

**UPOSATHA, VASSĀVĀSA, AND PAVĀRAṆĀ OF THE PĀLI VINAYA AND THE FOUR-  
PART VINAYA: A COMPARATIVE STUDY**

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Religious Studies

University of the West

In Partial Fulfilment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Hai Van Nguyen

Spring 2015

ProQuest Number: 10006563

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10006563

Published by ProQuest LLC (2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

APPROVAL PAGE FOR GRADUATE

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Religious Studies.

Hai Van Nguyen  
Candidate

04/28/2015

**UPOSATHA, VASSĀVĀSA, AND PAVĀRAṆĀ OF THE PĀLI VINAYA AND THE FOUR-  
PART VINAYA: A COMPARATIVE STUDY**

APPROVED:

Jane Iwamura  
Chair

04/28/2015

William Chu  
Committee Member

04/28/2015

Darui Long  
Committee Member

04/28/2015

I hereby declare that this dissertation has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at any other institution, and that it is entirely my own work.

© 2015

Hai Van Nguyen

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

---

Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*:

A Comparative Study

by

Hai Van Nguyen

The Vinaya offers a set of rules and disciplines for Buddhist monastics. It is a body of principles of conduct and practice that governs the life of monastics and lay supporters. And at the same time, it reveals the interrelationship between them. Different versions of the Vinaya have emerged in different cultural contexts throughout Buddhist history.

Although the *Four-Part Vinaya* (*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* 四分律), *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律, *Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律, *Pāli Vinaya*, *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律, and *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部律 are available, the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* are said to be the most complete Vinayas in the sense of being well preserved. Moreover, the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* are the two main Vinayas that are the most observed. This dissertation examines these two practical Vinayas and compares the similarities and differences between the two versions – specifically focusing on three chapters: (1) the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha or Poṣadha 布薩), (2) the Rains Retreat (Vassāvāsa/Varṣāvāsa 安居), and (3) the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pavāraṇā or Pravāraṇa 自恣).

By considering the possible cultural, social, historical, and contextual nature of the transformation of the canonical text as well as the comparison, this dissertation shows the similarities and differences between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. Moreover, although there is no strong evidence suggesting a gradual influence of Chinese and Indian culture over the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*, this dissertation can speculate that there are possible connections between Chinese and Indian culture on these two Vinayas. These possible connections show that the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* are similar and yet different from one another. Thus, this dissertation tries to provide a better understanding of how and why the *Four-Part Vinaya* is similar and different from its *Pāli Vinaya* counterpart.

## CONTENTS

---

ABSTRACT .....	ii
CONTENTS.....	iv
ABBREVIATIONS.....	vii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1.    Focus of the Study.....	1
1.2.    Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā as the Sources for the Comparative Study of the <i>Pāli Vinaya</i> and the <i>Four-Part Vinaya</i> .....	3
1.3.    Literature Review .....	8
1.4.    Methodology.....	12
1.5.    Chapter Overview .....	13
CHAPTER II: TEXTUAL BACKGROUND .....	17
2.1.    Defining Terms.....	17
2.1.1.    Defining Uposatha.....	17
2.1.2.    Defining Varṣavāsa .....	20
2.1.3.    Defining Pavāraṇā.....	28
2.2.    The Textual Development of Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā in the <i>Pāli Vinaya</i> and the <i>Four-Part Vinaya</i> .....	30
2.3.    The Uniqueness of the Buddhist Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā .....	43
2.3.1.    The Uniqueness of the Buddhist Uposatha .....	45

2.3.2.	The Uniqueness of the Buddhist Vassāvāsa.....	52
2.3.3.	The Uniqueness of the Buddhist Pavāraṇā.....	59
2.4.	Chapter Conclusion .....	61
CHAPTER III: SIMILARITIES IN UPOSATHA, VASSĀVĀSA, AND PAVĀRAṆĀ.....		67
3.1.	Similarity: Attempts on Changing, Adding, and/or Omitting.....	69
3.1.1.	Similarity: On Changing .....	73
3.1.2.	Similarity: On Adding and/or Omitting .....	90
3.2.	Similarity: Discrepancies Reveal Transcription Error in Both Vinayas ....	104
3.3.	Chapter Conclusion.....	117
CHAPTER IV: DIFFERENCES THROUGH CULTURAL INFLUENCES .....		120
4.1.	The Cultural Difference of Silence.....	123
4.2.	The Relationship Difference of Disciple and Master .....	141
4.3.	The Difference in Emergent Context.....	165
4.4.	Chapter Conclusion .....	176
CHAPTER V: DIFFERENCES THROUGH SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES.....		184
5.1.	The Textual Rearrangement Difference .....	185
5.1.1.	Uposatha Chapter Textual Rearrangement Difference .....	188
5.1.2.	Vassāvāsa Chapter Textual Rearrangement Difference .....	193
5.1.3.	Pavāraṇā Chapter Textual Rearrangement Difference .....	195
5.2.	The Monastics and the Lay People Status Difference.....	206
5.2.1.	The Difference Pertaining to the Other Religious Ascetics .....	209
5.2.2.	The Difference Pertaining to the Secular Authorities.....	218



5.2.3. The Difference Pertaining to the Common Lay People .....	240
5.2.4. The Difference Pertaining to Not Engaging in Practice.....	260
5.3. Chapter Conclusion .....	265
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION.....	271
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	280
APPENDIX I: SUPERNATURAL POWER.....	294
APPENDIX II: CASE STUDY WITH DHAMMACARA .....	297

## ABBREVIATIONS

---

<i>An.</i>	<i>Anguttara Nikāya</i> – ed. Edmund Hardy
<i>AN</i>	<i>Anguttara Nikāya</i> – trans. E.M. Hare and F.L. Woodward.
<i>DN</i>	<i>Dīgha Nikāya</i>
<i>IsMEO</i>	Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente
<i>MN</i>	<i>Majjhima Nikāya</i>
<i>PTSPED</i>	<i>The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary</i>
<i>SBE</i>	<i>The Sacred Books of the East</i> , ed. F. Max Müller
<i>SED</i>	<i>A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages</i>
<i>Skt.</i>	Sanskrit
<i>Sn.</i>	<i>Saṃyutta Nikāya</i> – ed. M. Léon Feer
<i>SN</i>	<i>Saṃyutta Nikāya</i> – trans. Rhys Davids and F.L. Woodward
<i>T</i>	<i>Dazang jing</i> 大藏經. 1974. ed. Takakusu, Junjirō, Kaigyoku Watanabe, and Xiuqiao Liu. Taipei Shi 台北市: Xin Wen Feng Chu Ban Gong Si 新文豐出版公司.
<i>Tran.</i>	Translation
<i>U</i>	Uposatha
<i>V</i>	Vassāvāsa/Varṣāvāsa
<i>P</i>	Pavāraṇā/Pravāraṇa
<i>UVP</i>	Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā

- Vin.* *Vinaya Piṭaka.* trans. I. B. Horner.
- VP* *Vinaya Piṭakaṃ* ed. Hermann Oldenberg
- X* *Wan Xuzang Jing* 卍續藏經. 1993. Taipei Shi 台北市: Xin Wen Feng  
Chu Ban Gong Si 新文豐出版公司.

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

---

### 1.1. Focus of the Study

There are six available Vinayas for study. They are: The *Pāli Vinaya*, *Four-Part Vinaya* (*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* 四分律), *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律, *Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律, *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律, and *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部律. Of these existing Vinayas, this dissertation chooses to compare the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* because they are the most complete and practical Vinayas. Specifically, this dissertation focuses on the study of the similarities and differences between the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The reason for this focus is that the practices of Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā are currently observed and practiced by most major schools of Buddhism such as Mahāyāna, Theravāda, and Vajrayāna. More importantly, these three practices directly enhance the harmony of the Saṅgha, develop discipline, and promote the growth of compassion and wisdom. At the same time, the practices of Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā are all routine gatherings in the monastic life. They offer monastics the opportunity to group together and live in concord, especially important for the lonesome wandering monastics. In addition, these three practices allow monastics who might stand in different rules, disciplines, and practices to share their thoughts in concord. These

regular meetings of the Buddhist monastics are important in Buddhism because they help to prevent schisms in the Saṅgha. And they help Buddhism to prosper and not decline as the Buddha has already declared in the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*.<sup>1</sup>

Uposatha 布薩, Vassāvāsa 安居, and Pavāraṇā 自恣 are the core practices in Buddhism and they all directly concern the routine life of monastics. Therefore, this dissertation chooses to compare the similarities and differences of these three practices between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Although the focus of the study in this dissertation is on the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters, some related sources are also looked at in the other chapters of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, as well as the other existing Vinayas.

The primary aim of this dissertation is to examine the similarities and the differences between the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. By so doing, this dissertation speculates that there are possible Indian and Chinese cultural and social connections that blend into the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. These blendings make the *Pāli Vinaya* similar and different from the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Correspondingly, this dissertation tries to develop possible answers for the questions on how and why the *Four-Part Vinaya* differs from the *Pāli Vinaya* although they are offshoots from the same branch of Buddhism, i.e. the *Sthaviravāda Vinaya*.

---

<sup>1</sup> DN II – *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* 16, 82.

## 1.2. Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā as Sources for the Comparative Study of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*

This dissertation will clarify why Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā (UVP) are chosen to be the sources for the comparative study of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In other words, this dissertation proves the significance of UVP in more detail for this study. This section is composed of two parts. The first part is an overview of how the Vinaya is significant to the study of Buddhism. The second part opens up the Vinaya to look into how UVP is significant for the comparative study of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

This dissertation looks into the significance of the Vinaya to the study of Buddhism. It is well known in Buddhism that part of the purpose of the Buddhist Vinaya is about moral training of the monastics and the harmony of the Saṅgha.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, other religions also have their own scope and value for moral conduct. For example, to define the moral conduct, Confucianism offers the term “humanness” (*ren* 仁). This term consists of two component ideograms “man” (*ren* 人) and “two” (*er* 二), and means that the moral conduct can only be fulfilled when one person develops harmonious feelings towards fellow beings and society; otherwise, “society falls into pieces and humanity is ruined.”<sup>3</sup> In sum, the moral purity of Confucianism is associated with the Confucian teachings and specifically the teaching on “humanness” which is the first of the Five Constant Regulations (*wuchang* 五常). In a

---

<sup>2</sup> Holt, *Discipline, the Canonical Buddhism of the Vinayapiṭaka*, 61. Cf. Keown, *Contemporary Buddhist Ethics*, 38.

<sup>3</sup> Suzuki, *A Brief History of Early Chinese Philosophy*, 51–58.

like manner, moral conduct of Buddhists is associated with the Vinaya. This is why every individual who wishes to join the monkhood is firstly enjoined and tamed with rules and disciplines created by the Buddha.<sup>4</sup> The Vinaya is so important to the life of monastics in the community that the president of the First Buddhist Council, Mahakassapa, advises his fellow monastics not to abolish any rule even the minor ones. He even disapproves of adding new rules. The reason for this, according to Mahakassapa, is because the Vinaya has the mutual relationship between monastics and lay people in which they perfect one another regarding their virtue.<sup>5</sup> Otherwise, the Buddhist community may fall apart. For example, at one time monks disagreed on a certain Vinaya rule and the community split into two. Even the Buddha could not resolve this dispute, so he goes into a deserted forest for a while. Missing the Buddha in the community, the laity assumes that the misbehavior of a group of monks is the reason for this absence of the Buddha. The lay people decide to turn away from those monks. "Then the lay-followers of Kosambī neither greeted the monks of Kosambī, nor stood up before them, they did not salute them with joined palms or perform the proper duties, they did not revere, respect, esteem or honour them and did not give them almsfood when they came (to them)."<sup>6</sup> In this example, it shows that only one disagreement on just one Vinaya rule was enough to cause the Buddha to temporarily leave the Saṅgha for the forest. Thus, the Vinaya is important for the study of Buddhism as a whole. In particular, the Vinaya is also significant for the study of Buddhist monasticism. As pointed out in the section on

---

<sup>4</sup> *MN III – Gaṇakamoggallānasutta 107, 52–53.*

<sup>5</sup> *Vin. V, 399.*

<sup>6</sup> *Vin. IV, 505. Cf. Skorupski et al., The Buddhist Forum IV, 146.*

the “Focus of the Study” that among all the rules and disciplines of the Vinaya, the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā discipline are the most important sources to study Buddhism. Now, having discussed the importance of the Vinaya, in the following this dissertation looks into how UVP is significant for the comparative study of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

Concerning the routine life, Buddhist monks and nuns as well as lay people gather together twice a month to recite the Paṭimokkha (Uposatha) and to confess any wrongdoings. Once a year, they observe three months of the Rains Retreat (Vassāvāsa) to live in harmony, and to improve themselves in their spiritual practice of Buddhism. When the Rains Retreat ends, they observe another ritual called Pavāraṇā (the Retreat Closing Ceremony) in which they invite other monastics to point out their possible wrong-doing(s) whether heard, seen, or suspected during the three months of the Rains Retreat.

Accordingly, the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā are all core practices in Buddhism. They all deal with the regular routine life of Buddhists since both Vassāvāsa and Pavāraṇā are held annually while the Uposatha is the gathering every half month. In addition, all three practices aim at the harmony of the Saṅgha. This harmony is always highly regarded, and these three practices have always been stressed by the Buddha. Of the seven factors that are expected to keep Buddhism from declining, the most important one is to gather together frequently in concord.<sup>7</sup> For example, the gathering of monks on Uposatha day is no doubt a must for all monastics. This is why Mahakappina, even though he is always “purified with the

---

<sup>7</sup> DN II – *Mahā Parinibbāna Suttanta* 16, 82.



highest purification,” still needs to join and honor the Uposatha ritual. The Uposatha practice is not only an obligation for monastics but also an obligation for lay people to observe regularly in order to achieve the great fruits.<sup>8</sup> For this reason, O. C. Handa has concluded that Uposatha day has long been a Buddhist holiday in which Buddhist monastics and lay people gather together to develop their spiritual life in terms of virtue and harmony.<sup>9</sup>

In the same manner, according to Gokuldas De and Kanai Lal Hazra, the Pavāraṇā is but a broader scale of the Uposatha tradition in which the purity of all individual monastics is enhanced.<sup>10</sup> During this ceremony, an individual monk/nun asks the community to judge his/her conduct and accordingly requires the cooperation between each individual and the community. Therefore, the Pavāraṇā, besides having the purpose of purifying, also enhances harmony within the Saṅgha.

Likewise, the designated purpose of the Vassāvāsa is to create a chance for Buddhists from the four corners of the country to group together and live in harmony and to share their thoughts in concord even when they hold different understandings of the rules, disciplines, and practices.<sup>11</sup> Thus, the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā are the important practices directly dealing with the regular routine life that governs the daily practice of the Buddhist monks and nuns. Moreover, these three rituals all strengthen the cohesion of the community and the fraternity between members of the Saṅgha. Therefore, this dissertation chooses to

---

<sup>8</sup> AN IV, 255; Cf. AN V, 86.

<sup>9</sup> Handa, *Buddhist Monasteries of Himachal*, 63–64.

<sup>10</sup> De, *Democracy in Early Buddhist Saṅgha*, 103–107; Cf. Hazra, *Constitution of the Buddhist Saṅgha*, 134–135.

<sup>11</sup> Schumann, *The Historical Buddha*, 170.

compare the practices of Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the two practical Vinayas as a starting point for the comparative study of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*.<sup>12</sup>

The author is aware that not everyone knows what Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā mean. Therefore, for the convenience of the reader, the English equivalents will be used where necessary. Hence, from now onward this dissertation will designate the Uposatha ceremony as the Biweekly Precept Ceremony and is abbreviated as U. The Vassāvāsa practice is rendered variously as the Rains Retreat, the Three Months Retreat, the Retreat Opening Ceremony, and is abbreviated as V. Note that other scholars interpret Pavāraṇā as the Invitation Ceremony. However, since the Pavāraṇā signifies the end of the Three Months Retreat, this dissertation chooses to define Pavāraṇā as the Retreat Closing Ceremony and is abbreviated as P. Here is the reasoning behind the idea of an Opening Ceremony. Since the Three Months Retreat is ended by the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pavāraṇā), it must have an opening ceremony. Therefore, Vassāvāsa is designated as the Retreat Opening Ceremony. Furthermore, in this dissertation, when Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā go together, they are reduced to simply UVP.

---

<sup>12</sup> The *Four-Part Vinaya* or the *Vinaya of the Four Categories* (Sifen Lu 四分律) is the translation of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* (*Cāturvargīya Vinaya*): The Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka School.

### 1.3. Literature Review

This review of existing scholarships is composed of two sections. First, this dissertation clarifies the adopted texts that are used in this study. Secondly, this dissertation points out the lack of research in the Buddhist Vinaya study as well as the deficiency in the study of the Biweekly Precept Ceremony, Retreat Opening Ceremony, and Retreat Closing Ceremony.

Since this dissertation is comparing the Vinaya of the Theravāda School and Dharmaguptaka School, the specific texts from the schools that this dissertation relies on are identified. According to E. Frauwallner, nowadays, the Vinayas of the following six schools are well preserved. The six schools are: Sarvāstivāda 說一切有部, Dharmaguptaka 法藏部, Mahīśāsaka 化地部, Theravāda [上座部] (Sthaviravāda), Mūlasarvāstivāda 根本說一切有部, and Mahāsāṃghika 大衆部.<sup>13</sup> Of all the Tripiṭaka as well as the Vinaya that have been handed down, the Tripiṭaka of the Theravāda School is the most widely used in all schools throughout Southeast Asia. On the other hand, the Dharmaguptaka School is said to have made the most effort in spreading Buddhism outside of India – especially in Central Asia. As a result, most Asian countries adopted the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*.<sup>14</sup> Thus, this dissertation chooses to compare the Vinaya of these two schools, i.e. the Dharmaguptaka School and the Theravāda School. Specifically, this present study focuses only on the chapters of the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha), the Rains Retreat (Vassāvāsa), and the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pavāraṇā) of the

---

<sup>13</sup> Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, 1–2.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 278.

*Mahāvagga*;<sup>15</sup> which are compared and contrasted with the Collection on the Biweekly Precept Ceremony 說戒撻度,<sup>16</sup> the Collection on the Rains Retreat 安居撻度,<sup>17</sup> and the Collection on the Retreat Closing Ceremony 自恣撻度<sup>18</sup> of the *Four-Part Vinaya* of the Taishō Tripiṭaka. Of these, of course, there are several translations of the *Mahāvagga* in English such as *The Book of the Discipline*, Volume IV by I. B. Horner, the *VinayaTexts* Volume XIII and Volume XVII by Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg, and *The Buddhist Monastic Code II* by Thanissaro Bhikkhu. This dissertation adopts the *Mahāvagga* translated by I. B. Horner because this text belongs to the translation series of the Pāli Text Society and is popular among scholars. For the original Pāli passages, this dissertation adopts the book *Vinaya Piṭakam* edited by Hermann Oldenberg.

Looking back through history, this study finds that there has been research done in the field of Vinaya study. Nonetheless, the number of Vinaya studies is still limited, and there are only a few works that investigate or mention the Biweekly Precept Ceremony, the Retreat Opening Ceremony, and the Retreat Closing Ceremony in detail. Studies have relied heavily on the primary sources such as the *Mahāvagga*, the *Cullavagga*, and the Taishō Tripiṭaka. Thus, they all drew the same conclusions in regard to the Biweekly Precept Ceremony, Retreat Opening Ceremony, and Retreat Closing Ceremony. For example, in 1969, Ñāṇamoli Thera

---

<sup>15</sup> The Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters, which this dissertation covers, are found in the *Mahāvagga* of the *Pāli Vinaya*. In addition, this dissertation compares the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the two Vinayas: The *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Dharmagupta Vinaya*. So, the *Mahāvagga* is a representation of the *Pāli Vinaya*.

<sup>16</sup> 撻度: Aggregate or collection. Skt.: *skandhaka*.

<sup>17</sup> 安: Tranquil; 居: Shelter. Another Chinese word of 安居 is 結制安居: Rains Retreat.

<sup>18</sup> 自恣 is also rendered as 隨意事 and 隨意: Retreat Closing Ceremony of Invitation Ceremony.

translated and published the book, *The Pāṭimokkha: 227 Fundamental Rules of a Bhikkhu*.<sup>19</sup> This work is a translation of the Pāṭimokkha<sup>20</sup> from Pāli to English. In the introduction, Ñāṇamoli discusses the origin and the development of the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha) in regard to the Pāṭimokkha. According to Ñāṇamoli, Uposatha was a borrowed custom from the existing Indian tradition by the Buddhists. The Buddha has modified it to suit the purpose of practicing Buddhism.

Moreover, as of this writing, the Vinaya is still not well studied. That is to say, study on the history of the Buddhist monastic orders has been covered by many scholars, however, there have been no extensive studies on the Biweekly Precept Ceremony, the Retreat Opening Ceremony, and the Retreat Closing Ceremony. The studies on UVP have been nothing more than just cursory glances. Some of the studies also made use of secondary sources such as the report of J. F. Dickson, or that of Ernest M. Bowden on the Biweekly Precept Ceremony who wrote from firsthand experience in observing and witnessing of the ceremony. Some of the modern works delve into the study of the Vinaya with the use of the secondary sources. For example, Charles Prebish, in his article, "Theories Concerning the Skandhaka: An Appraisal,"<sup>21</sup> analyzes and offers many valuable comments on the book of Erich Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*.

To a great degree, E. Frauwallner was a unique scholar among researchers who studied the Buddhist Vinaya, specifically on the comparative studies regarding

---

<sup>19</sup> Ñāṇamoli, *The Pāṭimokkha: 227 Fundamental Rules of a Bhikkhu*.

<sup>20</sup> Pāli: Pāṭimokkha; Sanskrit: Prātimokṣa; Chinese: *jieben* 戒本: Precepts for monks and nuns or code of morality for monks and nuns.

<sup>21</sup> Prebish, "Theories Concerning the Skandhaka: An Appraisal," 669–678.

the Biweekly Precept Ceremony, Retreat Opening Ceremony, and Retreat Closing Ceremony. In 1956, he composed the book, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*,<sup>22</sup> in which he listed the similarities of Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā in the different Vinayas. Nevertheless, this comparison is on the section names only, and only some of them from the different Vinayas are compared. A more appropriate description of the work is, more or less, just a listing of the section names. Moreover, deeper analysis shows that not all the section names in the chapters of the different Vinayas are listed. This dissertation does a more exhaustive listing of the section names. In addition, beyond the mere listing of the section names, this research also compares the sections and tries to discover the possible reasons for how and why the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya* are similar and/or different from one another. This research finds that the possible reasons for why the sections are similar and/or different are the blending of the culture and social perspectives of India and China into the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

As just mentioned above, although there are some works which mention the similarities and differences of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, none of the researchers devote themselves to the comparative study of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the Theravāda School and Dharmaguptaka School under the area of Vinaya study. Recognizing the lack of research in Vinaya study in existing scholarship and also being aware of the importance of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā, I would like to take this

---

<sup>22</sup> Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*.

opportunity to explore these elements of the Theravāda School and Dharmaguptaka School.

#### 1.4. Methodology

I primarily use the literary and close comparison method in studying the similarities and differences between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Within this method, stylistic differences in every section of these two Vinayas are highlighted and analyzed. By so doing, this dissertation is able to point out what is similar, what is different, what is overlap, and what is available in one Vinaya text and not in the other Vinaya text.

Not only does this dissertation compare the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha), the Rains Retreat (Vassāvāsa), and the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pavāraṇā) of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, but also, because there is no original copy of the *Four-Part Vinaya* in Sanskrit form, I need to take into consideration the other existing Vinayas from other schools so that I can draw out the relevant examples and philological context to support my argument as I do the comparison. The philological method is used in the comparison of the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya* because this method reveals different contexts placed on the similarities and differences between these two Vinayas.

By discussing the similarities and differences between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, I am able to provide a framework for the Indian and Chinese cultural, social, and contextual perspectives that may have blended into these two Vinaya texts. The sequences of the sections of these two Vinayas are not compatible

with one another (i.e. they are not in the same chronological order), so I will divide these chapters into sections and label them for comparison. For example, the subdivision dealing with the prohibition by the Buddha in the “Recitation of the Paṭimokkha according to the Assembly” held by a group of six monks 六群比丘<sup>23</sup> belongs to the section of the “Calculation of the Half-month” in the *Four-Part Vinaya*<sup>24</sup> while it is located in the “Recitation of the Paṭimokkha” of the *Mahāvagga*<sup>25</sup> in the *Pāli Vinaya*. Regarding this, I still group this prohibition section to the “Reciting of the Paṭimokkha according to Assembly” instead of the section on “Calculation.” Since there is no translation of the *Four-Part Vinaya* in English, in this dissertation, I will translate some sections of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Four-Part Vinaya* from Chinese into English where needed for the convenience of the reader.

## 1.5. Chapter Overview

There are six chapters in this dissertation as follows: Chapter I, "Introduction," is a statement of the problem, the outline of the significance of this study, as well as the direction taken to solve the problem throughout. To do so, this dissertation adopts the *Mahāvagga* of the *Pāli Vinaya* which is translated by I. B. Horner and the *Vinaya Piṭakam* edited by Hermann Oldenberg because these texts belong to the translation series of the Pāli Text Society that have been popular

---

<sup>23</sup> Group of six monks 六群比丘: The group of monks who are the cause for many rules and disciplines which are laid down by the Buddha.

<sup>24</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 817c27–818a28.

<sup>25</sup> *Vin. IV*, 136.



among scholars. In the same manner, for the Chinese version, this dissertation embraces the *Four-Part Vinaya* of the Taishō Tripiṭaka.

Chapter II provides the background such as the study in the textual development of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Moreover, in responding to the statement that Uposatha (Biweekly Precept Ceremony) and Vassāvāsa (Rains Retreat) are practices that the Buddha adopts and imitates from the existing Indian customs, this chapter challenges that story and asks the controversial question: Were the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā originally part of the Buddhist traditions in terms of having the same name as the other sects, but having distinctly different practices? This debatable question is important to discuss because if the Buddhist Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā were not original in Buddhism, there would be no need to study them for they would be the same in name and practice as the other Indian non-Buddhist sects.

Chapter III, “Similarities in Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā,” discusses two common features that the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* share under consideration. First of all, both these two Vinayas change, add, and omit parts or ideas while highlighting the faithfulness of their interpretations to draw attention away from these revisions. Secondly, as a result, discrepancies are found in both these two Vinayas. Interestingly, through these two points of similarity of edits and the resulting discrepancies, these two Vinayas are separated from one another, while the image of the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya* is portrayed in a realistic way, it is described in the *Four-Part Vinaya* in a way that is highly idealized and more conforming to the Chinese culture and context. For example, on the one hand, the

*Pāli Vinaya* speaks of both the good as well as the bad in the Saṅgha regarding the moral conduct of monks and nuns. On the other hand, it is evident that many stories behind the rules and disciplines in the *Four-Part Vinaya* craft a better image of monks in term of morality in comparison to the *Pāli Vinaya*.

Chapter IV is a discussion about the differences through the cultural influences both naturally and selectively. The *Four-Part Vinaya* is modified idealistically in terms of fitting in with the Chinese culture. Achieving such an idealistic aspiration is not easy because although culturally many aspects are accepted in India, they are not applicable in China. Many stories in the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, which may reflect some Indian cultural elements, are probably transformed to be more Chinese when they are translated into the *Four-Part Vinaya*. By these modifications, both naturally and selectively, monks and nuns are portrayed in the *Four-Part Vinaya* as still having morality even though there are cultural gaps between India and China.

The differences between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* are continued to be revealed through the social aspects between India and China in Chapter V. As a new religion emerging in the Chinese society wherein morality and virtue are well established by Chinese local thoughts and religions, a newcomer like Buddhism must be good and to some extent be superior to the existing religions and thoughts so that it can attract Chinese followers. Thus, the Buddhist texts in general and the Buddhist Vinaya texts are often re-organized in their structures to show only that which is good to the Chinese people. Not only is the structure of the Buddhist Vinaya texts polished, but also the monastics themselves must be superior

to the other people as well. Thus, in the *Four-Part Vinaya* the moral conduct of monastics is often overpraised while it is suppressed for the lay people. Therefore, with these social influences, Chapter V reveals the differences by pointing out the polishing of the *Four-Part Vinaya* and by showing how the *Four-Part Vinaya* overpraises the superiority of the monastics over the lay people.

Chapter VI, "Conclusion," provides a summary of the comparative analysis of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā between the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya*. Throughout the discussion, the possible Indian and Chinese social and cultural blending into these two Vinaya texts are revealed through examples that show how these two versions of the Vinaya are similar and different from one another. By so doing, this dissertation offers a better understanding on the values of these similarities and differences between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

## CHAPTER II: TEXTUAL BACKGROUND

---

### 2.1. Defining Terms

In this chapter, the key terms of Uposatha (Biweekly Precept Ceremony), Vassāvāsa (Rains Retreat or the Retreat Opening Ceremony), and Pavāraṇā (The Closing Ceremony) are defined and the relevant issues of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā are addressed.

#### 2.1.1. Defining Uposatha

In the Pāli texts, it is Uposatha while Poṣadha is commonly used in the Sanskrit versions, as well as their translations. According to *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary (SED)*, Uposatha has its origin in the Sanskrit word *upavasathá* in which *Upavasathá* is derived from the root words *upa* and *vas* which means “to fast” and “to dwell.” Uposatha also denotes the day and period preceding a Soma Sacrifice of the Brahmanism.<sup>26</sup> While, Uposatha has its origin in the Sanskrit word *upavasathá*, Poṣadha is rooted from *puṣ*<sup>27</sup> or *push*<sup>28</sup> which means thrive, flourish, prosper, increase, or nourish. From the root *puṣ*, it derives its gender and forms as *Upoṣadha*

---

<sup>26</sup> This is a fast of purification undertaken before a sacrifice. For detail, sees *SED*, 206; *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*. Vol 4, 94; and Hastings, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. Vol. 5, 868.

<sup>27</sup> Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 355.

<sup>28</sup> *SED*, 638.

where the Pāli term Uposatha is developed.<sup>29</sup> Thus, the Buddhist term of Uposatha grew out from the Sanskrit term Upavasathá and Poṣadha.

When the ritual of Uposatha is applied to Buddhism, it is a sacred day in which monks and nuns preach Dhamma, recite the Paṭimokkha, confess if they have done any wrongdoing, and thus they can obtain moral purity.<sup>30</sup> Through the process of reciting the Paṭimokkha, monks and nuns can purify their body, speech, and mind. Besides *bushata* 布沙他, *busata* 布灑他, *bushata* 逋沙他, *baoshatuo* 褒沙陀, and *busa* 布薩 (Poṣadha), Chinese also renders Uposatha as pure abode (*jingzhu* 淨住), abiding in goodness (*shansu* 善宿), and nurture (*changyang* 長養).<sup>31</sup> Not only monks and nuns, but also lay disciples can observe the Uposatha day by taking the Eight Precepts (*bajie* 八戒 or *baguanzhai jie* 八關齋戒) and live one day as monks and nuns.<sup>32</sup> By observing the Uposatha, it is said that laymen and laywomen can achieve great fruit, great benefit, great glory, and great radiance:

Therefore, the women the men devout  
Who keep this *sabbath* [Uposatha] with its precepts eight,  
Performing merit fruitful of results,  
In the heaven-world are born without reproach.<sup>33</sup>

Observing Uposatha by monks and nuns is called Samaggi Uposatha while the one carried out by the lay devotee is called Uposatha Upavasati.<sup>34</sup>

According to the Buddha, there are three kinds of Uposatha. They are the Uposatha of the herdsman, the naked ascetics, and that of the Ariyans. The Buddha

<sup>29</sup> Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 355.

<sup>30</sup> *Vin. IV*, 131–132.

<sup>31</sup> Ding 丁, *Fo Xue Da Ci Dian* 佛學大辭典 I – *Pu Sa* 布薩, 861–862.

<sup>32</sup> *AN I – Sorts of Sabbath*, 185–195.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 195.

<sup>34</sup> Robertson, *The Triple Gem and the Uposatha*, 2.

says that the first two kinds of Uposatha are not of great fruit or profit, not brilliant, and not of great radiance.<sup>35</sup> Buddhists should observe the third kind of Uposatha. That is, one has to clean the soiled mind by a proper technique in which he/she practices thinking about the Tathāgata, the Dhamma, the Saṅgha, the Virtue, and the Deva.<sup>36</sup>

The Buddha taught that in order to achieve the highest benefit from Uposatha, it should be observed regularly. At one time, as the Buddha visited Kapilavatthu, he asked Sakyān lay followers whether or not they had observed the Eight-Factored Uposatha 八關齋. After hearing their replies of “sometimes yes, sometimes no” by the Sakyāns, the Buddha disagreed with them, saying, “It's no gain for you, Sakyāns. It's ill-gotten, that in this life so endangered by grief, in this life so endangered by death, you sometimes observe the eight-factored Uposatha and sometimes don't.”<sup>37</sup> Thus, the Uposatha should be observed regularly. As mentioned above, one of the meanings of Uposatha is to nourish, to rise, and to develop (*changyang* 長養), so through observing Uposatha one can get to a higher and better status. In other words, by keeping Uposatha, the offender can gain purity and one who does not commit any offence can enhance his/her purity.

Moreover, Uposatha is the time for disciples to gather together so that they can learn and encourage each other, so absence on the Uposatha ceremony is prohibited in Buddhism. All have to observe Uposatha. This is the reason why the traditional Vinaya text states that when the great venerable Kappina had the

---

<sup>35</sup> AN I – *Sorts of Sabbath*, 186.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 187–190.

<sup>37</sup> AN V – *Sakyāns*, 59–61.

intention of not going to the Uposatha ceremony because he believes he had attained the highest purification already, the Buddha appeared in front of him and told him that he still needs to honor the Uposatha by attending the ritual.<sup>38</sup> Thus, Uposatha is one way for Buddhists to come clean, and thereby offers them an edge in developing their spiritual path in terms of purity.

### 2.1.2. Defining Varṣavāsa

Similarly, according to *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, the Rain Retreat or Varṣavāsa/Vassāvāsa 安居 has its origin in the Sanskrit word *varṣa/varshā* and *vāsa*. *Varṣa* means rain, the rains, rainy season, or monsoon while *vāsa* stands for dwelling, staying, abiding, or residence.<sup>39</sup> Hence, Varṣavāsa denotes a period of time in which monks and nuns must reside in one place. This happens because of the tropical rain in India that makes it difficult for monks and nuns to travel. Also, monks and nuns wander for the whole year and during the rainy season they trample down the crops and grasses, and kill insects. In so doing, they were criticized by the lay people. Accordingly, the Buddha laid down the rule that monks and nuns must enter retreat upon the rainy season for three months.<sup>40</sup> Consequently, the Chinese renders Varṣavāsa as *anju* 安居. The term *anju* 安居 is composed of two components, “tranquil” (*an* 安) and “shelter” (*ju* 居), which is signified by a period of intensified practice in the monastery life during which uninterrupted residence is mandatory for registered monks and nuns in training.

<sup>38</sup> *Vin. IV*, 136–137. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 818a28–b16.

<sup>39</sup> *SED*, 927.

<sup>40</sup> *Vin. IV*, 183.

This period of entering Varṣavāsa is often carried out during the summer because this season is also called the rainy season in India. Therefore, besides *anju* 安居, Varṣavāsa is also known to the Chinese as *zuoxia* 坐夏. In this connection, *zuoxia* 坐夏 denotes the retreat in which the Buddhist practitioners rest from wandering and reside in a certain place during the rainy season or the summer to practice meditation and purify themselves. The practice of Varṣavāsa is held once a year and it lasts for three months. As mentioned above, the Varṣavāsa is a period in which Buddhist practitioners devote themselves to practice and enhance their purity. Buddhist monastic rank is recognized by seniority in accordance with their religious age. This religious age (*xiala* 夏臘) is counted by the number of time a monastic successfully observes or attends the Varṣavāsa. Thus, also included in Varṣavāsa is the meaning of *zuola* 坐臘 in which monks and nuns, after their successful observing of the Rains Retreat, gain one year in their religious age.

According to the Buddha, there are two periods to enter the Rains Retreat: the Earlier Period and the Later Period. The former starts the day after the full moon of Āṣādha<sup>41</sup> and the latter may be entered upon a month after the full moon of Āṣādha.<sup>42</sup> However, in the *Additional Vinaya (Pini Zengyi* 毘尼增一) of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, we are told that indeed there are three kinds of Varṣavāsa: the Rains Retreat which is entered upon during the Earlier Period, the Middle Period, and the Later Period (有三種安居。前安居中安居後安居).<sup>43</sup> Regarding this, Daoxuan 道宣 (596–

---

<sup>41</sup> *Vin. IV*, 184. According to *SED*, the Āṣādha month corresponds to part of June and July in which the full moon is near the constellation Āṣādhā, 159.

<sup>42</sup> *Vin. IV*, 184. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 830c10–11 & T. no. 1428, 22: 832a20–25.

<sup>43</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 998b12–13.



667) seemed to be forced to develop some sort of interpretation of what they might be. In his *Commentary on Services of Cutting the Complex and Adding the Missing Parts of the Four-Part Vinaya* (*Sifenlü Shanfan Buque Xingshi Chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔), Daoxuan explained that there are three different starting points for these three periods for the Rains Retreat. According to Daoxuan, the Earlier Period (*qian anju* 前安居) begins on the sixteenth day of the fourth lunar month and lasts for three months while the Later Period (*hou anju* 後安居) begins on the sixteenth day of the fifth lunar month and also lasts for three months. However, the Middle Period (*zhong anju* 中安居) can begin any time from the sixteenth day of the fourth lunar month to the sixteenth day of the fifth lunar month and should last for three months as well:

There are three periods to start the Rains Retreat. The Earlier Period may be entered on the sixteenth day of the fourth lunar month. The Later Period may be entered on the sixteenth day of the fifth lunar month. The Middle Period may be entered any time between the seventeenth day of the fourth lunar month to the fifteenth day of the fifth lunar month. Thus, according to the Vinaya, there are three periods to enter the Rain Retreat: The Earlier, the Middle, and the Later Period. The Earlier Period lasts for three months and the Later Period also lasts for three months. Although there is no mention of the three months for the Middle Period, its duration is also as long as the Earlier Period and the Later Period.

今但就夏亦有三時。初四月十六日是前安居。十七日已去至五月十五日名中安居。五月十六日名後安居。故律中有三種安居。謂前中後也。前安居者住前三月。後安居者住後三月。雖不云中三月。然文中具明前後日數。中間不辨於理自明。<sup>44</sup>

As mentioned above, this division of three starting points for the Rains Retreat provided by Daoxuan probably originates from the different days that the Buddha

---

<sup>44</sup> T. no. 1804, 40: 38b22-27.

allowed monks to enter the Rains Retreat. In many places in the Vinaya, besides the Earlier Period and the Later Period to start the Rain Retreat, the Buddha also allows monks and nuns to enter at any time in between these two periods. For example, in the Collection on Varṣavāsa 安居撻度 of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, monks, specifically Śāriputra 舍利弗 and Maudgalyāyana 目犍連, head to the residence to enter the Rains Retreat together with the Buddha, but when they arrive there, the Earlier Period to enter the Rains Retreat has passed. Śāriputra 舍利弗 and Maudgalyāyana 目犍連 wonder whether they could enter the Rains Retreat or not. The other monks report this issue to the Buddha. Immediately, the Buddha allows them to enter the Rains Retreat under this situation and situations similar to it because these monks have the proper intention to enter the Rains Retreat.<sup>45</sup> However, in this rule, there is no mention of the Buddha declaring of the Middle Period to enter the Rains Retreat. Rather, according to this text, the Buddha allows Śāriputra 舍利弗 and Maudgalyāyana 目犍連 to join the retreat with him and the Saṅgha appropriately at the Later Period (佛言聽後安居).<sup>46</sup>

Additionally, in this Vinaya, the Buddha also identifies the two periods to enter the Rains Retreat: The Earlier Period (*qian anju* 前安居) and the Later Period (*hou anju* 後安居). None of the places in the Collection on Varṣavāsa 安居撻度 of the *Four-Part Vinaya* mention the so-called Middle Period:

At that time, Śāriputra 舍利弗 and Maudgalyāyana 目犍連 wish to enter the Rains Retreat together with the Buddha. They depart on the fifteenth day of the lunar month and arrive at the residence where the Buddha dwells on the

---

<sup>45</sup> T. no.1428, 22: 830c20–29.

<sup>46</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 833a23.

seventeenth of the lunar month. Both Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana are wondering and not knowing what they should do. They inform their fellow monks. These monks report the issue to the Buddha. The Buddha allows Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana to enter the Rains Retreat during the Later Period. From this incident, the Buddha declares that there are two starting-points for monks to enter the Rains Retreat: the Earlier and the Later Period.

爾時舍利弗目連。欲共世尊安居。十五日從所住處往。十七日乃至。不知當云何。即白諸比丘。諸比丘以此事白佛。佛言。聽後安居。有二種安居。有前安居。有後安居。<sup>47</sup>

Probably, the explanation from Daoxuan regarding the period to start the Rains Retreat is based on the *Additional Vinaya*<sup>48</sup> (*Pini Zengyi* 毘尼增一) of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In this book, we are told that there are three kinds of Varṣavāsa: the Rains Retreat that is entered upon during the Earlier Period, the Middle Period, and the Later Period (有三種安居。前安居中安居後安居).<sup>49</sup> However, this book simply provides three periods that monks and nuns can start their Rains Retreat without explanation. As one of the authority of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, Daoxuan needs to take into consideration a possible explanation of what these three periods might be. Nevertheless, the book that Daoxuan may have cited from is called the *Additional Vinaya* (*Pini zengyi* 毘尼增一). It seems to be of the later composition or later collection of the Vinaya. Consequently, the *Additional Vinaya* is not as focused and reliable as the Rain Retreat presented in the Collection on Varṣavāsa 安居撻度 of the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

Moreover, in the passage concerning the three retreat periods from the *Additional Vinaya*, it does not seem to suggest that the Buddha recommends monks

<sup>47</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 832a20–24.

<sup>48</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 994a13–1001c13.

<sup>49</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 998b12–13.

to enter the retreat late so as to enter the so-called Middle Period. The Buddha recommends, or to an extent requires, that monks be on time and enter the retreat either during the Earlier Period or the Later Period and not the period in between. The so-called Middle Period is meant to serve only as an exception that the Buddha does not recommend, but that the Buddha made to allow latecomers to join the retreat. This exception is not meant to be granted for admission into the retreat in the same way as the admission during the Earlier Period and Later Periods unless special unforeseen conditions demand such an exception. In short, the Buddha wants everyone to be on time. Do not be late! And do not look for exceptions unless it is necessary and appropriate. None of the places in the Collection on Varṣavāsa 安居撻度 of the *Four-Part Vinaya* mention the so-called Middle Period. The reason is because there is no place in the Collection of the Varṣavāsa that specifies where and to whom the Buddha taught the Middle Period. The compiler of the *Additional Vinaya* may have assumed the existence of the Middle Period to supplement the Earlier Period and the Later Period. Daoxuan has given the most detailed interpretation of the *Four-Part Vinaya* and in so doing was faced with the challenge of interpreting the meaning of the three periods. Therefore, Daoxuan probably did not invent the notion of the Middle Period but rather this Middle Period resulted from interpretation of the text in compartmentalizing the unidentified time between the Earlier Period and the Later Period. So, these three periods to enter the Rains Retreat in the *Additional Vinaya* could be the summarization of the time that the Buddha allows monks and nuns to enter the retreat in the Collection on Varṣavāsa 安居撻度 of the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

As was established earlier, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, the allowing of the Buddha for Śāriputra 舍利弗 and Maudgalyāyana 目犍連 to join the retreat is just the exception created by the Buddha for monks and nuns who desire and have the appropriate intention for the retreat, but have missed the starting point to enter the retreat of the Earlier Period. It is made sufficiently clearer in the *Four-Part Vinaya* that monastics who enter the Rains Retreat anytime after the starting point of the Earlier Period and before the starting day of the Later Period could carry out the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pavāraṇā). However, they need make up for the missing days by remaining in the residence and continue the retreat after the Pavāraṇā to fulfill the ninety days (three months) requirement. Otherwise, the religious age reckoned by observing three months of the Rains Retreat for those who enter later than the starting point for the Earlier Period would not count due to their Rains Retreat being incomplete (*poxia* 破夏: breaking or violating the rules of the summer retreat) which is another way of saying the individual has failed to attend the full three months of retreat.<sup>50</sup>

Additionally, in all the Vinayas that are available now, only the Earlier Period and the Later Period to enter the Rains Retreat are mentioned.<sup>51</sup> None of the so-called “Middle Period” to enter the Rains Retreat is found in these existing Vinayas. Thus, the passage in the *Additional Vinaya* of the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the

---

<sup>50</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 833a25–b1.

<sup>51</sup> For the two periods to enter the Rains Retreat, i.e. the Earlier Period and the Later Period, see *Vin. IV*, 184; *The Four-Part Vinaya*, T. no. 1428, 22: 830c10–11; *The Five-Part Vinaya* (*Pañcavargika Vinaya* or *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律), T. no. 1421, 22: 130b5–26; *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇, T. no. 1425, 22: 450c3–451a6; *The Ten Recitations Vinaya* (*Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律), T. no. 1435, 23: 173b1–176a12; and the *Mūla-sarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶, T. no. 1445, 23: 1041a25–1044c6. All these Vinayas only mention the Earlier Period and the Later Period to start the Rains Retreat and not the Middle Period.

interpretation of Daoxuan, suggesting the idea of three periods to start the Rains Retreat—the Earlier Period, the Middle Period, and the Later Period—seem to be problematic. Essentially, there are only two periods to enter the Rains Retreat taught by the Buddha, the Earlier Period and the Later Period.

Now, this dissertation looks at the place where monks and nuns reside during the retreat. The Buddhist settlement locations for the rainy season generally consists of two kinds: (1) the dwelling places, *āvāsas* which are determined, constructed, and maintained by the monastics themselves; and (2) the parks, *ārāmas* which are donated and maintained by some wealthy patrons. The ideal place for either *āvāsas* or *ārāmas* is located on the outskirts of towns and villages where it is quiet enough for monks and nuns to meditate. Also, it should not be too far from the town or village so that monastics can go for alms food and the laity can come to visit the Buddha, the monks, and the nuns. According to the Buddha, the requisites for the Rains Retreat settlement are as follows:

Now where could the Lord stay that would be neither too far from a village nor too near, suitable for coming and going, accessible for people whenever they want, not crowded by day, having little noise at night, little sound, without folk's breath, haunts of privacy, suitable for seclusion?<sup>52</sup>

The residence for the Rains Retreat should meet the requirement of “neither too far nor too near from the village” so that it is comfortable for both the monastics and the lay people in their daily interactions.

In short, the practice of *Varṣavāsa* (the Rains Retreat, also known exclusively in this dissertation as the Retreat Opening Ceremony) is mandatory for monastics.

---

<sup>52</sup> Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: The Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtras of the Mahāsāṃghikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins*, 5. Cf. *Vin. IV*, 51.

Monks and nuns can enter the Rains Retreat during either the Earlier Period or the Later Period. In addition, monks and nuns can enter the Rains Retreat either in *āvāsas* or *ārāmas*. The Varṣavāsa will end with the Pavāraṇā (*zizi* 自恣) Ceremony (the Retreat Closing Ceremony). The primary purpose of the Rains Retreat is to harmonize the members of the Saṅgha, as well as to purify monks and nuns regarding moral conduct. Thus, the practice of the Rains Retreat is another tool for Buddhists to discipline themselves for the achievement of purity and ultimately for the final achievement of full enlightenment.

### 2.1.3. Defining Pavāraṇā

Lastly, the custom of Pravāraṇā (Retreat Closing Ceremony) is an outgrowth from the Varṣavāsa (Rains Retreat). According to the Vinayas, one group of monks observes the Silence Practice (*yafa* 啞法) during the Rains Retreat. After the three months of retreat and without any kind of ceremony to close the retreat they go to see the Buddha—as it is the custom. Having heard about their practice of keeping silent by not talking and not learning from each other, the Buddha disapproved of their practice. Keeping silent during meditation is good, but avoiding speaking by resorting to body language and not sharing their knowledge and experience with each other by keeping silent is not good. On the contrary, the Buddha encouraged that monastics should engage in healthy conversations throughout the Rains Retreat to help improve each other's understanding and practice. The Buddha also laid

down the rule that monks and nuns should carry out the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pravāraṇā) at the end of the Rains Retreat (Varṣavāsa).<sup>53</sup>

Now, what is the Pravāraṇā/Pavāraṇā? Pravāraṇā is a Sanskrit word which is composed of *pra* and *vāraṇā*. According to the *SED*, *pra* means filling or fulfilling<sup>54</sup> and *vāraṇā* signifies warding off or restraining. Thus, Pravāraṇā indicates one's restraining that fulfills other people's wish. Accordingly, in Chinese Pravāraṇā is rendered as the following: one's own bent (*zizi* 自恣), at will in accord with the matter (*suiyishi* 隨意事),<sup>55</sup> and following one's own wishes (*suiyi* 隨意).<sup>56</sup> This is a ceremony of repentance performed at the end of the Rains Retreat wherein practitioners sincerely reflect on the content of their efforts during the retreat, and proactively confess and repent their offences if committed. By proactively asking others to point out one's own deficiencies and flaws the Buddhists have a systematic way of eradicating their possible misbehaviors and becoming more purified. Hence, together with Uposatha and Vassāvāsa, Pravāraṇā is one of the valuable practices of Buddhists to purify moral conduct in order to achieve the enlightenment.

---

<sup>53</sup> *Vin. IV*, 208–211. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 835c12–836a17.

<sup>54</sup> *SED*, 652.

<sup>55</sup> "At will in accord with the matter" means that an individual monastic fulfills his fellow monastics regarding his offence if committed in the matter of either seen, heard, or suspected.

<sup>56</sup> Pravāraṇā is transliterated as *boli polana* 鉢利婆刺拏 or *bohelo* 鉢和羅.



## 2.2. The Textual Development of Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā in the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*

The study of Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā in this dissertation is done by performing research of the textual development of these subjects in regard to the *Pāli Vinaya (Mahāvagga)* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The study of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* is important because different viewpoints from scholars regarding these two Vinayas result in different frameworks in the study of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā. At the outset, I should make it clear that this study is on the rituals of Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, so it will be useful to have beforehand an overview of the *Pāli Vinaya (Mahāvagga)*<sup>57</sup> and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Concerning this issue, I will consider, with the utmost brevity, only what is directly relevant to the present theme.

Now, what is the development of the *Pāli Vinaya (Mahāvagga)* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*? First, I will examine the textual development of the *Mahāvagga*. According to traditional Buddhist accounts, after the Mahāparinibbāna of the Buddha, the earliest community of monks was a loosely knit group of ascetics who lived a simple life in accordance with the discipline, eager to practice meditation, and to remember the Buddha's teaching orally. Thus, there was no dispute between the members of the Saṅgha regarding the Vinaya. It is common knowledge that the first composition of the Vinaya Piṭaka began at the First Buddhist Council. In this

---

<sup>57</sup> The chapters on Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā are found in the *Mahāvagga* of the *Pāli Vinaya*.

Council, it is also believed that only the Paṭimokkha is recited but not the other texts of the Vinaya Piṭaka. In his book, *Pāli Literature: Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*, Kenneth Roy Norman states:

In the oldest account which we possess of the first council, it is said that Mahākassapa asked Upāli about the twofold *Vinaya*. This suggests that he asked him only about the Pātimokkha rules for *bhikkhus* and *bhikkhunīs*. In the account which Buddhaghosa gives of that council, he states that the *theras* classified the *Mahāvibhaṅga*, the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*, the *Khandhaka* and the *Parivāras*, but he concedes that the *Vinaya-piṭaka* as he knew it contained material which had not been recited at the first council. It is obvious, and presumably Buddhaghosa realized, that the final two sections of the *Khandhaka*, which deal with the first council and the second council which occurred 100 years later, could not have been recited on that occasion, but there is no indication of the parts of the *Vinaya-piṭaka* he had in mind when he wrote of texts not being recited.<sup>58</sup>

From the above quote, we learn that although the Vinaya Piṭaka is recited during the First Buddhist Council, only the Paṭimokkha was in existence. Thus, the *Mahāvagga* of the Vinaya Piṭaka was not yet composed at that time. Not only is the *Mahāvagga* not yet composed during the First Buddhist Council, but also there are evidences showing that this text is also not recited during the Second Buddhist Council which takes place a hundred years after the Nibbāna of the Buddha. In the following, this dissertation considers whether or not the *Mahāvagga* is composed during the Second Buddhist Council.

A few decades after the First Buddhist Council, debates about the teaching of the Buddha among the Buddhists arose. Moreover, as the time, place, and situation changed demanding different conditions in different environments, some rules and

---

<sup>58</sup> Norman, *Pāli Literature: Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*, 18.

disciplines that had been taught by the Buddha were treated differently by the disciples of the Buddha and some were even manipulated to suit what they feel was the correct understanding. These events fundamentally led to the schism in the Saṅgha. According to the general opinion, the first schism happened about one hundred years after the Nibbāna of the Buddha resulting in the division of Buddhism into two great groups: the Mahāsāṅghika 大衆部 and the Sthaviravāda 上座部.<sup>59</sup> In the *Mahāvagga*, it is said that one of the reason for this schism is because of disagreements on some aspects of the Vinaya.<sup>60</sup> Thus, these two schools already possessed their own Vinaya at the time of the first schism. In general, there was no dispute in the First Council. There was dispute, however, in the Second Council. But the dispute was about the Paṭimokkha and there was no mention of the *Mahāvagga* at this time. The *Mahāvagga* was composed at a later time with the reason to be addressed in the following.

The reason that provoked the Second Buddhist Council was dispute regarding the Ten Points<sup>61</sup> related to the Vinaya, which were observed by the Vajjian monks. The Ten Points have nothing to do with the *Mahāvagga* (which roughly covers Buddhist history and discipline) but have everything to do with the Paṭimokkha (which specifically covers Buddhist codes of conduct, including the Ten Points). This idea is supported by Girija Shankar Prasad Mirsa, Rhys Davids,

---

<sup>59</sup> Although Sthaviravāda and Theravāda are both called the School of the Elders (*Shangzuobu* 上座部), the term Sthaviravāda is denoted as the school at the Second Buddhist Council while the term Theravāda is denoted as the continuation of the Sthaviravāda which derived from the Vibhajjavāda.

<sup>60</sup> *Vin. IV*, 407–430.

<sup>61</sup> For details of the Ten Points, sees *Vin. IV*, 416–418.

Hermann Oldenberg, and E. Frauwallner.<sup>62</sup> According to them, the Paṭimokkha came into existence first, and then it was followed by the commentaries (Vibhaṅga). It was after the compilation of the Vibhaṅga that the *Mahāvagga* was composed,<sup>63</sup> which was in the third century. It was not until the twentieth century, in 1952, that the *Mahāvagga* was first translated into English by I. B. Horner.

The development of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is more complex because there are two views about the offshoot of the Dharmaguptaka School. The first view is that the first schism took place after the Second Buddhist Council resulting in the splitting of the Saṅgha into two schools: the Mahāsāṅghika 大衆部 and the Sthaviravāda 上座部. Following this schism, the Sthaviravāda School was split up into eleven sects with the Mahīśāsaka School as a subsect. During the third century CE, the Dharmaguptaka School withdrew from the Mahīśāsaka School and established its own school of Buddhism.<sup>64</sup> Thus, according to this view, the formation of the *Four-Part Vinaya* started from the *Sthaviravāda Vinaya* and later was further developed through other schools following chronologically the *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya*—*Vibhajjavāda Vinaya*—*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*, and finally the *Dharmagupta Vinaya*. Therefore, prior to the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*, the predecessor of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is the Vinaya of the Sthaviravāda School 上座部, which is composed at the Second Buddhist Council.

Nonetheless, the origin of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is not a simple subject to study since there is a claim that there are two Mahīśāsaka Schools: the Earlier

---

<sup>62</sup> Misra, *The Age of Vinaya*, 29.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 530.

Mahīśāsaka School and the Later Mahīśāsaka School. Following this view, scholars claim that the *Four-Part Vinaya* has its origin from the Vinaya of the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School.<sup>65</sup> It is Nalinaksha Dutt who, following the ideas of Professor Przyluski, points out that the first schism took place right after the First Buddhist Council. According to them, after the reciting of the Dhamma and the Vinaya by the Elders which is headed by Mahakassapa, Pūraṇa of Dakkhiṇāgiri<sup>66</sup> arrives. Pūraṇa agrees with the Council on most of the issues except the seven/eight rules relating to food.<sup>67</sup> Thus, Pūraṇa of Dakkhiṇāgiri splits from Mahakassapa and forms the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School that is different from the Sthaviravāda School by the Elders at the First Buddhist Council.<sup>68</sup> Dutt states: “Regarding the geographical expansion of the school, Professor Przyluski points out that: (1) Pūraṇa refers to the people of the Earlier Mahīśāsaka School; (2) that the alternative name of this school [Earlier Mahīśāsaka School] is Mahāvantaka; and (3) that the Vinaya text of this school was found in Ceylon.”<sup>69</sup> Dutt reaffirms this argument by mentioning the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscription. This inscription, according to Dutt, is the evidence for the establishment of the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School: “Prof. Przyluski’s suggestions are supported by the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscription, in which it is stated

---

<sup>65</sup> Dutt, *Buddhist Sects in India*, 50–51.

<sup>66</sup> A district near Rājagṛha 王舍城 in ancient India where Pūraṇa was born.

