

# JIABS

Journal of the International  
Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 26 Number 1 2003

<i>In Memoriam Professor Akira HIRAKAWA</i> by Kotabo FUJIIA.....	3
Paul M. HARRISON <i>Relying on the Dharma and not the Person: Reflection on authority and Transmission in Buddhism and Buddhist Studies</i> .....	9
Colette CAILLAT <i>Gleanings from a Comparative Reading of Early Canonical Buddhist and Jaina Texts</i> .....	25
Robert H. SHARF <i>Thinking through Shingon Ritual</i> .....	51
Giulio AGOSTINI <i>On the Nikāya Affiliation of the Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha and the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā</i> .....	97
Mario D'AMATO <i>Can all Beings Potentially Attain Awakening? Gotra-theory in the Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra</i> .....	115
Dan ARNOLD <i>Candrakīrti on Dignāga on Svalakṣaṇas</i> .....	139
Carmen MEINERT <i>Structural Analysis of the bSam gtan mig sgron. A Comparison of the Fourfold Correct Practice in the Āryāvikalpapraveśanāmadhāraṇī and the Contents of the four Main Chapters of the bSam gtan mig sgron</i>	175
Notes on the Contributors.....	197

ON THE *NIKĀYA* AFFILIATION  
OF THE ŚRĪGHANĀCĀRASANĠRAHA  
AND THE SPHUṬĀRTHĀ  
ŚRĪGHANĀCĀRASANĠGRAHAṬĪKĀ

GIULIO AGOSTINI

The Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha is a Sanskrit text in verses on the conduct of Buddhist novices. It is extant only in the form of quotations found in a commentary on it, the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā, written by Jayarakṣita<sup>1</sup>. The name of the author of the verses is unknown<sup>2</sup>. Jayarakṣita mentions three other commentators<sup>3</sup> who worked on the same verses, but their commentaries are not extant. The Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha was therefore an important text for at least one monastic community.

According to Singh, “the text probably belongs to the Mahāsāṅghika school”<sup>4</sup>, because of the following passage<sup>5</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> The text was first edited in 1968 by Sanghasena. In 1983 the same scholar (as Sanghasen Singh) republished the same text (with different pagination), adding a translation and a reconstruction of the original verses. In this paper I always refer to this edition as Singh 1983. In the same year, Derrett published his own translation, based on the 1968 edition and on a microfilm (Derrett 1983: 5, n. 1). The two translations are independent from one another.

<sup>2</sup> Derrett (1983: 6) took the term *śrīghana* as the “pen-name” of a “*vinaya* specialist” who authored the verses. He knew (ib.: 14, n. 3) that according to lexical sources this term may be applied to *buddhas* (add now examples in Handurukande 2000: 6 and in inscriptions from the eleventh century in Tsukamoto 1996-1998: I 154, 200). Derrett (1983: 14, n. 3) even regarded it “as quite possible that Jayarakṣita really believed a Buddha called Śrīghana wrote the verses!” However, the term *śrīghana* is used in the text in the meaning of ‘novice’ (Singh 1983: 3-4). In 1961 Singh, too (paper re-published in Singh 1983: “Appendix i”, p. 241), had taken the term *śrīghana* as the name of the author, but in the same year he pointed out that this term in the text merely refers to novices (paper in Pāli of 1961, published as Singh 1974 and again as Singh 1983: “Appendix ii”). Shimoda (1990: 495) also took *śrīghana* as meaning ‘novice’.

<sup>3</sup> *bhadanta* Parahitagoṣa, *bhadanta* Prajñāsīrṅha, and *bhadanta* Dharmāvalokitamitra (Singh 1983: 57, 63, 119 = ff. 19a, 28b, 93b).

*yadi kaścit āgatyāgantukaḥ samavasthāniṣaṇṇam a[bhivādayati], tadānena vaktavyam ... katamas te nikāyaḥ, kati ca tasya nikāyasya bhedaḥ ... so 'pi yadi āryamahāsāṅghiko bhavati tadānena vācyam āryamahāsāṅghiko 'smi / tasya ced bhedaḥ*  
*vādinaś cārthasiddhārthāḥ śailadvayanivāsinaḥ /*  
*bhādrāyanā haimavatāḥ ṣaḍbheda mūlasāṅghikāḥ / /*

If any arriving [ascetic] addresses one settled and seated, then the latter should say to him: "... Which is your *nikāya*? How many divisions are there in your *nikāya*? ..." And if he is an Ārya-Mahāsāṅghika, then he should say: "I am an Ārya-Mahāsāṅghika". Here are their divisions: 1. Vādins, 2. Ārthasiddhārthas, 3. 4. Śailadvayanivāsins, 5. Bhādrāyanas, and 6. Haimavata; the Mūlasāṅghikas are divided into six [*nikāyas*].

Derrett, however, made a distinction between the original verses, which constitute the Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha, and the prose commentary by Jayaraṣita. According to Derrett, the passage quoted above is merely evidence that the commentator "Jayaraṣita is evidently interested in the Mahāsāṅghikas but it has been doubted whether he did appertain to that sect"<sup>6</sup>. As for the author of the verses, Derrett's "impression" is that he "worked for all *nikāyas*, and deliberately eschewed allegiance to any" (ib.). Therefore, I assume, Derrett did not think that the verse quoted above belongs to the *mūla* text, but implied that it is a mnemonic *śloka* produced by Jayaraṣita himself, and indeed Singh did not use it in his reconstruction of the *mūla* verses<sup>7</sup>. Derrett also noticed that the author of the verses refers to a sequence of the ten precepts unknown to any other school, including the Mahāsāṅghikas<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Singh 1983: 7. In a later article (id.: 1986), the work is Mahāsāṅghika in the title, but only "probably" so in the text (ib.: 6). Singh (1983: 7) also maintained that "the word 'saṅvara' [sic] for the conduct of a 'śrāmaṇera' " implies Mahāyāna, but it doesn't. The only Mahāyāna element is the mention of Mañjuśrī in the *maṅgalaślokas* (ib.: 45).

