

Journal of Buddhist Ethics

ISSN 1076–9005

<http://blogs.dickinson.edu/buddhistethics/>

Volume 24, 2017

Guṇaprabha on Monastic Authority and Authoritative Doctrine

Paul Nietupski

John Carroll University

Copyright Notice: Digital copies of this work may be made and distributed provided no change is made and no alteration is made to the content. Reproduction in any other format, with the exception of a single copy for private study, requires the written permission of the author. All enquiries to: cozort@dickinson.edu.

Guṇaprabha on Monastic Authority and Authoritative Doctrine

Paul Nietupski¹

Abstract

This essay is based on sūtras 70–102 in Guṇaprabha’s seventh century *Vinayasūtra*, his *Autocommentary*, and the associated sections in all Indian and Tibetan commentaries on the *Vinayasūtra*. In this excerpt Guṇaprabha and the commentators include remarks on the requirements for monastic community authority and references to relevant authoritative doctrines. The guidelines for monastic authority include applications of procedures in medieval Indian monastic life, including prerequisites and exceptions in the ordination process. The references to authoritative doctrine in Guṇaprabha’s and the commentators’ works include comments on the

¹ Department of Theology and Religious Studies, John Carroll University. Email: pniegupski@jcu.edu. Thanks to John Carroll University for a 2015 Grauel Faculty Fellowship in support of research for this project. Thanks to the *JBE* reviewer for helpful comments, and to Jenni Shelton for proofreading.

interface of ethics, concentration, and wisdom, and how ethical guidelines are based on the correct understanding of epistemological value as presented in canonical treatises on doctrine.

Guṇaprabha and His Community

Guṇaprabha (ca. 550–630) lived in the later Gupta period and was reportedly favored by King Harṣa Śīlāditya (ca. 590–647, r. 612–647) of the Vardhana lineage. The King's capital was in the Sthāṇeśvara region, west of Mathurā. Guṇaprabha is also associated with regions further east, in Magadhā.² His sectarian affiliations describe him as an adherent of Mahāyāna Buddhism, and he is associated with the Vaibhāṣikas. He is called a bodhisattva, is credited with authorship of commentaries on two Mahāyāna sūtras, and he is said to have had audiences with the Buddha Maitreya in the course of his many sojourns to Tuṣita, Maitreya's heaven. His rather fantastic pedigree includes associations with Vasubandhu (4th–5th century), Dignāga (5th–6th century), Dharmakīrti (c. 650), Sthiramati, and others. He was mentioned by Xuanzang (602–664, who traveled 629–645), and in other Chinese sources, but with the possible exception of a version of the *Vinayasūtra* itself, now lost, his works were not translated into Chinese. He is highly regarded; known as one of the Two Superiors, with Śākyaprabha the second, in the well-known formula, the Six Ornaments and Two Superiors.

In spite of the difficulties of locating the texts and communities, Yonezawa has shown that Guṇaprabha's works were circulated at

² BG note 32 says that the manuscript reads *madhurapāṭha*, which BG edits to *pāṭhapar-yantāḥ*. D reads *ma thu ra'i klog pa rnams*, D 10a1. Prajñākara reads *yul ma thu ra pa rnams*, DP 7a3. Yonezawa 2001 (4-8; 12-14).

Nālandā and Vikramalaśīla monasteries. They were composed or redacted, translated, and copied in a religiously plural context, where brahmanical and different sectarian Buddhist groups were in close proximity, and where state and with it community sponsorship were necessary and solicited. The difficulties with the texts themselves—see for examples sūtras 76, 97, and 102 for a few among the many lexical and source anomalies—shed light on the scholarly environment, and suggest that in the texts under study here the problems were not the fault of the translators. The translators of Guṇaprabha's texts, Jinamitra (fl. ca. 824) and Chokro Lü Gyentsen (*lcog ro klu'i rgyal mtshan*; ninth century; *Vinayasūtra* and *Ṭīkā*) and Alaṃkāradeva and Tsültrim Jungné Bepa (*tshul khrims 'byung gnas pa*; ca. 1107–1190; *Autocommentary*) are widely known for their accurate translations. In light of this we can see that the translators were faithful to the available but problematic Sanskrit versions of the *Vinayasūtra* and later the *Autocommentary*, preserving the at times the unclear expressions in the source texts. Similarly, the readability of the Tibetan translation of Dharmamitra's commentary suggests that their source, or sources for the *Ṭīkā* were in relatively better shape. The translators, source texts, translations, and thus, the degrees of accuracy of the *Vṛtti* and the *Vyākhyāna* are unknown. The texts taken together nonetheless show evidence of a vibrant academic community, with awareness of key compositions and commitments to their accurate translation and circulation.³

Further, among other circumstances, the later Gupta fragmentation of political authority resulted in inconsistent financial support for religious institutions. We can speculate that as centralized sponsorship

³ See Davidson 2002 (30-46; 102-168); Kulke & Rothermund (127-131); Thapar (136-166).

⁴ The grouping of sūtras 70-102 is clear in individual subject matter, but the sequence is overall rather random. This may signal an editorial process of clustering or grouping of

weakened, Indian religious institutions soon lost consistent and central authority. There was a range of factors including distance between religious centers, language differences, local beliefs and practices, and others. Different groups of Buddhists, sometimes in places far away from major source monasteries, made new interpretations of historical materials and developed new doctrines and ritual observances. Finding a single, consistent, pan-Indian Buddhist monastic system in Mathurā, Nepal, Kaśmīr, and Bengal was likely impossible.

Building on the previous sixty-nine sūtras on actual ordination rules and rituals, Guṇaprabha's following sūtras (70–102) on persons with monastic authority and on doctrines considered to be authoritative include, in rather disconnected segments: clarifications of proper behavior and attitudes, procedural matters, transgressions of rules, authoritative and appropriate intellectual orientation, and specific doctrinal parameters.⁴ The fragmented nature of the content in this section on authority may well signal efforts to collect core institutional texts and teachings for preservation, transmission, and translation. That is, the apparent segmentation Harṣa's kingdom, a probable resultant sense of political uncertainty, and the proximity of the northeastern Indian monasteries could have made Guṇaprabha's texts good choices for Indian editors and Tibetan translators. Luo Hong has presented an elaborate theory of multiple source texts for Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra*, and Yonezawa has shown the connections between this section and sections of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. It seems that the combination of social, political, and religious factors resulted in the adoption and canonization of Guṇaprabha's texts. Also, the brevity and resultant convenience of his

⁴ The grouping of sūtras 70–102 is clear in individual subject matter, but the sequence is overall rather random. This may signal an editorial process of clustering or grouping of sūtras in circulation, but not sequential composition. See Luo Hong for a theory of different recensions of the *Vinayasūtra*.

works for translators and for relative ease of memorization, the pedigree of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* and the known circulation of his works in northeastern Indian monasteries together provide probable reasons for the adoption of the texts by the Tibetans.

Buddhist *Dharma* and Buddhist *Vinaya*: The Integration of *Śīla*, *Samādhi*, & *Prajñā*

The *Mahāparinibbānasutta* (*Dīghanikāya* #16) tells us that the Buddha's teachings consist of the *Dharma* and *Vinaya*. These categories, respectively the wisdom and revelatory teachings in the *Dharma* and the social, non-philosophical, behavior rules in the *Vinaya* are very often understood to be mutually exclusive.⁵ Moreover, the Buddhist monastic codes, the *Vinaya*, are said to be rules for monks, simply institutional quasi-legal rules with little or no philosophical meaning and relevant to mental states only as a necessary foundation for ritual and meditation practices. This is an incorrect understanding of *Vinaya*. I.B. Horner made this point in her "Translator's Introduction" to Volume 4 of the *Book of the Discipline*:

But as it is rather hollow to lay down the rules for training and for outward behaviour without giving the underlying reasons why they should be observed, it is not possible to exclude philosophical concepts completely from a "book" principally concerned with discipline. (xxiv–xxv)

Here, Horner points to the content of the Buddha's "Three Utterances," or the three marks (*trilakṣaṇa*) of all compounded phenomena, taught in

⁵ "Yo vo, ānanda, mayā dhammo ca vinayo ca desito paññatto, so vo mamaccayena satthā" (DN 16).

the Pāli *Anguttaranikāya* III: *anitya*, *duḥkha*, and *anātma*. She shows that these are indeed philosophical concerns. And finally, from the *Cullavagga*, in the Pāli *Vinaya*: “Just, O Bhikkhus, as the great ocean has only one taste, the taste of salt—just so, O Bhikkhus, has this doctrine and discipline only one flavour, the flavour of emancipation” (304).

Similarly, as written in the *Samyuttanikāya* 1.13, in the Pāli Canon, the principles of the Buddhist Eightfold Path of ethics, concentration, and wisdom are to be practiced simultaneously, in contrast to the frequent dismissal of ethical behavior as isolated and distinct from so-called “deeper,” or more penetrative philosophical concerns. Holt wrote: “. . . [T]he disciplinary code of the *Vinaya* is essentially a means for overcoming [the] obstacles that block the way to *arahanship*” (14). Holt continued,

observance of the disciplinary rules can also be seen as conducive to achieving *nibbāna* or the elimination of an ego-oriented mindset. . . . [O]bserving the rules requires mindfulness which in turn leads to a disciplined disposition of detachment. . . . [that is,] awareness of oneself in relation to mental states (passion, hatred, etc.) and in relation to one’s total physical environment (*paṭiccasamuppāda*). (84)

This describes an at least potential link between living human consciousness and the ultimate religious goal, which is different from the relationship described in more theistic systems, where humans and divinity are differently defined.

Still, there are good reasons to understand *Vinaya* lifestyle and community rules and procedures on their own terms, fully separate from, for example, theoretical epistemologies intended to describe human perception and conception. The *Vinaya* rules and procedures are

noted by many modern behavioral scientists, who show that group activities like marching, singing, and by extension here, praying, meeting, and engaging in monastic rituals result in “group cohesion” and that “. . . acting in synchrony with others can foster cooperation within groups by strengthening group cohesion” (Wiltermuth and Heath 2). More to the point, collective activity promotes bonding, and the very survival of the group, through “. . . rituals involving synchronous activity [that] may produce positive emotions that weaken the psychological boundaries between the self and the group” (1).⁶ It is not surprising then that Buddhist monks through history have benefitted from membership in gender segregated, structured, and ritually programmed communities. The Buddhist *Vinaya* promotes a sense of community, which is crucial for its survival and for the well-being of its lay constituents (Gethin 91–94).⁷ Monks in pursuit of insight follow the Eightfold Path and live in communities of fellow monks.

These distinctions between the monastic *Vinaya* and the theoretical *Dharma* are evident in Guṇaprabha’s texts, but Guṇaprabha also shows that the *Dharma*, the wisdom teachings, are strengthened and preserved by the *Vinaya*, and the *Vinaya* in turn is based on the *Dharma*. In other words, the point is that human ethical behavior is seeking to actualize theory; theoretical analysis and understanding, while important,

⁶ Thanks to Brenton Sullivan for this reference; see Sullivan (82-105; 301-332). Similarly, anthropologists, for example Victor Turner, have noted similar phenomena (e.g., Turner’s well known “communitas”) in religious groups, especially in the course of pilgrimages. See also the works of Michel Foucault, especially his *Discipline and Punish*, where the author discusses strategies for implementing and revising social values, and how this “mind changing” of criminals was exercised in European societies.

⁷ Writing of the Pāli *Vinaya*, Gethin finds four concerns in the *Vinaya* system that describe Buddhist community life: the unity and cohesion of the *Saṅgha*, the spiritual life, the dependence of the *Saṅgha* on the wider community, and the appearance of the *Saṅgha* in the eyes of that community (91-94).

are useless until exercised in body, speech, and mind. This is made clear in Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* and related texts.

Recent scholarship has shown links between the Buddhist *Dharma* and *Vinaya* that bridge the divisions described above. Though primarily concerned with epistemology, Amber Carpenter's discussion of "epistemology as ethics" draws a link between *Dharma* and *Vinaya* concerns. After her broad description of major Buddhist philosophers, her discussion of Śāntideva provides a rationale for Guṇaprabha's argument that the exercise of ethical behavior depends on correct understanding and perception of internal and external objects, including the five aggregates (169; 226–231). Briefly, the point is that if one is trapped in a view of the self that is based on the aggregates or if one has the mistaken notion that the aggregates themselves are real, unchanging entities, one will engage in actions driven by addictive desire, anger, and delusion. An epistemic view generates behavior of body, speech, and mind, ethical or unethical. Carpenter wrote that "Buddhist thought emphasizes constantly attending to *how we experience things* . . . exposing how our conceptual activity distorts or constructs or reveals the true nature of things" and asks: "How do we understand and deploy the contents of experience so as to move forward on the path to enlightenment?"(170).⁸

The exercise of ethical, or unethical behavior is itself generative of experience. Here, Carpenter makes a connection between correct cognition, its understanding, and how it is deployed in ethical human behavior. She remarks that correct perception of the world according to the Buddhist *Dharma* is linked to activity based on that perception. The

⁸ AC's italics. See the review of Carpenter's work by Guerrero. The reviewer is critical of Carpenter's "metaphysical" approach to Buddhist philosophy. In support of Carpenter however, the goals of epistemology and philosophy in general are religious, and "metaphysical." See Phra Prayudh Payutto (61-76, *passim*).

Buddhist wisdom teachings, the *Dharma*, implicitly provide, or are a rationale for ethical, *Vinaya*-derived/defined behavior. The two are necessarily linked, and explained in detail in Guṇaprabha's works, as explained below. The addictive and knowledge delusions (*kleśa* and *jñeyāvaraṇa*) are linked mental states, driven by misappropriation first of the reality status of a self based on the aggregates, or second, an assumption of reality of persons and things themselves. These two misappropriations are the concern of *Dharma* or wisdom teachings, and they lead to or cause unethical behavior, concerns of *Vinaya* or ethical teachings.

Further, as Guṇaprabha and his followers wrote in the *Vinayasūtra* and related texts, the eliminations of the two types of misappropriation result in respectively *nirvāṇa* without and with remainder. The differences between the two types of *nirvāṇa* (*sopadhiśeṣa* and *nirupadhiśeṣa*) are not related to the human body in life and after death as is commonly thought; instead to delusional clinging to the false appearance of a real self based on the aggregates—the body and mind (*upādānaskandha*), or to the aggregates themselves. Both of these are caused by the misappropriation of the aggregates and result in unethical behavior (Nietupski “Reflections” 232; 236–237; 243–244; 247 *passim*).⁹ The *Dharma* and *Vinaya* may well be contained in different sections of the Buddhist Canon, but they are invariably related to one another. Progress on the Buddhist path is the primary objective. The wisdom of the *Dharma* and the physical, verbal, and mental behavior outlined in the *Vinaya* are of a piece, as is clearly stated in Guṇaprabha's text corpus.

