

Did the *Bodhisattva-Vinaya* Exist? The Situation of the Bodhisattva Precepts in India before Their Systematization

HIROMI HABATA

THE ORIGIN of the bodhisattva precepts (Skt. **bodhisattvaśīla*; Ch. *Pusa jie* 菩薩戒) in India remains obscure. It is well known that Dharmakṣema (Ch. Tan Wuchen 曇無讖; 385–433) gave the first ordination of bodhisattva precepts in China.¹ His translations, the *Pusa dichi jing* 菩薩地持經 (Skt. *Bodhisattvabhūmi*) and the *Youposai jie jing* 優婆塞戒經, belong to the earliest texts that are important for understanding the introduction of the bodhisattva precepts into China. Among his influential translations, another important text, the *Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經 (Skt. *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*; hereafter MPM), is also concerned with such matters as moral precepts (*śīla*) and regulations (*vinaya*). The descriptions in this sutra reflect the situation in India prior to the systematization found in other texts concerning the bodhisattva precepts. In a previous essay, I dealt with the problem of moral precepts and regulations in the MPM and clarified that the regulations in this sutra originated from an old *śīlaskandha* (Pali, *sīlakkhandha*), or “group of moral precepts.”² A short summary of this essay will be given in the following section. Some sutras in the Āgama tradition, namely the *Dīghanikāya* (hereafter, DN), the *Dīrghāgama*, and the *Chang ahan jing* 長阿含經, contain a passage referred to as the “group of moral precepts.” However, the group of moral

THE PRESENT article is a revised version of a paper I presented at the conference “Bodhisattva Precepts in East Asian Perspectives” at the University of California, Berkeley, February 17–19, 2017. I am grateful to Henry Albery for helping with my English.

¹ Funayama 1995, pp. 6–24; Funayama 2011, pp. 208–13.

² See Habata (forthcoming).

precepts in the MPM differs from that in the Āgama tradition. This fact raises a further question regarding the tradition to which the bodhisattva precepts of the MPM could be related. In this paper, I would like to compare the matters concerning moral precepts and regulations in two traditions: those of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* and the MPM.

Śīlaskandha in the Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra

The MPM contains a detailed enumeration of things and behaviors that one should be prohibited from possessing and engaging in.³ This listing shares some common features with the passage referred to as the “group of moral precepts,” which appears in a certain group of texts in the Āgama tradition. (Hereafter, “the Śīlaskandha” is used for these versions.) For example, it appears in the *Brahmajālasutta* and the *Sāmaññaphalasutta* in the *Dīghanikāya*, which transmit the version of the Theravada tradition. Therein, the group of moral precepts is divided three-fold into the “small (group) of moral precepts” (*cūlasīla*), “middle (group) of moral precepts” (*majjhimasīla*), and “great (group) of moral precepts” (*mahāsīla*). The Sarvāstivāda version of the Śīlaskandha is found in the *Samghabhedavastu*, and the Dharmaguptaka version in the *Amozhou jing* 阿摩晝經 of the Chinese *Dīrghāgama*.⁴ A precise comparison of the MPM paragraph with the different versions of the Śīlaskandha in the Āgama tradition reveals that their respective enumerations share a common source.⁵ It is noteworthy that the correspondences are largely found in the “small (group) of moral precepts” (*cūlasīla*), the first and fundamental part of the Śīlaskandha. And even in cases in which the corresponding terms are found in the second part, the *majjhimasīla*, wherein they are explained in greater detail, they are already mentioned in the first part. Another conspicuous characteristic is that the MPM paragraph often presents the prohibited objects in a less elaborate, simpler fashion. In this regard, the versions of the Śīlaskandha which are transmitted to us in the extant Āgama texts represent a more developed state. Similarly, the Śīlaskandha that we know from the available texts appears to be more systematically established, as the *Dīghanikāya* version has the three divisions—*cūla-*, *majjhima-*, and *mahāsīla*. Moreover, the enumerations found in the MPM and the Śīlaskandha, respectively, contain items that are

³ MPM §343.