<sup>5</sup> Singh 1983: 119-120. Translation as in Derrett (1983: 80-81; slightly modified).

<sup>6</sup> Derrett 1983: 7. He refers to Ejima (1976: 918-919). Following Ejima, Yuyama, in his survey of Vinaya literature (1979: 39-40), classifies Jayaraṣita's commentary as a Mahāsāṅghika text, but adds a question mark. However, Shimoda (1990: 492, n. 4) notices that Ejima does not give any reason for doubting a Mahāsāṅghika affiliation.

<sup>7</sup> According to Derrett (1983: 6, 82), the original verses numbered 102. According to Singh (1983: 219 and 239, n. 128), they numbered 200, although this figure does not need to indicate the exact number (ib.: 286). Both rely on the expression *śatadvayeneti* (Singh 1983: 121). Singh tries to reconstruct exactly two hundred verses in his "Appendix vi" (ib.: 289-313). Shimoda (1990: 495-494) agrees with Singh.

More recently Masahiro Shimoda, disagreeing with Derrett, has sought to prove the Mahāsāṅghika affiliation of the commentator, Jayarakṣita<sup>9</sup>. By comparing passages from the section on theft (*adattādāna*) in Jayarakṣita's commentary and in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, Shimoda was able to show that both texts agree very much in terms of contents, although the agreement "is not word for word"<sup>10</sup>. This result, based only on this section, led him to conclude that Jayarakṣita's work must be a summary from the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya<sup>11</sup>.

Shimoda's arguments are not conclusive. He did not explain why the order of the ten precepts in Jayarakṣita's work is different from the one in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya. Also, he only examined one section of the commentary to the Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha, a section that does not contain any *verbatim* quotations from the Vinaya. Therefore, he only showed that Jayarakṣita knew a Vinaya which is *similar* to the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya. We do not know yet if it was *identical* to it. For, similarity does not entail identity, as it is known for example that two texts belonging to the Lokottaravādins, the Bhikṣuṅī-Vinaya and the Abhisamācārika-Dharma, are similar, but not identical to the corresponding sections of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya. Moreover, Shimoda did not disprove Derrett's contention that the author of the verses "worked for all *nikāyas*, and deliberately eschewed allegiance to any". For, Shimoda only worked on Jayarakṣita's commentary, not on the verses<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> Derrett 1983: 8, where a comparative table of the ten precepts is given. Jayarakṣita's sequence of the ten precepts is as follows (Singh 1983: 51-52): 1. killing, 2. stealing, 3. sexual intercourse, 4. lying, 5. drinking liquor, 6. high beds and seats, 7. dancing, singing, and playing music, 8. perfumes, garlands, and unguents, 9. eating at the wrong time, 10. taking gold and silver. The greater part of the text is made of ten sections on each of the ten precepts. If one exchanges item 6 with item 8, the result is the sequence of the Mahāsāṅghikas, of the Dharmaguptakas (who add suicide as the eleventh precept), and of the Abhidharmakośa (see Derrett 1983: 8).

<sup>9</sup> Shimoda 1990. See also Shimoda 1987, where the text is taken to be a Mahāsāṅghika commentary on the ten precepts.

<sup>10</sup> Shimoda 1990: 494.

<sup>11</sup> Shimoda 1990: 495. Prebish (1994: 60-61) seems to follow Shimoda and classifies Jayarakṣita's work as a Mahāsāṅghika text.

<sup>12</sup> Shimoda 1990: 495.

Here I shall present evidence to determine whether both the author of the verses and Jayarakṣita refer to one and the same Vinaya, and to indicate how close this Vinaya was to the Mahāsārngghika Vinaya, extant in Chinese.

## I

Jayarakṣita comments on five items that define homicide and that were mentioned by the author of the verses in the following order: 1. *upakrama* (taking a weapon, etc.), 2. *nṛsaṃjñā* (the idea that one is a man), 3. *nara* (there is man), 4. *vadhakacetanā* (there is the intention of killing), and 5. *jīvitasya kṣaya* (destruction of life)<sup>13</sup>. We are not told whether these terms occur in the Vinaya. Jayarakṣita complains that some “stupid” (*mandadhīyaḥ*) fellows misread the verse: they read *nare vadhakacetanā* instead of the correct *naro vadhakacetanā*. Since the verse in question is about a list of five items in the nominative case, the wrong reading would yield a list of four items only, and the Vinaya would be “curtailed”<sup>14</sup>. Therefore, Jayarakṣita has to justify his reading by quoting an analogous list, not exactly the same one, from his Vinaya<sup>15</sup>:

*eṣa hi vinaye nirdeśaḥ / 1. prāṇī ca bhavati, 2. prāṇisaṃjñī ca bhavati, 3. vadhakacittaṅ ca pratyupasthitam bhavati, 4. upakramaṅ ca karoti, 5. jīvitāt vyavaropito bhavati iyatā prāṇātipātī bhavati /*

For, this is the explanation in the Vinaya: “There is a breathing being. One is conscious that it is a breathing being. A thought of killing is present. One starts to act. One is deprived of life. To this extent is one a killer of a breathing being”.

This passage in itself is probably pan-Buddhist. For example, parallel passages occur in Theravāda commentaries<sup>16</sup>. The style, moreover, has the

<sup>13</sup> *ebhir aṅgair manuṣyavadho bhāvatīti darśayan parāṃś codayann āha / upakrama ityādi / tatra śastrādiḡgahaṅam upakramaḥ / manuṣyoyam iti saṃjñā nṛsaṃjñā / kadācid upakramaṅ karoti nṛsaṃjñā bhavati na tv asau manuṣya ity āha / nara iti / yady asau manuṣyo bhavati / kadācid etāni trīṅy aṅgāni sambhavanti, na vadhakacetaneti / ato vadhacetanāvacaṅam / kadācid ... na tu jīvitāt vyaparopayati / ata āha / jīvitasya kṣayaś ceti* (Singh 1983: 59).