Similarly, in Maria Heim's rendering of Buddhaghosa, “. . . *vinaya* (discipline) is fourfold: the discipline of restraint, the discipline of abandoning, the discipline of calming meditation, and the discipline of the established rules” (142–144). She points out that these concerns go be-

⁹ Also see Fuller (1–13 *passim*) and Guang Xing (52–69).

yond simple institutional rules, for “what benefits the community practically is of a piece with its ethical and religious ideals” (142–144). Human behavior is related to human enlightenment. Indeed, as above, Guṇaprabha links ethical behavior not simply to beneficial community regulations, but to *nirvāṇa*, both with and without remainder; the latter, *nirvāṇa* with no remainder, is a matter of non-addictive behavior on the part of living humans. Heim adds that *Vinaya* rules

can be used in the sense of absence, restraint, calming, and the established rules themselves. Since absence and restraint, along with intention (*cetanā*), figure prominently in Sutta and Abhidhamma thinking as forms of *sīla*, we are particularly sensitive to their appearance here as forms of *vinaya*.¹⁰ (142–144)

Absence, restraint, and calming are mental practices, and they are based on epistemology. Heim continues that this is a mental process, noting that “. . . the very thought a person would have who has undertaken these rules, . . . [the] text makes explicit that practice is having certain intentions or thoughts . . . [t]he practice of *vinaya* creates certain identifiable thoughts in a person’s head, creating, as it were, a distinct intention”(142–144). These statements put the foundations for the exercise of ethical behavior in the mind.

In her discussion of the term “intention” (*cetanā*), Heim remarks that intention “. . . liberates the moral agent from a deterministic social and causal order and assigns human beings a substantial share of free-

¹⁰ Heim quotes from a late subcommentary on Buddhaghosa (*Vajirabuddhiṭikā*), “. . . the discipline of the established rules is for the sake of the discipline of calming meditation, calming meditation is for the sake of restraint, and restraint is for abandoning. The rules allow a calm mind, which helps people restrain themselves so that they can enjoy the absence of bad factors” (142–144).

dom and autonomy”(19). In a few words, even if understated in many monastic documents, but explicit in Guṇaprabha, discussed here below, the exercise of *śīla*, ethics in Buddhism necessarily involves mental states for both lay and ordained persons. Unethical behavior is generated by a fundamental misappropriation of the reality status of inner and outer objects (*moha*), which misplaced value leads one to addictive desire (*rāga*) and anger (*dveṣa*). *Śīla*, literally “coolness,” enables concentration (*samādhi*) and is generative of wisdom (*prajñā*).¹¹

These considerations of the meaning of *śīla* also shed light on the Buddhist religious worldview. Buddhism certainly involved theistic practices and devotions, which are also attested in Guṇaprabha’s writings, but at its core Buddhism is more focused on the development of human consciousness and mental states, not on the worship of a creator god, as in Hinduism and other theistic systems. As I show in a forthcoming study, Guṇaprabha’s writings and those of his commentators are careful to distinguish themselves from non-Buddhist *tīrthikas*, even more than is done in the earlier *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Vastu*. The many references to Buddhist self-definitions opposed to or in the middle of brahmanical contexts are useful because they help us understand Buddhist and

¹¹ See for example, the remarks in the *Bka’ ’gyur, Vinayavastu I*, Lhasa ed. དེས་ལྷོ་སྒྲོད་གསུམ་རྟོགས་པར་བྱས་ནས། ཉེན་མོངས་པ་ཐམས་ཅད་སྤངས་ཤིང་། དག་བཅོམ་པ་མངོན་གྲུམ་དུ་བྱས་ཏེ། དག་བཅོམ་པར་གྱུར་ནས་ཁམས་གསུམ་གྱི་ འདོད་ཆགས་དང་བྲལ་བ་གྱུ་མོ་དང་གསེར་དུ་མཉམ་པ། རྣམ་མཁའ་དང་ལག་མཐེལ་དུ་མཉམ་པའི་སེམས། ཅན་དན་དང་སྤྲུམ་མཉམ་པ། རིག་པས་མ་རིག་པའི་སྒོ་དའི་སྤྱབས་བྲལ་བ། རིག་པ་དང་མངོན་པར་ཤེས་པ་དང་། མོ་མོར་ཡང་དག་པར་རིག་པ་ཐོབ་པ། མྱིད་པ་དང་། རྗེད་པ་དང་། རྗེད་པ་དང་། ཆགས་པ་དང་། བཀུར་སྤྱོལ་སྤྱིར་སྤྱོགས་པ། དབང་པོ་དང་ཉེ་དབང་པོའི་ལྷ་དང་བཅས་པ་རྣམས་ཀྱིས་མཚོད་པར་བྱ་བ་དང་། རྗེད་པར་བྱ་བ་དང་། མངོན་དུ་སྤྱོད་པར་བྱ་བར་གྱུར་ཏེ། In ལྷ་ས་བཀའ་འབྲུག་ འདུལ་བ་གཞི། ༡ 368a1-4. On “cool,” see Nietupski “Reflections:” “The thirteenth century Tibetan commentator Tsonawa emphasizes that the implied meaning of *niryāṇa* is ethics (*śīla*), and that “. . . the word *śīla* when translated is ‘cool attainment’ (*bsil thob*) . . .” (232; 232n28). The extended passage reads “*shī la zhes pa de don bsgyur na tshul khirms zhes so/ shī la zhes pa de sgra bsgyur na bsil thob ces bya ste shī la zhes pa de la shi ta zhes sgra’i rkyen byin na bsil ba zhes so*” (Tsonawa, DTsh, 17). On the “coolness” of religious virtuosos, see Silber (36).

brahmanical worldviews, and how these groups co-existed in the same space, often in competition for royal and local community sponsorship.

With the above comments about Guṇaprabha's plural religious environment, the description of the composition, copying, and collection of texts, and the integration of *śīla*, *samādhi*, and *prajñā*, we now turn to navigate through what the Pāli *Vinaya* describes as an ocean of teachings:

Like the ocean, the Vinaya is like “all the great rivers” of the historical teachings, which “. . . on reaching the great ocean lose their former names and identities and are reckoned simply as the great ocean.” The collected Vinaya teachings are like “those streams which in the world flow into the great ocean, and those showers from the sky . . . fall into it, [but] neither the emptiness nor the fullness of the great ocean [are] affected by that,” it “. . . has one taste, the taste of salt.” So too the Vinaya consists of many streams and showers, but retains its consistency.¹² (Horn-er 332–336)

Navigating Through Guṇaprabha's Texts: Sūtras 70–102

In sūtras 1–69, Guṇaprabha summarized the processes for entering and conforming to the rules of the Buddhist monastic community. In terms of text structure, the transition to “authority” is marked by mention of “rules for ordination” (*upasaṃpadvidhiḥ*) after sūtra 69, and “authority” (*niśrayagataṃ*) after sūtra 102 (and in Bapat and Gokhale's edition, 13.11, before sūtra 70). Sūtras 70–102 include comments on authority (*niśraya*),

¹² Paraphrased from the eight ocean similes in the Pāli *Vinaya*.

beginning with some details on monastic behavior (70–79) and brief remarks on the prerequisites for monastic authority. There is information here about what kinds of activities can be undertaken without permission, who will grant ordination, and the prerequisite for an ordaining monk to have ten years of ordination seniority. The remark after (79), literally “connected,” “related,” or “relevant”¹³ marks the shift from the *Vinaya* ordination procedures to the teachings on salutary mental attitudes, and the epistemological orientation of the text, located in 80–86, and especially in sūtras 87–97. These latter sūtras include comments on the generation of wisdom (87–97), and finally in this section, further discussion of authority figures (98–102). Sūtras 98 and following return to strictly procedural matters, marked at the end by the term “in sum” or “in summary.”¹⁴ This segment is concerned with human authority figures, and with what is “authoritative” in terms of Buddhist doctrine.¹⁵

These different topics may signal what scholars have suggested about the text, namely that it is a collection of available fragments, not a single composition. The use of sources and the structural format of this section on authority appear to show the composition, or better, the process of collating segments of manuscripts available in seventh century north India. Yonezawa for example has identified numerous passages from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* quoted in content and sometimes nearly verbatim in sūtras 70–102 of Guṇaprabha’s *Autocommentary* (TY).

The segment (sūtras 70–102) or possibly collated segments here link ethical behavior to the Buddhist wisdom teachings, echoing the first sūtra in the *Pravrajyā* (Renunciation) chapter of Guṇaprabha’s *Vinayasūtra*, where the exercise of ethical conduct (*śīla*) is asserted as a prac-

¹³ *Samāyoga*, BG 14.31, *lhan cig sbyar ba* D 14b5-6.

¹⁴ *Samgrāhya*, BG 19.11; *bsdu bar bya ba*, D 24b2.

¹⁵ A literal translation of this section (sūtras 70–102) is in the *Appendix*.

tice for progress on the Buddhist path. Guṇaprabha opens the *Vinayasūtra* with a statement to the effect that *śīla* is indeed grounded in the mind, expressed in thought, speech, and physical activity, and can result in Buddhist enlightenment (Nietupski “Reflections” 247, *passim*). Sūtras 80 (in part similar to sūtra 73) and following advise monks to engage in activities conducive to the generation of wisdom and that are at the same time in service of the public good. These activities include medical care and activities intended to help others overcome mental difficulties; they teach compassion and the elimination of suffering (DT 22a1). They include helping others eliminate sadness, distorted views, and unhappiness. These latter passages concern mental events; wrong views of reality are mental matters, remorse and unhappiness are psychological functions. Linking these mental states and the apprehension and misapprehension of subjective and objective realities to ethical behavior is very much a matter of epistemology.

Again, in sūtra 80 and following Guṇaprabha mentions the subject matter of the passage. He notes that the present list (in sūtras 80–81) of five qualities is not an exhaustive rendering of the full theoretical subject matter of the *Vinaya*, and includes procedural matters, notably the requirement that a monastic ordination committee include a monk ordained for at least ten years, and others. The subject matter of the *Vinaya* is summarized in Guṇaprabha’s sūtras 80–97 and in Dharmamitra’s *Ṭīkā* in no fewer than twenty-one lists of five qualities (DT 22a7–26b4). Guṇaprabha and Dharmamitra here display the inclusive range of theoretical and practical concerns in Buddhist monasticism. On several occasions the five include ethics (*śīla*, *tshul khrims*) as a branch of study separate from the study of the *Tripitāka* (which includes the *Vinaya*), etc. This might reflect sensitivity to the philosophical foundations of ethics and to the exercise of ethics in society. Not the least, the elimination of distorted views is very much a matter of epistemology, not a mere behavioral rule. Dharmamitra explains that

[t]he actuality of this is ethical [behavior]. Here there is no occasion of unethical [behavior]. This is salutary. Knowing this is the correct understanding of ethics. Similarly, the actuality of erudition is being erudite. That means understanding many scriptures. Taken together, these two, ethics and erudition, [together with the *Piṭakas*] is the five-fold category of applying ethics and erudition. In this is the clear understanding (*mngon par shes pa*) of the *Piṭakas*; erudition includes the subjects of others' scriptures. . . . The expression "clear understanding of the *Piṭakas*" means clear understanding of the *Sūtras*, the *Vinaya*, and the *Abhidharma*.¹⁶ If ethics and erudition are added to these three it is a set of five. (DT 22b2–5)

In this quotation Dharmamitra follows Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* 80–97, the main point of which again appears to be linking monastic discipline with epistemological principles. All of the other commentators follow this basic point in elaborations and discussions of the details. This group of sūtras is rendered in terse language, but with far reaching implications, shedding light on the Buddhist monastic understanding of their beliefs and practices. Again, paraphrasing Dharmamitra,

the statement "clear understanding of the *Piṭakas*" [means] that they should be understood together. . . . The *Piṭakas*, etc., should be memorized (*'dzin pa*), held in mind without forgetting. The *Tripitaka* is interconnected, linked together so [only] an expert (*mkhas pa*) is able to [understand them] individually. Reasoning (*rigs pa*) is applying the two means of knowledge, direct perception and infer-

¹⁶ DT 22b4 uses *chos mngon pa*, *abhidharma* here in contrast to BG and D, *ma mo*, *māṭṛkā*. BG 18.5; D 18a2.

ence, scripture, etc., to the *Piṭakas*, etc. Analysis (*gsal ba*) is applying scripture and reasoning to the *Piṭakas*, enabling others to understand them. (DT 22b5–7)

Further, in broad terms

the expression “correct ethics” (*lhag pa'i tshul khrims*) means the full range of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. The expression “correct thought” means the four meditative states (*bsam gtan*), because those control the mind. The expression “correct wisdom” means the unblemished path [to enlightenment]. (DT 23a5–6)

The integration of *śīla*, *samādhi*, and *prajñā* is obvious in sūtras 87–96. Sūtras 87–88 juxtapose a sense of confidence, or faith (*śraddhā*) in the Buddhist teachings, ethical behavior, learning, and wisdom. The comments on sūtras 88–93 are emphatic in the association of ethical behavior, here not attaching reality status to internal or external objects, with “seeing the wisdom of liberation.” Sūtra 88 is an emphatic assertion of the association of ethics, concentration, and wisdom. The Sanskrit text in sūtra 88 is a paraphrase from the *Abhidharma* formula of sixteen divisions of the Four Noble Truths (*duḥkhe dharmajñānakṣānti*), “tolerating (*kṣānti*) wisdom of true (*dharma*) knowledge about suffering” . . . about the cause, . . . about liberation, and . . . about the path [in the *Kāmadhātu*]. Our text says only “[the path of] seeing is the wisdom that knows ethics, concentration, wisdom, and liberation.” Dharmamitra’s remark is a more verbatim rendering of the *Abhidharma* phrase, unlike the statement in Guṇaprabha’s sūtra 88.¹⁷

¹⁷ *Chos shes pa'i bzod pa la sogs pa shes rab ni mthong ba ste*, DT 24b4, in Sanskrit, [*duḥkhe dharmajñānakṣānti jñānadarśana*]. I am grateful for the comments by the anonymous JBE reviewer on this passage. The passage is a partial mention of a detailed *Abhidharma*

These sūtras associate ethical behavior found in the *Vinaya* with learning and wisdom, with mindfulness, meditation practice, and meditative equipoise. Again, the study of these topics is moreover linked in sūtra 93 to the “accumulation of concentration, wisdom, liberation, and realization of liberative knowledge.” These few passages are literal assertions of the integration of ethical behavior and mental states.

