have branched off from the former one. It seems to us, however, that, although there are many similarities between both *vinayas*, Pachow's conclusion cannot be sustained. Since the *Mūlasarvāstivādivinaya* also contains many 'ancient' elements that coincide to the Pali, to the Mahīśāsaka, and to the Dharmaguptaka *vinayas* and that do not figure in the *Sarvāstivādivinaya*, it is clear that the *Mūlasarvāstivādivinaya* cannot just have branched off from the *Sarvāstivādivinaya*, but must also be related to the other *vinayas* (see further).

22 See Snellgrove, D.L., 1987, p.306: "... , but the life of all Tibetan monasteries has been regulated over the centuries on the ancient Monastic Rule of the Mūla-

Accepting the above described evolution as correct, the Mūlasarvāstivāda disciplinary rules have to be characterized by three features:

1) They are related to the disciplinary rules of the ancient Buddhist zone (Vidiśā and Mathurā)<sup>23</sup>. It has, e.g., been shown in several studies on *vinaya* rules<sup>24</sup>, that the Pali, Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinayas* all have many similar rules<sup>25</sup>, thus pointing to a common ‘ancient’ origin. Although the above schools very often comment on the *vinaya* rules in a different way, the basic concepts of these rules generally coincide. Also the number of rules shows a remarkable conformity<sup>26</sup>, even though some rules differ in content:

---

Sarvāstivāda school, adopted by the Tibetans from the eighth century onward, because it happened to be the one chiefly favored in central and northwest India.” (see also pp.389, 431 and 486).

23 Several researchers have already pointed to

\* the presence of old material in the *vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins: Przyluski, J., 1923, pp.68-69; Hofinger, M., 1946, pp.235-241, p.256; Bareau, A., 1955a, p.154; Frauwallner, E., 1956, pp.24-41 (particularly p.37); Gnoli, R., 1977, p.xxi; Brekke, T., 1998, p.23;

\* the mixture of old and new material in the *vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins: Waldschmidt, E., 1951, p.120; Bareau, A., 1955b, p.146; Lamotte, É., 1958, p.730; Gnoli, R., 1977, p.xx; Panglung, J.L., 1981, pp.xi-xii.

24 For instance: Waldschmidt, E., 1926; Pachow, W., 1955; Kabilsingh, C., 1984.

25 In our study, we have limited ourselves to the extant *vinayas* of the Sthaviravāda group, i.e. the Pali *vinaya* and the *vinayas* of the Mahīśāsakas, the Dharmaguptakas, the Sarvāstivādins and the Mūlasarvāstivādins. Apart from these *vinayas*, there is one other extant *vinaya* that does not belong to the Sthaviravāda group, i.e. the *vinaya* of the Mahāsāṃghikas. On the one hand, the latter *vinaya* contains many elements that reveal a common origin with the *vinayas* of the Sthaviravāda group. On the other hand, it contains many peculiar features. See also note 14.

26 Since several researchers (Waldschmidt, E., 1926, pp.2-3; Pachow, W., 1955, appendix IV; Hirakawa, A., 1970, p.434 and p.493; 1982, pp.39-40; Kabilsingh, C., 1987, p.47) come to slightly different numbers, the following scheme is based on our own counting.

*BHIKṢUṆĪVIBHAṄGA*

	PĀR	SA	ANI	NP	PĀC	PRA	ŚAI	ADH	Total
Pali <i>vinaya</i>	4	13	2	30	92	4	75	7	227
<i>Mahī</i>	4	13	2	30	91	4	100 <sup>27</sup>	7	251
<i>Dharma</i>	4	13	2	30	90	4	100	7	250
<i>Sarva</i>	4	13	2	30	90	4	107 <sup>28</sup>	7	257
							or 113 <sup>29</sup>		or 263
<i>Mūla</i>	4	13	2	30	90	4	94 <sup>30</sup>	7	244

Abbreviations: PĀR = *pārājika*; SA = *saṃghāvaśeṣa*; ANI = *aniyata*; NP = *niḥsargika pācittika*; PĀC = *pācittika*; PRA = *pratideśanīya*; ŚAI = *śaikṣa*; ADH = *adhikaraṇaśamatha* (or variants)

- 27 The *Mahī* does not make any distinction between the individual *śaikṣa* rules. The number 100 is based on the *bhikṣuprātimokṣa* (T.1422).
- 28 This is the number of *śaikṣa* rules in the *bhikṣuvibhaṅga* of the Sarvāstivādins (T.1435).
- 29 This is the number of *śaikṣa* rules in the *bhikṣuprātimokṣa* of the Sarvāstivādins (T.1436). Also the Sanskrit *bhikṣuprātimokṣa* of the Sarvāstivādins (Finot, L. and Huber, É. (1913)) gives 113 rules.
- 30 Neither the *Mūla* (T.1442) nor the *bhikṣuprātimokṣa* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins (T.1454) makes a clear distinction between the individual *śaikṣa* rules. Consequently, the number 94 is an approximate total.  
The Sanskrit *bhikṣuprātimokṣa* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins (Banerjee, A.C. (1977)) gives 108 rules.

*BHIKṢUṆĪVIBHAṄGA*

	PĀR	SA	ANI	NP	PĀC	PRA	ŚAI	ADH	Total
<i>Pali vinaya</i>	8	17	–	30	166	8	75	7	311
<i>Mahī</i>	8	17	–	30	209 <sup>31</sup>	8	100	7	379
					or 210				380
<i>Dharma</i>	8	17	–	30	178	8	100	7	348
<i>Sarva</i>	8	17	–	30	178	8	107 <sup>32</sup>	7	355
							or 106		or 354
<i>Mūla</i>	8	20 <sup>33</sup>	–	33	180	11	94 <sup>34</sup>	7	353

It is obvious that the *vinayas* largely coincide. According to our view, this can only point to a common origin. The differences in the category of the *śaikṣa* precepts most probably are the result of the fact that this category

31 The number of *pācittika* precepts in the *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* of the Mahīśāsakas is not clear. The *Taishō*-edition, T.1421, p.100a15, gives a total of 207 precepts. In fact, 209 precepts are enumerated. The counting of the *Taishō*-edition displays some irregularities: between p.88a1 and p.89a19, there are not 10 but 9 precepts; between p.94b20 and p.95b27, there are not 10 but 12 precepts; between p.95b28 and p.96b12, there are not 10 but 11 precepts; between p.96b13 and p.97b2, there are not 10 but 8 precepts; between p.98c24 and p.99c8, there are not 10 but 12 precepts. The v.l. 3eds. and 宮 give a total of 105 precepts; the v.l. 聖 gives a total of 205 precepts.

The *bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa* of the Mahīśāsakas (T.1423) has 210 precepts.

32 The *Sarva*, *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*, does not mention the precepts common to *bhikṣus* and *bhikṣuṇīs*. Since also the *śaikṣa* precepts are not mentioned, we can logically assume that they coincide with the 107 precepts for monks. The *bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa* of the Sarvāstivādins (T.1437), however, enumerates 106 precepts. One precept mentioned in the *bhikṣuvibhaṅga* of the Sarvāstivādins (T.1435, p.138c6-9, pāc.77 (one may not throw away food that sticks to the hand)) is not mentioned. The v.l. 3eds., 宮 and 聖, however, do mention this precept in the *bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa* (see T.1437, p.487, note 11).

33 While the other *vinayas* all have 17 precepts, the *Mūla* displays 20 precepts. This is the result of the fact that one precept has been split up in four elements.

34 This is an approximate total (see note 30).

was regarded as ‘an open category’. Rules belonging to this category could be freely added.<sup>35</sup> In the *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*, more differences in more categories can be noted. This is probably due to the fact that several rules for nuns were developed at a time when the schools already flourished in separate areas.

2) They contain elements influenced because of contact with the Sarvāstivādins<sup>36</sup>. Comparative studies of the rules for monks and nuns (Waldschmidt, E., 1926; Pachow, W., 1955) have revealed that the rules of the Sarvāstivādins and of the Mūlasarvāstivādins display many similarities.<sup>21\*</sup> It is not unlikely that these similarities are the result of Sarvāstivāda influence on the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

3) They contain developments particular to the Mūlasarvāstivādins, some of them clearly of a relatively late origin<sup>37</sup>. The most striking feature is the many stories added to the *vinaya*.

Many previous *vinaya* studies have given evidence for one of the above three features.<sup>38</sup> That these three features are interrelated elements of a greater developmental theory is further revealed in the following:

35 See Waldschmidt, E., 1926, p.3: “Die śaikṣa-dharmas gelten als sambahulā dharmas (Mahāvī. 256), Chin. 衆學法, ihre Anzahl steht nicht genau fest und ist sogar in derselben Schule Schwankungen unterworfen.” See also Olivelle, P., 1974, pp.45-47 and von Hinüber, O., 1995, pp.14-15.

36 See also Lamotte, É., 1958, p.196 (≅ 1988, p.178): “As for the *Mūlasarv. Vin.* [...], it [...] was probably compiled in Kāśmīr in order to complete the *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya*” (see also note 15); 1958, p.727 (≅ 1988, p.657): “The *Mūlasarv. Vin.* is presented as an enormous compilation. It repeats all the earlier facts from the Sūtras, the Vinayas (particularly that of the Sarvāstivādins) and the autonomous Lives, ...”

37 Several researchers have already pointed to the relatively late material in the *vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins: Frauwallner, E., 1956, pp.24-41; Lamotte, É., 1958, p.196 and p.727ff.; Hirakawa, A., 1970, pp.565-567; Prebish, C.S., 1974, pp.175-176; Gnoli, R., 1977, pp.xix-xx; Nakamura, H., 1980, p.52; Kabilsingh, C., 1984, p.185; Brekke, T., 1998, p.26.

38 See notes 21, 23 and 37.

A) The *Mūla, bhikṣuvibhaṅga*, T.1442, p.630c6-10, gives the following explanation on the term *pārājika*: ‘*Pārājika* [po-lo-shih-chia] is the most serious and the most hateful offense. It is reprehensible and inadmissible. If a *bhikṣu* commits [such an offense], he is no longer a *śramaṇa* and he is no longer a *Śākya* disciple. He loses the capacity of a *bhikṣu* and he goes against *nirvāṇa*. He falls back. Defeated, he cannot be saved. It is as if one cuts off the top of a *tāla* tree<sup>39</sup>, this tree cannot grow again. In the same way, one cannot flourish, grow or increase. Therefore it is called *pārājika*.’

The other extant *vinayas* of the ancient Buddhist zone display the following explanations:

Pali *vinaya*, Oldenberg, H., *Vinaya Piṭakam*, Vol.III, *bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, p.28, translated by Horner, I.B., *BD*, Vol.I, p.48: ‘*Is one who is defeated [pārājiko]*<sup>40</sup> means: as a man with his head cut off cannot become one to live with that bodily connection, so is a monk indulging in sexual intercourse not a (true) recluse, not a (true) son of the Sakyans: therefore he is called *one who is defeated*.’

*Mahī, bhikṣuvibhaṅga*, p.4c21-23: ‘*Pārājika* [po-lo-i] implies that one falls back; it implies that one is bad; it implies that one cuts off the head; it implies that one is no longer a *śramaṇa*.’

*Dharma, bhikṣuvibhaṅga*, p.571c6-8: ‘Why is it called *pārājayika*<sup>41</sup> [po-lo-i]? It is as if one cuts off someone’s head and he cannot stand up again. This is also to be applied to a *bhikṣu*. If he commits such an offense [i.e. a *pārājayika*], he cannot again become a *bhikṣu*. Therefore it is called *pārājayika*.’

*Sarva, bhikṣuvibhaṅga*, p.2c16-18: ‘*Pārājika* [po-lo-i] implies that the fall is without an equal. The offense is corrupt and serious. If one commits such an offense, the fall is without an equal, one is no longer called a *bhikṣu*, one is no longer a *śramaṇa* and one is no longer a *Śākya* disciple. One loses the capacity of a *bhikṣu*.’

39 i.e. a palmyra tree or fan palm (*Borassus flabelliformis*).

40 Horner, I.B., *BD*, Vol.I, 1949<sup>2</sup> [1938], p.xxvi, supports the idea that *pārājika* might be related to the passive of *parā-√ji*, ‘to be defeated’.

41 Dharmaguptaka tradition: *pārājayika* instead of *pārājika* (cf. Chung, J. and Wille, K., 1997, 2.r4 and 6).

A comparison between the above *vinayas* reveals the following facts:

1) The Pali *vinaya* as well as two Chinese *vinayas* (*Mahī* and *Dharma*) compare the committing of a *pārājika* offense with a decapitation, while in the *Mūla*, it is compared with a ‘decapitation’ of a *tāla* tree. This similarity points to an initially common—and thus ancient—understanding of the term *pārājika*, thus sustaining our presumption that also the *Mūla* is to be traced back to the ancient Buddhist zone.

2) The similarities between the explanations of the *Sarva* and of the *Mūla* are striking, as in the following:

*Sarva*: ‘*Pārājika* [po-lo-i] implies that the fall is without an equal. The offense is corrupt and serious.’ ≅ *Mūla*: ‘*Pārājika* [po-lo-shih-chia] is the most serious and the most hateful offense. It is reprehensible and inadmissible.’

*Sarva*: ‘If one commits such an offense, the fall is without an equal, one is no longer called a *bhikṣu*, one is no longer a *śramaṇa* and one is no longer a *Śākya* disciple. One loses the capacity of a *bhikṣu*.’ ≅ *Mūla*: ‘If a *bhikṣu* commits [such an offense], he is no longer a *śramaṇa* and he is no longer a *Śākya* disciple. He loses the capacity of a *bhikṣu* and he goes against *nirvāṇa*. He falls back.’

3) The *Mūla* is the only *vinaya* that displays the concept of defeat. This concept is most likely a very late one, arisen as the result of an attempt of commentators to explain the etymology of the term *pārājika*.<sup>42</sup> The same idea is also displayed in the *Samantapāsādikā*, a commentary on the Pali *vinaya* most probably compiled in the fifth century AD<sup>43</sup>: Vol.I, p.259: “*pārājiko ti parājīto parājayaṃ āpanno*.”, translated by Horner, I.B., *BD*, Vol.I, p.38, note 3: (*pārājika* is) “defeated, fallen on defeat”.

B) The *Mūla*, T.1442, *bhikṣuvibhaṅga*, p.762c4-6, gives the following explanation on the term *pātayantikā/pācittika* (or variants, hereafter all *pāc*.)<sup>44</sup>: “‘po-i-ti-chia’ is that it burns (*√dah*), that it boils (*√pac*) and that

42 See also Heirman, A. (1999), pp.56-59.

43 von Hinüber, O., 1996, p.104.

44 See Edgerton, F., *BHSD*, p.340, s.v. *pātayantika*.

one falls (*√pat*). One who commits [such] an offense falls into the woeful courses of a being in hell, of an animal or of a hungry ghost while he is burning and boiling.<sup>45</sup>

Of the other extant *vinayas* of the ancient Buddhist zone, only the *Sarva* contains an explanation of the term *pāc.*:

*Sarva, bhikṣuvibhaṅga*, p.63c18-20: ‘A ‘po-ye-t’i’: this offense means that it burns (*√dah*), that it boils (*√pac*), that it hinders (*ā-√vr*); if one does not repent, one obstructs the path’;

*bhikṣuvibhaṅga* of the Sarvāstivādins, Rosen, V., 1959, p.130, *pāc.5.7* (and analogous passages): “(*pātayantikā pacati dahaty uddahaty avyutthita*)*syāvaraṇakṛtyaṃ karoti tenāha pā(tayantikā |)*”, “(Ein Pātayantika-Vergehen reift, brennt, brennt auf und schafft dem, der es nicht bereut,) Hinderung; daher heißt es ein Pātayantika-Vergehen.”<sup>46</sup>

Most Chinese *vinayas* do not translate the term *pātayantikā/pācittika*, but only give a phonetic rendering. Only the *Mahī* translates the term as 墮<sup>47</sup>, ‘to fall’. The idea ‘to fall’ is also found in the translation of the term *niḥsargikā pātayantikā* (or variants, hereafter all *niḥ-pāc.*)<sup>48</sup>: 捨墮 (*Mahī, Dharma, Sarva* and *Mūla*)<sup>49</sup>, ‘to give up—to fall’, referring to a precept involving the giving up of an object.

The above data reveal the following facts:

1) As the term *pāc.* is only explained in the *vinayas* of the Mūla-sarvāstivādins and of the Sarvāstivādins, an attribution of this explanation to the ancient Buddhist zone cannot be checked.

45 See also a similar explanation in the *Divyāvadāna* (Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition): Cowell, E.B. and Neil, R.A. (eds.), p.544.10; Lévi, S., 1912, p.506; von Hinüber, O., 1985, p.65.

46 According to von Hinüber, O., 1985, p.65, the use of the term *pacati* points to the fact that possibly, in earlier times, the *vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins had a term similar to the term *pācattika*.

47 Cf. *Mahī*, p.37b14.

48 See Edgerton, F., *BHSD*, p.310, s.v. *niḥsargika* and p.340, s.v. *pātayantika*.

49 Cf. *Mahī*, p.23a13; *Dharma*, p.601c6; *Sarva*, p.31b1; *Mūla*, T.1442, p.715b8.



2) The similarities between the explanations of the *Sarva* and of the *Mūla* are striking.

3) The *Mūla* is the only *vinaya* (of the Sthaviravāda *vinayas*)<sup>50</sup> that gives an explanation using the term ‘to fall’. The other *vinayas* only have this idea in their Chinese translation of the terms *pāc.* and *niḥ-pāc.*, but never in an explanation. The idea ‘to fall’ presumably is a relatively late attempt to explain the term *pātayantikā*.<sup>51</sup>

C) The *pratideśanīya* precepts for nuns<sup>52</sup> of the extant *vinayas* of the ancient Buddhist zone can be schematized in the following way:

Pali : Oldenberg, H., *Vinaya Piṭakam*, Vol.IV, pp.346-348

T.1421: p.100a16-b10 (*Mahī*)

T.1428: p.778a8-b10 (*Dharma*)

T.1435: p.345a23-b28 (*Sarva*)

T.1443: pp.1016a28-1017b10 (*Mūla*)

50 Apart from these *vinayas*, also the *Mahā* uses this idea: *bhikṣuvibhaṅga*, p.292b10-12 (concerning an unlawfully obtained extra robe): ‘Ni-sa-ch’i-po-ye-t’i’ is that he has to give up the extra robe in the *saṃgha* and that he has to repent of his ‘po-ye-t’i’ offense. ‘Po-ye-t’i’ is that what can cause someone to fall into a woeful course.’

51 See von Hinüber, O., 1985, pp.63-66.

52 The 8 *pratideśanīya* precepts for nuns do not correspond to the *pratideśanīya* precepts for monks. They are, however, related to a *pācittika* precept for monks to be found in all the *vinayas*: Pali *vinaya*: *pāc.* 39; *Mahī*: *pāc.* 41; *Dharma*, *Sarva* and *Mūla*, T.1442: *pāc.* 40.

	Pali	Mahī	Dharma	Sarva	Mūla
(熟) 酥 <i>sarpis</i>	1	1	1	4	4
油 <i>taila</i>	2	2	2	5	5
蜜 <i>madhu</i>	3	3	3	/	7
(黑) 石蜜 <i>phāṇita</i>	4	4	4	/	6 ((沙)糖)
乳 <i>kṣīra/dugdha</i>	7	5	5	1	1
酪 <i>dadhi</i>	8	6	6	2	2
魚 <i>matsya</i>	5	7	7	6	8
肉 <i>māṃsa</i>	6	8	8	7	9

生酥 <i>navanīta</i>	/	/	/	3	3
(乾) 脯 <i>vallūra</i>	/	/	/	8	10 11 (i.e. a precept corresponding to a <i>pratideśanīya</i> precept for <i>bhikṣus</i> )

A comparison between these *vinayas* reveals the following facts:

- 1) The Pali *vinaya*, T.1421 (*Mahī*), T.1428 (*Dharma*) and T.1443 (*Mūla, bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*) all have the same eight precepts. This points to a common ancient origin. (In T.1435 (*Sarva*) two precepts are lacking.)
- 2) The *Mūla* adds three precepts to the ancient eight ones. Two of these precepts correspond to two precepts that were—compared to the inheritance common with the other *vinayas* of the ancient Buddhist zone—added also by the *Sarva*. The *Mūla* thus most probably is influenced by the *Sarva*.
- 3) The *Mūla* has one precept that can only be found in this *vinaya*. It has been copied from the *bhikṣuvibhaṅga*.

\*\*\*

We realize that the above examples are certainly not exhaustive. Nevertheless, given the evidence of the philosophical development of the Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda Schools, given the natural way in which

*vinayas* gradually developed<sup>53</sup>, given the evidence regarding the Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinayas* revealed in previous *vinaya* studies, and, finally, given the above demonstrated, we can conclude

- 1) that the disciplinary rules of the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* are closely related to the *vinaya* rules of the ancient Buddhist zone (Vidīśā and Mathurā) expanded to Gandhāra;
- 2) that the disciplinary rules of the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* are influenced by the rules of the *Sarvāstivādavinaya*;
- 3) that the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* has been finalized in a later stage than the other extant *vinayas* of the ancient Buddhist zone.

It is precisely the fact that the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* is the natural continuation of ‘the immense compendium of discipline of the ancient Buddhist zone’, influenced by the *Sarvāstivādavinaya* and finalized at a late date, that explains why different scholars have characterized the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* both as the youngest and as the oldest *vinaya*. The above outlined developmental theory gives evidence that it is the constant *vinaya* evolution that is responsible for their conclusions. We thus have to conclude that the development of the *vinayas* of the Vaibhāṣika and Sautrāntika monks seems to parallel their philosophical development.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, Takakusu, J., Watanabe, K. (eds.), Tōkyō, 1924-1935:

No.1421 : 彌沙塞部和醯五分律 *Mi-sha-sai Pu Ho-hsi Wu-fen Lü*, trans. Buddhajīva, 慧嚴 Hui-yen and 竺道生 Chu Tao-sheng (*Mahī*).

No.1422 : 彌沙塞五分戒本 *Mi-sha-sai Wu-fen Chieh-pen*, comp. Buddhajīva (*bhikṣuprātimokṣa* of the Mahīśāsakas).

53 See also Heirman, A. (forthcoming), Introduction III.A.

- No.1423 : 五分比丘尼戒本 *Wu-fen Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-pen*, comp. 明徽 Ming-hui (*bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa* of the Mahīśāsakas).
- No.1425 : 摩訶僧祇律 *Mo-ho-seng-ch'i Lü*, trans. Buddhahadra and 法顯 Fa-hsien (*Mahā*).
- No.1428 : 四分律 *Szu-fen Lü*, trans. Buddhayaśas and 竺佛念 Chu Fo-nien (*Dharma*).
- No.1435 : 十誦律 *Shih-sung Lü*, trans. Punyatṛāta/Puṇyatara, Kumārajīva, Dharmaruci and Vimalākṣa (*Sarva*).
- No.1436 : 十誦比丘波羅提木叉戒本 *Shih-sung Pi-ch'iu Po-lo-t'i-mu-ch'a Chieh-pen*, trans. Kumārajīva (*bhikṣuprātimokṣa* of the Sarvāstivādins).
- No.1437 : 十誦比丘尼波羅提木叉戒本 *Shih-sung Pi-ch'iu-ni Po-lo-t'i-mu-ch'a Chieh-pen*, comp. 法穎 Fa-ying (*bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa* of the Sarvāstivādins).
- No.1442 : 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 *Ken-pen-shuo-i-ch'ieh-yu Pu P'i-nai-ye*, trans. 義淨 I-ching (*bhikṣuvibhaṅga* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins).
- No.1443 : 根本說一切有部苾芻尼毘奈耶 *Ken-pen-shuo-i-ch'ieh-yu Pu Pi-ch'u-ni P'i-nai-ye*, trans. 義淨 I-ching (*bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins).
- No.1454 : 根本說一切有部戒經 *Ken-pen-shuo-i-ch'ieh-yu Pu Chieh-ching*, trans. 義淨 I-ching (*bhikṣuprātimokṣa* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins).
- No.1509 : Nāgārjuna, *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*, 大智度論 *Ta Chih-tu Lun*, trans. Kumārajīva.

BANERJEE, A.C. (1977), *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit, Prātimokṣa Sūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākya*, Calcutta, The World Press Private Limited.

BAREAU, A. (1955a), *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*, Paris, Publications de l'École Française de l'Extrême-Orient 38.

— (1955b), *Les premiers conciles bouddhiques*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.

BECHERT, H. (1985), "Einleitung", Bechert, H. (ed.), *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, Erster Teil, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp.20-54.

BREKKE, T. (1998), 'The Skandhaka of the Vinaya Piṭaka and its Historical Value', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 42, pp.23-40.

BUDDHAGHOSA, *Samantapāsādikā*, TAKAKUSU, J., NAGAI, M. and (Vols.5 and 7) MIZUNO, K. (eds.) [1924-1947], London, Pali Text Society, (Vol.1) Routledge & Kegan Paul, (Vols. 2, 3, 4 and 5) Luzac & Company, (Vols. 6 and 7) The Ceylon Daily News Press, 7 Vols.

CHUNG, J. and WILLE, K. (1997), “Einige Bhikṣuvinayavibhaṅga-Fragmente der Dharmaguptakas in der Sammlung Pelliot”, BECHERT, H., BRETTFELD, S. and KIEFFER-PÜLZ, P. (eds.), *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*, Zweite Folge, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp.47-94.

COWELL, E.B. and NEIL, R.A. (1886), *Divyāvadāna, A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

EDGERTON, F. (1985<sup>5</sup> [1953]), *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, Vol. II: Dictionary, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass (*BHSD*).

FINOT, L. and HUBER, É. (1913), “Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins, texte Sanskrit par M. Louis Finot avec la version chinoise du Kumārajīva traduite en français par M. Édouard Huber”, *Journal Asiatique* 11<sup>e</sup> Série, Tome 2, pp.465-558.

FRAUWALLNER, E. (1956), *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, Roma, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

GNOLI, R. (1977), *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu, Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins*, Roma, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

GOMBRICH, R. (1993<sup>3</sup> [1984]), “Buddhism in Ancient India, The Evolution of the Sangha”, Bechert, H. and Gombrich, R. (eds.), *The World of Buddhism, Buddhist Monks and Nuns in Society and Culture*, London, Thames and Hudson, pp.77-89.

HEIRMAN, A. (forthcoming), *The Discipline in Four Parts, Rules for Nuns (Dharmaguptakavinaya, Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga, T. Vol. 22, No. 1428)*.

— (1999), ‘On Pārājika’, *Buddhist Studies Review*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.51-59.

VON HINÜBER, O. (1985), “Die Bestimmung der Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Texte nach sprachlichen Kriterien”, Bechert, H. (ed.), *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, Erster Teil, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp.57-75.

— (1995), “Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya, A Survey of Theory and Practice”, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 18, No.1, pp.7-45.

— (1996), *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter.

HIRAKAWA 平川, A. (1970), *Ritsuzō no Kenkyū* 律藏の研究, *A Study of the Vinaya-Piṭaka*, Tōkyō, Sankibō Busshorin.

— (in collaboration with IKUNO, Z. and GRONER, P.) (1982), *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns, An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, Patna, Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

— (1991), “An Evaluation of the Sources On the Date of the Buddha”, BECHERT, H. (ed.), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha*, Part 1, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp.252-295.

HOFINGER, M. (1946,) *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī*, Louvain, Bureaux du Muséon.

HORNER, I.B. (1949-1963<sup>2</sup>, 1966<sup>1</sup> [1938-1966]), *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya-Piṭaka)*, London, Pali Text Society, Luzac & Company, 6 Vols. (BD).

KABILSINGH, C. (1984), *A Comparative Study of Bhikkhunī Pāṭimokkha*, Varanasi, Delhi, Chaukhambha Orientalia.

LAMOTTE, É. (1958), *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien des origines à l'ère Śāka*, Louvain, Bibliothèque du Muséon 43.

— (1988), *History of Indian Buddhism from the Origins to the Śāka Era*, translated from the French by Sara Webb-Boin, Louvain-la-Neuve, Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste.

LÉVI, S. (1912), “Observations sur une langue précanonique du bouddhisme”, *Journal Asiatique* 10<sup>e</sup> Série, Tome 20, pp.495-514.

NAKAMURA, H. (1980), *Indian Buddhism, A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*, Hirakata, Kufs Publication.

NATTIER, J.J. and PREBISH, C.S. (1977), “Mahāsāṃghika Origins: the Beginnings of Buddhist Sectarianism”, *History of Religions* 16, No.3, pp.237-272.

OLDENBERG, H. (1964<sup>2-3</sup> [1879-1883]), *The Vinaya Piṭakaṃ*, London, Pali Text Society, Luzac & Company, 5 Vols.

OLIVELLE, P. (1974), *The Origin and the Early Development of Buddhist Monachism*, Colombo, Gunasena.

PACHOW, W. (1955), *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa on the Basis of Its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pali Versions*, Santiniketan, The Sino-Indian Cultural Society.

PANGLUNG, J.L. (1981), *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya analysiert auf Grund der tibetischen Übersetzung*, Tōkyo, The Reiyukai Library.

PREBISH, C.S. (1974), “The Prātimokṣa Puzzle: Fact versus Fantasy”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94, No.2, pp.168-176.

— (1979), “Recent Progress in Vinaya Studies”, NARAIN, A.K. and ZWILLING, L. (eds.), *Studies in Pali and Buddhism, A Memorial Volume in Honour of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap*, Delhi, B.R. Publishing Corporation, pp.297-306.

PRZYLUSKI, J. (1923), *La légende de l'empereur Açoka (Açoka-Avadāna) dans les textes indiens et chinois*, Paris, Paul Geuthner.

— (1940), “Dārṣṭāntika, Sautrāntika and Sarvāstivādin”, *Indian Historical Quarterly* 16, pp.246-254.

ROSEN, V. (1959), *Der Vinayavibhaṅga zum Bhikṣuprātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins, Sanskritfragmente nebst einer Analyse der chinesischen Übersetzung*, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag.

SNELLGROVE, D.L. (1987), *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism, Indian Buddhist and Their Tibetan Successors*, London, Serindia Publications.

WALDSCHMIDT, E. (1926), *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins mit einer Darstellung der Überlieferung des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa in den Verschiedenen Schulen*, Leipzig, Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft.

— (1951), 'Vergleichende Analyse des Catuṣpariṣatsūtra' in *Beiträge zur indischen Philologie and Altertumskunde, Walther Schubring zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von der deutschen Indologie*, Hamburg, Cram, De Gruyter & Co., pp.84-122.

WILLEMEN, C. (1998), "New Ideas about *Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma*", *Indian Journal of Buddhist Studies* (forthcoming).

WILLEMEN, C., DESSEIN, B. and COX, C. (1998), *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*, Leiden, Brill.