<sup>14</sup> *nare vadhakacetaneti saptamyantaṅ paṭhanti / teṣāṅ pañcāṅgāni na siddhyanti nare vadhakacetanety asya pādasyaikāṅgatvāt / vinayaś ca tair vilopito bhavati* (Singh 1983: 59).

<sup>15</sup> Singh 1983: 59.

<sup>16</sup> See references in Saddhātissa 1970: 89, n. 1.

flavor of a later scholastic elaboration<sup>17</sup>. Of all extant Vinayas, only the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya has anything similar. Here, both the section on the third *pārājika* (killing human beings) and the section on the sixty-first *pātayantika* (killing animals)<sup>18</sup> include comparable lists. In the section on the third *pārājika* we read<sup>19</sup>:

If one fulfills five conditions and kills a man, one commits a *pārājika* offence:  
1. a man, 2. the idea of a man, 3. starting to find a means [to kill], 4. the thought of killing, 5. cutting off the life [of a man]. These are called the five conditions.

In the section on the sixty-first *pātayantika* we read<sup>20</sup>:

If a monk is possessed of five *dharmas* and cuts off the life of an animal, [he is guilty of a] *pātayantika* offence. What five? [1.] An animal, [2.] the idea of an animal, [3.] the thought of killing, [4.] arising of bodily action, [5.] cutting off the faculty of life. These are called the five *dharmas*.

The Sanskrit list mentioned by author of the verses agrees with the Chinese list from the *pārājika* section, but the order is different. It is impossible to know whether the author of the verses took these terms directly from a Vinaya. Jayarakṣita, who is quoting a Vinaya, mentions a list that corresponds to the Chinese one from the *pātayantika* section, in the same order. For, he uses the word *prāṇin* (畜生, ‘animal’), not *nyānara* (人, ‘man’). Given that Jayarakṣita’s context is ‘killing human beings’, it is strange that he does not quote the passage from the pertinent section, using the same terms that the author of the verses used. Perhaps, Jayarakṣita’s Vinaya did not list these five items in the section on killing human beings, and therefore Jayarakṣita quotes an analogous list from the section on killing animals. On the basis of this comparison,

<sup>17</sup> So Gombrich (1984: 99), referring to the analogous list in the Pāli commentaries.

<sup>18</sup> I use the Sanskrit *pātayantika* instead of any middle Indic form for convenience of reference with the comparative table of the monastic precepts published by Rosen (1959: 42-49).

<sup>19</sup>

有五事具足殺人犯波羅夷。何等五。一者人。二者人想。三者興方便。四者殺心。五者斷命。是名五事。(T.1425 XXII 257c3-5).

<sup>20</sup> 若比丘成就五法斷畜生命。波夜提。何等五。畜生。畜生想。殺心。起身業。命根斷。是名五 (T.1425 XXII 378a24-25).

Jayarakṣita's Vinaya was similar to the Mahāsārngghika Vinaya, but perhaps it was not identical to it.

## II

Jayarakṣita refers to his Vinaya also in the context of *śukravisṛṣṭi*, 'emission of semen'. This is an offence, unless it occurs in a dream. Jayarakṣita continues<sup>21</sup>:

*pañca svapnāḥ vinaye uktāḥ / satyasvapno yathā bodhisattvena dṛṣṭaḥ, alīkasvapno yathā dṛṣṭaḥ tathā na bhavaty alīkaṃ mṛṣeti kṛtvā, acīrṇasvapno yat satatakaraṇīyaṃ vastu dṛśyate, anantasvapno yaḥ sakalāṃ rātriṃ dṛśyate na paricchidyate, svapnasvapno yaḥ svapna evānyaḥ svapno dṛśyate /*

Five [kinds of] dreams are mentioned in the Vinaya:

1. A truthful dream as seen by a *bodhisattva*.
2. A false dream. [A real occurrence] is not the same as it is seen [in a dream], taking 'false' as 'deceitful'.
3. An unfulfilled dream. Something is seen that remains to be done.
4. A ceaseless dream, which is seen during the entire night and is not interrupted.
5. A dream in a dream, i.e. another dream which is seen within the very same dream.

Only the Mahāsārngghika Vinaya, in the corresponding section, mentions five types of dreams. Still, there are some differences<sup>22</sup>:

夢者有五種。何等五。一者實夢。二者不實夢。三者不明了夢。四者夢中夢。五者先想而後夢。是為五。何者實夢。所謂如來為菩薩時。見五種夢如實不異。是名實夢。不實夢者。若人見夢覺不實。是名不實夢。不明了夢者。如其夢不記前後中間。是謂不明了夢。夢中夢者如見夢即於夢中為人說夢。是名夢中夢。先想而後夢者。如書所作想夜便輒夢。是名先想後夢。

<sup>21</sup> Singh 1983: 92. My translation is mainly based on Derrett (1983: 56), and less on Singh (1983: 186-187). The Pāli Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā in the same context mentions four dreams: *aññatra supinantā ti ettha supino eva supinanto, taṃ ṭhapetvā apanetvā ti vuttaṃ hoti. taṃ ca pana supinaṃ passanto catūhi kāraṇehi passati dhātukkobbhato vā anubhūtapubbato vā devatopasamhārato, vā pubbanimittato vā ti* (Samantapāsādikā III 520 = T.1462 XXIV 760a2-...).

<sup>22</sup> T.1425 XXII 263b8-16.