Conclusion

How much of the Authority section of the *Vinayasūtra* is reflective of actual community practices in Guṇaprabha’s lifetime? To what extent are the issues in any texts descriptive of actual practices? Are these sūtras a single composition or a collection of fragments? Schopen, Nance, and others have questioned the accuracy of the descriptions in *Vinaya* and other texts when compared with actual practices. Text materials give some indications, in the present case, of medieval Indian religious doctrines and rituals, but these are often ancient and inherited materials included out of piety, and not fully descriptive of Buddhist beliefs and practices in Guṇaprabha’s community. Yonezawa makes this clear in his partial edition of the *Vinayasūtra Autocommentary* (TY), where he calls attention to segments in Guṇaprabha’s text taken verbatim from the earlier *Mūlasarvāstivādivinaya*.

formula that describes the levels of knowledge attained by a practitioner. It refers to a level of knowledge of the Four Noble Truths (in its formulation with sixteen aspects), on the Path of Seeing (*darśana mārga*), and signals the first bodhisattva stage and the attainment of *arhat*, in the context of the Kāmadhātu. This passage and its mention here need further study. See Lamotte 613-616 ff.

On the other hand, Luo suggests that Guṇaprabha likely included fragments of *Vinaya* teachings circulated in the community, which can serve as indicators of actual practice. A full account of Guṇaprabha's sources is at this moment difficult to describe, but comparative analysis of available texts, in part attempted in this essay, suggests that Guṇaprabha's texts are reflective of actual practices in medieval India.

The section on authority (sūtras 70–102) begins with a brief discussion of activities that do not need validation from a monastic agency. These are unsupervised matters of etiquette, respect, and devotion. The section continues with a description of the activities that require a monastic authority, and ends with a description of authoritative Buddhist teachings.

On matters that require an authority, Dharmamitra's *Ṭīkā* describes a vibrant monastic community in which an authority, an abbot (*ācārya*) or master (*upādhyāya*), disciplines students and disciples (DT 21a1–4), and gives instruction about overcoming obstacles, medical practices, antidotes to remorse, and evil influences (BG 14.7–9). Dharmamitra also comments on practical matters involving “lecturers” (*ākhyāpitā*) and “instructors” (*anuśāsaka*; sūtra 96) and their roles in the community (DT 25b1–4). These activities do not help us localize Guṇaprabha in time or location, but they do describe the practical applications of the Buddhist teachings.¹⁸

¹⁸ Nance (Preachers) includes a detailed discussion of the roles of monastic teachers, *bhāṇaka*, and their roles in teaching Buddhism. This term is translated as *smra ba po* the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (and sometimes as *chos sgrogs pa*) but here *smra ba po* is used for *ākhyāpitā*, and *rjes su ston pa nyid* for *anuśāsakatvam* in Dharmamitra. (DT 25b1–4). See Nance 135, 137, n. 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, passim. Nance's outstanding essay raises questions for further study.

The text continues with further comments on the requirements for monastic authority and several exceptions to the rules. The text here (sūtras 73–81) does not flow smoothly, possibly a result of editing of fragments. There are similar remarks later in the section, in sūtras 98–102.

Sūtras 81 and following turn to matters of doctrine. This segment shows that the three “studies” in the *Tripitaka*—ethics, concentration, and wisdom—are interconnected, as noted above. That is, Buddhist ethics as presented in the *Vinaya* are based on the understanding of “wisdom,” the Buddhist theories of the nature of the mind and of external objects. Moreover, there is a connection between this correct understanding, how it is realized through concentration (*dhyāna*), and how it is deployed in ethical human behavior. Wisdom theories, reflection, and practice are interconnected. One cannot fully exercise ethics without an understanding of one’s own nature, one’s motives, and one’s goals, and then internalizing all three.

This “authoritative” Buddhist theory is based on the belief that the mind and external objects have three characteristics (*trilakṣaṇa*), misunderstanding of which generates unethical behavior. The three are (1) impermanence (*anitya*); (2) the quality of being inconsistent with human experience and expectations, and thus miserable (*duḥkha*); and (3) they are selfless (*anātma*) and do not exist as unchanging things. The view of a permanent, unchanging mind and real external objects results from either human concepts of a self based on but different from the aggregates, or from human assumptions of the reality of those very aggregates (*upādānaskandha*). However, humans are free and able to make choices, to act according to correct or incorrect motives, and thus able to influence causal changes internally and externally.

In this perspective these authoritative statements of the practical unity of epistemological belief, reflection, and successful human behav-

ior can extend to, challenge, and deconstruct mentally constructed misunderstandings of faith, conviction, and identity. For Buddhists, this allows for personal growth, freedom, and strengthening community identity.

Appendix¹⁹

Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhīdhānasvavyākhyānam:

The Elucidation of the Vinayasūtra—An Autocommentary, Sūtras 70–102

Authority²⁰

(70) Without consulting an authority,²¹ one does not act as an authority.

Without consulting means without asking. It means that without asking, one should not do anything. “However, the Bhagavan said to do certain

¹⁹ This Appendix includes an English translation of *Vinayasūtra* and *Autocommentary 70–102*, with detailed references to the two Sanskrit versions, the Indian commentaries available in Tibetan, and the Tibetan commentaries. The two Sanskrit texts are BG’s 1982 version (an edition from a Proto-Śarada manuscript, Tibetan translations, etc.) and the 1999 Taisho University Facsimile version of the Sanskrit *Dbus med* manuscript. Y. Yonezawa’s detailed work in “TY” includes a (1) transcription of the Sanskrit *Dbus med* manuscript; (2) an edited version based primarily on the two often similar Sanskrit versions—one from BG’s edition and the second from the *Dbus med* manuscript; and (3) a Japanese translation, with detailed references to the *Mūlasarvastivāda Vinaya* in Tibetan and in Chinese, the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, and Pāli texts. I regrettably am not able to compare Yonezawa’s Japanese translation, but offer this English version with detailed references to Indian and Tibetan commentaries. The translation is often literal, in an attempt to preserve the Sanskrit commentarial style, and the language of the manuscripts. The translation uses the two Sanskrit versions and the Tibetan at the translator’s discretion. The language and syntax of this text are sometimes problematic; all errors are mine. Scholars interested in further study of manuscript and translation history can study the numerous lexical anomalies noted in footnotes.

²⁰ *Niśrayagatam*, BG 13.11; this subtitle is not present in the D Tibetan version, or in TY.

²¹ *Anavalokya niśrayaṃ*, BG 13.12; *gnas pa la ma zhus bar*, D 13a3. *Niśrita* refers to a person who relies on others’ authority; *niśraya* means “an authority.” See (DT 21a1-4).

things . . . other than those which one asks about, without asking.”²² He said:

(71) Except for defecating, urinating, discarding toothpicks, and paying respects to *caityas* in monastery courtyards.

Courtyard indicates²³ the location of a *caitya*; it includes the numerous internal activities, the activities of threshing, etc. In the courtyard means within the courtyard; one pays respect to *caityas* there.

(72) This extends to forty-nine armspans from the monastery.²⁴

“From” is restrictive.²⁵ One from fifty is connected by the ablative case.²⁶ The meaning is that it extends up to fifty less one arm spans. This is used as a definition:²⁷ “The boundary of a monastery is a moat, a wall, or other enclosure.” When there are many enclosures, etc., it is outside of [them] all. Therefore, in respect to that, the limit of the measure is that outer side. But, where there is no courtyard, the limit is just the wall of the monastery.

Here, this position asserted by an opponent (*pūrvoktasyopa-vicārasya sthānaṃ*), that “one does not venerate a reliquary in a place one

²² *Karaṇīyeṣu avalokana prasaktasya*, BG 13.14; *bya ba mtha’ dag gnas la zhu bar byas pa thal ba la*, D 13a3-4, P 15b3. Minor lexical differences in TY.

²³ *Yujyate*, BG 13.17; *rig pa yin no*, D 13a5.

²⁴ *Ekāṇna pañcāsat*, BG 13.17-18; *bzhi bcu rtsa dgu*, D 13a5. See the Autocommentary: *gcig gis ma tshang ba’i lnga bcu*, D 13a6.

²⁵ *Muktvā ityanubandhaḥ*, BG 13.18; *ma gtogs so*, D 13a6.

²⁶ *Āṭ sandhiḥ*, BG 13.19; *āṭs mtshams sbyar bao*, D 13a6. See BG xxi, ref to Pāṇini 6.3.76; read TY, not BP. Minor *sandhi* differences in TY 37.13 & BG 13.20. Minor lexical and syntax differences between BG & TY, BG 13.21, TY 37.14.

²⁷ *Adhyavasānaṃ*, BG 13.20; *nges par rig pa yin no*, D 13a7.

goes to”²⁸ is settled here. “This is adhered to in places to which one travels.”²⁹ And further, therefore, “What does this statement “Venerate the *caityas*” prove?

[Answer:]

The meaning of that is one cannot travel around without permission, but one venerates *caityas*. This activity has two parts, the commencement and the actual salutation.³⁰ The commencement is required but the actual salutation is unrestricted.³¹

²⁸ *Parataḥ*, BG 13.22; *’og tu*, D 13b1. BG 13.22 adds *parataḥ*. The translation follows the Tibetan *ma yin* D 13b1, P 16a1, and BG, which includes a negative particle *na*, BG 13.23. TY 37.17n6 notes a *sa* in the *Dbus med* manuscript vs. the BG 13.23, D 13b1, and P 16a1 *na/ma yin*, but does not include the *na* or *sa* in TY 37.17. BG 13.23 includes another minor variation, *upatiṣṭhate* (. . . *ityatropatiṣṭhate*) vs. TY 37.18, *avatiṣṭhate*, but cf. TY 37n7, *āpatiṣṭhate* [sic.]. While the literal readings of the manuscripts are different, the interpretation makes veneration of *caityas* a requirement for travelling monks. Cf. TY 37n8, which does not include the *ma yin zhes bya ba* in D 13b1 and P 16a1.

²⁹ *Parisarpaṇa bhūtasya etadanujñānam*, BG 13.24; *bcag par bya ba’i phyir rjes su gnang ba ’di yin te*, D 13b1. TY 37.19, 37n9 reads *anuṣṭhānam*; *rjes su gnang ba*, D 13b1. Reading the Sanskrit *pari* & *ṣṛp* as “to wander to and fro,” or more literally, according to the JBE reviewer: “Reading the Sanskrit prefix *pari* (around) added to the root *ṣṛp* (move) as “move around,” for the Tibetan *bcag par bya ba*, from *’chag pa*, “to tread, walk, move.” This translation means that monks who travel from place to place are obliged to venerate *caityas*, etc. when in proximity. DT comments briefly on the passage, indicating that ‘an attitude of reverence is necessary when in the vicinity of sacred places,’ DT 19b6.

³⁰ *Ārambhabhūtaṃ abhinamanabhūtaṃ*, BG 13.26; *rtson par gyur pa dang mngon par phyag ’tshal bar gyur pa*, D 13b2.

³¹ *Yadārambhabhūtaṃ tasyaiva pratiṣedhaḥ*, BG 13.26-7; *de la gang zag rtsom par gyur pa de nyid bkag pa yin te*, D 13b2-3, P 16a3. This division of *ārambhabhūta* and *abhinamanabhūta*, with the former being described as more prescriptive, or restrictive (*pratiṣedha*) than the latter, *apraṭiṣedhatvaṃ*. *Nānāpṛcchya*, BG 13.27; *’di lta ste*, D 13b3, P 16a4.

“One does not answer without being asked,³² one does not chatter, does not joke, and one does not make arguments. One does not scoop up water to wash one’s hands and feet and one does not shake off his dusty clothes, etc. [All of] these go without saying; they are [even] mentioned in the *Itihāsa Stories*.³³

This [includes] “The discussions of shoes, toothpicks, [and] the assignment of readers, reciters, and associated topics, their operations and the various goals among monks of their class (*jāti*) and their associates, etc. [These monks] maintain their respective definitions, and are respectful [of each other].”

This [also] includes³⁴ bad renunciates, those with unresolved questions, or those who have not completely abandoned [attachment]. It is stated that³⁵ “The assembled reader[s] or reciter[s] will act at the appropriate time during the gathering,” etc.³⁶

³² *Nānāpṛcchya ālapitavyam na saṃlapitavyaṃ na pratisaṃmoditavya na prativacaṇaṃ dātavyaṃ nodakadigdheṇa pāṇinā dharmiteṇa pādau vā mukhaṃ vā hṛdayādikaṃ vā anuparimārṣṭavyaṃ*, BG 13.27-28; *’di lta ste gtaṃ ’dre ba dang phebs par smra ba dang phan tshun kun dga’ bar bya bar dang lan gdab pa dang ’ongs pa legs so zhes brjod pa la sogs pa dang lag pa tshur bsnyugs pa . . .*, D 13b3. In the Tibetan translation the negation does not come until the end of the passage. Minor differences in *saṃdhi* in BG 13.29-30 & TY 38.7-10.

³³ *Iti hāsapadabhūtasya vṛttasya āpatteḥ*, BG 13.30; *bzhad gang kyi gzhir ’gyur ba phyir ro*, D 13b4.

³⁴ *Nānyaḥ*, BG 14.3; *gzhan ni ma yin no*, D 13b6. Literally, “. . . is not concerned with things other than . . .”

³⁵ *Karaṇayītvēna*, BG 14.4; *bya ba nyid kyis*, D 13b6.

³⁶ *Upasaṃhārasya*, BG 14.5; *nye bar bsdu ba*, D 13b6, P 16a8. Both D 13b6 and P 16a8-16b1 add *nye bar bsdu bar bya ba ma yin no*; absent in the Sanskrit. The statement *ma yin no* is untranslated here.

Those with complete respect resolve this in their minds,³⁷ but bad [monks] do the opposite.³⁸ So now he will make some statements about that, the purpose for which he acts is shown. One should understand that drinking water, etc. are not asked about and are excluded here.

He [the authority] speaks to the initiates.³⁹

(73) A [renunciate also] carries out either the functions of the begging bowl,⁴⁰ the robes,⁴¹ etc., the medical practices,⁴² the antidotes to remorse⁴³ and evil influences of wrong views, saying with intense zeal “Oh my! I will do it” or “I want to do it.”

Here, some say that “speaking [with intense zeal]” means explaining.⁴⁴ This is not to be regarded as something greater than giving the robe material ceremonially.⁴⁵

³⁷ *Abhinamananam prakārātvamena hyetyasa manasi nilayamam*, BG 14.5; *mngon par phyag 'tshal ba ba'i rnam pa nyid kyis*, D 13b6. Note the usage of the word “*gnas pa*,” here *nilayatam*; *nilaya*, place, home, etc.

³⁸ *Vipakṣam*, BG 14.5; *mi mthun pa*, D 13b7. Literally, “. . . are oriented towards the opposite . . .” Minor lexical differences in these comments on sūtra 72, e.g. BG 14.5; differences noted in TY 38.14, 38n1-10; *saṅdhi* anomalies, BG 15.7.