⁴ DN vol. 1, 4.1–12.17; 63.19–70.6; SBV vol. 2, 232.7–240.17; T no. 1, 1: 83c14–84c13. For a comparative study on the Śīlaskandha see Ramers 1996.

⁵ For details of this comparison see Habata 2019, pp. 51–64; Habata (forthcoming).

unknown to the other, and therefore it is possible that the enumeration of the MPM derived from an early group of moral precepts (hereafter “the [old] *śīlaskandha*,” which once belonged to an expected older version, that is, the common content of the Āgama tradition and the MPM).

Another important feature of the MPM is that the text describes a conflict between two different manners of dealing with the things mentioned in the *śīlaskandha*. The MPM maintains the position of strictly following the old *śīlaskandha*, and criticizes the opposite position of accepting luxurious things prohibited in the *śīlaskandha*. This opposition between strictness and luxuriousness is clearly evident in the MPM. Generally speaking, there is a tendency in the known Vinaya texts to allow the possession of luxury items, such as gold and silver, which was strictly forbidden in the *śīlaskandha*.⁶ Contrastingly, the MPM maintains a position of strictness, thus retaining the old regulation from the *śīlaskandha*.

The Bodhisattva Precepts in the Bodhisattvabhūmi Tradition

A highly conspicuous example of a tendency towards luxuriousness is found in the story of Meṇḍaka. This narrative is transmitted in the Vinaya works of several different schools, specifically within the divisions entitled Khandhaka (Theravādins), Skandhaka (Dharmaguptakas), or Vastu (Mūlasarvāstivādins), respectively. (Hereafter, “the Skandhaka” is used as a common designation for all school traditions.) It relates that the Buddha allowed monks to possess gold, silver, and other items, indicating that this was accepted as a possible practice, not only by the Theravādins, but also by other Vinaya schools.⁷ This same trend of accepting luxurious things is not only encountered among the so-called Hinayana Buddhists, but also among the so-called Mahayana Buddhists. For instance, in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*,⁸ which enumerates four grave offences and

⁶ See von Hinüber 1999, p. 29.

⁷ Bhaiṣajyavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādins in MSV pt. 1, 241.1–250.4; Mahāvagga of the Theravādins in Vin I, 240.5–245.7; *Bhaiṣajya-Skandhaka of the Dharmaguptakas in T no. 1428, 22: 872b18–873a24; *Bhaiṣajya-Dharma of the Mahīśāsakas in T no. 1421, 22: 150b3–151b18; *Bhaiṣajya-Dharma of the Sarvāstivādins in T no. 1435, 23: 191a26–192c1. Among them, the version of the Sarvāstivādins differs notably from other versions. For details on the Meṇḍaka story, see Habata 2019, pp. 66–69.

⁸ Four versions are available: a Sanskrit version (Wogihara 1971); three Chinese versions, *Pusa dichi jing* translated by Dharmakṣema, *Pusa shanjie jing* 菩薩善戒經 by Guṇavarman (Ch. Qiunabamo 求那跋摩; 367–431), and *Pusa di* 菩薩地在 the *Yujie shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論 translated by Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664).

forty-three minor offences, the following passage is found: “If one person with [Buddhist] beliefs offers gold, silver, jewels (*maṇi*), pearls, cat’s eye gems (*vaiḍūrya*), as well as excellent treasure, a bodhisattva must receive them.”⁹ This regulation of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* corresponds to the Chinese translation of Dharmakṣema. Therefore, this tendency towards luxuriousness was already incorporated into the systematized tradition of bodhisattva regulations in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* at a time before the translation had been rendered; that is, prior to 412.¹⁰

One famous example for the mitigation of strict rules in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* is that the four *pārājikas*—the most serious offences that result in expulsion from the sangha—are allowed under exceptional conditions.¹¹ As is well known, this exaggerated mitigation of the four *pārājikas* does not find any correspondence in the version of Dharmakṣema. Furthermore, the part of the text that includes this mitigation evinces a different style of the Sanskrit from the parts which correspond to Dharmakṣema’s version.¹² Therefore, this form of the mitigation should be regarded as a relatively later development.