There are five types of dreams. What five? 1. A truthful dream, 2. an untruthful dream, 3. an unclear dream, 4. a dream in a dream, and 5. dreaming later what someone has thought of earlier. These are the five.

1. What is a truthful dream? The Tathāgata, when he was a *bodhisattva*, saw five dreams [which were] not different from the truth. This is called a truthful dream.
2. Untruthful dream: if a man sees a dream and, when he wakes up, it is not true. This is called an untruthful dream.
3. An unclear dream: if one does not remember the beginning, the end, and the middle part of one's dream.
4. A dream in a dream: if a man sees a dream, and then in [that] dream he tells a dream to [other] men, this is called a dream in a dream.
5. As for dreaming later what one has thought of earlier, if one dreams at night what has been done and thought during the day, this is called 'dreaming later what one has thought of earlier'.

Jayarakṣita's first and second types correspond to the first and the second ones of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya. But, Jayarakṣita's fifth type corresponds to the fourth one of the Mahāsāṃghika passage. Jayarakṣita's third and fourth types do not correspond to any type in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya. Therefore, from this passage it appears that Jayarakṣita's Vinaya was similar, but not identical to the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya.

### III

Jayarakṣita teaches how a junior monk should salute a senior one. In this context, he says<sup>23</sup>: *tasyāṃ jaṅghāyāṃ muṇḍe[na] sphoṭaṃ na dadyāt / kīṃ ivety āha / avinā yathā*, "one [a junior monk] should not make a smacking sound with the shaven head against the lower legs [of a senior monk] (...). Like what? « As by a sheep »"<sup>24</sup> The words *avinā yathā* are part of the original verses, as they are introduced by *āha*. Jayarakṣita goes on to say that *bhadanta* Avalokitamitra read *ravinā yathā* (ib.). He is wrong, says Jayarakṣita, because "in the Vinaya only the example of a ram is

<sup>23</sup> Singh 1983: 119.

<sup>24</sup> Derrett 1983: 80. Skr. *sphoṭa* also means 'boil'. Although it is difficult to see how this meaning could fit into this sentence, boils are part of the context, as it is clear from the passages quoted below.

given”, *vinaye meḍhakasyaiva dṛṣṭāntadānāt*<sup>25</sup>. Therefore, one should find this example in the Mahāsāṅghika or related Vinayas.

As Derrett noticed<sup>26</sup>, this entire section is very close to a passage from a canonical Vinaya text extant in hybrid Sanskrit, the Abhisamācārika-Dharma of the Lokottaravādins. The Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya also has a corresponding chapter on rules of deportment (威儀法), which often runs exactly as the Lokottaravādin chapter. I now present two parallel passages from both Vinayas, where the example of the ram occurs. I divide both passages into four paragraphs. For each paragraph I quote the Chinese of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, my translation of it, and the Sanskrit from the Lokottaravādin Vinaya. I shall then point out any correspondence with the wording of the Vinaya quoted by the author of Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha and by Jayarakṣita<sup>27</sup>.

1.

不得覆頭覆右肩著革屣作禮。“One may not, covering the head, covering the right shoulder, wearing leather shoes, make a salutation”.

*na kṣamati / oḡuṅṭhitakāyena na kṣamati / ohitahastena na kṣamati / upāna-hārūḍhena sāmīcīkarentena*

2.

不得禮膝禮腳禮脛。當接足禮。“One may not revere the knees, revere the legs, revere the shins. One should revere by touching the feet”.

*na kṣamati / jānukena vā jaṅghāhi vā vanditum / atha khalu pādā vanditavyā /*

3.

受禮人不得如啞羊不語。當相問訊。“The man who receives the salutation may not keep silent like a dumb sheep. He should reply with polite questions”.

*na dāni meṅḍhena viya āsitavyaṃ pādehi vandayantehi / atha khalu pratī-sāṃmodayitavyaṃ /* [in the original text this paragraph is the fourth one]

4.

若前人腳上有瘡。當護勿撻觸。“If the person in front has a boil on the foot, one should take care not to hit it with the head”.

*pādāṃ vandantena jānitavyaṃ / yadi kasyaci vraṇā bhavati / gaṅḍo vā piṭṭako vā na dāni sahasā utpīḍitavyaṃ / athā khalu tathā vanditavyaṃ yathā*

<sup>25</sup> Derrett 1983: 80. For *meḍhaka* cf. Sanskrit *meṅḍha(ka)* and Pāli *meṅḍa*.

<sup>26</sup> Derrett 1983: 80 nn. 4, 5, 9.

<sup>27</sup> Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, T.1425 XXII 510b18-21; Lokottaravādin Vinaya, Abhisamācārika-Dharma (Abhisamācārika-Dharma Study Group 1998: 120; I keep the *daṅḍas*, although they do not make much sense).

*na duḥkhāpiye pādehi vandayantehi* / [in the original text this paragraph is the third one]

As for the first paragraph, cfr. Jayarakṣita<sup>28</sup>:

*idānīm tu yādṛgvidhāvasthāvasthitena navakena yatinā na vanditavyam,  
tathā darśayitum āha / avaguṇṭhitetyādi / avaguṇṭhitam pidhitam śīrṣam  
śīro yasya yateḥ tena ... / ... sopānatkaḥ tena upānahārūḍhenety arthaḥ /*

This passage shows that the author of the verses used the term *avaguṇṭhitaśīrṣeṇa*, ‘by [a cleric] whose head is covered/veiled’. This term is similar, but not identical to the Lokottaravādin term *oguṇṭhitakāyena*, ‘by [a cleric] whose body is covered/veiled’. The reading of the author of the verses better corresponds to the Chinese Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya phrase “covering the head”. As for the Lokottaravādin term *upānahārūḍhena*, “by one who wears sandals”, the author of the verses used the synonym *sopānatkena*, probably *metri causa*, but Jayarakṣita clearly refers to the original reading. The Chinese phrase “wearing leather shoes” may correspond to both terms.