³⁹ *Tadvidhiṃ hyetat yad vidhaṃ dharmitasya gātrāṇāmudakena saṃsparśam*, BG 14.7-8; TY 38.20, n9 reads *gharmitasya* (“heated”) instead of *dharmitasya*; *chu 'thung ba la yang ma zhus par byed pa bar du gcod pa 'dis byas par rig par byao*, D 13b7-14a1. Just before sūtra 73 the Tibetan translation adds *gang gi phyir 'di ni rnam pa gnyis yin te rdul dang bral ba'i yan lag rnam la chus yan dag par reg pa'o gnas pa'i tshul khrims brjod par bya ste* D 14a1.

⁴⁰ *Pātra*, BG 14.9; *lung bzed*, DT 14a1.

⁴¹ *Cīvarakarmanī*, BG 14.9; *chos gos kyi las*, D 14a1.

⁴² *Glānopasthana*. Neither word is attested in these usages in the MVY.

⁴³ *Kaukr̥tya*, BG 14.9; *'gyod pa*, D 14a1.

⁴⁴ *Āpadyeta . . . paṭhanti* in BG 14.10-11; *āpadyate . . . paṭhati* in TY 39.2-3; *byed du 'jug go zhes brtson pa chen pos . . . 'dir kha cig ni mtshon gyi las kyang 'don pa yin te*, D 14ab.

(74) Those who zealously want admission into the Community—⁴⁶the Community [aspirants] who want to do zealous things call out, “Oh My! Community! What this authority,⁴⁷ the Community, has prohibited should not be done!”⁴⁸

This should be done with intense zeal, or rejected, like harm,⁴⁹ for example. It should be understood that everyone should adhere to this.

(75) Please allow this!

Those who act with intense zeal—“Oh my! Community! Please allow this!”⁵⁰

(76) Oh Community! Please give your fourfold punishment, etc.—

punishment, simple punishment, restriction, simple restriction, [and] absolution to us dependents.⁵¹

⁴⁵ *Cīvarakarmaṇo nātirekāt*, BG 14.11; *de chos gos kyi las las lhag pa med pa'i phyir . . .*, D 14a2; *de chos gos kyi las lhag pa med pa'i phyir . . .*, P 16b5.

⁴⁶ *Prāṇīdhātukāme*, BG 14.12, *prāṇīdhikarma*, 14.13; *nan tur byed par 'dod pa'i dge 'dun la*, D 14a3, *nan tur gyi las*, 14a3.

⁴⁷ *Nīśrayasyedaṃ*, BG 14.12-13, absent in both D 14a3 and P 16b6.

⁴⁸ The syntax in this sūtra varies considerably in the Sanskrit and Tibetan editions.

⁴⁹ *Ābr̥het*, BG 14.13; *bzod par bya ba*, D 14a4; P 16b8. Compare with the following use of the Tibetan *bzod par bya ba* for the Sanskrit, *avasārayet*, BG 14.14, attested in the MVY. *Bzod par bya ba* is normally *kṣānti* in Sanskrit. This lexically technical passage is clarified by Dharmamitra, DT 20a7-21a4. The meaning of *ābr̥het* is made clear here and in DT. It is an enthusiastic request for absolution of transgression.

⁵⁰ *Avasārayet*, BG 14.14; *bzod par bya ba*, D 14a4; P 16b8; *gtang bar byao zhes bya ba'i tha tshig go*, DT 20b4.

⁵¹ *Parivāsa mūlaparivāsa mānāpya mūlamānāpya ābarhaṇārthini nīśraye aho bata samgho asya parivāsādicatuṣkaṃ dadhyāt*, BG 14.15-17; *spo ba dang gzhi nas spo bar bya ba dang mgu bar bya ba dang gzhi nas mgu bar bya ba dang dbyung bar 'dod pa'i gnas la e mao dge 'dun gyis 'di la spo ba la sogs pa bzhi po sbyin par bya zhing*, D 14a5; P 17a1; Dharmamitra explains, DT

Absolution means “Please absolve me.”⁵²

(77)⁵³ Then, he should do that for him,⁵⁴ except for the request.

Then, he means the authority. That means the functions of the bowl, the robes, etc. For him means it should be done for one dependent on authority. Except for the request means except for the request only.

20b4-21a3 (with *gzhi sbyin par bya* instead of *bzhi po sbyin par bya*). Sūtra 76 draws entirely from the Pāli *Vinaya's Suttavibhaṅga*, and is concerned with the punishments and expiations for *Vinaya* rule breakers. In TY Yonezawa shows parallel texts here and for sūtras 70-102 from the *Mūlasarvāstivādā Vinaya* and the *Prātimokṣa sūtra*. Sūtra 76 signifies violations of any of a group of thirteen specific monastic rules, collectively called *saṅghādisesa* in Pāli, *saṅghāvaśeṣa* in Sanskrit, and *dge 'dun lhag ma bcu gsum* in Tibetan. They are not listed by Guṇaprabha in the *Vinayasūtra* and DT; only the punishments and expiations are included as part of the text. As BG explain in their Introduction, the BG text is modelled after the Pāli *Khandhaka*, but often includes material from the *Suttavibhaṅga*, again, as TY shows in detail. The name of the group of thirteen rules is cited in MVY 8359 with editorial and etymological notes in Sanskrit and Japanese. The actual thirteen rules are listed in MVY 8369-8381. Norman, K.R., *Pāli Literature*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1983, p. 18 ff, et al: “. . . the *saṅghāvaśeṣa* are five offenses deal[ing] with sexual transgressions, two with dwelling places, two with false accusation, two with schisms, one with a monk who is difficult to speak to, and one with monks who corrupt families.” The term *saṅghādisesa* is unclear, as “No etymological rendering of the term seems to make much sense,” Norman, K.R., *Pāli Literature*, 18. Again, sūtra 76 deals with the punishments and expiations for these violations. There are four kinds of punishments, as noted. The meanings of the terms are in Upasak, C.S., *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms*. Varanasi: Bharati Prakashan. *Parivāsa* and *mūlaparivāsa* are variable sentences, while *mānāpya*, etc. are fixed.

⁵² *Ābarhaṇārthini aho bata ābṛhet iti*, BG 14.17; . . . *zhing dbyung bar 'dod pa la e mao phyung shig ces bya bao*, D 14a5-6. The translation follows the Sanskrit syntax, which seems to use the *iti* to gloss the sūtra, as BG indicates in light and bold face print for comment and sūtra.

⁵³ Dharmamitra explains that the preceding dealt with disciples and those in attendance, and what follows concerns the ethical procedures of authorities. *Gnas pa'i tshul khrims bstan nas da ni gnas kyi tshul khrims brjod par bya ste*, DT 21a2.

⁵⁴ *So 'pyetadasmāi kuryāt*, BG 14.17; *des kyang 'di la de byas te*, D 14a6.

(78) One who has not been ordained for at least ten years should not act as abbot, authority, or independently.⁵⁵

One who has not been ordained for ten years should not do these three.

(79) Moreover, one who has been ordained for at least ten years is not without any of the subsequent associated factors.⁵⁶

The meaning is that it is possible for one appropriate person to be perfectly endowed⁵⁷ through eventual association with the five branches,⁵⁸ [but] not for others. Moreover, what is said here, that “Even others can be perfectly endowed with the five qualities,”⁵⁹ is not to be understood as including the statement “Even these and those [random] others . . .” Moreover, it is said “In the first place, these will do it.” This discriminates⁶⁰ between these and others.

Why is this?

⁵⁵ *Aniśritavāsān*, BG 14.20; *rang mi gnas par 'dug pa*, D 14a7; *mi gnas par 'dug pa*, DT 21a5.

⁵⁶ *Anantarebhyaḥ samāyogena*, BG 14.22; 'og nas 'byung ba dag las lhan cig sbyar ba, D 14a7.

⁵⁷ *Samanvita*, BG 14.23; *yang dag par ldan pa*, D 14b1.

⁵⁸ *Pañcāṅga*, BG 14.22; *yan lag lnga*, D 14b1. These ‘five branches’ are the same as the ‘five qualities’ (*dharma*) below. The Tibetan translations of the *Autocommentary* and the *Ṭikā* follow the Sanskrit literally, but in the *Vṛtti* (DV 11a1 and throughout) and the *Vyākhyāna* (DP 11a1 and throughout) Guṇaprabha and Prajñākara use *phrugs*. The five are actually four, since, according to Prajñākara, *spyir lnga phrugs bzhi yod par rig par byao*, “In general, the five parts are correctly regarded as having four parts.” These are listed in sūtra 80. These five are a specific group of qualities in this context, and since there are many (twenty-one) groups of such contextual ‘fives’ cited in the commentaries (DT 22a6-26b5), this five does not refer to any other invariable, numerically described Buddhist doctrinal category.

⁵⁹ *Pañcadharma*, BG 14.24; *chos lnga po*, D 14b2. See Horner IV, pp. 80-85.

⁶⁰ *Vikalpaḥ*, BG 14.25; *rnam par so so rtog pa*, D 14b3. See *tha dad rtog pa* for *vikalpaḥ* below.

Because there is no perception of [persons] possessing all five qualities.⁶¹ However, it is said that when beginning the five, the branch containing the ten year [requirement] is discussed. One is ten years old [before] being ordained.⁶² Therefore, it is well known that this ten years of [monastic experience] is the object to be understood throughout all statements. The *Vinaya* has the sense of what abides.⁶³

Having ten years of [monastic experience] is a [prerequisite] for functioning as an abbot, etc. If there is to be more of that [length of time of monastic experience] in particular, then possessing this particular [seniority] is the most excellent conduct.⁶⁴ If there is not, then one must depend on just this [ten years]. Just as one passes through the particulars of studies, just so, after ten years, is the sense of abiding in the *Vinaya*.⁶⁵

Now, the implications⁶⁶ of those [previous seventy-nine *sūtras*] will be discussed.

⁶¹ *Asaṃbhavāt sarvāsāmāsām pañcakānām sāksyasya*, BG 14.26; *lṅga po 'di rñams thams cad med pa'i phyir de ni gzhan lao*, D 14b3. BG 14.26 *sāksya*. TY 39.27 reads *sāpekṣayasya*, see 39n7; the meaning of *sa-apekṣa* approximates *sa-akṣya*; the Tibetan is unclear. See TY 40n1.

⁶² The Tibetan adds *lo bcu lon pa nyid yan lag tu gsungs so*, D 14b3-4, P 17b1.

⁶³ *Sthitārthatvaṃ vinaye*, BG 14.28; *'dul ba ni don nyid gnas pa ste*, D 14b4.

⁶⁴ *Kalpaḥ*, BG 14.30; *cho ga*, D 14b5.

⁶⁵ In DV 12a ff Guṇaprabha discusses the *mur 'dug pa*, the *mu stegs pa*, or *tīrthika*. In this passage there is an extra negative particle, “*naivam*,” in TY 40.7, supported by the Tibetan; but not in BG 14.30. The meaning of the passage seems clearest in BG 14.30, vs. the Tibetan and TY.

⁶⁶ *Samāyogā*; BG 14.31; *lhan cig sbyar ba de rñams*, D 14b6. This brief remark comes after seventy-nine *sūtras* on ordination procedures. It marks a transition in the text from one subject to another, beginning with sutra 80.

(80) One has the ability to carry out or cause to be carried out medical care, the elimination of remorse,⁶⁷ abandonment of distorted views, and getting rid of unhappiness.

Using⁶⁸ the ability to cause someone to eliminate remorse teaches the meaning of abiding in the *Vinaya*. Using abandonment of distorted views, one abides in the teachings of the wise.⁶⁹ By getting rid of unhappiness one frees [beings] and keeps the precepts.⁷⁰ Here, the expression of inability to make others act should not be understood that one can act [one-

⁶⁷*Kaukr̥tya*, BG 15.1; 'gyod pa, D 14b6, P 17b4, DT 21b5. However, cf. “doubt,” *the tshom*, DV 9a4, DP 10b4, another instance of varying language in the texts. Dharmamitra provides a definition of “remorse,” 'gyod pa zhes bya ba ni yid la gcags pa ste nyes byas la sogs pa'i ltung ba lhag par sbyad pa'i phyir yid la gcags pa skyes pa gang yin pa de bsal ba bshag pa la sogs pao, DT 20a5-6, Peking *Ṭikā* 25a4.

⁶⁸ *Grahaṇena*, BG 15.3; *tshig gis*, D 14b6.

⁶⁹ *Kuśalatva*, BG 15.4; *mkhas pa nyid*, D 14b7.

⁷⁰ *Apayujyatvasya ādeyavākyatvasya vā*, BG 15.4-5; *bsam par shes pa nyid dang ngag 'dzin pa nyid la yang ngo*, D 14b7; *bsal ba zhes pa nyid dang . . .*, P 17b5. DT 22a3, DP 10b6, CD 6b2, and BT 37b1 give *bsam pa shes par ston to* for *apayujyatvasya* and do not include *ādeyavākyatvasya*. DV 9a6 ff does not translate either term, but gives an extended explanation of the passage (quoted in BT 37b1), upon which the English translation partially depends. Of the Tibetan translations, only the Peking edition gives a literal rendering of *apayujyatvasya*, and the translation follows the literal meaning of the term against the D, etc. DL 28b2 does not comment on the passage. DTsh 69b3, instead of a comment, provides the following quotation from the *Las Grub Pa*: “The transformations of external activities reveal the intent in the hearts of men. Though fish are concealed in the ocean, they are revealed by the transformations of waves.” I have attempted to follow the reading of the Sanskrit manuscript *apayujyatva* and the Peking edition of the Tibetan *bsal ba zhes pa* with “frees [beings].” Otherwise, to follow the variant *bsam pa shes pa* in the commentaries, the passage can be translated “. . . knows [others'] intentions and adheres to the precepts.” I render *ādeyavākyatva* as “follows the precepts,” and follow the Tibetan *dang* against the Sanskrit *vā*.

self].⁷¹ Moreover, when a disciple knows, he acquires the ability to engage in causing others to function.⁷² In that regard, here, the sense of causing non-transgression, is to maintain the sense of abiding in the *Vinaya*.⁷³

(81) The [groups of] five [qualities] are not included in what has been studied up to the present; they are contained in ethical behavior and erudition.⁷⁴

⁷¹ *Nā 'tra kāraṇa grahaṇena aśaktenā 'pi karaṇaṃ kṛtaṃ mantavyaṃ*, BG 15.5; 'dir byed du 'jug pa'i sgras ni mi nus pas kyang byed pa zhes bya ba shes par bya ba ma yin no, D 14b7-15a1; . . . byas pa ma yin no, P 17b6. The Peking has the more accurate *byas pa* for *kṛtaṃ*, and both Tibetan editions add *zhes bya ba*. In the above phrase, the Sanskrit uses the word *grahaṇena*, translated into Tibetan as *tshig gis*, but in this passage, the Sanskrit *grahaṇena* is translated by the Tibetan *sgras*. Additionally, as noted in several places above, there is the irregular Sanskrit *nā 'tra* for *nātra*, and *aśaktenā 'pi* for *aśaktenāpi*. The meaning of the literal Sanskrit is merely that stating that someone is unable to act like a senior monk or nun should not be taken that the speaker him or herself is able to act like a senior monk or nun. This point, and the following are in the context of specifically defining who is an authority. The commentaries make the sense of this and the following passages. See DT 22a3; DV 9a6 ff; DP 10b6 ff; DL 28b3 ff; DTsh 69b3 ff; BT 37b2 ff, etc. I give an interpretation based on the context of the passage and the commentaries rather than a literal translation.