In contrast to this tendency towards allowing luxuriousness and the mitigation of the strict rules, the MPM shows an uncompromising strictness. This is expressed with the word *saṃlekha*:

An *ācārya* is a teacher (*upadeṣṭṛ*) of the Mahayana; he has the right insight . . . he does not [serve] kings and ministers, he utters [no flattery] to donors for [more] gains, he behaves perfectly. . . . He is called an *ācārya*, who has moral discipline and good dharma, having [understanding like an ocean] . . . who desires neither figure and appearance nor gain and respect. [He knows satisfaction and] teaches the austere life (*saṃlekha*). He drives away a follower who desires gain and respect.¹³

⁹ For the Sanskrit, see BoBh 162.26–163.4; for the Chinese, BoBh ChinD 914a14–17.

¹⁰ Another translation by Guṇavarman, *Pusa shanjie jing*, also has a section corresponding to this regulation: BoBh ChinG 1015c18–20. Guṇavarman translated the *Pusa shanjie jing* in 431, which reflects the version from Jibin 罽賓 (Kashmir), made before 396: see Mukai 1981, p. 685; Funayama 1995, p. 45.

¹¹ See Schmithausen 2007, Hartmann 2005.

¹² Those paragraphs (BoBh 165.26–168.20) lacking in the version of Dharmakṣema begin with the phrase *yathā’pi tad bodhisattvo*, whereas those corresponding to the version of Dharmakṣema begin simply with the word *bodhisattvaḥ*.

¹³ The Sanskrit text is available in fragments. See MPM SF 10.7. For the Tibetan translation, see MPM §155; for the Chinese, MPM ChinD 384b12–19 and MPM ChinF 867a27–b6.

Austerity (Skt. *saṃlekha*; Pali, *sallekha*), whilst abandoned by most of the Vinaya schools known to us, is essential in the MPM.¹⁴ The teacher (*ācārya*) who advocates an austere life is conscious of being on the side of the Mahayana. In other Mahayana scriptures, however, the austere life seems far less supported. For example, in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*:

Those who have bad intelligence and are dishonest, deceitful, foolish, and arrogant, and think that they have arrived [at a wonderful condition] though they have not arrived; [and] those of bad mind will in the future, during terrible times, say: “We lived the forest-life, wearing patched garments, and practiced the austere life.”¹⁵

In this picture of a monk, the practice of the austere life is rather regarded as being of negative value.

Daśakuśalakarmapatha in the Mahayana scriptures

According to Akira Hirakawa,¹⁶ the bodhisattva precepts or “Mahayana precepts” (*dasheng jie* 大乘戒) are based on the *daśakuśalakarmapatha* (*shi shan* 十善), or “path of ten good deeds.”¹⁷ In Mahayana scriptures, this path of ten good deeds is often mentioned in connection with the six *pāramitās* (*liu poluomi* 六波羅蜜). As the traditional interpretation shows, the group of ten items seems to be oriented toward enacting “good deeds” in the body (Skt. *kāya*; Ch. *shen* 身), speech (Skt. *vācā*; Ch. *kou* 口), and mind (Skt.

¹⁴ For details see Habata 2018.

¹⁵ *durbuddhinaś ca vaṅkāś ca śaṭhā bālādhimāninaḥ | aprāpte prāptasamjñī ca ghore kālasmi paścime || 4 || aranyavṛttakāś caiva kanthāṃ prāvāriyāna ca | saṃlekharitā asme evaṃ vakṣyanti durmatī || 5 ||* (SP 272.1–4).

¹⁶ Hirakawa 1990a, 1990b, 1990c.