As for the second paragraph, cfr. Jayarakṣita: *jānu ca jānu ca jānunī,  
taylor jānuyor yā jaṅghā tasyām jaṅghāyām muṇḍe[na] sphoṭam na dadyāt* (ib.). This passage shows that the author of the verses used the terms *jānu* and *jaṅghā*, ‘knee’ and ‘shin’, found in both the Mahāsāṃghika and Lokottaravādin Vinayas.

As for the third paragraph, cfr. Jayarakṣita: *kim ivety āha / avinā yathā /  
avir meṣaḥ / yathā avinā meṇḍakena dvayor jānunor jaṅghāyām hanyate,  
tadvad yatir api vṛddhāntikasya yater jaṅghāyām na vandeteti yāvat / ...  
vinaye meḍhakasyāiva dṛṣṭāntadānāt* (ib.). This passage shows that the author of the verses used the word *avi*, ‘sheep’, but this term according to Jayarakṣita is only a substitute for the Vinaya reading *meḍhaka*, ‘ram’. This Vinaya term is indeed found in the Lokottaravādin Vinaya, in the form *meṇḍha*<sup>29</sup>. A similar word, if not the same one, was in front of the Chinese translators<sup>30</sup>. Therefore, Jayarakṣita’s Vinaya seems to be close

<sup>28</sup> Singh 1983: 119.

<sup>29</sup> Jinānanda (1969: 125), however, reads *merāṭena*, which he emends into *śraṣṭhena*. Prasad (1984: 134) follows this emendation in his paraphrasis and takes it as meaning ‘banker’: “The senior monk whose feet are to be greeted is not to sit like a banker”.

<sup>30</sup> 如啞羊, ‘like a dumb sheep’. According to the Mvy (7684), the similar Chinese phrase 啞如羊 translates *eḍamūka*, ‘dumb like a sheep’ (Tibetan *lug ltar lkug pa*), which is also

to both the Mahāsāṃghika and Lokottaravādin Vinayas. But, in an important point the Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha and its commentary differ from both of them. In the Mahāsāṃghika and Lokottaravādin Vinayas, it is the cleric who receives the salutation who should not be “dumb like sheep”, i.e. he should not keep silent, but should say some polite words. More awkward is Jayarakṣita’s understanding of his own Vinaya, in consonance with the author of the verses: it is the junior cleric who makes the salutation who should not hit with his head — like a sheep or a ram - the shins of the senior cleric. It is difficult to decide whether this understanding is based on a different wording of Jayarakṣita’s Vinaya or on a misinterpretation of it. *Bhadanta* Dharmāvalokitamitra, as shown above, read *ravi*, ‘sun’, instead of *avi*, ‘sheep’, probably because he did not know how to interpret the example of the ‘sheep’<sup>31</sup>. Therefore, the correct understanding of the example of the sheep was indeed a problem. Perhaps an examination of the fourth and last paragraph will shed some light on this.

As for the fourth paragraph, cfr. Jayarakṣita: *yadā samavasthāniṣaṅṅo yatih pādarogeṇa glānaḥ syāt ...*<sup>32</sup>. Jayarakṣita here is not quoting, but only referring to a passage close to the last paragraph from both the Mahāsāṃghika and Lokottaravādin Vinayas, quoted above. This shows that Jayarakṣita’s Vinaya had a passage corresponding, in some form, to that paragraph. The order of the last two paragraphs in both Vinayas is the opposite of the one found in Jayarakṣita. In the Lokottaravādin Vinaya the last two paragraphs follow each other as follows:

*pādām vandantena jānitavyam / yadi kasyaci vraṇā bhavati / gaṇḍo vā piṭako vā na dāni sahasā utpīḍitavyam / athā khalu tathā vanditavyam yathā na duḥkhāpiye pādehi vandayantehi / [new paragraph] na dāni meṇḍhena viya āsitavyam pādehi vandayantehi / atha khalu pratisaṃmodayitavyam /*

attested in the form *eḍakamūka* and corresponds to Pāli *eḷamūga*. See BHSD s.vv. *eḍakamūka* and *eḍamūka*.

<sup>31</sup> According to Derrett’s emendation and translation, Dharmāvalokitamitra’s explanation is that “Just as the sun is not to be saluted (?) by one wearing shoes [...] so an ascetic who has his shoes on should not salute” (Derrett 1983: 80, corresponding to Singh 1983: 119).

<sup>32</sup> Singh 1983: 119.

[... the feet must be revered]. [The cleric] who reveres the feet must know if some [cleric in front of him] has a boil, or a pimple, or a blister [on a foot]. He must not inconsiderately squeeze it, but he must revere [the feet] so as not to cause pain while the feet are being revered. [new paragraph] [The cleric who is being revered] must not sit like a ram, while his feet are being revered, but should make a salutation in return.

It is possible that the author of the verses and Jayarakṣita had in mind this paragraph order, and that they construed *na dāni meṇḍhena viya* with the preceding paragraph: *tathā vanditavyaṃ yathā na duḥkhāpiye pādehi vandayantehi / na dāni meṇḍhena viya*, “the salutation must be made so as not to cause pain while the feet are being revered, not as if [it were made] by a ram”. To be sure, the word *dāni* does not allow such a construction, but one does not need to assume that Jayarakṣita had the word *dāni* in his mind or in his Vinaya. This construction would explain why the author of the verses and Jayarakṣita compare the junior cleric to a ram that hits the shins, as opposed to comparing the senior cleric to a ram that merely keeps silent.