⁷² *Sāmarthyasya upagrhitatvam*, BG 15.6-7; *nus pa nye bar bzung ba nyid do*, D 15a1.

⁷³ *Evañca atra bhavati anātīlāṅghasya kāraṇasya vināye sthītārthatvasya alāṅghanam*, BG 15.7; *de ltar na 'dir shin tu 'da' bar bya ba ma yin pa'i byed du 'jug pa'i don 'dul ba la gnas pa nyid la shin tu 'da' bar byed pa med par 'gyur ba ma yin no*, D 15a1, P 17b7. First, the Tibetan negates the entire phrase, while the Sanskrit does not. Second, the place of *artha*, *don* is different in the Sanskrit and the Tibetan. Third, the Tibetan does not distinguish between *atīlāṅgha* and *lāṅghanam*. I am unsure of the literal meaning of this passage. Cf. *anātīlāṅghasya*, TY 40.17.

⁷⁴ *Prāk śaikṣatvāt apañcake saśīlavattā bāhuśrutyam*, BG 15.8; *slob pa nyid yan tshad* [sic.] *lnga pa nyid pa la tshul khrims dang ldan pa nyid dang mang du thos pa nyid dang sbyar ro*, D 15a2; P 17b7 reads *yan chad*. Here, and following, I do not translate the Sanskrit endings *-vant* and *-tā*, also departing from the Tibetan translation in this respect.

“What has been studied and what has not been studied” up to the present are not the comprehensive fives; for example, the other associated things, faith, ethical behavior, etc.,⁷⁵ should also be understood as being included in [the categories of] ethical behavior and erudition. The five-fold ethical behavior and erudition are included with [the categories of] ethical behavior and erudition. Ethical behavior, here, in particular⁷⁶ [means] that abiding⁷⁷ with unethical conduct⁷⁸ is incorrect. [Rather,] it should be understood as thinking “This is salutary.”⁷⁹

Again, it should be understood that one of erudition means one with the [five] associated qualities who understands the *Piṭakas*, knows⁸⁰ the negative examples [of opponents’ syllogisms], others’ positions, the branches of objects, words, and speech, meter and composition, etc., and fables and stories. When that is not the case, one [only] understands the *Piṭakas*.⁸¹

⁷⁵ *Śraddhāśīlādīsamāyogābhyām*, BG 15.10; *dad pa dang tshul khrims la sogs pa las*, D 15a3.

⁷⁶ *Prativiśiṣṭā*, BG 15.12; *khyad par can te*, D 15a4. Note the variant readings on BG 15.12, *prativiśiṣṭā yathā*, and on TY 40.24, following the *Dbus med* manuscript, *prativiṣṭā yayā*.

⁷⁷ *Samvāsa*, BG 15.12; *gnas pa*, D 15a4.

⁷⁸ *Duḥśīla*, BG 15.12; *tshul khrims ’chal pa*, D 15a4.

⁷⁹ *Kalyāṇa*, BG 15.12; *dgeo*, D 15a4. *Tshul khrims dang ldan pa ni pham pa dang lhag ma rnams ma nyams pa ste*, DV 9b2, quoted in DTsh 70a1, but with a slightly different reading. DTsh goes on at some length on this point, adding for example, *’dir tshul khrims dang ldan pa’i tshad ni dge slong pham pas ma gos shing pham lhag bcu bdun gyis ma gos kyang . . .*, DTsh 70a2. DL gives a precise definition in a quotation: *’od ldan las tshul khrims dang ldan pa zhes bya ba ni pham pa’i ltung ba bzhi po rnams las gang yang rung ba ma byung bao zhes gsungs*, DL 29a2-3.

⁸⁰ *Abhijñātvaṃ*, BG 15.15; *mngon par shes pa nyid*, D 15a5. Minor discrepancies between BG 15.11-15 and TY 41.1-3; see TY’s edits on p. 41.

⁸¹ *Lnga pa gang la sde snod mngon par shes pa nyid yod pa der ni mang du thos pa nyid gzhan gyi bstan bcos kyi yul can yin no gang du sde snod mngon par shes pa ma bsdus pa der ni mang du thos pa nyid rang gi grub pa’i mtha’i yul can yin par rig par byao*, DT 22b3-4.

(82) Knowledge of the *Piṭakas*.

Knowledge of the *Sūtras*, the *Vinaya*, and the *Sources* combined⁸² with ethical behavior and erudition are the five. It is stated in the *Vinaya*: Mastery of the *Sūtras*, mastery of the *Vinaya*, and mastery of the *Sources*. Learned⁸³ in the *Sūtras*, learned in the *Vinaya*, and learned in the *Sources*. Skill⁸⁴ of the *Sūtras*, skill of the *Vinaya*, and skill of the *Sources*. Expertise⁸⁵ in the *Sūtras*, expertise in the *Vinaya*, and expertise in the *Sources*.

The three *Piṭakas* consist of the mastery of the *Sūtras*, etc., without forgetting to uphold⁸⁶ them. One understands them individually and sees that they are otherwise combined.⁸⁷ Thus, skill is the ability to analyze these components individually.⁸⁸ Expertise is applying scriptural authority and reasoning⁸⁹ to the *Sūtras*, etc. Thus, learned is the ability to teach others through that application. Knowledge means staying mindful of all these; this is the general meaning of the word knowledge.⁹⁰

(83) Ability to make [others] adhere to those.

⁸² *Prakṣīpya*, BG 15.16; *sbyar nas*, D 15a6. Note the use of “sources” (*Mātrkā*) here and “Abhidharma” (*chos mngon pa*) above, n. 33.

⁸³ *Vyaktaḥ*, BG 15.17; *gsal ba*, D 15a7.

⁸⁴ *Kuśalaḥ*, BG 15.18; *mkhas pa*, D 15a7.

⁸⁵ *Kovidāḥ*, BG 15.18; *rig pa*, D 15a7.

⁸⁶ *Udgrhītasāvismṛtiḥ*, BG 15.19; *bzung ba mi brjed pa ni 'dzin pa*, D 15b1.

⁸⁷ *Ekatra gatasya itaradarśanāt sām̐karyeṇa*, BG 15.20; *gcig tu gnas pa la gnas la mthong bas 'dres par gnas pao*, D 15b1; *gcig tu gnas pa la gzhan la mthong bas . . .*, P 18a7. The translation follows the Sanskrit *itaratra* and P Tibetan *gzhan la* over D Tibetan *gnas la*.

⁸⁸ *Sde snod gsum phan tshun 'brel pas 'dres par gnas pa la so sor gnas par nus pa ni mkhas pao*, DT 22b6.

⁸⁹ *Yuktyāgamābhyām*, BG 15.21; *lung dang rigs pa dag gis*, D 15b1.

⁹⁰ *Sāmānyena abhijñāvacanenoktam*, BG 15.23; *spyir mngon par shes pa'i tshig gis gsungs so*, D 15b2.

[This] is the ability to make those who do not know the *Piṭakas* adhere to them. Therefore, this should be understood as the particular sense of the words “knowledge of the *Piṭakas*.”

(84) The courses of study are correct ethical behavior, concentration, and wisdom.⁹¹

Courses of study means things that are studied; the two [expressions] mean the same thing. The expression correct ethical behavior means adhering⁹² to all of the practices⁹³ in the *Vinaya*. The expression correct concentration means meditative concentration.⁹⁴ The expression meditative wisdom means the practice of seeing truth.⁹⁵

(85) Ability to⁹⁶ or making [others] study.

The word “or” is used to generate belief in “correct ethical behavior, etc.”; it does not indicate dichotomous conceptualization.⁹⁷ Without studying correct ethical behavior, etc., there is no competence⁹⁸ in

⁹¹ *Adhiśīlacittaprajñā śikṣattā*, BG 15.25; *lhag pa'i tshul khrims dang sems dang shes rab la slob pa nyid do*, D 15b3.

⁹² *Grahaṇa*, BG 15.26; *tshig*, D 15b4; *grahaṇa*, BG 15.26; *gzung ba*, D 15b4. Two uses of the Sanskrit *grahaṇa* in the same phrase, translated differently in the Tibetan.

⁹³ *Vṛtta*, BG 15.26; *lugs*, D 15b4.

⁹⁴ *Dhyānānām*, BG 15.27; *bsam gtan rnam*, D 15b4.

⁹⁵ *Satyadarśanābhyāsya*, BG 15.27; *bden pa mthong ba'i goms pa lao*, D 15b4.

⁹⁶ *Pratibalatvaṃ*, BG 15.27; *nus pa*, D 15b4.

⁹⁷ *Vikalpa*, BG 15.29; *tha dad pa rtog pa*, D 15b5. The Tibetan translation is more emphatic here than the usual *rnam par rtog pa*, which I preserve with the adjective “dichotomous.”

⁹⁸ *Pratibala*, BG 15.29; *stobs*, D 15b5. *Pratibala* is translated with *nus pa* above.

studying. Just this in particular should be understood as the meaning⁹⁹ of the expression “courses of study.”

(86) Correct practice,¹⁰⁰ the *Vinaya*, and the *Prātimokṣa* are likewise.

This likewise refers to¹⁰¹ “The ability to engage in or to make one study the courses of study.” And therefore, these syntheses are twofold. In that regard, correct practice is right procedure. The rest [of *sūtra* 86] is concerned with the *Vinaya*—the study of the *Prātimokṣa* and the procedures of the *Sections (Vastu)* and their branches.¹⁰² The “*Prātimokṣa*” is an abbreviation¹⁰³ of the parts¹⁰⁴ of the courses of study.

(87) Faith, ethical behavior, learning,¹⁰⁵ abandoning, and perfected wisdom.

Here, the word ethical behavior indicates the *Vinaya*.

(88) [The path of] seeing is knowledge, of ethics, concentration,¹⁰⁶ wisdom, [and] liberation.¹⁰⁷

“The state of perfection” is implied [for each of these]. Here, the words perfect ethical behavior refer to¹⁰⁸ the *Vinaya*, and not to something else. It is said that one who has the perfect ethical behavior of a monk is ful-

⁹⁹ *Iti*, BG 15.30; untranslated in the Tibetan D 15b6.

¹⁰⁰ *Adhyācāra*, BG 15.30; *lhag pa'i spyod pa*, D 15b6.

¹⁰¹ *Parāmarśaḥ*, BG 16.1; *gzung bao*, D 15b6.

¹⁰² *Saparikara*, BG 16.2; *yan lag dang bcas pa*, D 15b7.

¹⁰³ *Paryāpanna*, BG 16.3; *mdor gtogs pa*, D 15b7.

¹⁰⁴ *Padāni*, BG 16.3; *gzhi*, D 15b7. The Tibetan *gzhi* is also used for *vastu*.

¹⁰⁵ *Śruta*, BG 16.3; *thos pa*, D 16a1.

¹⁰⁶ *Samādhi*, BG 16.4; *ting nge 'dzin*, D 16a1.

¹⁰⁷ *Chos shes pa'i bzod pa la sogs pa shes rab ni mthong ba ste*, DT 24b4. See note 17.

¹⁰⁸ *Ākṣiptatvaṃ*, BG 16.6; *grags pa nyid*, D 16a2. Not attested in MVY.

filled.¹⁰⁹ The words “knowledge of that” refer to liberation. It is “seeing is the knowledge of liberation.”(89) Also together with engaging with effort¹¹⁰ and wisdom.¹¹¹

The word also establishes the previously studied statement of “ethical behavior and erudition.” From here on there is no [reference to] the previously studied statements of the fivefold synthesis. They are to be understood as including engagement with effort and wisdom. Further, here, the third [thing] is liberation of each.¹¹²

(90) Mindfulness,

(91) Well oriented to¹¹³ meditation,

(92) Equipoise.¹¹⁴

There are four implicit¹¹⁵ in these. One of ethical behavior is erudite, engages with effort, is wise, and mindful. And again, having discussed these four, being well oriented to meditation will be mentioned. Further, equipoise.

(93) Study.

¹⁰⁹ *Sambhavaḥ*, BG 16.6; *yang dag par 'byung ba yin*, D 16a2.

¹¹⁰ *Vīryatva*, BG 16.7; *brtson 'grus*, D 16a3.

¹¹¹ *Prajñā*, BG 16.7; *shes rab*, D 16a3.

¹¹² *Ekakānyuktāni*, BG 16.10; *re re las grol ba rnams*, D 16a5; P 19a6.

¹¹³ *Pratiṣaṃlīnatvam*, BG 16.11; *nang du yang dag par bzhag pa nyid*, D 16a5.

¹¹⁴ *Samāhitatvam*, BG 16.11; *mnyam par bzhag pa nyid*, D 16a5.

¹¹⁵ *Pūraṇam*, BG 16.13; *kha skong ba yin*, D 16b5.

Study includes “Being endowed with an accumulation¹¹⁶ of ethical behavior. Study [is endowed] with an accumulation of concentration, wisdom, liberation, and realization of liberative knowledge.”¹¹⁷

(94) “Without study.”¹¹⁸

In regard to the statements “[endowed] with an accumulation of non-studied ethical behavior,” complete knowledge of what is good and bad with respect to both the ultimate reality and to determined ethical behavior¹¹⁹ must first be understood.¹²⁰ Further, because of the [restriction of] ten years of seniority, etc. of complete knowledge of what results in evil deeds¹²¹ and the remaining¹²² *Vinaya* procedures, “one abides independently [and] makes intense efforts.” Here, because it is a cause of non-transgression, one should know that there is no transgression.

(95) Knowledge of what is produced, what is instituted, what is amended,¹²³ what is rejected, and what is approved.¹²⁴

¹¹⁶ *Skandha*, BG 16.13; *phung po*, D 16a6.

¹¹⁷ *Vimukteh jñānadarśanaskandhena*, BG 16.13; *rnam par grol ba'i ye shes mthong ba'i phung po dang*, D 16a7.

¹¹⁸ *Aśaikṣeṇa*, BG 16.15; *mi slob ba nyid do*, D 16a7. In DT 24b5-25a1 Dharmamitra distinguishes between *arhats* and those on the path of the *Āryas*. See the citation in DT 24b7: *mngon par rtogs pa las byung ba kho nao*.

¹¹⁹ *Dharmatā viniyataṃ vṛttaṃ*, BG 16.16; *chos nyid dang rnam par nges pa'i tshul khrims*, D 16b1. *Vṛttaṃ* is here translated as *tshul khrims*; see sūtra 1 (Nietupski “Reflections”).

¹²⁰ *Ādhigamikam*, BG 16.16; *rtogs pa 'byung ba yin no*, D 16b1.

¹²¹ *Āpattivavasthā*, BG 16.17; *ltung ba rnam par gzhas pa*, D 16b1.

¹²² [*Yacca śiṣṭasya*], BG 16.17; *lhag ma'i 'dul ba'i cho ga*, D 16b1. The editors of BG chose *śiṣṭa* over *śeṣa*, as above, and here in the Tibetan.

¹²³ Note here the provisions to change Buddhist monastic rules to meet changing circumstances. See *paññatti* and *anupaññatti* in C.S. Upasak, *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms*.

“This is produced from that.” These words express production of a cause, which is produced from the sections of study. Institution means causing engagement with a section of study. The term “institutes” contains the statements “Any errors and serious transgressions are to be revealed,” etc.¹²⁵ Here, again, this amend means “rejected and approved.” For example, there are the specific prohibitions of “When one is given shoes one clicks the heels,”¹²⁶ etc. There is the prohibition of eating at the wrong time, and the approval of medical discourse for the sick. And the statement “This excessive [thing]¹²⁷ should not be done” is a prohibition of a function.¹²⁸ For example, even though [served on] *Kuśa* grass, do not drink intoxicants, [and refrain from] sexual misconduct, etc.¹²⁹ Here again, there is approval¹³⁰ for doing or not doing any action appropriate for one’s well-being; there is no transgression. For example, to put an

¹²⁴ *Utpatti prajñapti anuprajñapti pratikṣepa abhyanuññābhijñatvam*, BG 16.19; *byung ba dang bcas pa dang rjes su bcas pa dang bkag pa dang gnang ba mngon par shes pa nyid do*, D 16b2. These are clearly explained in DT 25a2 ff.

¹²⁵ *Prajñaptigrahaṇena iyatā antike ca sthūlātyayo deśayitavyaḥ*, BG 16.21; *byas pa'i tshig gis ni 'di tsum dang nyes pa sbom po'i ltung ba bshags par bya*, D 16b3; P 19b5. The Tibetan uses *byas pa* for *prajñapti*. The editors of BG cite the Tibetan as the source for the word *antike*, but the Tibetan is *nyes pa*; perhaps mistaken for *nye ba*, and *antike*. A better Sanskrit reading would be *antara*.

¹²⁶ *Ṣaṣaṣāpattiḥ*, BG 16.23; *krig krig byed pa*, D 16b4. Onomatopoeic.

¹²⁷ *Atyantam*, BG 16.24; *shin tu nas kyang*, D 16b4; P 19b7. Unattested in MVY.

¹²⁸ *Vidhānaṃ*, BG 16.25; *bsgrub pa*, D 16b5.

¹²⁹ *Tṛṇāgreṇāpi madyasyāpānaṃ abrahmacaryādi*, BG 16.25-26; *rtsa mchog gis kyang chang mi btung ba dang mi tshangs spyod pa la sogs pa*, D 16b5.

¹³⁰ *Abhyanuññā punaḥ yasya karaṇīyasya akaraṇe vā nā 'sti doṣaḥ kāmācāro 'tra pravṛtto*, BG 16.26; *gnang ba mngon par shes pa nyid dang zhes bya ba ni slar bya ba gang zhis byed pa la skyon med pa der 'jug pa la mi byed dam byed na 'jug pa lao*, D 16b5; P 19b7-8. Compare Dharmamitra, which is much closer to the Sanskrit: *gnang ba zhes bya ba ni ci dgar spyad pa'i yul la bya ba gang yang rung ba zhis mi byed dam byed na ltung ba zhes bya ba'i nyes pa med pa ste*, DT 25a7.

end to controversy, non-Buddhist scriptures may be read, etc. Here, there is no error of transgression at all in not acting or acting.¹³¹ And just this complete knowledge of doing and not doing is learned¹³² from the respective [sections of the] *Vinaya*. Therefore, one who does not have complete knowledge of this is taught by the five at once,¹³³ and known by the five transgressions, etc.

(96) Lecturers [and] instructors know what are obstacles [and] what are not obstacles.

This is an abbreviation for “Lecturers and instructors know what are obstacles and what are not obstacles.” Obstacles are actions prohibited by the *Vinaya*, and what are not obstacles [are not prohibited]. Knowledge of those two shows that they both have the meaning of abiding¹³⁴ in the *Vinaya*.

Again, a lecturer is capable of or tirelessly becomes proficient in these two in order to lecture and¹³⁵ make them understood. An instructor speaks in conformity with what establishes¹³⁶ avoidance [from error]¹³⁷ and speaks in conformity with what motivates the lazy. This very statement “instructor” expresses the meaning of a reciter. Some say for these topics: “He gives precepts”¹³⁸ and “He instructs.” In this regard, “He instructs” is similar to this—“He is an instructor.” “He gives pre-

¹³¹ *Akaraṇe karaṇe*, BG 16.28; *mi byed pa dang mi byed pa la*, D 16b6; P 19b8. The Tibetan versions add *des rjes su gnang ngo zhes gsungs ba lta buo*, D 16b6; P 20a1.

¹³² *Śeyam*, BG 16.29; *shes par byao*, D 16b6; P 20a1.

¹³³ *Adhikaṃ*, BG 16.29; *gcig tu*, D 16b7.

¹³⁴ *Udbhāvakaṃ*, BG 17.3; *bstan to*, D 17a1.

¹³⁵ *Vā*, BG 17.3; *dang*, D 17a2.

¹³⁶ *Samsthāpanānurūpaṃ*, BG 17.4; *yang dag par gnas pa nyid dang rjes su mthun par*, D 17a2.

¹³⁷ *Nyes pa las rnam par bzlog cing*, CD 7b3.

¹³⁸ *Avavadati*, BG 17.6; *gdams ngag tu byed pa*, D 17a3.

cepts” indicates one who teaches¹³⁹ the meaning of states of mind.¹⁴⁰ This is the meaning of renunciation.¹⁴¹ Therefore, here, this has a particular ability—“to gather in groups” or a close gathering of these [monks].¹⁴²

(97) An authority or attendant authority [is endowed] with the ability to make [others] adhere.¹⁴³

Ability to cause adherence is the ability to make [others] adhere. [Endowment] with this ability to make [others] gradually adhere is from a set of five:¹⁴⁴ knowledge, etc.¹⁴⁵ The word “or” joins these two expressions. One is concerned with authority, and the other, the attendant authority, is one who carries out the fourfold [ordination ceremony].

When the abbot¹⁴⁶ travels to other places he applies [his] ability to make [a monk] be the authority. When the abbot or the authority is elsewhere his intention, while travelling or residing, is to use the ability

¹³⁹ *Upadeśaḥ*, BG 17.7; *gdams ngag*, D 17a4.

¹⁴⁰ *Manasikāra*, BG 17.7; *yid la byed pa*, D 17a4; ‘attitudes, states of mind.’

¹⁴¹ *Pravrajyā*, BG 17.8; *rab tu byung ba*, D 17a4.

¹⁴² *Tasmādeṣo ’tra viśeṣato arhati parṣatsaṃgrahaṃ iti vā asyopasaṃgrahaḥ*, BG 17.8-9; *de bas na ’dir bye brag tu ’khor bsdus pa ’di ’os pa yin to zhes bya ba ’di’i nye bar bsdus pao*, D 17a4.

¹⁴³ *Saha grahaṇapratibalatvena niśrayasyopaniśrayasya vā*, BG 17.9; *lhan cig ’dzin du ’jug nus pa nyid kyis gnas sam nye bar gnas*, D 17a4-5; . . . *nyid kyis gnas sam nye bar gnas*, P 20a8. The Tibetan does not separate this as an individual sūtra; the translation is causative here and in the following *grāhaṇa*.

¹⁴⁴ *Pañcakam*, BG 17.11; *yan lag bzhi po*, D 17a5.

¹⁴⁵ *Grāhaṇe pratibalatvaṃ grāhaṇa pratibalatvaṃ* [TY 44.2] *saha anena grāhapratibalatvenaitad āntarāyikā ’bhijñatvāpañcakam*, BG 17.10-11; *’dzin du ’jug nus pa nyid ’di dang lhan cig tu yan lag zhi po ’di rnamshes nas gnyis po ’di dag lhan cig sbyar bas te*, D 17a4; P 20a8. This passage is articulated in Sanskrit further than the Tibetan. I add single quotes around the word “or” for clarification.

¹⁴⁶ *Upādhyāye*, BG 17.12; *mkhan po*, D 17a5-6. The word *upādhyāya* might fit the syntax better if it were in the nominative singular, **upādhyāyaḥ prakrāmati*.

to make [a monk] be an attendant authority for the sake of whatever persons.¹⁴⁷

(98) Transgression, non-transgression, knowledge of severe and minor [offenses], [and] reciting the extensive *Prātimokṣa*.

Application on behalf of those [disciples] dependent on authority is the engagement of action and non-action related to the knowledge of transgression and non-transgression.¹⁴⁸ Confession of gross errors is related to the knowledge of severe and minor [offenses]. Reciting the extensive *Prātimokṣa* shows establishment¹⁴⁹ in the *Vinaya*. And further, the word extensive includes the entire *Vinaya*.¹⁵⁰ It should be known that the expression the extensive *Prātimokṣa* “teaches more than the divisions”—[it teaches] the Sections, the Miscellaneous, etc., for all of this is included in

¹⁴⁷ *Upādhyāye anyatra vā nīśraye tāvatkālikābhiprāyeṇa prakrāmati tiṣṭhati ca kasyacijjanasya vaśāt upaniśrayagrāhaṇe (pratibalatvaṃ) upayujyate*, BG 17.14; *mkhan po gzhan du gnas pa la de srid kyi dus la dgongs pas 'jug pa dang gnas pa la dgongs pa 'ga' zhiq gi dbang gis nye bar gnas 'dzin du 'jug ba nus pa nyid dang sbyar ro*, D 17a6; . . . *de srid kyi dus las dgongs pas 'jug pa dang gnas pa la dgos pa 'ba' zhiq gi dbang gis . . .*, P 20b2; *gal te mkhan po gzhan du 'gro na gnas 'char gzhugs nus pa dang re zhiq pa'i bsam pas gzhan du 'gro 'am de nyid na spo ba la sogs pa dgos pa'i dbang gis 'dug pa na gnas pa re zhiq gi gnas 'char gzhugs nus pa ste*, DT 26a4-5. The Sanskrit uses inaccurate case markers and a mixture of *ātmanepada* and *parasmaipada*. The underlined phrases in this note point out the discrepancies in readings of this passage. The translation follows the literal meaning of the Sanskrit *jana* instead of the Tibetan *dgongs pa* (D) and *dgos pa* (P & DT). DT interprets the text but does not here literally reproduce all of Guṇaprabha's comment. *Yan lag 'di gnyis yan lag snga ma bzhi dang sbyar na lnga pa gnyis su 'gyur ro*, DT 26a5.

¹⁴⁸ *Tatra āpattyanāpatti abhijñatvasya karaṇīya viniyoge nīśritapratyupayogaḥ*, BG 17.15-16; *de la ltung ba dang ltung ba ma yin pa dang mngon par shes pa nyid la bya ba nyid dang bya ba ma yin pa nyid dang rnam par sbyar ba la gnas pa'i slad du nye bar sbyar ba la dgongs so*, D 17a6-7. The Tibetan translation does not preserve the Sanskrit syntax here.

¹⁴⁹ *Adhiṣṭhita*, BG 17.17; *gnas pa*, D 17b1. Note the minor lexical differences in TY.

¹⁵⁰ *Vinayasya gr̥hitam*, BG 17.18; *'dul ba mtha' dag bsdu pa nyid do*, D 17b1.

the extensive *Prātimokṣa*.¹⁵¹ First of all, everything comes out of the *Prātimokṣa*. The statement “Again, together with monks and nuns” sets up¹⁵² the topic of renunciation. The statement “Monks, observe the rainy season retreat” [sets up] the topic of the rainy season retreat. The statement “A particularity of the rainy season retreat is the late summer¹⁵³ lifting retreat restrictions [ceremony]” [sets up] the topic of the seasons. Just because of that the topic of breaking the rainy season retreat¹⁵⁴ is established, since it is related to living in the rainy season. The statement “The clothes are selected”¹⁵⁵ [sets up] the topic of robe consecration. The statement “The monks with the complete robes” [sets up] the topics of robe material. Since the statement “The subjects of the topic of robes and the subjects of leather articles and medicine” is the cause of setting it up,¹⁵⁶ there is the topic of leather articles.

The statement “The Lord gave whatever medicines [he had] to the sick monks” [sets up] the topic of medicine. The statements “One should ask in earnest and complete purity!¹⁵⁷ Do not go to other places in order to break up Community gatherings!” etc. [sets up] the topic of the

¹⁵¹ The Sanskrit has a double negative, for *mantavyaḥ* and for *pratipādikaḥ*; the Tibetan leaves both in the affirmative.

¹⁵² *Utthānaṃ*, BG 17.21, TY 44.17; *'byung ba*, D 17b2. *Utthānaṃ* and *'byung ba* have verbal roots but are used as nouns. Here, in English, they are translated as active verbs, “sets up,” or “gives rise to,” etc.

¹⁵³ *Īnavarṣakā*, BG 17.22; *dbyar ma tshang ba*, D 17b3.

¹⁵⁴ *Pravāraṇāvastuno*, BG 17.23; *dgag dbye'i gzhi*, D 17b3.

¹⁵⁵ *Uddhṛte kaṭhina*, BG 17.23-4; *tshul khrims la gnas pa la ni sra brkyang zhes bya ba*, D 17b3; P 20b7. See TY for minor editorial and spelling corrections in these passages, not all noted, e.g. *bikṣu* [sic.], TY 44.22. The meaning of these passages is nonetheless clear in both versions.

¹⁵⁶ *Utthānakāraṇa*, BG 17.25; *ldang par byed du 'jug pa nyid*, D 17b4. The Sanskrit *utthāna* is translated with *'byung ba* throughout this section.

¹⁵⁷ *Chandaṃ*, BG 17.27; *'dun pa*, D 17b5.

Kauśāmbis and the topic of schism in the Community. And thus, “Since action is clearly explained in renunciation, etc., as long as one lives¹⁵⁸ without attaining [these], [does] that” [sets up] the topic of action. The statement “A monk should always abide in the collected¹⁵⁹ Community,”¹⁶⁰ etc. [sets up] the topics of Paṇḍukas and Rohitas. Undesirable action [sets up] the topic of punishment.¹⁶¹

The topic that establishes the rainy season retreat shows the cause after establishing what a transgression is, and there is confession of each of the offenses.¹⁶² The statement “The monks great monastery”¹⁶³ [sets up] the topic of dwelling places. And the meaning of the ability to adjudicate establishes [the meanings of] transgressions and rehabilitation.¹⁶⁴

The statement “There are two other kinds of ethical behavior which are areas to be mentioned” [sets up] the *Prātimokṣa* and the remaining topics. Ask for the explanation of¹⁶⁵ “The statements the miscellaneous and the topics related to the Sources,¹⁶⁶ etc.”; the teachings on practice are causes of resolving questions. The topic of leather articles,

¹⁵⁸ *Iha*, BG 17.28; *gnas pa*, D 17b6.

¹⁵⁹ *Samkrāmaṇ*, BG 17.29; *kun nas 'dod pa*, D 17b6. See the Tibetan translation of the following *akāmatvena*, BG 17.30; *mi 'dod pa*, D 17b6.

¹⁶⁰ At this point (BG 17.30) one side of one folio (“fol. II 2A”) of the Sanskrit is lost, retranslated from the Tibetan by BG. See BG, n40; see TY.

¹⁶¹ *Parivāsa*, BG 17.30; *sbod pa*, D 17b7; *sbo ba*, P 21a4. See sūtra 76.

¹⁶² *Sanḡhāvaśeṣa*, BG 18.1; *dge 'dun lhaq ma*, D 17b7.

¹⁶³ *Mahāvihāra*, BG 18.2, *gnas pa ni chen po yin*, D 17b7.

¹⁶⁴ *Āpattiṣoḍhavyavasthāpanāt*, BG 18.3; *rtsod pa la nus pa'i bstan pa dor nas*, D 18a1; P 21a5.

¹⁶⁵ *Nirdeśa*, BG 18.6; *rnam par mtshon pa*, D 18a2.

¹⁶⁶ *Mātrikā*, BG 18.5; *Ma mo*, D 18a2.

etc. is for novices.¹⁶⁷ Thus, without the remaining [topics], this is not the extensive *Prātimokṣa*. Engaging them with mere analysis is not a cause of renunciation, etc.; because this is just showing the functions.

(99) When there is no elder, one is to be dependent on a youth as authority.

If it happens that there is no elder endowed with the appropriate set of five, there is the [following] procedure. It is said “Venerable monks, even if a monk is ordained for sixty years yet cannot memorize the *Prātimokṣa sūtras*, read extensively, or recite, [then,] follow another authority, or, the assembly becomes dependent on a different authority.” Here, even though this one may have “sixty years of seniority,” he is not independent, because there is no distinction (*viśeṣābhāvāt*) of erudition.¹⁶⁸

(100) Except for veneration only.

¹⁶⁷ *Carmavastvādayaḥ dārakeṣu*, BG 18.6; missing in Tibetan D 18a2; *ko lpaqs kyi gzhi la sogs pa rnams ni khyeu lao*, P 21a7. TY has provided an alternative reading of this passage from the manuscript, 46.1-4, the passage just prior to sūtra 99. TY reads *māṇava*; BG reads *dāraka*; both mean a young person. In addition, TY gives a precise account of the many minor variations in the *Dbus med* and BG Sanskrit versions and the Tibetan of sūtra and commentary of sūtra 98 in notes on pp. 44-46. Most of the variations and anomalies are noted in TY and in the notes to the translation given here.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. TY 46.1-14. The two Sanskrit versions express the same meaning but with lexical differences. After a summary of ordination procedures in sūtra 98, sūtras 99-102 deal with exceptions to standard practices; Dharmamitra deals with these matters in some detail, see DT 26b4 ff. These passages, and the implications of flexibility and alternative procedures need further study. Thanks to the anonymous *JBE* reader for suggestions for the expression . . . *bāhuśrutyaṣya viśeṣābhāvāt* . . . , TY 46.10-11, BG 18.13-14. See D 18a4-5: *'dir lo drug cu lon pa nyid kyang rang dbang can ma yin gyi shin du mang ba nyid ston par gnas pa yin zhas bya ba khyad par med par rgan pa med na zhes by aba la sogs pa gsungs so*.

This is equivalent to the statement “The elder is to follow¹⁶⁹ the younger in all except the ethical behavior of veneration.”¹⁷⁰

(101) One with five years seniority, who will finally be endowed with the sets of five, may travel abroad without an authority [present].

One who will finally be endowed with the sets of five, [knowledge of] “transgression and non-transgression,” etc., who has five years seniority, may travel abroad without an authority.

(102) Otherwise, even if one possesses the three knowledges, one may not [travel abroad without an authority].¹⁷¹

“Otherwise” means that since one does not possess the five qualities and does not have five years seniority there is deterioration of self control¹⁷² while on the road. In that case, one possesses the actuality of ethical be-

¹⁶⁹ *Rjes su gnas par byao*, D 18a6; *anusamṃvāsavitavyaḥ*, BG 18.16.

¹⁷⁰ *Gnas pa'i tshul khirms de las gzhan pa dag la rgan pas gzhon pa la*, D 18a6-7.

¹⁷¹ *Nānyathā*, BG 18.19; *nānyas*, TY 46.19; *gzhan du na*, D 18a7. Dharmamitra, DT 27a4 ff.; DP 12b5; DV 12a1. The three knowledges here are knowledge of one's former lives, one's future lives, and the knowledge from eliminating defilements, DV 12a1. Dharmamitra describes the “three knowledges” somewhat differently: “though one has [knowledge of] previous lives, of death, intermediate state, and rebirth, and the elimination of defilements,” DT 27a4. Note minor spelling discrepancies in BG and TY, e.g. *pūrvanivāsa* TY 46.19; *pūrvanivāsa*, BG 18.24, etc.

¹⁷² The following passage, BG 18.19-19.4, is missing in BG and reconstructed from the Pāli *Vinaya* by BG. It is different from the Sanskrit *Dbus med* version in TY, as Yonezawa wrote, a “reconstruction on the basis of the Pāli *Vinaya*,” TY 47n3. There are several key lexical anomalies in this interesting passage, at the end of the Authority section. For example, TY includes *damasransas*, TY 46.21, (see TY ms. 34.23) (sic., alt. *sraṃsas*), *dama* meaning “self-control,” and *sransas* (sic) meaning “deterioration.” This is translated in Tibetan as *'dul ba nyams par gyur ba*, D 18a7, using the word “*'dul ba*,” usually “*Vinaya*,” for *dama*. The translation of entire comment on sūtra 102 is tentative.

havior for five years, [and] one experiences the transformations of suffering. “It is not without five full years” describes the meaning here.

“And the three knowledges” means that one possesses full knowledge of what should and should not be done in regard to authorities and by those dependent on authority, and the method of complete discipline.¹⁷³

In that regard, if, because of knowledge of the ultimate,¹⁷⁴ because of the vision that operates by means of knowing one’s previous lives, and through implementing knowledge with little difficulty,¹⁷⁵ one’s future perfection will bring about full understanding of what should and should not be done. Then, additionally, one dependent on authority should act on authority in order to become completely disciplined. Since the conventionalities of suffering [include] the actualities of adhering to the *Vinaya*, one discards one’s previous self nature. In relation to *arhats*, one learns that they discard their previous self natures.¹⁷⁶ [For example,]

¹⁷³ At this point DT 27a6, DP 12b6, and DV 13a2—all of the Indian commentaries, but not the *Autocommentary*—complete the chapter on Authority. The Tibetan commentaries DL 34b2, BT 41a7, CD 8a1, and DTsh 71a4 ff however continue with comments on the remaining passages of this chapter. DTsh 71b5 is the only commentary that mentions that the root text and *Autocommentary* end at this point; DTsh explains that the discussion continues on the subject of perfection and imperfection, which DTsh proceeds to discuss in great detail.

¹⁷⁴ *Dharmatā*, TY 46.24; BG 18.24; *chos nyid*, D 18b2.

¹⁷⁵ *Dka’ ba chung ngu rig pa bsten pas*, D 18b2; *duṣkara alpasaṃvitpratisevanayā*, BG 18.24-5; cf. TY for this entire passage, 47.1-9.

¹⁷⁶ This passage is provocative, missing in the original BG version, and rendered differently in BG’s reconstruction, in TY, and in the Tibetan. BG 18.26-28; TY 47.3-5; D 18b2-3. The text describes how one keeps one’s conventional personality even after becoming an *arhat*. That is, in Buddhist terms, one has realized selflessness and thus achieved enlightenment, but one still keeps his everyday conventional behavior, etc. The texts use technical terms that in other contexts generate a good deal of discussion. For examples, *vyavahāra*, TY 47.3; *pūrva-prakṛity . . .*, TY 47.4, BG 18.24; *pūrvātma*, BG 18.27; *svabhāva*, BG

some *arhats* were jumping across the river. The Venerable Pilinda said to the goddess of the Ganges, “Woman! Stop the river!” etc.¹⁷⁷

18.27 vs. *prakriti*, TY 47.4-5; *rang bzhin*, D 18b3-4; *ātmibhāvaḥ*, TY, 47.4. *Gang gi phyir sdug bsngal ba'i tha snyad ni 'dul ba nyid dang bcas pa'i dngos po sngon gyi rang bzhin 'phrogs pa'i phyir*, D 18b3.

¹⁷⁷ *Dgra bcom pa la la zhig ni mchong zhing mchong zhing chu bo rnam las rgal bar gyur ba dang tshe dang ldan pa pi lin da'i bus gang gaa'i lha mo la rlang ma 'dug shig ces bya ba*, D 18b3-4; *kaścidarhan pūjākṣetraḥ pūjākṣetrebhyaḥ saṃtīrṇaḥ āyusmān pilindavatsaḥ ca gaṅgādevyai vṛṣalīti coditavān*, BG 18.28-19.1, reconstructed from the Pāli in BG and different in TY: *utplutyotplutya kaścid arhan srotāṃsi laṃghitavāṃ tiṣṭha vṛṣalīty āyusmān pilindavatsa gaṅgādevatām uktavān ityādi . . .*, TY 47.5-6. This passage in the *Autocommentary* is not commented on by Dharmamitra, Prajñākara, or by Guṇaprabha in the ‘*Grel Chung*.’ Bu ston comments, briefly, BT 41a6-7. BG identifies the passage in the *Arthavinīścayasūtra*: *Āryapilindavatsasya gaṅga vṛṣalīvāda saṃcodanam*, BG 61 n40b; *rlangs ma*, D 18b4. TY includes the version from the Sanskrit *Dbus med* manuscript, 47n3; there are several lexical differences. The translation follows TY, with reference to BG and D. For a discussion of the *Arthavinīścayasūtra* see Nance (Nance, Speaking). See Lamotte 93. See Nāgārjuna:

The Venerable Pilindavatsa was constantly afflicted with eye pain. In the course of his regular rounds begging for food, this personage always forded the River Ganges. Upon reaching the shore of the Ganges he would snap his fingers and call out, “Little slave! Stop! Don’t flow!” The waters would then part and he would be free to cross and beg for food. This Ganges River spirit went to where the Buddha dwelt and addressed the Buddha, complaining, “The Buddha’s disciple, Pilindavatsa, is forever insulting me, saying, ‘Little slave! Stop! Don’t flow!’”

The Buddha instructed Pilindavatsa to apologize to the Ganges spirit. Pilindavatsa immediately pressed his palms together and said to the Ganges spirit, “Little slave, don’t be angry. I now apologize to you.” At this moment, the Great Assembly laughed at this, exclaiming, “How can you apologize to her, and yet proceed to insult her once again even while doing so?!”

The Buddha said to the Ganges spirit, “As you look at Pilindavatsa, is he pressing his palms together and apologizing or not? He is apologizing without any arrogance and yet he still speaks this way.

Furthermore, this will in no way result in (*āvaśyakam*) knowledge of the *Vinaya*, because of difficulties, and because of the many obstacles in plurality, subtlety, and chaotic views. Therefore, the result is that there is a variety of circumstances.¹⁷⁸

For example,¹⁷⁹ if a reverend with the three knowledges abandons the three defilements for three years, and yet does not¹⁸⁰ perfectly possess the five qualities, then it is said that he may not travel to other countries without an authority, or to neighboring places.¹⁸¹ “Abandon this for longer than a long time!” In order to establish [such] full endowment, one should be careful to maintain the *Vinaya*.¹⁸²

In order to rid oneself of generating impure behavior towards others by means of practice,¹⁸³ one proceeds to not transgress¹⁸⁴ engage-

You should understand that this is not deliberate insolence. For the last five hundred lifetimes this man has repeatedly been reborn into Brahman households and thus has always been haughty and esteemed himself while slighting and demeaning others. This is just the manner of speaking which he originally practiced, that's all. In his mind there is no haughtiness.”

In just this way, although the Arhats have cut off the fetters, they still retain residual traces of them (如是諸阿羅漢雖斷結使，猶如餘氣)。

¹⁷⁸ At this point the BG Sanskrit manuscript resumes.

¹⁷⁹ *Yaduta*, BG 19.4; *'di lta ste*, D 18b5.

¹⁸⁰ *Na*, BG 19.5; *ma*, D 18b6. BG edits the Sanskrit by adding *na* according to the Tibetan.

¹⁸¹ *Nopālin*, BG 19.6; *nye ba 'khor mi byao*, D 18b6. The editors of the BG Sanskrit supply a question mark here, reading the last phrase as a rejoinder to the objection.

¹⁸² *Vinayagataṃ*, BG 19.6; *'dul ba la gnas pa*, D 18b6-7. Yet another use of *gnas pa*. The Tibetan and Sanskrit syntax are less close than normal in this text, and though there are so many *itis* throughout the text, the Sanskrit lacks an *iti* after *apasārayatu*, which is present in the Tibetan.

¹⁸³ *Adhyācāra*, BG 19.7; *lhag par spyod pa*, D 18b7.

¹⁸⁴ *Adyātikrama*, BG 19.9; *mi 'da' bar 'gro bar 'gyur ro*, D 18b7-19a1.

ment in [the three] studies and one proceeds in order to generate respect, namely, “respect for this,”¹⁸⁵ and for the sake of what is known to be maintaining the teachings. Moreover, [he said]¹⁸⁶ when there is any transgression, the *Dharma* deteriorates.¹⁸⁷ Therefore, here, just as one is not endowed with other things [like seniority],¹⁸⁸ so it is with the three knowledges.¹⁸⁹

This is the section on authority.

Abbreviations

- BG Guṇaprabha. *Vinayasūtra and Autocommentary on the Same by Guṇaprabha*. Edited by P.V. Bapat & V.V. Gokhale. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1982.
- BT Bu ston rin chen grub. *'Dul ba mdo'i rnam par 'byed pa: 'dul ba rgya mtsho'i snying po rab tu gsal bar byed pa. The Collected Works of Bu ston 21 (zha)*. Edited by Lokesh Chandra. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971.

¹⁸⁵ *Atrādarān*, BG 19.8; *'di la gus pa dang ldan ba zhes bya ba*, D 18b7. There is no *iti* in the Sanskrit to account for the Tibetan *zhes bya ba*.

¹⁸⁶ *Iti*, BG 19.9, not present in Tibetan.

¹⁸⁷ *Dhvaṃso 'nyathā śāsanasya saṃpadyate*, BG 19.9-10; *gzhan du na ... bstan pa nyams pa grub pa yin no*, D 19a1.

¹⁸⁸ *Ananujñānaṃ*, BG 19.10; *ma gnang ba*, D 19a1. The meaning of *anujñāna*, *gnang ba*, is “permit, allow,” or “endow.” *Prayatnānāṃ vicitrā hi prasaṃgāḥ*, TY 47.8.

¹⁸⁹ Explained in detail by Bu ston BT 41a4; by Kun mkhyen mtsho sna ba DTsh 82a5, but introduced on DTsh 74b3 ff; by Dharmamitra DT 27a4 ff; and by Dge 'dun grub pa DL 34b3 ff. Mentioned briefly by Prajñākara in DP 12b5-6 and by Guṇaprabha in DV 12b7-13a2.

- CD Kun mKhyen mTsho sNa Ba, *'Dul ba mdo rtsa ba'i mchan 'grel mthong ba don 'grub kyi dkar chag dang sa bcad gleng brjod bcas*. Blo gLing mKhas Grub Rim Byon gyi gSung Thor Bu Phyogs bsGrigs gLegs Bam du bKod Pa, Drepung Loseling Library Society, Karnataka, India, n.d.
- D Guṇaprabha. *'Dul ba'i mdo'i 'grel pa mngon par brjod pa rang gi rnam par bshad pa*, **Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhīdhānasavyākhyānam*, in *sDe dGe bsTan 'Gyur Series*, vol. 161, #12, New Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Chodhey, 1986, Zhu.
- DL Dge 'dun grub pa, The First Dalai Lama. *Legs par gsungs pa'i dam pa'i chos 'dul ba mtha' dag gi snying po'i don legs par bshad pa rin po che 'phreng ba*. *The Collected Works of the First Dalai Lama dge 'dun grup pa*, vol. 1, Gangtok: Dodrup Lama Sangye, Deorali Chorten, 1981.
- DP Prajñākara. *'Dul ba mdo'i rnam par bshad pa*, **Vinayasūtravyākhyāna*, in *sDe dGe bsTan 'Gyur Series*, vol. 164, #15, New Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Chodhey, 1986, Ru.
- DT Dharmamitra. *'Dul ba'i mdo'i rgya cher 'grel pa*, **Vinayasūtraṭīkā*, in *sDe dGe bsTan 'Gyur Series*, vol. 162, #13, New Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Chodhey, 1986, 'U.
- DTsh Mtsho sna ba shes rab bzang po. *'Dul ṭik nyi ma'i 'od zer legs bshad lung gi rgya mtsho*. Edited by rDo rje rgyal po. Xining, Qinghai: China Tibetan Studies Publishing House, 1993.
- DV Guṇaprabha. *'Dul ba'i mdo'i 'grel pa*, **Vinayasūtravṛtṭi*, in *sDe dGe bsTan 'Gyur Series*, vol. 165, #16, New Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Chodhey, 1986, Lu.
- MVY. *A Tibetan index to the Mahāvīyūtpatti, with its Sanskrit equivalents*. Kyōo Nishio. Kyoto, Isseido Pub. Co., 1941.

- P Guṇaprabha. 'Dul ba'i mdo'i 'grel pa mngon par brjod pa rang gi rnam par bshad pa, *Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhidhānasvavyākhyānam, Suzuki, D.T. (ed.), *The Tibetan Tripiṭaka: Peking Edition*, Tibetan Tripiṭaka Research Institute, Tokyo, 1955, Vol. 'U, no. 5621.
- TY Guṇaprabha. Svavyākhyānābhidhānavinayasūtravṛtṭi. In "A Study of the Pravrajyāvastu in the Vinayasūtra (1–9)." *Annual of the Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism*, vols. 25 (2002): 44–93; 26 (2004): 54–76; 27 (2005): 50–77; 29 (2007): 50–77; 31 (2009): 83–125; 32 (2010): 48–84; 33 (2011): 65–104; 34 (2012): 29–44; 35 (2013): 20–64. Edited & translated into Japanese by Yonezawa, Yoshiyasu. Tokyo: Taisho University (AICBS).

Bibliography

Primary texts in Sanskrit and Tibetan

Bka' 'gyur, Vinayavastu I, Lhasa ed.

Bu ston rin chen grub. 'Dul ba spyi'i rnam par gzhas pa 'dul ba rin po che'i mdzes rgyan sogs chos mtshan khag cig. Reproduced from the Lha sa zhol gsar print (Cazadero, CA: Ye shes sde'i chos 'khor 'phrul par khang, 2002). TBRC W1KG3641, Online. Available HTTP: <<http://www.tbrc.org>> (accessed July 2013).

Bu ston rin chen grub. 'Dul ba mdo'i rnam par 'byed pa: 'dul ba rgya mtsho'i snying po rab tu gsal bar byed pa. See BT.

Cullavagga IX.1.4. The Sacred Books of the East. Clarendon Press, 1885.

Dge 'dun grub pa, The First Dalai Lama. *Legs par gsungs pa'i dam pa'i chos 'dul ba mtha' dag gi snying po'i don legs par bshad pa rin po che 'phreng ba*. See DL

Dharmamitra. *'Dul ba'i mdo'i rgya cher 'grel pa*, **Vinayasūtraṭīkā*. See DT.

Guṇaprabha. *'Dul ba'i mdo'i 'grel pa mngon par brjod pa rang gi rnam par bshad pa*, **Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhīdhānasvayākhyānam*. See P.

_____. *'Dul ba'i mdo'i 'grel pa*, **Vinayasūtravṛtṭi*. See DV.

_____. *'Dul ba'i mdo'i 'grel pa mngon par brjod pa rang gi rnam par bshad pa*, **Vinayasūtravṛtṭyabhīdhānasvayākhyānam*. See D.

_____. *The Facsimile Edition of a Collection of Sanskrit Palm-leaf Manuscripts in Tibetan dBu med Script*. Tokyo: The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University, 1999.

_____. [TY]. *Svayākhyānābhīdhānavinayasūtravṛtṭi*. In “A Study of the Pravrajyāvastu in the *Vinayasūtra* (1–9).” *Annual of the Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism*, Vols. 25 (2002), pp. 44–93; 26 (2004): pp. 54–76; 27 (2005): pp. 50–77; p. 29 (2007): pp. 50–77; 31 (2009): pp. 83–125; 32 (2010): pp. 48–84; 33 (2011): pp. 65–104; p. 34 (2012): pp. 29–44; 35 (2013): pp. 20–64. Edited and translated by Yoshiyasu Yonezawa. Taisho University (AICBS).

_____. *Vinayasūtra and Autocommentary on the Same by Guṇaprabha*. See BG.

Mtsho sna ba shes rab bzang po. *'Dul ṭik nyi ma'i 'od zer legs bshad lung gi rgya mtsho*. Also published as *'Dul ba mdo rtsa'i rnam bshad nyi ma'i 'od zer legs bshad lung gi rgya mtsho*. Karnataka: Drepung Losel Ling, n.d. See DTsh.

Prajñākara. *'Dul ba mdo'i rnam par bshad pa*, **Vinayasūtravyākhyāna*. See DP

Secondary sources

Carpenter, Amber. *Indian Buddhist Philosophy*. Acumen, 2014.

- Davidson, Ronald M. *Tibetan Renaissance: Tantric Buddhism in the Rebirth of Tibetan Culture*. Columbia University Press, 2004.
- _____. *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement*. Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage Books, 1995.
- Fuller, Paul. *The Notion of Diṭṭhi in Theravāda Buddhism: The Point of View*. Routledge Curzon, 2005.
- Gethin, Rupert. *The Foundations of Buddhism*. Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Ghosh, Anandamayee. *Buddhist Vinayas: A Focus (w.r.t. Mulasarvastivada Vinaya)*. Buddhist World Press, 2013.
- Guerrero, Laura. "Guerrero on Carpenter, 'Indian Buddhist Philosophy.'" Rev. of *Indian Buddhist Philosophy*, by Amber Carpenter. *H-Buddhism*. July, 2015: H-Net Reviews. Online. Available H'TTP: <<https://networks.h-net.org/node/6060/reviews/76815/ guerre-ro-carpenter-indian-buddhist-philosophy>> (accessed 26 July 2016).
- Guang Xing, Asanga. "The Buddhist Notion of Transcending the World." In *Ñāṇappabhā: A Felicitations Volume in Honour of Venerable Dr. Pategama Gnanarama Mahā Thera*, edited by Venerable Dr. Rangama Chandawimala Thera and Professor Chandima Wijebandara, 52–69. Ti-Sarana Buddhist Association, 2011. Online. Available HTTP: <https://www.academia.edu/3484981/The_Buddhist_notion_of_transcending_the_world> (accessed 28 August 2016).

Heim, Maria. *The Forerunner of All Things: Buddhaghosa on Mind, Intention, and Agency*. Oxford, 2014.

Holt, John C. *Discipline: The Canonical Buddhism of the Vinayaṭaka*. South Asia Books, 1983.

Horner, Isaline B. (trans.). *The Book of Discipline (Vinayaṭaka)*. *Sacred Books of the Buddhists* IV. Oxford University Press, 1938–1952.

Kulke, Hermann and Dietmar Rothermund. *A History of India*. Routledge, (1986) 1990.

Lamotte, Étienne. (trans. Sara Webb-Boin). *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śaka Era*. Peeters Press, 1988.

_____. “Passions and Impregnations of the Passions in Buddhism.” In *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, edited by L. Cousins, A. Kunst, and K.R. Norman, 91–104. Dordrecht, 1974.

Luo Hong 罗鸿. “The Recensions of Guṇaprabha’s *Vinayasūtra*—Towards an Editorial Policy for the Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text.” In *Annali: Rivista del Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici e del Dipartimento di Studi e Ricerche su Africa e Paesi Arabi* 67. Università degli Studi di Napoli L’Orientale, 2011, pp. 171–186.

_____. “A Brief Survey of the Tibetan Translation of the *Vinayasūtra* in the ‘Dul Ba’i Mdo’i ‘Grel Pa: In the Light of the Sanskrit Manuscripts of the *Vinayasūtra*.” In *Buddhist and Pali Studies in Honour of The Venerable Professor Kakkapalliye Anuruddha*, edited by K.L. Dhammajoti and Y. Karunadasa, 299–341. The University of Hong Kong, 2009a.

_____. “A Preliminary Report on a Newly Identified Sanskrit Manuscript of the *Vinayasūtra* from Tibet.” In *Sanskrit Manuscripts in China: Proceedings of a Panel at the 2008 Beijing Seminar on Tibetan Studies*,

October 13 to 17, edited by Ernst Steinkellner, in cooperation with Duan Qing and Helmut Krasser, 195–224. China Tibetology Publishing House, 2009b.

_____. “德光律師考略.” A Brief Investigation of the Vinaya Master Guṇaprabha.” *South Asia Research 南亚研究* 2, 2008, pp. 69–77.

_____. “A Study of the Pravrajyāvastu of the *Vinayasūtra* 德光《律经出家事》研究.” PhD diss., Peking University, 2007.

Nāgārjuna. 大智度論摘譯, 大智度論卷二. 畢陵伽婆磋與恆河神. Excerpts from the *Treatise on the Great Perfection of Wisdom*, “Pilindavatsa and the Ganges River Spirit” (T25.71a17–29 [fasc.2]). 龍樹菩薩著 Written by Bodhisattva Nāgārjuna, 姚秦三藏法師鳩摩羅什中譯 Translated into Chinese by Tripiṭaka Master Kumārajīva of the Yaoqin dynasty 法友英譯 Translated into English by Dharmamitra. Online. Available HTTP: <<http://www.drbachinese.org/vbs/publish/353/vbs353p024.htm>> (accessed 4 August 2016).

Nance, Richard F. *Speaking for Buddhas: Scriptural Commentary in Indian Buddhism*. Columbia University Press, 2012.

_____. “Indian Buddhist Preachers Inside and Outside the Sūtras.” *Religion Compass*, Vol. 2, no. 2, 2008, pp. 134–159, 10.1111/j.1749–8171.2007.00057.x

Nietupski, Paul. “Guṇaprabha’s *Vinayasūtra* Corpus: Texts and Contexts,” *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies*, Vol. 5, December 2009, pp. 1–17.

_____. “Atha niryāṇavṛttam: Reflections on the first sūtra and the opening passages of Guṇaprabha’s *Vinayasūtra* and Autocommentary—With reference to Indian and Tibetan commentaries,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 35, no. 1–2, 2012 (2013), pp. 225–258.

Norman, K.R. *Pāli Literature*. Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.

Phra Prayudh Payutto. *Buddhadhamma: Natural Laws and Values for Life*. Trans. Grant Olson. SUNY Press, 1995.

Sullivan, Brenton. “Monastic Customaries [bca’ yig] and the Promotion of Dge lugs Scholasticism in A Mdo and Beyond.” *Asian Highlands Perspectives*, Vol. 36, 2015, pp. 82–105; 301–332. Online. Available HTTP: <https://archive.org/download/AHP36MappingTheMonguor/AHP%2036%20Brenton%20Sullivan.%202015.%20Monastic%20Customaries.pdf> (accessed 26 July 2016).

Silber, Ilana Friedrich. *Virtuosity, charisma, and social order: A comparative sociological study of monasticism in Theravada Buddhism and medieval Catholicism*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Thapar, Romila. *A History of India*, Vol. 1. Penguin, (1966) 1990.

Tseng, Bhikṣuṇī Vinītā (Vinita Tseng 自運). *A unique collection of twenty sutras in a Sanskrit manuscript from the Potala: Editions and translation [Sanskrit texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region 7]*. Two volumes. China Tibetology Publishing House/Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences, 2010.

Upasak, C.S., *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms*. Bharati Prakashan, 1975.

Wiltermuth, Scott S. and Chip Heath, “Synchrony and Cooperation,” *Psychological Science*, Vol. 20, no. 1, 2009, pp. 1–5.

Yonezawa, Yoshiyasu. *Introduction to the Facsimile Edition of a Collection of Sanskrit Palm-leaf Manuscripts in Tibetan dBu med Script*. The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taishō University, 2001.