<sup>67</sup> According to the Mahīśāsaka School, Pūraṇa proposed seven rules while the number of rules is eight in the Dharmagupta School. For details, see Nalinaksha Dutt, *Buddhist Sects in India*, 122. The eight rules proposed by Pūraṇa are: (1) cooking food indoors, (2) cooking indoors, (3) cooking food of one’s own accord, (4) taking food of one’s own accord, (5) receiving food when rising early in the morning, (6) carrying food home in compliance with the wish of the giver, (7) having miscellaneous, and (8) eating things grown in a pond. For details, see footnote number 3 of Dutt’s book, entitled *Buddhist Sects in India*, 39.

<sup>68</sup> Dutt, *Buddhist Sects in India*, 122.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*

that the Queen of Vanavāsī erects a pillar and a monastery at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa for the benefit of the *ācāryas* [elders] of the Mahīśāsaka sect.”<sup>70</sup>

In this connection, the establishment of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is as follows. With the event of Pūraṇa of Dakkhiṇāgiri, the first schism took place after the First Buddhist Council resulting in the formation of the Sthaviravāda and the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School. Then, the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School gave birth to the Dharmaguptaka School in which the *Four-Part Vinaya* is the foundation of the morality and discipline. Hence, according to this view, the predecessor of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is the Vinaya of the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School and not the Sthaviravāda School.

However, the proposal of Dutt seems to be problematic when he includes the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscription as the evidence for establishing the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School. The Queen of Vanavāsī was the wife of King Ikṣhvāku, and King Ikṣhvāku ruled over his kingdom during the third century CE.<sup>71</sup> So, properly speaking, this inscription was erected by the Queen for the so-called Later Mahīśāsaka School (as suggested by Dutt and Przyłuski that there are two Mahīśāsaka Schools: the Earlier Mahīśāsaka School and the Later Mahīśāsaka School). Dutt continues that Vanavāsī is one of the countries that the missionaries of Aśoka visited.<sup>72</sup> So, it seems evident that there is no Buddhism, or Buddhism did not develop in Vanavāsī until the arrival of the missionaries of Aśoka during the third

---

<sup>70</sup> Sastri, *Epigraphia Indica and Record of the Archaeological Survey of India Vol. XX*, 24–25.

<sup>71</sup> Sircar, *The Successors of the Sātavāhanas in Lower Deccan*. The date of King Ikṣhvāku, see page 4. The date of the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions, see page 9. For the information in regard to the Queen of Ikṣhvāku, see page 16.

<sup>72</sup> Dutt, *Buddhist Sects in India*, 123.

century BCE. The Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscription was erected by the Queen during the third century CE. In addition, in this inscription, it does not specify whether the erecting of the monastery by the Queen is for the elders (*ācāryas*) of the Earlier Mahīśāsaka School or the Later Mahīśāsaka School. Rather, this inscription only informs us that this monastery is for the “*ācāryas* of the Mahīśāsaka sect.” So, it is possible that this inscription signifies the so-called Later Mahīśāsaka School instead of the Earlier Mahīśāsaka School because the inscription was engraved at a later time (the third century CE) compared to the formation of the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School (c. 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE).

Moreover, there is no information to hint at the formation of a separate school by Pūraṇa. All the contemporary Vinayas, including the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律,<sup>73</sup> in mentioning the event of Pūraṇa, only state that Pūraṇa rejoices with the recitation but suggests another seven rules which are permitted by the Buddha.<sup>74</sup> Furthermore, according to the *Four-Part Vinaya*, it seems that Kassapa and Pūraṇa, finally, come to an agreement with one another. In this text, Kassapa said: “Let’s make an agreement like this, Pūraṇa, do not include the rules which were not laid down by the Buddha, and do not omit any rules which were laid down by the Buddha. We should observe all the rules which were taught by the Buddha.” (富羅那。我等作如是制。是佛所不制不應制。是佛所制則不應却。如佛所制戒應隨順而學。制戒應隨順而學).<sup>75</sup> Thus, the arguments that the schism happened after the First Buddhist Council and the existence of two schools of Mahīśāsaka are

---

<sup>73</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 192b3.

<sup>74</sup> *Vin. V*, 402; *Cf.* T. no. 1421, 22: 191c19.

<sup>75</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 968c13.

awkward. Instead, the Saṅgha is still unified after the First Buddhist Council. Hence, there is only one school named Mahīśāsaka.

As a consequence, the sequence leading to the formation from the so-called *Earlier Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* to the *Four-Part Vinaya* is problematic and does not exist. Instead, there is only one school named Mahīśāsaka School which branched out from the predecessor Sthaviravāda School. Therefore, the progression on the development of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is: Sthaviravāda at the Second Buddhist Council gave birth to Sarvāstivāda, Sarvāstivāda gave birth to Vibhajyavāda, Vibhajyavāda gave birth to Mahīśāsaka, and then from Mahīśāsaka School, Dharmaguptaka School was established. This formation was also supported by Xuanzang, Lamontte, and Vasumitra.<sup>76</sup> Hence, the *Four-Part Vinaya* has its origin in the Vinaya of Mahīśāsaka School in regard to the lineage from Sthaviravāda School recognized at the Second Buddhist Council, Sarvāstivāda School, Vibhajyavāda School, Mahīśāsaka School, and then Dharmaguptaka School. This text was brought to China from Ceylon in its original Sanskrit by Faxian 法顯 (?-422).<sup>77</sup> However, by the time Faxian brought the Indian *Dharmagupta Vinaya* back to China, it was already translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* by Buddhayaśas 佛驮耶舍 (c. 5<sup>th</sup> century CE)<sup>78</sup> with the help of Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (5<sup>th</sup> century CE)<sup>79</sup> in 410 A.D.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 530. Cf. Shizuka, "Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period (4): The Structure of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya," 55.

<sup>77</sup> Faxian 法顯: Famous Chinese Buddhist pilgrim and translator.

<sup>78</sup> Buddhayaśas 佛驮耶舍: a prolific translator of Buddhist texts into Chinese. He is said to have committed to memory several million words of Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna scripture. In 408 CE, he was invited to China, and he translated the *Dharmagupta Vinaya* 四分律 in sixty fascicles.

<sup>79</sup> Zhu Fonian 竺佛念: A Chinese monk of the Eastern Jin 東晉僧 who was an important early translator.

<sup>80</sup> Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, 5.



The lineage of the development of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is important to discuss in this dissertation because its different predecessor can result in different framework of its Vinaya and thus the comparative study of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* is affected accordingly. In the following, this dissertation emphasizes why it is important to discuss the lineage of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. As presented above, if the predecessor of the Dharmaguptaka School was the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School, the *Earlier Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* would be the direct father Vinaya of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In his book, *Buddhist Sects in India*, Nalinaksha Dutt cites from the study of Vasumitra and states that the Dharmaguptaka School withdraws from its predecessor schools because of their doctrinal differences and not because of the Vinaya. For example, while the Mahīśāsakas hold the view that gifts made to the Buddha are more meritorious than those made to the Saṅgha, the Dharmaguptakas insists that gifts made to the Saṅgha are more superior than to the Buddha because the Buddha is included in the Saṅgha. In another example, Dutt continues that despite its predecessor, the Sarvāstivādins propose that enlightenment is a gradual process. The Dharmaguptakas disagree and claim that the realization of the truth can take place any time during practice.<sup>81</sup> Therefore, these are disputes over the teaching or the dharma and have nothing to do with the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka School with its predecessors.

Moreover, if the immediate predecessor of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* were the Vinaya of the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School, there would be not much of a

---

<sup>81</sup> Dutt, *Buddhist Sects in India*, 172.

difference in detail in the content of the rule and discipline in the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters since the major reason leading to the split of the Dharmaguptaka School from its predecessor is related to the dharma. Consequently, the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka School must be similar with the one of the Sthaviravāda School with the exception of the seven rules related to food as presented above. Furthermore, the Theravāda School is said to be the continuation of the Sthaviravāda School and the Theravādins prefer to keep their canon similar to the one of the Sthaviravāda School,<sup>82</sup> thus the Vinaya of the Theravāda School should be similar to the *Sthaviravāda Vinaya*. In this connection, it is evident to conclude that the Vinaya of the Theravāda School should be similar to the one of the Dharmagupta School except the seven rules added by Pūraṇa of Dakkhiṇāgiri since these two Vinayas refer to the basic Vinaya text at the First Buddhist Council—the *Sthaviravāda Vinaya*. As a result, the study of the similarities and differences between the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* needs to focus only on the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* and not the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. In other words, all the modification of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, which reveal the similarities and differences, is done when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is translated into Chinese as the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

However, a comprehensive reading of the chapters on the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha), the Rains Retreat (Vassāvāsa), and the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pavāraṇā) of the Indian *Pāli Vinaya* and the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* shows that there are many differences in detail in these two Vinayas. Thus, they

---

<sup>82</sup> Tripāṭhī, *Encyclopaedia of Pali Literature*, 108.

cannot claim to be referred to by the same immediate source, i.e. the *Sthaviravāda Vinaya*. For example, there is no mention of fixing the temporary Uposatha boundary in the *Pāli Vinaya* while it is stated in detail in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the *Four-Part Vinaya*, we are told that on a certain Uposatha day, a group of monks come across a non-resident place and they did not know what they should do. The Buddha advised them to agree upon a temporary Uposatha boundary (*xiaojie* 小界) by a formal act 羯磨 so that they can carry out the Uposatha ceremony. The Buddha also taught that after finishing the Uposatha ceremony the monastics should abolish this temporary boundary.<sup>83</sup>

In the same manner, a long section of “Room and Bed Distribution” during the Rains Retreat period is found in the *Four-Part Vinaya*<sup>84</sup> but there is no equivalent part in the *Pāli Vinaya*. Even when there are equivalent parts, their approaches are still differentiated from one another. For instance, both the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* mentions the Silence Practice (*yafa* 啞法) of some group of monastics. In the *Pāli Vinaya* the Buddha takes the event concerning this Silence Practice of the monastics as the condition to set up the new discipline in which monastics should observe the Pavāraṇā ceremony.<sup>85</sup> However, in the *Four-Part Vinaya* the Buddha does not take this Silence Practice as the important issue for setting up the Pavāraṇā Ceremony. In the *Four-Part Vinaya*, we are told that after rebuking the Kosāla monks who observe the Silence Practice during the Rains Retreat, the Buddha advised monks to encourage, help, and teach each other. Based

---

<sup>83</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 820c17–821a9.

<sup>84</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 831a2–832a20.

<sup>85</sup> *Vin. IV*, 211.

on this advice, the group of six monks 六群比丘, without any reason and without any invitation, exposes the mistakes of the pure monks (i.e. without giving any prior notice to and/or without having obtained permission, consent, approval etc.... from the pure monks). But, when the pure monks try to obtain an invitation to expose the mistakes of the group of six monks, they go away. This matter is reported to the Buddha. So, the Buddha lays down the rule that, after the three months of the Rains Retreat, monks should carry out the Pavāraṇā ceremony in which monks can expose the mistakes of their fellow monks in three aspects of what has been seen, what has been heard, and what has been suspected.<sup>86</sup> During the Pavāraṇā ceremony the revealing of mistakes can be offered to the monastic community by any monastic member with the invitation from the individual monk who wishes to obtain purification. Moreover, in the case that a monk or even a group of monks, such as the group of six monks as cited above, refuses to invite fellow monks to comment on one's mistake, the Buddha gives permission for any monk to speak of the known mistakes of any monk or group of monks who chooses to not give out any invitation for purification.

From what is mentioned above, it is possible that many parts of the *Four-Part Vinaya* may be modified, added, and omitted in China, but also many of them may have already been changed in India by the time the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is composed. These discrepancies of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, as presented here, could not happen if its ancestral parent were the *Earlier Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*. This dissertation has proved that the Indian *Dharmagupta Vinaya* is identical to the *Pāli Vinaya* in

---

<sup>86</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 835c12-836b14.

comparing to the same source of the *Sthaviravāda Vinaya*. Therefore, the *Four-Part Vinaya* needs a longer period of time in its formation as it gradually evolved and changed through many generations of different schools that adopted it for use as their own Vinaya so that it could have such significant differences when compared to the *Pāli Vinaya*. As a result, the similarities and differences found in the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* could have happened when the *Dharmagupta Vinaya* was composed in India or it could have taken place when it was translated in China.

In short, if the immediate ancestral parent of the *Four-Part Vinaya* were the *Earlier Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*, the modification leading to the similarities and differences between the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya* would have taken place in China only, because the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* would be identical with the *Pāli Vinaya*. However, it is evident that this is not the case since there are many differences in detail between these two Vinayas which seems to have already been established in India by the time the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was composed. Therefore, the similarities and differences, while comparing the chapters on the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, can be accounted for in two possible ways. These similarities and differences can take place either in India when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is composed or in China when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. As is argued throughout this dissertation, although these similarities and differences could have happened in India, these discrepancies are more likely to

made, or at least are pronounced, in China when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*.

### 2.3. The Uniqueness of the Buddhist Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā

To stress the importance of the Buddhist Vinaya, in his article, Oskar Von Hinüber quotes the conversation between the Buddha and his foremost disciple Sāriputta 舍利弗 in the Vinaya Piṭaka, which says:

Wait, Sāriputta, wait! The Tathāgata will know the right time. The teacher will not prescribe any rule (*sikkhāpadaṃ paññāpeti*) to his pupils, he will not recite the Pātimokha as long as no factors leading to defilement (*āsavaṭṭhāniyā dhammā*) appear in the order (Vin III 9.26–30). This is the answer of the Buddha to Sāriputta’s worries that harm may be done to the order, if no rules of conduct are prescribed in time. And Sāriputta further points out that some of the Buddhas of the past neglected this very duty with disastrous results: Their teaching suffered a quick decay and an early disappearance.<sup>87</sup>

Hinüber continues that the Buddhist Vinaya is so significant to Buddhism that if there is no Vinaya, there is no Buddhism. Moreover, rules and disciplines are only prescribed by the Buddha as a practical measure to cease and regulate misbehavior or misconduct of certain monks or nuns.<sup>88</sup> This, according to the traditional Vinayas, has much to do with the well being of the lay people, so that their faith in Buddhism will increase, as well as for the welfare of the Dhamma. For example, people at the time of the Buddha believed that observing the three months of the Rains Retreat was a must by all ascetics due to the climate in India at that time. At the beginning, Buddhist monks and nuns did not observe this common rule, so they were looked

---

<sup>87</sup> Hinüber, “Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya,” 7.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*

down on and criticized by the people. Hence, to please and sympathize with the people who are being annoyed by the reckless monks, the Buddha advises monks and nuns to enter the Rains Retreat.<sup>89</sup> In the same manner, for the benefit and increasing of faith in Buddhism for lay people, and under the recommendation of King Bimbisāra, the custom of Uposatha was incorporated into Buddhism by the Buddha.<sup>90</sup> Hence, it is because of this evidence, scholars tend to conclude that the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā were merely the Buddha's imitation of the Indian pre-existing practices. This dissertation attempts to challenge the scholars' conclusion and propose another interpretation. The Buddha did not imitate anyone. What the Buddhists were performing in these three rituals can be claimed as their tradition and are unique in Buddhism. In other words, although the Buddhist terms of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā can be similar with same terms of the other non-Buddhist sects, the Buddhist Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā practices are different and can be claimed as the Buddhist traditional rituals in comparison to those in the other non-Buddhist sects.

The proving of what Buddhists do during the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā is important because these are all core practices of Buddhists and they directly enhance the daily life and regulation of monks and nuns as well as the laity. If these practices are not traditional or are not distinguished from those of the other non-Buddhist sects, as it will be explained below, there is no need to study the similarities and differences of Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

---

<sup>89</sup> *Vin. IV*, 183. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 830b5–c10.

<sup>90</sup> *Vin. IV*, 130. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 816c6–29.

### 2.3.1. The Uniqueness of the Buddhist Uposatha

First of all, is Uposatha practice a traditional and unique custom in Buddhism? This dissertation proves the uniqueness of the Buddhist Uposatha by drawing from both the primary and secondary sources. Now is a look at the primary sources. The word Uposatha actually has its origin from the Sanskrit word Upavasatha. Thus, it is a borrowed term by the Buddhists from the other non-Buddhist sectarians. It is evident that the Uposatha practice is a Vedic tradition, a ritual of Brahmanism.<sup>91</sup> All the existing Vinayas, which are the primary sources, state that the practice of Uposatha was popular at and before the time of the Buddha. For example, in the *Pāli Vinaya*,<sup>92</sup> the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律,<sup>93</sup> and the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*,<sup>94</sup> it is stated that King Bimbisāra of Magadha, after seeing people of the other religions observing Uposatha, decided that Buddhism should also have this similar practice. So he goes to the Buddha's place and recommends this custom. The Buddha approves the recommendation of King Bimbisāra, thus Uposatha becomes a part of the Buddhist traditions.

The *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律 also mentions that people criticized Buddhist monks and said that all ninety-six religions have Uposatha except Buddhism. After hearing the report, the Buddha laid down the rule that bhikṣus<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> *SED*, 206.

<sup>92</sup> *Vin. IV*, 130–131.

<sup>93</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 121b5.

<sup>94</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 816c6.

<sup>95</sup> Skt. *bhikṣus* (Pāli *bhikkhu*). In this dissertation, it denotes the Buddhist monastics.



must observe the Uposatha ceremony.<sup>96</sup> In a like manner, the *Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律 further makes known to us that a brāhmaṇa<sup>97</sup> asked a bhikṣus whether they observe the Uposatha or not. These bhikṣus replied to the brāhmaṇa that they did not have the custom of Uposatha. Immediately, the brāhmaṇa criticized these monks and later openly commented that all other religions have Uposatha, why is it that the bhikṣus of Gotama do not observe it. This matter is reported to the Buddha. The Buddha thus gathers the monastics together and set up the Uposatha custom. With these accounts, scholars claim that Uposatha is not originally a Buddhist practice but is copied from other religions.

The discussion above is drawing from the primary sources. Now, this dissertation examines the secondary sources regarding whether or not Uposatha is originally a part of the Buddhist traditions. It is W. Pachow who, in his book *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, affirms that there is a connection between the tradition of observing the Darśapūrṇamāsa Sacrifice<sup>98</sup> and the sacred day Upavasatha. According to Pachow, Uposatha is no doubt an antiquity of Indian culture in which, to him, Uposatha has its origin from Brahmanism.<sup>99</sup> I. B. Horner shares the same idea with Pachow. Horner states that Uposatha, in fact, belongs to the Vedic tradition and is denoted by a fasting day in preparation for the performance of the Soma Sacrifice.<sup>100</sup> She continues that the ritual of Uposatha is just an imitation adopted by the Buddha from the existent practice of the other non-

---

<sup>96</sup> T. no. 1425, 22: 0446c7.

<sup>97</sup> A follower of Brahmanism.

<sup>98</sup> The Darśapūrṇamāsa Sacrifice: It is offered on the days of the new and full moon. For detail, sees *SED*, 470.

<sup>99</sup> Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 56. Cf. *SBE* 12.

<sup>100</sup> *Vin. I*, xi.

Buddhist sects. Horner's idea is strengthened by Durga N. Bhagvat and Jotiya Dhirasekera. In his book *Early Buddhist Jurisprudence*, Bhagvat states that the gathering of Buddhist monastics on the Uposatha day is adopted by the Buddha based on existing ancient Indian practices.<sup>101</sup> Dhirasekera reiterates this idea in more detail. He says that the Buddhist Uposatha is no more than the regular meetings of the other ancient Indian religions. At first, there is no mention of Paṭimokkha (the Precept Recitation 波羅提木叉) on the Uposatha day. The Buddha later adds the practice of recitation of the Paṭimokkha on Uposatha day.<sup>102</sup> On the whole, there is evidence strongly supporting the idea that the Uposatha, in fact, is an adaptation of the existing Indian practice by the Buddha. Although these statements are correct, there is evidence indicating that what the Buddhists do during the Uposatha ceremony is different from the other sectarians. In other words, the manner in which Buddhists observe Uposatha is entirely traditional to the Buddhist circle. In the following, this dissertation proves the uniqueness of the Uposatha comparing it to that of the other non-Buddhist sectarians.

In Brahmanism, Upavasatha is the day of sacrifice, the *Darśapūrṇamāsa* sacrifice, which happens on the new and full moon day of the month. On these days, the Hindu priests and lay people will gather together to make sacrifices to the gods. According to them, the gods give breath, food, and fruits to human beings.<sup>103</sup> Moreover, Upavasatha is made up of “upa” which means “near” and “vas” which is “dwell.” At first, Upavasatha is the day human beings can live nearby the gods. But

---

<sup>101</sup> Bhagvat, *Early Buddhist Jurisprudence*, 117.

<sup>102</sup> Dhirasekera, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 93.

<sup>103</sup> *SBE 12*, 302–308.

later in time, Upavasatha denotes fasting or the fast day, i.e. the preliminary fast day before the sacrifice when gods are invited to dwell on earth during the ceremony.<sup>104</sup> The objects that are used for offering to the gods are rice, cakes, fruits, goat, and ram which are usually decorated with phallus-emblems.<sup>105</sup>

Similarly, Jains also observe the fast days (Poṣadha or Uposatha). There are eight fast days in Jainism: the last four days of the month of the Śrāvaṇa<sup>106</sup> and the first four days of the month of Bhādrapada.<sup>107</sup> According to the Jain tradition, it takes only one day instead of eight days to complete the ceremony, i.e. the fifth day of Bhādrapada. During this day, Jains will fast by not consuming any food or water. For Jains, the Poṣadha is mostly for laymen and laywomen to come to the monastery (*upāsara*) to become monks or nuns for a short time. Jains do not leave the *upāsara* for twenty-four hours, and they spend all of these twenty-four hours meditating and fasting. Besides, Jains can also fast part time, i.e. they can come to the *upāsara* to observe fasting for any period they choose, generally ranging from ten to twenty-four hours. They can also take food and water at will, provided that the water is hot and the food is not especially prepared for them. Making a confession of one's misdeeds is one part of the fasting day, confined to only monastics, and only happens during the Saṃvatsari<sup>108</sup> season.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Bhatt, *Pandit N. R. Bhatt: Felicitation Volume*, 76.

<sup>105</sup> Hastings, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, 867–868.

<sup>106</sup> Śrāvaṇa is a month of the Hindu calendar. In India's national civil calendar, Śrāvaṇa is the fifth month of the Hindu year, beginning in late July and ending in the third week of August.

<sup>107</sup> Bhādrapada is a month of the Hindu calendar. In India's national civil calendar (Shaka calendar), Bhaadra is the sixth month of the year, beginning on August 23 and ending on September 22.

<sup>108</sup> This is the last day of Pajjusaṇa, the last day of the Jain religious year, and it is also the most solemn day of all holy festivals.

<sup>109</sup> Hastings, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, 875–879.

From the above discussion, it is evident that most of the religions during the Buddha's time practiced fasting and sacrificing on the Upavasatha (Poṣadha or Uposatha) day. No doubt that Buddhism has adopted this custom by its name; however, the Uposatha day still can be unique in Buddhism because the way the Buddhists practice Uposatha is different from the other Indian religions at that time.

The first difference between the Buddhist Uposatha and the other non-Buddhist Uposatha is the periodical gatherings. The Jains' Poṣadha is eight times per month, i.e. the last four days of Śrāvaṇa month and the first four days of Bhādrapada month (it usually falls on August).<sup>110</sup> In Hinduism, the Upavasatha day is not fixed by the month but according to its feast days. The fast days of Hinduism generally take place on the new and full moon every month. Besides, the tenth and eleventh of each month, the feast of Sivaratri,<sup>111</sup> the ninth day of the lunar month Cheitra,<sup>112</sup> the eighth day of Sravana,<sup>113</sup> days of eclipses, equinoxes, solstices, and conjunctions of planets, memorial days, and Sundays are all the fast days in Hinduism.<sup>114</sup> However, in Buddhism, there are only two days for Uposatha held every half-month. "Monks, there are two Uposatha days, the fourteenth and the fifteenth. These, monks, are the two Uposatha days."<sup>115</sup>

The second difference between the Buddhist Uposatha and the other Indian non-Buddhist Uposatha is that in Buddhism the lay people also actively participate

---

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 875.

<sup>111</sup> A Hindu festival celebrated every year in reverence of Lord Shiva. It is also known as Padmarajarathri.

<sup>112</sup> Cheitra: Indian ancient month. Cf. Sewell, *The Indian Calendar: With Tables for the Conversion of Hindu and Muhammadan into A.D. Dates, and Vice Versa*, civ.

<sup>113</sup> A month in ancient Indian month. Cf. Sewell, *The Indian Calendar: With Tables for the Conversion of Hindu and Muhammadan into A.D. Dates, and Vice Versa*, civ.

<sup>114</sup> Kittler, *Food and Culture*, 98.

<sup>115</sup> *Vin. IV*, 146.

in the Uposatha ceremony by purifying their mind, taking the Eight Precepts, namely: (1) not to destroy life, (2) not to take what is not given, (3) not to tell lies, (4) not to become drinkers of intoxicating liquors, (5) to refrain from unlawful sexual intercourse—an ignoble thing, (6) not to eat at the wrong time, (7) not to wear garlands or use perfumes, and (8) not to sleep on a big and high bed.<sup>116</sup> For monks and nuns, they will recite the Pātimokkha,<sup>117</sup> and this reciting of the Pātimokkha during the Uposatha ritual is said to be unique to Buddhism.

But though the Uposatha observance was a widespread popular custom, the Buddhist Bhikkhus adapted it to their own uses and purposes: they made it fit with their congregational life. Its form was changed; it became a confessional service, an instrument of monastic discipline.<sup>118</sup>

Moreover, before the recital of the Pātimokkha, monks and nuns have to confess their offences if committed to the Saṅgha, and to take upon themselves the penance should the transgression have incurred.<sup>119</sup> After this, a series of rules regarding the Uposatha is laid down by the Buddha and these rules are also unique in Buddhism. For example, Uposatha should be held in a fixed boundary (*sīmā* 戒場),<sup>120</sup> monks and nuns could declare their entire purity and give the consent on behalf of ill monks.<sup>121</sup> Also, before reciting the Pātimokkha monks and nuns should carry out a formal act for Uposatha 布薩羯磨 and the types of formal acts are explained in detail by the Buddha.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup> Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, 100. Cf. *AN IV*, 255.

<sup>117</sup> *Vin. IV*, 131.

<sup>118</sup> Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, 84. Cf. Prebish, "The Prātimokṣa Puzzle: Fact versus Fantasy," 171.

<sup>119</sup> *SBE 13*, x.

<sup>120</sup> *Vin. IV*, 136–139. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 821a9–20.

<sup>121</sup> *Vin. IV*, 158–162. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 821c5–822a6.

<sup>122</sup> *Vin. IV*, 146–147. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 821b22–c5. For details of this series or rules, see *Vin. IV*, 130–182.

From what is mentioned above, the purpose of the Buddha when he sets up the Uposatha tradition is different from that of the other non-Buddhist sects. While the Poṣadha of the other Indian non-Buddhist sects focus on fasting and sacrifice, the Buddhists observe this ritual as a chance for them to purify and perfect themselves in term of conduct and virtue as well as wisdom and compassion. Through the Uposatha (Poṣadha) one who is not perfect in his/her behavior will attain purity, and one who is perfect in his/her behavior will enhance his/her purity. Thus, the Uposatha is a way for Buddhists to create harmony and good reputation of the Saṅgha. Therefore, although the name Uposatha was accepted by the Buddha in response to the custom in Indian during his time, the manner or the practice in which the Buddhists observe the Uposatha is entirely original in Buddhism.

It is conclusive to say that the name Uposatha is the same in Buddhism as it is in other non-Buddhist religions. But, the practice of Uposatha is different in Buddhism as compared to other non-Buddhist religions. Uposatha in Buddhism is about purification leading to wisdom and compassion while Uposatha in other non-Buddhist religions is about fasting and sacrificing. There is a difference between the Buddhist Uposatha leading to purification and the non-Buddhists fasting and sacrificing leading to purification—if indeed it does lead to purification at all. The difference lies in the notion of self-power and other-power. The Buddhists use self-power by actively giving forth energy and purifying themselves through Uposatha. By contrast, the non-Buddhists use fasting and sacrificing to the gods so that they can ask for help from the gods, which clearly indicates that the non-Buddhists are

relying on other-powers, i.e. the gods, in their practice of Uposatha. Another important difference is that the Buddhists tend to base their practice more on purification by way of the mind, whereas, the non-Buddhists tend to base their practice on improvement by way of the body, i.e. fasting and sacrificing. Therefore, in terms of name and practice it is meaningful to study the Buddhist practice of Uposatha because even though the name may be similar it is practiced differently in Buddhism.

### **2.3.2. The Uniqueness of the Buddhist Vassāvāsa**

In the same manner, with the support of the primary sources, scholars conclude that the Vassāvāsa (the Rains Retreat or the Retreat Opening Ceremony) is just an imitation by the Buddha of the existing Indian custom. For instance, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, which is the primary source, it is said that at that time, the use of the Rains Retreat for monks and nuns had not come to be laid down by the Buddha. So, some monks would travel for the whole year. During the rainy months, the robes of some of these monks would be carried away by the flood. Moreover, monks were trampling down the crops and grasses and injuring or killing many small creatures unintentionally. This was highly criticized by the people and those of the other non-Buddhist sects. The issue was brought to the Buddha and he immediately gathered monastics together and laid down the rule requiring that monks and nuns have to enter the Rains Retreat for three months.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 830b7-c11.

Based on these primary sources, the secondary sources also confirm that the practice of the Vassāvāsa is a copied idea by the Buddhists from the existing Indian practice. It is G. S. P. Misra who verifies that the practice of Vassāvāsa is just an imitation of an Indian existing practice by the Buddha with the statement that it is because of climatic requirements in India that all religious sects should enter the Rains Retreat. Due to the prevalence of this custom and the physical troubles involved in moving about in the rainy season, the Buddha just adopted this tradition.<sup>124</sup> Sakumar Dutt also validates this idea. He says, at first, Buddhist monks led a wandering life without any fixed residence and the Rains Retreat (Vassāvāsa) is an imitation of the existing tradition of the other non-Buddhist sects. Dutt continues that: “The Uposatha of the Rain-retreat, however, was a custom among the Buddhist *bhikkhus* inherited from the parent community.”<sup>125</sup> Although these statements are correct, there is evidence showing that what the Buddhists do during the Rains Retreat is different and distinguished from that of the other non-Buddhist sects.

As mentioned above, the custom of observing the Rains Retreat is to avoid killing small creatures and trampling on the plants. Ahiṃsā (non-killing) is said to be one of the main tenets of the Jain creed. Jains respect and care for living things and this is why they are all vegetarian. They only eat food that does not cost a life. Not only do Jains not eat animal flesh, fish, and eggs, but they also don't partake of some types of vegetables that are thought to contain life forms<sup>126</sup> such as potatoes,

---

<sup>124</sup> Misra, *The Age of Vinaya*, 121–122.

<sup>125</sup> Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, 12–13.

<sup>126</sup> The vegetables and fruits that contain life are the ones that can be planted.



carrots, or fruits with large numbers of seeds in them. The principle of ahiṃsā is described in the *Ācārāṅga sūtra* as follows:

The (living) world is afflicted, miserable, difficult to instruct, and without discrimination. In this world full of pain, suffering by their different acts, see the benighted ones cause great pain. See! There are beings individually embodied (in earth; not one all-soul) See! There are men who control themselves, (whilst others only) pretend to be houseless (i.e. monks, such as the Buddhas, whose conduct differs not from that of house-holders), because one destroys this (earth-body) by bad and injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of earth, through his doing acts relating to earth. About this the Revered One has taught the truth: for the sake of the splendor, honour, and glory of this life, for the sake of birth, death, and final liberation, for the removal of pain, man acts sinfully towards earth, or causes others to act so, or allows others to act so. This deprives him of happiness and perfect wisdom. About this he is informed when he has understood or heard, either from the Revered One or from the monks, the faith to be coveted. There are some who, of a truth, know this (i.e. injuring) to be the bondage, the delusion, the death, the hell. For this a man is longing when he destroys this (earth-body) by bad, injurious doings, and many other beings, besides, which he hurts by means of earth, through his doing acts relating to earth. Thus I say.<sup>127</sup>

This means that whoever harms, injures, destroys, or kills beings, and does not comprehend or renounce these sinful acts, he/she cannot achieve enlightenment. On the other hand, he/she who does not harm, and comprehends and renounces these sinful acts will attain enlightenment, according to Jainism. So, it is no doubt that observing the Rain Retreat is mandatory for Jains. However, it is not unique to Jains as other religions also observe the Rains Retreat. Accordingly, the main reason for Jains to enter the Rains Retreat is to avoid injuring small creatures and trampling on the plants. Not only did the Jains have a three-months Rains Retreat during the

---

<sup>127</sup> SBE 22, 3-4.

Buddha's time, the other sects such as Sikhism and Brahmanism also entered the retreat with a similar purpose during the rainy season.<sup>128</sup>

Despite the fact that Buddhism and the other non-Buddhist religions observe the Rains Retreat, what the Buddhists observe during the Rains Retreat still can be claimed as being unique and far different from what the other non-Buddhist sects practice. As we know, the Buddha, prior to his enlightenment, studied with Ālāra Kālāma and Udraka Rāmaputra, and these two teachers are said to have stayed indoors during the rainy season too.<sup>129</sup> In other words, they do observe the Rains Retreat. Thus, the Buddha must have known clearly that Vassāvāsa is a custom for all religious ascetics of Indic religions. However, the Buddha does not force the Buddhist monks to enter the retreat all at once; rather, the Buddha sets up this discipline naturally, as needed, or as the condition arises. For example, we are told that the Buddhist monks are involved in various missionary activities during the rainy season. The other leading religious dignitaries and normal people criticize the Buddhist monks. Considering the pros and cons of the situation, the Buddha, as a great listener (a quality of a great leader), mandates that the Buddhist monks and nuns enter the Rains Retreat and purify themselves in meditation and other religious activities. Thus, the Buddhist Rains Retreat is the natural response of the Buddha to these complaints.

Moreover, in the same manner as the Uposatha tradition as explained in section 2.3.1 above, a series of rules and conducts regarding the Rains Retreat has

---

<sup>128</sup> Elvehjem Museum of Art and Gautamavajra Vajrācārya, *Watson Collection of Indian Miniatures at the Elvehjem Museum of Art*, 63. Cf. *Vin. IV*, 183. and T. no. 1428, 22: 830b5–c10.

<sup>129</sup> "Significance of Rain Retreat."

been laid down by the Buddha. For instance, Udena built a dwelling place for the Saṅgha, invited monks to come and give dhamma talks, and wanted to offer gifts to that Saṅgha. Unfortunately, at that time monks were stuck because they were in a Rains Retreat and could not leave. They could not go to Udena's place because of the rules forbidding them from travelling during the retreat. Hence, they tell Udena to wait until the Rains Retreat is over. When the Rains Retreat ends, Udena has an urgent task to do so his wish could not be fulfilled. The disappointed Udena then laments on how monks could not come when he sends for them while he is the benefactor, builder, and supporter of the Saṅgha. Upon hearing this, the Buddha lays down another rule that allows monks and nuns to set on tour and return within seven days during the retreat 七日法.<sup>130</sup>

Another example of an exception to the rule happens when a group of monks at Sāvattihī come to an agreement that no one would be allowed to be ordained during the Rains Retreat. After the agreement takes effect, a nephew of Visākhā comes and asks for ordination, and thus he is refused. These monks advise the nephew of Visākhā to wait until the retreat is over if he still wants to be ordained. After the retreat, the nephew changes his mind and has no more desire to be ordained, and thus Visākhā complains to the Sāvattihī monks about this issue. The matter is conveyed to the Buddha. Correspondingly, the Buddha lays down the rule that “the agreement in which no one should be allowed to be ordained during the Rains Retreat” should not be made, and whoever makes this agreement commits an

---

<sup>130</sup> *Vin. IV*, 185–189.

offence of wrong-doing.<sup>131</sup> All the activities of the Buddhists during the Rains Retreat arise from conditions which distinguish themselves from those of other non-Buddhist sects at the time of the Buddha. Specifically, the difference lies in the rules. The rules that govern the Rains Retreat for the Buddhist naturally must be unique and different from the other non-Buddhist sects because the Buddha did not copy rules for retreat from other religions. Rather, the Buddha created the new rules accordingly for different situations. And since the situations, events, and conditions differ from place to place and from time to time for everyone, the rules the Buddha invented are naturally unique to the Buddhists and are for use within the Buddhist circle only. If the Buddhist retreat rules were to be used by non-Buddhist sects, I do not think it could fit or that it would make any sense.

Furthermore, Omacanda Hāṇḍā, in his book, *Buddhist Art & Antiquities of Himachal Pradesh: Up to 8th Century A.D.*, also affirms that the Buddha had his own purpose when he sets up the Rains Retreat. According to Hāṇḍā, the conduct of the Rains Retreat is for the solitary monks/nuns to group together because during the retreat monks/nuns have to live together in a congregation within a defined boundary (monastic boundary, *sīmā*). Hāṇḍā also states that monks/nuns during the rainy season have to observe and be regulated by some disciplinary codes of conduct, perform services like the recital of the Paṭimokkha, and carry out the Pavāraṇā and Kaṭhina<sup>132</sup> ceremonies. All these three services are said to be original

---

<sup>131</sup> Ibid., 202–203.

<sup>132</sup> This ceremony is carried out at the end of the Rains Retreat in which monks and nuns receive the robes of merit 衣功德. It symbolizes five merits to which they have attained. There are five things that are allowed to monks/nuns when they receive kaṭhina cloth. They are: (1) going to families for alms without having asked for permission, (2) walking for alms not taking the three

in Buddhism.<sup>133</sup> Therefore, the rules associated with these ceremonies only apply in the Buddhist context and would probably not make much sense if they were applied to the non-Buddhist sects.

From what has been presented, it is evident that people of the other non-Buddhist sects observe the three months of the Rains Retreat (Vassāvāsa), their practice is just the regular meeting between lay people and the ascetics in which the ascetics can avoid traveling during the rainy season. The main tenet of the Vassāvāsa training by the non-Buddhist sects is to practice and observe the concept of ahiṃsā in which they avoid unintentional killing of other living beings. However, like the Uposatha and Pavāraṇā tradition, the practice of Vassāvāsa is an intensive continuous three-months period of exercise in which the Buddhist monks and nuns actively develop their insight. In addition, this three-months period is a great chance for the Buddhist monks and nuns to experience communal life and to advance the cohesion of the community. More importantly, since Uposatha and Pavāraṇā are also included in the Vassāvāsa practice, this continuous three-months of Rains Retreat is another chance for monastics to guard and advance their conduct by “resisting the stream of craving 逆流.” For these reasons, it is fair to say that what the Buddhists do during the Rains Retreat is their original. Just as the practice of ahiṃsā is most likely unique and it may have originated in Jainism, the practice of, in

---

robes, (3) a group meal, (4) as many robes as monks/nuns require, and (5) whatever robe material accrues there, that will be for them.

<sup>133</sup> The ceremonies of recital of the Paṭimokkha and Pavāraṇā are already explained to be Buddhist original ceremonies. The ceremony of Kaṭhina is also a Buddhist original because after the Raina Retreat and after the Pavāraṇā ceremony, some monks came to see the Buddha, and their robes are ragged because of rains, water, mud, and heat. Because of this, the Buddha lays down the rule that monks/nuns make up kaṭhina cloth when they complete the Rains Retreat. For details, see *Vin. IV*, 351–352. Cf. Zhang, *A Comparative Study of the Kaṭhinavastu*, 19–20.

this case, “resisting the stream of craving 逆流” by the Buddhists through the UVP (Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā), is unique to Buddhism for it has its origin in the teachings of the Buddha.

Vassāvāsa is a term that exists in Buddhism as well as in non-Buddhist sects. However, Vassāvāsa is a practice that differs considerably between Buddhism and the other non-Buddhist sects. For example, as just stated above, during the Rains Retreat the focus in Jainism is ahiṃsā but the focus in Buddhism is different. It is on resisting craving. It is meaningful to study the similarities and differences of the Vassāvāsa from the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya* because it is practiced differently in Buddhism.

### 2.3.3. The Uniqueness of the Buddhist Pavāraṇā

There is no dispute on whether the ritual of Pavāraṇā is an original Buddhist tradition or not. All the primary and secondary sources in one way or another affirm this. Here is an example from the primary source indicating that Pavāraṇā is an original Buddhist tradition. In the *Mahāvagga*, a group of monks at Kosala country entered the Rains Retreat by observing the Silence Practice 啞法. They agreed among themselves to train in the Silence Practice without the permission of the Buddha. In this practice, when a monk needs help he can only make gestures to his fellow monks. After the retreat, they went to see the Buddha. Knowing their practice during the retreat, the Buddha refutes them and said that observing the Silence Practice during the Rains Retreat is not a proper practice. Then, the Buddha gathered monks together and laid down the rule that after the Rains Retreat monks

should carry out the Pavāraṇā ceremony.<sup>134</sup> Let it be noted that the Buddha did not teach the Silence Practice. It is a practice which non-Buddhists in India at the time practiced.<sup>135</sup> It just so happens that some Buddhist monks decided to imitate it.<sup>136</sup> But, since it does not improve the spiritual life nor does it help with the harmony of the Saṅgha, the Buddha rejected it.<sup>137</sup>

Here are some more examples from the secondary sources indicating that Pavāraṇā is an original Buddhist tradition. The reason to lay down the rule of observing the Pavāraṇā ceremony is different in the research of Ellison Banks Findly. In his book, *Dāna: Giving and Getting in Pali Buddhism*, Findly states that the Pavāraṇā serves as a natural ceremony in which monks and nuns should observe as they end their three months of the Rains Retreat. During the Rains Retreat, grievances and conflicts may have developed among the community, or monastics may have done or thought of unwholesome actions towards their fellow friends. The Buddha does not want these “gripes and animosities” to be repressed in silence once the wandering time begins again. So, he asks monastics to observe the Pavāraṇā ceremony in which they will gather together to bring out any hidden grievances, resolve them, and create a friendly and harmonious setting. This can be done in three ways, i.e. to invite comments about any grievous aspect of a monk’s behavior that was seen, heard, or suspected, so that out of compassion (*anukampā*) amends can be made.<sup>138</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup> *Vin. IV*, 208–212. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 835c12–836a17.

<sup>135</sup> Sharma and Sharma, *Cultural and Religious Heritage of India*, 130–131.

<sup>136</sup> Tieken, “The Buddhist Pavāraṇā Ceremony According to the Pāli Vinaya,” 271.

<sup>137</sup> Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Monastic Life*, 126. Cf. Brewster, *The Life of Gotama the Buddha: Compiled Exclusively from the Pali Canon*, 110.

<sup>138</sup> Findly, *Dāna: Giving and Getting in Pali Buddhism*, 144.

Patrick Olivelle has different idea. In his book, *The Origin and Early Development of Buddhist Monarchism*, Olivelle argues that the practice of the Pavāraṇā is actually a different form from the ritual of Uposatha in which monks have to confess their wrongdoings in front of the community. He continues that the only difference between the Uposatha and Pavāraṇā ritual is that in the former practice the guilty monastics confess their faults, while in the latter it is the guilty monastics who invite their fellow friends to indicate their wrongdoings.<sup>139</sup> Despite these differences in the reason to formulate the Pavāraṇā practice, on the whole, both the primary and secondary sources all agree that the ritual of Pavāraṇā is an original invention of the Buddha and practiced within the Saṅgha only, which is to say that Pavāraṇā is not practiced in non-Buddhist circles.

In terms of name and practice, Pavāraṇā is a term that does not exist in non-Buddhist religions. Logically, if the name does not even exist then the Pavāraṇā practice does not exist in non-Buddhist religions. The way of purification in Buddhism through Pavāraṇā is, in this case, a uniquely Buddhist practice, a uniquely Buddhist invention, a practice that exists only within the Buddhist circle. Therefore, a comparative study of *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* through the practice of Buddhist Pavāraṇā is meaningful in this dissertation.

#### **2.4. Chapter Conclusion**

In short, in order to have a better understanding about the comparison between the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part*

---

<sup>139</sup> Olivelle, *The Origin and Early Development of Buddhist Monachism*, 40.



*Vinaya*, this dissertation has defined Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā. To Buddhists, Uposatha is the ceremony of purifying oneself by the ritual of reciting the monastic precepts (the Paṭimokkha), together with making confession if any offence is committed. By observing the Uposatha practice, the purity of monks and nuns is enhanced, but this practice requires regular observing so that one can achieve its great fruits. Like the Uposatha, Varṣavāsa is also the period that monks and nuns make great efforts in both purifying and gaining spiritual improvement. Generally, there are two periods that monks and nuns can enter the Rains Retreat: the Earlier Period and the Later Period. Monks and nuns can enter the Rains Retreat either in *āvāsas* (dwelling places which are determined, constructed, and maintained by the monastics themselves) and *ārāmas* (parks which are donated and maintained by some wealthy patrons.) These three months of the Rains Retreat will end with the Pravāraṇā ceremony in which each individual asks fellow monks or nuns to judge his/her training so that after the three-months of intensified practice, he/she is worthy of offerings. The intensified practice will add value and meaning to the monastic life by enhancing, purifying, and perfecting wisdom and compassion.

Besides the defined terms, this Chapter II also points out that this dissertation relies on the *Mahāvagga* translated by I. B. Horner and the *Four-Part Vinaya* of the Dharmaguptaka School which is available in the Taishō Tripiṭaka. Rationally, in this chapter, this dissertation also examines the textual study of these two Vinayas. After analyzing the sources, it appears that only the Paṭimokkha was composed during the first two schisms of the Saṅgha. The *Mahāvagga* was of the later composition and it was first translated into English in 1952 by I. B. Horner.

In a like manner, throughout this chapter, this dissertation reviews the textual development of the *Four-Part Vinaya* and finds that there are two views regarding its formation and development. On the one hand, some scholars propose that indeed there are two Mahīśāsaka Schools: the Earlier Mahīśāsaka and the Later Mahīśāsaka. The so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School was established after the First Buddhist Council together with the Sthaviravāda School. Following this view, a branch called the Dharmaguptaka School was a direct outcome of the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School. Therefore, the predecessor of the *Four-Part Vinaya* 四分律 is the Vinaya of the so-called Earlier Mahīśāsaka School.

However, this chapter has examined and concluded that indeed there is only one Mahīśāsaka School from which the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* evolved. There is no so-called the Earlier Mahīśāsaka School nor the Later Mahīśāsaka School as suggested by the other scholars. The correct canonical lineage leading to the *Four-Part Vinaya* should be as follows: the Sthaviravāda School gives birth to the Sarvāstivāda School, the Sarvāstivāda School gives birth to the Mahīśāsaka School, and then Mahīśāsaka School gives birth to the Dharmaguptaka School. Therefore, the predecessor of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is the Vinaya of the Sthaviravāda School at the First Buddhist Council. The father text of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*, and this Vinaya was brought to China by Faxian. However, by the time Faxian came back to China, the *Four-Part Vinaya* had already been translated into Chinese by Buddhayaśas 佛陀耶舍 in 410 A.D.

Searching for the predecessor of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is important because different predecessors of the *Four-Part Vinaya* can result in different frameworks

regarding the similarities and differences between the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* as studied in this dissertation. That is to say, if the predecessor of the *Four-Part Vinaya* were the *Earlier Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*, then the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* would be identical with the *Pāli Vinaya* when they were composed in India because they would both stem from the same Sthaviravāda School. In addition, evidence has been put forth from scholars arguing that the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* split from their ancestors only because of dispute on the Dharma and not because of the Vinaya, so the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* would be similar with one another. If this were the case then, when the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* reached China and was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, all the discrepancies between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and *Pāli Vinaya* were produced in China.

However, this is not the case. There is no *Earlier Mahīśāsaka School* nor is there a *Later Mahīśāsaka School*. Instead, there is only one school named *Mahīśāsaka School* and this school itself is a branch of the *Sthaviravāda School*. Thus, the lineage runs from the *Sthaviravāda Vinaya* of the *Sthaviravāda School* to the *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya* of the *Sarvāstivāda School* to the *Vibhajjavāda Vinaya* of the *Vibhajjavāda School* to the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* of the *Mahīśāsaka School* and finally to the *Four-Part Vinaya* which is the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* of the *Dharmaguptaka School*. This lineage suggests a long enough period of time sufficient for the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* to have some significant differences when compared to the *Pāli Vinaya* since there are evidences showing that the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is different from the *Pāli Vinaya* while they are composed in India. Therefore, the

comparative study of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* opens up to two options. Option one is that the similarities and differences take place when the *Dharmagutaka Vinaya* is composed in India. Or, option two is that the similarities and differences takes place when the *Dharmagutaka Vinaya* is translated in China into the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Based on the research, this dissertation would like to suggest that although there are evidences suggesting discrepancies between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* which trace back to the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, it is more likely that many of these discrepancies happen when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. Or, at least, these discrepancies are stressed or enhanced in China with possible connections to the Chinese culture and society.

Lastly, this dissertation turns direction to discuss the uniqueness of the Buddhist Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā comparing them to those of the other non-Buddhist sects. Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā are mostly observed within the monastic circle only and the lay people have very little to do with these practices. Hence, there are not many scholars who study the Vinaya in terms of UVP. And of those studies, most are cursory glances. In addition, the existing Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā studies simply draw from the same sources. So, the conclusion that the practice of Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā are imitations of the existing Indian practices by the Buddha is repeated.

With the supported evidence, this dissertation has argued that although it may be the case that the names/terms Uposatha (Biweekly Precept Ceremony) and Vassāvāsa (the Retreat Opening Ceremony) are present in both the indigenous

Indian religions and in Buddhism, it must be stressed that these practices are very different from the Buddhist practices. In other words, what Buddhists do during the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā is unique within the Buddhist circle. This dissertation also proves that it is meaningful to study Pavāraṇā (the Retreat Closing Ceremony) because it does not exist in the indigenous Indian religions. And, since Pavāraṇā is original to Buddhism and Uposatha and Vassāvāsa are practiced differently in Buddhism, the comparative study of Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* is meaningful in the Buddhist context. For if Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā (UVP) were identical in every way with all other religions, then there would be no need to study UVP in the Buddhist context because one could study UVP in other religions and still get the same result. If it were the case that the Buddhist UVP were identical with those of the other non-Buddhist sects, then the similarities and differences between the Buddhist UVP would not be uniquely Buddhist because UVP would be identical with other religions. These similarities and differences would be identical with other religions. However, this is not the case. Rather, the Buddhist UVP is far more different in practice as compared to the other Indian non-Buddhist sects. Therefore, it is meaningful to study the Buddhist UVP. As a result, the comparative study of UVP of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* is meaningful to study in this dissertation.

### CHAPTER III: SIMILARITIES IN UPOSATHA, VASSĀVĀSA, AND PAVĀRAṆĀ

---

A cursory reading of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* shows that the structure of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters in the *Pāli Vinaya* are almost identical with those in its *Four-Part Vinaya* counterpart, so it seems that both these two Vinayas are derived from the same source. For example, both versions start with the narrative in which King Seniya Bimbisāra 瓶沙王 of Magadha knows that people from other non-Buddhist sects gather together three times every half-month. King Seniya Bimbisāra also learns that the other non-Buddhist sects gained adherents, so he recommends the Uposatha practice to the Buddha. Thus, the Buddha set up the discipline in which monks should observe the Uposatha ceremony.<sup>140</sup> After this allowance, sequences of related rules are set up by the Buddha to modify and regulate the Uposatha ceremony. For instance, monks should fix the boundaries for the Paṭimokkha/Prātimokṣa 波羅提木叉 recitation.<sup>141</sup> Monks can declare their entire purity and give consent on behalf of ill monks,<sup>142</sup> and there are certain situations that the recitation of the Paṭimokkha/Prātimokṣa should be interrupted or it should not be recited.<sup>143</sup> In general many of the rules are similar in both the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. This idea is also the proposal of E. Frauwallner. In his book, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist*

<sup>140</sup> *Vin. IV*, 130–131. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 816c6–29.

<sup>141</sup> *Vin. IV*, 137–141. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 818b16–821a20.

<sup>142</sup> *Vin. IV*, 158–162. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 821c5–822b24.

<sup>143</sup> *Vin. IV*, 180–181. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 829c2–830a4.

*Literature*, Frauwallner suggests that all the existing Vinayas, i.e. the Vinaya of the Theravāda, Sarvātisvāda, Dharmagupta, Mahīśāsaka, Daśabhāṇavāra, Mahāsāṅghika, and Mūlasarvātisvāda originates from the “same basic text.” This “basic text,” according to Frauwallner, is the text brought by the missionaries of King Aśoka (c. 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE) to different parts of the world.<sup>144</sup> Therefore, there is no doubt that the content of all the existing Vinayas from all existing schools are similar in one way or another. In the following, there are at least two potential common points that the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya* share. Firstly, both the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya* try to change, omit, and/or add background information to rules and disciplines which were set up by the Buddha. As a result, this dissertation speculates that the acts of changing, adding, and/or omitting background information supporting certain Vinaya rules may lead to the second similarity which is the presence of discrepancies in these two Vinayas. The interesting feature of these two common points is that in the *Pāli Vinaya* the unwholesome deeds of monks and nuns are naturally kept while in the *Four-Part Vinaya* these unwholesome deeds are possibly modified or taken away. By so doing, it seems that the *Four-Part Vinaya* is trying to show the virtue of monks and nuns regarding their high regard of moral conduct. Consequently, the *Four-Part Vinaya* seems to be trying to show that the Buddhist monks and nuns were held in highest esteem and their moral conduct seen as the finest example for people to follow. In other words, through these common points between the chapters on the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha), the Retreat Opening Ceremony (Vassāvāsa), and the Retreat Closing Ceremony

---

<sup>144</sup> Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, 23.

(Pavāraṇā) of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, it shows the close connection between the Indian and the Chinese social and cultural perspectives to the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the following, this dissertation further elaborates these two common points which the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* share.

### 3.1. Similarity: Attempts on Changing, Adding, and/or Omitting

The first major common point between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* is the attempt on changing, adding, and omitting parts or ideas of the background story/information on which the Buddha based the setting up of new rules and disciplines. This common point is found scattered throughout the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters of these two Vinayas. This happens because rules and disciplines are integrated with different habits, geographies, and contact with lay people, and thus their identities gradually changed.<sup>145</sup> This is said to be the main reason that led to the convening of the Second Buddhist Council. We are told that when Yaśa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, visits Vesālī he finds that the Vejjis monks of Vesālī are observing the Ten Points which are (1) preserving salt in a horn; (2) eating after the noon hour; (3) after finishing one meal, going to another town for another meal; (4) holding several confession ceremonies within the same monastic boundary; (5) confirming a monastic act in an incomplete assembly; (6) carrying out an act improperly and justifying it by its habitual practice in this way; (7) after eating, drinking unchurned milk that is somewhere between the states of

---

<sup>145</sup> Heirman, "Can We Trace the Early Dharmaguptakas?" 398.



milk and curd; (8) drinking unfermented wine; (9) using a mat without a border; and (10) accepting gold and silver.<sup>146</sup> These Ten Points, according to Yaśa, are not the proper practices for monks and nuns. However, according to the Vejjis monks of Vesālī, these practices should be practiced flexibly since they are not against the essence of the rules and disciplines. The Vejjis monks of Vesālī claim that the Ten Points they made up and were practicing were in compliance with how the Buddha creates rules (i.e. based on the Ten Reasons the Buddha appropriately sets up rules and disciplines).<sup>147</sup> The reason for promulgating the Ten Points, according to the Vajjis monks of Vesālī, was appropriated to them and to their environment for they said these practices promote the “benefit of non-believers” and “increase in the number of believers.” Also, these practices are flexible because not all rules apply in all places at all times. To promote the faith of the laities who are “faithful and believing”<sup>148</sup> certain rules should be appropriately omitted and/or applied to conform to the condition of the time and place. Still, the Ten Points are not accepted by Yaśa and his fellow monks. Consequently, the Saṅgha is split into two Schools: the Sthaviravāda/Theravāda 上坐部 and Mahāsaṅghikā 大衆部.<sup>149</sup> Of course, there are debates on the reason for this first schism in the Saṅgha. The first schism could be caused by the Vinaya,<sup>150</sup> the Dharma,<sup>151</sup> or both.<sup>152</sup> However, the cause for the

---

<sup>146</sup> *Vin. V*, 407–414.

<sup>147</sup> Rules and disciplines of the Buddha are set up based on the Ten Reasons: (1) For the excellence of the Order; (2) for the comfort of the Order; (3) for the restraint of evil-minded men; (4) for the ease of well-behaved monks; (5) for the restraint of the cankers belong to the here and now; (6) for the combating of the cankers belongings to the other worlds; (7) for the benefit of non-believers; (8) for the increase in the number of believers; (9) for the establishing dhamma indeed; and (10) for following the rules of restraint. *Vin. IV*, 37–38; *Cf. T. no. 1428*, 22: 570c2–7.

<sup>148</sup> *Vin. V*, 408.

<sup>149</sup> *Vin. V*, 407–430.

<sup>150</sup> *Vin. V*, 393–406 ; *Cf. Banerjee, Sarvāstivāda Literature*, 30.

schism is not the primary concern in this dissertation. Ultimately, the Vinaya was one of the matters leading to the dispute within the Saṅgha. This not only happened at a later time, but also when the Buddha was still alive, there was already dispute because there was disagreement on the Vinaya. At that time, the Buddha was dwelling at Kosambī. Due to a different understanding about Vinaya, the Saṅgha was split into two groups. Even the Buddha was not able to resolve this dispute so he departed from Kosambī and went to live in an isolated forest by himself for a while.<sup>153</sup> Here, it is clear that the Saṅgha had the same basic Vinaya that was taught directly by the Buddha. But because of different viewpoints, it still led to strife in the Saṅgha even at that time when the Buddha was still alive.