In short, a comparison with these four paragraphs has shown that: 1. the Vinaya quoted or implied by the author of the Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha and by Jayarakṣita was generically similar to both the Mahāsāṅghika and the Lokottaravādin Vinayas; 2. the term *avaḅḅhitaśirṣeṇa*, used by the author of the verses, is found in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, not in the Lokottaravādin Vinaya; 3. the author of the verses and Jayarakṣita’s understanding of the example of the ram/sheep is at variance with both the Mahāsāṅghika and the Lokottaravādin Vinayas, but could be based on the word order of the Lokottaravādin Vinaya, or of a similar one; 4. the author of the verses and Jayarakṣita had in mind the same Vinaya, contrary to what Derrett thought.

#### IV

Another passage shows that not only Jayarakṣita, but also the author of the verses depends on the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya or on a very similar one. It occurs in the section on ‘false speech’ (*mṛṣāvāda*), which corresponds to the first *pātayantika* in the Vinaya. Jayarakṣita says that one becomes a liar (*mṛṣāvādin*) because of four elements (*aṅga*): 1. there is some matter; 2 there is a man who is aware that [something] is false; 3. his mind is directed toward [lying]; 4. he is aware that it is false speech;

5. he utters words<sup>33</sup>. A few lines below, Jayarakṣita adds that the last four, or the last three, or the last two, or even the very last *aṅga* are enough to define a liar<sup>34</sup>. From Jayarakṣita's quotations of the original verses, it appears that the author of the Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha himself referred to the same theory<sup>35</sup>. Of all extant Vinayas, only the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya has anything similar, although it might be based on a somewhat different terminology<sup>36</sup>:

有五法成就知而妄語。得波夜提罪。何等五。實有有想轉心背想異口說。... 有四法成就。... 三法 ... 二法 ... 一法 ... 知而妄語。波夜提。

If one, being possessed of five *dharmas*, consciously lies, one incurs a *pātayantika* offence. What five? 1. there really is [such and such matter], 2. awareness that there is [such and such matter], 3. one turns his mind [to it], 4. awareness of disobeying [a precept], and 5. one utters words different [from the truth]. ... If one is possessed of four *dharmas* [i.e. the last four] ... three *dharmas* ... two *dharmas* ... one *dharma* ... and consciously lies, it is a *pātayantika* offence.

The Chinese renderings of some of these five items are not completely clear to me, as my translation shows, but they are clear enough to indicate the similarity with the five items mentioned by the author of the Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha and by Jayarakṣita.

## V

Jayarakṣita uses the technical term *arthotpatti*, which can be translated as ‘particular case’<sup>37</sup>. This term is peculiar to the Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya of the

<sup>33</sup> *katibhiḥ punar aṅgaiḥ mṛṣāvādī syād ity āha / vastu cety ādī ślokaḥ / vastu ca bhavati, alīkasamjñī ca bhavati, vinihitam cittam bhavati, mṛṣāvādasamjñī bhavati, vācam ca bhāṣate* (Singh 1983: 99).

<sup>34</sup> *na kevalam pañcabhir aṅgaiḥ samprajānamṛṣāvādo bhavati, kin tu hy ekenāpīti darśayam āha / catuṣṭrīty ādī / ... tatra caturbhir aṅgaiḥ mṛṣāvādī bhavati / alīkasamjñī cety ādī / alīkasamjñītena vastunaḥ parigrahān na pṛthaṅ nirdīśyate ...* (similarly for the other *aṅgas*; Singh 1983: 100)

<sup>35</sup> See the reconstruction of *ślokas* 144-145 in Singh (1983: “Appendix vi”, p. 306) and the underlined words in the quotations given in the two preceding notes.

<sup>36</sup> T.1425 XXII 325b2-12.

<sup>37</sup> See Roth (1970: 109, §142, n. 1) and Nolot (1991: 376, n. 2). The former translates *arthotpatti* as the “arising of a particular case” (ib.), the latter as “cas particuliers” (ib.).

Lokottaravādins: after a story that leads to the promulgation of a precept, other stories follow which represent ‘particular cases’. An *arthopatti* does not constitute a separate precept. This term is conspicuously absent in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya.

Jayarakṣita has to comment on a verse that forbids a novice to drink water containing living beings and then on other verses that forbid a novice to use water containing living beings in order, for example, to water plants. An opponent says that the first verse is redundant, because it prohibits what is implicitly prohibited in the other verses<sup>38</sup>. Jayarakṣita defends the author of the verses as follows<sup>39</sup>: *kiñ cārthot-pattivaśān na likhitety adoṣaḥ arthotpattiprabhāvadvād vinayasyeti kṛtvā*, “furthermore, there is no fault that ‘[the verse] is not [to be] written because it is a special case’ [i.e. part of a precept], because the Vinaya is the source for [what should or should not be accepted as] special cases”. Even though my translation might need improvement<sup>40</sup>, it is clear that Jayarakṣita uses the term *arthopatti* in the same technical sense as found in the Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya of the Lokottaravādins. His point is that in the Vinaya itself the rule ‘not to drink water containing living beings’ is not an *arthopatti* contained in the section about the precept ‘not to use water containing living beings’. He and his readers knew that they are two different precepts<sup>41</sup>, and therefore one cannot fault the author of the Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha for devoting verses to both of them.

One does not need to assume that Jayarakṣita’s Vinaya contained the term *arthopatti*. Even though this term is not represented in the Chinese version of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, it could have been part of Mahāsāṃghika exegetical terminology. Therefore, Jayarakṣita’s mention

<sup>38</sup> *atha kimartham iyaṃ kārīkā pṛthag vyavasthāpyate? ... yatra hi sekaḥ pratiśidhyate sutarāṃ tatra pānapratiśedhaḥ* (Singh 1983: 62).

<sup>39</sup> Singh 1983: 62-63.

<sup>40</sup> Derrett (1983: 29; bracketed words are his own) translates: “Moreover there is no harm if it is written [del. *na*], so as to bring out the meaning, since the strength of the *vinaya* is its meaningfulness”. Singh (1983: 149) translates: “That is why, there is no fault (here in composing separately) taking into account that the Vinaya has got the effect of meaning some thing”. Both miss the technical meaning of *arthopatti*.