¹⁷ The ten good deeds (Skt. *daśakuśalakarmapatha*-, Pali, *dasakusalakammapatha*-) are according to the Pali tradition (DN vol. 3, 269.5–9 in the *Saṅgīti-suttanta*): (1) *pāṇātipātā veramaṇī*, “to avoid killing living beings,” (2) *adinnādānā veramaṇī*, “to avoid stealing,” (3) *kāmesu micchācārā veramaṇī*, “to avoid immoral copulation,” (4) *musāvādā veramaṇī*, “to avoid speaking lies,” (5) *pisuṇāya vācāya veramaṇī*, “to avoid malicious speech,” (6) *pharusāya vācāya veramaṇī*, “to avoid rough speech,” (7) *samphappalāpā veramaṇī*, “to avoid frivolous talk,” (8) *anabhijjhā*, “not to be covetous,” (9) *avyāpādo*, “to have no evil intention,” and (10) *sammā-dīṭṭhi*, “to have the right belief.” For the Sanskrit terms see SWTF, s.v. *karma-patha*. According to the fragmentary text of the *Daśottarasūtra*, the following ten bad deeds are to be avoided: (1) *prāṇātipāta*-, (2) *adattādāna*-, (3) *kāmamithyācāra*-, (4) *mṛṣāvāda*-, (5) *paśunya*-, (6) *pāruṣya*-, (7) *saṃbhinnapralāpa*-, (8) *abhidhyā*-, (9) *vyāpāda*-, and (10) *mithyādrṣṭi*-, which correspond to the list of the Pali. For variations in other texts see Hirakawa 1990a, pp. 211–14.

manas; Ch. *yi* 意). It is also clear that the *daśakuśalakarmapatha* shares common moral principles with the “five precepts” (Skt. *pañca śīla*; Ch. *wu jie* 五戒)¹⁸ or indeed with the *cūlasīla* of the Śīlaskandha paragraph.¹⁹ However, in the case of the last three items of the *daśakuśalakarmapatha*, the general purpose is to frame good acts, rather than stipulate specific regulations.

In the MPM, the *cūlasīla* of the Śīlaskandha paragraph is essential to the regulations, whereas the *daśakuśalakarmapatha* appears to have played a very limited role. It is mentioned only briefly at MPM §380 (MPM SF 18.6) in a list of “ten bad acts,” the negative counterpart to the *daśakuśalakarmapatha*:

If there is the element (*dhātu*) of the [Tathāgata], why do living beings betake themselves to the ten bad acts like murder, the stealing of things from others, [immoral] copulation, and others; Why does a drunken man become intoxicated?²⁰

This passage appears in a discussion on the existence of the (constructive) element of the Buddha (*tathāgatadhātu*, or *buddhadhātu*, both usually translated as “buddha-nature”) functioning as a self. Therefore, the context has little to do with the matter of the moral precepts. Where the text does deal with the moral precepts, however, the *daśakuśalakarmapatha* is not mentioned. Of outstanding importance to the MPM is the austere life and the rejection of luxurious things, a tenet lacking in the *daśakuśalakarmapatha*.

The relation between the three traditions of moral maxims—the *prātimokṣasūtra* with its approximately two-hundred-and-fifty regulations, the *śīlaskandha*, and the *daśakuśalakarmapatha*—is difficult to ascertain, and it remains unclear how the three functioned in the daily lives of monks. Regarding this problem, there is an interesting story in one Jataka (no. 56, “Kañcanakkhandha”). One from a good family

¹⁸ The first four items of the *daśakuśalakarmapatha* in the Pali tradition (listed above) correspond to four of the five precepts. The variant in the Prajñāpāramitā tradition adds, “not to drink alcohol” (*surāmaireyamadyapramādasthānāt prativirato bhavati*, AsP 667.27–668.1), thus corresponding to all five precepts; see Hirakawa 1990a, p. 212.

¹⁹ The first seven items of the *daśakuśalakarmapatha* in the Pali tradition (listed above) have corresponding elements in the *cūlasīla*. On the relation between the *daśakuśalakarmapatha*, the *pañca śīla*, and the Śīlaskandha paragraph, see von Hinüber 1999, pp. 24–26.

²⁰ For the Tibetan translation, see MPM §380.3–5. Only a fragmentary version of the Sanskrit text is available; see MPM SF 18.6.