Moreover, it is also out of differences in habits and geographies that the conditions pertaining to the rules of the Vinaya are changed. As we know, the Buddha traveled to almost all parts of India to teach his Dhamma. New rules and disciplines are taught by him in different places. Due to the difference in the habits and geographies, some rules/disciplines might work when set up and applied in one region but might not work in the others. Consequently, despite the fact that the Vinaya gets its final shape after the First Buddhist Council, disciples keep adding, omitting, and changing this finalized version of the Vinaya. For example, after the rehearsal at the First Buddhist Council, Purāṇa comes with his acknowledgement that he accepts only the Dhamma and the Vinaya that he has received and heard in

---

<sup>151</sup> Dutt, *Buddhist Sects in India*, 23; Cf. Baruah, *Buddhist Sects and Sectarianism*, 40; Pachow, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, 29–30; Cousins, "The 'Five Points' and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools," 53–59.

<sup>152</sup> Holt, *Discipline: The Canonical Buddhism of the Vinayapiṭaka*, 45; Cf. Nattier and Prebish, "Mahāsāṃghika Origins: The Beginnings of Buddhist Sectarianism," 270.

<sup>153</sup> *Vin. IV*, 483–504.

person from the Buddha.<sup>154</sup> Following this, Nalinaksha Dutt suggests that the groups of monks who hold Purāṇa in high esteem have established a different school in which they agree with all the orally chanted rules and disciplines during the First Buddhist Council. However, they decided to add an additional “Seven Rules.”<sup>155</sup> Needless to say, Mahakassapa, the president and the authority over the making of the Vinaya, does not give consent for Purāṇa to add the “Seven Rules.” Here, even during the time of the Buddha, different viewpoints about the Vinaya already exist; therefore, later in time, it is natural to have differences in the background conditions supporting the rules and disciplines in these existing Vinayas. The idea on the inevitable changes to the Vinaya is supported by E. Frauwallner. In his book *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, Frauwallner states that people of each school of Buddhism have modified the original Vinaya so that it agrees with their own canon.<sup>156</sup> The *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* are outgrowth branches of Buddhism. Thus, the similarities in the inevitable changing, adding, and omitting of the background stories of new rules and disciplines in which the Buddha sets up in these two Vinayas are a natural consequence of the change in time and place. The interesting thing is that there are probably close connections between the Indian and Chinese social and cultural perspectives that blend into these modifications of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the following, this dissertation examines these two major similarities between these two Vinayas.

---

<sup>154</sup> *Vin. V*, 401–402.

<sup>155</sup> Dutt, *Buddhist Sects in India*, 122.

<sup>156</sup> Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, 150.

### 3.1.1. Similarity: On Changing

First of all, it is not difficult for one to recognize the factor of changing the background of rules and disciplines in both the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. For example, in the rule where the Buddha allows monks to gather in one residence to recite the Paṭimokkha, monks and nuns do not know where the Uposatha is to be carried out. And thus the Buddha advises monks and nuns to carry out a formal act 羯磨 to agree upon an Uposatha Hall<sup>157</sup> (choosing an Uposatha Hall 布薩堂). This is similar in both the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

As we know, it is a common view that the Vinaya is set up only by the Buddha and not the monks. After the Mahāparinibbāna/Mahāparinirvāṇa<sup>158</sup> of the Buddha, even the Saṅgha cannot make any new rule or omit any existing rule that is already laid down by the Buddha. Even the chief disciple of the Buddha, the president of the First Buddhist Council, had declared in front of the council that the Vinaya is set up only by the Buddha. The Saṅgha does not have the authority to establish or abolish any rule even if it is a minor one.<sup>159</sup> Thus, at the outset, the monks have done as best they could so that the Vinaya of all schools meet with a general agreement. That is also the reason why the structure and the content of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters of the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya* are almost identical with one another. Despite the fact that the main theme of the rule of trainings and disciplines cannot be added or abolished by the elder monks, discrepancies could be found in the background stories to certain Vinaya rules. This happens because the

<sup>157</sup> *Vin. IV*, 139. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 818b29–c10.

<sup>158</sup> The passing away of the Buddha.

<sup>159</sup> *Vin. V*, 399.

same rule can have different causes. As a result, the elders of different schools probably chose different background conditions for the rules and disciplines in customizing their Vinayas to fit with their purposes and environments.

In the above example, in the same rule where the Buddha allowed monks and nuns to agree upon an Uposatha Hall, the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* have different backgrounds, causes, and/or reasonings. In the *Pāli Vinaya*, it is said that the resident monks and nuns recite the Paṭimokkha in different places randomly. This causes the incoming monastics to be lost in the jungle because they do not know where they should go to attend the ceremony. Immediately, the matter is reported to the Buddha. The Buddha rebukes the resident monks and nuns for reciting the Paṭimokkha in random places without making prior announcements of the specific location. The reason, according to the Buddha, is because this action is regarded as a cause for the making of schisms within the Saṅgha. The Buddha continues that whoever recites the Paṭimokkha in random places, without making prior announcements of the specific location, would commit an offense of wrongdoing.<sup>160</sup>

Alternatively, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, it is said that after the Buddha approved the gathering of monks and nuns to recite the Prātimokṣa, they wait for each other in various places such as in the Black Rock Mountain (Maddakucchi 山黑石), the Cave of the Seven Leaves (Saptaparṇa-guhā 七葉窟), or the Bamboo Monastery (Karaṇḍa-Venuvana 竹園迦蘭陀). The problem is that monks and nuns

---

<sup>160</sup> *Vin. IV*, 146–147. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 821b22–c5. Also, when monks/nuns recite the Paṭimokkha according to assembly, it means that the Order is incomplete. Thus, the Uposatha is not successful.

are waiting in different places. Consequently, they could not recite the Prātimokṣa because the Order is incomplete. The issue is conveyed to the Buddha, and then the Buddha counsels monks and nuns to carry out a formal act in which they should agree upon a specific Uposatha Hall.<sup>161</sup>

Although the stories are pretty much similar in the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, subtle discrepancies can be found in the content of these stories because the way in which the monks behave in the two stories is different from one another. In the *Pāli Vinaya*, the steps of choosing the Uposatha Hall (the boundary for the Biweekly Precept Ceremony) for the Paṭimokkha recitation are natural, meaning unorganized and randomly designated. When the Buddha allows monks and nuns to recite the Paṭimokkha together in one residence, he means a complete Order. In the *Pāli Vinaya*, however, even with an incomplete Order, some monks and nuns still carry out the Uposatha ceremony. This is a harmful behavior of monastics because it might cause separation in the Saṅgha. According to the Buddha, whoever does this unwholesome action commits the offence of wrongdoing.<sup>162</sup> This harmful behavior exemplifies the carelessness of the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

This careless action of the monastics is continuously presented in the *Pāli Vinaya*. There is also another instance, which can be found in the *Pāli Vinaya*, in which the monastics were acting badly regarding the choosing of the Uposatha Hall. For example, it is said that the Buddha ordered the monastics to perform the Uposatha service in a specific Uposatha Hall in a residence. However, without the permission of the Buddha, the monastics chose two Uposatha Halls in one residence

---

<sup>161</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 818b22-c2.

<sup>162</sup> *Vin. IV*, 139.

as the places for the Uposatha ceremony. This event is troublesome for the monastics because they do not know in which Uposatha Hall the ceremony is to be held. The Buddha then ordered the monastics to abolish one Hall and keep the other as the place for the Uposatha ceremony.<sup>163</sup> Again, in this story, the monastics continuously perform their careless action in the *Pāli Vinaya*. Thus, their moral conduct is not perfect in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

Note that this story is quite different in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the *Four-Part Vinaya*, firstly, the monks chose an Uposatha Hall on the mount of the Gṛdhrakūṭa 耆闍崛 Mountain. Later on these monks wanted to change the location for the Uposatha from Gṛdhrakūṭa 耆闍崛 to Karaṇḍa-venuvana 迦蘭陀竹園. The interesting thing worth pointing out is that these monks do not carry out the formal act to choose Karaṇḍa-venuvana as another Uposatha Hall. Instead of acting by themselves, these monks carefully asked the Buddha for his advice, and they are instructed by the Buddha that they should abolish the Uposatha Hall on the mount of the Gṛdhrakūṭa Mountain. After this abolishment, these monks chose an Uposatha Hall in the Karaṇḍa-venuvana.<sup>164</sup> In this connection, unlike the *Pāli Vinaya*, the monastics are regarded as a fine example of good moral conduct because they carefully seek advice from the Buddha before making a decision. Therefore, the monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya* do not act as badly as those in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

Thus far, this dissertation has established that in the *Pāli Vinaya* there are monks and nuns who act poorly because they decide to carelessly recite the

---

<sup>163</sup> *Vin. IV*, 139–140.

<sup>164</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 818c10–19.

Paṭimokkha when the Order is still incomplete. In other words, the example in the *Pāli Vinaya* drives one to a rhetorical perspective in which it portrays Buddhist monks and nuns in a realistic manner. This means the monks and nuns in the *Pāli Vinaya* are human beings and human beings make mistakes. Therefore, they are not perfect in their morality at once.

But, the situation is quite different in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In this Vinaya, monks and nuns are portrayed in a more idealized way, meaning flaws in the reputation of monks and nuns are possibly taken away. We are told that when the Buddha permits monks and nuns to recite the Prātimokṣa together in one residence, they wait for each other in different places. Monks and nuns dare not recite the Prātimokṣa because they are aware that the Order is still incomplete. Then, these monks and nuns report this matter to the Buddha. The Buddha instructs them to decide on a specific Uposatha Hall so that all members would know and come to the right place to attend the ceremony. In this case, these monastics do not “act badly” since they do not carelessly recite the Paṭimokkha when they are aware that the Order is still incomplete. Moreover, we are told that in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, monks and nuns mindfully wait for each other so that together they may carry out the Uposatha ceremony. The monastics are more perfect in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, and this is why the Buddha does not declare of any offense placed on these monks.<sup>165</sup>

Furthermore, a comprehensive comparison between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* to the other existing Vinayas on the rule regarding the Buddha allowing the monastics to agree upon a specific Uposatha Hall shows that the story

---

<sup>165</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 818b22-c2.



behind this rule possibly exists only in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. For example, the chapter on the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Poṣadha 布薩事) is lost in the Chinese *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶. There is a chapter named Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Poṣadha 布薩法) in the Chinese *Ten Recitations Vinaya* (*Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律). However, there is no section mentioning the allowance by the Buddha for monastics to agree upon a specific hall for the Biweekly Precept Ceremony.<sup>166</sup> Consequently, the story behind this rule, in which the resident monks and nuns recite the monastic precepts (Prātimokṣa 波羅提木叉) in different places in one residence and causing the incoming monks and nuns not being able to join the ceremony, is not found in the Chinese *Ten Recitations Vinaya*. Although the story behind the rule, in which the Buddha asks monks and nuns to choose a specific Uposatha Hall in a residence, is found in the Chinese *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya* and the Chinese *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*, they are similar with the one in the *Pāli Vinaya*. However, there is a discrepancy in that certain details likely exist only in the *Four-Part Vinaya* in China. In the following, this dissertation examines this story in the other existing Chinese Vinayas, i.e. the *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya* and the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*.

First, in the *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya*, the story states that the Buddha is dwelling at cave Ḡḍhrakūṭa 耆闍崛 in the city of Rājagṛha 王舍城. Many monastics do not know the place for the Biweekly Precept Ceremony. So some of them carry out the ceremony but some do not. This makes chaos in the Saṅgha; therefore,

---

<sup>166</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 158a1-165a4.

monks and nuns report this issue to the Buddha. The Buddha immediately asks monks and nuns to choose a specific Uposatha Hall so that all monks and nuns in that residence know the right place to go and participate in the ceremony.<sup>167</sup> Thus, similar to the *Pāli Vinaya*, the *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya* suggests that monks and nuns do act badly by carelessly carrying out the Uposatha ceremony when the Order is still incomplete. Thus, monks and nuns in the *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya* also make a mistake when they recite the Prātimokṣa with an incomplete Order. Therefore, like the *Pāli Vinaya*, monks and nuns in the *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya* are also portrayed in a realistic way as human beings and human beings make mistakes.

In the same manner, the resident monks and nuns in the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* (the immediate predecessor Vinaya of the *Four-Part Vinaya*) also carry out the Uposatha ceremony in random places and make the incoming monks confused and not able to join the ceremony. This matter is also conveyed to the Buddha. The Buddha orders the monks and nuns that if there is no difficulty 難事, they should not hold the Biweekly Precept Ceremony in random places.<sup>168</sup> Thus, again, monks and nuns as described in the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* also carelessly carry out the Uposatha ceremony when the Order is still incomplete. Therefore, they also commit the offence of wrong-doing. Consequently, like the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya*, monks and nuns in the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* are also portrayed naturally and they also make mistakes.

Thus far, there are monastics who carelessly carry out the Uposatha ceremony in random places within the boundary of the residence and that prevents

---

<sup>167</sup> T. no. 1425, 22:447a24-b4.

<sup>168</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 128c21-23.

the other fellow monastics from joining the ceremony. This action is highly criticized by the Buddha for it is regarded as the making of a schism in the Saṅgha in the *Pāli Vinaya*, as well as in the other existing Chinese Vinayas, such as the *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya* and the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*. Thus, the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya*, as well as in the other Chinese Vinayas, are depicted naturally wherein not only are they not morally perfect at once but also they make mistakes. Consequently, the moral conduct of monastics in the Indian *Pāli Vinaya*, the Chinese *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya*, and the Chinese *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* regarding the rule of choosing a specific Uposatha Hall is narrated in a realistic way in which mistakes made by monastics are not hidden. Thus, the story behind the rule of choosing of a specific Uposatha Hall for the Biweekly Precept Ceremony remains the same in all the existing Vinayas, i.e. the Indian *Pāli Vinaya*, the Chinese *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya*, and the Chinese *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*. In this story from the three aforementioned Vinayas, monks and nuns are depicted as they are. This means in the *Pāli Vinaya* as well as in the other existing Chinese Vinayas, the monastics make mistakes. They are portrayed naturally and realistically to the extent of the story surrounding the rule of choosing the Uposatha Hall for the Uposatha ceremony.

However, this is not the case in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In this Vinaya, monks and nuns are endeavored to be exemplaries in their moral conduct. This is true to the extent that even when monks and nuns are tired of waiting for each other to carry out the Uposatha ceremony, they dare not carry out the ceremony for they are aware that the Saṅgha is incomplete. Thus, while all the existing Vinayas agree that the monastics do carry out the Uposatha ceremony in various places within the

boundary of one residence, the *Four-Part Vinaya* is the only Vinaya which states that these monastics dare not carry out the ceremony in random places. Instead, the *Four-Part Vinaya* carefully states that the monks wait for each other to carry out the ceremony together. Thus, the story behind the rule of choosing a specific Uposatha Hall in which the monastics are depicted as having morality, as being errorless, or as being faultless is only found in the *Four-Part Vinaya* and not in the other existing Vinayas. Unfortunately, there is no extant Sanskrit version of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* on the account of choosing the Uposatha Hall (Uposathāgāra), so we will never know for sure whether the story behind the rule of choosing the Uposatha Hall for the Uposatha ceremony exists in the Sanskrit version of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* or not. Or we simply do not have a way to determine from where this background of the story is incorporated in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. However, as far as the analysis in this dissertation can tell, it is possible that this story behind the rule in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* is probably modified at a later time in China. Therefore, unlike the Indian *Pāli Vinaya*, the monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are portrayed in a more idealized way in which they do not make mistakes and they are recognized to be more perfect in their moral conduct to the extent of the rule on choosing a Hall for the Uposatha ceremony. That is to say, the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* is trying to prove that there is no canker existing within the Saṅgha, and monks and nuns are naturally the finest examples regarding their ethical conduct for all to follow.

Throughout the chapter on the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, not only the rule on choosing a Hall for the

Uposatha ceremony is found, but also there are many other typical examples of evidence which clearly indicate the act of changing the stories behind (background, context, setting, the causes that prompted the creation of) the rules and disciplines that reveals the discrepancies between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. In another example, we learn that the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* both have the story concerning the pre-ceremony preparation for the Uposatha ceremony. Before the Uposatha ceremony can be carried out, the newly ordained monks should sweep the floor, arrange the seats, fill up the water for drinking and foot-washing, light the lamp, and make the tally board 舍羅<sup>169</sup> ready for counting the number of monks. If the newly ordained monks do not know that they should do the pre-ceremony preparation for the Uposatha, the Elders should instruct them. If the Elders do not order the newly ordained monks to do the pre-ceremony preparation, they would commit an offense of wrongdoing (*pācittiya* 波夜提). If, on the other hand, the newly ordained monks were instructed by the Elders but the monks do not perform the pre-ceremony preparation, then the monks would commit an offence of wrong-doing.<sup>170</sup>

In a like manner, there is a discernable discrepancy in areas such as the background stories or conditions that prompted creation of the rules by the Buddha concerning the pre-ceremony preparation as provided to us in the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. In the *Pāli Vinaya*, the setting up of the pre-ceremony preparation rule is based on the story that the incoming monks complain that the

---

<sup>169</sup> Skt. *Śārikā*: Bamboo or wooden tallies used in numbering monks.

<sup>170</sup> *Vin. IV*, 155–156. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 818c26–819a10.

resident monks fail to properly prepare for the Uposatha ceremony. The Uposatha Hall is not swept, the seats are not prepared, and the drinking water is not set out. These issues are reported to the Buddha. Appropriately, the Buddha lays down the rule that newly ordained monks should do the pre-ceremony preparation for the Uposatha day.<sup>171</sup> However, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, the story behind the pre-ceremony preparation rule is different. In this *Vinaya*, we are told that an elder monk comes to the Uposatha Hall first. He does all the pre-arrangement for the Uposatha. He becomes exhausted and cannot join the ceremony. The matter is conveyed to the Buddha, and then the Buddha laid down the rule that newly ordained monks should do the pre-arrangement for Uposatha.<sup>172</sup>

As the juxtaposition of the two examples above shows, it is easy for one to recognize the discrepancy between these two stories. In the *Pāli Vinaya*, it is because the resident monks ignored their obligation that displeases and annoys the incoming monks so much so that they complain about this issue to the Buddha. This lack of obligation certainly is not appropriate according to the rules of right conduct for monks and nuns. Also, in order to avoid having the lay people lose faith in the monastics, the Buddha declared that should the resident elders fail to instruct the newly ordained monks of their duty, or should the young monks fail to execute their responsibility in doing the pre-arrangement for Uposatha, then they would commit the offense of wrongdoing.

The lack of obligation of the monks is not only found in the section on the pre-ceremony preparation but also is continuously revealed in the other places in

---

<sup>171</sup> *Vin. IV*, 155–156.

<sup>172</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 818c26–819a4.

the *Pāli Vinaya*. For instance, in the *Cullavagga*, again, the resident monks failed to observe their obligation towards the incoming monks. The resident monks did not prepare the seats, offer the waters, appoint the lodgings, greet the senior incoming monks, and even did not want to meet them. This poor behavior of the resident monks annoyed the incoming monks so much that they decided to report it to the Buddha. The Buddha immediately rebuked the resident monks and laid down a rule in which the resident monks should observe their obligation towards the incoming monks.<sup>173</sup> Let it be made very clear that this misbehavior of the resident monks is not found in the *Four-Part Vinaya*.<sup>174</sup> Instead of describing events realistically as in the *Pāli Vinaya* by clearly mentioning the misbehavior of the resident monks as the background cause for the Buddha to set up a rule on the obligation of the resident monks, the *Four-Part Vinaya* does not contain this background story and conveniently starts with the obligation by itself. Thus far, the analysis of this dissertation has established that the *Pāli Vinaya* consistently includes the misbehavior of the resident monks in which they failed to observe their duties towards the incoming monks. This failure in obligation of the resident monks suggests that some monks are, to some extent, incomplete in their moral capacity. This moral incompleteness also signifies the natural human error potential such that the monastics are human beings and human beings still make mistakes. Thus, the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya* are portrayed in a realistic way to the extent of the story on the pre-ceremony preparation.

---

<sup>173</sup> *Vin. V*, 295–296.

<sup>174</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 931c1–28.

Nevertheless, the monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are more diligent and more eager in practice. We are informed that the resident monks, even though they are old, were willing to come to the Uposatha Hall early to do the pre-ceremony preparation. Because of old age, after doing the pre-ceremony arrangement, these old monks were too exhausted to join the Uposatha ceremony. The matter was narrated to the Buddha, and the Buddha laid down the rule in which the newly ordained monks should do the pre-arrangement.<sup>175</sup> This story shows that the monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are dedicated in their practice, their moral conduct is perfect, and they always represent a virtuous life. Here, the discrepancy between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* is that the reason the Uposatha cannot start on time is, according to the *Pāli Vinaya*, due to bad monks who neglected their duty, whereas it is, according to the *Four-Part Vinaya*, due to good monks who overworked to exhaustion—even at an old age.

Thus, concerning the background of the rule on the pre-Uposatha ceremony preparation, the monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya* were more refined in their moral conduct than those in the *Pāli Vinaya*. This improvement in morality signifies that, in comparison to the *Pāli Vinaya*, the monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are portrayed in a more idealized way in which the mistakes of monks and nuns are not mentioned. Not only are there mistakes not mentioned, monks and nuns in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are even portrayed as having obtained moral flawlessness, as evident in that they are old, but still eager to offer their services to the Saṅgha.

---

<sup>175</sup> T. no. 1428. 22. 818c26–819a4.



Now, the task is to prove whether the story behind the episode of pre-Uposatha ceremony preparation in the *Four-Part Vinaya* is of Indian origin or if it was modified when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. A comprehensive study of the other existing Vinayas shows that this story is not found in the Uposatha chapter of the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* (*Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律),<sup>176</sup> *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律,<sup>177</sup> and *Mūla-sarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶.<sup>178</sup> However, there is a reference to this story in the *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律), the immediate father Vinaya of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. In the *Five-Part Vinaya*, the same story is mentioned but with different detail. The *Five-Part Vinaya* informs that the monastics carried out the Uposatha ceremony in an open space 露地, thereby, they had to endure the suffering caused by natural forces such as: mosquitoes, flies, wind, rain, and dust. These monks reported the matter to the Buddha and he advised them to choose an Uposatha Hall for the ceremony. However, these monks failed to maintain and upkeep the Upostha Hall. This is why the Uposatha Hall was so dirty and caused the other monastics to get sick when they congregated inside the Hall. In response to this issue, the Buddha ordered the young monks to sweep the Hall, get the tally board 籌 ready for counting the number of monks, and arrange the light. Also, the elder is the person who is responsible for instructing the young monks on the pre-ceremony preparation.<sup>179</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 1a1-470b20.

<sup>177</sup> T. no. 1425, 22: 227a1-594a3.

<sup>178</sup> T. no. 1442, 23: 627a1-905a7.

<sup>179</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 121c8-12 and T. no. 1421, 22: 128c24-26.

Thus, besides the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* 四分律, there is at least one Vinaya—the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律—that includes the same story on the pre-Uposatha ceremony preparation as in the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. However, unlike the *Four-Part Vinaya*, the detail of this story is similar to the one in the *Pāli Vinaya* in which monks and nuns fail to maintain and upkeep the Uposatha Hall. Therefore, the monastics in the Indian *Pāli Vinaya*, as well as in the Chinese *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*, are portrayed in a realistic way in which they make mistakes by failing to maintain and upkeep the Uposatha Hall. Thus, among the five existing Chinese Vinaya, only the *Four-Part Vinaya* depicts monastics in a more idealized way, wherein, monks and nuns are virtually faultless for they are not only successful in maintaining and upkeeping the Uposatha Hall, but also eager to offer their services to the Saṅgha even in their old age. Since there is no extant Sanskrit version of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* available to trace for the origin of the story on the pre-Uposatha ceremony preparation of the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* in the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* version. There is no solid evidence to determine whether this story has its origin in the Sanskrit text in India or whether it was modified in China when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. However, with careful philological analysis, thus far, this dissertation has tried to establish that it is likely the detail of the story on the pre-Uposatha preparation was probably modified in China when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. More importantly, instead of portraying the misdeeds of the monastics, as is the case in *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Five-Part Vinaya*, this modification praises the high moral conduct of monastics, as

mentioned already, in that they are successful in observing their duty and are willing to offer their services to the Saṅgha. It is now safe to conclude that discrepancies are found in the details of the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* such that the former portrays the monastics in an idealized way while the later depicts the monastics in a more realistic approach.

Moreover, this dissertation would like to suggest that the idealized description of the monastics from the story behind the rule on the pre-Uposatha ceremony preparation in the *Four-Part Vinaya* has a possible connection with the Chinese cultures. Specifically, this description, in which the monastics are portrayed as the ones who represent a virtuous life, has a possible connection with the Chinese social and cultural context of “humane” or “to be human,” especially with Confucianism.<sup>180</sup> The Chinese people believe in the mutual relationship between human beings and nature, in which there should be a regulator to regulate the moral conduct of human beings and between human beings and nature. This moral regulator, according to the Chinese culture, is controlled by an “inborn feeling” (*ren* 仁) that does not allow one to be happy in response to the others’ suffering, but to be glad or rejoice at the happiness of other people.<sup>181</sup> Moreover, this fundamental innate ethical feeling (*ren* 仁) also expresses the reverential attitude 恭 towards fellow beings, especially the elders.<sup>182</sup> Thus, this disobedience or irreverential attitude towards the elders is highly criticized according to the Chinese culture. Needless to say, this “reverential attitude 恭” towards the elders, found in China, is

---

<sup>180</sup> Huang and Zürcher, *Norms and the State in China*, ix; Huang, *Humanism in East Asian Confucian Contexts*, 81.

<sup>181</sup> Suzuki, *A Brief History of Early Chinese Philosophy*, 51–54.

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*, 55–57.

found elsewhere, including India. This “reverential attitude 恭” towards the spiritual master/teacher *guru* is also highly emphasized in ancient India in general.<sup>183</sup>

However, not only does Buddhism emerge among the ancient Indian society, but there are monks who join the Buddhist community with an improper intention.

Moreover, there are monks who come from low castes with little or no education.

So, the improper conduct, where monks do not revere their elders is a matter of fact.

And it is natural, or even inevitable, for these improper actions to show up in the

Indian Vinaya, i.e. the *Pāli Vinaya*. Therefore, the improper conduct of these monks

has been recorded in the *Pāli Vinaya* during its emergent context in India.

In contrast, as a new foreign religion which emerged in the Chinese society rooted by well-established philosophies in regard to the “fundamental innate ethical feeling (*ren* 仁),” the “irreverential attitude 恭” of young monks towards their elders could be the troublesome matter that makes the Chinese people disregard or even look down on Buddhism. In this way, the deletion of the “irreverential attitude 恭” of young monks towards their elders in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, for one thing, acknowledges the “fundamental innate ethical feeling (*ren* 仁)” and more importantly, shows that the Buddhist monastics, as presented in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, have already cultivated this innate ethical feeling.

Furthermore, not only do monks and nuns fully cultivate the “fundamental innate ethical feeling,” but they are also diligent in practice. That is why monks and nuns, even in old age, are willing to work hard for their spiritual practice. For example, even though the senior monks do not need to do the pre-Uposatha

---

<sup>183</sup> Vaswani, *Perfect Relationship: Guru and Disciple*, 134.

ceremony preparation, they still come earlier to help. Thus far, by showing the attempts to change the background of rules and disciplines pertaining to the pre-Uposatha ceremony preparation, a discrepancy is found in the comparison of the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. In the *Pāli Vinaya*, the modification directs one to a rhetorical strategy in which the monastics are portrayed as is. This portrayal means that the monastics are human beings and human beings still make mistakes. Similarly, the modification in the *Four-Part Vinaya* also directs one to a rhetorical strategy. However, in this strategy, instead of portraying the monastics as is, the monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are portrayed in a more idealistic way in which monks and nuns are unblemished in their nature, their moral conduct are fully cultivated, and they are always represented as a moral standard of a saintly life.

### **3.1.2. Similarity: On Adding and/or Omitting**

Section 3.1.1 above shows that while changing the background for rules and disciplines, the rhetorical strategies used in the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* takes an important role in making these two Vinayas similar. One takes an idealistic approach while the other other takes a realistic approach. Not only do the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* share the similarity in that both have certain sections in which there are changes in the background of the rules and disciplines, but also these two Vinayas have a second similarity which is identified in this dissertation as the attempts at adding and/or omitting parts or ideas of the same event. In the following, this dissertation examines the common point of adding and/or omitting parts or ideas in certain sections of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

Firstly, the evidence for an attempt at omitting an event is found in the section on the “Inexperienced Monks.” Both the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* point out that in a certain residence, the elders and all the other monks did not know the Uposatha and the formal act for the Uposatha. When they are called upon to recite the Paṭimokkha, they all are not able to do so. Accordingly, the Buddha declares that monks who get full ordination under five years have to learn to recite the Paṭimokkha. Also, the inexperienced monks should rely on experienced monks to learn to recite the Paṭimokkha and to observe the three months of the Rain Retreat. If during the time of the Rains Retreat and reciting the Paṭimokkha, the experienced monk passes away, disrobes, or commits the five heinous sins 五逆罪,<sup>184</sup> the inexperienced monks should invite other experienced monks to their residence to learn from, or go to the other residences where there are experienced monks to depend on, or go to the other residences to learn the Paṭimokkha and the formal act of Uposatha. The *Four-Part Vinaya* does not specify who the Order should send to the other residence to learn the Paṭimokkha. However, the *Pāli Vinaya* clarifies that monks wanted to know who the Order should send. They explained this to the Buddha, and he tells them that the newly ordained monks should be selected to go to the other residence to learn the Paṭimokkha. In addition, the *Pāli Vinaya* continues that the newly ordained monks disobeyed the elders and refused to go to the other residence. This matter is reported to the Buddha and he teaches

<sup>184</sup> Chinese: 五逆罪; Skt.: Pañcānantarya. The most commonly seen set is: (1) matricide 害母 or 殺母 (Skt. *mātr-ghāta*); (2) patricide 害父 or 殺父 (Skt. *pitṛ-ghāta*); (3) killing a saint 害阿羅漢 or 殺阿羅漢 (Skt. *arhad-ghāta*); (4) wounding the body of the Buddha 出佛身血 or 惡心出佛身血 (Skt. *tathāgatasyāntike duṣṭa-citta-rudhirôtpādana*); and (5) destroying the harmony of the *saṃgha* 破僧 or 破和合僧, 鬥亂衆僧 (Skt. *saṃgha-bheda*).

that a monk/nun, who is not sick and is chosen to be sent by the elder, must go; otherwise, he/she commits an offense of wrongdoing.<sup>185</sup>

It is a common ethic that the young should respect the elders; otherwise, society would be in chaos. The Buddhist monks/nuns are leading a moral life, thus this chaos of immorality cannot be accepted. However, as mentioned earlier, there are four types of monks, which include monks who join the Order from both extremes. While some join the Order with appropriate motives, many become monks with negative intentions. The Buddha, having accepted them into the Order, needs time to instruct these monks with improper intention so that they could step by step change into wholesome monks.<sup>186</sup> Nevertheless, the troubles caused by the ill-intentioned monks are unavoidable. Therefore, harmful behaviors do take place within the Saṅgha. As a matter of fact, there are accounts recorded in the *Pāli Vinaya* which clearly show that when the elders instructed the young monks, the young monks deliberately disobeyed the order.

Elswhere in the *Pāli Vinaya*, disobedience of monks towards their elders is detected. This disobedience is even worse than the example of the Paṭimokkha analyzed above because the action is directly against the order of the Buddha. At that time, the Buddha had not instructed the monastics to enter the Rains Retreat, so some groups of monastics travel for the whole year, including the rainy season. These monastics trample on the grass and kill small insects during the rainy season. Therefore, they are highly criticized by the people. To prevent this careless action, the Buddha immediately orders the monastics to enter the Rains Retreat for three

---

<sup>185</sup> *Vin. IV*, 153–154.

<sup>186</sup> *T. no. 6, 1*: 183b10–27.

months during the rainy season. However, after entering the Rains Retreat, it is recorded in the *Pāli Vinaya* that the group of six monks still traveled. They trampled down on the grass and killed small insects. As a result, they are again criticized by the people. The Buddha, after hearing this criticism, rebuked the group of six monks and declared a penalty of wrongdoing. The group of six monks still showed their disobedience by deciding not to enter the Rains Retreat, so that they can travel freely without committing any offense of wrongdoing. In addition, this group of six monks even decides to leave their residence when the period to enter the Rains Retreat is approaching. Regarding these ill intentions, the Buddha passes another rule that any monastic who has the intention of not entering the Rains Retreat commits the offense of wrongdoing, *dukkata*.<sup>187</sup> For the sake of comparison, after the rule that the monastics have to enter the Rains Retreat takes effect, this disobedience, in which monastics have the ill intention of not being willing to enter the Rains Retreat is not found in the *Four-Part Vinaya*.<sup>188</sup> It is evident that the disobedience of the young monastics towards their elders is included in the *Pāli Vinaya* as a matter of fact. In this section on the Inexperienced Monks where the young monks disobeyed the command of the Elders, the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya* are portrayed in a realistic way.

By contrast, no equivalent account regarding the disobedience of young monks is found in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Thus, the event on the disobedience of young monks is probably omitted in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. As pointed out in section 3.1.1 above, this immoral conduct can cause great harm for Buddhism at its first

---

<sup>187</sup> *Vin. IV*, 184–185.

<sup>188</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 830b6–c11.



phase of emergence in the ancient Chinese society, which is already rich in its culture and thoughts. As we know, the social order and hierarchy is highly emphasized by the Chinese culture: "The proper order between the old and the young cannot be abandoned."<sup>189</sup> To them, the veneration of the elder by the young is the innate factor of the social ethical conduct. Therefore, the rude or the improper behavior of the young monks towards the elder in the above example is unacceptable by the ancient and medieval Chinese society. In the story above, it is evident that the *Four-Part Vinaya* is missing the event in which the young monks do not obey the advice of the elder. There is no rude behavior and the hierarchy of respect is always observed by Buddhist monastics. In comparison with the *Pāli Vinaya*, the monastics are portrayed in a more idealized way in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The misbehavior in regard to the hierarchy is not included in this Vinaya.

Moreover, a research on the existing Vinayas shows that the omission of the misbehavior of the young monks in the above story in the *Four-Part Vinaya* was likely done in China. Research also shows that the rule regarding the Inexperienced Monks is available only in the *Pāli Vinaya*, the *Four-Part Vinaya*, *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律), and the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* (*Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律). In the *Ten Recitations Vinaya*, the story behind the rule regarding the Inexperienced Monks is slightly different from the other existing Vinayas. In this Vinaya, we are told that in a residence, all monks were young and they did not know the Prātimokṣa, the Uposatha (the Biweekly Precept Ceremony), or the formal act for the Uposatha (布薩羯磨). In this case, the Buddha advised them to go to the

---

<sup>189</sup> Yee, "Confucian Conception of Gender," 318.

other residence where there are experienced monks who know the Prātimokṣa, the Uposatha, and the formal act for the Uposatha, to carry out the Uposatha ceremony. In this Vinaya, there are cases in which some young monks do not follow the advice of the Buddha because they do not go to the other residences to join the Uposatha ceremony. Thus, the Buddha declares that these young monks have committed an offense of wrongdoing.<sup>190</sup> We learn that there are young monks who do not obey or listen to the advice of the elders, specifically the Buddha. This action is considered improper, and therefore the young monks, as described in the *Ten Recitations Vinaya*, are not perfect regarding their moral conduct. Consequently, like the *Pāli Vinaya*, the monastics are also portrayed in a realistic way in the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* to the extent of the story on the section of the Inexperienced Monks.

Even in the *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律)—the immediate ancestor of the *Four-Part Vinaya*—the same story that monks make mistakes regarding the section on the Inexperienced Monks is found. In this Vinaya, we are told that in a residence, all monks did not know the Prātimokṣa, the Uposatha (the Biweekly Precept Ceremony), or the formal act for the Uposatha (布薩羯磨). The Buddha advised these monks to carry out a formal act (羯磨) in which they assign a monk to go to the other residence to learn the Prātimokṣa, either in short or in full. The assigned monk, after learning, should return to his residence for the recitation of the Prātimokṣa. However, there are cases in which the assigned monk when enjoined by the Saṅgha to go to the other residence to learn the Prātimokṣa, goes but does not come back to his residence. The Buddha declares an offence of wrong-

---

<sup>190</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 159b11-16.

doing on this monk.<sup>191</sup> Thus, like the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Ten Recitations Vinaya*, there are monks and nuns who act carelessly by not fulfilling the request of the Saṅgha. There are also monks and nuns who fail to obey the command of the elders as shown in the *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律). As a result, the misbehavior of the young monks in regard to the section of the “Inexperienced Monks” is found in all the other existing Chinese Vinayas except one, the Chinese version of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Because the Sanskrit version of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, is lost, one cannot determine with certainty that the story from Chinese version of the *Four-Part Vinaya* concerning the inexperienced young monastics is of Indian origin or whether it was deleted in China when the *Indian Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*.

Granted that one cannot determine with certainty the origin of the story, having said that, as far as this dissertation can tell, a case has been made for the fact that the disobedient action of the inexperienced young monks is found in all the existing Chinese Vinayas, as well as in the *Pāli Vinaya*, but is missing in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Therefore, it is likely that this deletion of the disobedient action of the young monks is made when the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. The deletion of the disobedience of the young monks suggests that the monastics are portrayed in a realistic way in the *Pāli Vinaya* while they are described in a more idealized way in the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

---

<sup>191</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 124b27–c3.

From the examples above, we are made aware that both the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* have a common point, which is the act of adding, changing, or omitting the background stories of the rules and disciplines. Still, there is more to say about the *Four-Part Vinaya* because the background for the rules and disciplines are mostly available in this Vinaya. In other words, the *Pāli Vinaya* simply does not have as many background stories as can be found in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the following example, this dissertation looks at a rule that exists in both of these two Vinayas, but with careful attention as to how the *Pāli Vinaya* mentions the rule without any mentioning of the story behind it. On the other hand, the *Four-Part Vinaya* mentions both the rule and the story behind it. It is noteworthy to say that the *Four-Part Vinaya* has a story behind almost every rule. That is to say, one would be hard pressed to find in the *Four-Part Vinaya* a rule that does not have a story behind it. When it comes to the stories behind the rules, the *Four-Part Vinaya* is more complete than the *Pāli Vinaya*. Take, for instance, a rule that does not have a background story. In the *Pāli Vinaya*, after the Buddha allowed monastics to enter upon the three months of the Rains Retreat, some monks do not know when they should start the retreat. They explain this dilemma to the Buddha, and he advised them to enter the Rains Retreat either at the Earlier Period or the Later Period<sup>192</sup> since these are the two periods which the Buddha deem as appropriate to enter a Rains Retreat.<sup>193</sup> Notice here that only the rule is mentioned and that the story behind the rule is not present in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

---

<sup>192</sup> The Earlier Period starts one day after the full moon of the Āsāḷhī month while the Later Period starts one month after the Earlier Period.

<sup>193</sup> *Vin. IV*, 184.

This dissertation finds that rules without supporting reasoning and related causal conditions are typical throughout the *Pāli Vinaya*. Besides the rule on the two periods to start the Rains Retreat, which has no background condition, the rule on days for the Precept Reciting Ceremony (Uposatha) also has no supporting background story in the *Pāli Vinaya*. As the story has it, with the recommendation of King Bimbisāra, the Buddha ordered the monastics to observe the Uposatha ceremony on the Uposatha day, either every fourteen days or every fifteen days,<sup>194</sup> which is to say the Uposatha ceremony should be held twice a month, on the full moon day and on the last day of the month. Take careful note here that in the *Pāli Vinaya* the rule is written as is, i.e. there is no background story to serve as a supporting justification. It would not be wrong to say that in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, where there is a rule, it is inevitable that one can find at least a supporting condition. And just as expected, there is a story behind the rule on the days for the Uposatha Ceremony in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The following background story is not found in the *Pāli Vinaya*. In the *Four-Part Vinaya*, after the Buddha allowed the monastics to recite the Prātimokṣa, monks and nuns, on their own, decide to recite it every day. As a result, they get tired. This matter was reported to the Buddha. Immediately, he disagreed and ordered the monastics to recite the Prātimokṣa only on the Uposatha days, i.e. either every fourteen days or every fifteen days.<sup>195</sup> Thus, unlike the *Pāli Vinaya*, the condition that led the Buddha to decide the days for the Precept Recitation is clearly mentioned in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Therefore, up to this point, it is justifiable to conclude that the *Pāli Vinaya* is less comprehensive than the *Four-*

---

<sup>194</sup> *Vin. IV*, 131 and 146.

<sup>195</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 817c26-27.

*Part Vinaya* in regard to the conditions in which resulted in the Buddha setting up new rules and disciplines. The structural arrangement in the *Pāli Vinaya* is presented in a realistic way—more “down to earth,” naturally less organized, and in a sense, more simple than the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

Not so in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, for here one can find both the description of the rule as well as the carefully crafted story behind the reasoning for the rule. The logic for the existence of a story behind every rule in the *Four-Part Vinaya* can be traced to the way the Buddha himself tended to behave. The Buddha created a rule only when the condition called for it.<sup>196</sup> A case in point in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, is where the reason for the two periods to begin the Rains Retreat is mentioned in detail. At that time, Śāriputra 舍利弗 and Maudgalyāyana 目犍連 preferred to spend the Rains Retreat with the Buddha. However, they started their tour on the fifteenth (the full moon) day and arrived at the Buddha’s place on the seventeenth. They are one day late for the Rains Retreat and they do not know what they should do. This matter is reported to the Buddha, and he then allowed monks and nuns two starting points for the Rains Retreat: the Earlier Period and the Later Period.<sup>197</sup>

More importantly, the story behind the rule in which the Buddha allowed monks and nuns the two periods to begin the Rains Retreat was likely added in China, when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. The story behind the rule in which the Buddha allows monks and nuns the two periods to begin the Rains Retreat is likely a later addition in China to

---

<sup>196</sup> Hinüber, “Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya,” 7. Cf. T. no. 1421, 22: 2a1–10.

<sup>197</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 832a20–25.

show the systematic organization of the *Four-Part Vinaya* by the monastics. A careful reading from the other Vinayas shows that the story behind the rule exists only in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. None of the existing Vinayas contain this story behind the starting points for the Rains Retreat rule as indicated in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* (*Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律),<sup>198</sup> the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶,<sup>199</sup> and the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律,<sup>200</sup> although the rule for the two periods to start the Rains Retreat—the Earlier Period and the Later Period—is mentioned, there is no story behind the rule. This means that the event of the late arrival of Śāriputra 舍利弗 and Maudgalyāyana 目犍連 for the Earlier Period to enter the Rains Retreat together with the Buddha is missing in these three Chinese versions of the Vinaya. Even in the *Five-Part Vinaya* 五分律 of the Mahīśāsaka School, which is the direct predecessor of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, the story behind the starting points for the Rains Retreat rule is not found. Only the rule in which the Buddha allows the monastics two periods to enter the Rains Retreat is mentioned.<sup>201</sup> It is fair to say that the *Pāli Vinaya*, as well as the other four Chinese Vinayas, is not polished to be as complete as the *Four-Part Vinaya* since many conditions for the rules are not found. In this connection, to the extent of adding the backgrounds/contexts for the rules and disciplines, it is now possible to conclude that the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya*, and its structural organization are described and constructed in a natural way.

---

<sup>198</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: - 173b1-c9.

<sup>199</sup> T. no. 1445, 23: 1042b3-4.

<sup>200</sup> T. no. 1425, 22: 450c11-17.

<sup>201</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 129b21-23.

However, this is not the case in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In this Vinaya, there is the rule in which the Buddha allows the monastics to start the Rains Retreat either at the Earlier Period or the Later Period. More importantly, the condition that leads the Buddha to introduce this rule is carefully crafted in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The *Four-Part Vinaya* is mimicking the consistency found in the way the Buddha creates the rules and disciplines, that is the Buddha never sets up any new rule or discipline without conditions. Again, this dissertation faces the same difficulty of lacking the original source for the study of the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* since the Sanskrit version of the *Four-Part Vinaya* (the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*) is lost, and only fragments are available. Thus, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to determine whether the condition for the Buddha to set up the rule for the two periods to start the Rains Retreat is of Indian origin or was added in China. However, as far as this dissertation can claim, it is likely that the story behind the rule on the two periods to start the Rains Retreat is found only in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. Therefore, this dissertation, for now, can conclude that the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* is far more informative and polished than the *Pāli Vinaya* and the other four versions of the Chinese Vinayas with respect to the act of including and adding the conditions or the backgrounds to the rules and disciplines. Thus, the description of monastics and the structural organization of the *Pāli Vinaya* is more natural, while it is more idealistic in the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

In short, with the evidence presented in the sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, it is safe to say that both the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya* share the first common feature which is trying to add, omit, and/or change the stories behind the rules and



disciplines. This dissertation has pointed out that the *Pāli Vinaya* clearly indicates that defilements exist within the members of the Saṅgha—as a matter of fact. On the other hand, the *Four-Part Vinaya* changes, omits, and/or adds the conditioning stories to support the rules and disciplines to show that monastics are virtually flawless. Moreover, in all the examples that are cited from the *Pāli Vinaya*, analyzed in the sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, despite the fact that the Buddhist monastics are serious about their virtue and keep themselves guarded from all defilements, there are monastics who intentionally or unintentionally act in a way that shows they do make mistakes. Even though their actions are grounded in fundamental ethical conduct, they are mortal and are not perfect—albeit some monks as portrayed in the *Pāli Vinaya*, especially the new and young monks, seem to not care about morality as they go about living their childish way of life and testing the limit of tolerance of the laity, monastics, and even the Buddha. The *Pāli Vinaya* describes the imperfection of monks truthfully as their mistakes have been recorded as is, as one would expect, without modifications, or if they were selectively modified from one school to another they still portray imperfect monks making mistakes, which shows a natural description of the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya* during the emergence of Buddhism in India. However, there is evidence showing that the mistakes of monks and nuns as presented in the *Pāli Vinaya* are edited out in the compilation of the *Four-Part Vinaya* in China which presents the monastics as diligent and morally perfect. The *Four-Part Vinaya* consistently portrays the members of the Saṅgha as always pure regarding their moral conduct. Therefore, this dissertation has shown that, for now, both the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya* share a similarity. Both

Vinayas incorporates the same rhetorical strategy. That is to say, the rules are the same in both Vinayas. However, the rule is one thing, but the background, the condition, or the story behind the rule is another totally different issue. The stories behind the rules, which may have been presented in order to elucidate, persuade, or reinforce, are very different from one another. In this rhetorical strategy, the monastics are portrayed in a more idealized way in the *Four-Part Vinaya* while they are described in a more realistic way in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

Furthermore, this dissertation also points out that the discrepancies between the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya* have strong connections with the Indian and Chinese culture. Buddhism was born in India. Moreover, the Buddhist monastics come from all castes and many of them are from low castes. So, their careless behaviors are natural and are just a matter of fact. Human imperfections were visible to the Indian people at that time. Thus, these misbehaviors of some Buddhist monastics are found recorded as is in the *Pāli Vinaya*. However, many of these misbehaviors are possibly edited out in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Although there is no solid evidence, this dissertation tries to develop the argument that these modifications were possibly, and to some extent most likely, made in China when the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. These changes in the making of the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* may have been influenced in part by the close connection, that the many added background stories, have with the Chinese culture.

### 3.2. Similarity: Discrepancies Reveal Transcription Error in Both Vinayas

It is inevitable that discrepancies are found while comparing the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Discrepancies are the second major similarity between them. It may seem that both Vinayas are fairly similar. For example, reading between the chapters on the Uposatha (Biweekly Precept Ceremony), Vassāvāsa (Three Months Retreat or the Retreat Opening Ceremony), and Pavāraṇā (Retreat Closing Ceremony), this dissertation finds that both the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* approve that in a seated assembly of monks, the formal act for the Pravāraṇā/Pavāraṇā 羯磨自恣 should not be carried out in the presence of a nun, probationer, male novice, female novice, or an eunuch. Also, the formal act for the Pavāraṇā should not be carried out on a non-Pravāraṇā day unless the Order is unanimous.<sup>202</sup> However, under scrutiny, comparative analysis, more study, and a deeper level of examination, the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* exhibit discrepancies in the fine details, which reveal the transcription errors. Beside the above similar cases in which monks should not carry out the formal act for the Pravāraṇā, the *Pāli Vinaya* offers some fine points that the *Four-Part Vinaya* does not mention. The *Pāli Vinaya* states that the formal act for the Pavāraṇā should not be carried out in front of: one who disavowed the training, one who committed an extreme offense, one who is suspended for not seeing one's mistake, one who is suspended for not repenting for an offense, one who is suspended for not giving up a wrong view, one who is living in the Saṅgha as a thief, before an animal [this is a discrepancy between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* that will be

---

<sup>202</sup> *Vin. IV*, 220. T. no. 1428, 22: 843a10–b8.

elaborated upon shortly], one who has joined another sect, a matricide [killing one's mother], a patricide [killing one's father], a slayer of the Perfected One [an arhat], a seducer of a nun, a schismatic [religious schism maker], a shedder of a Truth-finder's blood, a hermaphrodite [intersexual], and the formal act for the Pavāraṇā should not be carried out in the presence of one who has declared complete purity while in fact on probation.<sup>203</sup> On the other hand, the *Four-Part Vinaya* states that the formal act for the Pavāraṇā should not be carried out only before human beings who haven't got full ordination; other kinds of living beings are not prohibited.<sup>204</sup> The *Four-Part Vinaya* states clearly that when monks are carrying out the formal act for the Pavāraṇā, celestial and spirit beings<sup>205</sup> come and join the Pavāraṇā ceremony. Monks who achieve the divine eye see the spirit beings so the monks were afraid that the formal act would not be successful thinking that the Buddha would not allow them to carry out the formal act for the Pavāraṇā ceremony in front of beings that haven't received full ordination. Monks told the Buddha, and the Buddha says that they can carry out the formal act for the Pavāraṇā ceremony in front of all kinds of beings except humans who have not received full ordination.<sup>206</sup>

Having mentioned the discrepancies, it is now time to investigate the transcription error. A transcription error is identified as a word or phrase translated with meanings that are vague, misleading, ambiguous, unintelligible, meaningless in context, and/or simply wrong. This dissertation elaborates the discrepancy between

---

<sup>203</sup> *Vin. IV*, 220.

<sup>204</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 843b4–8.

<sup>205</sup> Skt. *deva-nāga* and *yakṣa*: Invisible and trans-human beings that possess spiritual powers such as: gods, demigods, ghosts, and demons.

<sup>206</sup> T. no 1428, 22: 843b4–8.

the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* to a deeper level in order to show the transcription error—first in the *Pāli Vinaya* and then in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. For example, the *Pāli Vinaya* indicates that the formal act for the Pavāraṇā cannot be fulfilled in front of animal as was mentioned above. There are many kinds of animals. There are animals that ordinary eyes can see but there are others that ordinary eyes cannot see. This is why a water strainer<sup>207</sup> is required for the monkhood life so that monks do not unintentionally kill small living organisms in the water.<sup>208</sup> The Buddha and his disciples were aware of living life forms surrounding them that are either out of sight or invisible. Again, the *Pāli Vinaya* forbids monks from carrying out the formal act for the Pavāraṇā in front of an animal. Here, the word “animal” is identified as a transcription error because it does not make sense given the context; it is meaningless in actual application, and to a large degree this interpretation is simply wrong. This transcription error of the word “animal” in the *Pāli Vinaya* is unintelligible unless it is supplemented with the missing contexts that are necessary to give it a meaningful interpretation. Otherwise, as it stands it is a transcription error. The first reason is that there are many small creatures such as flies or ants that are present everywhere on earth. So, monks theoretically will not be able to carry out the formal act for the Pavāraṇā, most likely than not, anytime and anywhere on this planet.

---

<sup>207</sup> One among four personal belongings of a monk. The four personal belongings of a monk are: three robes (*trai-cīvarika/ti-cīvara*), begging-bowl (*pātra*), stool (*niṣīdana*), and water-strainer (*parisrāvaṇa*).

<sup>208</sup> Hazen, *Inside Buddhism*, 34.

Secondly, the Buddha does not encourage his disciples to use supernatural powers<sup>209</sup> even in difficult situations—much less use the divine eye to see invisible beings. The Pavāraṇā ceremony is a common practice and there is no need for any kind of supernatural power to be performed during this ritual. Furthermore, surrounding us are animals that are out of sight or beings that are not visible to the naked eyes. Thus, without divine eyes, monks cannot see them. If monks carry out the formal act for the Pavāraṇā ceremony in the presence of these out-of-sight animals or even invisible spiritual beings that may be in the form of an animal, it would unavoidably result in an unsuccessful Pavāraṇā according to the *Pāli Vinaya* because it explicitly states that carrying out the Pavāraṇā in front of “animals” is forbidden. If taken literally the word “animal” would cause an interruption to the Pavāraṇā ceremony in all places and at all times, and is, therefore, probably a wrong statement in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

There is a consistency to the transcription error found in the various chapters of the *Pāli Vinaya*. The interesting thing is that the statement pertaining to the forbidding of the formal act for Pavāraṇā in front of animals is not only found in the Pavāraṇā chapters, it is also found in the other chapters of the *Pāli Vinaya*. For example, the *Pāli Vinaya* consistently mentions that the consensus for the Uposatha ceremony 布薩羯磨 is interrupted with the presence of unauthorized beings which also includes animals, *tiracchānagatassa*.<sup>210</sup> Note that the *Four-Part Vinaya* does not mention the word *tiracchānagatassa*. In the *Four-Part Vinaya*, during the consensus for the Uposatha ceremony, only human beings who are not fully ordained yet are

---

<sup>209</sup> See Appendix I on Supernatural Power.

<sup>210</sup> *Vin. IV*, 180. Cf. *VP I*, 136.

forbidden; other living beings do not cause the interruption of the consensus.<sup>211</sup> It is evident that there is a discrepancy connected to the word *tiracchānagatassa* that is found in the comparative work between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. While the word “animal” or *tiracchānagatassa* is considered a transcription error in the *Pāli Vinaya*, in this discrepancy, there is no transcription error in the *Four-Part Vinaya* (which does not mean that the *Four-Part Vinaya* does not have any transcription errors. More to be said later).

Now, the concern of this dissertation is which the original Pāli term is used and translated into “animal” in the English translation of the *Mahāvagga*. Research finds that the Pāli term for “animal” is *tiracchānagatassa*.<sup>212</sup> By tracing the original meaning and use of the Pāli term for “animal,” this dissertation addresses two questions: (1) Is the word “animal” a correct translation for the Pāli term *tiracchānagatassa*? And (2) is it a misleading statement to say that *tiracchānagatassa* is the cause for the failure of the Pavāraṇā ceremony? Firstly, this dissertation examines the meaning of the Pāli term *tiracchānagatassa*. An excellent study on the Pāli term for animal is depicted in the article “Buddhism and Animal Rights” of Damien Keown. In this article, Keown states that there are various Pāli terms in the Pāli Canon that indicate the meaning of animal such as “*satto*, *jīvo*, *bhūto*, and *pāṇo*.”<sup>213</sup> However, all these terms can be translated as living beings, which indicate human beings most of the time. To Keown, all the four Pāli terms above indicate the generic definition for living things, which do not necessary

---

<sup>211</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 829c19–830a4.

<sup>212</sup> *VP I*, 136 or 168.

<sup>213</sup> Keown, *Contemporary Buddhist Ethics*, 89.

designate animals specifically. According to Keown, the specific and narrower term that directly points to animals is *tiracchānagatassa/tiracchānagata*.<sup>214</sup> The *Pāli Vinaya* does indicate that the formal act for the Pavāraṇā is not successful if it is carried out in the presence of animal (*tiracchānagatassa*). In other words, there are certain times in which the monastics carry out the formal act for the Pavāraṇā in the presence of animals.<sup>215</sup> Logically then, according to the *Pāli Vinaya*, this formal act cannot be performed because it is illegal. So, is the word “animal” a correct translation for the Pāli term *tiracchānagatassa*? Yes. But is it a transcription error? Yes. Even though *tiracchānagatassa* is correctly translated to mean animal, the meaning of the word “animal” in the context of this rule, as already proven, does not make sense in practical application.

Secondly, this dissertation now considers whether the case that the monastics are forbidden to carry out the formal act in the presence of animal is a misleading statement or a proper practice in the *Pāli Vinaya*. The reason for this consideration is because the claim that prevents monastics from carrying out the formal act in the presence of animals might be an unnoticed mistake in the *Pāli Vinaya*. As Damien Keown has pointed out, there are three different levels in using the Pāli term to indicate the living beings in the Pāli Canon. The first level is the generalization about all living things, which primarily means human beings. In this generalization, the Pāli nouns such as “*satto, jīvo, bhūto, and pāṇo*”<sup>216</sup> are often used. The second level of the generalization of living beings is addressed by the compound

---

<sup>214</sup> Ibid., 89–90.

<sup>215</sup> Ibid., 90.

<sup>216</sup> Ibid., 89.



noun *tiracchānagatapāṇo*. This term is used generally to identify animals more so than human beings, such as the first Precept that forbids killing of *tiracchānagatapāṇo*. Although *tiracchānagatapāṇo* generally conveys the meaning of animals, it is again still a broad term. And according to Keown, it is “encompassing the great diversity of life on the earth which Buddhists clearly noticed.”<sup>217</sup> The only Pāli term that specifically points to the animal realm which human beings are not a part of is *tiracchānagata*.<sup>218</sup> The term *tiracchānagata* is regularly used in the Pāli Canon, as well as in the *Pāli Vinaya*, to specifically denote only animals.

This research project would like to propose a correction to the *Pāli Vinaya* with respect to the term *tiracchānagata*. Instead of using the word *tiracchānagata*, a better choice of word is *tiracchānagatapāṇo*. For one thing, the term *tiracchānagatapāṇo* generally indicates animal realm.<sup>219</sup> Moreover, *tiracchānagatapāṇo* also includes human beings. And it makes a little better sense for the *Pāli Vinaya* to forbid the formal act from being performed in front of human beings in the context of people who have not gotten full ordination. However, *tiracchānagatapāṇo*, even though it is a better choice than *tiracchānagata*, is still not the best choice because it also denotes animals. And, to conduct the formal act in front of animals simply does not make logical sense when put into the context of practical application. Moreover, *tiracchānagatapāṇo* is similar to *tiracchānagata* in both meaning and spelling, and ultimately these two Pāli terms share the same Pāli root (*tiracchāno*). Ultimately, what may have happened during the compilation of

---

<sup>217</sup> Ibid.

<sup>218</sup> Ibid., 90.

<sup>219</sup> Ibid., 89.

the *Pāli Vinaya* could be that instead of using the word *tiracchānagatapāṇo*, somehow the word *tiracchānagata* was used, perhaps because the two words are so similar. However, the best choice is, instead of using the word *tiracchānagata* or *tiracchānagatapāṇo*, the other Pāli words for human should be used such as “*satto*, *jīvo*, *bhūto*, and *pāṇo*.”

In contrast, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, the Buddha does not forbid monks and nuns to perform the formal act for the Retreat Closing Ceremony in front of animals. Instead, the formal act of the ceremony is not allowed to be carried out only in the presence of human beings who have not yet gotten full ordination, which means the ceremony can be carried out in all other situations, including in front of animals and even invisible beings. This practice seems to be more appropriate because before any service of the Saṅgha that requires the formal act to be carried out, the reciting preceptor 羯磨師/羯磨阿闍梨<sup>220</sup> at the assembly can only ask whether or not all lay people have left 未受大戒者出.<sup>221</sup> None of the existing Vinayas, namely the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*, *Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya*, *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya*, and *Mūla-sarvāstivāda Vinaya* mention that monks and nuns cannot carry out the formal act in the presence of animals except the *Pāli Vinaya*. For example, throughout the *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律), there is no place which mentions that the formal act is forbidden in the presence of animals. Rather, it only states that lay people and novices (śrāmaṇera 沙彌/śrāmaṇerī 沙彌尼)

<sup>220</sup> Reciting preceptor. Skt.: *Karma-vācācāryaḥ*; Pāli: *Kamma-vāccariya*.

<sup>221</sup> Yin, *Choosing Simplicity: A Commentary on the Bhikshuni Pratimoksa*, 119. Cf. T. no. 1429, 22: 1015b16.

cannot participate in the formal act of the Saṅgha.<sup>222</sup> In a different example, when monks are about to carry out the formal act for the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha), some thieves come. The monks just keep silent because they do not know what the appropriate response should be, which accidentally makes the thieves feel uneasy thinking that the monks are silently trying to ambush them. When the thieves ask why the monks gathered then keep silent, the monks tell them that they cannot carry out the formal act in front of a layperson.<sup>223</sup> In a like manner, as shown in the story above, there is no mention of a case where the Pravāraṇā ceremony is forbidden from being performed with the presence of unauthorized beings in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律. However, there is a reference that monks should not carry out the formal act for the Uposatha ceremony in the presence of Kings, thieves/robbers, and those who haven't gotten full ordination.<sup>224</sup> The *Ten Recitations Vinaya* (*Daśa-bhāṇavāra-Vinaya* 十誦律) has the same statement as the Vinayas mentioned above, that is, monks should not carry out the formal act in front of lay people, śrāmaṇera 沙彌/śrāmaṇerī 沙彌尼, and impure monks.<sup>225</sup> Overall, none of the existing Vinayas indicate that monks and nuns cannot carry out the formal act in front of animals with the exception of the *Pāli Vinaya*. Since there are no references in all the existing Vinayas, with the exception of the *Pāli Vinaya*, which forbid the monastics from carrying out the formal act for the Pravāraṇā in the presence of animals, this suggests that the allowance of the formal act in the presence of animals is original in the *Pāli Vinaya* in India. This also means

<sup>222</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 123a17-21.

<sup>223</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 126b16-22.

<sup>224</sup> T. no. 1425, 22: 447c3-21.

<sup>225</sup> T. no. 1425, 22: 164c14-165a3.

that the formal act in the presence of animals may or may not be found in the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. However, whatever the case may be, given what is presented in the *Four-Part Vinaya* concerning this rule on carrying out the formal act in front of animals, it is reasonable to state that there exists an unreasonable statement in the *Pāli Vinaya*, while there is a more reasonable statement in the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the other existing Vinayas. Thus, to the extent of carrying out the formal act of the Saṅgha in front of unauthorized beings, there is a discrepancy between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, which reveals that there is a transcription error in the *Pāli Vinaya*, whereas the *Four-Part Vinaya* is more perfect in this regard.

In the following example, this dissertation is only trying to show a potential of discrepancy between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. This is done by attempting to point out the possible transcription error that might be found in the *Four-Part Vinaya* by performing a simple comparison of pattern. In this case it is the pattern of two syllables in the different Vinayas, which some readers may agree with and some may disagree. Because the difference between two syllables and three syllables is very minor or even insignificant, this case goes to prove the argument of this dissertation that there is a possible discrepancy between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*.

By comparison, the transcription error is also found in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. It is in the section of “Agreement for an Insane Monk.” In both the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, we are told that at that time, the Buddha gathered monks together for the Uposatha ceremony. There is an insane monk 心亂狂癡 who

sometimes remembers to come for the Uposatha ceremony (The Biweekly Precept Ceremony), but sometimes not. The Buddha allowed the monks to carry out the Uposatha with or without the insane monk.<sup>226</sup> However, the name of the insane monk is different in the two Vinayas. It is “Gagga” in the *Pāli Vinaya*, while it is “Nanayou” 那那由 in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. It seems to be a transcription error in the *Four-Part Vinaya* for the name of the insane monk has three syllables which is Nanayou 那那由. However, it seems that the name of the insane monk should be two syllables as Nana 那那 instead of Nanayou 那那由. You 由 should be a conjunction to indicate the reason of the next sentence. The original passage is:

At that time, the Buddha is staying at Mount Gṛdhrakūṭa at Rājagṛha. There is a monk, namely Nanayou 那那由, who is insane. So, he sometimes remembers the Uposatha day and sometimes does not remember it, and sometimes he comes for Uposatha and sometimes does not come for it.

爾時世尊在羅閱城耆闍崛山中。時有一比丘。名那那由。心亂狂癡。或時憶說戒。或不憶說戒。或時來。或不來。<sup>227</sup>

From this Chinese quote, the reason for Nana to be called as Nanayou may be because of the wrong punctuation. It is acknowledged that there are many punctuation mistakes in the *Four-Part Vinaya* as well as in the Taishō Tripitaka. Even in the much later time, for example, in the Qing dynasty (1644 to 1912), there is still no punctuation in the Chinese Tripitaka. Thus, it is possible that the name of the insane monk is Nanayou 那那由 instead of Nana 那那. The evidence is found in the Collection on the Biweekly Precept Ceremony 說戒捷度 of the *Qianlong Dazang Jing* 乾隆大藏經. In this section, there is no rule to determine whether the name of

<sup>226</sup> *Vin. IV*, 163. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22:823b16–c11.

<sup>227</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 823b16–18.

the insane monk is Nanayou 那那由 or Nana 那那: “爾時世尊在羅閱城耆闍崛山中時有一比丘名那那由心亂狂癡。或時憶說戒或不憶說戒或時來或不來。”<sup>228</sup> This passage can be translated as:

At that time, the Buddha is staying at Mount Gṛdhrakūṭa at Rājagṛha. There is a monk, namely Nanayou 那那由, who is insane. So, he sometimes remembers the Uposatha day and sometimes does not remember it, and sometimes he comes for Uposatha and sometimes does not come for it.<sup>229</sup>

Or:

At that time, the Buddha is staying at Mount Gṛdhrakūṭa at Rājagṛha. There is a monk, namely Nana 那那. Because he is insane, he sometimes remembers the Uposatha day and sometimes does not remember it, and sometimes he comes for Uposatha and sometimes does not come for it.<sup>230</sup>

However, the name of the insane monk continues to be Nanayou 那那由 in the following passage for at least thirteen times in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Thus, the name of the insane monk, either Nanayou 那那由 or Nana 那那 is not a matter of punctuation and copy error. The name of the insane monk in the *Four-Part Vinaya* must be Nanayou 那那由 and not Nana 那那 because Nanayou 那那由 makes more sense than just Nana 那那. Nevertheless, I would like to suggest that the passage should be written with the correct Chinese punctuation like this: “爾時世尊在羅閱城耆闍崛山中。時有一比丘。名那那。由心亂狂癡。或時憶說戒。或不憶說戒。或時來。或不來” to give the following meaning: “At that time, the Buddha is staying at the Mount Gṛdhrakūṭa at Rājagṛha. There is one monk, namely Nana 那那. Because he is insane, he sometimes remembers the Uposatha day and sometimes does not

<sup>228</sup> *Qianlong Dazang Jing* 乾隆大藏經 Vol. 70, 324b6–8.

<sup>229</sup> My translation.

<sup>230</sup> My translation.

remember it, and sometimes he comes for Uposatha and sometimes does not come for it.” The argument that the name of the insane monk is Nana 那那 instead of Nanayou 那那由 is supported by the other Vinayas. For example, the *Daśa-bhāṇavāra-Vinaya* 十誦律 indicates the name of the insane monk as Shiyue 施越,<sup>231</sup> and it is Jiajia 伽伽<sup>232</sup> in the *Five-Part Vinaya* 五分律. The rest of the existing Vinayas do not include the rule on the insane monk. As can be seen, there are only two syllables in most of the other existing Vinayas while there are three syllables in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Therefore, the name of the insane monk should be correctly written as Nana. But, it is likely due to a transcription error that the *Four-Part Vinaya* has it as Nanayou 那那由 instead of Nana 那那. If it is really hard to see the error in the *Four-Part Vinaya* then it proves the point of this dissertation, which is the *Four-Part Vinaya* is idealized to the point that even if the error is found it is likely just a minor error.

In summarizing the analysis regarding the transcription error found in both the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, only a minor conceivable transcription error of the name of a insane monk is found in the *Four-Part Vinaya* while the mistakes found in the *Pāli Vinaya* are much more serious, such as the example of the rule about carrying out a formal act in front of an animal. This arguably misconstrues the practice concerning the formal act of the Saṅgha for the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pravāraṇā). This mistake found in the *Pāli Vinaya* is much more serious than the minor transcription error found in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, that is, if

---

<sup>231</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 161a29.

<sup>232</sup> This would have been pronounced similar to Gagga in early medieval pronunciation.

we even consider it an error. The *Pāli Vinaya* has transcription errors that cause problems for the practice in Buddhism. For example, if one follows the rule of not allowing monks and nuns to carry out the formal act for the Pravāraṇā in front of animals as suggested in the *Pāli Vinaya*, it is troublesome for monks and nuns to perform this ritual. On the other hand, if one really presses it, it could be argued that, yes there is a transcription mistake in the *Four-Part Vinaya* in the translation of the name Nana, which could very well be translated as Nanayou. Even when one tries to find an error in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, it is really difficult, or at least not as obvious when compared to the *Pāli Vinaya*. The mistake found in the *Pāli Vinaya* is potentially more serious than the mistake found in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Despite the seriousness of the potential transcription error, the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* share a similarity such that there are discrepancies between these two Vinayas and with careful analysis transcription errors could be found. The transcription errors show that the *Pāli Vinaya* is presented in a realistic manner with mistakes that can be potentially serious, while the *Four-Part Vinaya* is presented in an idealistic manner in the way it is reconstructed. Its transcription errors are less serious than the ones found in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

### 3.3. Chapter Conclusion

In short, from the two main points of similarity of sections 3.1 and 3.2, although there are many discernable details, both the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* share the same common feature on adding, omitting, and changing the background conditions or stories of the rules and disciplines. While the *Pāli Vinaya*



adds, omits, and changes the stories behind the rules and disciplines, these stories behind the rules and disciplines are narrated in a natural way. The monks and nuns are still human beings and human beings make mistakes. Therefore, there are monastics who act and behave poorly, which reflects the moral immaturity in their conduct and these misbehaviors are recorded as is in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

Likewise, the *Four-Part Vinaya* also adds, omits, and changes the stories behind the rules and disciplines. However, the rhetorical strategies deployed in this *Vinaya* are different from the *Pāli Vinaya*. Almost all the unwholesome actions and negative behaviors of monks and nuns in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are simply modified or generated into wholesome deeds and positive conducts. Therefore, unlike the *Pāli Vinaya*, monks and nuns in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are depicted in a much more idealistic way. In this way, flaws in reputation of monks and nuns are generally taken away.

The act of adding, omitting, and changing the stories behind the rules and disciplines in the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* leads to the second similarity, which are the discrepancies between these two *Vinayas* that reveal the transcription errors. In these discrepancies, this dissertation finds that there is at least one transcription error found in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, albeit a seemingly insignificant one, and one in the *Pāli Vinaya*. In the *Four-Part Vinaya*, it may be the misinterpretation of the name of a monk, so it may be that it is not a serious error. In this regard, the *Four-Part Vinaya* is polished to be a more complete *Vinaya* in the sense that the *Vinaya* text itself is reconstructed to be an idealized *Vinaya*. But, the transcription error in the *Pāli Vinaya* relates to the practice, that is, the formal act of

the Saṅgha on the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pravāraṇa 自恣), so it is more problematic because it can cause chaos or difficulty in carrying out this ceremony. Therefore, the *Pāli Vinaya* is a more realistic Vinaya and is not as carefully polished as the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

## CHAPTER IV: DIFFERENCES THROUGH CULTURAL INFLUENCES

---

Throughout Chapter III, “Similarities in Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā,” the similarities between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* are publicized. Certain stories behind the rules and disciplines in the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* are added, omitted, and/or changed. The *Pāli Vinaya* presents these modified stories in a natural way through the mistakes of monks and nuns. This means monks and nuns do not intrinsically have perfect moral conduct. Rather, throughout their practice, monks and nuns attempt to achieve their goal of purification. By comparison, the *Four-Part Vinaya* also takes part in adding, omitting, and/or changing the data to the stories behind the rules and disciplines. However, instead of portraying monks and nuns as they are, naturally error prone, as in the *Pāli Vinaya*, monks and nuns in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are described as having intrinsically impeccable morality. While each Vinaya is modified, similarities are found in both the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya*. A careful examination on their discrepancies shows that the transcription error in the *Four-Part Vinaya* is not as serious as it is in the *Pāli Vinaya*. The reason is because the seemingly unnoticeable transcription error found in the *Four-Part Vinaya* is merely the name of a monk, while the transcription error in the *Pāli Vinaya* is more serious since it is related to the practice.

However, the far more interesting and far more important part of this dissertation is in the different features between the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya*. It is no doubt that India and China are the two biggest cradles of the world's civilizations, and each cradle has its own distinct features and religions. Daniel Boucher, in his book, *Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China*, suggests that in order to have a better understanding of the Chinese Buddhist texts in translation one should learn to straddle the two cultures.<sup>233</sup> This is because the Chinese Buddhist texts in translation, especially the studied text in this dissertation, the *Four-Part Vinaya*, was translated orally from the Indian monks with the help of Chinese collaborators, and they are both not well versed in foreign languages.<sup>234</sup> Consequently, when the Indian monks recited, the Chinese monks would write it down. But the Indian monks cannot tell whether the Chinese monks are writing with inaccuracy or not. The more alarming issue is that the Chinese monks cannot tell whether what they wrote down was correct or not. Thus, both the Indian monks and the Chinese collaborators could not verify the accuracy of the translations. And to add to the complexity, both the Indian monks and the Chinese monks could have changed the content of the source texts during or after the translation for reasons that may be identified as wanting to blend in with the Chinese cultures, that is, to make Buddhism more Chinese. In the book, *Effective Inculturation and Ethnic Identity*, María de la Cruz Aymes also stresses the influence of Chinese cultural paradigms on translated Buddhist texts in China. Aymes says the Chinese writing systems is far more ancient than Buddhism and has long acquired a symbolic value,

---

<sup>233</sup> Boucher, *Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China*, 5.

<sup>234</sup> Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 89.

which is more than just the surpassed denotation. This high evaluation was even reinforced by the Confucian literature from the sixth century BCE. Aymes continues that because of the high value of the Chinese writing system in the Chinese culture, the process of the written words in the translated texts from Indian to Chinese is analyzed with more care.<sup>235</sup>

The Chinese cultures and treatments are found scattered throughout the chapters of Uposatha (Biweekly Precept Ceremony), Vassāvāsa (Three Months Retreat or Retreat Opening Ceremony), and Pavāraṇā (Retreat Closing Ceremony) of the *Four-Part Vinaya* and they make these two Vinayas different from one another. As will be demonstrated in the following, by acknowledging these differences between the two Vinayas, what comes out are the rhetorical strategies that each Vinaya aims at. In the following, this dissertation examines the three features regarding cultural differences between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. These three features are the cultural differences on the silence, the relationship between masters and disciples, and the emergent context of Buddhism between India and China. In the rhetorical strategies revealed through cultural differences that are found in these two Vinayas, the rules are the same in both these two Vinayas. However, the examples that these two Vinayas offer in order to elucidate, persuade, and reinforce the rhetorical strategies are different from one another. The three main cultural differences are now examined below.

---

<sup>235</sup> Aymes, *Effective Inculturation and Ethnic Identity*, 58.

#### 4.1. The Cultural Difference of Silence

An examination of the different views on silence between India and China shows that the cultural differences place a significant impact on the *Four-Part Vinaya* that makes it different from the *Pāli Vinaya*. Throughout the survey on the differences on silence, despite a gap between the Indian and Chinese cultures, monks and nuns in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are still ideally portrayed to have impeccable morality according to Chinese culture. This issue of silence is found in the different ways the consensus of the Saṅgha (the formal act of the Saṅgha—Saṅghakarma/Saṅghakarma 僧伽羯磨) is carried out between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

According to the traditional Vinayas, the success of any activity of the Saṅgha is based on the accomplishment of the formal act of the Saṅgha 僧伽羯磨. For example, before reciting the Paṭimokkha (precepts for monks and nuns), a formal act has to be carried out to announce that the Paṭimokkha is going to be recited, and to let monks and nuns announce their purity. If any monk or nun commits any offence, he/she has to confess his/her faults in front of the Order.<sup>236</sup> An illegal formal act for Uposatha (Biweekly Precept Ceremony) inevitably results in an unsuccessful Uposatha ceremony. An illegal formal act is identified in the following three groups of conditions: first, a formal act for Uposatha is illegal if carried out not in accordance with the rule and when an Order is incomplete 非法別眾羯磨說戒; second, a formal act for Uposatha is illegal if carried out not in accordance with the rule even when the Order is complete 非法和合眾羯磨說戒; and third, a formal act

---

<sup>236</sup> *Vin. IV*, 132–133.

for Uposatha is illegal if carried out in accordance with the rule but with an incomplete Order 法別眾羯磨說戒. The Buddha confirmed that only a formal act for Uposatha, which is carried out both in accordance with the rule and when the Order is complete 法和合眾羯磨說戒, leads to a successful Uposatha ceremony.<sup>237</sup> Likewise, the success of the Pavāraṇā ceremony (Retreat Closing Ceremony) is marked by a fulfillment of the formal act of the Saṅgha (Saṅghākarma) in which a competent and experienced monk is elected to be the preceptor 自恣人 of the Pavāraṇā ceremony.<sup>238</sup> Above all, Vassāvāsa (Three Months Retreat) is the ritual that requires many types of formal acts of the Saṅgha. For instance, all of the following three formal acts are required during the Rains Retreat: the formal act to assign monks or nuns to be the room and bed distributor 差分房分臥具人,<sup>239</sup> the formal act allowing monks and nuns to travel during the Rains Retreat for seven days 七日法,<sup>240</sup> and the formal act for the Uposatha ceremony 說戒羯磨.<sup>241</sup> Thus, the formal act of the Saṅgha plays an important and controlling factor for a successful or unsuccessful Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, or Pavāraṇā ceremony. Therefore, the Saṅghākarma is significant to the study of this dissertation. What is more, by reviewing and comparing the formal act practiced in both Indian and Chinese Buddhist traditions, this research finds that the practice of the Indian original formal act has been carefully modified as is suggested in the commentaries on the

---

<sup>237</sup> *Vin. IV*, 164–166. *Cf.* T. no. 1428, 22: 821b22–c5.

<sup>238</sup> *Vin. IV*, 213. *Cf.* T. no. 1428, 22: 836b19–c3.

<sup>239</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 831a8–22.

<sup>240</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 833c17–834a1.

<sup>241</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 835a14–835c5.

*Four-Part Vinaya*. The reason for this modification has much to do with different angles between the Chinese and Indian cultural perspectives.

Research shows that although the ritual of a formal act of the Saṅgha remains the same in almost all existing Vinayanic traditions (the six existing Vinayas: the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, which is the *Four-Part Vinaya* 四分律; the *Pāli Vinaya*; the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律; the *Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya*, which is the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* 十誦律; the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律; and the *Mūla-sarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶), there is a difference in the way the Chinese observe this practice and the way it is exercised in the other Vinayanic traditions. This difference lies in how the monastics respond to the questions from the reciting preceptor during the Saṅghākarma. The difference probably starts from the time of Daoxuan 道宣 who lived between 596 to 667 CE. While almost all the existing Vinayas agree that by responding with a “silence” means “to agree/approve” for a formal act of the Saṅgha, Daoxuan, in his commentary *Report on Private Observing of Commentary on Services of the Four-Part Vinaya* (*Sifenlü xingshi chao Zichi Ji* 四分律行事鈔資持記), suggests that after the reciting preceptor 羯磨師 finishes announcing a formal act of the Saṅgha, he/she should ask all the members of that community whether they approve that act or not. In response, all members should speak out whether they “approve” 成 or “suspend” 遮羯磨 that formal act:

Honored venerables, please listen carefully. This person wishes for full ordination from this master. This person asks the order for full ordination through this master. This person claims to be pure and have passed the [thirteen ordination] obstacles. This person is twenty years old, and he/she has a bowl and three robes. If the Order deems it to be the right time, the Order may ordain him through this master. This is the announcement.



[Daoxuan added the following comments] After the opening remarks, [the reciting preceptor] should ask the Order whether they approve of the consensus or reject it. The opening remark should be asked three times and should be answered the same even for the first, second, and third time. This procedure is in accordance with the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*. If the Order agrees, they should say “approve” *cheng jiu* 成就.

大德僧聽。此某甲從和尚某甲求受具足戒，此某甲今從眾僧乞受具足戒，某甲為和尚，某甲自說清淨無諸難事，年滿二十，三衣鉢具。若僧時到，僧忍聽。授某甲具足戒，某甲為和尚。白如是。作白已，問僧成就不？乃至羯磨中第一、第二、第三，亦如是問。此僧祇文。準此，僧中知法者，答言成就。<sup>242</sup>

The above passage is also found in the other existing Vinayas such as in the *Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律:

Honored venerables, please listen carefully. This person wishes for full ordination from this master. This person asks the order for ordination through this master. If the Order deems it to be the right time, the Order may agree to ordain him through this master. This is the announcement! This full ordination consensus procedure is fulfilled through the four times consensus 白四羯磨<sup>243</sup> [which is one announcement and three consensuses].<sup>244</sup>

大德僧聽。是某甲。從某甲受具足戒。是從僧乞受具足戒某甲。和尚某甲。若僧時到僧忍聽。僧當與某甲受具足和尚某甲。如是白。白四羯磨。<sup>245</sup>

This Saṅghakarma is reinstated by Sengye 僧業 (367–411 CE)<sup>246</sup> in his work *The Basic Formal Act of Bhikṣu according to the Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya (Shisong Jiemo Biqiu Yaoyong* 十誦羯磨比丘要用):

Honored venerables, please listen carefully. This person wishes for full ordination from this master. This person asks the order for full ordination

<sup>242</sup> Daoxuan 道宣, *Si Fen Lü Xing Shi Chao Zi Chi Ji* 四分律行事鈔資持記 II, 830–831. This text was composed between 628–630 CE.

<sup>243</sup> Skt. *Jñapti-caturthena karmanā* or *jñapti-caturtha-karman*; Pāli: *Ñatti-catuttha-kamma*: An announcement is first made to the assembly and after that a motion is put to a vote for three times.

<sup>244</sup> The four times consensus 白四羯磨 is also known as the three times consensus 三羯磨.

<sup>245</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 148b14–17. My translation.

<sup>246</sup> A master of the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* 十誦律. Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 (344–413) is regarded as a reincarnation of Upāli 優波利.

through this master. This person claims to be pure and have passed the [thirteen ordination] obstacles. This person is twenty years old, and he/she has a bowl and three robes. The Order may now ordain him/her through this master. If the ordination of this person through this master is deemed good by the present venerables, then be silent; anyone who disagrees should speak. This is the first time I speak forth this matter, does the assembly approve of this formal act or not? (Repeated three times). This person is ordained by the Order through this master. The Order agreed by having remained silent. This is how I take your silence to be.

大德僧聽。某甲。從和上某甲。求受具足戒。某甲已從眾僧乞受具足戒。和上某甲。某甲自說清淨無諸難事。年歲已滿衣鉢具足。某甲和上某甲。僧今與某甲受具足戒。和上某甲。誰諸長老忍。與某甲受具足戒。和上某甲。忍者是長老默然。誰不忍者便說。是初羯磨成就不(如是三說)僧已忍與某甲受具足戒竟。和上某甲。僧忍默然故。是事如是持。<sup>247</sup>

In the *Four-Part Vinaya* 四分律:

Honored venerables, please listen carefully. This person wishes for full ordination from this master. This person asks the order for full ordination through this master. This person claims to be pure and have passed the thirteen [ordination] obstacles. This person is twenty years old, and he/she has a bowl and three robes. The Order may now ordain him/her through this master. If the ordination of this person through this master is deemed good by the present venerables, then please be silent; anyone who disagrees should speak. This is the first consensus! The second and the third consensus are the same. The Order agreed by having remained silent. This is how I take your silence to be.

大德僧聽。此某甲。從某甲求受具足戒。此某甲。今從僧乞受具足戒。和上某甲。自說清淨無諸難事。年滿二十三衣鉢具。僧今授某甲具足戒。和上某甲。誰諸長老忍僧與某甲受具足戒和上某甲者默然。誰不忍者說。是初羯磨(第二第三亦如是說)僧已忍與某甲受具足戒竟。和上某甲僧忍默然故。是事如是持。<sup>248</sup>

In the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律:

Honored venerables, please listen carefully. This person wishes for full ordination from this master. The order now ordains this person through this master. If the Order deems that this is the right time then please agree. This

<sup>247</sup> *The Basic Formal Act of Bhikṣu according to Daśa-bhāṇavāra-Vinaya (Shisong jiemo biqiu yao yong 十誦羯磨比丘要用)*. The authorship of this text is credited to Sengye 僧業 (367–411 CE): T. no. 1439, 23: 501b15–22.

<sup>248</sup> T. no. 1432, 22: 1042c19–25.

is the announcement. Honored venerables, please listen carefully. This person wishes for ordination from this master. The order now ordains this person through this master. Any elder who agrees should remain silent; any elder who disagrees should speak. The second and the third consensus are the same. The Order agreed by having remained silent. This is how I take your silence to be.

大德僧聽。此某甲欲受具足戒。某甲為和尚。僧今與某甲受具足戒。和尚某甲。若僧時到僧忍聽。白如是。大德僧聽。此某甲欲受具足戒。某甲為和尚。僧今與某甲受具足戒。和尚某甲。誰諸長老忍默然。若不忍者說。第二第三亦如是。僧已忍某甲受具足戒和尚某甲竟。僧忍默然故。是事如是持。<sup>249</sup>

In the *Pāli Vinaya*:

The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: “Honored sirs, let the Order hear me. This one, so and so, wishes for ordination from the venerable so and so. He is quite pure in regard to the things which are stumbling-blocks; he is complete as to bowl and robes. So and so is asking the Order for ordination by means of the preceptor so and so. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order ordain so and so by means of the preceptor so and so. This is the motion” ... If the ordination of so and so by mean of the preceptor so and so is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak.... So and so is being ordained by the Order by means of the preceptor so and so. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.<sup>250</sup>

There is no similar formal act for ordination in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部尼毘奈耶. However, there is a chapter called “On Ordination” 出家事 in this Vinaya<sup>251</sup> in which a similar act of the Saṅgha is found:

Honored venerables, please listen carefully! This person wishes to become ordained and he has been trained for four months and has served his master 鄔波馱耶 [和尚]<sup>252</sup> and the Saṅgha. If it is the right time and is accepted by the Order, then please be silent, he who disagrees should speak. It should be repeated three times. The Order has agreed, therefore the Order is silent. I now understand this to be so.

<sup>249</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 111b16-23.

<sup>250</sup> *Vin. IV*, 123.

<sup>251</sup> T. no. 1444, 23: 1020b12-1041a21.

<sup>252</sup> Sanskrit: Upādhyāya; Pāli: Upajjhāya.

大德僧伽聽。此外道某甲。今求出家。以本服於四月中。供養鄔波馱耶。及以僧伽。若僧伽時至聽者。僧伽應許。若不許者說。如是三說。僧伽已聽許。由其默然故。我今如是持。<sup>253</sup>

Even in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律 in which the suggestion of Daoxuan is said to be cited from, there is no part pertaining to the question and answer between the reciting preceptor and the members of the Order:

Honored venerables, please listen carefully. This person wishes for full ordination from this master. He has been taken to a quiet place and has been examined on the ordination obstacles. He already asked the Order for full ordination. He had asked for his parents' consent. His master has granted him permission to be in possession of a bowl and three robes. He is a man, and he is twenty years old. He claims to be pure and have passed the thirteen [ordination] obstacles. If the Order deems it to be the right time, the Order may ordain him through this master. This is the announcement! This full ordination consensus procedure is fulfilled through the three times consensus. These three consensuses are repeated up to the Order agreed by having remained silent. This is how I take your silence to be.

大德僧聽。某甲從某甲。受具足。某甲已空靜處教問訖。某甲已從僧中乞受具足父母已聽。已求和上三衣鉢。具是男子。年滿二十。自說清淨無遮法。若僧時到。僧今與某甲受具足和上某甲如是白白三羯磨。乃至僧忍默然故。是事如是持。<sup>254</sup>

None of the existing Vinayas suggest a response of “approval” (*cheng* 成) to the reciting preceptor 羯磨師 in order to approve of a formal act of the Saṅgha except the commentary of Daoxuan on the *Four-Part Vinaya*, that is, the *Report on Private Observing of Commentary on Services of the Four-Part Vinaya* (*Sifenlü xingshi chao Zichi Ji* 四分律行事鈔資持記). Rather, all these Vinayas state that one should keep silent if one approves that formal act. Even in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇

<sup>253</sup> T. no. 1444, 23: 1032a7–11.

<sup>254</sup> T. no. 1425, 22: 413c6–12.

律, to which Daoxuan claims for his proposal (此僧祇文), the idea of “responding to approve of a formal act” is not found.

The debate on whether Daoxuan’s suggestion is relevant to this dissertation or not is complex. Daoxuan claims that he got his idea from the *Mahāsāṃghika-Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律 that one should respond to the question of the reciting preceptor during the formal act of the Saṅgha to approve a formal act. However, nowhere in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* does it say that one should agree by saying “approve” (*cheng* 成). The choices presented are either to be silent to approve or speak to disapprove. Quite frankly, the part that demands a positive response to approve a formal act is invented by Daoxuan, which does not exist in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* as Daoxuan claims. However, it is found in his commentary on the *Four-Part Vinaya*. This dissertation is a study on the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya*, not so much on the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*. Having said that, research shows that Daoxuan’s suggestion in his commentary is relevant because he is the authority of the *Four-Part Vinaya* and his suggestions (or his inventions) are found in the commentary on the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

As scholars may know, Daoxuan is a preeminent figure of the Nanshan Vinaya School 南山律宗 in China, together with his great pioneer Daoan 道安 (312/314–385 CE) who was a famous teacher and a meticulous Vinaya observer in China. It is said that before the appearance of any Vinaya in China, Daoan had established his own regulation (rules and disciplines) for the Chinese Buddhist Saṅgha. This, together with the Chinese local customs, is probably also the reason that led to the difference between the Indian Vinaya and Chinese Vinaya context,

because Chinese monks and nuns already had preconceptions regarding rules and disciplines defined by Daoan before the arrival of the Indian Vinayas. This is supported by Ann Heirman. In her article “Indian Disciplinary Rules and Their Early Chinese Adepts,” Heirman points out that many practices that are considered offensive in India are observed by Chinese monks and nuns. This has become the custom for Chinese people and Chinese monastics. So, almost all the Chinese preeminent monks such as Yijing 義淨 (635–713) or Daoxuan feel “hopeless to change the way” their fellow monastics observe the Vinaya. However, they still feel the need to point out the mistakes in the way their fellow monastics observe the Vinaya: “Both Daoxuan and Yijing were not positive about a change of Vinaya rules. But, when confronted with Chinese reality, both feel the need to point out that mistakes are being made.”<sup>255</sup> Therefore, the custom of “responding to approve for a formal act of the Saṅgha” by the Chinese probably emerges from this similar context.

When the *Four-Part Vinaya* was introduced to China, Daoan 道安 is dedicated to study and follow this Vinaya and many of his commentaries are based on it. Thus, Daoan is regarded as the “authority of the *Four-Part Vinaya*.” He even establishes a lineage, the Vinaya School of the Southern Mountain 南山律宗, which focuses only on the *Four-Part Vinaya*.<sup>256</sup> Being an inheritor of the Nanshan Vinaya School 南山律宗, Daoxuan has distinguished himself as another founder of this school, together with his pioneer Daoan.<sup>257</sup> Moreover, although Daoxuan’s suggestion of saying

---

<sup>255</sup> Heirman, “Indian Disciplinary Rules and Their Early Chinese Adepts,” 267–269; Cf. Kieschnick, *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture*, 222–249.

<sup>256</sup> Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, 5–23.

<sup>257</sup> Penny, *Religion and Biography in China and Tibet*, 82–83.

“approve,” is claimed by him to be found in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*, it appears in his work, *Report on Private Observing of Commentary on Services of the Four-Part Vinaya* (*Sifenlü xingshi chao Zichi Ji* 四分律行事鈔資持記).

In his commentary on the *Four-Part Vinaya*, Daoxuan argues that during the formal act of the Saṅgha, the reciting preceptor 羯磨師 should ask, and all members of the Order should respond, whether they approve of the formal act or not. However, this is not a proper practice, for it would contradict itself. At the end of every passage cited above from all of the canonical Vinayas, even in the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*, it is consistently made clear that if one approves, one should keep silent. If one does not approve, one should speak out (忍者是長老默然。誰不忍者便說). Thus, if all the members of the Order speak out, it means they do not approve for the formal act.

As stated above, before the coming of any full Vinaya in China, Daoxuan 道宣 had already established his own regulations for monks and nuns. He is even the founder of the Nanshan School of Vinaya 南山律宗. We are told that during his lifetime, Daoxuan has created new models for the practice and ritual of Buddhist monks and nuns. Therefore, in his book, *Report on Private Observing of Commentary on Services of the Four-Part Vinaya* 四分律行事鈔資持記, Daoxuan adds to the end of the formal act the responding of members of the Order to the question of the reciting preceptor 羯磨師. As a result of his reputation, Daoxuan, a famous Chinese Vinaya teacher and practitioner, made this practice popular throughout China. The act of making a response in order to approve a formal act of Saṅgha, which is

attributed to Daoxuan, is not only popular in China, but also it has become common practice in other countries that are influenced by Chinese Buddhism such as Korea, Taiwan, and Vietnam.

Another reason the Buddha regards “silence” to mean “approve” is that he is aware that “one should give his own decision” in voting. For example, if a monk actually wants to disagree on a specific formal act but his preceptor or another highly respected monk “approves” of that act, he would not dare to speak out to “disagree.”. In contrast, if “silence” means “to approve,” this monk can easily speak out his idea and disagree with the formal act. Incidentally, in the passages of all existing Vinayas above, there is only the question of the reciting preceptor 羯磨師: “This is the first time I speak forth on this matter, is the formal act approved or not?” Then, if one approves the formal act, then one remains silent; if one does not approve, one should speak out. Still, none of the part that suggests the idea of responding “*cheng* 成” to approve for a formal act is found in all the existing Vinayas. Based on the question of the reciting preceptor 羯磨師, Daoxuan adds the part of responding “*cheng* 成” to approve for a formal act by the members of the Order.

Furthermore, a formal act of the Saṅgha requires 100 percent vote by monks and nuns for it to pass. The suggestion of Daoxuan may make the formal act of the Saṅgha more complicated. For instance, although almost all members of the Order approve for a formal act by means of responding “*cheng* 成,” there may be a few members who choose to suspend the formal act 遮羯磨. Thus, he speaks out but the reciting preceptor 羯磨師 and other members of the Order may not hear his voice of



disapproval. Or for that matter, it could be that some may remain silent (even when they are required to speak) while a few speak to approve and a few speak to disapprove all at the same time. The formal act thus may still be approved, and this is said to be an illegal formal act because it is not carried out by rule (a formal act which is carried out not in accordance with the rule even when an Order is complete 非法和合眾羯磨).<sup>258</sup> Therefore, this research finds that the suggestion of Daoxuan regarding the issue of responding “*cheng* 成” is a contradiction because it drowns out the few voices that may disagree and thereby pass an act that does not get a 100 percent vote.

Nevertheless, there is still another potential problem that should be made clear in this section. In general, if a question is asked and the question is not answered, then there is something missing or there is something impolite and it will be dismissed as an improper practice of communication. Immediately, one recognizes that this is not a strong argument. As mentioned earlier, in general when the Buddha confronts a problem he creates the rules and disciplines based on Ten Reasons. Two reasons among them are “for the excellence of the Order” and “for the comfort of the Order.”<sup>259</sup> So, any decision or action that makes the Saṅgha excellent and/or comfortable is supported by the Vinaya. However, a monk might feel uncomfortable suspending a formal act 遮羯磨 because even though he may

---

<sup>258</sup> *Vin. IV*, 146–147. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 821b22–c5.

<sup>259</sup> The Ten Reasons are: (1) For the excellence of the Order; (2) For the comfort of the Order; (3) For the restraint of evil-minded men; (4) For the ease of well-behaved monks; (5) For the restraint of the cankers belonging to the here and now; (6) For the combating of the cankers belonging to the other worlds; (7) For the benefit of non-believers; (8) For the increase in the number of believers; (9) For establishing dhamma indeed; and (10) For following the rules of restraint. Sees, *Vin. I*, 37–38. Cf. T. no. 1421, 22: 3b28; T. no. 1435, 23: 1c15; and T. no. 1425, 22: 228c22.

disapprove, his master or a highly respected monk approves the act by speaking “*cheng* 成.” That monk may be peer pressured or may feel pressured by the responses of the elders and therefore he may suppress his thoughts and may decide to follow his master by keeping silent.

How it should be done is to use silence as a way to approve an act. The practice of “silence to approve an act” is strengthened with the example from the formal act for the Uposatha ceremony (Precept Recitation Ceremony 說戒羯磨). In this formal act, the reciting preceptor 羯磨師 asks the Order whether they are pure or not. If they are pure they should keep silent and thus the reciting preceptor will move on to recite the Paṭimokkha. The formal act is suspended only when there is an offender among the Order, and it is said that if monks and nuns know they have committed an offense they should speak out. The *Four-Part Vinaya* states:

Honored venerables, let the Order pay careful attention! I now will recite the Pratimokṣa; all present must listen and pay careful attention. If one commits an offence, one should reveal it. If there is no offense, one should keep silent. By your silence thus I know that you are pure. If one is asked by others, one should respond likewise. A monastic member in this assembly who knowingly commits an offense and chooses to remain silent, even after having been asked for the third time, is guilty of intentional lying. This “conscious lying” offense is called a stumbling block by the Buddha. Therefore, if one remembers an offense and desires purity, one should reveal it. By revealing it, there arises comfort for him/her.

諸大德！我今欲說波羅提木叉戒，汝等諦聽，善思念之。若自知有犯者即應自懺悔，不犯者默然；默然者，知諸大德清淨。若有他問者，亦如是答。如是比丘在眾中，乃至三問，憶念有罪而不懺悔者，得故妄語罪；故妄語者佛說障道法。若彼比丘憶念有罪，欲求清淨者，應懺悔；懺悔得安樂。<sup>260</sup>

The equivalent is found in the *Pāli Vinaya*:

---

<sup>260</sup> T. no. 1429, 22: 1015b20.

Honored sirs, let the Order listen to me. [Today], the fifteenth (day), is an Observance (day). If it seems right to the Order, the Order may carry out the Observance, [and] may recite the Pāṭimokkha. What is the Order's first duty? Let the venerable ones announce [their] entire purity. I will recite the Pāṭimokkha (while) one and all of us present listen properly and pay attention to it. He for whom there may be an offense should reveal it. If there is no offense, you should become silent. By your becoming silent I shall thus know that the venerable ones are quite pure. For as there is an answer for each question, so it is proclaimed up to the third time in an assembly like this. Whatever monk remembering while it is being proclaimed up to the third time that there is an existent offense and [does] not reveal it, there comes to be conscious lying for him. Now, conscious lying, venerable ones, is a thing called a stumbling block by the Lord. Therefore the existent offense should be revealed by a monk who remembers that he has fallen (into an offense) and who desires purity; for when it is revealed there comes to be comfort for him.<sup>261</sup>

Thus, silence as a means to approve a consensus (the formal act) of the Saṅgha 僧伽羯磨 is more appropriate. When studying about the Pavāraṇā (the Retreat Closing Ceremony) of the *Pāli Vinaya*, Herman Tieken has strongly confirmed that silence is the way to approve for a consensus of the Saṅgha. "When the list of transgressions was recited a monk could listen on in silence. Only when he felt that a certain offence applied to him, he was expected to raise his voice."<sup>262</sup>

The references on the formal act for the Uposatha in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律 and *Mūla-sarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 also support the view that silence is a means to approve for the formal act. The formal act is only suspended when there is an offender. The *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* and *Mūla-sarvāstivāda Vinaya* state:

For whom there may be a fault, it should be confessed by that [person]. If there is no fault, [one] should be silent. By being silent, we will understand the Venerable Ones to be completely pure. Just as there is an explanation for

---

<sup>261</sup> *Vin. IV*, 132–133.

<sup>262</sup> Tieken, "The Buddhist Pavāraṇā Ceremony According to the Pāli Vinaya," 280.

a monk questioned individually in this or that form, so also there is the threefold public proclamation in the assembly of monks. For whatever monk, being questioned in this way three times in the assembly of monks, who does not reveal an existing fault which is remembered, there is the speaking of a deliberate lie. Speaking a deliberate lie, O Venerable Ones, has assuredly been declared by the Blessed One to be an obstructive condition. Therefore, an existing fault should be revealed by a fallen monk, remembering [the offense and] hoping for purity. By revealing it, there is comfort for him, but by not revealing it, there is none. O Venerable Ones, the introduction of the Prātimokṣa Sūtra recitation has been recited by me. Therefore, I ask the Venerable Ones, are you completely pure in this matter? A second and also a third time I ask, are you completely pure in this matter? Since there is silence, the Venerable Ones are [completely pure] in this matter. Thus do I understand.<sup>263</sup>

Thus, regarding the question in the formal act above, in both Northern and Southern Buddhist traditions, and in all the existing Vinayas, all the members of the Saṅgha should keep silent. So, “not responding to the question” does not mean that one is impolite. Moreover, it is difficult to define impolite because different cultures have their own definition and scope for politeness. For example, some cultures observe silence as “agree or approve” of other people’s question, but some cultures suggest that one should respond to the questioner.

Indian culture is an example of the first category. If one agrees with other people, he/she should keep silent. From ancient time, “silence” has long been seen as noble. As a result, in their article “The Functions of Silence in India: Implications for Intercultural Communication Research,” Nemi C. Jane and Anuradha Matukumalli praise the subtlety of the Indian silence: “In India, silence is viewed as a “state of being” which encompasses a wide range of indescribable phenomena such as God, truth, self being, freedom, bliss, nothingness, and Nirvana. The highest

---

<sup>263</sup> Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, 49.

truth and bliss are both experienced in *shantam* or silence.”<sup>264</sup> This is why the Buddha is honored with the title of Śākyamuni (a *muni*, sage, of the Śākya) because the Buddha has attained the noble quiescence, ultimate tranquility, stillness, calm abiding, stabilizing meditation, or enlightenment. According to Alex Wayman, the Sanskrit *mauna* (*muni*) or *mona* as in Pāli is “silence.”<sup>265</sup> Not only is “silence” used in the religious context, but also in the daily public communicative context, silence plays an important part at the interpersonal level. Nemi C. Jane and Anuradha Matukumalli, in the same article, continue that for public communication, silence promotes harmony, cooperation, and mutual respect.<sup>266</sup> So, in a conversation, it is still respectful for one to keep silent during a conversation in the Indian culture.

The Buddha is called the great saint of silence, so the aspect of “silence” during his conversation with the other people is common. Many times, when the Buddha is invited for a meal, he just keeps silent, and his silence indicates his acceptance for the invitation. For instance, in the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, when the Buddha is invited for a meal by Sunīdha and Vassakāra, the Buddha signifies his consent by a silence.<sup>267</sup> The function and power of the Buddhist “silence” is again stressed by Dean C. Barnlund, Larry A. Samovar, and Richard E. Potter. They all state that the Buddhist silence is more trustworthy than words in a conversation: “One of its [Buddhist] tenets is that words are deceptive and a silent intuition is a truer way to confront the world; mind-to-mind communication through words is less reliable than heart-to-heart communication through an

---

<sup>264</sup> Wayman, “Two Traditions of India: Truth and Silence,” 389.

<sup>265</sup> Ibid.

<sup>266</sup> Asante, *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader*, 253.

<sup>267</sup> *DN II – Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* 16, 93.

intuitive grasp of things.”<sup>268</sup> Therefore, in India during the emergence of Buddhism, silence during communication is recognized as a means and a superior way in conversation. The silence during a conversation even indicates a high quality in practice of the Buddha and the members of the Saṅgha.

By contrast, in China, silence has somewhat of a different meaning than the silence in India. Silence in the religious context for the Chinese is a mode used by educated and smart people who have knowledge and are articulate enough to express the ultimate truth, which cannot be described by words. By contrast, silence for the Chinese people in the daily public use context is a mode of action that, at best, expresses momentary silent thinking before making a quick decision and, at worst, expresses disrespect and may even disrupt harmony. Most of the ancient and medieval Chinese saints recognize this value of silence. Silence has become the lifestyle of the Chinese people. For example, in the *Tao Te Ching* (*Daode jing* 道德經), Laozi 老子 teaches that one should not over speak in praise of oneself. Instead, one should value one’s action rather than one’s speech: “Those who know do not talk; Those who talk do not know.”<sup>269</sup> This is also one of the basic tenet in Daoism: “The Way that can be told of is not an Unvarying Way; The names that can be named are not unvarying names.”<sup>270</sup> Thus, the sublime way, according to Daoism, is not revealed by speech but by noble silence.

However, silence for the Chinese in the common public context is not noble silence. Rather, it is to be cautioned. For example, Confucius 孔子 (551–479 BCE)

---

<sup>268</sup> Barnlund, *Communicative Styles of Japanese and Americans*, 142; Samovar and Porter, *Communication Between Cultures*, 211.

<sup>269</sup> Laozi, *Tao Te Ching Vol. I*, 59.

<sup>270</sup> *Ibid*, 1.

advises people to be careful about their words. He said: "Your words, sir, show you to be a superior man, but four horses cannot overtake the tongue."<sup>271</sup> Moreover, silence is the way to protect oneself in a Chinese context in some cases.<sup>272</sup> From ancient and medieval time, Chinese people are careful with their speech during a conversation. Harmony during the process of communication is the ultimate goal of the Chinese, since they follow the communicative patent of Confucianism in which four principles of humanism (*ren* 仁), faithfulness (*yi* 義), propriety (*li* 禮), and wisdom (*zhi* 智) are stressed. "Silence" regarding not answering a question during a conversation may be misinterpreted as an act of impoliteness and the flow of the conversation may be interrupted. Thus, it may cause uncomfortable feelings for the speaker as well as the questioner. This goes against the harmony, therefore it is generally unacceptable by the Chinese since its culture is such that "politeness can take precedence over truth."<sup>273</sup> The Buddhist monastics live a noble life, wherein, excludes anything that is not wholesome, and at the same time, is virtuous at the beginning (*ādi* 初善), the middle (*majjha* 中善), and the end (*pariyosāna* 後善).<sup>274</sup> Therefore, in the public social context, silence of the Buddhist monastics during a conversation may interrupt or create disorder and discomfort for others, and thereby, indicates impoliteness and is discarded as an immoral mode of action according to the Chinese culture.

With the prevalence of the Chinese verbal communicative culture, it is likely that Daoxuan, while commenting on the *Four-Part Vinaya* found that it was missing

---

<sup>271</sup> Confucius, *The Teachings of Confucius, Special Edition*, 67.

<sup>272</sup> Lewis, *When Cultures Collide: Leading Across Cultures*, 7.

<sup>273</sup> Samovar and Porter, *Communication Between Cultures*, 253.

<sup>274</sup> Kalupahana, *Ethics in Early Buddhism*, 65–66.

something when there was no answer from the members of the Order when being asked by the reciting preceptor 羯師磨 during a formal act 羯磨. Keeping silent during a conversation which is in flux may be strange and disrespectful in the Chinese culture. Hence, feeling uncomfortable with a question that is followed by a silence from all members of the Order and for the “excellence and well being of monastics and community” which is in accord with the Chinese cultures, Daoxuan proposed the idea of responding “approval” (*cheng* 成) to the question of the reciting preceptor 羯師磨. By so doing, Daoxuan filled in the cultural gap between India and China regarding the issue on silence. While Indian silence is regarded as noble during communication, the Chinese understands it in another way. The Chinese culture may disapprove of silence and consider silence during a conversation which is in flux as a rude mode of behavior that can be a factor in creating disorder in society. By recommending the responding of “approval” (*cheng* 成) by the members of the Order to the question of the reciting preceptor during the formal act, Daoxuan has made the Indian formal act become more Chinese.

#### **4.2. The Relationship Difference of Disciple and Master**

Another indication of the differences between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* is found through the comparison of the cultural difference between these two Vinayas in the context of the monastery system. The life of Buddhist monks and nuns is as simple as those of the other non-Buddhist sects. At first, they



all lead a wandering life.<sup>275</sup> In the early period of Buddhism, Buddhist monks and nuns even lead a simpler life because they set out on tour for the whole year while ascetics of the other non-Buddhist sects have a fixed abode for three months during the rainy season.<sup>276</sup> This idea is supported by Mathieu Boisvert. In his article “A Comparison of the Early Forms of Buddhist and Christian Monastic Traditions,” Boisvert suggests that at first the Buddha does not want to establish a fixed abode for monks and nuns. The reason is because the Buddha wants to direct monks and nuns to a simple life in which they possess nothing so that they can dedicate their whole mind to the practice. The Buddha only initiates the rule for the requiring of a fixed abode during the rainy season in response to the criticism of people at that time on the carelessness of certain monks and nuns when they trample on grass and kill the small insects.<sup>277</sup> Thus, prior to the fixed abode during the three months of the Rains Retreat, there is almost no concept of Buddhist monasticism. In the book *Buddhist Art Antiquities of Himachal Pradesh: Up to 8<sup>th</sup> Century A.D.*, Omacanda Hāṇḍā points out that with the incorporation of the practice of fixed abode for a period of three months during the Rains Retreat (Vassāvāsa), Buddhist monasticism enters its early phase of development.<sup>278</sup> Although at this first phase, Buddhist monasticism is still simple and just temporarily meeting the requirement of a fixed abode during the three months of the Rains Retreat. Generally, it is divided into two types: the fixed places that are chosen and kept up by monks and nuns themselves

---

<sup>275</sup> Che'n, “Some Problems in the Translation of the Chinese Buddhist Canon,” 178.

<sup>276</sup> *Vin. IV*, 130. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 816c6–29.

<sup>277</sup> Boisvert, “A Comparison of the Early Forms of Buddhist and Christian Monastic Traditions,” 134.

<sup>278</sup> Hāṇḍā, *Buddhist Art & Antiquities of Himachal Pradesh, Upto 8th Century A.D.*, 34.

(*āvāsa*), and the places that are donated by patronages (*ārāma*).<sup>279</sup> Although these settlements of monks and nuns are simple, it is the condition for a “clear idea of an ideal monastery” that the Buddha bases his decision on to decide on the type of fixed abode to establish:

Now where could the Lord stay that would be neither too far from a village, nor too near, suitable for coming and going, accessible to people whenever they want, not crowded by day, having little noise at night, little sound, without folks' breath, secluded from people, fitting for meditation?<sup>280</sup>

The prerequisites of an ideal monastery in India during its early period are simple. It is built on the outskirts of a town or village in order to meet the requirements of “neither too far nor too near.” Monks and nuns can go for alms and it is easy for people to come to the monastery. The idea of “neither too far nor too near” accommodates an environment that is quiet enough for monks and nuns to meditate. Gregory Schopen even stresses that during the first phase of the development of the Indian monastery up to the pre-Aśokan period (304–232 BCE), an Indian Buddhist monastery is so simple that it could be regarded as a non-monastery:

The earliest Buddhist “monasteries” that are known in India . . . are not “monasteries” at all. They are either only barely improved, unorganized, natural caverns or caves, or poorly constructed and ill-organized shelters built of rubble or other cheap materials.<sup>281</sup>

Thus, the accommodations of monks and nuns, as well as the system of monasteries in India during its first phase of development, are simple. More importantly, during this period monks and nuns focus on the wandering life, and thus, the relationship

---

<sup>279</sup> Prebish and Keown, *Buddhism—The EBook*, 70.

<sup>280</sup> *Vin. IV*, 51. Cf. Pichard, “Indian Buddhist Monasteries,” 20.

<sup>281</sup> Schopen, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 1–2.

between disciple and master is not a strong one. The supported evidence for the above claim is found in the section called “Inexperienced Monks” in the *Pāli Vinaya*. In this section, a group of inexperienced monks traveled to distant places and they did not ask permission of their masters/preceptors. When seeing their disciples about to travel to distant places, the preceptors ask where they are going and with whom.<sup>282</sup>

The relationship between master and disciple is proclaimed by the Buddha in some early discourses from the Sutta Piṭaka. For example, in the *Early Discourses of the Buddha*, the Buddha made his opinion known regarding the relationship between master and disciple. It is said that the Buddha went on tour to Ikkhānankala of Kośala and the good reputation of the Buddha spread. Doubting this reputation of the Buddha, Brahman Pokkhārasadi sent his chief disciple Ambattha to the dwelling of the Buddha to verify whether or not the widely circulated news was true. During the dialogue, Ambattha converses with the Buddha in an improper way. The Buddha criticizes him saying: “Is that the way, Ambattha, that you would hold converse with aged teachers, and teachers of your teachers well stricken in years, as you do now, moving about the while or standing, with me thus seated?”<sup>283</sup> Thus, the idea of the Buddha about the relationship between disciples and teachers or between an elder and younger is clear. There is a hierarchy in the relationship between teachers and disciples in which disciples or the younger should pay respect to teachers or elders. Although there is a hierarchy, it does not mean that disciples have to passively accept everything from their masters. The Buddha always

---

<sup>282</sup> *Vin. IV*, 156–157.

<sup>283</sup> *DN I – Ambattha Sutta* 3, 112.

encouraged free inquiry even in the context of the hierarchy in the relationship between disciples and masters:

Yes, Kālāmas, you may well doubt, you may well waver. In a doubtful matter wavering does arise. Now, look you, Kālāmas, be ye not misled by report or tradition or hearsay. Be not misled by proficiency in the collections, nor by mere logic or inference, nor after considering reasons, nor after reflection on and approval of some theory, nor because it fits becoming, nor out of respect for a recluse (who holds it). But, Kālāmas, when you know for yourselves: These things are unprofitable, these things are blameworthy, these things are censured by [intelligence]; these things, when performed and undertaken, conduce to loss and sorrow, then indeed do ye reject them, Kālāmas.<sup>284</sup>

Accordingly, the Buddha did not support a passive listener, he even encouraged free inquiry, but this applies to the practice only. If the disciple has any doubt in learning and practicing, he/she should ask his/her master immediately in a respectful way. Free inquiry does not mean that the disciple can dismiss or disobey his/her duty to his/her master. Although the Buddha encouraged free inquiry in the disciples, hierarchy and responsibility in the relationship between disciples and teachers was stressed by the Buddha.

On another occasion, in the *Dīgha Nikāya*, the Buddha clarified the relationship and obligation between teachers and disciples. According to him, the teacher should lead his disciple to virtuous discipline, ensure that the disciple truly understands the Dhamma, and encourage the disciple in all areas. In response, the disciple should be eager to learn, should have respect, and more importantly should offer personal services to the teacher.<sup>285</sup> Ultimately, the duties of disciple to the teacher/preceptor are mentioned in detail in the Vinaya such as the disciple should not interrupt his teacher when he is speaking, the disciple should clean the place

---

<sup>284</sup> *AN I*, 171–172.

<sup>285</sup> *Vin. V*, 311–317. Cf. *DN III – Sigālovada Suttanta 31*, 181.

where the preceptor stays, and the disciple should not set on tour without obtaining permission to leave from the preceptor.<sup>286</sup>

Although the relationship and hierarchy between the disciple and the master in the Buddhist Order has been clearly declared by the Buddha, those rules and disciplines are not always observed properly, because the system of the Buddhist monastery during its first phase was not well developed in India. Also, the Buddhist monks and nuns were not tied to any specific monastery; instead, they lead a wandering life. Therefore, the connection between teachers and disciples is set loose. For instance, in the *Pāli Vinaya*, a group of inexperienced monks set out on tour but they did not ask permission from their masters. Note that, according to the Buddhist Vinaya, this action is improper by the disciples because it indicates that these disciples do not respect their masters. At the same time, having known that their disciples were about to set on tour, the masters do not even ask them where they are going and with whom.<sup>287</sup> The Buddha rebukes those inexperienced disciples because they have failed to observe their duties towards their masters. Here, it seems that because the organization and administration of the early Indian monastery are not well developed, and the monastics at that time are leading a wandering life, the mutual relationship, especially between masters and disciples, is not so close. As a result, in the *Pāli Vinaya*, this group of young monks set out on tour without obtaining permission from their masters. This was not a proper practice and the Buddha declared that an offense has been committed by these young

---

<sup>286</sup> *Vin. V*, 311–317.

<sup>287</sup> *Vin. IV*, 157.

monks.<sup>288</sup> Thus, during the first phase of its development, the Indian Buddhist monastery is simple. It simply fits the requirements of “neither too far from a village, nor too near.” Sometimes, it is even regarded as “non-monastery” because monks and nuns during this period focus on a wandering life in which they do not want to possess anything, so that they can dedicate their whole time to practice. Therefore, the relationship between the master and the disciple is set loose. That is why there are monks/nuns who travel to distant places and do not seek for permission from their masters as described in the *Pāli Vinaya*. Therefore, there are monastics who are imperfect regarding their moral conduct in the *Pāli Vinaya*. During the emergence of Indian Buddhism, the monastics are portrayed realistically—they are human beings and human beings make mistakes.

Research also shows that not only is the relationship between master and disciple set loose in India during the 5<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century BCE (the emergence of Buddhism in India), but also, this relationship is not strong in India during the 4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE (the period the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is transmitted to China and translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*). In this section, this dissertation compares and examines the relationship between master and disciple during the emergence of Buddhism in China during the 4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE with that of India during the 4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE.

During the second phase of its development, that is by the time Buddhism is transmitted to China and by the time the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is translated into Chinese as the *Four-Part Vinaya* 四分律 (c. 1<sup>st</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> century AD), Indian

---

<sup>288</sup> Ibid.

monasteries had entered the developed period of fixed abodes where monks and nuns reside throughout the year. During the Gupta Age (c. 200–350 AD) the Buddhist monasteries have become much bigger, and at the same time richer in both artistic decorations, as well as increased in number. Plentiful material provisions were well prepared for both the residents and the incoming monks and nuns.<sup>289</sup> Not only do the monasteries grow bigger, the organization and administration were also well developed. Many office-bearers such as the Saṅghasthavira (director, chief priest, or head abbot), requisite of monastics distributor, and the monastery officer of secular affair were selected.<sup>290</sup> Gregory Schopen in his book, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, not only confirms the development of the Indian Buddhist monastery regarding its organization, administration, and architecture but also mentions the ideology of Buddhist monasteries and compared it to that of Brahmanism. He states that there were infirmaries, manpower, and organization to provide care to others in the Buddhist monasteries, whereas, these services were lacking in the system of the monasteries of Brahmanism.<sup>291</sup> With this growth of the system of the monastery in India during the second phase of its development, the administration, organization, and the relationship between monks and nuns in the monasteries was much more connected. They were responsible for their specific monastic duties as they interacted with each other. If any issue arose, monks and nuns would sit together and solve the issue together in harmony. Their voice, even from a young monk,

---

<sup>289</sup> Dutt, *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India*, 197.

<sup>290</sup> Daswani, *Buddhist Monasteries and Monastic Life in Ancient India*, 123–135.

<sup>291</sup> Schopen, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 8.

would be heard and taken seriously. At the same time, if a monk or nun broke the rules of the monastery consistently without paying attention to the voice of the Saṅgha, he/she would be forced to leave the monastery.<sup>292</sup>

With the growth of the system of the Indian Buddhist monastery, the admission into the monkhood life was a more systematic and elaborate procedure. Once the master was chosen by a candidate who desired to join the Saṅgha, the master could accept or reject the candidate. If the master accepted then he was obligated to take responsibility for the candidate (by now know as a disciple) and teach him.<sup>293</sup> The master should consider the disciple as his/her own son/daughter. And in a similar way the disciple should regard his/her master as his/her father/mother.<sup>294</sup> Up to this point, the monastery system was supportive of the relationship of the master and disciple. The disciples were expected to perform all the duties of a personal attendant to the masters, but when the system of the monasteries evolves and laity and servants come to stay, these duties were performed by them.<sup>295</sup> When the laity and servants began to serve as attendants to the masters, the disciples began to loose contact with the master and consequently, the relationship between master and disciple is limited and even weakened.

Most of the Buddhist monasteries during this second phase of development in India served as places for monks and nuns from all four quarters to reside. There were always large numbers of monks and nuns staying at the same monastery—this

---

<sup>292</sup> Daswani, *Buddhist Monasteries and Monastic Life in Ancient India*, 138. Cf. Dutt, *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India – Appendix*, 313.

<sup>293</sup> Daswani, *Buddhist Monasteries and Monastic Life in Ancient India*, 95–96.

<sup>294</sup> *Ibid.*, 170.

<sup>295</sup> Daswani, *Buddhist Monasteries and Monastic Life in Ancient India*, 170–171. Cf. Takakusu, *Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy*, 36, 47, 64, 144, 145, and 154.



number could be in the thousands or even tens of thousands.<sup>296</sup> Despite the fact that the monastery system was developed, the wandering life was still held in high esteem.<sup>297</sup> The hierarchy had shifted from being a primitive one (a not-well-formed hierarchy) in the early Buddhist Saṅgha to a ranking system which was generally represented by three gradings, that is, the elders (the *thera*), the middle status (the *madhyama*), and the young monks/nuns (the *navaka*).<sup>298</sup> This ranking system, in a way, was weakening the relationship between master and disciple in that each ranking grade had its specific monastic duties.<sup>299</sup> The job of the master was different than the job of the disciple, so much so that the disciple was not directly serving the master anymore, rather, the disciple is now serving the rules of the monastery. There were two reasons for this: (1) because the duties of the disciple to the master was mostly performed by the lay devotees and (2) because monks/nuns at the same monastery were ranked by their seniority, which caused each ranking group to be busy with their specific monastery duty, the relationship between disciple and master was even looser than it was in the earlier Indian Buddhist Saṅgha period. This is the reason, as we will see below, why young monks and nuns could travel to distant places without their preceptor. This was against the common rule during the second phase of the development of Indian monasticism, because they were not allowed to accept any young monastics in the monastery without their preceptors.

---

<sup>296</sup> Sharma and Sharma, *Encyclopaedia of Higher Education*, 29; Faxian, *Travels of Fah-Hian and Sung-Yun, Buddhist Pilgrims, from China to India (400 A.D. and 518 A.D.)*, 105.

<sup>297</sup> Daswani, *Buddhist Monasteries and Monastic Life in Ancient India*, 149; Dutt, *Early Monastic Buddhism*, 207–208.

<sup>298</sup> Daswani, *Buddhist Monasteries and Monastic Life in Ancient India*, 100–101.

<sup>299</sup> *Ibid.*, 123–134.

Furthermore, although the system of the monastery in early medieval India was developed, there is strong evidence supporting the idea that the relationship between master and disciple was not strong. In his book, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, Gregory Schopen makes known to us that if we want to learn about the system of Buddhist monasticism during the early medieval period in India, we have to consult with the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶, because this Vinaya is recomposed and used during this time.<sup>300</sup> Schopen continues to confirm the well-developed organization and administration in the monastery in the second phase of its development in India. He states that monks and nuns from the four quarters could stay in the monastery. But whoever travels alone without supporting monks (preceptors) is denied. “. . . and numerous monasteries are said to have passed ordinances denying traveling monks who lack such a supporting monk the right to accommodations for even one night.”<sup>301</sup> This evidence, on the one hand, supports development of the system of the Indian monastery during the early medieval period regarding its organization and administration. On the other hand, it also shows that during this period there were monks and nuns (young monks/nuns and novices) who did not obey the common rule that young monks/nuns and novices must travel with their preceptors. This is why there are young monks/nuns and novices asking for accommodations in the monasteries, however, they are denied by the monastery administrators.

More importantly, these types of young monks and novices who traveled alone were not few but many. Almost all monasteries in India during the early

---

<sup>300</sup> Schopen, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 2.

<sup>301</sup> *Ibid.*, 8-9.

medieval period passed a rule which denied the right of accommodation for young monks and novices who traveled without their preceptors. This again shows that these monasteries face many such situations. It is troublesome for the monastery administrators to arrange accommodations for these young monks. Therefore, to avoid this type of trouble, these monasteries passed the rule to make known to young monks that if they travel alone or without their preceptor, they would be denied the right to stay in the monastery. If they have no preceptor to travel with, do not ask for accommodation! Thus, even during the time the system of the monastery is developed wherein monks and nuns have a long-term residency, the aspect of a wandering life of Indian monks and nuns still prevails because the monastery at this time serves as the place for monks from the four quarters to reside. The main point that this dissertation is making here is that during the time that Indian monasteries entered the period of development, there is strong evidence showing that young monks did not obey the rule which states that they cannot travel to distant places without the supporting monastics. Therefore, it is fair to claim that even during the period that the Indian monastery was developed, the relationship between the master and the disciple is not strong. What is more, there are imperfect monks regarding moral conduct during the early medieval period in India—the period when the systems of the Indian monasteries developed and the monasteries became more of a fixed abode for monks. There are monks who make mistakes and there are monks who are imperfect in their moral conduct. Thus, the monastics are described in a more or less realistic way in the Indian *Pāli Vinaya* during the ancient (5<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century BCE) and early Indian medieval (4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE) period.

In short, from what is analyzed here, there are monks who make mistakes by not obtaining permission from their master before setting out on tour during both the first (5<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century BCE) and the second phase (4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE) in the development of Indian monasticism. The reason for these mistakes was the weak connection and weak relationship between the disciple and the master during the emergence of Buddhism in India when Buddhist monasticism entered its first phase of development. Not only are the connection and relationship weak during the emergence of Buddhism in India, when Indian Buddhist monasticism develops and the monasteries become more of a fixed abode where monks reside throughout the year, the connection and relationship between masters and disciples were still set loose on the reasoning that there are still monks who make mistakes by not obtaining the permission from the masters before setting out on tour.

On the other hand, the development of Buddhist monasteries in early medieval China, i.e. 4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE, supported a strong tie in the relationship and connection between masters. At first, there was no specific religious place designated for Buddhist monks. When foreign monks first come to China to propagate Buddhism, they just stayed in government offices. Regarding this, in his book, *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia*, James A. Benn traces the origin of the Chinese monasteries as follows:

... si 寺 originally designated the name of a government office (si 司). When monks coming from the West arrived [in China] they temporarily resided within government offices. In order to not forget their original connection to a government office, when they moved to separate institutions they

continued to use the term *si* 寺 [to refer to their new residence]. This is the origin of the name used for Buddhist monasteries (*sengsi* 僧寺).<sup>302</sup>

Thus, according to James A. Benn, Chinese Buddhist monasticism has its origin in the government office. Isabelle Charleux and Vincent Goossaert confirm the idea of James A. Benn regarding the origin of Chinese Buddhist monasteries by stating that Chinese Buddhist monasteries at their first phase is no more than an architecture and organization of the bureaucratic office. This is why Chinese Buddhist monasteries have their names as *si* 寺 or *yuan* 院 (official hall).<sup>303</sup> This is somewhat different from the monasteries in India, because they are called either *āvāsa* (the dwelling places made by monastics themselves) or *ārāma* (the monastery donated by the lay people) which could be a garden, grove, park, or just a simple enclosed site with some permanent buildings.<sup>304</sup>

The Chinese Buddhist monasteries were an outgrowth from the government office. In the course of time, although they were separated from the government office, the structure and administration were influenced by the royal court in one way or another. The main tenet of the early medieval royal court in China was that ministers and other people have to obey the King or Emperor; even if the King asks his ministers to kill themselves, the ministers have to obey. Otherwise, the ministers would commit the serious offense of being unfaithful 君教臣死,臣不死不忠<sup>305</sup> or 君叫臣死,不死不忠.<sup>306</sup> Thus, under the influence of the administration of the royal

---

<sup>302</sup> T. no. 2126, 54: 236c19–22. *Sengshi lue* 僧史略.

<sup>303</sup> Charleux, "The Physical Buddhist Monastery in China," 309.

<sup>304</sup> Pichard, "Indian Buddhist Monasteries," 20.

<sup>305</sup> Zhai 翟, *Zhongguo Gu Dai Xiao Shuo Su Yu Da Ci Dian* 中国古代小说俗语大词典, 551.

<sup>306</sup> Luo 罗, *Zhongguo Lun Li Xue Bai Ke Quan Shu* 中国伦理学百科全书, 96.

court to the Chinese monasteries in which the power of the King was far more superior to those of the ministers, the power of the Buddhist master was also emphasized so that it is difficult to accept the incident that the disciples in a monastery could travel to a distant part without obtaining permission from the master.

Not only were the Chinese monasteries influenced by the Chinese royal court regarding its organization and administration, other Chinese aspects also placed a great impact on it. It is Benn who states that by the time the term “monastery 寺” is in use, the practice of geomancy (*fengshui* 風水) is already prevalent in China. Again, the erection of Chinese Buddhist monasteries was strongly influenced by this practice; otherwise, it is believed that the monasteries were facing failure. Evidence shows that a monastery built by a group of monks in Zhongnan Shan without applying the principle of *fengshui* failed. “To the North it [the monastery] faces the White Tiger and the Evening Star. There is no mountain behind it to lean on. It does not seem to me a good place.”<sup>307</sup> With the application of geomancy (*fengshui*) and the influence from administration of the Royal Court, the development of monastery in early medieval China was not just an attempt at satisfying the requirement of being “neither too near nor too far” as in India. “The location of a monastery [was] thought to have a direct connection not only to individual practices, but also to the overall success or failure of the monastery.”<sup>308</sup> Since the Chinese have much concern over the success and failure of a monastery through the practice of geomancy

---

<sup>307</sup> Benn, *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice*, 43.

<sup>308</sup> *Ibid.*, 49.

(*fengshui*) and since it was an outgrowth of the government offices as practiced by the Royal Court, the administration and organization of the monastery was developed in medieval China such that it was greatly influenced by the Chinese practice of geomancy (*fengshui*) and more or less copied the mode of administration of the Royal Court. This idea is supported by Lien-sheng Yang. In his article, "Buddhist Monasteries and Four Money-Raising Institutions in Chinese History," Yang states that during the fifth century CE onward, there were at least four types of money-raising institutions in the history of Chinese monasteries: pawnshop, the mutual financing association, the auction sale, and the sale of lottery tickets.<sup>309</sup> This evidence shows that the administration and organization of the Chinese monastery in China was well developed even much earlier than the fifth century CE. Besides the religious duties, monks were also in charge of many other non-regular religious duties. The main reason for performing these non-religious duties was for a better monastery. These non-religious duties generated the much-needed supplemental financial support for the monastery. Moreover, the more duties the monks were involved in, the better the administration and organization in the monastery could be. More importantly, this evidence also shows that Chinese Buddhist monastics during the fourth and the fifth century CE did not lead a wandering life, but led a fixed-abode life all the time within their monastery center.

By the time Buddhism was introduced into China, the hierarchy and the relationship between student and teacher were of high importance to the Chinese people. As pointed out by William F. Pinar, the authority of the teachers was always

---

<sup>309</sup> Yang, "Buddhist Monasteries and Four Money-Raising Institutions in Chinese History," 174.

overemphasized while suppression was applied to students. This hierarchy seemed to put a great influence on the relationship between teacher and disciple in Early Chinese Buddhism. Many hierarchical matching points in this relationship are found. For instance, in China, students cannot address their teachers directly, students should refrain from drinking before their teachers, and students should demonstrate their commitment to learn with their teachers.<sup>310</sup> All these rules are quite similar to those in Buddhism. For example, in the *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註, it is said that a novice (*sāmaṇera*) may not call the name of his teacher and elder 不得喚大沙門字. When serving food, a *sāmaṇera* should offer by his two hands and when his teacher finishes eating, the *sāmaṇera* should clean up; 持師飲食, 皆當兩手捧。食畢斂器, 當徐徐. A disciple should choose for himself a great teacher, and he should dedicate himself in learning with that teacher and also he should not depart from the teacher too early 凡弟子當擇明師, 久久親近, 不得離師太早.<sup>311</sup> Thus, by the influence of the Chinese indigenous religions, the mutual duties between disciples and masters were more emphasized such that the master is the center and is controlling all activities and demanding, directly or even indirectly, as governed by the monastic codes of conduct, all disciples to obey to his every command. Students cannot make a

---

<sup>310</sup> Bell, *China's New Confucianism*, 48.

<sup>311</sup> X. no. 1118, 106: 303a3–349a6 (Hongzan, *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註卷下).



decision on their own, for, they must obey and listen to their teacher without preconditions.<sup>312</sup>

Moreover, the system of monasteries, together with the impact of the Chinese local view during the 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> century CE, placed a great influence on the hierarchy and relationship between disciples and masters. This idea again supports the condition that a disciple who traveled to a distant place without seeking permission from the master was unusual in China and was not a proper practice by the disciple. As a result, if a disciple traveled to a distant place without seeking permission from the master, he/she would be criticized and looked down on by people of society in China. Therefore, the incident where the disciples depart for a distant place without obtaining the permission from their masters could have not happened in China. If it did happen, it would have resulted in a bad image of the Buddhist monks in the eyes of the Chinese people. It would make the Buddhist monastics substandard according to Chinese culture. Therefore, this negative action of the Buddhist young monks in which they travel to distant places without seeking permission from their masters is probably deleted or edited out in the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

This research project has already shown that the relationship between masters and disciples was weak in the Indian Vinayas starting from its emergence time to the early medieval period of Buddhism pertaining to the departing of disciples to distant places without permission. The representatives for the Indian Vinayas during these periods are the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶. Gregory Schopen, in his book, *Buddhist Monks and Business*

---

<sup>312</sup> Wankel et al., *Increasing Student Engagement and Retention Using Immersive Interfaces*, 181; Cf. Wang, *The Confucian Mind*, 43.

*Matters*, claims that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*<sup>313</sup> is the primary source for the study of Indian monastics and monasticism during the early medieval period, because during this period the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* was widely used in India.<sup>314</sup> This dissertation has proved that during the emergence of Buddhism in India, there were young monks who made mistakes, because they failed to observe their obligation towards their masters by traveling to distant places without seeking permission from their masters. Even later in time—c. 4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE—when the administration and organization of the Indian Buddhist monasteries developed, there were still many young monks who did not obey the common rule that they cannot travel without the supporting monks (preceptors). This is why almost all monasteries in India during this time repeatedly made the notice visible for incoming monks that young monks travelling without preceptors cannot stay in the monastery for even one night.<sup>315</sup> Thus, even by the time monasteries in India entered the period of development, there were still monks who made mistakes by not obtaining the permission from their masters before going to distant places. This shows that the connection between masters and disciples was not a strong tie during the emergence of Buddhism in India (c. 5<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century BCE). Similarly, during the time Buddhism is transmitted into China (c. 1<sup>st</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century CE), this connection is also set loose in India. However, the connection between masters and disciples is a close and dependent relationship in the *Four-Part Vinaya* in China. Consequently, the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* could not have been influenced by the

---

<sup>313</sup> The version of Vinaya that Schopen uses is the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.

<sup>314</sup> Schopen, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 2.

<sup>315</sup> *Ibid.*, 8–9.

Indian Vinayas, which is true to the extent that the example cited above of monks in the 5<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century BCE as well as during the 4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE, who made mistakes by not seeking for permission before going to a far place.

Research also shows that not only is the master and disciple connection weak in the *Pāli Vinaya*, it is set loose in the Tibetan Vinaya. The Tibetan Vinaya, in fact, is a translation of the Indian *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. Of course, there is also the Chinese translation version of the Indian *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. However, it is said that the Chinese version of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* is “mediocre and incomplete.”<sup>316</sup> Research shows that there is no chapter on the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha 布薩) in the Chinese *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶.<sup>317</sup> The much more complete and accurate form of the Indian *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* is preserved in the Tibetan version.<sup>318</sup>

The story of young monks and nuns who made mistakes by not obtaining permission from their teachers is also found in the Tibetan Vinaya where the relationship between the masters and disciples is stressed. Besides the teaching and learning relationship, the caregiving function between the masters and disciples was important. Thus, the relationship was strong and could not be separated. This relationship is called “*gnas bcas pa*,” “entering into dependence” which every monk and nun must have.<sup>319</sup> More importantly, according to the Tibetan Vinaya, “monks are forbidden to travel without a monk [i.e. master] in regard to whom they have

---

<sup>316</sup> Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 170; Cf. Prebish, *A Survey of Vinaya Literature*, 84.

<sup>317</sup> T. no. 1442, 23: 627a1–905a7.

<sup>318</sup> Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 170; Cf. Prebish, *A Survey of Vinaya Literature*, 84.

<sup>319</sup> Schopen, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 8–9.

entered into dependence.”<sup>320</sup> Despite this fact, many young monks made mistakes by not asking permission or traveling without their masters when they traveled to distant places. This is why these young monks are denied the right of having accommodations in the monasteries even for a single night.<sup>321</sup> In regard to traveling to far places, the Buddha teaches that monks, specifically the young ones, must depend on their master in such a way that if they depart from the master to go far away, they have to seek permission from their masters first or they must go together with their masters. This story shows that despite the fact that the Buddha set up the rule regarding traveling to far places, there are monks who break this rule as presented in the Tibetan Vinaya. Consequently, this annoys the administrators of the monasteries during that time. This annoyance prompted almost all monasteries to pass an “ordinance” to deny accommodation to the incoming monks who travel without the permission from their masters or travel by themselves.<sup>322</sup> Thus, in the Tibetan Vinaya, there are monks who make mistakes by breaking the Vinaya that is set up by the Buddha, and there are monks who make mistakes by not obeying the “ordinance” of the monasteries. So, like the Indian Vinaya, monks in the Tibetan Vinaya are also portrayed realistically.

Because the Sanskrit version of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is lost, there is no method to adequately determine whether the rule on disciples traveling to distant places and its background story in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* is of Indian or Chinese origin. However, what is presented in the *Four-Part Vinaya* in Chinese

---

<sup>320</sup> Ibid., 9.

<sup>321</sup> Ibid.

<sup>322</sup> Ibid.

regarding the relationship between the master and the disciple is different from that in the other existing Chinese Vinayas, the Indian *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, and the Tibetan Vinaya. Instead of traveling to distant places without obtaining permission from the master as presented in the other existing Chinese Vinayas, including the Indian *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, and the Tibetan Vinaya,<sup>323</sup> in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, the disciple respectfully seeks permission from the master before departing to distant places.<sup>324</sup> The Chinese version of this story shows that the action of asking for permission by the disciple strictly conforms to the Chinese culture in which the master/teacher is the center of the disciple's world. Thus, carefully seeking permission by the disciples from the masters before traveling to distant places as stated in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* suggests that the monastics in this Vinaya are portrayed in an idealistic way in which monks obey the rule, fully observe the hierarchy in the teacher and disciple relationship, and do not break the social ethical conduct.

To sum things up, it is true that the Indian monasticism during its early phase of development is so simple that sometimes it is not regarded as a monastery. Monks and nuns during this period lead a wandering life. Thus, living in this environment the relationship between the master and disciple could not have been strong in the Saṅgha. As a result, although the disciple has to perform certain duties and obligations for the master, many disciples in the Indian *Pāli Vinaya* have failed to perform these duties and obligations. This is why in the *Pāli Vinaya*, there are

---

<sup>323</sup> The evidence that monks/nuns travelling without their preceptors were denied the right to accommodation is from the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.

<sup>324</sup> T. no. 1428, 22:825b14–c14.

disciples who travel to distant places without asking permission from their master. This is not a proper practice, and these disciples commit the offence of wrong-doing. And these improper actions are found in the *Pāli Vinaya*. Thus, during the first phase of the development of Indian monasticism (5<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century BCE), the monastics are described as is in the *Pāli Vinaya* in which they are human beings and human beings make mistakes.

In a like manner, although the system of the Indian monastery is well organized during its second phase of development (4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE) this is the time when they become fixed abodes where monks reside throughout the year. However, most of the Indian monasteries during this period serve as places for monks and nuns from the four quarters to reside. Thus, despite the fact that the monastery becomes a fixed abode, monks in general still prefer the wandering way of life and so traveling to distant places by monastics still prevails. Moreover, monks, including masters and disciples, during this time serve the monastery rules and they are all busying themselves with the monastery duties. The duties of the disciples towards the master are generally taken over by the laity and servants, therefore the relationship between the master and disciple becomes even weaker than in the first phase of development (5<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century BCE) in India. This is why there are many monks who travel to distant places without their preceptor, do not obey the rule of the Indian monasteries during the second phase of the development of the Indian monasticism. Therefore, during the time Indian monasticism develops, there are imperfect monastics who do not follow the common rule of the Saṅgha. Consequently, during the 4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE in India and to the extent of traveling to

distant places by the disciples without seeking permission from their masters, the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya* are portrayed realistically.

Not only does this dissertation prove that the monastics are portrayed realistically from the emergence of Buddhism in India at least until the 4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE—the time when Buddhism is transmitted to China—regarding the story on travelling to the distant places, but also in the Tibetan translation of the Indian *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, the young monks in the Tibetan Vinaya make the same mistakes as in the *Pāli Vinaya* by not obtaining the permission from their masters before they travel to distant places. Like the *Pāli Vinaya*, the translated version of the Tibetan Vinaya also shows that there are imperfect monastics who do not follow the common rule of the Saṅgha. Thus, the monastics in the Tibetan Vinaya are also described realistically.

In contrast, Chinese monasticism, during the emergence of Buddhism in China, is influenced significantly by the Chinese practice of geomancy (*fengshui* 風水), and the organization and administration of the Chinese royal court. In addition, the Chinese idea of “teacher-center” also has an impact on the relationship between master and disciple in the Chinese Buddhist monastery in which the master controls and guards every action of the disciple. Therefore, it is unlikely to be the case that a disciple in a Chinese Buddhist monastery can travel to distant places without asking for permission from the master. Thus, the portion of “seeking permission before traveling to distant places” by the disciples as described in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* is presented only in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, and it is not found in either the Indian Vinaya or the Tibetan Vinaya. This modification of the story behind

the rule regarding traveling to the far places in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* is the result of a difference in context in Indian and Chinese monasticism. Besides, it is heavily influenced by Chinese culture and the Chinese social ethical conduct on the idea of “teacher-center.” By these influences and through the comparison of the relationship between master and disciple in the section of “Inexperienced Monks” in the Indian *Pāli Vinaya* and the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, it is now safe to conclude that the monastics are portrayed realistically in the *Pāli Vinaya* while they are described in a more idealized way in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In addition, the cultural and social factors of India and China are possible causes that lead to the difference in the way that the monastics are described in these two Vinayas. The rule remains the same in both Vinayas. However, it is a natural portrayal for monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya* while the image of them is reconstructed to be more intrinsically flawless in the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

#### **4.3. The Difference in Emergent Context**

Section 4.2 above studies the difference between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* under the context of the system of monasteries during the emergence of Buddhism in both India and China. By so doing, it reveals that there is a natural portrayal of the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya* while there is a ritualized performance of the monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In this section, this dissertation continues to explore the difference through the Buddhist emergent context in general in both the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*.



As explained in Chapter II, Historical Background, the *Four-Part Vinaya* was brought to China in its Sanskrit original form and translated into Chinese during the fifth century CE.<sup>325</sup> During this period, Buddhism was developing in China. Buddhist monastics are highly respected by people. This dissertation has shown in section 4.2 that because of the cultural distinction, the way the stories are narrated is different in the chapters of the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha), the Rains Retreat (Vassāvāsa), and the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pavāraṇā) in the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. One way in which the stories are narrated differently is that respectful words are often used to describe the Buddhist monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In other words, rude or impolite words are often modified or taken out of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. However, the situation is different in the *Pāli Vinaya*. There are many religious sects during the emergence of Buddhism in India and in order to praise themselves, people of these religious sects often criticize the Buddhist monastics. As a result, the common people often use rude words to criticize Buddhist monastics. Thus, the way Buddhist monastics are described in the *Pāli Vinaya* is different than in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In this section, this dissertation examines these differences. More importantly, this dissertation finds that while words of disrespect are used to describe the Buddhist monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya*, they are possibly modified or deleted in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Through these modifications, the Buddhist monastics appear to have good, or even complete, moral conduct in the *Four-Part Vinaya* while disrespectful and imperfect behavior in the monastics is detected in the *Pāli Vinaya*. In other words, the Buddhist monastics are

---

<sup>325</sup> Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, 5.

portrayed realistically in the *Pāli Vinaya*. However, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, they are described in a more idealized way—all the rude words are edited out.

The rude words used in describing Buddhist monastics become quite common not only in the Vinaya itself but also in the whole Buddhist Tripiṭaka. For example, in the *Ambaṭṭha Suttanta*, Brahmin Ambaṭṭha uses disrespectful words to converse with the Buddha, such as rough, breed, rude, touchy, violent, menial, and having no respect.<sup>326</sup> In the Chinese counterpart of this sutra, the manner of the dialogue between Ambattha and the Buddha is similar, i.e. fierce words are used by Ambaṭṭha to converse with the Buddha. At first, Ambaṭṭha looks down at the Buddha and refers to the Buddha as inferior because the Buddha is a *kṣatriya* 刹帝利 while Ambaṭṭha is a Brahmin. So, during the conversation, when the Buddha sits Ambaṭṭha stands, and when the Buddha stands he sits.<sup>327</sup> What is more, Ambaṭṭha even quarrels with the Buddha: “The Buddha tells Ambaṭṭha: ‘Is that the manner that you [Ambattha] perform when you discuss with your elder Brahmins?’ . . . This Sākya is rough and violent.”<sup>328</sup>

Although rude words are found in both the Sutta Piṭaka of the Pāli Canon, as well as the Chinese Tripiṭaka, there is a difference in the manner in which the story is narrated. This dissertation finds that the fierce attack and slander on the Sakyans and the members of the Saṅgha, including the Buddha himself, are found in the *Ambaṭṭha Sutta* of the Pāli Canon. However, the level of this fierce attack and slander of Ambaṭṭha is reduced in the Chinese Āgama. In the *Ambaṭṭha Sutta* of the *Dīgha*

---

<sup>326</sup> *DN I – Ambattha Suttanta* 3, 112–113.

<sup>327</sup> T. no. 1, 1: 82b18–28.

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.*

*Nikāya* of the Pāli Canon, Ambaṭṭha insults the Sakyans, including the Buddha, and charges them to be menial. “Rough is this Sākya breed of yours, Gotama, and rude; touchy is this Sākya breed of yours and violent. Menials, mere menials, they neither venerate, nor value, nor esteem, nor give gifts to, nor pay honour to Brahmans. That, Gotama, is neither fitting, nor is it seemly!”<sup>329</sup> However, in the Chinese version of the *Ambaṭṭha Sutta*, which is *Amozhou Jing* 阿摩晝經, these fierce words are reduced to merely jealousy and having no respect 此釋種子好懷嫉惡，無有義法。<sup>330</sup> Even more so, in the Chinese *Ambaṭṭha Sutra*, when Ambaṭṭha talks about his view towards the Sakyans when he has direct contact with them, again, he only says that the Sakyans are the people who do not have respect for the Brahmin (昔我一時為師少緣，在釋迦維羅越國。時，有眾多諸釋種子，以少因緣集在講堂，遙見我來，輕慢戲弄，不順儀法，不相敬待)。<sup>331</sup> Nevertheless, in the Pāli sutta counterpart, many rude words are used to explicitly portray the Sakyans, such as the Sakyans are merely menials, and they do not know the common rule that they have to respect and venerate the Brahmin. Even these Sakyans fail to perform their duty towards the Brahmin by not offering a seat or giving gifts.<sup>332</sup>

Rude and rough words are often used to describe the Buddhist monastics, the relatives of the Buddha, and even the Buddha himself in the Pāli suttas.

Therefore, the monastics are, again, portrayed realistically in the Pāli Sutta Piṭaka while their image possibly is reconstructed in the Chinese Sutta Piṭaka.

---

<sup>329</sup> *DN I – Ambattha Suttanta 3*, 112–113.

<sup>330</sup> T. no. 1, 1: 82b26–28.

<sup>331</sup> T. no. 1, 1: 82b29–c2.

<sup>332</sup> *DN I – Ambattha Suttanta 3*, 113.

Moreover, this dissertation also finds that although there is the Sutra Piṭaka in the Tibetan Tripiṭaka, many of these sutras are just the translation from the Chinese versions.<sup>333</sup> This is why when doing research on the *Dīrgha Āgama*, the Dharma Drum Institution makes known to us that up to this present time (2015), there are three different versions of the *Dīrgha Āgama* that are available for comparative research. They are the *Dīgha Nikāya* of the Pāli Canon, the fragment manuscripts of the *Dīrgha Āgama* in Sanskrit, and the *Dīrgha Āgama* 長阿含經 in the Chinese translation.<sup>334</sup> However, it is unfortunate that the extant Sanskrit version of the *Ambaṭṭha Sūtra* is not available. So, this dissertation cannot determine whether the reducing of rude and rough words in the Chinese *Dīrgha Āgama* is of Indian or Chinese origin. However, this dissertation finds that the Chinese *Dīrgha Āgama* is also translated around the same time as the *Four-Part Vinaya* and by the same translators, i.e. Buddhayaśas 佛陀耶舍 and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念. This dissertation has provided plenty of evidence showing that the modification from the bad behavior to the neutral or even the positive conduct is likely to have happened in China when the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is translated into the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Thus, under this philological context, the reducing of rude words in the *Ambaṭṭha Sūtra* of the *Dīrgha Āgama* is likely to have happened in China when the *Ambaṭṭha Sūtra* was translated into the Chinese *Amozhou jing* 阿摩晝經. Thus, to the extent of the *Ambaṭṭha Sūtra*, it is a natural portrayal of the monastics in the Pāli Vinaya while it is more of a ritualized performance of them in the *Four-Part Vinaya* counterpart.

<sup>333</sup> Keown and Prebish, *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, 763.

<sup>334</sup> Dhammadinnā, *Research on the Dīrgha-Āgama (Taisho 125)*, ix.

In the following, this dissertation examines the difference regarding the rude words in describing the Buddhist monastics through the comparison of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The evidence for rude words in describing the Buddhist monastics is found in the section of “Preaching Dhamma on the Uposatha Day.” In this section, we are told that having been allowed by the Buddha to gather together on the Uposatha day, monks and nuns just sat in silence and no Dhamma was taught by them. This action did not satisfy the lay people. The matter is reported to the Buddha, so the Buddha certified monks and nuns to speak Dhamma on the Uposatha day. This portion of the story on the preaching of Dhamma on the Uposatha day is similar in both the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. However, the way in which the story behind this rule is narrated is different in these two Vinayas.

In the *Pāli Vinaya*, there is fierce criticism by the lay people towards monks when they gather together and do not preach the Dhamma:

Those people came up to hear *dhamma*. They looked down upon, criticized, spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, having assembled together on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month, sit in silence, like dumb pigs?”<sup>335</sup>

Te manussā upasaṅkamanti dhammasavanāya. Te ujjhāyanti, khīyanti, vipācenti: “kathaṃ hi nāma samaṇā sakyaputtiyā cātuddasā paṭṭarase aṭṭhamiyā ca pakkhassa santipativā tuṅhī nisīdissanti seyyathāpi mūgasūkarā?”<sup>336</sup>

According to the *PTSPED*, the phrase “ujjhāyanti, khīyanti, vipācenti” generally expresses great annoyance,<sup>337</sup> and the word “mūgasūkarā” is a compound

---

<sup>335</sup> *Vin. IV*, 131.

<sup>336</sup> *VP I*, 102.

<sup>337</sup> *PTSEPD*, 128.

of the root “*mūga*” (dumb)<sup>338</sup> and “*sūkara*” (pig),<sup>339</sup> which together means a dumb pig. These words insinuate that those monks are fat in body and useless. Thus, in the *Pāli Vinaya*, the silence of monks makes lay people dislike and disrespect them and the expectation of the people turns out to be a great disappointment. As a result, lay people criticized the monks with furious words. At the time of the Buddha, there are many religions, and almost all of them try to compete with each other to gain adherents. So, people of one sect often try to find the weakness of the others to attack them in order to increase their reputation. Thus, it seems to be normal for the people of the other sects to use fierce words to criticize Buddhist monks. Accordingly, it is reasonable for people of the other non-Buddhist sects to criticize and abuse Buddhist monks and refer to them as “dumb pigs” when monks and nuns gather together on Uposatha day and just keep silent. As a local religion which emerges in India, these furious words are common in describing the Buddhist monks. So, it is normal for these words to appear in the *Pāli Vinaya*. Consequently, in the story on preaching the Dhamma on Uposatha day, the monastics are portrayed realistically in the *Pāli Vinaya* in which they are human beings and human beings are not always perfect.

By contrast, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, monks also gathered together on Uposatha day, and they also sat in silence. The lay people came and expressed their wish to hear the Dhamma, but these monks dared not speak because at that time preaching the Dhamma on Uposatha day still had not been approved by the Buddha

---

<sup>338</sup> Ibid., 539.

<sup>339</sup> Ibid., 721.

yet. What is note worthy here is that there is almost no criticism by the lay people.

According to the *Four-Part Vinaya*:

After all of the monastics had gathered, they all sat in silence. The people told the monks that they wished to hear the Dhamma. But the monks dared not preach. Those monks reported the matter to the Lord, and the Buddha allowed them to preach the Dhamma. Although it is allowed by the Buddha to preach the Dhamma, those monks did not know which Dhamma they should preach. The Buddha says that from now on they may preach the sūtra.

時諸比丘來集已。各各默然而坐。諸長者白諸比丘言。我等欲聞說法。諸比丘不敢說。以此事白佛。佛言。聽汝等與說法。既聽已。不知當說何法。佛言。自今已去。聽說契經。<sup>340</sup>

Thus, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, not only are the monks not looked down upon or criticized by the lay people, but also they display moral conduct by fully observing and respecting the words of the Buddha. The reason that monks do not speak the dharma is not because they do not know how to preach and are useless like “dumb pigs,” but because the Buddha has not yet permitted them to do so. Unlike the *Pāli Vinaya*, lay people in the *Four-Part Vinaya* seem to understand the issue that preaching the Dharma on Uposatha day has not been permitted by the Buddha yet, so no Dharma talk given by monks is understandable. Thus, lay people not only do not criticize monks, but also they respect the decision of the monastics. Therefore, the moral conduct of the monastics is even praised by acknowledging that monks in the *Four-Part Vinaya* simply do not do what has not been permitted by the Buddha.

This dissertation finds that there is no conclusive evidence as to whether the origin of the story behind the rule on preaching Dhamma on Uposatha day is of Indian or Chinese origin. However, through strong philological analysis, there are

---

<sup>340</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 817a3-7.

indications suggesting that the story behind the rule on preaching Dhamma on Uposatha day is likely to have been modified in China. Research shows that there is no chapter on the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha 布薩) in the Chinese *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶.<sup>341</sup> Therefore, there is no section on preaching the Dharma on Uposatha day in this Vinaya. Consequently, there is no background story to this section. There is a chapter on the Biweekly Precept Ceremony in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律<sup>342</sup> and the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* (*Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律).<sup>343</sup> However, there is no section on preaching the Dharma on Uposatha day in both the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* and the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* (*Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya*). As a result, there is also no story behind the rule on preaching the Dharma in these two Vinayas as well.

Research also shows that in the *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律), there is a story behind the rule on preaching the Dharma on Uposatha day and this story is similar to the *Four-Part Vinaya*, that is, monks and nuns only preach the Dharma on Uposatha day when the Buddha allows them to do so.<sup>344</sup> This indication suggests there are at least two Vinayas—the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* (translated from the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*) and *Five-Part Vinaya* (translated from the Indian *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*)—that have the same story in which it is made known to us that monks dare not speak the Dharma on Uposatha day because the Buddha has not yet permitted them to do so. Since there are two similar stories in the two

---

<sup>341</sup> T. no. 1442, 23: 627a1–905a7.

<sup>342</sup> T. no. 1425, 22: 446c7–450c2.

<sup>343</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 158a1–165a4.

<sup>344</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 121b22–26.



Chinese Vinayas, and more importantly, both of which are translated from two different Indian sources, it suggests that the story behind the rule on preaching the Dharma on Uposatha day is of Indian origin. At first glance, this suggests that the story on preaching the Dhamma on Uposatha day is translated as is from Indian to Chinese.

However, under close examination, it is unlikely to be the case that the story behind the rule on preaching the Dharma on Uposatha day is actually of an Indian origin. Although the same story on preaching the Dharma on Uposatha day is found in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* and *Five-Part Vinaya*, some parts of the story on the section of preaching the Dharma on Uposatha day in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are still likely to have been modified in China when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* and the Indian *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Five-Part Vinaya* 五分律. The reason is because the Tibetan Vinaya has the same story as the *Pāli Vinaya*. In her book, *Sisters in Solitude: Two Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Ethics for Women*, when comparing and analyzing the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* and the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa Sūtras*, Karma Lekshe Tsomo makes known to us that due to sitting in silence on Uposatha day, Buddhist monks experienced many sufferings, including criticism from lay people, as well as from the people of the other non-Buddhist sects.<sup>345</sup> Thus, similar to the Indian *Pāli Vinaya*, in the Tibetan Vinaya, monks also suffered from insults when they did not preach the Dharma on Uposatha day.

---

<sup>345</sup> Keown and Prebish, *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, 763.

However, in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, as already pointed out, not only do monks not suffer the criticism from the lay people but also their moral conduct is praised by the acknowledgement of not going beyond the permission of the Buddha on Uposatha day. The monks do not preach the Dhamma because the Buddha has not permitted them to do so. Since there is no extant Sanskrit version of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, we will never know for sure how and why there is no part in the story in which the monastics are described as having to endure fierce words in the section on preaching the Dharma on Uposatha day in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*.

However, as far as this dissertation can rationalize, although the fierce words used against the monastics in the section on preaching the Dhamma on Uposatha day are found not only in the Chinese *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, but also in the Chinese *Five-Part Vinaya*, still this story is more likely to have been modified when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. The reason is simply that these fierce words are found in both the Indian *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Dul-ba* (the Tibetan Vinaya). To sum up the comparison, this dissertation finds that there is criticism of monks in the Vinayas in Tibet and India. However, there is either no story, or there are stories but with no criticism in the Vinayas in Chinese. Somehow, somewhere, and perhaps done out of respect for the monastics, things may have been changed when the Vinaya gets to China. Thus, in regard to the story on preaching the Dharma on Uposatha day, monastics are described idealistically in the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

#### 4.4. Chapter Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter IV has revealed the rhetorical strategy deployed in the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* by acknowledging the cultural differences found in these two Vinayas. Ancient and medieval China and India were both rich in culture. Therefore, when the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* were composed, the Indian and Chinese cultural elements may have blended into these texts. This chapter has pointed out that there are at least three cultural differences in comparing the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. The first cultural difference between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* has much to do with the different views on the concept of “silence” between the Indian people and Chinese people. Although “silence” has subtle meanings in both the Indian and Chinese culture, there is a distinct difference in the act of keeping “silence” in these two cultures. Besides the ultimate bliss, the Indian “silence” also signifies the harmony and mutual respect with each other during the daily conversation. Thus, in the *Pāli Vinaya*, during the process of coming to a consensus (formal act 羯磨), when being asked by the reciting preceptor, 羯磨師, members of the Saṅgha can express their approval by remaining “silent.” This silence is recognized by the Indian people, and it does not signify a sense of carelessness of the speaker or the listener during a conversation. Thus, by silence in response to a question from the reciting preceptor, Indian monks and nuns are not blamed for any lack of morality. This is natural in regards to the social ethical conduct in India. Therefore, silence is not an error in the Indian culture. And silence during the consensus of the Saṅgha is just a natural portrayal of the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya* regarding their moral conduct.

Conversely, although the Chinese also recognize the sublime aspect of silence used in religions as well as the importance of “silence” in daily life—for they believe that “speech is silver; silence is gold 万言万中不如一默.”<sup>346</sup> However, this silence in the Chinese culture is not a complete silence as in the Indian culture. But rather, this silence in the Chinese culture indicates a momentary thoughtfulness, quick pause for thinking, temporary suspension of answering in order to have more time to think twice before giving an answer. The point is that for the Chinese during a conversation silence is good, but it must be accompanied by an answer. Otherwise, “silence” as a one-way discourse during a conversation, which should be in flux, shows the impoliteness and disrespect of the listener. This disrespect breaks the harmony between people during a conversation, and thus it does not go along with the Chinese culture. Therefore, it is regarded as a non-ethical action in China.

In the Indian consensus act of the Saṅgha 僧伽羯磨, as mentioned above, when being asked by the reciting preceptor, all members of the Saṅgha remain silent in order to express approval for the consensus. However, this silence is unusual according to the Chinese culture. The Chinese, specifically Daoxuan 道宣, recommends that members of the Saṅgha should respond “approval” (*cheng* 成) to the question from the reciting preceptor 羯磨師 during the consensus (the formal act of the Saṅgha). This chapter has explained that the recommendation by Daoxuan indeed is merely his thought and it is not a proper practice according to Indian Buddhism because whatever members of the Saṅgha speak out, it denotes the failure of the formal act of the Saṅgha. The reason is simply because speaking out

---

<sup>346</sup> Rohsenow, *ABC Dictionary of Chinese Proverbs (Yanyu)*, 154.

means to suspend the consensus 遮羯磨. The consensus is successful only when all the members of the Saṅgha remain silent. However, the practice suggested by Daoxuan is still popular in China. The reason is because in China not responding to a question during a conversation indicates carelessness and impoliteness of the listener. Monks and nuns are people who lead a moral life and guide people to have a moral life, thus they should not be careless or impolite during a conversation. So, by adding the answer “approval” (*cheng* 成) to the question of the reciting preceptor, the Chinese monks and nuns (specifically Daoxuan) make the Indian practice of forming a consensus become more of a Chinese way. This allows them to claim that the Chinese monastics do not go against the common Chinese ethical conduct, even though there is a cultural gap between India and China regarding the act of remaining silent. More importantly, by adding the answer “approval” (*cheng* 成) to the question of the reciting preceptor, the image of monastics is reconstructed to be more Chinese in which it sets the Buddhist monastics as a standard of the finest example of moral conduct for all to follow.

Another aspect of the Chinese culture that makes the *Four-Part Vinaya* different from the *Pāli Vinaya* lies in the relationship and hierarchy between master and disciple under the context of the development of the monastery in India and China. Although the relationship and hierarchy between disciple and master are both stressed in India and China, with the different angles in the development of the administration and organization of the Indian and Chinese Buddhist monastery, the relationship between master and disciple is tightened together in China while it is set loose in the Indian context.

In India, it shows that during the first phase of its development, the monasticism in India is simple, so simple in fact that it is even regarded as not a monastery. It simply fits the requirements that it is “neither too far from a village, nor too near.” The main reason for this is because the Buddha wants monks and nuns to possess as little material as possible so that they can live a wandering life and dedicate their whole time to the practice. This wandering lifestyle creates separation between master and disciple and unconditionally results in weakening the relationship between the master and the disciple. Therefore, in the Indian Vinaya (the *Pāli Vinaya*), there are monks and nuns who travel to distant parts without seeking permission from their masters. This is not a proper practice of the disciples; however, it has happened in India during the early phase of the development of Indian monasticism. This means there were monks and nuns who were immoral in their conduct and they were recorded as is in the *Pāli Vinaya*. Consequently, monastics were portrayed realistically in the *Pāli Vinaya* during the 5<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century BCE, which is during the emergence of Buddhism in India.

A few centuries later, Indian monasticism shifts from poor construction to a well-developed organization wherein monks and nuns reside for a longer term. Still, the relationship between the master and the disciple was weak, because both the master and disciple busy themselves with their own monastery duties. Also, the duties of the disciples towards their masters were replaced by the laity and servants when they are permitted to dwell in the monastery. More importantly, there is evidence showing that there were monks and nuns who did not obey the common rule that if they travel to a distant place, they needed to travel with supporting

monks. Thus, even when the system of the monastery is developed in India during the early medieval time, there are monks and nuns who disobey the common rule of the Saṅgha. Thus, it again shows that monastics in the Indian Vinayanic system are described realistically as there are monks and nuns who make mistakes. As a result, it is a natural portrayal of the image of monastics during the 4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> century CE in the Indian Vinaya even when the system of monastery is better constructed and organized.

In contrast, under the Chinese culture of “teacher-centered” ideology, as well as the developed administration and organization of the monastery in early medieval China such that it is greatly influenced by the Chinese practice of geomancy (*fengshui* 風水) and more or less copied the mode of administration of the Royal Court, a disciple who traveled to distant places without obtaining the permission from the teacher caused chaos in the Chinese society. This was unacceptable by the people. Thus, this action of the disciple is regarded as going against the social ethical conduct by the Chinese people. The Buddhist monastics led a moral life, and above all, the Chinese Buddhist disciples must obey and accept their master as superior. As presented above, young monks and nuns in Indian Buddhism make mistakes, because they do not seek permission from their masters before traveling to distant places. In the like manner, monks and nuns in the Tibetan Vinaya, which is the translation of the Indian *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, also indicate the mistakes of young monks and nuns by showing that they do not seek the permission when they traveled to distant places or they traveled without their preceptors. However, young monks and nuns in the Chinese Vinaya (the *Four-Part*

*Vinaya*) carefully seek the permission from their masters before setting on tour. They only traveled when their master agreed. There is no mistake that is made by young monks and nuns in the Chinese *Vinaya*. Therefore, unlike the *Pāli Vinaya* and the Tibetan *Vinaya*, where monks and nuns are portrayed naturally regarding their moral conduct, the image of the monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya* is reconstructed wherein monks and nuns are described idealistically to have obtained complete morality.

It is no doubt that because of the distinctions in culture and society, that the Indian and Chinese Buddhist contexts are also different. At its first phase, although Buddhism is the new emergent religion in both India and China where existing thoughts are withheld, the contextual difference has changed the direction on the way the Buddhist texts are presented. Buddhism is born in India, thus it is undergoing many challenges to be stable and developed in India. It becomes normal for people to discuss or even look down at Buddhism when they come in contact with monastics who act in an improper manner. However, by encountering properly trained and disciplined monastics and learning deeper into the doctrine of the Buddha, people start to develop faith in Buddhism. They either join the monkhood life or become devout lay devotees. As for the furious words used against Buddhist monastics, they are just merely a fact and they are found only in the Indian *Pāli Vinaya* and the Tibetan *Vinaya*. The *Pāli Vinaya* describes the monastic moral conduct gradually and naturally, i.e. they are not perfect regarding the moral conduct at once; rather, through intensive practice they eventually attain the highest purification.



In the similar way, when Buddhism is introduced to China, it is also confronted with many threats that mostly come from Chinese indigenous thinking. To survive and advance in the new land, Buddhism has to proclaim its superiority to other local customs, even to the point of pronouncing possession of so-called miracle powers. Thus, any element suggestive of imperfection in Buddhism in general, and in Buddhist monastics in particular, is eliminated. For example, the section on the “Emergent Context in Buddhism,” while the furious words such as “dumb pig” are found in the Indian *Pāli Vinaya* and the Tibetan *Vinaya*, they are deleted and not found in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. This dissertation has concluded that this modification was more likely deleted when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. By deleting this criticism, the reputation of the Buddhist monastics is more secure in the eyes of the Chinese people and may serve as an advantage for Buddhism to take root in China. Therefore, during the emergent period of Buddhism in China, the image of Buddhist monastics may have been reconstructed in such a way that it shows monastics with full ethical conduct as they represent the finest example among the people in the society.

In short, while many practices are observed naturally in India without any blame of having no morality, they actually go against the social ethical conducts according to the Chinese cultures. Because of the Chinese cultural influences, these Indian practices observed by Indian monks and nuns as described in the Indian *Vinaya* may have been modified in the Chinese *Vinaya*, specifically the *Four-Part Vinaya*, to suit with the Chinese environment, so that these monks and nuns still

have morality despite the fact that there are cultural gaps between India and China. Therefore, due to the cultural differences between India and China, the image of the Buddhist monastics is also different in the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. While the monastics are portrayed realistically in the *Pāli Vinaya*, they are described idealistically in the *Four-Part Vinaya* counterpart.

**CHAPTER V:**  
**DIFFERENCES THROUGH SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES**

---

Since it is one of the biggest cradles of world civilizations, China is rich in its own cultures. No doubt that these cultures place a great impact on the *Four-Part Vinaya* when it was translated into Chinese. Through the comparison, there are at least three factors of the culture that lead to the differences between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In this chapter V, this dissertation continues to examine the difference between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* regarding the social aspects. They are: “The Neatness in the Appearance of Buddhism” and “The View That Monastics Are Superior to Lay People.” As a new religion emerging in a society that is rich in its local thoughts and religions, Buddhism more or less must be polished in its layout (appearance) so that it can attract people. And at the same time, its teaching also has to be modified to suit the culture of the new society that was China. These Indian and Chinese perspectives may separate and make the *Four-Part Vinaya* different from the *Pāli Vinaya* counterpart. In the following, this dissertation examines these two differences between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* regarding the Indian and Chinese social perspectives

## 5.1. The Textual Rearrangement Difference

In an article, "The Movement of Buddhist Texts from India to China and the Construction of the Chinese Buddhist Canon," Lewis Lancaster states that ancient Chinese people are not guided well by the Indian missionary monks, so they themselves must search for their own Buddhist canonic model. Their task is to obtain all Buddhist canonical texts from India. Thus, texts from different schools of Indian Buddhism are housed, named, and cataloged by the Chinese to form their own Tripiṭaka.<sup>347</sup> Therefore, the Chinese social features that may have an influence on the Chinese canonical texts in general and in the *Four-Part Vinaya* in particular are obtainable.

By the time the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, many Chinese local thoughts and religions are already well established. Therefore, in order to take root in China, Buddhism, besides its profound doctrines, must make its appearance neat enough to be attractive to the people. In the following, this research project argues that the structural reorganization of the *Four-Part Vinaya* serves as the first evidence to show that Buddhism is perfect in the way that it is a systematic thought. Thus, not only is the image of the Buddhist monastics idealistically portrayed as having fully obtained the Chinese common ethical conduct, but the Buddhist texts are also reconstructed and rearranged in a more systematic way so that it looks neater and better. In the following, this dissertation examines the structural arrangement of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

---

<sup>347</sup> Lancaster, "The Movement of Buddhist Texts from India to China and the Construction of the Chinese Buddhist Canon," 520–531.

Regarding the structural organization of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, specifically the chapters on the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha), the Retreat Opening Ceremony (Three Months Retreat or Vassāvāsa), and the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pavāraṇā), some other scholars already divided these chapters into sections; however, they are all random arrangements. For example, in his book, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, E. Frauwallner, while comparing the common sections of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters of the different existing Vinayas, merely does nothing more than label the sections of the Vinayas to identify what each section specifically talks about. However, many sections of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters are missing in his work. For example, there is no section on the “separation from the three robes” in the Uposatha chapter in his list.<sup>348</sup> Likewise, both the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* have a section on the instruction of the Buddha for the Retreat Closing Ceremony (Pavāraṇā) if there are only one, two, three, four, or five monks;<sup>349</sup> however, it is not found in the comparison by Frauwallner.<sup>350</sup>

Jayeeta Gangopadhyay takes a step further to break the Uposatha chapter into seven segments as she compares the Uposatha chapter of the different Vinayas in her book, *Uposatha Ceremony: The Earliest Tradition(s) and Later Developments (Mainly from Vinayic Traditions Preserved in Chinese)*. Yet, both these scholars, in regard to the arranging of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters, do

---

<sup>348</sup> Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, 78–82. This section is available in both the *Four-Part Vinaya* (T. no. 1428, 22: 819c23–820a25) and the *Pāli Vinaya* (*Vin. IV*, 142–143).

<sup>349</sup> *Vin. IV*, 214–216. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 837c17–838a7.

<sup>350</sup> Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginning of Buddhist Literature*, 84–88.

nothing more than a simple arrangement of the Uposatha chapter or just randomly group the sections of the chapter and label them. Gangopadhyay's book focuses only on the Uposatha chapter. Still, much information and other details of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* are missing. For instance, a section on the knowledge of the monastics on keeping track of the ceremony date and member number, which is found in the *Pāli Vinaya*<sup>351</sup> and the *Four-Part Vinaya*,<sup>352</sup> is not found in the book of Gangopadhyay.<sup>353</sup>

Moreover, the division of sections into groups of the Uposatha chapter by Gangopadhyay is not only incomplete but also, as will be mentioned shortly, far more different than the division of sections into groups in this dissertation. Gangopadhyay divides the Uposatha Observance into seven chapters: (1) Chapter I: The Introduction of the Uposatha Observance; (2) Chapter II: The Recital of the Prātimokṣa; (3) Chapter III: The Venue for the Uposatha; (4) Chapter IV: The Compulsory Attendance of all the Monks at the Uposatha Observance; (5) Chapter V: Modes of the Uposatha Observance and Recital of the Prātimokṣa; (6) Chapter VI: The Mutual Behaviour of the Incoming and Resident Monks on the Day of Uposatha; and (7) Chapter VII: The Suspension of the Recital of the Prātimokṣa and the Forms of Legal and Illegal Suspension.<sup>354</sup>

Frauwallner may also be credited with merely taking note of what is present in which Vinaya and what is missing in which Vinaya. Quite frankly, this is not a

---

<sup>351</sup> *Vin. IV*, 154.

<sup>352</sup> T. no. 1428, 22:817c28–819a29.

<sup>353</sup> Gangopadhyay, *Uposatha Ceremony: The Earliest Tradition(s) and Later Developments (Mainly from Vinayic Traditions Preserved in Chinese)*.

<sup>354</sup> *Ibid.*, Contents.

structured arrangement of these chapters. In other words, Frauwallner, even including Gangopadhyay, does not break the sections down into groups to show that there is neatness in the structure of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, while it is random in the *Pāli Vinaya*. By breaking sections down into groups and labeling the groups, this dissertation shows more clearly that the groupings found in the *Pāli Vinaya* are not perfect, in that there are sections that simply do not belong in the group or that sections are placed randomly even when they clearly do not belong under that group. More importantly, by breaking sections down into groups and labeling the groups, this dissertation shows more clearly that the groupings found in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are not random. Thus, the structure of the *Pāli Vinaya* is natural while it is reconstructed in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the following, this dissertation arranges, labels, and compares the structural organization of the chapters on the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*.

### 5.1.1. Uposatha Chapter Textual Rearrangement Difference

There are three parts on the Uposatha chapter of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Although the Uposatha chapter of these two Vinayas is divided into three parts, the structural arrangement of the *Pāli Vinaya* is different from the *Four-Part Vinaya* counterpart as follows:

The Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Uposatha) chapter of the *Four-Part Vinaya* contains three parts. Part I is “The Beginning of the Prātimokṣa Recitation.” This part is from page 816c5 to 818b16 in the Taishō Tripiṭaka edition which consists of seven sections:

- (1) The Beginning of Uposatha: T. no. 1428, 22: 816c5–816c29;
- (2) Preaching the Dharma on Uposatha day: T. no. 1428, 22: 816c29–817b22;
- (3) Beginning of the Prātimokṣa recitation: T. no. 1428, 22: 817b22–817c27;
- (4) The calendar calculation: T. no. 1428, 22: 817c27–818a15;
- (5) Announcement of Uposatha day: T. no. 1428, 22: 818a15–818a21;
- (6) The recitation of the Prātimokṣa should be carried out with a complete Order: T. no. 1428, 22: 818a21–818a28; (the author feels that this Part I Section 6 should be moved to Part II Section 1 for reasons to be discussed in detail below).
- (7) Respecting Uposatha day (the story of Elder Kapina): T. no. 1428, 22: 818a28–818b16.

Part II is on the Boundaries (*sīmā* 疆界), which are made up of five sections:

- (1) Uposatha Hall: T. no. 1428, 22: 818b16–819a29. (As noted in Part I Section 6, the author feels that the recitation of the Prātimokṣa should be carried out with a complete Order (T. no. 1428, 22: 818a21–818a28) in Part I Section 6 would make more sense if it is moved to this Part II Section 1, since it serves as the reason the Buddha set up this rule that monks should agree upon an Uposatha Hall for the Prātimokṣa recitation;)
- (2) Boundary of the same communion: T. no. 1428, 22: 819a29–819c23;
- (3) Boundary of separating from the robes: T. no. 1428, 22: 819c23–820a25;
- (4) Combination of boundary and boundary: T. no. 1428, 22: 820a25–820c17; and
- (5) Minimal boundary (小界): T. no. 1428, 22: 820c17–821a20.



Part III is on the Saṅgha, which is made of nine sections:

- (1) Informing the Saṅgha of the Uposatha ceremony: T. no. 1428, 22: 821a20–821c5;
- (2) Declaring complete purity and giving consent on behalf of ill monks: T. no. 1428, 22: 821c5–822b24;
- (3) The Prātimokṣa recitation: T. no. 1428, 22: 822b24–825c23;
- (4) Confession: T. no. 1428, 22: 825c23–827b6;
- (5) Resident monks and incoming monks: T. no. 1428, 22: 827b6–828a28;
- (6) Making schisms in the Saṅgha: T. no. 1428, 22: 828a28–829b7;
- (7) Moving from one residence to another: T. no. 1428, 22: 829b7–829c2;
- (8) The interruption of the Uposatha ceremony caused by the presence of unauthorized persons: T. no. 1428, 22: 829c2–830a4; and
- (9) Re-harmonizing the Saṅgha to recite the Prātimokṣa: T. no. 1428, 22: 830a4–24.

The Uposatha chapter in the *Pāli Vinaya* is also divided into three parts. Part I is on, as it is in the *Pāli Vinaya*, the “Repeating on Members of Other Sects” and is from page 130 to page 152, which has eighteen sections:

- (1) Permission from the Buddha for monks to gather together (p. 130–131);
- (2) Permission to preach the Dhamma on Uposatha day (p. 131);
- (3) Beginning of the recitation of the Paṭimokkha (p. 131–136);
- (4) The story regarding Elder Mahākappina (p. 136–137);

- (5) Boundaries (p. 137v139);
- (6) Uposatha Hall (p. 139–141);
- (7) Regarding the coming of the elder monks and newly ordained monks (p. 141);
- (8) Two Uposatha Halls in one residence (p. 141–142);
- (9) The story regarding Elder Mahākassapa and the permission from the Buddha for monks to separate from their three robes (p. 142–143)
- (10) Fixing and abolishing boundary (p. 144–145);
- (11) Boundary of town and village (p. 145);
- (12) Fixing boundary illegally (p. 145-146);
- (13) Days and formal acts (羯磨) of Uposatha (p. 146–147);
- (14) Five ways for the recital of the Paṭimokkha. Recital of the Paṭimokkha in brief (p. 147–148);
- (15) Giving a Dhamma talk without a request and asking about discipline in the midst of an Order (p. 148–149);
- (16) Requesting approval from the offender before declaring the offender's mistake (p. 150v151);
- (17) To protest an illegal consensus act 僧伽羯磨 (p. 151); and
- (18) Issues regarding the recitation of the Paṭimokkha (p. 152).

Part II is on, again as it is in the *Pāli Vinaya*, the “Repeating on Codanāvattu”<sup>355</sup> and is from page 152 to page 171, which contains ten sections:

- (1) Paṭimokkha as a responsibility of an elder monk (p. 152–154);
  - (2) The calculation of the half-month and the counting of the number of monks (p. 154);
  - (3) Announcing Uposatha day (p. 154–155);
  - (4) Preparation before the Uposatha ceremony (p. 155–156);
  - (5) Inexperienced monks (p. 156–158);
  - (6) Declaring complete purity and giving consent on behalf of ill monks (p. 158–162);
  - (7) The Uposatha ceremony should be carried out when the Order is complete (p. 162);
  - (8) The insane monk (p. 163–164);
  - (9) The Uposatha ceremony for one, two, three, or four monks (p. 164–166);
- and
- (10) Repentance of an offence (p. 166–171).

Part III is on, as it is written in the *Pāli Vinaya*, the “Repeating in the Section on Uposatha” and is from page 171 to page 181 which contains eight sections:

- (1) Fifteen cases in which there is no offense (p. 171–173);
- (2) Fifteen cases on thinking that an assembly is incomplete when it is incomplete (p. 173);

---

<sup>355</sup> Name of a city.

- (3) Fifteen cases on being in doubt (p. 173–174);
- (4) Fifteen cases on acting badly (p. 174);
- (5) Fifteen cases on aiming at schism (p. 174);
- (6) The Uposatha ceremony issue between the resident monks and incoming monks (p. 174–178);
- (7) The places where monks should not go on Uposatha day (p. 178–180);
- and
- (8) Cases in which the Paṭimokkha should not be recited (p. 180–181).

### 5.1.2. Vassāvāsa Chapter Textual Rearrangement Difference

In the same manner, the arrangement of the Vassāvāsa/Varṣāvastu chapter (the Rains Retreat or the Retreat Opening Ceremony) of the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* can be divided in different ways. According to their contexts, the chapter on the Vassāvāsa of the *Pāli Vinaya* is made up of two parts with their sections as the follows:

Part I:

- (1) Reason for Vassāvāsa (p. 183);
- (2) Periods to enter upon the Vassāvāsa (p. 183–184);
- (3) Prohibition of setting on tour during the Vassāvāsa (p. 184);
- (4) Not wanting to enter the Vassāvāsa (p. 184–185);
- (5) Changing the date for the Vassāvāsa; and
- (6) Setting a tour up to a maximum duration of seven days (p. 185–196).

Part II:

- (1) Cutting short the Vassāvāsa without committing any offense (p. 196–201);
- (2) Places that are allowed for entrance into the Vassāvāsa (p. 201);
- (3) Places that do not allow for entrance into the Vassāvāsa (p. 201–202);
- (4) Rejecting ordination during the Vassāvāsa (p. 202–203); and
- (5) Cases that interrupt the Vassāvāsa (p. 203–205)

On the contrary, it seems that there is no distinct division of parts in the chapter of the Three Months Retreat (Vassāvāsa) in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. This whole chapter is one neatly organized and structured with its eight sections as the following:

- (1) Reason for Vassāvāsa (T. no. 1428, 22: 830b5–c10);
- (2) Room and cushion distribution (T. no. 1428, 22: 831a22v832a20);
- (3) Earlier Period and Later Period of the Vassāvāsa (T. no. 1428, 22: 832a20v25);
- (4) Residence for Vassāvāsa (T. no. 1428, 22: 832b9–833a1);
- (5) Setting on tour during Vassāvāsa (T. no. 1428, 22: 833a2–c14);
- (6) Cases whereby monks/nuns can permanently leave the residence during the Vassāvāsa (T. no. 1428, 22: 834a10–835a6);
- (7) Cases whereby monks/nuns accidentally cannot return to his/her residence within the seven days (T. no. 1428, 22: 835a6–a14); and
- (8) Cases that interrupts the Vassāvāsa (T. no. 1428, 22: 835a14–835c10).

### 5.1.3. Pavāraṇā Chapter Textual Rearrangement Difference

Likewise, there is no division of parts in the Pavāraṇā (the Retreat Closing Ceremony) chapter of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, which is not like the *Pāli Vinaya* where there are two distinct parts. First, this dissertation looks at the Chinese Vinaya. The whole chapter of the Pavāraṇā in the *Four-Part Vinaya* is one carefully structured and continuous text with its nine sections, namely:

- (1) Condition (T. no. 1428, 22: 835c11–836b14);
- (2) Method to carry out the Pavāraṇā (T. no. 1428, 22: 836b14–838a7);
- (3) Giving Invitation (Pavāraṇā) and giving consent on the Invitation day (T. no. 1428, 22: 838a7–c2);
- (4) Valid and invalid Pavāraṇā (T. no. 1428, 22: 838c3–839a15);
- (5) Suspending the Pavāraṇā (T. no. 1428, 22: 839a15–840b3);
- (6) Extending the date of the Pavāraṇā day (T. no. 1428, 22: 840b3–13);
- (7) Resident monks and incoming monks (T. no. 1428, 22: 840b13–843a10);
- (8) Cases that the Pavāraṇā should not be carried out (T. no. 1428, 22: 843a10–b8); and
- (9) Incorporating Prātimokṣa recitation on the Invitation day (T. no. 1428, 22: 843b8–10)

The Pavāraṇā chapter of the *Pāli Vinaya* is separated into two parts.

Part I:

- (1) Condition (p. 208–211);

- (2) Method to carry out the Pavāraṇā (211–213);
- (3) Giving Pavāraṇā and giving consent on Pavāraṇā day (213–214);
- (4) Pavāraṇā should be carried out with a complete Order (p. 214);
- (5) Pavāraṇā carried out by one, two, three, four, or five monks only (p. 214–216); and
- (6) Repentance on Pavāraṇā day (p. 216–217).

Part II has thirteen sections:

- (1) Fifteen cases where there is no offense (p. 217–218);
- (2) Fifteen cases on being aware that an Order is incomplete when it is incomplete (p. 218–219);
- (3) Fifteen cases on being in doubt (p. 219);
- (4) Fifteen cases on acting badly (p. 219);
- (5) Fifteen cases on aiming at a schism (p. 219–220);
- (6) Resident monks and incoming monks (p. 220);
- (7) Places where one should not go on Pavāraṇā day (p. 220);
- (8) Cases when the Pavāraṇā should not be carried out (p. 220);
- (9) Abbreviated formula of the Pavāraṇā ceremony (p. 221–223);
- (10) Suspending the Pavāraṇā (p. 223–227);
- (11) Repentance on Pavāraṇā day (p. 227–229);
- (12) Regarding matter and individual (p. 229–230); and
- (13) Extending the date of Pavāraṇā day (p. 230–234).

From all the parts and sections listed above of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā chapters of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, the sections in the *Pāli Vinaya* generally do not belong to the parts in which they are placed. Many sections in Part I of the Uposatha chapter do not belong under the group entitled “Repeating on Members of Other Sects.” For example, the section on fixing a boundary and its related rules is placed under the group entitled, “Repeating on Members of Other Sects.” But fixing boundary has nothing to do with members of other sects. Rather, it should belong to the task which is related to the members of the Saṅgha only. This task should be placed under the Boundary part as it is in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Therefore, the section on fixing boundary should be placed in another group instead of “Repeating on Members of Other Sects” in the *Pāli Vinaya*. In this section, the Buddha sets up rules that monks have to fix their boundary of the same communion and the Uposatha Hall. If any of the above boundaries do not function anymore, monks/nuns should abolish them.<sup>356</sup> These all belong to the duties of the Saṅgha (Saṅghakamma) and it is said to be unique in Buddhism.<sup>357</sup> So, it has nothing to do with the “members of the other sects” as suggested in the label of Part I. Even though Part I lists seventeen sections, only two sections, namely sections one and two, are related to members of other sects, the other fifteen sections are on other topics of which some should be placed into other parts of the Vinaya. In the same way, while Part II is about events that happen in Codanā, there are many sections in which the events do not take place in Codanā. For instance, the

---

<sup>356</sup> *Vin. IV*, 137–146.

<sup>357</sup> For detail, see Chapter II of this dissertation, section on “The Uniqueness of the Buddhist Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā.”



section on keeping track of the half-month and counting numbers of monks and nuns on Uposatha day occur in Rājagaha<sup>358</sup> instead of in Codanā. Thus, “Repeating on Codanāvattu” is not a good label for Part II. Only Part III has all the sections appropriately listed.

On the other hand, the Uposatha chapter in the *Four-Part Vinaya* is organized into three parts in which sections are related to the label of their parts. For instance, all seven sections of Part I are associated with the beginning time of the Prātimokṣa recitation. All five sections of Part II are concomitant with boundaries. And it is evident that all nine sections of Part III are affiliated with the Buddhist community (Saṅgha). Thus, the structural arrangement of the *Pāli Vinaya* is random while it is well organized in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The *Four-Part Vinaya* divides the Uposatha chapter into three parts and each part deals with one specific matter. For instance, all sections in Part I deal with the matter of the beginning of the Prātimokṣa recitation. All sections of Part II correspond to the matter of boundary. And all sections of Part III relate to activities of the Saṅgha. The *Four-Part Vinaya* is carefully edited. However, humans are not perfect, and upon close examination there is still a trace of human mistake in that the *Four-Part Vinaya* has a section in the incorrect order, that is, the reason the Buddha set up the rule of setting a boundary for the Uposatha ceremony should be placed in the “Boundary” part. However, the section on setting up the boundary is split up with half in the “Keeping track of the ceremony date and member number” and the other half in the “Boundary”

---

<sup>358</sup> *Vin. IV, 154.*

section.<sup>359</sup> This does not invalidate the thesis of this dissertation. Rather, it only goes to show that humans are not perfect—that is all. In general, the *Four-Part Vinaya* is far better arranged than the *Pāli Vinaya* in regard to the structure of the Uposatha chapter. Therefore, by reviewing the structure of the Uposatha chapter of the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Four-Part Vinaya*, it shows that the structural arrangement of the *Pāli Vinaya* is random while it is neatly reconstructed in the *Four-Part Vinaya* counterpart.

In regard to the structure of the Uposatha chapter, it is similar in the chapters of Vassāvāsa (the Retreat Opening Ceremony) and Pavāraṇā (the Retreat Closing Ceremony) of the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. The whole chapter of Vassāvāsa and Pavāraṇā are simple sequences of sundry related rules regarding Vassāvāsa and Pavāraṇā. These two chapters do not need to be divided into parts. Thus, the whole Vassāvāsa and Pavāraṇā chapters in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are one part with its sections, while the *Pāli Vinaya* still splits the chapter into two parts. Again, the sections in the chapter of Vassāvāsa and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* do not correspond to their parts.

In defense of any argument claiming that this arrangement regarding the structure of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* (the *Four-Part Vinaya*) started in India, this dissertation disproves it by showing that the *Four-Part Vinaya* has been carefully edited during the time it was translated into Chinese to this present structure. Here, there are two possibilities that can be claimed: (1) the *Four-Part Vinaya* was already well systematized in its original Sanskrit text and (2) the *Four-Part Vinaya* was

---

<sup>359</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 818a21–28 and T. no. 1428, 22: 818b16–22.

rearranged when it was translated into Chinese. The first possibility happened when the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, which is the *Four-Part Vinaya* in Chinese, was already well organized in its structure before it was translated into Chinese. This is not the case and not appropriate for the following reasons. In the first place, the Pāli and Sanskrit texts shared the same Indian context during their early phase of compiling, so the way to organize these Vinayas should be similar. This means that the Sanskrit Vinaya is also random in its structural arrangement in one way or another. This claim is supported when the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is compared to the other existing Chinese Vinayas. For example, although there are three different parts and each part deals with a specific issue related to the Uposatha chapter in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, it is only one continuous part in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律 with its sections. These sections are:

- (1) On Verses; (2) On the fourteenth and the fifteenth day; (3) Uposatha Hall; (4) Daytime Uposatha; (5) Inside the Hall [Offense Monk during the Uposatha Ceremony]; (6) Thief; (7) Issue related to the King; (8) Honor to the Uposatha day; (9) Two ways of Counting the Numbers of Rules; (10) Not remembering any rules in the Prātimokṣa at all; (11) Partly remembering rules in the Prātimokṣa; (12) Reciting the Prātimokṣa in the reverse order; (13) Starting over in reciting the Prātimokṣa; (14) Not fully ordained people; (15) Reciting the Prātimokṣa too early; (16) Carrying out the Uposatha Ceremony in one residence too many times; (17) Groups with different Uposatha Ceremony days; (18) Concerning one group already recited the Prātimokṣa and the other not; (19) Giving consent; (20) Receiving consent; (21) Too many people giving consent; (22) The Uposatha ceremony cannot be carried out with just half of the members present; (23) the donor Ghoṣiḷa; (24) Mahāprajāpati; (25) Chandaka; (26) Sick monk; (27) araṇyaa—a desolate or a solitary place; (28) Giving consent at an inappropriate time; (29) Ajiravatī<sup>360</sup> river; (30) Eleven cases of failed consent: Transferring the consent, Overnight consent, Giving consent out of the boundary, Giving consent for a nun, Giving consent for not fully ordained people, Receiving

<sup>360</sup> Ajiravatī is rendered in Chinese as *A zhi luo* 阿脂羅, *A yi luo he di*, 阿夷羅和帝, *A li luo ba ti* 阿利羅跋提, or *A shi duo fa di*, 阿特多伐底 which runs through Kuśinagara. It was on the western bank of this river in Śāla Forest where Śākyamuni entered into Nirvāṇa.

consent but going out of the boundary, Giving consent then going out of the boundary, Receiving consent but disrobes, giving consent then disrobes, Losing the consent, and No member of the Saṅgha to convey the consent; (31) Four types of Uposatha; (32) Four ways to recite the Prātimokṣa; and (33) Seven cases that the Uposatha ceremony should be suspended; and (34) Two cases that the Uposatha ceremony should be suspended.

偈。十四日十五日示布薩。晝日布薩。堂賊王。阿那律。二種數。不利不一切利順逆。欲聞初未受具足人。太早說。一住處。二眾。二已說二未說。與欲取欲與欲多等欲。瞿師羅。大愛道。闍陀。病。阿練若。不應與而與。阿脂羅河。十一事不名與欲。轉欲宿界外。比丘尼。未受具足。持欲出。與欲出。取欲已還戒。與欲已還戒。失欲。壞眾四布薩。四說。七事應語遮。二事應語遮。<sup>361</sup>

From the quote above, it shows that the whole chapter of the Uposatha chapter in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律 is a random division. For example, the beginning of this chapter is about the “Beginning of the Uposatha ceremony” in the quote above which is (1) “On Verses” and (2) “On the fourteenth and the fifteenth day.” But then it jumps to the boundary which is (3) “the Uposatha Hall.” Then, this chapter continues with the “Beginning of the Uposatha ceremony” in (5) “Inside the Hall [Offense Monk during the Uposatha Ceremony]” or (8) “Honor to the Uposatha day.” Even in the middle of (1) and (8), the issues related to the Saṅgha are mentioned such as (6) “Thief” and (7) “Issues related to the King.” Unlike the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律, these sections are arranged in their corresponding parts in the *Four-Part Vinaya* as explained above. This means that all sections on the reciting of the Prātimokṣa are grouped in the “Beginning of the Prātimokṣa,” all issues on the boundary are placed in the “Boundary” part. All the matter related to the members of the Saṅgha are gathered together in the “Saṅgha” part. Thus, to this extent, it is fair to say that, like the *Pāli Vinaya*, the *Mahāsāṃghika*

<sup>361</sup> T. no. 1425, 22: 446c12–20.

*Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律 is also unorganized in its structure.<sup>362</sup> By contrast, the *Four-Part Vinaya* is more informative than the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* in its structural arrangement.

Similarly, the structure of the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* (*Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律) is also random. The reason is because the part on “Boundary” is separated by the task of the Saṅgha which is the formal act of the Saṅgha. This means that the Uposatha chapter of the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* is talking about choosing the boundary for the Uposatha ceremony.<sup>363</sup> Then, it turns to the formal act in which the monks can separate from their robes.<sup>364</sup> This formal act is more appropriate when it is grouped under the section related to the task of the Saṅgha. However, after the section on permission to separate from the robe, the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* continues with the boundary section in which the boundary can be modified.<sup>365</sup>

Even in the *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīsāsaka Vinaya* 五分律), out of which the *Four-Part Vinaya* grew, the structure is also as random as the *Pāli Vinaya*, the *Ten Recitations Vinaya*, and the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*. For instance, the Uposatha chapter of the *Five-Part Vinaya* starts with the section on the Beginning of the Uposatha ceremony. However, in the middle of this section, the task of the Saṅgha is inserted, which is on the different types of the consensus of the Saṅgha 僧伽羯磨 (the formal act of the Saṅgha—*Saṅghakarma*). This is a consensus for Uposatha which is carried out in one of four ways: (1) both not in accordance with the rule

---

<sup>362</sup> For the broader randomly arranged regulations of the *Pāli Vinaya* and *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*, see Shizuka, “Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period (4): The Structure of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya,” 23.

<sup>363</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 158b5–c10.

<sup>364</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 158c11–159a7.

<sup>365</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 159a8–22.

and when an Order is incomplete 作別眾不如法布薩; (2) not in accordance with the rule even when an Order is complete 和合不如法布薩; (3) although in accordance with the rule but when an Order is incomplete 如法別眾布薩; and (4) both in accordance with the rule and when an Order is complete 如法和合布薩.<sup>366</sup> After this task of the Saṅgha, the Uposatha chapter of the *Five-Part Vinaya* continues with the “Beginning of the Uposatha ceremony” with the section on knowledge about the calendar date for the Uposatha day.<sup>367</sup> Thus, by comparison on the structural arrangement, the *Four-Part Vinaya* is also far better than the *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律). Most of the existing Vinayas, including those composed in India and those translated into Chinese, are structured randomly. Only the *Four-Part Vinaya* is well organized in their structural arrangement. The difficult task of this dissertation is that there is no Sanskrit version of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, so this dissertation cannot trace the origin of the structure of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Thus, there is no rule to determine on whether or not the structure of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is already arranged in a well-organized form prior to its translation to the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. However, with the analysis above, as far as this dissertation can tell, it is likely that this well-organized structure of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is rearranged when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. Otherwise there would be no difference.

Moreover, it is believed that Buddhism has undergone a process of sinicization through the process of becoming rooted in China, so the form of Chinese

---

<sup>366</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 122b7-11.

<sup>367</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 122b12-19.

Buddhism is quite different from the Indian form.<sup>368</sup> What is more, when Buddhism was introduced into China, the Chinese people discriminated between Mahāyāna (Greater Vehicle) and Hīnayāna (Lesser Vehicle) with the common view that the latter is inferior to the former.<sup>369</sup> This is why most of the Chinese practitioners of the Mahāyāna tradition start what can be considered a movement which disregards certain parts of the Vinaya and to some extent even looks down on the precept observers.

The people [Mahayana] who received the knowledge of Buddhist philosophical treatise (*abhidharma*) and practiced wrong precepts [i.e. disregarding the precept while acting righteously] were viewed to be clever and wise; the people who heard the *Lankavatara*-[*Sūtra*] while enjoying food and drink were considered to be the profound and ultimate. They exaggerated and were steeped in the world, and admonished those who were previously considered wise. They ridiculed the heavenly river and belittled the net of prohibition. They called heresy wisdom on the genuine interpretation, and viewed wrong knowledge as the ultimate wisdom.<sup>370</sup>

Daoxuan (596–667) was the person who went against this idea of acting outside of the precepts without qualifying conditions. According to him, the “textual learning and the observation of precepts” must go together. To stress this idea, Daoxuan said that at first he also discarded learning and observing the Vinaya. But later on he changes his direction:

When I first received precepts, I was fond of meditation and talked to my master (Huijun) about it. My master said, “Meditation will be manifested once the precepts have become clear, and this is the order of the Buddhist teaching. So you should learn Vinaya first. If you hold to or violate the rules and precepts, and then visualize and synthesize the Vinaya, that will be enough.”<sup>371</sup>

---

<sup>368</sup> Thompson and Paper, *The Chinese Way in Religion*, 77.

<sup>369</sup> Powers, review of *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, 194–195.

<sup>370</sup> Cited in Chen, *The Revival of Buddhist Monasticism in Medieval China*, 31.

<sup>371</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.

Finding that many monastics at that time, c. 5<sup>th</sup>–6<sup>th</sup> century, claimed themselves as Mahāyāna followers and seem to have enjoyed the movement of neglecting the observation of the Vinaya, Daoxuan redefined many aspects of Vinaya learning. Daoxuan also wrote many commentaries on the Vinaya, especially on the *Dharmagupta Vinaya (Four-Part Vinaya)*. Accordingly, in her book, *The Origin of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, Yifa points out that these are the reasons that make Daoxuan the authority on the *Four-Part Vinaya*.<sup>372</sup> Consequently, the *Four-Part Vinaya* has been influenced significantly by the works of Daoxuan in one way or another, especially in the form of practice. This idea is supported by John Powers. In his book review, "Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya: Essays Presented in Honor of Professor Stanley Weinstein," Powers points out that "[almost all of the] translation [of the Vinaya] into Chinese in the early part of the fifth century began a process of evaluation and adaptation of the norms of Indian Buddhist monasticism."<sup>373</sup> This evaluation of the sinicization of Buddhism in China shows that the Chinese Vinaya has undergone much change especially through the influence of the works of Daoxuan. This change in the Vinaya as analyzed structurally has been shown to reveal careful work in the structural arrangement in the Chinese Vinaya. Whereas the *Pāli Vinaya* is more realistic as indicative in the randomness of its structure, the *Four-Part Vinaya* is more or less rearranged to be better regarding its structural organization when it is translated into Chinese, which in effect makes it more of an idealized Vinaya.

---

<sup>372</sup> Yifa, *The Origin of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, 23.

<sup>373</sup> Powers, review of *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, 194.



## 5.2. The Monastics and the Lay People Status Difference

There is a status difference between the monastics and the laity in that monastics are viewed as superior to the lay people. This status difference is another area that is indicative of the presence of discrepancies between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. In the discrepancies, the *Four-Part Vinaya* seems to be idealized radically, at times through misinterpretation, so as to preserve superiority of the monks and nuns over the lay people by prohibiting the lay people from studying, or for that matter, voting during the recitation and formal act of the Prātimokṣa. The details shall be described below in this section. Not only is the *Four-Part Vinaya* overly idealized in terms of restricting the lay people from accessing certain parts of the Vinaya, which are designated only for fully ordained monks and nuns, but also the *Four-Part Vinaya* bends to show that the monastics are superior to the lay people, including the other religious ascetics. This showing of superiority is done by re-designating the role of the lay people such that while the Indian version of the Vinaya (the *Pāli Vinaya*) allows the laity to achieve equal spiritual attainment as the monastics, the Chinese Vinaya (the *Four-Part Vinaya*) clearly indicates that the monks and nuns are charged with the superior task of renunciation and seeking spiritual attainment, while the less superior role of the lay people is to take care of the more mundane tasks of taking care of the family, giving donations to the temple, or joining beneficial social activities. The *Four-Part Vinaya* displays the monastics as (1) superior to the lay people in the form of challenging the authority of even the king and elevating the moral standard of monastics to be as good, if not better than, the ascetics of the other religious groups, (2) misinterpreting and over-idealizing

the Vinaya (by claiming the high virtue and knowledge of the Buddhist monastics, and by prohibiting the lay people from accessing certain parts of the Vinaya), and (3) separating the role of the monastics from the lay people. These three descriptions of the monastics all show signs of discrepancies between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*.

When translating the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, Bhikkhu Bodhi makes known to us the qualities of the monastics' life, and these qualities, according to him, are uttered by the Buddha himself from several short suttas. Bodhi states:

The happiness of monastic life is superior to that of lay life; the happiness of renunciation superior to sensual happiness; the happiness without acquisitions superior to the happiness arisen from acquisitions; the happiness without taints superior to that with taints; and spiritual happiness superior to worldly happiness.<sup>374</sup>

From the quote above, it shows that the monastic life is superior to the lay life, and worldly happiness is substandard when compared to the true happiness of renunciation. During the Buddha's time, many lay people also recognize this fact.

They say:

In so far as I understand *dhamma* taught by the Lord [the Buddha], it is no easy matter for one living in a house to fare the Brahma-faring completely fulfilled, completely pure and polished like a conch-shell. Suppose that I, having cut off hair and beard, having donned saffron garments, should go forth from home into homelessness.<sup>375</sup>

Thus, the lay people understand that the lay life is limited such that they cannot or it is too difficult for them to attain the higher states of the spiritual life. However, according to the lay people, they recognize that the monastic life is unlimited and it

---

<sup>374</sup> Bodhi, *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha*, 12.

<sup>375</sup> *MN II*, 251. The Chinese equivalent is: “如我知佛所說法者，若我在家，為鎖所鎖，不得盡形壽清淨行梵行。世尊！願我得從世尊出家學道而受具足，得作比丘，淨修梵行。” T. no. 26, 1: 623b11-12.

is much easier for a monastic to complete the goal of enlightenment. The Buddha also confirms this understanding of the lay people. He even praises the monastic life by saying that any monastic who disrobes and returns to lay life will be subject to the present sorrow as well as the long-term suffering.<sup>376</sup> However, if a monastic retains a monastic life but with a “tearful face” and crying in “pain and distress,” he/she may still be praised by the Buddha.<sup>377</sup> This goes to show that not only is a monastic life superior to the lay life but also even a painful monastic life is still better than a lay life. Because the monastic life is so valuable, the Chinese monks seem to create a protective boundary around the Vinaya to prevent access from outsiders and to keep an image of monastic excellence as governed by the Vinaya. Probably, with this in mind, there is a drive of restriction/limit placed on lay practitioners in certain parts of their study and practice of Buddhism, particularly restricted access to all parts of the Vinaya related to activities of fully ordained monastics, which is evident in the Chinese Vinaya (the *Four-Part Vinaya*) and not present in the *Pāli Vinaya*. In this section, this dissertation re-evaluates the Buddhist discipline—especially on the relationship between monastics and lay practitioners on whether or not any restriction is attributed to the lay people in their study and practice of Buddhism. By so doing, it reveals that the monastics are over-praised while suppression is applied to the lay people. As a result, this suppression proves that there are discrepancies between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. The

---

<sup>376</sup> Present sorrow and long-term suffering denote the suffering of being subjected to the cycle of birth and death.

<sup>377</sup> *AN III – The Training*, 3–4.

four ways in which the discrepancies expose the relationship between the monastics and the lay people are now examined.

### 5.2.1. The Difference Pertaining to the Other Religious Ascetics

In the first place, research finds that a certain weakness pertaining to the lack of knowledge of the Buddhist monastics about the ceremony date and member number may be omitted in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, so as to hide the imperfections of monks and nuns and to strengthen their appearance in the eyes of the Chinese people. The evidence can be found in the section on knowledge about the ceremony date and member number. In this section, both the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* mention an occasion in which Buddhist monks are asked by the lay people regarding the knowledge of the date and the number of monastics in their residence. However, these monks do not know, so they acknowledge that they do not know.<sup>378</sup>

Up to this point, the story is the same in both the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. However, in the *Pāli Vinaya*, there is frustration, disrespect, and disappointment by the lay people towards some Buddhist monks when they become aware that these Buddhist monks do not know how to keep track of the ceremony date as well as the number of monastics in their residence. The *Pāli Vinaya* states:

Now at that time people asked the monks as they were walking for almsfood: "Which (day) of the half-month is it, honoured sirs?" The monks spoke thus: "We, sirs, do not know." The people . . . spread it about, saying: "These recluse, sons of the Sakyans, do not even know the calculation of the half-month, so how can they know anything else that is good?"  
Now at that time people asked the monks as they were walking for almsfood: "How many monks are there, honoured sirs?" The monks spoke thus: We, sirs do not know." The people . . . spread it about, saying: "These recluses,

---

<sup>378</sup> *Vin. IV*, 154. Cf. T. 1428, 22: 817c28-819a29.

sons of the Sakyans, do not even know one another, so how can they know anything else that is good?<sup>379</sup>

From the above quote, there is evidence indicating that the lay people are judging the Buddhist monastics and doubting that they have morality based on the fact that the monks do not even know some basic knowledge about keeping track of the ceremony date. If not knowing basic knowledge of important calendar dates for the monastics is bad, it is much worse of a judgment to say that monks “do not even know one another” because if so, “how can they know anything else that is good.” After each criticism the monks just keep silent. And by remaining silent in the Indian culture, it means yes, right, agree, acknowledged, etc. More on the Indian notion of silence is discussed in section 4.1 above. But for now, the judgment from the lay people is an assault on the moral capacity of the monks, which is bad to say the least. But perhaps the intended emphasis of the moral of this story is to encourage monastics to have at least some minimum level of, for the lack of a better term, education. In any case, the lay people look down at the Buddhist monastics and regard them as inferior to not only the ascetics of the other non-Buddhist sects but also inferior to the common people since the Buddhist monastics are blamed for having nothing which is “good.” Thus far, in the *Pāli Vinaya*, the Buddhist monastics are looked down by the other people for potentially having no morality and no sense of what is “good.” In comparison to non-Buddhist groups, some Buddhist monastics are even considered to be inferior to the people of the other non-Buddhist sects in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

---

<sup>379</sup> *Vin. IV*, 154.

An important part that needs to be addressed is on how this story is recorded in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the *Four-Part Vinaya*, there is no mention of the attitude of the lay people on the weakness of Buddhist monastics regarding their knowledge of the date and the number of monastics in their residence. In other words, the entire section explaining how some Buddhists are criticized for their ignorance of matters pertaining to simple mathematical calculations, is simply omitted/cut/not present in the background story from the section on the knowledge on the ceremony date and member number in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The only thing left of this story in the *Four-Part Vinaya* is just as simple as what is stated above. In other words, the story stops before the criticism. Hence, there is no sign of any disrespect to the Buddhist monks and nuns by the lay people. By showing only that which is good, the honor is kept intact for the Buddhist monks and nuns in the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

As for the rationality behind the discrepancies in these two Vinayas, there could be two reasons why the part of the story that criticizes the monks is deleted from the *Four-Part Vinaya*. First, it is deleted because it could be argued that the criticism on the monks is an incorrect generalization of the Buddhists. Also, it may be a sectarian prejudiced opinion. For starters, it seems that what is shown in the *Four-Part Vinaya* is that it is common for people, especially among the religious people, to have no knowledge of dates and number of members. It is normal that in any organized group there are people with a certain knowledge, there are people without a certain knowledge, and it is very unlikely, if not to say impossible, that everyone knows about everything at all times. Therefore, if some Buddhists do not

know the dates and members, then of course there are certainly some Buddhists who do have knowledge of keeping track of the ceremony date and member number,<sup>380</sup> because it cannot be the case that all Buddhists do not know the calculation. More likely than not, the same conditions may apply to the ascetics of the other non-Buddhist sectarians. It is claimed in the example story that the ascetics of the other sects have knowledge of ceremony dates and member numbers. By the same logic, there must be at least some ascetics who do not know the ceremony date and the member number because it is highly unlikely that all ascetics in all places at all times know the date and the member number. And thus, the lacking of knowledge about the date and number does not make the Buddhists any different than the ascetics of the other sects. There is no specific group of Buddhist monastics that can be claimed as inferior to the people of the other non-Buddhist sects. Thus, the Buddhist monastics are as perfect as the ascetics of the other religious sects regarding the knowledge of the date and member number. Second, the portion of the story covering the criticism of the monks may be deleted from the *Four-Part Vinaya* because it, if nothing more, makes the Buddhists look bad, which is a weakness that must be fixed to secure a position for Buddhism among prominent religions.

Now, this dissertation examines whether the modification in the *Four-Part Vinaya* surrounding the knowledge of ceremony date and member number occur in India or in China. Firstly, the possibility of this modification in India, prior to the translation of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, will be

---

<sup>380</sup> Schopen, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 270–273.

ruled out. Research shows that the whole story surrounding the knowledge of the date and number of monastics in a residence is not present in almost all other existing Chinese Vinayas. No similar story regarding the calendar calculation is found in the *Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律 of the Sarvāstivāda School,<sup>381</sup> the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School,<sup>382</sup> and the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律 of the Mahāsāṃghika School 大眾部.<sup>383</sup> Besides the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, only the *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律) of the Mahīśāsaka School has the story regarding the knowledge of ceremony date and member number. In the *Five-Part Vinaya* it is said that the lay people ask the Buddhist monks about the date. When they know that the Buddhist monks do not know how to calculate the date, they criticize the monks and lament over the likelihood that if the Buddhist monastics do not even know how to keep track of the date, how can they know anything deeper? (有諸居士問諸比丘。今日幾。諸比丘不知。便譏訶言。沙門釋子曰尚不知。何況深理).<sup>384</sup> Thus, there are at least two Vinayas in Chinese—the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Five-Part Vinaya*—which have the same story on the section pertaining to the knowledge of ceremony date and member number. However, the available portion of the story on the knowledge of the date and member number in the *Four-Part Vinaya* and *Five-Part Vinaya* is different. Like the *Pāli Vinaya*, the *Five-Part Vinaya* has the whole story, which includes both the questioning portion and the criticism portion. By contrast,

<sup>381</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 158a1–164c29.

<sup>382</sup> T. no. 1442, 23: 627a1–905a7.

<sup>383</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 121b1–128c29.

<sup>384</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 123b3–7.



the *Four-Part Vinaya* has only part of the story, which is only the questioning portion and not the criticism portion. Thereby, to the extent of the story surrounding the section on the date and member number, like the *Pāli Vinaya*, there is also a discrepancy between the Chinese *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律) and the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

Research shows that there is also a discrepancy between the Tibetan Vinaya and the *Four-Part Vinaya* regarding the section on the knowledge of ceremony date and member number. In his book, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, Gregory Schopen offers us the Tibetan passage as well as his translation on the section on the knowledge of the calendar date and member number of the Poṣadhavastu chapter of the Indian *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*:

At a time when the Buddha, the Blessed One, was staying in Śrāvastī, in the Jetavana, in the park of Anāthapiṇḍada, when brahmins and householders came to the monks and asked them, “What, Noble Ones, is today’s date?” (*‘phags pa de ring tshes grangs du zhes dris pa*), the monks said: “Sorry, we don’t know.”

But the brahmins and householders said: “When members of other religious groups know not only the date but the position of the sun and the stars and the moment as well, how can you, when you have entered the religious life, not even know the date?” (*mu stegs can gyis kyang tshes grangs dang/nyi ma dang/skar ma dang/yud tsam yang shes na/khyed cag rab tu byung na tshes grangs tsam yang mi shes sam/*).<sup>385</sup>

Schopen, then, continues with the Tibetan Vinaya regarding the rule that the Buddha made on the date and number section in which only certain Elders are charged with the task of keeping tract of the date and number and that the other

---

<sup>385</sup> Schopen, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 270–271.

monks do not need to worry about it, which incidentally resulted in the brahmins and householders criticizing the Buddhist monastics for the second time:

When brahmins and householders now came to the *vihāra* and asked for the date, the monks referred them to the Elder-of-the-Community and the Guardian-of-the-*Vihāra*, who had been charged with keeping track of it. The laymen, however, are once again critical, insisting that the monks themselves should know the date, and the Buddha responds to this criticism by ordering that “the date must be announced in the midst of the community!” (*de Ita bas na dge 'dun gyi nang du tshes grangs brjod par gyis shig*).<sup>386</sup>

Thus far, like the *Pāli Vinaya* and the Chinese *Five-Part Vinaya*, the Buddhist monastics in the Tibetan *Vinaya* also face somewhat of a fierce criticism by the lay people when they do not know how to calculate the date and the member number. In his same book, Schopen again offers us more information surrounding this criticism. He says:

A brahmin who wished to invite the monks to a meal asked how many monks there were in the Jetavana, and the monks—as in our text—say they do not know. When the Brahmin—again much like in our text—castigates them, . . .  
<sup>387</sup>

From all of the above quotes, it is evident that the lay people and the people of the other non-Buddhist sects looked down at the Buddhist monastics and even regarded them as substandard compared to the other religious ascetics regarding their knowledge on the ceremony date and member number, which is absolutely true in the Tibetan *Vinaya*. Therefore, like the Indian *Pāli Vinaya* and the Chinese *Five-Part Vinaya*, the Buddhist monastics in the Tibetan *Vinaya* are also portrayed realistically in which they are not at once perfect in all aspects pertaining to social knowledge.

---

<sup>386</sup> Ibid., 273.

<sup>387</sup> Ibid., 272.

At this point, it is fortunate that the fragment on the description of the calendar date and the member number of the Sanskrit Vinaya is available for tracing the original passage in the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. In his same book, Schopen, once again, points out that the same story regarding the knowledge about the ceremony date and member number is found in this Sanskrit fragment. In this Sanskrit fragment, the Buddhist monks are criticized at least twice. At first, when the lay people know that some of the Buddhist monastics do not have knowledge of the date and member number, they compare the Buddhist monastics to the ascetics of the other religious groups and then they make unfavorable judgments about the Buddhist monks. In order to get rid of this criticism, the Buddha orders monks to keep track of the date as well as the number of monks in the residence. However, only some Elders of the Saṅgha and/or the Guardians of the Vihāra (monastery) are in charge of keeping track of the date and member number. Nevertheless, on another occasion, the lay people come to the Vihāra and ask monks for the date. The monks themselves do not know the date, so these monks refer the lay people to the Elders and/or the Guardian. Still not satisfied, the lay people for the second time criticize the monks and insist that the monks themselves should know the date for the Biweekly Precept Ceremony and the number of fellow monastics in their Vihāra (monastery).<sup>388</sup> In this connection, in the original Sanskrit text, the Buddhist monks also suffer from the criticism from the people of the other non-Buddhist sects for their lack of knowledge of the ceremony date and member number. Thereby, the Buddhist monks in the Sanskrit Vinaya (the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*) are not only

---

<sup>388</sup> Ibid., 272–273.

substandard compared to the lay people, but also are criticized of lacking even the minimum knowledge of what other sectarians take to be standard. In other words, as a monastic, one should have knowledge of the ceremony date. But, as shown in the Sanskrit manuscript, the Buddhist monastics do not have this minimum knowledge and cause the lay people to say, “How can you, when you have entered the religious life, not even know the date?”<sup>389</sup> It is a shock for the lay people. The criticism happens due to a reduced respect for the Buddhist monastics in the eyes of the lay people. Therefore, like the *Pāli Vinaya*, the *Five-Part Vinaya*, and the *‘Dul-ba* (Tibetan Vinaya), regarding the story on knowledge of the ceremony date and member number, the monastics are also described realistically in the Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*.

From what has been addressed thus far, all the existing Vinayas include the episode on the Buddhist monastics being criticized and charged for their inferior knowledge about the knowledge of the date and member. Even the story in the fragment of the Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* also supports the fact that the Buddhist monks are looked down upon by the people of the other non-Buddhist sects. This fact, again, suggests that the criticism by the lay people of the Buddhist monks is applied to almost all existing Vinayas, including the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. However, the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* is the only exception wherein the criticism by the lay people on the Buddhist monastics is deleted. Therefore, it is now safe to conclude that the elimination of the criticism by the lay people on the Buddhist monastics regarding their lack of knowledge of the

---

<sup>389</sup> Ibid., 271.

ceremony date and member number was done in China when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*.

In his book, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, Schopen points out that keeping track of the dates by the Buddhist monastics is the “way to compete with other religious groups” in India.<sup>390</sup> Likely, the elimination of the criticism by the lay people towards the Buddhist monks probably serves as a means to compete with the other formidable Chinese local religions and thoughts. By these eliminations, the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* tries to show to the Chinese people that the Buddhist monastics always aspire to the highest value and that they are the finest examples for all to follow. Regarding the section on the date and member, it is conclusive to say that there are no signs of over praising the virtue of the Buddhist monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya* as well as in all the other existing Vinayas except the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Virtue and practice are overpraised in the *Four-Part Vinaya* in China during the emergence of Chinese Buddhism. And the reason for this praise may have been brought about by the pressure of competition with the other Chinese local religions and thoughts.

### **5.2.2. The Difference Pertaining to the Secular Authorities**

Section 5.2.1 above has established that the weakness of the Buddhist monastics in their knowledge of keeping track of the date, as well as the member number in their monastery, is removed in the *Four-Part Vinaya* in China. This deletion effectively keeps only the superiority of the Buddhist monks and nuns and

---

<sup>390</sup> Ibid., 271.

eliminates their weak points. As a result, this deletion creates a perfect Vinaya in China that idealistically depicts the moral excellence of the Buddhist monks and nuns in comparison to the people of the other non-Buddhist sects. In this section, the discrepancies between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* are revealed through the relationship between the Buddhist monastics and the secular authorities. Not only is the superiority regarding the ethical conduct of the Buddhist monastics, in comparison to the people of the other non-Buddhist sects emphasized, but also the high value of the moral conduct of the Buddhist monastics in comparison to the secular authorities, specifically the kings or the emperors, may also be stressed in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The evidence supporting the view that the monastics are superior to the secular authorities is found in the difference on how King Bimbisāra greeted the Buddha, in comparing the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The *Pāli Vinaya* states:

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. . . . Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, gladdened . . . delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord departed keeping his right side towards him.<sup>391</sup>

The *Four-Part Vinaya* states:

King Bimbisāra then departs from his palace to see the Buddha. When the King meets the Buddha, he bows to the Buddha with his head and then sits down at one side . . . Having known that the Buddha accepted by mean of his silence, King Bimbisāra arises from his seat, bows to the Buddha with his head, and then leaves.

時瓶沙王。即下閤堂往詣世尊所頭面禮足已在一面坐。王見世尊默然受語已。即從座起頭面禮足遶已而去。<sup>392</sup>

<sup>391</sup> *Vin. IV*, 130–131.

<sup>392</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 816c14–23.

In the *Pāli Vinaya*, the way in which King Bimbisāra greets the Buddha is not specific. It seems that King Bimbisāra and the Buddha just exchange “greetings” with one another. However, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, it is clearly stated that King Bimbisāra bows down to the Buddha’s feet with his head (頭面禮足). It is possible that the *Pāli Vinaya* does not emphasize the ascendancy of the Buddha over King Bimbisāra but the *Four-Part Vinaya* explicitly depicts the superiority of the Buddha over King Bimbisāra by stating that the King touches his head to the Buddha’s feet. This difference in the description in the action of the king shows the discrepancy between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* counterpart.

Now, this dissertation defends for any argument which suggests that the king in the *Pāli Vinaya* may also bow to the Buddha’s feet when they exchange the salutation. This defense is made on the grounds that it is not the case that in the *Pāli Vinaya* the King bows down to the Buddha’s feet. To make this argument clear, first of all, the original Pāli verb is examined in the scene of King Bimbisāra touching his head to the Buddha’s feet. The original passage in the Pāli language is:

Atha kho rājā Māgadho Seniyo Bimbisāro yena bhagavā ten' upasaṃkamaṃ, upasaṃkamaṃ bhagavantam abhivādetvā ekamantaṃ nisīdi... atha kho rājā Māgadho Seniyo Bimbisāro bhagavatā dhammiyā kathāya sandassito samādapito samuttejito sampahaṃsito uṭṭhāyāsanaṃ bhagavantam abhivādetvā padakkhiṇam katvā pakkāmi.<sup>393</sup>

In the quote above, the Pāli verb which indicates the greeting of King Bimbisāra is *abhivādetvā*. *Abhivādetvā* is made up of the prefix *abhi* which literally means “towards, against, on to, at,”<sup>394</sup> and the root *vand* which means “to greet respectfully, salute, to pay homage, to honor, respect, to revere, venerate,

<sup>393</sup> VP, 101–102.

<sup>394</sup> PTSPED, 61.

adore.”<sup>395</sup> Alternative forms of this word are also found in the Pāli dictionary. For example, *abhivandati* is mentioned in the Pāli dictionary, which means “to salute respectfully, to honour, greet.”<sup>396</sup> The short form for *abhivandati* is *vandati* which indicates “to greet respectfully, salute, to pay homage, to honour, respect, to revere, venerate, adore.”<sup>397</sup> As a result, Rhys Davids translates this verb in the scene pertaining to the greeting exchange between King Bimbisāra and the Buddha as “having respectfully saluted the Blessed One,”<sup>398</sup> and I. B. Horner renders it as “having greeted the Lord.”<sup>399</sup>

Not only is the Pāli verb *abhivādetvā* found in the *Pāli Vinaya* to depict the way of greeting of King Bimbisāra, but also it is found in the Sutta Piṭaka in which it is also used to describe the greeting of the other King with the Buddha. For example, in the *Aṅgulimālasutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*, a passage that describes the greeting of King Pasenadi is also found. And in this sutta, it is said that King Pasenadi also salutes the Buddha respectfully. “Having gone by vehicle as far as the ground permitted, he dismounted from his vehicle and approached the Lord on foot; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance.”<sup>400</sup> (“yāvatiko yānassa bhūmi yānena gantvā yānā paccārohitvā pattiko va yena Bhagavā ten’ upasaṅkami; upasaṅkamtivā Bhagavantam abhivādetvā ekamantaṃ nisīdi.”)<sup>401</sup> Thus, it could be the case that the Pāli verb *abhivādetvā* could have the sense of explicitly touching one’s head to someone’s feet. However, none of the

<sup>395</sup> Ibid., 601.

<sup>396</sup> Ibid., 69.

<sup>397</sup> Ibid., 601.

<sup>398</sup> *SBE 13 – Vinaya Texts – Part I – The Pātimokkha & The Mahāvagga I-IV*, 240.

<sup>399</sup> *Vin. IV*, 130–131.

<sup>400</sup> *MN II – Aṅgulimālasutta 86*, 287.

<sup>401</sup> Chalmers ed., *Majjhima Nikāya II – Aṅgulimālasutta 86*, 100–101.



above translations renders the Pāli verb *abhivādetvā* explicitly as touching one's head to someone's feet. So, what is the Pāli verb that is specifically used to explicitly indicate bowing to the feet of the Buddha?

Reading through the *Mahāvagga*, we can find a number of other instances in which an individual is explicitly described as touching his/her head to the Buddha's feet. However, they all use quite different verbs. For example, the Pāli verb which signifies greeting to the Buddha is *nipatitvā* which is easily found in the *Mahāvagga*.

Then the venerable Sāgata, having shown in the air, in the atmosphere, various states of further-men and wonders of psychic power, having inclined his head towards the Lord's feet, spoke thus to the Lord.<sup>402</sup>

Atha kho āyasmā Sāgato ākāse antalikkhe anekavihitam  
uttarimanussadhammaṃ iddhipāṭihāriyaṃ dassetvā bhagavato pādesu  
sirasā nipatitvā bhagavantaṃ etad avoca.<sup>403</sup>

According to the *PTSPED*, *nipatitvā* means "to fall down, fly down, descend, go out."<sup>404</sup> Thus, similar with *abhivādetvā*, *nipatitvā* also means greeting respectfully. In the passage that just quoted, the disciple of the Buddha, Sāgata, explicitly greets the Buddha's feet with his head because this passage includes the Pāli word *pādesu* which means "feet." Therefore, I. B. Horner translates this Pāli verb as "having inclined his head towards the Lord's feet." Similarly, T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg also translate *nipatitvā* as "fell down with his head at the feet."<sup>405</sup>

---

<sup>402</sup> *Vin. IV*, 237-238.

<sup>403</sup> *VP*, 180.

<sup>404</sup> *PTSPED*, 360.

<sup>405</sup> *SBE 13 – Vinaya Texts: The Pātimokkha & The Mahāvagga I-IV*, 4.

Another verb found in the *Mahāvagga* which also describes the act of bowing one's head to the Buddha's feet is *vanda*: "Tena hi tvaṃ Soṇa mama vacanena bhavagato pāde sirasā vanda upajjhāyo me bhante āyasma Mahākaccāno bhagavato pāde sirasa vandatīti, evañ ca vadehi."<sup>406</sup> The English translation of this Pāli passage offered by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg is: "Do you therefore, Sona, bow down in my name at the feet of the Blessed One, and say, 'Lord! My superior, the venerable Mahā Kakkāyana, bow down in salutation at the feet of the Blessed One! and add'"<sup>407</sup> I. B. Horner, too, has a similar translation as the one offered by Davids and Oldenberg: "Well then, do you, Soṇa, in my name salute the Lord's feet with your head, saying."<sup>408</sup> What is notable here is the verb *vanda* which, as mentioned above, shares the same root "*vand*" with the verb *abhivādetvā* in the scene of greeting exchange between King Bimbisāra and the Buddha. And, again, this verb means "to greet respectfully, to salute, to pay homage, to honor, to respect, to revere, to venerate, and to adore."<sup>409</sup> More importantly, instead of simply being rendered as "having greeted" in the scene of King Bimbisāra, the verb *vanda* together with the Pāli word *pāde* explicitly denote the "head" and the "feet" in which Soṇa, a disciple of the Buddha, explicitly bows down to the Buddha's feet with his head. However, the verb *vanda* when used to describe the action of King Bimbisāra is not accompanied by the Pāli word *pāde/pādesu*. Thus, it is not rendered as bowing to anyone's feet. When it comes to the king, the verb *vanda* is only rendered as an act of exchanging greetings respectfully.

<sup>406</sup> *VP I*, 195.

<sup>407</sup> *SBE 14 – Vinaya Texts: Part II – The Mahāvagga V-X & The Cullavagga I-III*, 34.

<sup>408</sup> *Vin. IV*, 262.

<sup>409</sup> *PTSPED*, 601.

It is true that the verb *vandati* and *nipatitvā* could have the sense of bowing to the feet of the Buddha with one's head. And it is also the case that *abhivādetvā* could have the sense of bowing to someone's feet with one's head. Bowing to the feet is rendered when the agent is the disciple of the Buddha. However, there is no instance in the *Mahāvagga*, which is the *Pāli Vinaya*, where a king is explicitly described as touching his head to the Buddha's feet. Therefore, this simple greeting exchange between the Buddha and the king means that the *Pāli Vinaya* is not claiming for the superiority of the Buddha to King Bimbisāra or any other Indian kings.

Nevertheless, the situation is different in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the passage which is quoted from the *Four-Part Vinaya* above, the king is explicitly described as touching his head to the Buddha's feet 頭面禮足. Thus, the Buddha is described as far more superior to King Bimbisāra in comparison to the *Pāli Vinaya*. The question now is whether the scene of King Bimbisāra touching his head to the Buddha's feet is of Indian origin or was invented when the Indian *Dharmagupataka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*? To answer this question, we have to juxtapose the scene of King Bimbisāra touching his head to the Buddha's feet from the *Four-Part Vinaya* to the other existing Chinese Vinayas. There are two possibilities that may apply.

First, if only the *Four-Part Vinaya* and not the other existing Chinese Vinayas depicts the king as touching his head to the Buddha's feet, this should mean that this scene is found only in the *Four-Part Vinaya* in China when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. However,

this is not the case. There is at least one Chinese Vinaya that contains the same story regarding the recommendation of the Poṣadha Ceremony by King Bimbisāra.

“Having thus thought, King Bimbisāra went to the Buddha’s place, after touching his head to [the Buddha’s] feet in homage, sat down to one side.” (瓶沙王念已到佛所，頭面禮足，却坐一面).<sup>410</sup> This passage is from the *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律), thus the *Five-Part Vinaya* is also included the scene in which the King touches his head to the Buddha’s feet.

Although the other Vinayas in the Chinese translation do not contain this particular story, they do describe other interactions between King Bimbisāra and the Buddha, and we can see the king was described as performing this particular gesture of homage in other contexts. For example, in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* (摩訶僧祇律), the king also bows to the Buddha’s feet as in the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Five-Part Vinaya*. “At that time, King Bimbisāra urgently spurred his carriage to go to see the World-Honored One. Touching his head to the Buddha’s feet in homage, he sat down to one side.” (爾時瓶沙王疾勅嚴駕往詣世尊，頂禮佛足却坐一面).<sup>411</sup> Besides “touching his head to the Buddha’s feet in homage” 頂禮佛足, the similar phrase “paying homage at the feet of the World-Honored One” 禮世尊足 is found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (根本說一切有部毘奈耶): “Then, it was a regular practice for King Bimbisāra to go every day to pay homage at the feet of the World-Honored One, the fully ordained monks, and the elder bhiksus.” (時頻毘娑羅王常

---

<sup>410</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 121b14–15.

<sup>411</sup> T. no. 1425, 22: 242c15–16.

法，每日恒往禮世尊足并諸大德，上座苾芻).<sup>412</sup> Even in the *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya* (十誦律), the exact phrase as in the *Four-Part Vinaya* is found. “At that time, the Buddha was dwelling at Rājagṛha. When King Bimbisāra . . . had arrived, he touched his head to the Buddha's feet, and sat down to one side.” (佛在王舍城。是時泐沙王 . . . 到已，頭面禮佛足一面坐).<sup>413</sup> Thus, all these evidences do not support that the scene of King Bimbisāra touching his head to the Buddha's feet exist only in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Therefore, it could be the case that this scene is of the Indian origin and it is directly translated from the Indian language into Chinese in all the five Chinese Vinayas including the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

Now, the second possibility is examined. There is a possibility in which the scene of King Bimbisāra touching his head to the Buddha's feet exists only in all these five Chinese Vinaya texts in China. This is still not the case for there is also evidence showing that the scene of King Bimbisāra touching his head to the Buddha's feet is found in the other non-Chinese Vinayas. Fortunately, there is a good example of a non-Chinese Vinaya and it is partially an extant Sanskrit manuscript of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. In this Sanskrit text, the scene which describes King Bimbisāra explicitly touching his head to the Buddha's feet is found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* as follows.

It was King Bimbisāra's habit to descend from his great elephant whenever he saw a monk or a nun, and pay homage at their feet (*pādā*). One day, he mounted his elephant and set out to go to pay homage at the Buddha's feet.

---

<sup>412</sup> T. no. 1442, 23: 651a28–b1.

<sup>413</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 194c12–19.

ācaritaṃ rājño bimbisārasya bhikṣuṃ vā bhikṣuṇīm vā dṛṣṭvā  
hastistaskandhād avatīrya pādābhivandanam karoti | so'pareṇa samayena  
hastinam abhiruhya bhagavataḥ pādābhivandakaḥ saṃprasthitaḥ. <sup>414</sup>

What is worthy of careful attention in the Sanskrit passage above is the verb *pādābhivandanam*. This Sanskrit verb is made up of three components: (1) *pāda* which has its root as *pad* meaning foot;<sup>415</sup> (2) prefix *abhi* which indicates the preposition of at, to, upon, into, towards, and over;<sup>416</sup> and (3) the main verb *vanda* which has its root as *vand*, meaning to venerate, to show honor to somebody, to greet respectfully.<sup>417</sup> Thus, the Sanskrit verb *pādābhivandanam* clearly indicates that King Bimbisāra respectfully bows down to the Buddha's feet with his head. Let it be noted that the verb *abhivandanam* in this Sanskrit text is the Sanskrit equivalent of the Pāli verb *abhivādetvā* that is used in the *Mahāvagga* (the Pāli *Vinaya*) which means to salute respectfully. Thus, it is now safe to conclude that the scene of King Bimbisāra touching his head to the Buddha's feet is of Indian origin, and more specifically means that this scene likely exists in the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* before it was transmitted to China. Consequently, it is possible that the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* has praised the superiority of the Buddha over the Indian secular authorities, such as the Indian kings.

Thus far, our analysis has established that the moral conduct of the Buddhist monastics is not overpraised in the *Pāli Vinaya* since this *Vinaya* does not make a claim for the superiority of the Buddha over the secular authorities. However, this

---

<sup>414</sup> "Cīvaravastu," *Digital Sanskrit Buddhist Canon*, accessed on Feb. 10, 2015, <http://www.dsbcproject.org/node/5192>.

<sup>415</sup> *SED*, 582–583.

<sup>416</sup> *Ibid.*, 61.

<sup>417</sup> *Ibid.*, 919.

praise is present in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, the other Chinese Vinayas, and the Indian Sanskrit Vinaya. As a result, regarding the scene of King Bimbisāra touching his head to the Buddha's feet, it is true that the monastics are superior to the lay people in the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* in India, and this was transmitted to China when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the following, this dissertation continues to examine the relationship between the scene of King Bimbisāra touching his head to the Buddha's feet and the Indian Chinese cultural and social perspectives. By so doing, this dissertation shows that although this scene is of Indian origin and although this scene does not fit with the Chinese social and cultural perspectives, it is still found in the Chinese Vinaya, especially in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, possibly to make a claim for the superiority of the monastics over the lay people.

In India and at the time of the Buddha, it was common knowledge that the caste system was a highly rigid hierarchy of restriction on people in the ancient Indian society. Generally, there were four classes:<sup>418</sup> *Brahmins* (priests), *kṣatriyas* (rulers), *vaiśyas* (merchants/commoners), and *sūdras* (slaves). Among these four, the *Brahmins* are considered to be at the highest position in the social order.<sup>419</sup> Swami Vevekananda goes further and states that the center of Indian society is the spiritual man (*brahmins/shramana*<sup>420</sup>) and not the warrior (*kṣatriyas*). "In every other country, the highest honour belongs to the *Kshatriya*—the man of the sword.

---

<sup>418</sup> Sometimes, the other group of people is mentioned. This group of people (Pariahs) are outcastes and considered as untouchables. Generally, they were originated from *sūdras* class who were prisoners, criminals, ethnic minorities, and other groups that considered outside Indian society.

<sup>419</sup> Sharma, *Indian Society, Institutions and Change*, 20.

<sup>420</sup> *Brahmins/shramana* 沙門: The religious ascetics.

In India the highest honour belongs to the men of peace—the *Shramana* or the 'Brahmin', the men of God."<sup>421</sup> Thus, in ancient Indian social institutions, the *Brahmins* and *Shramanas* always stand at the highest position and are not regarded as subjects by the ruling classes. As a result, it is normal for the *Brahmins* and *Shramanas* to not bow down to the secular authorities but just exchange greetings with each another.

Since the *Brahmins* and *Shramanas* were ranked higher and more respectful than the *kṣatriyas* in the ancient Indian society, the *kṣatriyas* should even bow down to them. Buddhism is also a religious order in the ancient Indian society, so the same principle that the secular authorities should bow to a Buddhist *Shramana* was applied. This is the reason it is found in many places of the Tipitaka (Tripiṭaka) such that the Indian kings and the Buddha just exchanged greetings with one another. For example, in the *Samyutta Nikāya*, when King Pasenadi of Kosala visits the Buddha, it is mentioned in the sutra that they simply exchanged greetings with one another, and then they start their conversation.<sup>422</sup> Not only does the king exchange greeting with the Buddha, but also in order to pay respect to the Buddha, the king, when he enters the dwelling place of the Buddha, dismounts from his vehicle and approaches on foot to pay respect to the Buddha.<sup>423</sup> Even more, in the *Milindapañhapāḷi sutta*, Milinda<sup>424</sup> is said to be a wise and powerful king, and with his knowledge he has defeated almost all *shramanas* in the debates during his time.<sup>425</sup> Nevertheless, when

---

<sup>421</sup> Vivekananda, *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda*. Vol. 4, 243.

<sup>422</sup> *SN I – Kosala*, 93.

<sup>423</sup> *MN II – Aṅgulimālasutta* 86, 287.

<sup>424</sup> Great King who ruled over the city of Sāgala in India.

<sup>425</sup> *Milinda's Question I*, 5–8.



King Milinda meets the religious leaders, they just exchange friendly greetings with each other.<sup>426</sup> Moreover, when King Milinda meets *bhikkhu* Nāgasena, it is said that Nāgasena is more senior than the King. Thus, at the meeting, King Milinda greets Nāgasena first and then he sits down at a respectful distance from Nāgasena, and in order to gladden “the heart of King Milinda,” Nāgasena greets him in return.<sup>427</sup> This means even though Milinda is older than Nāgasena and even though Milinda is a powerful king, he holds Nāgasena in high esteem.

The Buddha never accepts the caste system in India. Since everyone is equal and the same in the sense that the tears of all human beings is salty and their blood is red, so there is no discrimination among people, and there is no so-called noble or stigma of *sudra* and untouchable class. According to the Buddha, all human beings are equal by birth: “Do not ask of the origin (*jati*), ask of the behavior. Just as fire can be born out of any wood, so can a saint be born in a *kula* [family] of low status.”<sup>428</sup> Therefore, people from all castes in India were welcomed to join the community of the Buddha. This is one of the aspects that make the Buddha a reformer. However, at first, this reformation causes chaos in Indian society during the Buddha’s time. Many people criticized and said that Buddhism is not worthy, because many disciples of the Buddha are from low castes. Even King Pasenadi of Kosala has to question the Buddha when he accepts the untouchable Sunita into the Buddhist community, because the King is afraid that people would look down on Buddhism. However, by witnessing the superiority of the *arhat* Sunita, King Pasenadi changes

---

<sup>426</sup> Ibid., 7 & 26.

<sup>427</sup> Ibid., 34.

<sup>428</sup> Singh, *A History of Ancient and Early Medieval India: From the Stone Age to the 12<sup>th</sup> Century*, 310.

his mind and he is willing to pay respect to Sunita.<sup>429</sup> Thus, even the powerful king in India still pays respect to the *shramana* who was previously of a low caste. Accordingly, no evidence is found that the Buddha or his disciples ever bow down to the King and other secular authorities. Rather, the king and other secular authorities should pay respect to the Buddha and his disciples. Thus, it may be common that the king should bow down to the Buddha in Indian society during the Buddha's time. Consequently, in the Sanskrit Vinaya, it is a "habit" of King Bimbisāra to bow to the feet of Buddha and the Saṅgha members with his head.<sup>430</sup> Therefore, in comparison between the Indian *Pāli Vinaya* and the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, this dissertation proposes that the superiority of the monastics over the lay people may exist in the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* in India, since the king in the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is explicitly described as touching his head to the Buddha's feet while there is no instance in the *Pāli Vinaya* that explicitly depicts the king as bowing down to the Buddha's feet. However, in the story of King Bimbisāra urging the Buddha to set up the Biweekly Precept Ceremony, this superiority which is found in the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* has a weak connection with the Indian culture and society. It may be the case that there is no need to call for the superiority of the Buddha over the king since this superiority was recognized, as is in India.

Nonetheless, the situation is different in China. While the highest rank in Indian society belongs to the *Brahmin/Shramana*,<sup>431</sup> the king/emperor is the most powerful person in ancient and medieval Chinese society. It is also said that a

---

<sup>429</sup> Ishigami, *Disciples of the Buddha*, 164-165.

<sup>430</sup> "Cīvaravastu," *Digital Sanskrit Buddhist Canon*, accessed on Feb. 10, 2015, <http://www.dsbcproject.org/node/5192>.

<sup>431</sup> Vivekananda, *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda Vol. IV*, 243.

common belief of Chinese people from ancient times is that *Shangdi* 上帝, or God, is the supreme divine being who rules over all human beings and controls all of nature on Earth.<sup>432</sup> Following this idea, emperors of the Zhou/Chou dynasty 周朝 (1046–256 BCE) claim that they are the “Mandate of Heaven” 天命 since their power is at the zenith in this world.<sup>433</sup> Moreover, all the Chinese emperors titled themselves as the “Son of Heaven” 天子 with the mandate of the Heaven 天命 that they rule all over the earth without any obstruction or any limit that could be placed on them.<sup>434</sup> Therefore, to state that the kings/emperors bow to the Buddha or the Buddhist monastics is unacceptable during ancient and medieval China. Rather, the Chinese kings/emperors request that the monastics bow down to the throne. Erik Zürcher is a supporter of this idea. In his book, *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, Zürcher states that the controversy over monastics bowing at court was a big issue in China during the fourth and the fifth century CE, which was the time when the *Four-Part Vinaya* was translated. This was also the time in which the royal court required monastics to pay reverence to the rulers, for they argued that monastics were also subject to the secular authorities.<sup>435</sup> The reason is that the political system developed to a super-stabilized structure in China from ancient times, and the power of the Chinese kings/emperors is paramount. In a sense, the tradition and the culture of the Chinese people, with the kings/emperors at the top, logically requires everyone below, including monastics, to bow down to them.

---

<sup>432</sup> Fowler and Fowler, *Chinese Religions: Beliefs and Practices*, 21.

<sup>433</sup> Ibid.

<sup>434</sup> Guo, *Chinese Politics and Government: Power, Ideology, and Organization*, 44.

<sup>435</sup> Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*, 157.

When Buddhism is introduced to China and during its first phase of encounter with the kings/emperors, there is none or not much conflict between Buddhist monks and the kings/emperors in the way they exchange salutation with each other. The reason for this, according to Wing-tsit Chan, is that most eminent monks do not like to meet the kings/emperors, and the monastics who meet the kings/emperors are almost always the foreigners so they are not expected to fully follow the Chinese culture.<sup>436</sup> However, the problem in the exchange of salutation between monastics and the kings/emperors starts to arise when the number of the native Chinese Buddhist monastics grows up and the native eminent Chinese monastics have more chances of meeting the kings/emperors. Especially, when some anti-Buddhist kings/emperors ascend the throne, the problem concerning the Buddhist monks not bowing down to the secular authorities becomes more serious.<sup>437</sup> Following the Indian culture, the Chinese monastics with the outstanding figure Huiyuan 慧遠 (334–416 CE) argue that one who renounces the world leaves all his worldly possessions, so he/she is no more a subject of the secular authorities. Consequently, he/she does not need to bow down to secular authority—even before a King/Emperor.<sup>438</sup> The debate on whether Buddhist monastics have to bow down to a King takes several centuries to end. This problem starts from the Eastern Jin 東晉 (317–420 CE) to the Tang dynasty 唐朝 (618–906 CE).<sup>439</sup> Of course, during the

---

<sup>436</sup> Chan and Adler, *Sources of Chinese Tradition I: From Earliest Times to 1600*, 426.

<sup>437</sup> Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*, 156–157.

<sup>438</sup> Wang 王, *Zhongguo Li Dai Si Xiang Jia* 中國歷代思想家 Vol. IV, 220–221; Cf. T 2102. 52.29c19–32b11; Dao'xuan 道宣, *Guang Hongming Ji* 廣弘明集 Vol. 105, 305–316; Sengyou 僧祐, *Hongming Ji* 弘明集 97, 156–168.

<sup>439</sup> Ye 業, *Zhongguo Fo Jiao Tu Jian* 中國佛教圖鑒, 37.

debate period, there is much suffering for Buddhist monastics, since they have to face the difficulties from the powerful authorities. However, this is off topic, so no further examination on this suffering is discussed. Though, one can learn that the Chinese monastics during this debate period tried their best to defend their proposal that a monk does not need to bow down to the secular authorities.

As stated in the “Overview of the *Four-Part Vinaya*” in Chapter II, Historical Background, the *Four-Part Vinaya* was brought to China from its original Sanskrit and it was translated into Chinese by Buddhayaśas 佛陀耶舍 with the help of Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (early 5<sup>th</sup> century) in 410 A.D.<sup>440</sup> During this time, the debate on Buddhist monks not bowing down to the secular authorities is at its zenith. Huiyuan 慧遠 (334–416) even writes a treatise titled, “A Monk Does Not Bow Down Before a King” 沙門不敬王者論,<sup>441</sup> to popularize this idea. Thus, this debate in one way or another had an effect on the translation of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The *Four-Part Vinaya*, more or less, may support the idea that Buddhist monks did not bow down to the secular authorities, and therefore the Indian phrase of “the king bows down to the Buddha’s feet with his head 頭面禮足” is copied and exercised. As analyzed above, the political constitution is well developed in China from ancient periods, and the power of kings/emperors is paramount, so it is unreasonable and difficult for one to state that the kings/emperors bow down to the Buddha in the Chinese culture. Research shows that not only is it the case that one suffers when insisting that a king/emperor should touch his head to the Buddha’s feet, but also one will be

---

<sup>440</sup> Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, 5.

<sup>441</sup> T. no. 2102, 52: 29c19–32b11.

sentenced to death. The evidence suggests that the mighty dragon is associated with only the power of the kings/emperors in the Chinese dynastic times. Anyone who violates this command by using this dragon symbol will be sentenced to death. Moreover, even the name with the character of *Long* 龍 is reserved for kings/emperors only. Anyone who is named with the *Long* character will be subjected to the death penalty as well.<sup>442</sup> With this paramount power, the Chinese kings/emperors never accept that they would bow down to someone's feet with the head, even when this idea is circulated in printed form as books written by eminent monks. In China, not only do the kings/emperors not bow down to the monastics' feet with the head, but also they request monks and nuns to bow down to the throne. The power of the Chinese kings/emperors is far more overwhelming than the monastics'. For example, during the Tang dynasty 唐朝 (618–907), many commands and orders are issued by the emperors to defrock the Buddhist monks and nuns and force them to return to lay life. The emperors also make monks and nuns docile because they do not want the religious Orders to hold great power. Even more, the emperor issues an edict that requires monks and nuns to bow down to the throne.<sup>443</sup> So, under the viewpoint of some ancient and medieval Chinese royal courts, Buddhist monks are still subjected to secular authorities.<sup>444</sup> To protest this decree, monks and nuns demonstrated their proposal in many ways—that since they renounce the world, they are no more subject to the worldly issues. Therefore, they do not need to show deference to the secular authorities. Monks and nuns

---

<sup>442</sup> Thong and Fu, *Finding God in Ancient China*, 263.

<sup>443</sup> Weinstein, *Buddhism Under the T'ang*.

<sup>444</sup> Arjomand and Tiryakian, *Rethinking Civilizational Analysis*, 153.

demonstrated either in person or in writings against this decree. Again, as mentioned above, the *Four-Part Vinaya* was brought to China and translated during the time that the debate whether monks have to bow down to a king or not is at its zenith. Moreover, in this Vinaya, there are many meeting times and conversations between the kings and the Buddha, and we already learn that in the Indian tradition, the Buddha is more respected than the king, so it is possible or it can happen that the king bowed down to the Buddha. However, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, even with the danger that may be caused from the secular authorities if one claims any superiority that can exceed the power of the kings, the Indian scene of the king bowing down to the feet of the Buddha with his head still persists. This persistence may indirectly demonstrate against the decree of the king, because in the Chinese culture the king demands that everyone, including monks and nuns, bow down to the throne. And at the same time, this persistence of the Indian practice of not bowing down to the king invading the Chinese culture also supports for the superiority of the Buddha over the secular kings/emperors in China. Therefore, although the scene of King Bimbisāra touching his head to the Buddha's feet has its origin in India, it more or less supports and enhances the proposal of the Buddhists that the monastics are superior to the lay people in the *Four-Part Vinaya* in the Chinese society.

Another reason that leads to the difference in the way of greeting between the Buddha and kings is related to the rendering of the term *cakravartin*.<sup>445</sup> According to the *SED*, *cakravartin* derives from the Sanskrit words *cakra* which

---

<sup>445</sup> Pāli: *Cakkavattī*.

means wheel and *vartin* which means to turn freely. Thus, *cakravartin* is the one who is the highest monarch or the Universal Emperor.<sup>446</sup> Mircea Eliade, when editing *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, explains that *cakravartin* is an ideology and aspiration of the second class (*kṣatriya*) of the ancient Indian society. Moreover, in ancient Indian culture, it is believed that only the one who renounces the political and secular kingship and leads people to improve their spiritual life is called the true *cakravartin*.<sup>447</sup> Eliade further states that, in Buddhism, “the religious truth is more powerful and universal than political prestige.”<sup>448</sup> Thus the spiritual universal monarchs *cakravartins* are more powerful than the secular authorities such as the kings and the emperors. So, it is reasonable that the secular kings/emperors should bow down to the religious universal monarch, *cakravartins*. Therefore, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha should and it is common for him to touch his head to the Buddha’s feet when he greets the Buddha.

However, when the idea of *cakravartin* is introduced and adopted in China, the Chinese render it as “Wheel-Turning Sage King” or the “Universal Sage King” 轉輪聖王. In Chinese culture, the “Universal Sage King” 轉輪聖王 is considered the emperor 皇帝 while kings 王 are only regarded as the rulers of the states, and it is said that the emperor is ranked higher than the kings and the kings have to bow down to the emperor.<sup>449</sup> The issue that the king has to bow down to the emperor is said to have started from the time of Qin Shi Huang 秦始皇 (259–210 BCE). After

---

<sup>446</sup> *SED*, 380–381.

<sup>447</sup> Eliade and Adams, *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, 7.

<sup>448</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>449</sup> Thong and Fu, *Finding God in Ancient China*, 281.



conquering all the states and unifying China, Qin Shi Huang wanted his title to go far beyond king (*wang* 王). Having thus considered, the title of emperor 皇帝 is chosen by Qin Shi Huang in which he distinguishes himself as the First Emperor.<sup>450</sup> Prior to Qin Shi Huang and during his time, Chinese people worshipped *Di* 帝 as a Supreme God. With the title of emperor 皇帝, Qin Shi Huang declares his power in both the religious and the political domains of life. Nevertheless, the Supreme God (*Shangdi* 皇帝 or *Di* 帝) is a subject of veneration by both the emperor and the common Chinese people.<sup>451</sup> With their paramount power, it is unacceptable that the emperors should bow down to the monastics in China. Thus, the custom of bowing down to the Buddha's feet with his [king's] head" found in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, which again, although has its origin in the Indian context, may have been influenced by the Chinese understanding of the Sanskrit term *cakravartin*, and the way the Chinese differentiate the ranking between the emperor and the king. Although, the *cakravartin*, which is the Buddha, is superior to the king in the Indian context, it is generally not accepted in China especially for some anti-Buddhist kings and emperors. Ultimately, the Chinese kings or emperors are the most powerful persons of the country. As a result, most Chinese kings/emperors strongly refuse to accept the practice that the kings/emperors bow to the feet of the Buddha and the Saṅgha members with their head in the Chinese historical context. Therefore, although the practice of touching the king's head to the Buddha's feet in homage 頭面禮足 as indicated in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* has its origin from Indian context, under

---

<sup>450</sup> Wood, *China's First Emperor and His Terracotta Warriors*, 26.

<sup>451</sup> Ibid.

the Chinese social and cultural context, it supports and enhances the proposal from the Chinese that the monastics are superior to the lay people. As a result, through the practice of touching the king's head to the Buddha's feet, the monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are overpraised or, in other words, they are described idealistically in which their virtue and practice are promoted to be superior to the lay people

Thus, through the philological analysis of the historical context between India and China, it is shown that this superiority of the monastics over the laity, as revealed through the story of King Bimbisāra urging the Buddha to institute the Biweekly Precept Ceremony (Poṣadha Ceremony) has weak connections to the Indian culture and society, while it has much to do with the Chinese culture and society. Thus, it is possible that although the superiority of the Buddha over King Bimbisāra through the scene of King Bimbisāra touching his head to the Buddha's feet is of the Indian origin, the use of the Sanskrit word *pādābhivandanaṃ* appears consistently throughout the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. By the presence of the consistent use of this Sanskrit term, it more or less supports that there is a discrepancy between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. The discrepancy is that the king in the *Pāli Vinaya* just exchanges greeting with Buddha, while the King in the *Four-Part Vinaya* explicitly bows down to the feet of the Buddha with his head. In a sense, there is a natural portrayal for the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya*. On the contrary, their image is idealistically reconstructed to be superior to the lay people in the *Four-Part Vinaya* in China.

### 5.2.3. The Difference Pertaining to the Common Lay People

Section 5.2.2 above points out that even though the power of the ancient and medieval Chinese secular authorities is at the zenith, the superiority of monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya* is still stressed either directly or indirectly in the form of bending the power of the secular authorities below the Buddha and the monastics. Moreover, the high rank and superiority of monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya* among the Chinese society are over-emphasized to the point that probably makes them feel they possess something that is equal to the “secret treasure of the King,” which common people cannot acquire or participate in. Just like the King/Emperor who always has his own secret treasure that no one in his country can access:

What is Vinaya? It is the secret Vinaya that only monks and nuns have access to guard themselves from unwholesomeness and misdeed. It is either two hundred and fifty precepts or five hundred things that prevent monks and nuns from misconduct. The Vinaya is just like the secret treasure of the nation only the King knows its place, and even the other ministers don't know where it is. Thus, it is called the secret treasure. This Vinaya is also the same. It is not open for śrāmaṇera/śrāmaṇerī or lay people to study. Therefore, it is called the Vinaya.

毘尼者。禁律也。為二部僧。說檢惡歛非。或二百五十。或五百事。引法防  
姦。猶王者祕藏非外官所司。故曰內藏也。此戒律藏者亦如是。非沙彌清信  
士女所可聞見。故曰律藏也。<sup>452</sup>

Out of respect for the monastics, Buddhist monks and nuns in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are equal or even superior to the kings/emperors. Since the power of the ancient Chinese kings are always at the zenith and possess many “secret things,” Buddhist monks and nuns should own something similar. That thing happens to be the [Vinaya] Prātimokṣa 婆羅提木叉 which serves as the finest valuable object chosen

<sup>452</sup> T. no. 1507, 25: 32, a11–15.

as the secret treasure for monks and nuns. As the Prātimokṣa is the secret treasure for the monastics, the lay people cannot study it because the Prātimokṣa is exclusively designated for monks and nuns in order that they be properly guided to regulate their conduct.

The Vinaya designated for a lay person or for a śrāmaṇera 沙彌/śrāmaṇerī 沙彌尼 is much simpler, such as the Five Precepts 五戒, the Eight Precepts 八關齋戒, or the Ten Precepts 十戒. However, in India, as it should be everywhere else, including China, although lay people have their own precepts to observe, it does not mean that they cannot read or study the Prātimokṣa of fully ordained monks and nuns. In contrast, China is the exception in that the restriction on the Vinaya study placed on lay practitioners was a new rule that started in China and eventually influenced the surrounding Asian countries, which may suggest the presence of the superiority of monastics over the lay people. Paradoxically, many Asian Buddhist countries such as China, Korea, and Vietnam still follow the idea that lay people cannot study the Vinaya of monks and nuns. For those reasons, this dissertation would like to take a further step to discuss the view of whether lay people are allowed to study the Vinaya or not. By discussing the issue on whether or not lay people can study the Vinaya of monks and nuns, this dissertation finds that this debate is popular in China. One thing is for certain, the Chinese take this issue of forbidding the laity access to the Vinaya quite seriously. As a consequence, this restriction permeated the surrounding countries. More importantly, the issue on whether or not lay people can study the Vinaya of monks and nuns in China directly reveals the discrepancies between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*.

Although the investigation into whether the laity is allowed to read the monk's and nun's Vinaya can be a big project, only the heart of the issue is addressed in this dissertation.

To the best of my knowledge, the author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* 大智度論, which is assumed to be Nāgārjuna 龍樹 (150–250 CE), may have been the first person who promoted this idea. In the treatise of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* 大智度論, the author who is unknown, and may or may not be Nāgārjuna, said that the Vinaya taught by the Buddha is only for monks and nuns and the Buddhist laity cannot study it 此毘尼中說，白衣不得聞。<sup>453</sup> Regarding this, the author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* seems to contradict himself because this statement is made while he explains a precept in the Vinaya that actually is accessible to both the monastic and the laity.

For example, the precept of abstaining-from-eating-at-inappropriate-times 非時食 is applicable not only to the monastics but also to the laities. First, this dissertation demonstrates how it is that this precept on eating is applicable to the monastics. The author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* clearly elucidates the two types of time, i.e. the actual time (*kalā* 迦羅/實時) and the provisional/non-specific one (*samaya* 三摩耶/假時). The Vinaya the Buddha taught is to prevent his disciples from suffering in the mundane worldly defilements. So, the Vinaya that the author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* expounds here is for worldly people and not for transcendent beings. However, the author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* is

---

<sup>453</sup> T. no. 1509, 25: 66 a12–13.

incorrect when he states that the laity cannot listen to this Vinaya, for example, the discipline for both monastics and lay people to abstain from eating at inappropriate times. Whenever monks and nuns eat during an inappropriate time, they commit the offense of wrongdoing (*pāyattika* 波逸提).<sup>454</sup> In the other sutras, the Buddha also teaches this discipline to monks. For example, in the *Uposatha Sutta* of the *Āṅguttara Nikāya*, the Buddha gathers monks together and gives a discourse on the Uposatha. According to the Buddha, the Uposatha that brings glorious, radiant fruit and benefit for monks and nuns is the one with eight factors. They are to: (1) avoid the intentional taking of life, (2) forego taking what has not been given, (3) abstain from sexual misconducts, (4) desist from the telling of lies, (5) refrain from the taking of liquors and intoxicants, (6) relinquish partaking food at night and at a wrong time, (7) refrain from singing and dancing as well as the playing of musical instruments and the watching of entertainments, and (8) renounce from lying on large or high beds.<sup>455</sup> The discipline of abandoning consumption of food at night or during wrong times is taught by the Buddha to monks and nuns. Also, according to the Buddha, if monks and nuns on Uposatha day can observe and keep this discipline as well as the other seven rules, then it is fruitful, of great advantage, splendid, and thrilling.<sup>456</sup>

Second, this dissertation demonstrates how it is that this precept on eating is applicable to the laity. In the *Visākhā* sutra of the *Āṅguttara Nikāya*, the Buddha also

---

<sup>454</sup> T. no. 1429, 22: 1019a17. "Whatever monks should eat or partake food at the inappropriate time, there is an offense of *pāyattika*." (若比丘! 非時, 受食食者, 波逸提). Cf. *Vin. IV*, 335-337.

<sup>455</sup> *AN IV*, 170-171.

<sup>456</sup> *Ibid.*

teaches the same principles as stated above to the lay people. In this sutra, the Buddha explains to lay Buddhist practitioner Visākhā<sup>457</sup> the Eight Precepts that she should observe on Uposatha day so that they may bring great fruit, great advantage, great splendor, and great range. The Eight Precepts are to: (1) refrain from killing living beings, (2) refrain from taking what is not given, (3) refrain from sex outside of social customs and regulations, (4) refrain from false speech, (5) refrain from distilled and fermented intoxicants, (6) refrain from partaking food at night, (7) refrain from dancing, singing, listening to music, experiencing entertainments, adorning flower circlets, and attracting with perfumes and beautifying with cosmetics, and (8) refrain from high beds and large beds.<sup>458</sup> Accordingly, unlike what is said in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sāstra*, the lay people also can study and observe the same precepts that monks and nuns study, that is, even the lay people can have access to the above eight disciplines.

Moreover, in the Bairāt Bhābrā Rock Edict of Aśoka, when King Aśoka 阿育王 (304–232 BCE) of the Mauryan dynasty 孔雀王朝 (c.325–c.183 BCE) approaches the Saṅgha, he states that Buddhism will last for a long time only when the four fold disciples<sup>459</sup> of the Buddha learn and preserve the teaching of the Buddha, that is, the Dhamma and the Vinaya.<sup>460</sup> Thus, both monastics and lay people should study and observe the Dhamma and the Vinaya. More importantly, the Vinaya is designated

---

<sup>457</sup> Visākhā: A lady follower 優婆夷 of Śākyamuni Buddha, outstanding for her support of the early Buddhist monastic community.

<sup>458</sup> AN IV, 174.

<sup>459</sup> Four-fold disciples (四眾): monks *bhikṣu*, nuns *bhikṣuṇī*, male devotees *upāsaka*, and female devotees *upāsikā*.

<sup>460</sup> Thapar, *Aśoka and the Decline of the Mauryas*, 261. Cf. Talim, *Edicts of King Aśoka: A New Vision*, 139-141; Mookerji, *Asoka*, 117–120; Rastogi, *Inscription of Asoka*, 247.

specially for maintaining the relationship between monastics and lay people. Lay people should learn and know the Vinaya of monastics so that they know how to behave when interacting with monks and nuns.<sup>461</sup> As a result, there is no limitation or restriction prohibiting the lay people from accessing the entire Vinaya 律藏全書. Therefore, the author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* is probably incorrect when he states that lay people cannot study the Vinaya. What is more, there is no text or evidence found in India to show that lay people cannot study the Vinaya of monks and nuns with the exception of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* text. However, the author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* text, in which the restriction on the lay people in studying the Vinaya of monks and nuns is found, is obscure and the text itself in Sanskrit is lost. Furthermore, the idea that lay people cannot study the Vinaya of monks and nuns has never been an issue in India. So, no further investigation on the issue that lay people cannot study the Vinaya of monks and nuns in India is necessary in this dissertation. However, this issue is taken seriously in China. In the following, this dissertation reviews the issue on whether or not lay people can study the Vinaya of monks and nuns. By reviewing this issue, it shows that the Chinese monks and nuns claim their superiority over the lay people. This claim, at the same time, reveals the discrepancies between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*, in which the monastics are portrayed idealistically in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, while they are described realistically in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

When Buddhism was introduced to China, the idea that lay people cannot study the Vinaya was also promoted. The Han 漢, text *A Treatise on the Different*

---

<sup>461</sup> *Vin. V, 339.*



*Levels of Merit* (*Fenbie gongde lun* 分別功德論), which is a commentary on the *Ekōttarāgama-sūtra* 增一阿含經 composed during the third century CE,<sup>462</sup> is probably the first evidence in China to point out that a layperson cannot study the Vinaya:

What is Vinaya? It is the secret Vinaya for monks and nuns to guard themselves from unwholesomeness and misdeed. It is either two hundred and fifty precepts or five hundred things that prevent monks and nuns from misconduct. The Vinaya is just as the secret treasure of a nation that only the King knows its place, and even the other ministers don't know where it is. Thus, it is called the secret treasure. This Vinaya is also the same. It is not open for *śrāmaṇera* 沙彌/*śrāmaṇerī* 沙彌尼 or lay people to study. Therefore, it is called the Vinaya.

毘尼者。禁律也。為二部僧。說檢惡歛非。或二百五十。或五百事。引法防姦。猶王者祕藏非外官所司。故曰內藏也。此戒律藏者亦如是。非沙彌清信士女所可聞見。故曰律藏也<sup>463</sup>

The above quote is strong evidence to argue for the idea that lay people cannot study the Vinaya. The quote above is probably a paraphrase from the author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sāstra* 大智度論. Not only does the quote state that lay people cannot study the Vinaya as it is in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sāstra*, it also makes the idea persuadable by offering a rational claim. In this claim, the Han text goes further than the author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sāstra's* 大智度論 by indicating the Prātimokṣa as a private fortune of the monastics. Just like the secret treasure of a king, this private Prātimokṣa is accessible only by fully ordained monks and nuns. So other people, even the novices, are not allowed to read the Vinaya of monks and nuns because this Vinaya is likened to be the secret treasure of a king, where even the other ministers do not know where it is. In this connection, by using the

<sup>462</sup> This text composed during the Han dynasty 漢朝 (206 BC-220 AD).

<sup>463</sup> T. no. 1507, 25: 32, a11-15.

Prātimokṣa as a secret treasure preserved strictly for the monastics only, and by either copying or inventing the rule that the lay people are denied access to the Vinaya (the Prātimokṣa), it suggests that the idea, in which monastics are superior to the laity in terms of having a higher level of access to the Vinaya, gains ground starting sometime during the Han dynasty (c. 3<sup>rd</sup> CE) and gradually evolves through the 7<sup>th</sup> century, the seventeenth century, and all the way up to the twenty-first century.

A few centuries later (c. 6<sup>th</sup>–7<sup>th</sup> century CE), Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667 CE), a preeminent figure in the Nanshan School of the Vinaya 南山律宗 in China, in his book, *The Commentary on Services of Cutting the Complex and Adding the Missing Parts of the Four-Part Vinaya* (*Sifenlü Shanfan Buque Xingshi Chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔), also confirms that lay people cannot study the Vinaya of monks and nuns. “This discipline which is laid down by the Buddha is sublime and profound, and lay people are not allowed to study it.” (此戒法唯佛出世樹立此法.祕故勝故.不令俗人聞之故).<sup>464</sup>

Moreover, Daoxuan stresses this idea by saying that among the six destinies 六道, only human beings can receive this discipline (六道之中唯人得受).<sup>465</sup> However, this statement of Daoxuan is incorrect. In his statement, Daoxuan uses “this discipline 此戒法”, and this means the system of precepts, i.e. the Prātimokṣa of monks and nuns or *sīla*. To examine the idea of Daoxuan, firstly the meaning of *sīla*

---

<sup>464</sup> T. no. 1804, 40: 29, a16–17 (Daoxuan, *The Commentary on Services of Cutting the Complex and Adding the Missing Parts of the Four-Part Vinaya* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔).

<sup>465</sup> T. no. 1804, 40: a17–18.

should be defined. According to the *SED*, *sīla* is a habit, custom, usage, nature or acquired way of living or acting, practice, conduct, disposition, tendency, character, moral conduct, piety, and virtue.<sup>466</sup> The foundation of Buddhist *sīla* is based on social custom and morality. For example, Udāyin 迦留陀夷 sits down together with a lady in a secret and secluded place. Visākhā, on her visit to the house of that lady, sees Udāyin sitting together with that lady in a secret and secluded place. She says that it is not proper and suitable for a monk to sit together with a lady in a secret and secluded place, even if the monk does not have any sensual desire but unbelieving people are difficult to convince. According to the Indian cultures, it is not proper for a monk to sit together with a lady in a secret and secluded place. Based on this culture and because of Visākhā's recommendation, the Buddha lays down the rule that a monk should not sit together with a lady in a secret and secluded place, and whoever does so, he/she commits an offense of defeat 波羅夷, entailing a formal meeting of the Order 僧伽婆尸沙, or involving expiation 波逸提 in accordance with what the accusation of the witnesses.<sup>467</sup>

Another example is found in the first expiation offense (*pācittiya*). In this rule, Hatthaka is criticized by the followers of the other sects because when they discuss, Hatthaka speaks in a twisted way and tells a lie. Having heard this, the Buddha sets up a rule that whoever tells a conscious lie,<sup>468</sup> he/she commits the

---

<sup>466</sup> *SED*, 1079.

<sup>467</sup> *Vin. IV*, 330–335. Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 600b9–601a5.

<sup>468</sup> The conscious lie is the one that involves seeing what one has not seen, cognizing what one has not cognized, or speaking in twisted way, and so forth. This is different from telling a conscious lie that one claims a state of further-men 上人/聖人. If one claims a state of further-men when one is not, one commits the offense of *pārājika* 波羅夷 (*Pārājika IV*, *Vin. IV*, 151–191). This

expiation offense 波逸提. Thus, many rules just simply deal with the social custom and conduct in order to prevent the arising of defilements in the Saṅgha. Moreover, before his great Nibbāna, the Buddha told Ānanda that the Saṅgha can abolish the lesser and minor precepts if they wish.<sup>469</sup> Thus, if, as Daoxuan suggests, “this discipline were sublime and profound 祕故勝故,” the Buddha would not have allowed the Saṅgha to abolish any existing rules or disciplines. Even though the Buddha gives the permission to the Saṅgha to abolish the minor precepts, not only does the Saṅgha choose not to abolish any rules and disciplines that have been laid down by the Buddha, but also, they do not make up what has not been set up by the Buddha.<sup>470</sup> Also, according to Mahakassapa—the president of the First Buddhist Council, the disciplines that the Buddha laid down are the moral conduct that trains monks and nuns in the proper interactions with the householders, as well as for householders to have the proper conduct towards monks and nuns.<sup>471</sup> This statement of Kassapa clearly points out that lay people also should know the rules and disciplines of the Vinaya, in order to show the proper concern for monks and nuns. Hence, there should be no restriction on the lay people from reading and studying the rule and disciplines of monks and nuns in the Vinaya. In other words, the claim of Daoxuan that lay people cannot study the Vinaya of fully ordained monks and nuns is incorrect.

---

conscious lie is also not the one that falsely accuses someone of a pārājika (This is the offense of *saṅghādiṣeṣa* 僧伽婆尸沙 VIII, *Vin. IV*, 271–287).

<sup>469</sup> *DN II – The Mahāparinibbāna Sutta* 16, 171.

<sup>470</sup> *Vin. V*, 399.

<sup>471</sup> *Vin. V*, 339.

Despite that fact, the idea that lay people cannot study the Vinaya of monks and nuns continues to be popular in China. In the pre-modern time, Hongzan 弘贊, who lived during the years 1611 to 1685 under the Ming (1368–1644) and Qing (1644–1911) dynasties, makes it clear that lay people are “prohibited” from reading the rules and disciplines of monks and nuns. In his book, *Commentary on the Prātimokṣa of the Four-Part Vinaya* 四分戒本如釋, Hongzan emphasizes his idea by paraphrasing the Abhidharma with the addition of his own thoughts into his commentary to strengthen his argument with the following quote from the *Fenbie gongde lun* 分別功德論:

The Buddhas of the three times<sup>472</sup> all preach Tripiṭaka. Among these three baskets, the Sutta Piṭaka and Abhidharma Piṭaka can be studied by both monastic and lay people, but the Vinaya Piṭaka is only for monastics. Just as the secret treasure of a nation, only the King knows its place. If the lay people or the *sāmaṇera* study the Vinaya, later in time, they would never get full ordination. If they open and read it, this offense will be similar to the five heinous sins 五逆罪. So, one who is a teacher should keep this in mind.

三世諸佛。俱說經律論三藏聖教。經論二藏。咸通在家出家。惟律一藏。比丘獨持。如王秘藏。非外官所司。故白衣。沙彌。若先覽者。後永不得受大戒。罪與五逆同例。凡為師者。最宜謹慎。<sup>473</sup>

The ideas of Hongzan are probably an anomaly from the book of Zhuhong 株宏 (1535–1615) in which Zhuhong states that a *sāmaṇera*/*śrāmaṇeri* (novice) should not stealthily listen to the recitation of the Prātimokṣa by monks and nuns 不得盜聽大沙門說戒。<sup>474</sup> In the *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of*

<sup>472</sup> Three times: past, present, and future.

<sup>473</sup> X. 63, 35b15–18 (Hongzan, *Commentary on the Prātimokṣa of the Four-Part Vinaya* 四分戒本如釋).

<sup>474</sup> X. 106, 303a15 (Hongzan, *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註).

*Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註, Hongzan states that when monks and nuns are reciting the Prātimokṣa and preaching the Vinaya, a sāmaṇera cannot come and listen to it. Otherwise, he/she will commit a serious offense and later in time he/she cannot receive full ordination.<sup>475</sup>

However, it seems that Hongzan misreads the passage of Zhuhong. In this passage, Zhuhong undoubtedly claims that a sāmaṇera cannot stealthily (盜) observe or listen to the Prātimokṣa that is being recited by monks and nuns. A sāmaṇera is a person who has not received full ordination yet, so he/she is not counted as a member of the Saṅgha. Thus, a sāmaṇera cannot vote in any formal act of the Saṅghā 僧伽羯磨. If, for any reason, a sāmaṇera stealthily sits among the Saṅgha and votes for a formal act, he/she commits one of the Thirteen Obstacles 十三難,<sup>476</sup> i.e. receiving the precepts with exploitive intentions 賊心受戒. It is said that if one commits any of these Obstacles, he/she cannot receive the full ordination.<sup>477</sup> This is also the reason that before a formal act is carried out, the reciting preceptor 羯磨師 should ask whether or not all lay people have exited the precept recitation hall 未受大戒者出.<sup>478</sup> Thus, it is evident that lay people are only prohibited from participating and voting in a formal act and stealthily listening to the Prātimokṣa. There is no prevention or restriction of lay people from studying the Vinaya as Hongzan suggested.

---

<sup>475</sup> X. 106. 303a16–b2 (Hongzan, *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註).

<sup>476</sup> For the details of Thirteen Obstacles, sees T. no. 1428. 22: 589a19–23. Cf. X. 71. 73b17–78b7.

<sup>477</sup> T. no. 1432, 22: 1042b13.

<sup>478</sup> T. no. 1429, 22: 1015b16.

To be sure, let us read and examine more about the idea of Zhuhong. Again, in the book, *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of a Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註, Zhuhong states that if a sāmaṇera is eager to learn more about the Brahma-life (the monastic life), he should read the entire Vinaya 若樂廣覽。自當閱律藏全書.<sup>479</sup> Similarly, Zhuhong encourages the sāmaṇera to study more, and according to him there is no passage in his whole book, the *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of a Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註, that prevents a sāmaṇera from studying the Vinaya. Still, Hongzan misunderstands the idea of Zhuhong. In his commentary, Hongzan said: “The entire Vinaya 全書 is the Ten Precepts and Departments of a sāmaṇera. This book is just an outline to make it easy for the beginners to capture what they should do and what they should not do. If a sāmaṇera wishes to know the details, he should read the whole text” (律藏全書。即沙彌十戒法并威儀等經。今此要略。為便初進。庶知持犯麤相。欲悉微細行持。自當廣閱全書).<sup>480</sup> It is clear that Hongzan is incorrect when he limits the entire Vinaya 律藏全書 to only the Ten Precepts and Departments of a sāmaṇera. The entire Vinaya is designated for monks and nuns and most of it is not suitable for a sāmaṇera. Because there are some people who join the Saṅgha at a young age, and are not yet eligible to receive full ordination, the Buddha laid down only the Ten Precepts and Departments for them because these rules are simpler for a sāmaṇera to observe. Thus, the Buddha specially opens up extra precepts and departments for

---

<sup>479</sup> X. 106. 269b7 (Hongzan, *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註).

<sup>480</sup> X. 106. 269b8–10 (Hongzan, *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註).

a sāmaṇera—even though a sāmaṇera is still not recognized as a member of the Saṅgha who can vote for a formal act.

Interestingly, at the beginning of the same book, the *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of a Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註, Zhuhong already clarifies that the Ten Precepts and Departments of sāmaṇera are called precepts and departments 律儀 and not the entire Vinaya 律藏全書.<sup>481</sup> Nevertheless, the explanation of Hongzan is misleading. At the same time and in the same book, Zhuhong says that although it is the business of monks and nuns, a sāmaṇera should learn and knows them beforehand: “雖比丘事沙彌當預知之.”<sup>482</sup> So, Zhuhong’s idea is clear that there is no prohibition or restriction on a sāmaṇera from studying and reading the Vinaya of monks and nuns. Zhuhong even encourages the ambitious sāmaṇera to not only study the sāmaṇera’s Vinaya but also, if possible, learn more about the Vinaya of monks and nuns. By doing so, a sāmaṇera will thoroughly understand and know how to behave correctly with monks and nuns. Furthermore, the argument against the idea that lay people cannot study the Vinaya is consolidated by some case studies with Thai<sup>483</sup> and Burmese monastics.<sup>484</sup> These case studies show that there is no restriction of lay people on reading the Vinaya in the Theravāda Buddhist tradition.

---

<sup>481</sup> X. 106. 266a5 (Hongzan, *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註卷上).

<sup>482</sup> X. 106. 304a2–3 (Hongzan, *Commentary and Summary of the Precepts and Departments of Sāmaṇera* 沙彌律儀要略增註卷下).

<sup>483</sup> These case studies were carried out on Feb. 18, 2013 with Pradoocho Pornarai, Somchai Thomtha, Sayan Thongpim, and Anake Panguan who are all currently chaplaincy program students at the University of the West.

<sup>484</sup> This case study is carried with Dhammacara via email on Feb. 15, 2013. For details, see Appendix II.



In defense of any argument claiming that the reason for the prevention of a *sāmaṇera* from reading the Vinaya of monks and nuns is that if a *sāmaṇera* (novice) studies the Vinaya of monks and nuns beforehand, it may be a disadvantage for him. The disadvantage is that there are many rules and disciplines for the monastic life, and if a *sāmaṇera* studies the Vinaya of the monastics beforehand, he may become afraid that he cannot follow the Brahma-life. Thus, it may cause him to disrobe and turn back to a household life. This argument, at first, seems to be reasonable. However, this argument turns out to be not the case. The Buddha, before his final Nibbāna, says that the Truths (Dharma) and the Rules (Vinaya) will be the Teacher of the Order,<sup>485</sup> and the Buddha always stresses the importance of the Vinaya. Every single rule, which is laid down by the Buddha, is based on these Ten Reasons:

(1) For the excellence of the Order, (2) for the comfort of the Order, (3) for the restraint of [the] evil-minded, (4) for the ease of well-behaved monks, (5) for the restraint of the cankers belonging to the here and now, (6) for the combating of the cankers belonging to other worlds, (7) for the [arising of faith in] non-believers, (8) for the increase in the number of believers, (9) for the establishing *dhamma* indeed, (10) for following the rules of restraint.<sup>486</sup>

Right at the introduction of the Prātimokṣa, many benefits of the Vinaya are discussed in general and many benefits of the Prātimokṣa are mentioned in particular. For example, the benefits of the Prātimokṣa are unlimited just like an ocean which has no shore; the Prātimokṣa is like a great treasure that one continues to desire; and among the Vinaya, the Prātimokṣa is ranked as the highest position.<sup>487</sup> This is why, according to Bimala Churn Law, the Vinaya is the life of Buddhism; without the Vinaya, there would be no Buddhism. Law states:

---

<sup>485</sup> DN II – Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta 16, 171.

<sup>486</sup> Vin. I, 37–38.

<sup>487</sup> T. no. 1429, 22: 1015a23–b14.

In fact, from very ancient times *Vinaya* has been given so great regard that at one time it was even put first in the order of the *Ti-pitaka*, *Sutta* being placed next and *Abhidhamma* last, it being believed that *Vinaya* was *ayu* (life) or the very life of Buddhism and as long as it was observed the true religion would live, but if it was ignored the true religion would perish. Even at the present time this belief is very much alive among the so called Southern Buddhists of Ceylon and Siam. In China and Japan, we have a sect known by the name of *Risshu* (lit. *Vinaya* Sect), which was founded on the teaching contained in the *Shibun-ritsu* (*Vinaya* of *Dhammaguttika*). It goes without saying that this sect makes the *Vinaya-pitaka* the fountainhead of its life.<sup>488</sup>

Thus, if a *sāmaṇera* could read these *Vinayas*, and know the great benefits of the *Vinaya*, it would be better for him. His desires to get full ordination will be strengthened, and faith in Buddhism will deeply develop in him as suggested in the reasons seven to ten of the above Ten Reasons<sup>489</sup> for the Buddha to set up rules and disciplines. As a result, a *sāmaṇera*, instead of despising the monastics, will respect the monastics more and more because he realizes that the monastics follow the noble teachings that lead to a *Brahma-life*. Thus, monastics are the fine examples that a *sāmaṇera* should follow. This indication is reinforced by the *Raṭṭhapāla-suttanta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya* or its equivalent in the *Rāṣṭrapāla Sutra* of the *Middle Length Āgama Sutras* 中阿含經.<sup>490</sup> In these sutras, it is said that *Raṭṭhapāla/Rāṣṭrapāla*, having deeply understood the Buddhist Dharma/Dhamma and *Vinaya*, sets his mind on the monkhood life because he understands that the Dhamma and *Vinaya* spoken by the Buddha is the ultimate way to attain purification and enlightenment, he states:

---

<sup>488</sup> Law, *Buddhistic Studies*, 365–366.

<sup>489</sup> Rules and disciplines of the Buddha are set up based on the Ten Reasons: (1) For the excellence of the Order; (2) for the comfort of the Order; (3) for the restraint of evil-minded men; (4) for the ease of well-behaved monks; (5) for the restraint of the cankers belonging to the here and now; (6) for the combating of the cankers belonging to the other worlds; (7) for the benefit of non-believers; (8) for the increase in the number of believers; (9) for the establishing dhamma indeed; and (10) for following the rules of restraint. *Vin. IV*, 37–38; Cf. T. no. 1428, 22: 570c2–7.

<sup>490</sup> T. no. 26, 1: 623a11–628a9.

Insofar as I understand *dhamma* taught by the Lord [the Buddha], it is no easy matter for one living in a house to fare the Brahma-faring completely fulfilled, completely pure and polished like a conch-shell. Suppose that I, having cut off hair and beard, having donned saffron garments, should go forth from home into homelessness.<sup>491</sup>

The equivalent passage is also found in the *Raṭṭhapāla/Rāṣṭrapāla Sutra* 賴吒和羅經 of the *Middle Length Āgama Sutras* (*Madhyamāgama* 中阿含經):

As I understand the Dharma which is taught by the Buddha, if I remain as a layman, there are many obstacles that prevent me from devoting my whole life to the practice of a holy life. O Buddha! Please ordain me to become a fully ordained monk under your instruction so I can live the holy Dharma.

如我知佛所說法者，若我在家，為鎖所鎖，不得盡形壽清淨行梵行。世尊！願我得從世尊出家學道而受具足，得作比丘，淨修梵行。<sup>492</sup>

Thus, having deeply understood the Buddhist Dhamma and Vinaya, and knowing the benefits of the Buddhist Vinaya which can lead one to the fullness in the Brahma life, despite his parents' prevention, Raṭṭhapāla receives the full ordination, and finally attains the noble *arhat* fruit 阿羅漢果. So, if laypeople can study the Vinaya and understand its benefits, surely it will reinforce their faith in monks and nuns, and especially, their desire to attain full ordination will be consolidated and strengthened.

And yet, another issue that needs to be made clear in this section is whether the idea of the lay people studying the Vinaya is worthy to discuss or not because this idea existed a long time ago. What is more, nowadays, there are many translations and commentaries on the Vinaya of the monastics, which are composed by scholars who are not monastics and who are not fully ordained people. So, what

---

<sup>491</sup> *MN II – Raṭṭhapāla-suttanta*, 251.

<sup>492</sup> T. no. 26, 1: 623b11–12.

happens to these scholars? Do they commit the offense of reading the Vinaya of monastics, that is, “receiving the precepts with exploitive intentions 賊心受戒” and later could they get full ordination? In other words, in the twenty-first century CE, the belief that lay people cannot read the Vinaya of monastics, which starts roughly from the third century CE, is likely unreasonable, indefensible, and not applicable, except in some circles of practitioners. This dissertation finds it important to discuss this incorrect third century view in the twenty-first century, because even though there is conclusive evidence for its inaccuracy, there are some Buddhist countries, mainly China, that still have practitioners who observe it strictly.

Research shows that Daoxuan and Hongzan were all well-known masters well versed in the Vinaya, and they all are the Vinaya practitioners and teachers through the ages. Their influence is widespread in their country and all over the world. The practitioners in many other countries still practice and follow in the footsteps of Daoxuan and Hongzan. Specifically, the idea of preventing a sāmaṇera from reading the Vinaya of monastics is still popular in the Northern Buddhist traditions such as in China, Korea, and Vietnam. Thus, the idea of whether or not there is any restriction on the lay people from studying the Vinaya of monastics is worthy of discussion in this dissertation.

A case study with some Buddhist monastics show that the idea of preventing lay people from reading the Vinaya of monastics is still popular in the Northern Buddhist tradition. For example, a case study with Chanju Mun (Seongwon), the abbot of Tongdo-sa Monastery near Busan, Korea, shows that sāmaṇeras (male novices) and sāmaṇerīs (female novices) are not allowed to read the Vinaya of

monastics until they get full ordination. Mun continues that: “Sramaneras do not have a class in the Vinaya but study the *Shami luyi* 沙彌律儀 (*Sramenara Precepts and Customs*) in their monastic seminaries.”<sup>493</sup> Thus, in the Korean tradition, lay people are not allowed to read and practice the Vinaya of monastics.

Another case study is carried out with Ming Qing 明清 who is a member of the Nanhua Temple 南华寺 in Guangdong Province 广东省, China. He is a student at the University of the West, California. Ming Qing says the same thing as stated by Mun, i.e the *sāmaṇeras* and *sāmaṇerīs* are forbidden to read the Vinaya of monastics.<sup>494</sup>

The situation is similar in Vietnam when a case study is carried out with the abbot of Vọng Cung Temple, Nam Định City, Vietnam. The abbot of Vọng Cung temple says a person who wants to join the monastic Order generally has to undergo two periods of preparation. Firstly, there is training for at least two years as a lay practitioner, and then his/her master can shave his/her hair, and the lay practitioner becomes a novice. Secondly, after another one or two years of training, that person can receive an ordination to become a *sāmaṇera*. During these two periods, a *sāmaṇera* has to learn some basic sutras such as the *Sāmaṇera’s Ten Precepts* (*Sa Di Thập Giới*)<sup>495</sup> and the *Twenty-Four Chapters of Deportment* (*Hai Bốn*

---

<sup>493</sup> This case study was carried out through emails between Chanju Mun and myself on April 13, 2011.

<sup>494</sup> The case study was carried out in the library of the University of the West between Ming Qing and myself on April 13, 2011.

<sup>495</sup> X. 106. 265a1–302b8 (*Sāmaṇera’s Ten Precepts* – 沙彌律儀要略增註卷上).

*Chuong Uy Nghi*).<sup>496</sup> Still, the *sāmaṇeras* are not allowed to open and read the Vinaya of monks and nuns.<sup>497</sup>

All the case studies mentioned thus far show that the restriction on the Vinaya study by lay people is a highly rigid principle in the Northern Buddhist traditions. However, it is not an issue for Westerners and for the Southern Buddhist traditions—that is, India, Thailand, and Burma. Lay people of the Southern Buddhist traditions, as well as the Westerners, are encouraged to study the Vinaya of the monastics. Therefore, discussion on whether lay people can study the Vinaya of the monastics is important even if this idea was promoted a long time ago, that is, from roughly the third century CE.

Moreover, what is discussed above also shows that the restriction on the Vinaya study by lay people is merely a misinterpretation by some Chinese monks. More importantly, the Chinese bring this restriction to its highest level by bringing up specific sources such as the *Prātimokṣa* to make the argument that only fully ordained monastics are eligible to study the Vinaya. If lay people open and study the Vinaya of fully ordained monastics, they commit the serious offense of the five heinous crimes 五逆罪.<sup>498</sup> Thus, bringing up the evidence as well as the claiming of offense made by lay people when they read the Vinaya of monastics displays the relationship between monastics and lay people in which lay people are not as

---

<sup>496</sup> X. 106. 302b9–354b5 (*Twenty-Four Chapters of Deportment* – 沙彌律儀要略增註卷下).

<sup>497</sup> The case study was carried out between the abbot of Vọng Cung temple and myself on April 13, 2011.

<sup>498</sup> Five heinous crimes 五逆罪: (1) matricide 害母 or 殺母 (Skt. *mātr-ghāta*), (2) patricide 害父 or 殺父 (Skt. *pitr-ghāta*), (3) killing a saint 害阿羅漢 or 殺阿羅漢 (Skt. *arhad-ghāta*), (4) wounding the body of the Buddha 出佛身血 or 惡心出佛身血 (Skt. *tathāgatasyântike duṣṭa-citta-rudhirôtpādana*), and (5) destroying the harmony of the *saṃgha* 破僧 or 破和合僧, 鬥亂衆僧 (Skt. *saṃgha-bheda*).

qualified as monastics to study and practice certain parts of the Vinaya. At the same time, by preventing the lay people from reading certain parts of the Vinaya, the superiority of monastics is overpraised while the suppression of the lay people is applied. Therefore, to the extent of whether the lay people can have access to the Vinaya or not, there is a discrepancy between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* in which the *Pāli Vinaya* portrays the monastics realistically while the image of the monastics is reconstructed to be more idealized in the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

#### **5.2.4. The Difference Pertaining to Not Engaging in Practice**

While the monastics are regarded as far more superior than the lay practitioners, which is evident in the *Four-Part Vinaya* as stated in the section 5.2.3, the engagement of practice of the lay people in this Vinaya is also constrained when compared to those in the *Pāli Vinaya*. This limitation shows that the laity is considered inferior to the monastics. This inferiority, again, reveals the discrepancies between these two Vinayas. In the following, this dissertation conducts a comparison of the ability of the lay people and the monastics regarding their practice in the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. In brief, the *Four-Part Vinaya* shows that the ability of the monastics to practice is more superior to the lay people while in the *Pāli Vinaya* this ability is shown to be equal for both monastics and laity.

The supported evidence is found in the section of “Forming the ritual of Uposatha.” In this section, both these two Vinayas present the same story stating that in seeing people of the other non-Buddhist sects gather together on Uposatha

day and under the suggestion of King Seniya Bimbisāra 瓶沙王 of Magadha, the

Buddha lays down the rule to establish the Buddhist Uposatha tradition.<sup>499</sup>

However, the awareness of King Bimbisāra is described differently in the two

Vinayas. In the *Pāli Vinaya*, the awareness of King Bimbisāra is described as the

following:

Then reasoning arose thus in the mind of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha as he was meditating in seclusion: “At present wanderers belonging to other sects, having collected together on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month, speak *dhamma*. These people go up to them to hear *dhamma*. They gain affection for the wanderers belonging to other sects, they gain faith (in them), the wanderers belonging to other sects gain adherents. Suppose the masters should also collect together on the fourteenth, fifteenth, and eighth days of the half-month.<sup>500</sup>

In the *Four-Part Vinaya*:

At that time, King Bimbisāra, from his palace, having seen people come to the place of the ascetics of the other sects, asks his court officers: “Where are these people going?” They reply: “My Lord, the ascetics in this city gather together three times a month: on the eighth, the fourteenth, and the fifteenth. The lay practitioners also gather together there. Having collected together, they offer foods to each other with their utmost joy and loving kindness. This is the reason why these people go to the place of the ascetics.

時瓶沙王在閣堂上.遙見大眾往詣梵志聚會處.即便問左右人言.今此諸人.為欲何所至.答言.王今知之.此城中梵志.月三集會.八日十四日十五日眾人來往周旋.共為知友給與飲食極相愛念.是故眾人往詣梵志聚集處.<sup>501</sup>

In the *Pāli Vinaya*, even though Bimbisāra is a king, he is regarded as a diligent practitioner. No secular power of a king is presented at all in the Pāli passage above.

Rather, as the king meditates a thought comes up into his mind. He thinks that it

would be a good practice for the Buddhists to gather together on Uposatha as the

people of the other non-Buddhist sects. With this thought in mind, the King comes to

<sup>499</sup> *Vin. IV*, 130–131. Cf. T 1428, 22: 816c6–29.

<sup>500</sup> *Vin. IV*, 130.

<sup>501</sup> T. no. 1428, 22: 816c9–14.



the Buddha's place and suggests that the Buddha form the Uposatha tradition. In the following paragraph King Bimbisāra is delighted with the teaching of the Buddha. "Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha gladdened . . . delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, raising from his seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him."<sup>502</sup>

Due to the Indian social order and the idea that the "man of peace is more superior than the man of sword," although Bimbisāra is a king, he is still a devout practitioner, a follower of the Buddha, and he still needs to pay homage to the Buddha. As a diligent practitioner, King Bimbisāra engages in practicing meditation and contributes to Buddhism through his insight. Thus, in the *Pāli Vinaya*, both monastics and lay people engage in practice and they all have the similar potential of attaining certain levels of spiritual achievement. Therefore, there is no limitation in practice of lay people, much like there is no limitation for the monastics in their practice in accordance to the *Pāli Vinaya*. In other words, the ability of practice of the lay people and the monastics is similar. This ability of practice similarity between the lay people and the monastics suggests that there is no superiority of the monastics over the lay people. Therefore, the image of the monastics is described realistically in the *Pāli Vinaya* to the extent of ability in practice of the monastics and the lay people.

In contrast, as pointed out in section 5.2.2 above, the ancient and medieval Chinese kings/emperors were the most powerful people in the nation and they even declared themselves as "sons of heaven" 天子. Following the Indian cultures, the

---

<sup>502</sup> *Vin. IV*, 130–131.

Chinese monks petition for the right to not bow down in front of a king/emperor. However, many Chinese kings do not approve of this petition and they even persecute the Buddhist monks. Probably because of the ultimate power, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, King Bimbisāra is described as a powerful king and not a practitioner. This secular power of King Bimbisāra is possibly unique in the *Four-Part Vinaya* because this secular power of King Bimbisāra is found only in this Vinaya. For instance, there is no description of King Bimbisāra and his contribution on the Uposatha ceremony in the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* (*Daśa-bhāṇavāra Vinaya* 十誦律).<sup>503</sup> There is a section in the beginning of the Uposatha in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* 摩訶僧祇律; however, the agent that causes the Buddha to set up the Uposatha ceremony is the lay people.<sup>504</sup> In the *Five-Part Vinaya* (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* 五分律), the agent that causes the Buddha to set up the Uposatha ceremony is also King Bimbisāra. However, in this Vinaya, both the Buddha and King Bimbisāra have the similar insight (the insight that arises from their practice/meditation) on the thought of setting up the Uposatha ceremony.

Having seen so, King Bimbisāra thinks that it would be great if the Buddha allows the Buddhist followers to gather on the Uposatha day. The King himself and his ministers can come to offer to the Buddha and the Saṅgha, and listen to the Dharma talk. At that time, the Buddha also thinks that the Prātimokṣa is assigned for monastics but there are those who have not heard it. They are not able to recite and practice it. Now, I should allow monks and nuns to carry out the Uposatha ceremony to recite the Prātimokṣa.

瓶沙王見之作是念。若正法弟子亦如是者不亦善乎。我當率諸官屬往彼聽法恭敬供養令一切人長夜獲安。爾時世尊亦作是念。我為諸比丘結戒。而諸比

<sup>503</sup> T. no. 1435, 23: 1a1–470b20.

<sup>504</sup> T. no. 1425, 22: 446c07–12.

丘有不聞者不能誦學不能憶持。我今當聽諸比丘布薩說戒。<sup>505</sup>

Similar to the *Pāli Vinaya*, in the *Five-Part Vinaya*, the king also contributes to Buddhism through his practice and insight. Moreover, the insight of King Bimbisāra is quite the same as the Buddha. Both of them take into consideration the development of Buddhism in India and they both recognize that Buddhism will gain popularity by the means of gathering together on Uposatha day. More importantly, like the *Pāli Vinaya*, King Bimbisāra does not present any secular power as a king, but only through his insight as a practitioner. It is unfortunate that there is no extant Sanskrit version of the *Four-Part Vinaya*—the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. Therefore, there is no adequate way to determine whether or not the secular power of King Bimbisāra as presented in the *Four-Part Vinaya* is of Indian or Chinese origin. Whatever the case may be, the secular power of King Bimbisāra has a strong connection with the Chinese social and cultural tradition during the time in which the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. Therefore, unlike the *Pāli Vinaya* and other existing Vinayas, in the *Four-Part Vinaya* King Bimbisāra does not meditate, but he asks his ministers to report to him of what is happening in his kingdom. Having known that the other non-Buddhist sects gain adherents by the Uposatha ceremony (Biweekly Precept Ceremony) and as a supporter of Buddhism, King Bimbisāra recommends the Uposatha ceremony be applied to Buddhism. Accordingly, the king in the Chinese Vinaya (the *Four-Part Vinaya*) contributes to Buddhism by his secular power and not from his insight through meditative practice as stated in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

---

<sup>505</sup> T. no. 1421, 22: 121b09–b14.

More importantly and broadly speaking, even though the agent who introduces the Uposatha practice in Buddhism is a king, he is a representative for the lay people who have not gotten the full ordination yet. Thus, through the event related to King Bimbisāra, lay people in the *Pāli Vinaya* are more active in regard to the practice than those in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. The reason is because lay people, as described in the *Pāli Vinaya*, actively engage in the practice and they also attain certain levels of spiritual achievement. By contrast, in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, lay people are described as merely supporters. In other words, there is a barrier that separates the lay people and the monastics in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* in which the quality of practice of the monastics is considered superior to the lay people. Therefore, in regard to King Bimbisāra's recommendation of the Uposatha practice in Buddhism, there is a discrepancy between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya*. In the *Pāli Vinaya*, the monastics are described realistically by not claiming any superiority over the lay people regarding their ability of achievement in practice. However, in the *Four-Part Vinaya*, the monastics are portrayed in a more idealized way, in which their superiority is overpraised and suppression is applied to the lay people.

### 5.3. Chapter Conclusion

On the whole, this Chapter V has exposed two main different points between the *Four-Part Vinaya* and the *Pāli Vinaya* based on the Indian and Chinese social perspectives. Buddhism, as a new religion, attempts to merge into the Chinese society. It is unavoidable that Buddhism be influenced by the Chinese social

perspectives in one way or another. To attract the interest of people, Buddhism needs to possess something that can equally attract or have a better look than those of the Chinese local thought, especially in its first appearance and encounter with the Chinese people. This dissertation has proved the random structural arrangement in the *Pāli Vinaya* as well as in the other existing Vinayas. This lack of organization distracts the reader by making people value Buddhist texts less than the texts of well-established Chinese religions. Buddhism, seen in light of texts with disorganized contents, loses a fighting chance to be properly introduced to the Chinese people, to take root in the Chinese culture, and to flourish in China. Although the Buddhists were not aware that their efforts paid off in a fantastically successful endeavor, as we can see now that Buddhism not only flourishes in China, but also has spread the Chinese version of Buddhism all over the world in the twenty-first century. But, before Buddhism could have its success, there needed to be work done during its first encounter with the Chinese people. To give Buddhism an initial chance of survival, the *Four-Part Vinaya* was probably restructured to have a better organization. By so doing, unlike the disorganized contents of the *Pāli Vinaya*, the *Four-Part Vinaya* was polished to be a standard Vinaya in China for Buddhist members to follow. By this polishing, it revealed that unlike the *Pāli Vinaya* wherein its textual structure is a natural arrangement, the textual structure of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is idealistically reconstructed to be a standard Vinaya.

Not only do the Buddhist texts have to appear in a well organized structure, the image of the monastics themselves in China also has to be praised as the finest examples in society for people to follow. This is most likely why suppression is often

placed on the lay people, while the superiority of monastics is stressed in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the ancient and medieval Chinese society, the power of kings/emperors was paramount and they not only entitled but also titled themselves as the “Sons of Heaven 天子.” So the notion that the king/emperor has to “bow down to the feet of the Buddha with his head,” which can also be understood as bowing down to the Buddhist monastics<sup>506</sup> as indicated in the *Pāli Vinaya*, would not be appropriate in China. On the contrary, the Chinese kings/emperors even forced monastics to bow down in their court.

Research finds that the notion that the king/emperor has to “bow down to the Buddha’s feet with his head,” is of Indian origin. In defense for the position of the Buddhist against the Chinese kings/emperors, even to the extent of risking being beheaded, the Buddhists in China decide to keep this notion in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, which unmistakably requires that the king/emperor has to “bow down to the Buddha’s feet with his head.” The application of this notion is in accordance with the Indian culture from which the monastics introduce to the Chinese culture.

To participate in protesting the decree of the king and to follow the Indian footsteps, the idea that the king bows down to the Buddha’s feet with his head (頭面禮足) in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* probably is an indirect way of promoting the superiority of the monastics to the Chinese people, including the Chinese kings/emperors, for the Buddhists in China believe what the Indians believe that the “men of peace” are superior to the “men of sword.” By claiming the superiority of the monastics over the lay people including the Chinese kings/emperors, it reveals

---

<sup>506</sup> T. no. 1442, 23: 651a28–b1.

that the image of the monastics is idealistically reconstructed so that they appear to be more superior to the lay people.

In the ancient Chinese culture, the kings/emperors were ranked the highest position in society and their power over other people of the nation was unobstructed. Moreover, it is the tradition that kings/emperors usually possess a “secret treasure” that no one should know. Thus, to indicate the similar superiority in Buddhism, monastics also need to own a similar treasure. For this reason, the Buddhists in China designated the Prātimokṣa 婆羅提木叉 as the most valuable object in Buddhism, and like the secret treasure of a king, so too, the lay people are not allowed access to it. From the example of the secret treasure of the king, one idea becomes popular. And that idea is the idea that lay people, and even the śrāmaṇera 沙彌/śrāmaṇerī 沙彌尼, cannot study the Vinaya of monastics. This idea is further developed, especially in China, and transmitted into neighboring countries such as Korea, Vietnam, and Taiwan. The Prātimokṣa serves as a strong proof to show the superiority of monastics over lay people in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. However, despite the fact that the life of the monastics is superior to the lay people in regard to the spiritual life, it does not mean that lay people cannot have access to the Vinaya of the monastics. It only means that the lay people still have strong tie with their family and society, therefore they cannot devote their whole time for the practice. In comparing to the monastics who can devote their whole time for practice, it is more difficult for the lay people to attain the higher noble fruits in Buddhism. Therefore, by prohibiting the lay people from having access to certain parts of the Vinaya and by suggesting that the Prātimokṣa as a text strictly

designated for monastics only, there can be discerned a discrepancy between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In the *Pāli Vinaya*, the monastics are described in a realistic way wherein both the monastics and the lay people have equal access to the Vinaya. However, the image of the monastics is reconstructed to be ideal among people in society in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In this reconstruction, the monastics are overpraised because they are the only ones who can access to the Vinaya while in the *Four-Part Vinaya* there is a limitation on the lay people from accessing certain parts of the Vinaya.

While the superiority of monastics among the Chinese society is reinforced, the inferiority of lay people is visible. Thus, the practice and contribution of the lay people to Buddhism is mainly focused on their material offerings and not from their insight. Therefore, in the *Four-Part Vinaya* even though King Bimbisāra is a Buddhist follower, he is described simply as a secular king. None of the religious practice is found through King Bimbisāra regarding his recommendation of the Uposatha ceremony to the Buddha. This event suggests that lay people in the *Four-Part Vinaya* are portrayed as passive observers or that their religious practice is low in quality in comparison to the *Pāli Vinaya*. In other words, regarding the practice, the monastics are far more superior than the lay people in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Thus, it is an idealized description of the monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. However, in the Indian *Pāli Vinaya*, the king recognizes the advantages of the Uposatha ritual from his insight during the practice of meditation. This practice of King Bimbisāra goes to suggest that the lay people in the *Pāli Vinaya* also actively engage in practice. And through practice they also attain spiritual insight. The ability of attaining spiritual



insight of monastics and lay people are equal, albeit the laity have more obstacles, nonetheless, the attainment is the same. Therefore, unlike the *Four-Part Vinaya*, there is a realistic description of the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

## CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION

---

In the *Siṃsapā Sutta* of the *Samyutta Nikāya*, the Buddha declares that although his knowledge about the truth is far more than what he has taught, he teaches only what is relevant and useful to the spiritual life. That is to say, the Buddha does not teach what is not connected, fundamental, or fruitful to the spiritual goal.<sup>507</sup> This is why the Vinaya informs that the first few years after his enlightenment, the Buddha does not lay down any rule and discipline even when his foremost disciple, Sāriputta, has invited him to do so. The Buddha is keenly aware that the Vinaya is important for the monastics and for the long existence of Buddhism. However, when there is no need or when it is not the right time, the Buddha still does not appoint it.<sup>508</sup> The reason for this decision of the Buddha is because during these first few years after the formation of the Saṅgha, his disciples are all pure and the Vinaya does not help in their spiritual life. However, after the event pertaining to the misdeed of Sudinna,<sup>509</sup> the Vinaya rules and disciplines are one by one introduced by the Buddha. In such manner of introduction, the Vinaya is important in that it systematically reduces error and thereby harmonizes the Buddhist community. Thus it is significant to the study of Buddhism and the Buddhist community.

---

<sup>507</sup> Edelglass and Garfield, *Buddhist Philosophy*, 181.

<sup>508</sup> *Vin. I*, 18.

<sup>509</sup> The first defilement appears in the Saṅgha with the event of Sudinna. With the event of Sudinna, the first pārājika offense (defeat/grave offense) is laid down by the Buddha. For details, see: *Vin. I*, 1–63.

Recognizing the importance of the Vinaya in studying Buddhism, this dissertation develops a further step to explore Buddhism, which is through the research on the Vinaya. This dissertation finds that although there are several existing Vinayas, the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* 四分律 are the most complete and practical Vinayas for study. Hence, this dissertation chooses to compare the *Pāli Vinaya* of the Theravāda School and the *Four-Part Vinaya* of the Dharmaguptaka School. More importantly, this research finds that the practices of Uposatha (Biweekly Precept Ceremony), Vassāvāsa (Rains Retreat or Retreat Opening Ceremony), and Pavāraṇā (Retreat Closing Ceremony) are the important disciplines and the important sources in studying the Buddhist Vinaya and the Buddhist community. Thus, this dissertation mainly focuses on the comparative study of the Uposatha, Vassāvāsa, and Pavāraṇā of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Having said that, the related sources and studies are also looked at such as the other chapters of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya* as well as in the other existing Vinayas.

A comprehensive reading shows that there are similarities between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. This dissertation finds that there are at least two main similarities that these two Vinayas share. First of all, both these Vinayas attempt on changing, adding, and/or omitting information to the stories behind the rules and disciplines. This act of changing, adding, and/or omitting inevitably leads to the second similarity between these two Vinayas. And that is the transcription errors, which are found in both these two Vinayas.

Although there are similarities between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*, many differences are found. The interesting features of this dissertation are on these differences, because they point out the different direction in the rhetorical strategies deployed in these two Vinayas. There are many differences in details in these two Vinayas. However, all these differences can be grouped into two main categories, i.e. the discrepancies in cultural and social perspectives between India and China that may have blended into these two Vinayas.

In the cultural perspectives, both China and India are rich in their own culture because these two countries are among the biggest cradles of the world civilizations. Many cultural differences are found between China and India. For example, this dissertation has pointed out that there are at least three cultural differences that are found while making the comparison between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. They are the different views on the concept of silence, in the relationship between masters and disciples under the context of the development of the monastery between India and China, and on the emergent context of Buddhism between India and China.

Not only are there differences in terms of cultural influences, but also many discrepancies are found while comparing the social perspectives of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. The discrepancies on the social perspectives are revealed through the textual rearrangement difference between these two Vinayas. In this rearrangement, the *Pāli Vinaya* is more random and in general there are many disordered sections throughout this Vinaya. This shows that the *Pāli Vinaya* is natural/random in its order and structure. However, the *Four-Part Vinaya* is

rearranged to be neat and almost all sections are in their appropriate order. This shows that the *Four-Part Vinaya* is polished to be an idealized Vinaya so that it is easier for people to follow. More importantly, the status difference between monastics and the lay people directly points out the discrepancies between the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In this status difference, the achievement pertaining to practice of the monastics and the lay people is equal in the *Pāli Vinaya*. On the other hand, the quality of the monastics and their high position among the society are generally emphasized while suppression is applied to the lay people in the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

The interesting feature of these similarities and differences are on the rhetorical strategies deployed in the two Vinayas. The rules and disciplines are literally the same in both. However, the examples presented in the two Vinayas in order to elucidate, persuade, and reinforce the rule and discipline are quite different from one another. In the rhetorical strategy of the *Pāli Vinaya*, the image of the monastics is described in a realistic way. This means that although they are monastics, they are still human beings and human beings make mistakes. And these mistakes are recorded as is in the *Pāli Vinaya*. In contrast, the image of the monastics is portrayed in a more idealized way. The reason is because many mistakes or unwholesome deeds of the monastics as found in the same rules in the *Pāli Vinaya* counterpart are generally not found, supplemented, replaced, and/or corrected in the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Many of these mistakes or unwholesome deeds, as found in the *Pāli Vinaya*, are modified or edited out to be neutral or even to be positive conducts of monastics in the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

Moreover, this dissertation has tried to develop an answer for the different direction of this rhetorical strategy of the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Due to the fact that the Sanskrit version of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, which is the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, is lost and only the Chinese version of this Vinaya, which is the *Four-Part Vinaya*, is available, there is literally no way to positively conclude that the discrepancies in this rhetorical strategy, which is revealed from the similar and different features between these Vinayas, are of Chinese or Indian origin. However, by way of philological context, through close comparison and analysis, and by using the evidence that is obtainable, this dissertation hypothesizes that the Indian and Chinese cultural and social features are possibly blended into the *Pāli Vinaya* and the *Four-Part Vinaya*. These cultural and social features account for the different directions in the rhetorical strategy that are found through the comparison on the similarities and differences of these two Vinayas.

An examination into the Chinese religion at the time of translation of the *Four-Part Vinaya* (early fifth century CE) shows that there are three major religions: Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism. All these three religions try their best to win the hearts of the people. That is why there are many debates among these three religions.<sup>510</sup> To try to expel Buddhism from their own land, the Daoists have fabricated the *Hua Hu* 化胡 theory (Laozi goes to the Western Regions to convert the barbarians) in which it accuses Buddhists, including the Buddha himself, to be barbarians. The Buddha is no more than the Laozi himself who wants to convert the

---

<sup>510</sup> Kohn, *Laughing at the Tao*, 24–32.

barbarians.<sup>511</sup> Through this theory, the Daoists claim the “greater antiquity for their teaching”<sup>512</sup> over Buddhism. In order to survive in the new land—that was China—and in order to protect Buddhism from further harmful criticisms, the Buddhists take measures against the *Hua Hu* 化胡 theory. In these reactions, the Buddhists, firstly, declare the usefulness and positive aspects of Buddhism. Secondly and more importantly, the Buddhists attack Daoists and Confucians by claiming that Laozi and Confucius indeed are just disciples of the Buddha who are sent by the Buddha to propagate Buddhism in China.<sup>513</sup>

And that is not all. Many times the Daoists charge Buddhists for their subversive activities and claim that Buddhism is not qualified as a religion and that it should be expelled from China. In response, the Buddhists also accuse the Daoists to be merely superstitious and the Buddhists claim themselves to fully have morality. Only Buddhism can bring fourth truly pure sages and not the other religions.<sup>514</sup> Thus, in order to react to the attacks of the Chinese local religions and thoughts such as those from Daoism and Confucianism, the Buddhist teaching and the virtues of monastics are often justified and are often referenced with the teaching and moral code of conduct of Confucianism. The reason for this reference is because during the fourth and the sixth centuries CE, the time when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, the

---

<sup>511</sup> Ibid., 8–16.

<sup>512</sup> Ibid., 16.

<sup>513</sup> Ibid., 16–17; Cf. Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China; the Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*, 288–320.

<sup>514</sup> Kohn, *Laughing at the Tao*, 20–21.

teaching and moral code of conduct of Confucianism were generally held at high esteem.

With that said, Chinese Buddhism felt a need to be sanctified to be perfect in its appearance in terms of the Buddhist texts and the Buddhist monastics themselves. This dissertation has proved that the Vinaya texts of all schools of Buddhism were reorganized. Although they were reorganized, most of the Vinaya texts are still random in their structures. While almost all the existing Vinaya texts are random in their structures, only the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* is neatly and orderly rearranged to be a merely perfect Vinaya. In other words, the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* seems to be reconstructed again in China in its appearance to be the model Vinaya for the Chinese people to follow. Not only is the Vinaya text well reorganized to near perfection, the image of the Buddhist monastics is also reconstructed.

This dissertation has pointed out that it is a natural portrayal pertaining to the moral conduct of the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya* as well as in almost all the other existing Vinayas except the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. This natural portrayal means that the Buddhist monastics as described in the *Pāli Vinaya* are human beings and human beings make mistakes. Therefore, it is a realistic description of the monastics in the *Pāli Vinaya*.

However, unlike the *Pāli Vinaya*, there is much evidence—some of it is possibly modified and/or edited out in China when the Indian *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* is translated into the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, and some is produced in China—in which the image of the monastics is reconstructed to be ideal people of



society in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*. This idealized performance of the monastics in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* is likely to assume that the monastics are intrinsically perfect regarding their moral conduct or they are naturally flawless.

Thus, it seems that there is a movement that sanctifies the Buddhist texts and the Buddhist monastics to be perfect in China. In other words, this movement is an act that idealistically portrays the monastics as absolutely perfect, errorless, faultless, and/or completely wholesome . . . and the like. This movement may be given a name such as the “moral perfection movement.” If a movement is defined as an act which brings about a desired change, then like a musical movement bringing about enjoyable music or a civil rights movement bringing about peace and justice, the moral perfection movement brings about perfectly virtuous monks and nuns. It is probably a crucial move to portray monks and nuns as perfectly virtuous in order for Buddhism to take root and survive in the new country that was China with already well-established and therefore formidable teachings of Daoism and Confucianism.

With the all examples provided throughout this dissertation, the image of the monastics is portrayed realistically in which mistakes and misdeeds are found in the *Pāli Vinaya*. Therefore, the “moral perfection movement” is not found in the *Pāli Vinaya*. However, the image of the monastics is described idealistically in which most of the mistake and misdeeds of the monastics are edited out or modified to be more neutral or even to be positive actions in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*.

Although there is no actual record of the moral perfection movement or at least this

movement is not obvious in the Chinese Buddhist history, as well as in the Chinese religious history from the ancient to medieval period of China, it is likely that there is a moral perfection movement in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*, in which it elevates the moral conduct of the Buddhist monastics to be intrinsically perfect. This movement probably is also the reason that makes the *Pāli Vinaya* different from the *Four-Part Vinaya* although they are all offshoots from the same mother text, which is the *Sthaviravada Vinaya* that was recited at the First Buddhist Council.

With that said, this dissertation would like to suggest further studies in the following areas: (1) Is the moral perfection movement a possible cause that makes the *Pāli Vinaya* and the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya* similar and/or different from one another? (2) Is the moral perfection movement only found in the Chinese *Four-Part Vinaya*? and (3) Can the moral perfection movement be found in the other existing Vinayas besides the *Four-Part Vinaya*?

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

### Primary Sources

Buddhist Text Translation Society, Dharma Realm Buddhist University, Dharma Realm Buddhist Association, and Corporate Body of the Buddha Educational Foundation. *Sutra of the Past Vows of Earth Store Bodhisattva*. Taipei, Taiwan: Corporate Body of the Buddha Educational Foundation, 2008.

Chalmers, Robert, ed. *Majjhima Nikāya II*. London: Pali Text Society, 2004.

Davids, T. W. Rhys, trans. *Samyutta Nikāya I: The Book of the Kindred Sayings*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1999.

———. *Dīgha Nikāya I: Dialogues of the Buddha*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2002.

———. *Dīgha Nikāya II: Dialogues of the Buddha*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2002.

———. *Dīgha Nikāya III: Dialogues of the Buddha*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2002.

Davids, T.W. Rhys and Hermann Oldenberg, trans. *Sacred Books of the East: The Pātimokkha; The Mahāvagga I – IV*. Vol. 13. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1996.

———. *Sacred Books of the East: The Mahāvagga V-X & The Cullavagga I – III*. Vol. 14. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1996.

Eggeling, Julius and Friedrich Max Müller, trans. *Sacred Books of the East: The Satapatha-Brāhmana: According to the Text of the Mādhyandina School*. Vol. 12. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1993.

Feer, Léon, ed. *Samyutta Nikāya III*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001.

Hardy, Edmund, ed. *Anguttara Nikāya III*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1994.

Hare, E. M., trans. *Anguttara Nikāya III: The Book of the Gradual Sayings*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001.

———. *Anguttara Nikāya V – The Book of the Gradual Sayings*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2003.

- Horner, I.B., trans. *Vinaya-Piṭaka I: The Book of the Discipline*. London: Pali Text Society, 1992.
- . *Vinaya-Piṭaka II: The Book of the Discipline*. London: Pali Text Society, 1993.
- . *Vinaya-Piṭaka IV: The Book of the Discipline (Mahāvagga)*. London: Pali Text Society, 1993.
- . *Vinaya-Piṭaka V: The Book of the Discipline (Cullavagga)*. London: Pali Text Society, 1992.
- . *Milinda's Questions I*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1996.
- . *Majjhima Nikāya I: The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2007.
- . *Majjhima Nikāya II: The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2002.
- . *Majjhima Nikāya III: The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1999.
- Jacobi, Hermann, trans. *Sacred Books of the East: The Jaina Sūtras: The Ākārāṅga Sūtra: The Kalpa Sūtra*. Vol. 22. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1994.
- Legge, James, trans. *Sacred Books of the East: The Sacred Books of China: The Texts of Confucianism*. Vol. 3. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1988.
- Oldenberg, Hermann, ed. *Vinaya Piṭakaṃ I: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*. London: Published for the Pali Text Society by Luzac, 1964.
- Watson, Burton, and Kumārajīva. *The Lotus Sutra*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Woodward, F. L., trans. *Samyutta Nikāya III: The Book of the Kindred Sayings*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1992.
- . *Udāna II: The Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon*. London: Pali Text Society, 2003.
- . *Aṅguttara Nikāya I: The Book of the Gradual Sayings*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2006.

———. *Āṅguttara Nikāya IV: The Book of the Gradual Sayings*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2006.

## Secondary Sources

Arjomand, Said Amir, and Edward A. Tiryakian. *Rethinking Civilizational Analysis*. London; Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 2004.

Asante, Molefi Kete, Yoshitaka Miike, and Jing Yin. *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Aymes, María de la Cruz. *Effective Inculturation and Ethnic Identity*. Rome: Centre “Cultures and Religions,” Pontifical Gregorian University, 1987.

Banerjee, Anukul Chandra. *Sarvāstivāda Literature*. Calcutta: Dr. Banerjee, 1957.

Barnlund, Dean C. *Communicative Styles of Japanese and Americans: Images and Realities*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Pub. Co, 1989.

Baruah, Bibhuti. *Buddhist Sects and Sectarianism*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons, 2000.

Bhatt, N. R., Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat, Satya Pal Narang, and C. P. Bhatta. *Pandit N.R. Bhatt, Felicitation Volume*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1994.

Bell, Daniel A. *China’s New Confucianism: Politics and Everyday Life in a Changing Society (New in Paper)*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Bell, Daniel A. and Hahm Chaibong. *Confucianism for the Modern World*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Benn, James A., Lori Rachelle Meeks, and James Robson. *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Bhagvat, Durga. *Early Buddhist Jurisprudence. Theravāda Vinaya-Laws*. New Delhi: Cosmo Publications, 1939.

Bodhi, trans. *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha: A Complete Translation of the Āṅguttara Nikāya*. Somerville, Mass: Wisdom Publications, Inc., 2012.

Bodhi and Nyanaponika. *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha: Āṅguttara Nikāya: An Anthology of Suttas from the Āṅguttara Nikāya*. Walnut Creek, California: AltaMira Press, 1999.

- Boisvert, Mathieu. "A Comparison of the Early Forms of Buddhist and Christian Monastic Traditions." *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 12 (1992): 123–141.
- Boucher, Daniel. *Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China: A Study of Dharmarakṣa and His Translation Idiom*. PA: University of Pennsylvania, 1996.
- . *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna: A Study and Translation of the Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā-sūtra*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008.
- Brewster, E. H. *The Life of Gotama the Buddha: Compiled Exclusively from the Pali Canon*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2013.
- Brown, William P. *The Ten Commandments: The Reciprocity of Faithfulness*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.
- Carman, John Braisted, Mark Jürgensmeyer, and William Darrow. *A Bibliographic Guide to the Comparative Study of Ethics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Chan, Wing-tsit. *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Chan, Wing-tsit, and Joseph Adler. *Sources of Chinese Tradition: Volume 1: From Earliest Times to 1600*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.
- Chappell, David W. "From Dispute to Dual Cultivation: Pure Land Responses to Ch'an Critics." In *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, edited by Peter N. Gregory, 163–198. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1986.
- Charleux, Isabelle and Vincent Goossaert, "The Physical Buddhist Monastery in China." In *The Buddhist Monastery: A Cross-Cultural Survey*, edited by Pierre Pichard and F. Lagirarde, 305–350. Paris: École française d'extrême-orient, 2003.
- Chen, Huaiyu. *The Revival of Buddhist Monasticism in Medieval China*. New York, Washington D.C., Baltimore: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Che'n, Kenneth. "Some Problems in the Translation of the Chinese Buddhist Canon." *Qinghua Xuebao* 請華學報 [*Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*] 2, No. 1 (1960): 178–186.

Confucius, James Legge, and James H. Ford. *The Teachings of Confucius: The Analects, the Great Learning, the Doctrine of the Mean*. El Paso, TX: El Paso Norte Press, 2005.

Cousins, L. S. "The 'Five Points' and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools." In *Buddhism: Critical Concepts in Religious Studies II: The Early Buddhist School and Doctrinal History: Theravāda Doctrine*, edited by Paul Williams, 52–83. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.

Daswani, Rekha. *Buddhist Monasteries and Monastic Life in Ancient India: From the Third Century BC to the Seventh Century AD*. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 2006.

De Bary, William Theodore. *Sources of Chinese Tradition*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

De, Gokuldas. *Democracy in Early Buddhist Saṃgha*. Calcutta: Calcutta University, 1955.

Dhammadinnā. *Research on the Dīrgha-Āgama (Taisho 125) = Chang E Han Jing Yan Jiu Lun Wen Ji*. Taipei: Dhama Drum Institute of Liberal Art Research Series, 2014.

Dhirasekara, Jotiya. *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: A Study of Its Orgin and Development in Relation to the Sutta and Vinaya Pitakas*. Colombo: Ministry of Higher Education, 1982.

Dutt, Nalinaksha. *Buddhist Sects in India*. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1970.

———. *Early Monastic Buddhism*. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1971.

Dutt, Sukumar. *Early Buddhist Monachism*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1996.

———. *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India: Their History and Their Contribution to Indian Culture*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1988.

Edelglass, William. "Buddhist Ethics and Western Moral Philosophy." In *A Companion to Buddhist Philosophy*, edited by Steven M. Emmanuel, 476–490. Malden, US and Oxford, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2013.

Edelglass, William, and Jay L. Garfield. *Buddhist Philosophy: Essential Readings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Edgerton, Franklin. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1998.

- Eliade, Mircea, and Charles J. Adams. *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- Elvehjem Museum of Art and Gautamavajra Vajrācārya. *Watson Collection of Indian Miniatures at the Elvehjem Museum of Art: A Detailed Study of Selected Works*. Madison, WI: Elvehjem Museum of Art, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 2002.
- Fan, Ruiping. *Reconstructionist Confucianism: Rethinking Morality After the West*. Dordrecht: Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- Faxian, Samuel Beal, and Xuanzhi Yang. *Travels of Fah-Hian and Sung-Yun, Buddhist Pilgrims, from China to India (400 A.D. and 518 A.D.)*. London: Susil Gupta, 1964.
- Findly, Ellison Banks. *Dāna: Giving and Getting in Pali Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2003.
- Fowler, Jeaneane D., and Merv Fowler. *Chinese Religions: Beliefs and Practices*. Brighton; Portland, Or.: Sussex Academic Press, 2008.
- Frauwallner, Erich. *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1956.
- Fu, Charles Wei-hsun. "Morality or Beyond: The Neo-Confucian Confrontation with Mahāyāna Buddhism." *Philosophy East and West* 23, No. 3 (1973): 375–396.
- Gangopadhyay, Jayeeta. *Uposatha Ceremony: The Earliest Tradition[s] and Later Developments, Mainly from Vinayic Traditions Preserved in Chinese*. Delhi, India: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 1991.
- Gómez, Luis O. "Emptiness and Moral Perfection." *Philosophy East and West* 23, No. 3 (1973): 361–373.
- Guo, Sujian. *Chinese Politics and Government: Power, Ideology, and Organization*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Hamilton, William. *Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic by William Hamilton: Lectures on Metaphysics*. Vol. 1. Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 2010.
- Handa, O. C. *Buddhist Monasteries of Himachal*. New Delhi: Indus Publishing, 2004.
- Hāṇḍā, Omacanda. *Buddhist Art & Antiquities of Himachal Pradesh, Up to 8th Century A.D.* New Delhi: Indus Pub. Co, 1994.



- Harvey, Peter. *An Introduction to Buddhist Ethics: Foundations, Values and Issues*. Cambridge, UK; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Hastings, James, John A. Selbie, and Louis H. Gray. *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. Vol V. New York: Scribner's, 1955.
- Hazen, Walter A. and Lisa Marty. *Inside Buddhism*. St. Louis, Mo: Milliken, 2003.
- Hazra, Kanai Lal. *Constitution of the Buddhist Saṅgha*. Delhi: B.R. Publishing Company, 1988.
- Heirman, Ann. "Can We Trace the Early Dharmaguptakas?" *T'oung Pao* 88, No. 4/5 (2002): 396-429.
- . "Indian Disciplinary Rules and Their Early Chinese Adepts: A Buddhist Reality." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 128, No. 2 (April 1, 2008): 257-272.
- Hinüber, Oskar Von. "Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya: A Survey of Theory and Practice." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 18, No. 1 (1995): 7-45.
- Holt, John. *Discipline: The Canonical Buddhism of the Vinayapīṭaka*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981.
- Huang, Junjie. *Humanism in East Asian Confucian Contexts*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2010.
- Huang, Junjie, and Erik J. Zürcher. *Norms and the State in China*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993.
- Hurka, Thomas. *Perfectionism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Ishigami, Zen'ō. *Disciples of the Buddha*. Tokyo: Kosei Pub. Co, 1989.
- Jones, Charles B. "Foundations of Ethics and Practice in Chinese Pure Land Buddhism." *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 10, (2003): 1-20.
- Kalupahana, David J. *Ethics in Early Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2008.
- Kern, Hendrik. *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1974.
- Keown, Damien. *Contemporary Buddhist Ethics*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 2013.

- Keown, Damien, and Charles S. Prebish. *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. London, New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Kieschnick, John. *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Kittler, Pamela Goyan, Kathryn Sucher, and Marcia Nelm. *Food and Culture*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Belmont, CA: Printed in the United States of America, 2012.
- Kohn, Livia. *Laughing at the Tao: Debates among Buddhists and Taoists in Medieval China*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Lamotte, Etienne. *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Saka Era*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université catholique de Louvain, Institut orientaliste, 1988.
- Lancaster, Lewis. "The Movement of Buddhist Texts from India to China and the Construction of the Chinese Buddhist Canon." In *Collection of Essays 1993: Buddhism Across Boundaries: Chinese Buddhism and the Western Regions*. edited by E. Zürcher, 517–544. Sanchung, Taiwan: Fo Guang Shan Foundation for Buddhist & Culture Education, 1999.
- Laozi. *Tao Te Ching*. Hertfordshire, Great Britain: Wordsworth Editions, 1997.
- Law, Bimala Churn. *Buddhistic Studies*. Delhi: Indological Book House, 1983.
- Lee, Der-Huey. *Indian Buddhist Literature and Chinese Moral Books: A Comparative Analysis*. Delhi: Vidyanidhi Prakashan, 2005.
- Lewis, Richard D. *When Cultures Collide: Leading Across Cultures: A Major New Edition of the Global Guide*. Boston: Nicholas Brealey International, 2006.
- Lopez, Donald S. *Buddhist Hermeneutics*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Pub., 1993.
- Misra, G. S. P. *The Age of Vinaya*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1972.
- Mollier, Christine. *Buddhism and Taoism Face to Face: Scripture, Ritual, and Iconographic Exchange in Medieval China*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008.
- Monier-Williams, Monier, Ernst Leumann, and Carl Cappeller. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981.
- Mookerji, Radhakumud. *Asoka*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1962.

- Nakamura, Hajime. "The Influence of Confucian Ethics on the Chinese Translations of Buddhist Sutras." In *Liebenthal Festschrift (Sino-Indian studies 5, No. 3/4)*, edited by Kshitis Roy, 156–170. Santiniketan: Visvabharati, 1957.
- Nattier, Janice J., and Charles S. Prebish. "Mahāsāṃghika Origins: The Beginnings of Buddhist Sectarianism." *History of Religions* 16, No. 3 (February 1, 1977): 237–272.
- Norman, K. R. *Pāli literature: Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna schools of Buddhism*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1983.
- Ñāṇamoli Bhikkhu and Phra Sobhana Sāsana. *The Pāṭimokkha: 227 Fundamental Rules of a Bhikkhu*. Bangkok: Mahāmaṅgalājavidyālaya, 1969.
- Olivelle, J. Patrick. *The Origin and the Early Development of Buddhist Monaschism*. Colombo, Sri Lanka: M.D. Gunasena, 1998.
- Pachow, W. *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa: On the Basis of Its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit, and Pāli Versions*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2000.
- Penny, Benjamin. *Religion and Biography in China and Tibet*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 2013.
- Pichard, Pierre. "Indian Buddhist Monasteries." In *The Buddhist Monastery: A Cross-Cultural Survey*, edited by Pierre Pichard and F. Lagirarde, 17–37. Paris: École française d'extrême-orient, 2003.
- Powers, John. Review of *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, edited by William M. Bodiford. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 33, No. 1 (2006): 194–198.
- Prebish, Charles S. "Theories Concerning the Skandhaka: An Appraisal." *The Journal of Asian Study* 32, No. 4 (1973): 669–678.
- . "The Pratimoksa Puzzle: Fact Versus Fantasy." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94, No. 2 (1974): 168–176.
- . *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: The Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtras of the Mahāsāṃghikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1975.
- . *A Survey of Vinaya Literature*. Taipei: Jin Luen Pub. House: Distributed by East Asia Books, 1997.

- Prebish, Charles S. and Damien Keown. *Buddhism – The Ebook: An Online Introduction*. S.l.: Journal of Buddhist Ethics Online Books, 2010.
- Rastogi, Naresh Prasad, and Aśoka. *Inscriptions of Asoka*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1990.
- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Robertson, Alec. *The Triple Gem and the Uposatha: Buddhist Ethics and Culture*. Colombo: Printed at the Colombo Apothecaries' Co., 1971.
- Rohsenow, John S. *ABC Dictionary of Chinese Proverbs (Yanyu)*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 2002.
- Samovar, Larry A, and Richard E Porter. *Communication Between Cultures*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1995.
- Shizuka, Sasaki. "Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period (4): The Structure of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya." *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyo Kenkyu 佛教研究)* 3 (1994): 55–100.
- Sastri, Hirananda. *Epigraphia Indica and Record of the Archaeological Survey of India*. Vol. XX. Delhi: Manager of Publications, 1933.
- Schopen, Gregory. *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004.
- Schumann, Hans Wolfgang. *The Historical Buddha: The Times, Life, and Teachings of the Founder of Buddhism*. London; New York, N.Y., U.S.A.: Arkana, 1989.
- Sewell, Robert, Śāṅkara Bālakṛṣṇa Dīkshita, and Robert Gustav Schram. *The Indian Calendar: With Tables for the Conversion of Hindu and Muhammadan into A.D. Dates, and Vice Versa*. London: S. Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd, 1896.
- Sharma, Rajendra K. *Indian Society, Institutions and Change*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Dist, 2004.
- Sharma, Suresh K. and Usha Sharma. *Cultural and Religious Heritage of India: Zoroastrianism*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 2004.
- . *Encyclopaedia of Higher Education*. New Delhi, India: Mittal Publications, 2005.

- "Significance of Rain Retreat." *General Interest Periodicals: Daily New*. Colombo, Malaysia: HT Media Ltd, 2011.
- Singh, Upinder. *A History of Ancient and Early Medieval India: From the Stone Age to the 12th Century*. New Delhi: Pearson Education India, 2008.
- Sircar, Dines Chandra. *The Successors of the Śātavāhanas in Lower Deccan*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1939.
- Skorupski, Tadeusz, University of London, and School of Oriental and African Studies, eds. *The Buddhist Forum IV*. London, New York: Routledge Curzon, 1996.
- Slote, Walter H. and George A. De Vos. *Confucianism and the Family: A Study of Indo-Tibetan Scholasticism*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1998.
- Sriwarakuel, Warayuth. *Cultural Traditions and Contemporary Challenges in Southeast Asia: Hindu and Buddhist*. Washington D.C.: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2005.
- Suzuki, Teitaro. *A Brief History of Early Chinese Philosophy*. London: Probsthain & Co, 1914.
- Takakusu, Junjirō, Wing-tsit Chan, and Charles Alexander Moore. *Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy*, 3th ed. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1956.
- Talim, M. V. *Edicts of King Aśoka: A New Vision*. New Delhi: Aryan Books International, 2010.
- Thapar, Romila. *Aśoka and the Decline of the Mauryas*. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1998.
- Thompson, Laurence G. and Jordan D Paper. *The Chinese Way in Religion*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Pub. Co, 1998.
- Thong, Chan Kei and Charlene L. Fu. *Finding God in Ancient China*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2009.
- Tieken, Herman. "The Buddhist Pavāraṇā Ceremony According to the Pāli Vinaya." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30, No. 3 (June 2002): 271–289.
- Tripāṭhī, Śrīdhara. *Encyclopaedia of Pali Literature: The Pali Canon*. New Delhi: Anmol Publications, 2008.

- Tsomo, Karma Lekshe. *Sisters in Solitude: Two Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Ethics for Women: A Comparative Analysis of the Chinese Dharmagupta and the Tibetan Mūlāsarvāstivāda Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa Sūtras*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Vaswani, J. P. *Perfect Relationship: Guru and Disciple*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd, 2013.
- Vivekananda, Bodhasarananda, and Advaita Ashrama. *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda*. Vol. 4. Kolkata, India: Advaita Ashrama, 2009.
- Wang, Daniel. *The Confucian Mind: A Historical and In-Depth Look at Asian Culture and Psyche*. Philadelphia, Pa: Xlibris Corporation, 2006.
- Wankel, Charles, Patrick Blessinger, Jurate Stanaityte, and Neil Washington. *Increasing Student Engagement and Retention Using Immersive Interfaces: Virtual Worlds, Gaming, and Simulation*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing, 2012.
- Wayman, Alex. "Two Traditions of India: Truth and Silence." *Philosophy East and West* 24, No. 4 (October 1, 1974): 389–403.
- Weinstein, Stanley. *Buddhism Under the T'ang*. Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Wijayaratna, Mōhan. *Buddhist Monastic Life: According to the Texts of the Theravāda Tradition*. Cambridge, England; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Williams, Paul. *Buddhism: Buddhist Origins and the Early History of Buddhism in South and Southeast Asia*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2005.
- Wood, Frances. *China's First Emperor and His Terracotta Warriors*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2008.
- Wright, Arthur F. *Buddhism in Chinese History*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Yang, Lien-sheng. "Buddhist Monasteries and Four Money-Raising Institutions in Chinese History." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 13, No. 1/2 (Jun., 1950): 174–191.
- Yao, Xinzhong. *An Introduction to Confucianism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Yee, Chan Sin. "Confucian Conception of Gender." In *Confucianism for the Modern World*, edited by Daniel Bell and Chae-bong Ham, 312–333. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Yifa and Zongze. *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Qinggui*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002.

Yin, Wu, Jendy Bhikshuni, and Thubten Chodron. *Choosing Simplicity: A Commentary on the Bhikshuni Pratimoksha*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 2001.

Zhang, Kun. *A Comparative Study of the Kaṭhinavastu*. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957.

Zürcher, E. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.

### Chinese Sources

Chuan Zheng You Xian Gong Si 傳正有限公司. *Qianlong Da Zang Jing* 乾隆大藏經. Zhanghua Shi 彰化市: Bao Yin Fo Jing Liu Tong Chu 寶印佛經流通處, 1997.

Daoxuan 道宣, and Gongben Dong 鞏本棟. *Guang Hongming Ji* 廣弘明集. Vol. 105. Taibei Shi 臺北市: Fo Guang Wen Hua Shi Ye You Xian Gong Si 佛光文化事業有限公司, 1998.

*Dazang jing* 大藏經. ed. by Takakusu, Junjirō, Kaigyoku Watanabe, and Xiuqiao Liu. Taibei Shi 台北市: Xin Wen Feng Chu Ban Gong Si. 新文豐出版公司, 1974.

Ding, Fubao 丁福保. *Fo Xue Da Ci Dian* 佛學大辭典. Taibei Shi 台北市: HuaZang Fo Jiao Shi Ting Tu Shu Guan 華藏佛教視聽圖書館, 1989.

Luo, Guojie 罗国杰. *Zhongguo Lun Li Xue Bai Ke Quan Shu* 中国伦理学百科全书. Changchun Shi 長春市: Jilin Ren Min Chu Ban She 吉林人民出版社, 1993.

Sengyou 僧佑. *Hongming ji* 弘明集. Shanghai 上海: Zhonghua shu ju 中華書局, 1927.

*Wan Xu Zang Jing* 卅續藏經: *Zang Jing Shu Yuan Ban* 藏經書院版. Taibei Shi 台北市: Xin Wen Feng Chu Ban Gong Si 新文豐出版公司, 1977.

Wang, Shounan 王壽南, and Zhonghua Wen Hua Fu Xing Yun Dong Tui Xing Wei Yuan Hui 中華文化復興運動推行委員會. *Zhongguo Li Dai Si Xiang Jia* 中國歷

代思想家. Vol. IV. Taipei Shi 臺北市: Taiwan Shang Wu Yin Shu Guan 臺灣商務印書館傳正有限公司, 1979.

Ye, Luhua 業露華. *Zhongguo Fo Jiao Tu Jian* 中國佛教圖鑒. Taipei Shi 臺北市: Zhi Shu Fang Chu Ban She 知書房出版社, 2006.

Yuanzhao 元照, Daoxuan 道宣, Hongyi 弘一, Ermay 二埋, and 元照. *Si Fen Lü Xing Shi Chao Zi Chi Ji*. 四分律行事鈔資持記. Vol. II. Tainan Shi 台南市: He Yu Chu Ban She 和裕出版社, 2001.

Zhai, Jianbo 翟建波. *Zhongguo Gu Dai Xiao Shuo Su Yu Da Ci Dian* 中国古代小说俗语大词典. Shanghai 上海: Han Yu Da Ci Dian Chu Ban She 汉语大词典出版社, 2002.

### Internet Sources

“Cīvaravastu.” *Digital Sanskrit Buddhist Canon*. Accessed on Feb. 10, 2015, <http://www.dsbcproject.org/node/5192>.



**APPENDIX I:**  
**SUPERNATURAL POWER**

---

The Buddha did not encourage his disciples to perform supernatural power even when there was difficulty. In the traditional Vinaya texts, one time the Buddha dwelt at Vejañā 毘蘭若. At that time, Vejañā was facing a famine, thus it was difficult to obtain alms food. Having seen the difficulty of monks in obtaining alms food, Moggallāna/Maudgalyāyana 目犍連<sup>515</sup> asked the Buddha for permission to use his miraculous powers to invest in the earth so that he could get the nutritive essence of the water-plants for monks. For the first time, the Buddha did not allow Moggallāna/Maudgalyāyana to do so. Then, Moggallāna/Maudgalyāyana asked as if the Buddha would allow him to use his magical powers to enable all community of monks to be present in Uttarakuru 鬱單越 for alms food since there was adequate food for alms in Uttarakuru. For the second time, the Buddha did not approve the quest of Moggallāna/Maudgalyāyana. The main reason the Buddha did not permit Moggallāna/Maudgalyāyana to do so is because he was concerned about difficulties for the future monks who do not possess any kind of magical powers.<sup>516</sup>

Through this event, the Buddha also stressed that without magical powers, monks should be able to manage and overcome all difficulty. Although the Buddha possessed all kinds of supernatural power, he seldom demonstrated them.

---

<sup>515</sup> One of the ten chief disciples of Śākyamuni Buddha 十大弟子, specially noted for his miraculous powers.

<sup>516</sup> *Vin. I*, p. 13–14. Cf. T. no. 1428. 22: 568c7–569a19.

According to the traditional Buddhist texts, the Buddha only uses his magical power to subdue the pride of his listeners which enables them to enter the path of practice.

Ultimately, the Buddha never used magical power to show that he is beyond human beings. For example, in the *Brahmanimantaṇikasutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*, Brahma Baka held the wrong view that this is permanent, eternal, complete, and a non-changing thing; this is unborn, does not decay, does not die, is not re-born; and there is no refuge that is higher than this. To keep Baka under his power, Mara tries to interrupt the Buddha from liberating the deluded opinion of Baka. Out of his compassion to Baka, the Buddha, firstly, asserts the superiority of his awakened knowledge to any of the other Brahmas or devas. However, Baka is still dull about the explanation of the Buddha because of Mara. Secondly, to help Baka get rid of the interference of Mara, the Buddha presents his psychic powers, and finally Baka and other heavenly Brahmas give up their wrong view and they took refuge in the Buddha.<sup>517</sup> Henceforth, the use of psychic power by the Buddha does not show that he is beyond beings.

The Buddha sometimes used psychic power but only when it was needed for the listeners to enter the path of practice. For all, the Buddha never praised the use of psychic power, and he even discourages it. In the *Kevaddha Suttanta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, the Buddha notes some kinds of psychic power, such as having been one he becomes many, or having been many he becomes one, one can vanish and reappear, or one can dive in and out of the earth as if it is water. According to the Buddha,

---

<sup>517</sup> *MNI – Brahmanimantaṇikasutta* 49, 388–395.

these can backfire and this could make the one without faith look down on Buddhism.

The Buddha never encouraged his disciples to demonstrate psychic power, even if there are difficulties. He stressed: "It is because I perceive danger in the practice of mystic wonders, that I loathe, and abhor, and am ashamed thereof."<sup>518</sup> Further, to answer the question of Sāriputta as to which type of monk of those assembled would give the highest praise, Moggallāna does not speak of one who possesses the magical power although he is praised by the Buddha to be the foremost one among his disciples who possesses the supernormal powers.<sup>519</sup> Rather, Moggallāna says a monk who is given the highest admiration is the one that engages best in dialogue and discussion about the *dhamma*. When their discussion is reported to the Buddha, the Buddha confirms that the proper answer for the question of Sāriputta is "a talker on *dhamma*."<sup>520</sup> The Buddha continues that whether magical powers are performed or not, they are useless to the total destruction of suffering. So, the practice of magical power is not the concern of the Buddha. Importantly, according to the Buddha, one has to realize the Four Noble Truths and put an end of birth and death cycle.<sup>521</sup>

---

<sup>518</sup> *DN I – Kevaddha Suttanta 11*, 272–284.

<sup>519</sup> *AN I*, 16.

<sup>520</sup> *MN I – Mahāgosinsasutta 49*, p. 2263–271.

<sup>521</sup> *DN III – Pāṭika Suttanta 24*, 9.

**APPENDIX II:**  
**CASE STUDY WITH DHAMMACARA**

---

To nothing05 [Dhammacara]

Thank you Bhante! It is a great answer. By the way, do you have reference for this information, i mean the inscription.

Of course, I always remember you, we did have great time in India together.

Take care Bhante,

Best,

Bhante Hai

Dear Sur [Venerable]

Nice to receive your mail. I'm good here, extending 8 years stay in India, doing nothing but enjoying Chapatti.

Thank you so much for remembering me. I think I have an answer, but not sure academically.

To my experience, when I was a lay person even before I entered to Monastic Order I knew a little bit about Vinaya, Monastic Code. I unexpectedly got that book from my uncle's small bookshelf at home. It was interesting and I read it again and again. Now I realized it helped me to catch up with what I need to do when I joined the Samgha. I found no restriction for lay people not only to look at Vinaya but to learn it thoroughly. Later I knew a lot of lay people who understand Vinaya almost the same as monks who also appreciate laity's interest on Vinaya.

Recently I'm doing my research on Asoka's inscriptions but my main focus is on only one inscription. In this inscription named "Bairāt Bhābrā Rock Edict of Asoka," Asoka mentioned his recommendation for fourfold disciple of the Buddha to learn some selected teachings of Dhamma. It is believed that one is Vinaya. Fourfold disciple contains monk, nun, lay male and lay female. Asoka believed that the teaching of the Buddha would be safe for a long time only when all disciples of the Buddha learn and preserve the Buddha's teachings (Dhamma and Vinaya). That was King Asoka's message to the Buddhist community since 3rd Century B.C.

This is what I understand for learning Vinaya with my personal perspective and clear evidence I got. I hope it'll be a small answer for your query.

Wish you the Best!

Much Mettā

Dhammacara

Dear Bhante,

How are you doing recently? Are you still in India or already graduated? Hope that you are doing well. I have a question regarding to my dissertation. I am writing something about vinaya. I want to double check that in Theravada tradition, is it allow for lay people to look at monastics' vinaya?

Many thanks,

Best,

Bhante Hai