<sup>41</sup> *Pāṭayantika* 19 (about using water) and 51 (about drinking water) in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya.

of the term *arthotpatti* does not exclude his affiliation to the Mahāsārngghikas and does not prove his affiliation to the Lokottaravādins.

## VI

Finally, we should notice the occurrence of term *bhikṣuvinaya*, ‘Vinaya of monks’. The commentator Jayarakṣita says that the original verses are merely “an excerpt from the *bhikṣuvinaya*”, and maybe the author of the verses himself had already used this term<sup>42</sup>. It is not a common term because it does not correspond to any section of the Vinayas of most schools<sup>43</sup>. The usual arrangement is: *vibhaṅga*, divided into *bhikṣuvibhaṅga* and *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*, and a section made of various chapters called *khandhakas* or *vastus*<sup>44</sup>. The Vinayas of the Mahāsārngghikas and of the related Lokottaravādins, however, have a different arrangement: the *bhikṣuvinaya* is made of a *bhikṣuvibhaṅga* with its own *prakīrṇaka* (corresponding to the *khandhakas* or *vastus*), and the *bhikṣuṇīvinaya* is made of a *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* with its own *prakīrṇaka*<sup>45</sup>. The Lokottaravādin *bhikṣuṇīvinaya* is indeed extant in Sanskrit. Therefore the term *bhikṣuvinaya* in Jayarakṣita’s commentary most probably refers to the appropriate section of the Mahāsārngghika Vinaya<sup>46</sup>, or of a similar one.

### Conclusions

The evidence so far presented clearly shows that the author of the Śrīghaṇācārasaṅgraha and its commentator Jayarakṣita knew the same

<sup>42</sup> *bhikṣuvinayāt samuddhṛtam acārāntaraṃ na tu svamanīṣikayānyat kṛtam iti darśayitum āha / vinaya iti* (Singh 1983: 121). According to Singh’s reconstruction, the entire compound *bhikṣuvinaya* was part of the original verse, although this is not certain (ib., “Appendix”, p. 313, *kārikā* 199).

<sup>43</sup> It occurs in the commentary to the Pāli Vinaya, but it refers to ‘discipline’, not to a section of the Pāli Vinaya: *vinayaṃ paccakkhāmi ti na vevacanena paccakkhānaṃ / bhikkhuvinayaṃ paccakkhāmi bhikkhuṇīvinayaṃ ... paccakkhāmi ti evam ādinā vinayavevacanena sikkhāpaccakkhānaṃ hoti* (Samantapāsādikā I 252).

<sup>44</sup> Hirakawa 1982: 14-15.

<sup>45</sup> Hirakawa 1982: 16-18. The Sarvāstivāda Vinaya also has a similar structure (ib.).

<sup>46</sup> As already suggested by Singh (1983: 238 n. 127).

Vinaya, but it does not definitely solve the problem of their precise *nikāya* affiliation. Their Vinaya appears to have been generally close to the Mahāsāṃghika and Lokottaravādin Vinayas, but in some details it differed from both of them. If one dismisses these differences as unimportant and due to the vagaries of the tradition or the imperfection of the Chinese translation, one will have to be generic on the *nikāya* affiliation of both the author of the verses and Jayarakṣita: they belonged either to the Mahāsāṃghikas or to any related *nikāya*. If one stresses the importance of these differences, one will have to maintain that both the author of the verses and Jayarakṣita were neither Mahāsāṃghikas nor Lokottaravādins, but belonged to a different *nikāya* related to the Mahāsāṃghikas.

I am inclined to give importance to these differences, because — as noted above — both the author of the verses and Jayarakṣita accept a sequence of the ten precepts unknown to any other *nikāya*. Derrett suggested that the author of the verses used this “curious order” intentionally, because he wanted to address all *nikāyas*<sup>47</sup>. However, I have shown that there is no reason to doubt that the author of verses and Jayarakṣita referred to one and the same Vinaya, and it is therefore more simple to suggest that also their unique sequence of the ten precepts belonged to one Vinaya school. While the Mahāsāṃghika sequence is known, the sequence adopted by any sub-schools is not<sup>48</sup>. Therefore, the available evidence strongly suggests that the author of the Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha and Jayarakṣita were

<sup>47</sup> Derrett 1983: 7.

<sup>48</sup> In principle, an unknown sequence of the ten precepts can be inferred from a known sequence of the eight precepts. For, the wording and order of the ten precepts taken by novices is very similar to the wording and order of the eight precepts taken by laypersons during fasting days: two precepts taken by novices — abstention from dancing etc. and abstention from perfumes etc. - correspond to one precept taken by laypersons; novices also abstain from taking gold and silver (see e.g. Gombrich 1991: 78). A short text on lay precepts, the 受十善戒經 (unknown *nikāya* affiliation), lists the eight precepts of the weekly fast in the following order: 一者不殺。二者不盜。三者不婬。四者不妄語。五者不飲酒。六者不坐高廣大床。七者不作倡伎樂故往觀聽。不著香薰衣。八者不過中食 (T.1486 XXIV 1023c29-1024a3). If one splits the seventh precept into two and adds the precept about gold and silver, the result is Jayarakṣita’s sequence. However, the same text, after the passage just quoted, adds some verses where the eight lay precepts are listed in a different order: 不殺亦不盜, 不婬不妄語, 遠酒避花香, 高床過中食 (ib. a5-6). From this order one can derive the list of the ten precepts of the Mahāsāṃghikas, of the Dharmaguptakas, and of the Abhidharmakośa (see table in Derrett 1983: 8).

not Mahāsāṃghikas, but belonged to a *nikāya* that was related to the Mahāsāṃghikas.