(*kulaputta*) was ordained as a Buddhist monk. His teachers (*ācariya* and *upajjhāya*) taught him a lot of *sīla*: *sīla* from the *Śīlakkhandha* (*cullasīla*, *majjhimasīla*, and *mahāsīla*), *sīla* from the *Pātimokkha* (*pātimokkhasaṃvarasīla*), *sīla* on the sense organs (*indriyasaṃvarasīla*), *śīla* for the pure life (*ājīvaṇṇasuddhisīla*), and *sīla* on the practices of necessities (*paccayapaṭisevanasīla*). The new monk thought that they were too much, that he could not observe so many, and wanted to go back to the profane life. He visited the Fortunate One to say goodbye, then the Fortunate One taught him to observe only three *sīla*: to protect the three “doors” (*dvāras*) of body, speech, and mind (*kāyadvāra*, *vācīdvāra*, and *manodvāra*). In addition, he told him not to perform bad acts with these three doors (*mā kāyena pāpakammaṃ kari mā vācāya mā manasā*). The monk was very satisfied with the simple teaching and remained a monk.

It is interesting that in this story the three moral maxims function in parallel. This last simple collection of *śīla*, with its three fields of the body, speech, and mind, could well correspond to the “path of ten good deeds.” It is difficult to know when exactly the story was formulated, but it reflects a situation in which the old *śīlaskandha* was still not abandoned and was being learned together with the *prātimokṣasūtra*.

In contrast to this Jataka story, there is little trace of the old *śīlaskandha* in the regulations for the bodhisattva in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*.²¹ Under the category of “all *śīla*” (*sarva-śīla*), three kinds of *śīla* are explained: the first, “preventive regulation” (*saṃvaraśīla*), corresponds to the traditional regulations for each grouping of the seven-fold Buddhist community;²² the second, “*śīla* that holds the good dharma” (*kuśaladharmasaṃgrāhakaśīla*),

²¹ A few words that are common to the *Śīlaskandha* of the *Āgamas* appear sporadically in the *śīla* of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, for example, *kuhana-*, or “hypocrisy” (BoBh 143.22; 168.21), and *lapana-*, or “boasting” (BoBh 140.16: *ālapana-saṃlapana-*; 168.21). Both words belong to “the five wrong ways of making a living (*mīthyājīva*)”: *bodhisattvaḥ utpannāṃ kuhanāṃ lapanāṃ naimittikatāṃ naiṣpeṣikatāṃ lābhena lābhaṃ niścikīrṣutāṃ mīthyājīvakarāṃ dharmān adhivāsayati. na tai rīṭiyate. na vinodayati. sāpattiko bhavati sātisāraḥ kliṣṭāṃ āpattim āpadyate* (BoBh 168.21–25). For the five *mīthyājīva*, see Wogihara 1971, pp. 21–26.

²² The *saṃvaraśīla* consists of regulations for seven discrete groups of Buddhists: monks, nuns, (female) students, (male) novices, (female) novices, (male) lay-disciples, and (female) lay-disciples (*tatra saṃvaraśīlaṃ bodhisattvasya yat sapta-naikāyikaṃ prātimokṣasaṃvarasamādānaṃ bhikṣu-bhikṣuṇī-śikṣamāṇā-śrāmaṇera-śrāmaṇery-upāsakopāsikāśīlam*; BoBh 138.24–26).

corresponds well to the *daśakuśalakarmapatha*;²³ the third, “*śīla* practiced for (the benefit of) living beings” (*sattvānuvrāhakaśīla* or *sattvārthakriyāśīla*), expresses the ideal practices of the bodhisattva. In this system, the *śīlaskandha* has disappeared. The new system was oriented toward the ideal of bodhisattva practices, to which the old *śīlaskandha* no longer applied. The *Bodhisattvabhūmi* called this new system the “three-fold *śīlaskandha*” (*trividha śīlaskandha*).²⁴ Although it is unclear if it was intended or not, the “threefold *śīlaskandha*” of the bodhisattva appears to have replaced the *Śīlaskandha* of the Āgamas, which also consists of three parts in the Pali version.

Bodhisattva-vinaya

It is generally upheld that the *śīlaskandha* does not seem to have functioned within the system of Buddhist moral conduct after a certain time, as the approximately two-hundred-and-fifty disciplines of the *prātimokṣasūtra* (Pali, *pātimokkhasutta*) could have replaced the old *śīlaskandha* as the central codes of conduct.²⁵ The aforementioned Jataka could well reflect a moment in which the *prātimokṣasūtra* had not yet entirely superseded the old *śīlaskandha*. And in this transitional phase, the difficult question of which moral code should be observed may have arisen. In this regard, the MPM provides us with a very rare documentation of the issue, posing the question: “Which moral principle (*pramāṇa*) should one observe?”

The following passage appears in another paragraph, in which the related question of “who is an expert in moral regulations (*vinayadhara*)” is discussed:²⁶

One also holds the imperfect (*sāvaśeṣa*, literally “with the remnant”) *vinaya* as his principle of authority, in which the improper gifts are praised. He (a correct *vinayadhara*) does not hold such a *vinaya* as his principle of authority. He learns (the content) in the

²³ The version of Guṇavarman affirms this correspondence: 善法戒者。菩薩摩訶薩離七種戒。爲菩提故修身口意十種善法。是名受善法戒。BoBh ChinG 982c11–12. See Funayama 2011, p. 218.

²⁴ The term *trividha śīlaskandha* is evidenced in BoBh 152.22, but no corresponding term (*sanju jie* 三聚戒 or *sanju jingjie* 三聚淨戒) is found in the Chinese versions of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*.

²⁵ See von Hinüber 1999.

²⁶ For an interpretation of the whole paragraph see Habata 2018.

vinaya, casting away (the improper issues). A monk who has bad morality is a big child wearing the robes of the monks.²⁷

In the context of the MPM, the “*vinaya* with the remnant (to abandon)” in this passage seems to refer to the extended Vinaya, including the so-called Skandhaka part. As we have seen, this part includes the story of Meṇḍaka, in which luxurious items such as gold and silver are accepted as permissible possessions. Does this suggest the Vinaya with the Skandhaka part was still not regarded as an absolute authority? And if not, what was the moral maxim upon which one could rely? The MPM mentions the fact that there was a kind of group who kept their moral maxim (*pramāṇa*), relying on the sutra and not on the *vinaya*:

One who also holds no *vinaya* as his principle of authority appears in the Vinaya. His highest satisfaction is found in that he teaches according to the words of the Buddha. I (Buddha) say that this is also *vinaya*. [He is a *vinayadhara*]. He knows one syllable. Such a one who knows one syllable is a *vinayadhara* [accommodated to] the world. He is called *vinayadhara-sautrāntika*.²⁸

The figure mentioned as a *vinayadhara-sautrāntika* holds the “words of the Buddha” (*buddhavacana*) as his “*vinaya*.” The words of the Buddha here denote the sutras that mention the moral regulations; namely, the sutras with the *śīlaskandha* paragraph and the *prātimokṣasūtra*. The word “*vinaya*” is used here in the meaning “keeping away from bad behavior,” which is the basic meaning of the term,²⁹ and serves as his “monastic code.”³⁰ The Sanskrit compound *vinayadhara-sautrāntika* could be interpreted in this context as an “expert in moral regulations who regards sutras as the ultimate maxim.” It remains open to question whether these figures attempted to establish their own *vinaya* as an independent monastic code.

²⁷ For the Sanskrit text, see MPM SF 11.6; for the Tibetan translation, MPM §159.1–5; and for the Chinese translations, MPM ChinD 384c12–14 and MPM ChinF 867b28–c2.

²⁸ The Sanskrit text is found at MPM SF 11.7–8; the Tibetan translation at MPM §159.6–11; and the Chinese translations at MPM ChinD 384c14–17 and MPM ChinF 867c2–5.

²⁹ See Hara 2004.

³⁰ The term *sautrāntika* here does not designate a philosophical school known as Sautrāntika in later texts, but an attitude toward sutras: for details see Habata 2018.

In the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, we also encounter an attempt to legitimate a *bodhisattva-vinaya*.³¹ However, the contents and the circumstances of the “*vinaya*” in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* and the MPM differ considerably. The latter maintains the strict regulations found in the old *śīlaskandha*, whereas the former—against the old sutras—accepts the softened regulations. This difference should not be understood as a dichotomy between Mahayana and non-Mahayana. Conflict between strictness and mitigation is also found in a debate between the Vaibhāṣikas of Kashmir and Vasubandhu (fl. ca. 4th or 5th c.) who wrote his *Abhidhamakośabhāṣya* from the standpoint of the Sautrāntikas.³² This demands that further investigations should be conducted to answer the question as to whether the figures of the *vinayadhara-sautrāntika* in the MPM and the Sautrāntikas in the *Abhidhamakośabhāṣya* could be related in some way.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AKBh *Abhidhamakośabhāṣya*. In Pradhan 1967.
 AsP *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. In Wogihara 1932.
 BoBh *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. In Wogihara 1971.
 BoBh ChinD *Pusa dichi jing* 菩薩地持經. T no. 1581, 30. Translated by Dharmakṣema.
 BoBh ChinG *Pusa shanjie jing* 菩薩善戒經. T nos. 1582 and 1583, 30. Translated by Guṇavarman.
 BoBh ChinX *Pusa di* 菩薩地 in the *Yuqie shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論. T no. 1579, 30. Translated by Xuanzang 玄奘.
 DN *Dīgha-Nikāya*. In Rhys Davids and Carpenter 1890–1911.
 MPM *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* (Tibetan text is found in Habata 2013 and quoted with the paragraph number).
 MPM ChinD *Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經. T no. 374, 12. Translated by Dharmakṣema.
 MPM ChinF *Da bannihuan jing* 大般泥洹經. T no. 376, 12. Translated by Faxian 法顯 (ca. 337–422).
 MPM SF Sanskrit fragments of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*. Habata 2007, 2019.
 MSV *Mūlasarvāstivādinayavastu*. In Dutt 1942–1950.
 SBV *Saṅghabhedavastu*. In Gnoli 1978.
 SP *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. In Kern and Bunyiu 1908–12.

³¹ *Bodhisattva-vinaya*, BoBh 181.7; *pusa pini* 菩薩毘尼, BoBh ChinD 917a14–15; *pusa pinaiye fa* 菩薩毘奈耶法, BoBh ChinX 521a27: see Funayama 2011, pp. 231–33. The version by Guṇavarman lacks the corresponding term.

³² Concerning the *pārājikas*, the Sautrāntikas retain the strict form of punishment, whereas the Vaibhāṣikas insist on soft treatment (AKBh 223.6–224.16): see Sasaki 2018, pp. 358–61.

- SWTF *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvāstivāda-Schule*. Edited by Ernst Waldschmidt. Vols. 1–4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, (1973) 1994–2018.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–35.
- Vin *Vinayapīṭaka*. In Oldenberg (1879–1883) 1969–1995.

REFERENCES

- Dutt, Nalinaksha, ed. 1942–1950. *Mūlasarvāstivādavinayavastu*. In *Gilgit Manuscripts*. Vol. 3, pts. 1–4. Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Press.
- Funayama Tōru 船山徹. 1995. “Rikuchō jidai ni okeru bosatsukai no juyōkatei: Ryūsō, Nanseiki o chūshin ni” 六朝時代における菩薩戒の受容過程：劉宋・南齊期を中心に. *Tōhō gakuho* 東方學報 67, pp. 1–135.
- . 2011. “Daijōkai” 大乘戒. In *Daijō bukkyō no jissen* 大乘仏教の実践, vol. 3 of *Shirizu daijō bukkyō* シリーズ 大乘仏教, edited by Katsura Shōryū 桂紹隆, Saitō Akira 齋藤明, Shimoda Masahiro 下田正弘, and Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士, pp. 205–40. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Gnoli, Raniero, ed. 1978. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu, Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. 2 vols. Serie Orientale Roma 49. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Habata, Hiromi. 2007. *Die zentralasiatischen Sanskrit-Fragmente des Mahāparinirvāṇamahāsūtra: Kritische Ausgabe des Sanskrittextes und seiner tibetischen Übertragung im Vergleich mit den chinesischen Übersetzungen*. Indica et Tibetica 51. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- . 2013. *A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Translation of the Mahāparinirvāṇamahāsūtra*. Contributions to Tibetan Studies 10. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- . 2018. “Some Reflections on the Term *Sautrāntika* in Vinaya Context: *Vinayadharah sautrāntikah* in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 46, no. 2, pp. 241–61.
- . 2019. *Aufbau und Umstrukturierung des Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra: Untersuchungen zum Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra unter Berücksichtigung der Sanskrit-Fragmente*. Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 25. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- . Forthcoming. “The Conflict with the Opponent Traced in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra: Sautrāntika* and *Ichchantika*.” In *Proceedings of the Berkeley Conference on the Nirvana Sutra*, edited by Mark Blum and Masahiro Shimoda.
- Hara Minoru 原實. 2004. “Vinaya kenkyū” Vinaya 研究 (A Note on the Sanskrit Word *vinaya*). In *Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Daigakuin Daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要 (*Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies*) 7, pp. 1 (270)–54 (217).
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. 2005. “‘Triffst du den Buddha, wirst du ihn töten’: Wie groß ist das Gewaltpotential im Buddhismus?” In *Jahrbuch der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 2004*, pp. 107–29, München: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- Hinüber, Oskar von. 1999. *Das Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin: Seine Gestalt und seine Entstehungsgeschichte. Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus II*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse Jg. Nr. 6. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1990a. “Shōki daijō bukkūō no kaigaku toshite no jūzendō” 初期大乘仏教の戒学としての十善道. In *Hirakawa Akira chosakushū* 平川彰著作集, vol. 7, pp. 201–38. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- . 1990b. “Daijōkai to jūzendō” 大乘戒と十善道. In *Hirakawa Akira chosakushū*, vol. 7, pp. 239–51. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- . 1990c. “Daijōkai to Bosatsukaikyō” 大乘戒と菩薩戒経. In *Hirakawa Akira chosakushū*, vol. 7, pp. 253–75. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Kern, Hendrik, and Bunyiu Nanjio, eds. 1908–12. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. St. Petersburg: Imprimerie de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences.
- Mukai Akira 向井亮. 1981. “‘Yugaron’ no seiritsu to Asanga no nendai” 『瑜伽論』の成立とアサンガの年代 (On the Compilation of the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the Dates of Asanga). *Indogaku bukkūōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 58 (vol. 29, no. 2), pp. 680–86.
- Oldenberg, Hermann, ed. (1879–1883) 1969–1995. *Vinayapiṭaka*. 5 vols. London: Williams & Norgate. Reprint, Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Pradhan, P., ed. 1967. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Ramers, Peter. 1996. “Die ‘Drei Kapitel über die Sittlichkeit’ im Śrāmaṇyaphala-sūtra: Die Fassungen des Dīghanikāya und Saṃghabhedavastu, verglichen mit dem Tibetischen und Mongolischen; Einführung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar.” PhD diss., University of Bonn.
- Rhys Davids, T. W., and J. Estlin Carpenter, eds. *Dīgha-Nikāya*. 1890–1911. 3 vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- Sasaki, Shizuka. 2018. “Who Used the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya?” In *Reading Slowly: A Festschrift for Jens E. Braarvig*, edited by Lutz Edzard, Jens W. Borgland, and Ute Hüsken, pp. 357–73. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 2007. “Zur Frage, ob ein Bodhisattva unter bestimmten Voraussetzungen in einer neutralen Geisteshaltung (*avyākṛta-citta*) töten darf.” In *Indica et Tibetica. Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*, edited by Konrad Klaus and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, pp. 423–40. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 66. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
- Wogihara, Unrai, ed. 1932. *Abhisamayālamkāra 'ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā: The Work of Haribhadra; Together with the Text Commented on*. Tokyo: Sankibō.
- , ed. 1971. *Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of Whole Course of the Bodhisattva (Being Fifteenth Section of Yogācārabhūmi)*. Tokyo: Sankibō.