### References

- Abhisamācārika-Dharma Study Group 比丘威儀法研究会. 1998. 『大衆部説出世部律・比丘威儀法』梵文写本影印版手引/ *A Guide to the Facsimile Edition of the Abhisamācārika-Dharma of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin* (Tokyo: The Institute for Comprehensive Study of Buddhism, Taishō University).
- BHSD = Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary. Volume II: Dictionary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953). Reprints, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970 etc.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. 1983. *A Textbook for Novices: « Jayarakṣita's Perspicuous Commentary on the Compendium of Conduct by Śrīghana »* (Torino: Indologica Taurinensia) (Pubblicazioni di Indologica Taurinensia XV).
- Ejima, Yasunori 江島惠教. 1976. “Daishubukei ritten bonpon ni tsuite” 大衆部系律典梵本について [Some Observations on the Sanskrit Vinaya Texts of the Mahāsāṃghikas], in *Okuda Jiō Sensei Kiju Kinen “Bukkyō Shisō Ronshū”* 奥田慈應先生喜壽記念佛教思想論集 [Studies in Buddhist Thought Dedicated to Professor Jiō Okuda in Commemoration of His Seventy-Seventh Birthday] (Kyōto: Heirakuji Shoten 平樂寺書店), pp. 911-922.
- Gombrich, Richard. 1984. “Notes on the Brahminical Background to Buddhist Ethics”, in Gatare Dhammapala, Richard Gombrich, and K.R. Norman, *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Hammalava Saddhātissa* (Nugegoda, Sri Lanka: University of Sri Jayewardenepura), pp. 91-101.
- Gombrich, Richard. 1991. *Buddhist Precept and Practice. Traditional Buddhism in the Rural Highlands of Ceylon* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).
- Handurukande, Ratna. 2000. *Three Sanskrit Texts on Caitya Worship. In Relation to the Ahorātravrata*, an edition and synopses in English (with an introduction) (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies) (Studia Philologica Buddhica. Monograph Series XVI).
- Hirakawa, Akira. 1982. *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns: An English translation of the Chinese text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Jinānanda, B. 1969. *Abhisamācārikā [Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka]* (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute) (Tibetan Sanskrit works Series volume IX).
- Mvy = Sakaki, R. (ed.). 1916-1925. *Mahāvvyūtpatti*, part 1 & 2 (Kyoto) (Kyoto Imperial University Series 3).
- Nolot, Édith. 1991. *Règles de discipline des nonnes bouddhistes. Le Bhikṣuṇīvinaya de l'école Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*. Traduction

- annotée, commentaire, collation du manuscrit (Paris: Édition-Diffusion de Boccard) (Collège de France. Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne. Fascicule 60).
- Prasad, Maulichand. 1984. *A Comparative Study of Abhisamācārikā. Abhisamācārikā-Dharma-Vinaya of the Ārya Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādins and the Pali Vinaya of the Theravādins* (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute) (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series; No XXVI).
- Prebish, Charles S. 1994. *A Survey of Vinaya Literature* (Taipei: Jin Luen Publishing House) (The Dharma Lamp Series, Volume 1).
- Rosen, Valentina. 1959. *Der Vinayavibhaṅga zum Bhikṣuprātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins: Sanskritfragmente nebst einer Analyse der chinesischen Übersetzung* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag) (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Institut für Orientforschung. Nr. 27) (Sanskrit Texte aus den Turfanfunden II).
- Roth, Gustav. 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya. Including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādin*. Edited and annotated for the first time with *Introduction* and two *Indexes* (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute) (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series. Volume XII).
- Saddhātissa, Hammalawa. 1970. *Buddhist Ethics: Essence of Buddhism* (New York: George Braziller).
- Samantapāsādikā = J. Takakusu and M. Nagai, *Samanta-Pāsādikā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka*, 6 vols. (London: Pali Text Society, 1938-1966).
- Sanghasena. 1968. *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā* (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute) (Tibetan Sanskrit texts series, v. XI.). For a second edition by the same editor see Singh 1983.
- Shimoda, Masahiro 下田正弘. 1987. "Daishubukei shamikai no tekisuto ni tsuite" 大眾部系沙彌戒のテキストについて [A Note on the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā] *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 35, 2: 941(80)-939(82).
- Shimoda, Masahiro 下田正弘. 1990. "The Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā and the Chinese Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya", *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies) 39, 1: 495(11)-492(13).
- Singh, Sanghasen. 1974. "Sirighana-sadda-vīmaṁsā", *Buddhist Studies The Journal of the Department of Buddhist Studies, University of Delhi* 1: 101-103.
- Singh, Sanghasen. 1983. *A Study of the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha* (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayasawal Research Institute) (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series; No. XXIV). For a previous edition by the same editor see Sanghasena 1968.
- Singh, Sanghasen. 1986. "A Study of the Scriptural References and Comments in the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā of the Mahāsāṅghika Sect", *Buddhist Studies* (The Journal of the Department of Buddhist Studies, University of Delhi) 10: 1-6.

- T. = Takakusu, Junjirō and Kaigyoku Watanabe (eds.), 大正新修大藏經 *Taishō shinshū Daizokyo*, 55 vols. (Tōkyō: 1924-1929).
- Tsukamoto, Keishō 塚本啟祥. 1996-1998. *Indo bukkō himei no kenkyū* インド佛教碑銘の研究 [A comprehensive study of Indian Buddhist Inscriptions]. Part I: Text, note, wayaku [Text, notes and Japanese translation] (Kyōto: Heirakuji shoten, 1996). II: Sakuin, zuhan [Indices, maps and illustrations] (Kyōto: Heitakuji shoten, 1998).
- Yuyama, Akira. 1979. *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur - A systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature. Erster Teil: Vinaya Texte* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag).