

The Implications of Bu ston's (1290–1364) Doubts about the Authenticity of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha**

KISHINO Ryōji

Introduction

Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364), a Tibetan Buddhist monk who is well known as a polymath and prolific writer, wrote several works concerning the monastic law code (Tib. *'dul ba*; Skt. *vinaya*) that was brought from India to Tibet, i.e., the so-called *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Recently, it has become clearer that they may enable us to better understand this voluminous monastic code, and have therefore received the attention of Buddhist studies scholars, especially those who specialize in it. The *'Dul ba spyi'i rnam par gzhag pa* (“The General Presentation of the *Vinaya*”; 1357) is one of these works.¹⁾ As the title suggests, it includes brief overviews of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and related Indian texts about which Bu ston knew. In his overview of the **Vinaya-saṃgraha* (Chin. *Genbensapoduobu lüshe* 根本薩婆多部律攝 [T. 1458]; Tib. *'Dul ba bsdus pa* [Der. 4105²⁾], the handbook of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* attributed to *Viśeṣamitra (Chin. Shengyou 勝友; Tib. Khyad par bshes gnyen; no later than 7th century), Bu ston critically states that five *vinaya* issues mentioned in the handbook do not appear in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and Guṇaprabha's handbook, the *Vinaya-sūtra* (5th–7th century CE). He concludes that *Viśeṣamitra might have been confused or unfamiliar with the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and therefore dismisses the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* as unreliable. However, a close inspection of these five *vinaya* issues based on the now widely available recensions of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the *Vinaya-sūtra*, and the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* does not entirely support Bu ston's critical statement. There appears to be less disagreement than Bu ston claims between the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*/*Vinaya-sūtra* and the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*. In this paper, I will report the result of my investigation of Bu ston's critical statement about the five *vinaya* issues in the *'Dul ba spyi'i rnam par gzhag pa*, and conclude that his criticism of them is not always reasonable. Furthermore, I will discuss the significance of this discrepancy between Bu ston's and our understandings of these *vinaya* issues.

1. Bu ston's Nine Works on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and Its Related Indian Texts

Bu ston Rin chen grub is undoubtedly one of the most influential Tibetan monks who played an important role in the history of Tibetan Buddhism. His great influence on the traditions of Buddhist textual classification and transmission in general may be the most pronounced. Bu ston is well known for being an early compiler of a large collection of translated scholarly works of Indian Buddhist texts, which he designated as “*bsTan ’gyur*.”³⁾ It is also well known that he compiled detailed catalogues of various Buddhist texts on more than one occasion.⁴⁾ These labor-intensive works indicate that Bu ston had extensive knowledge of Buddhist texts. Since Bu ston composed several works on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, his knowledge clearly encompassed it as well.

There are six *vinaya* texts extant and available to us that are generally thought to be fully preserved and to have been connected with different schools.⁵⁾ The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is the only one of these six *vinaya* texts that was transmitted from India to two different cultural spheres: Chinese and Tibetan. It was translated in the 8th century CE into Chinese by Yijing 義淨 (635–713), and in the 9th century CE into Tibetan. Yijing’s Chinese translation has not come down to us completely, but the Tibetan translation is generally thought to be fully preserved.⁶⁾

The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is the most voluminous of the six extant *vinaya* texts.⁷⁾ Probably due to its enormous size, a large number of commentaries and handbooks made by medieval Indian monks have come down to us. Bu ston composed at least nine works apparently concerning the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and some related Indian texts. These nine works are available to us in *The Collected Works of Bu ston*. In *A Catalogue of the Tohoku University Collection of Tibetan Works on Buddhism* (hereafter Tohoku Catalogue), 70–72, his works are itemized with Japanese titles and brief explanations in English as follows:

5185 (Zha 1–70) *’Dul ba spyi’i rnam par gzhas pa, ’dul ba rin po che’i mdzes rgyan*. (律の総説, “律なる寶の麗莊嚴” といふ書). Introduction to the *vinaya* in general in accordance with the *Vinayasūtra* (No. 4117).

5186 (Zha 1–295) *’Dul ba mdo’i don rnam par ’byed pa, ’dul ba rgya mtsho’i snying po rab tu gsal bar byed pa*. (律經の義を分別せる “律海の心髓を明らかにする” といふ書). A commentary on Guṇaprabha’s *Vinayasūtra* (No. 4117), referring to No. 1–6 and their commentaries. cf. No. 4104–4116, 4119–4123.

5187 (Zha 1–125) *Las brgya rtsa gcig gi rnam par bshad pa cho ga’i gsal la byed*

- ba*. (百一作法の解説たる“作法を明らかにする”という書). A commentary on the Ekottarakarmaśataka by Guṇaprabha (No. 4118), referring to No. 5185–5186, 5188–5190.
- 5188 (Za 1–43) *'Dul ba'i lag len gyi cho ga, dri ma med pa'i phreng ba*. (律を実修する作法たる“無垢鬘”という書). Practical rules of the śrāmaṇeraśikṣāpadā and the upasāmpadā. cf. No. 5187.
- 5189 (Za 1–17) *'Dul ba'i lag len gyi cho ga dri ma med pa'i phreng ba'i shar byung, khyim pa la phan gdags pa'i cho ga*. (律の実修作法たる“無垢鬘”の補録, “在家利益の作法”という書). An explanation of the discipline for upāsaka and upāsikā, written as a supplement to No. 5188.
- 5190 (Za 1–45) *Dge slong ma'i rnam par 'byed pa'i don gsal bar byed pa, snying po gska ba*. (“比丘尼分別”の義を明らかにせる“心髓明”といふ書). A commentary on the Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya-vibhaṅga. cf. No. 5 (根本説一切有部苾芻尼毘奈耶. 大正 1443).
- 5191 (Za 1–226) *Ston pa bcom ldan 'das sākya thub pa'i rnam par thar pa 'dul ba'i lung las 'byung ba bsdus pa, dad cing dga' skyed*. (本師薄伽梵釋迦牟尼伝, 律文の出典により集成せるもの“信じ歡喜を生ず”といふ書). Life of Śākyamuni compiled from the tales of Nidāna, Jātaka, and Itivutaka in vinaya canons and their commentaries.
- 5192 (Ha 1–419) *'Dul ba pha'i gleng 'bum chen mo*. (律, 比丘十万説話大集). This book entitled ‘A hundred (*sic.*) thousand stories of Buddhist monks’ contains various stories on the behaviour of monks, collected from the vinaya canons. cf. No. 5193.
- 5193 (Ha 1–59) *'Dul ba dge slong ma'i gleng 'bum*. (律, 比丘尼十万説話). This book entitled ‘A hundred (*sic.*) thousand stories of nuns’ contains various stories on the behaviour of nuns, collected from the above said canons. cf. No. 5192.

It is not certain from where these brief explanations of the nine works originated or whether they are accurate. It should be repeated, moreover, especially for the benefit of those unfamiliar with Japanese, that the English explanations are not translations of the Japanese titles, which themselves are simply translations of the Tibetan titles. The *'Dul ba spyi'i rnam par gzhaḡ pa* (no. 5185), the principal text for this paper, for example, is said to be “in accordance with the Vinayasūtra,” but its title does not support this explanation at all, and several studies of this text published after this catalogue—we will discuss some of them below soon—do not find any close relationship between the *'Dul ba spyi'i rnam par gzhaḡ pa* and the *Vinaya-sūtra*.⁸⁾ It remains to be explored, therefore, whether the other explanations are accurate. However, it is immediately

apparent from the titles of these nine texts that Bu ston worked not only on the canonical *vinaya* texts, but also on the *Vinaya-sūtra* and the **Ekottara-karma-śataka* (nos. 5186 and 5187), both of which are attributed to Guṇaprabha (5th–7th century CE), the medieval Indian *vinaya* master who is undoubtedly one of the most authoritative Indian monks in the Tibetan Buddhist traditions. The fact that Bu ston left two works on two of Guṇaprabha’s texts may suggest that Guṇaprabha was already highly esteemed by the time of Bu ston.

Research on the above nine texts has progressed at a snail’s pace in the modern field of Buddhist studies. A few of them have been dealt with by only a small handful of modern scholars, and most of them remain largely unexplored. There are, however, several pioneering studies about the *’Dul ba pha’i gleng ’bum chen mo* (no. 5192) and the *’Dul ba spyi’i rnam par gzhag pa* (no. 5185).⁹ With regard to the *’Dul ba pha’i gleng ’bum chen mo*, Schopen (1998: esp. 178, n. 67) noted that while it appears to be simply a collection of the narrative stories from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, it is far more than that. The stories collected therein are arranged in order according to Guṇaprabha’s *sūtra*-form digest of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, or the *Vinaya-sūtra*, and as a result, the *’Dul ba pha’i gleng ’bum chen mo* in its entirety also serves as “a condensed version of the *entire Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*,” just like the *Vinaya-sūtra*.¹⁰

The *’Dul ba spyi’i rnam par gzhag pa* (hereafter *’Dul spyi*) has also already received scholarly attention to some degree. In his discussion about Bu ston’s views on Buddhist schools in early India, Vogel (1985: 110) noted that the *’Dul spyi* includes an interesting passage in which Bu ston states his suspicion that the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* belongs to a non-Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition.¹¹ Ever since Vogel drew our attention to this, scholars have discussed what Bu ston’s suspicion exactly means. It seems that it may be best explained by his ignorance of the multiple traditions of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* rules for nuns.¹² Maeda (2001) focuses on the *’Dul spyi* in his discussion about the history of the transmission of *vinaya* texts in Tibet. Though Maeda never references Vogel’s work, he also notes in further detail that the *’Dul spyi* contains Bu ston’s brief overviews of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and related Indian texts, including his interesting suspicion about the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* that Vogel discussed. Moreover, Maeda highlights that Bu ston reported that there were some Indian texts related to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* of which he had only heard or which had not been translated into Tibetan.¹³

These important studies indicate that the *’Dul spyi* is worthy of more scholarly attention: it shares with us the situation surrounding the circulation and transmission of *vinaya* texts in Tibet, and, more interestingly, includes some of Bu ston’s thought-provoking opinions on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*

tradition. His overview of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, which I will quote and discuss in detail in this paper, is a good example of this.¹⁴⁾

2. The *Vinaya-saṃgraha*

Before analyzing Bu ston's overview of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, I will provide some general information on this text. There are about thirty Indian commentaries on and handbooks of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* extant and available to us. The *Vinaya-saṃgraha* is one of them. It is generally regarded as a commentary on the *Prātimokṣa* rules for monks,¹⁵⁾ and attributed to *Viśeṣamitra (Chin. Shengyou 勝友; Tib. Khyad par bshes gnyen). Details are not known about *Viśeṣamitra, who appears to have lived in the 7th century CE or earlier. While most of the thirty Indian commentaries on and handbooks of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* have come down to us only in Tibetan translations, the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* is one of only two exceptions.¹⁶⁾ It was transmitted into both the Chinese and Tibetan cultural spheres and has been fully preserved not only in Tibetan translation (*'Dul ba bsduṣ pa*: D. 4105, Nu 88a–268a, 13 *bam po*¹⁷⁾) but also in Yijing's 義淨 Chinese translation (*Genbensapoduobu lüshe* 根本薩婆多部律攝: T. 1458 [24] 525a–617a, 14 *juan* 卷).

Although it is unclear how much attention the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* received in India, it seems certain that Buddhists in Chinese and Tibetan cultural spheres had conflicting attitudes toward it. Yijing 義淨, a Chinese pilgrim who spent time at Nālandā, seems to have esteemed the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* as much as the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* itself. When he returned to China from his long journey, he translated the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* before any of the canonical *vinaya* texts.¹⁸⁾ Also, in his travel record (the *Nanhai jigui neifazhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳), Yijing quotes many passages from the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, as well as from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* itself.¹⁹⁾ Furthermore, in Japan the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* was read as intensively as (and perhaps more intensively than) the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* around 1000 years after Yijing's death, especially by monks of the Shingon 真言 school. These monks were aware that in his so-called *Sangaku roku* 三學錄, the founder of their school, Kūkai 空海 (774–835), referred to Yijing's *vinaya* corpus, including the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, as all-important texts. One of the Shingon monks, Gakunyo 學如 (1716–1773), who insisted that they should lead the monastic life based primarily on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, highly valued the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, and even published an annotated edition.²⁰⁾

In Tibetan Buddhist traditions, however, the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* seems to have not been so popular. There seems to be little, if any, evidence that the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* was ever studied in them as intensively as any other Indian text

related to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, such as Guṇḍrabha's *Vinaya-sūtra* and Viśākha(deva)'s *Vinaya-kārikā*.²¹⁾ More significantly, as we will see below, one of the most influential monks in Tibetan Buddhist traditions, Bu ston, doubted the authenticity of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* and explicitly asserted that it was not trustworthy.

3. Bu ston's Overview of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* in His 'Dul spyi

The Collected Works of Bu ston, part 21 *Zha*, 114 (57 verso) ll. 3–6.

*so so thar pa'i 'grel pa 'dul ba bsdus pa bam po bco lnga pa slob dpon khyad par bshes
gnyen gyis mdzad pa / bai ro tsa na dang / rgyal ba shes rab dang / shākya bshes
gnyen gyi 'gyur / 'di la (1) bslab pa phul ba'i go yang chod la sdom pa mi gtong ba
dang / (2) byang sgra mi snyan pa las brkus na pham pa 'ong ba dang / (3) dge tshul
gyi lhung bzed dang chos gos byin gyis rlob pa dang / (4) bla ma gnas su gyur pa'i dge
slong rnam la pus mo btsugs pas phyag gi go chod bya ba dang / (5) rung khang byin
gyis rlob pa la 'jug pa zhan pa'i byin rlabs / shes pa chung ngu'i byin rlabs zhes pa la
sogs pa lung sde bzhi / 'dul ba'i mdo dang 'gal ba mang po yod pa'i phyir sde pa
gzhan gyi grub mtha' 'chug pa'am / yang na / gzhi thams cad yod smra'i 'dul ba mi
shes pa zhig gis byas par snang bas 'di la yid brtan mi bya'o //*

The *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, a commentary on the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* in 15 *bam po*, was made by Ācārya *Viśeṣamitra. It is a translation by Vairocana[rakṣita], rGyal ba shes rab, and Shākya bshes gnyen.²²⁾ Because in this [work], there are many [statements] that conflict with [those in] the *Vinaya* of Four Parts (= the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*²³⁾) and the *Vinaya-sūtra*, such as (1) abandonment of the training (Skt. *śikṣā-pratyācakṣa*, *-pratyākhyāna*), even though it functions [i.e., has been accomplished], is not followed by renouncement of *saṃvara*, (2) Pārājika offense occurs when one steals from the Uttarakurus, (3) a novice's taking formal possession of a bowl and a robe, (4) [a monk] showing reverence to respectable ones (Skt. *guru*) and those who are worthy of great respect (Skt. *guru-sthānīya*²⁴⁾) by [a monk's] falling on his knee towards them, and (5) with regard to the formal recognition [of a place] as a *kalpika-sālā*,²⁵⁾ a formal recognition [of a place as *kalpika-sālā* can be proposed] by a monk of silly disposition and of little intelligence, [this work] appears to have been made by one who confused [Mūlasarvāstivādins' doctrine with] another school's doctrine, or who did not know about the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Therefore, you should not trust this [work].²⁶⁾

The wording of the Tibetan text above is too terse to immediately understand. Moreover, it includes several technical *vinaya* terms. *Byin gyis rlob pa*, for example, is one. It is commonly known as the attested translation of derivatives of Skt. *adhi-śthā* and refers in Buddhist text in general to the Buddha or some other prominent ones manifesting a supernatural or magical power.²⁷⁾ In *vinaya* texts, however, it is used to signify that monks and nuns turn something new into something formal, official, or legal.²⁸⁾ Those who are unfamiliar with *vinaya* texts might be misled by such technical *vinaya* terms, and could misunderstand the passage.

The purport of the passage quoted above is, however, virtually certain. Bu ston provides bibliographical information about the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* and claims that it is not trustworthy because it includes more than five statements—which I numbered from (1) to (5) in the text and translation above—that, he suggests, contradict the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and the *Vinaya-sūtra*, and are therefore problematic. Bu ston's claims can be summarized, uncritically, as follows:

Table I: Bu ston's claims regarding the *V.saṃgraha*, *MSV*, and *VS*
(*V.saṃgraha* ≈ *Vinayasamgraha*; *MSV* ≈ *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*; *VS* ≈ *Vinaya-sūtra*)

	<i>V.saṃgraha</i>	<i>MSV</i>	<i>VS</i>
(1) Abandonment of the training that does not entail renouncement of <i>saṃvara</i>	○	×	×
(2) Pārājika offense occurs when one steals from the Uttarakurus	○	×	×
(3) A novice's taking formal possession of a bowl and a robe	○	×	×
(4) Showing reverence to respectable ones (Skt. <i>guru</i>) and those who are worthy of great respect (Skt. <i>guru-sthānīya</i>) by falling on the knee	○	×	×
(5) Formal recognition of a place as a <i>kalpika-sālā</i> by a monk of silly disposition and little intelligence	○	×	×

○: included, ×: not included

If the situation is exactly as this table shows, Bu ston's rejection of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* might be reasonable. However, some examination would be required to determine whether his rejection holds water. As I mentioned above, it has become clearer that Bu ston's skepticism of the authenticity of the *Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya* in this same work is misguided. In addition, I have already noted that though Bu ston referred to the last of the four major parts of the

Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya, the *Uttaragrantha*, as “commentary-like (*’grel pa lta bu*)” in his *History of Buddhism*, this description may also be inaccurate.²⁹⁾ It is possible, therefore, that Bu ston’s rejection of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* may also lack sufficient justification. His rejection can be only regarded as valid if the five statements that Bu ston indicates appear in the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* and are completely dismissed or unheeded in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and the *Vinaya-sūtra*. We will discuss, then, the five statements one by one in the following.

4. An Examination of Bu ston’s Overview of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* in His *’Dul spyi*

4. 1. Possible Problems in the Bibliographical Information

Before we begin discussing the five statements that Bu ston held to be peculiar to the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, let us briefly address the bibliographical information about it provided by Bu ston. He refers to it as “a commentary on the *Prātimokṣa-[sūtra]* in 15 *bam po*.” This description is noteworthy in two ways. First, the number of *bam po* that Bu ston indicates differs from the number we find in two major xylograph editions that are most accessible to us today. While Bu ston states that the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* consists of 15 *bam po*, the texts preserved in the Derge and Peking xylograph editions contain just 13 *bam po*. Given that Bu ston himself refers to the text as containing 13 *bam po* in another of his major works in 1335, the so-called *Zhwa lu* Tanjur catalogue,³⁰⁾ his reference to the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* as 15 *bam po* in the *’Dul spyi* might indicate that there were two different versions of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* in Tibetan Buddhist traditions. We will discuss this issue in some more detail later.

The second notable point regarding Bu ston’s bibliographical information is that he states that the text is “a commentary” on the *Prātimokṣa* rules. Though it is not clear what he means by “commentary,” it seems that his statement does not fully capture the major textual characteristics of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*. It is true that the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* addresses each of the rules comprising the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, following the order of presentation of the rules. As Nishimoto (1933) precisely notes, however, it also provides various regulations that are preserved in the four major sections of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and are not always closely related to the *Prātimokṣa* rules. That is, the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* in its entirety seems to be more an essential compendium of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* than a commentary on the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*.³¹⁾ It is true that Bu ston does not make an argument that the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* is a commentary as opposed to a handbook. However, his reference to it as simply as a commentary on the

Prātimokṣa-sūtra is possibly a misleading statement.³²⁾

4. 2. Statement (5)

Now let us discuss the five statements in question. I will start my discussion by addressing statement (5), since its meaning is clear, and Bu ston's comments about it are simple. In contrast, statement (1) includes several technical *vinaya* terms that require some further explanations, and moreover, Bu ston's criticism of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* based on this statement is slightly complicated. For these reasons, I will discuss the five statements in reverse order: (5) → (4) → ... (1).

The passage in which statement (5) appears is found in the Tibetan version of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* that is available to us. It appears after the reference to five *kalpika-sālās* as follows:

*gtsug lag khang du ni rung ba'i khang pa bsko bar bya'o // de yang lnga ste / bteg pa'i mtha' las byung ba dang / sems bsdus pa'i mtha' las byung ba dang / ba lang gi lhas lta bu dang / 'phral la byung ba dang / bskos pa ste lnga pa'o // bteg pa'i mtha' las byung ba zhes bya ba ni shes pa chung ba dang / blun po'i rgyud kyis rung bar bya ba ni dge 'dun la bstan pa ma byas kyang ltung ba med do //*³³⁾

Within the *vihāra*, the *kalpika-sālā* must be established. [In regard to *kalpika-sālās*] there are also five: [the one] made by piling up [bricks], [the one] made by attracting attention, [the one] like a cowshed, [the one] made by abandonment [of a place], and [the one formally] established. Regarding [the *kalpika-sālā*] made by piling up [bricks], it is Regarding [the case in which] a monk of silly disposition and of little intelligence sets [a place as] the *kalpika-sālā*, there is no fault, even if he does not let the community know [about it].³⁴⁾

It has been noted that the five *kalpika-sālās* appear but are not clearly explained in the *Bhaiṣajya-vastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya.³⁵⁾ Given that its passage is almost identical to the passage I cited above from the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, it appears that the above was sourced from the *Bhaiṣajya-vastu*. In the *Bhaiṣajya-vastu*, however, there is no reference to the case in which a monk of silly disposition or of little intelligence sets a place as a *kalpika-sālā*. Likewise, the *Vinaya-sūtra* also includes a series of *sūtras* that concern the regulations regarding the *kalpika-sālā*, which must have been sourced from the *Bhaiṣajya-vastu*,³⁶⁾ but no reference to a monk of silly disposition or of little intelligence appears in the *sūtras*.³⁷⁾

Taking this textual evidence into account, it might be safe to say that statement (5) is unique to the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, as Bu ston suggests. That is to say, based on statement (5), Bu ston's criticism of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* appears to be tenable.

4. 3. Statement (4)

The passage in which statement (4) appears is preserved in both Chinese and Tibetan versions of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*. It is a description of the proper manners of junior monks when showing reverence to senior monks:

bla ma dang bla ma'i gnas lta bu la pus mo gzugs pa dang / 'dud par bcas pa'am / thal mo sbyar ba bcas pa 'am / sgyid pa nas 'khyud pa 'am / de bzhin du tsog pus 'dug pa'o //³⁸⁾

[One must show reverence] to respectable ones (Skt. *guru*) and those who are worthy of great respect (Skt. *guru-sthānīya*) by either kneeling and maintaining a bowing posture, maintaining the gesture of supplication with one's hands, holding their knees in one's arms, or maintaining the posture of squatting.

Instructions regarding proper manners to show reverence are preserved in the *Pravrajyā-vastu* and the *Kṣudraka-vastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.³⁹⁾ Therein, however, there are only two ways of showing reverence: 1) throwing down one's whole body on the ground, and 2) holding respectable ones' knees in one's arms. No reference to a monk's kneeling on the ground is found. The *Vinaya-sūtra* also includes a *sūtra* that refers to two ways of showing reverence, and there is no mention of kneeling.⁴⁰⁾ It is true, thus, that statement (4), like statement (5), appears to be unique to the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, as Bu ston suggests. On closer investigation, however, one notices that the way of showing reverence by kneeling is referred to as one of the "others' views" in the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*:

gzhan dag na re ston pa las dkyil 'khor chen po lnga pas phyag bya'o // bla ma dang bla ma'i gnas lta bu la pus mo gzugs pa dang / 'dud par bcas pa'am / thal mo sbyar ba bcas pa 'am / sgyid pa nas 'khyud pa 'am / de bzhin du tsog pus 'dug pa'o // tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa gzhan rnams la ni mgo 'dud dam / thal mo sbyar ba 'am / ngag yang dag par brjod pa'o zhes kyang zer ba'o //⁴⁴⁾

It is also said by others that one must show reverence to the Teacher (i.e.,

the Buddha) by throwing down the whole body on the ground, to respectable ones (Skt. *guru*) and those who are worthy of great respect (Skt. *guru-sthānīya*) by either kneeling and maintaining a bowing posture, maintaining the gesture of supplication with one's hands, holding their knees in one's arms, or maintaining the posture of squatting, and to fellow-monks (Skt. *sabrahmacārin*) by either bowing, maintaining the gesture of supplication with one's hands, or greeting with words.

There is little, if any, that one can say with certainty about the "others' views" that *Viśeṣamitra mentions in the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*. His opinion of them is unclear, since he expresses neither criticism nor approval towards them. The source of these views also remains to be explored. It seems certain, however, that he does not regard them as standard or mainstream interpretations. If they are in fact not standard or mainstream interpretations, it would be natural that they appear neither in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, which is undoubtedly the main source for the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, nor in the *Vinaya-sūtra*, which probably does not provide atypical interpretations of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. In the end, Bu ston's suggestion that the way of showing reverence by kneeling is found solely in the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* and not in the other two texts is well supported. It does not mean, however, that we can conclude that the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* contradicts the other two texts, since it refers to showing reverence by kneeling not as Viśeṣamitra's own view, but as one of the "others' views." In short, Bu ston's criticism of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* based on statement (4) is not entirely reasonable.

4. 4. Statement (3)

Statement (3) concerns taking formal possession of a bowl and robes, one of the ritual acts that must be performed by a candidate through a pronouncement during the ordination ceremony.⁴²⁾ It is unclear, however, why Bu ston criticizes the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* based on this statement.

As is well known, there are two successive steps a male layman takes in Buddhist ordination: the first step is from a layman (Skt. *upāsaka*) to a novice (Skt. *śrāmaṇera*), and the second step is from a novice to a monk (Skt. *bhikṣu*). The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* prescribes in the *Pravrajyā-vastu* that a novice takes formal possession of a bowl and robes in the process of becoming a monk,⁴³⁾ and the *Vinaya-sūtra* appears to have included this prescription.⁴⁴⁾

The *Vinaya-saṃgraha* also provides a variety of information about ordination in its explanations of the 72nd *pāyantikā* offense and states as follows

that a novice must take formal possession of a bowl and robes during the ordination ceremony:

*chos gos rnamdang lhung bzed ni dge 'dun la bstan te / byin gyis brlab par bya'o //*⁴⁵⁾

Regarding robes and a bowl, [they] must be shown to the community and taken formal possession of.

Here we see that the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, along with the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and the *Vinaya-sūtra*, refers to a novice's taking formal possession of a bowl and robes during the ordination. It seems, therefore, that the reason for Bu ston's criticism is not that the reference is not found in the latter two texts. There must be another issue for which Bu ston criticizes the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* based on statement (3). The disagreement between the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* and the *Vinaya-sūtra*, noted by Yamagiwa Nobuyuki, about the time when a bowl is given to a candidate in the ordination procedures should be mentioned here; perhaps it is the issue that Bu ston considers problematic in statement (3).

In his discussion about the characteristics of the procedures for becoming a Buddhist novice preserved in various texts related to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, Yamagiwa (1987: 84) notes that the *Vinaya-sūtra* and also one of the commentaries on it attributed to Guṇaprabha himself, the *Vinayasūtra-vṛtty-abhidhānasvavākyāna*, suggest that only a robe should be given to the candidate before he becomes a novice,⁴⁶⁾ while it is explicitly mentioned in the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* that a bowl absolutely must be given to the candidate in the process of becoming a novice, i.e., before he becomes a novice.⁴⁷⁾

Since the disagreement noted by Yamagiwa concerns a bowl and statement (3) also refers to "a novice's bowl," it might be possible to connect the two. That is to say, "a novice's bowl" in statement (3) may refer to a novice's own bowl, i.e., the bowl that the novice already possesses. Perhaps we can see the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* as instructing that a novice takes formal possession of the bowl that he obtained before becoming a novice, and the *Vinaya-sūtra* as suggesting that a novice should take formal possession of a new bowl which is given after he has become a novice. If this is the case, and as long as we give preference to the *Vinaya-sūtra* over the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, we may conclude that Bu ston's criticism is reasonable to an extent.

However, Yamagiwa notes another important fact: it is not only the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* but also the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that stipulates that a bowl should be given to the candidate before he becomes a novice.⁴⁸⁾ That is to say, the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* agree on the issue of when to

give a bowl to a candidate, which, according to Yamagiwa, conflicts with the position of the *Vinaya-sūtra*.⁴⁹⁾ Therefore, even if Bu ston is criticizing the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* due to its difference from the *Vinaya-sūtra*, it follows that he disregards the same disagreement between the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and the *Vinaya-sūtra*. However, this is technically unlikely: it means that Bu ston prioritized the *Vinaya-sūtra* over not only the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* but also the canonical *vinaya*.⁵⁰⁾ In any case, Bu ston's criticism is not well supported by the current versions of the three texts, and it remains uncertain what he regards as problematic in statement (3).

4. 5. Statement (2)

Next, we will look at statement (2). The problem with Bu ston's criticism of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* is most apparent here. It is not only because a similar statement does not appear in the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, but because it includes an explanation that suggests that the monks are free from any grave faults, even if they steal something from Uttarakurus:

byang gi sgra mi snyan na ni yongs su 'dzin pa med pas ma byin par len pa med do
//⁵¹⁾

Since there is no possession [of anything] in Uttarakuru, there is no stealing.

The statement above suggests that the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* takes the position that no one could possess anything in Uttarakuru, a sort of utopia where people semi-permanently lead happy and comfortable lives without any negative thoughts or actions, such as killing and stealing,⁵²⁾ and therefore, stealing would never occur. This position is presumably shared by both the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and the *Vinaya-sūtra*, since both texts include almost the same statements.⁵³⁾ More importantly, this position appears to suggest that those who have stolen something from the Uttarakurus could not be charged with the offense of stealing—a Pārājika offense. There seems no doubt, in any case, that there is little difference between the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya/Vinaya-sūtra* regarding monks' stealing from the Uttarakurus. We can therefore conclude that Bu ston's rejection of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* based on statement (2) seems to be poorly supported.

4. 6. Statement (1)

Statement (1) is about the relationship between “abandonment of the training” and “renouncement of *saṃvara*.” Both are technical phrases. “Abandonment of the training” is established in the rule of celibacy (the 1st Pārājika) as a means for monks to avoid violating this rule. Even if they engage in sexual intercourse, they are not considered to have transgressed the rule as long as they have first declared that they abandon the training.⁵⁴⁾ This is because the declaration brings about secession of monkhood; it turns monks into laymen, i.e., those who are out of reach of any monastic rules.⁵⁵⁾ Regarding *saṃvara*, though details about it are absent in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*,⁵⁶⁾ it seems to refer to what we may translate as “self-restraint,” which deters undesirable actions⁵⁷⁾ and which monks should always possess. Given that “abandoning the training” essentially means the loss of monkhood, “abandonment of the training” appears to be closely linked to “renouncement of *saṃvara*.”

As far as I can tell from my research, there is no specific discussion about the relationship between abandonment of training and *saṃvara* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. As I mentioned above, there is little, if any, reference to *saṃvara* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. The *Vinaya-sūtra* includes several *sūtras* that refer to *saṃvara*, but, to the best of my knowledge, they do not concern its relationship to abandonment of the training. It is difficult, thus, to find a conclusive passage in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and the *Vinaya-sūtra* that confirms the close relationship between abandonment of the training and renouncement of *saṃvara*. In his study of the Sanskrit text of the *Vinayasūtra-vṛṭty-abhidhānasavyākhyana*, however, Nakagawa Masanori notes that it includes a passage that explicitly refers to abandonment of the training and the *saṃvara*, and, more importantly, explains that the former entails the renouncement of the latter.⁵⁸⁾

If, as Bu ston suggests, the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* did consider abandonment of the training and renouncement of *saṃvara* to be unconnected, it would be reasonable for him to have been so puzzled at the reference in the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* that he was led to doubt the authenticity of the text as a whole. Such a statement, however, is not found in the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*. On the contrary, it explains, as the Sanskrit version of the *Vinayasūtra-vṛṭty-abhidhānasavyākhyana* suggests, that “abandonment of the training” and “renouncement of *saṃvara*” are virtually the same:

bslab pa ma phul zhes bya ba ni / sdom pa gtong bar 'gyur pa'i rgyu rnams kyis sdom

pa ma btang (Der: *gtang*) *ba zhes bya ba'i tha tshig go / de'i rgyu ni bzhi ste / bslab pa phul ba dang / mtshan gnyis byung ba dang / dge ba'i rtsa ba med pa dang / shi 'phos pa'o //*⁵⁹)

Regarding the expression “without abandoning the training,” it means that [the monk] does not renounce *saṃvara* by meeting the conditions for renouncement of *saṃvara*. The conditions are four: abandonment of the training, occurrence of two sexes, cessation of the root of merit, and death.

It is obvious that the relationship between abandonment of the training and renouncement of *saṃvara* is explained here. Since there seems to be no other passage in the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* in which both of these are mentioned together, the passage I quoted above is most likely the one Bu ston refers to in his statement (1). It seems, however, the above passage and this statement have opposite meanings. In the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, “abandonment of the training” is explained as synonym for “renouncement of *saṃvara*.” On the other hand, Bu ston suggests with statement (1) that the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* holds that abandonment of the training does *not* entail renouncement of *saṃvara*. What Bu ston suggests about the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* here and what we actually find in the current versions of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* do not match. That is to say, Bu ston's criticism of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* based on statement (1) seems to be untenable.

Conclusion

I have inspected the five statements that Bu ston, in his *'Dul spyi*, suggests appear exclusively in the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* and are therefore problematic. It turns out that Bu ston's claim may not hold true in every case. I have shown this in the table below:

Table II: Statements (1)–(5) in *V-saṃgraha*, *MSV*, and *VS*
(*V-saṃgraha* ≈ *Vinayasamgraha*; *MSV* ≈ *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*; *VS* ≈ *Vinaya-sūtra*)

	<i>V-saṃgraha</i>	<i>MSV</i>	<i>VS</i>
(1) Abandonment of the training that does not entail renouncement of <i>saṃvara</i>	×	×	×
(2) Pārājika offense occurs when one steals from the Uttarakurus	×	×	×
(3) A novice's taking formal possession of a bowl and a robe (A novice takes formal possession of the bowl that he obtained before becoming a novice.)	○(○)	○(○)	○(△)

(4) Showing reverence to respectable ones (Skt. <i>guru</i>) and those who are worthy of great respect (Skt. <i>guru-sthānīya</i>) by falling on the knee	△	×	×
(5) Formal recognition of a place as a <i>kalpika-sālā</i> by a monk of silly disposition and little intelligence	○	×	×

○: included, △: partially matches, ×: not included

There are at least three ways to explain this result. First, Bu ston might have not sufficiently read the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*. Second, the texts of *'Dul spyi* might have somewhat changed through a process of transmission, and consequently the current version that we see today in Bu ston's complete works may differ to some extent from the original version that he wrote in 1357. Third, Bu ston saw a version of the Tibetan translation of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* different from the one that has come down to us.⁶⁰⁾ This third possibility might be supported by two facts: the Chinese translation of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* is said to have circulated in two versions—14 *juan* 卷 and 20 *juan* versions—the latter of which is not commonly available at present,⁶¹⁾ and the Tibetan translation also seems to have circulated in two versions—13 *bam po* and 15 *bam po* versions⁶²⁾—the former of which is, as I briefly mentioned above, available to us in Derge and Peking xylograph editions. However, it is unclear what these different *juan* 卷 and *bam po* numbers mean. It is possible that they are merely due to the differences between recensions, and though each of Tibetan and Chinese translations of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* was circulated in two versions, the two might not differ so much in content.⁶³⁾ The 15 *bam po* version of the Tibetan translation of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* does not seem to be extant. It seems, however, that the 20 *juan* version of Chinese *Vinaya-saṃgraha* has come down to us. It is reported that the old manuscripts of Chinese Buddhist texts that have been preserved in several temples in Japan, such as Ishiyamadera 石山寺 and Kōshōji 興聖寺, include full copies of the 20 *juan* 卷 version of Chinese *Vinaya-saṃgraha*.⁶⁴⁾ I hope to view them in the near future to verify whether they include significant textual variations that do not appear in the 14 *juan* version.⁶⁵⁾

There seems to be no doubt, in any case, that Bu ston's brief overview of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* in his *'Dul spyi* is an interesting account that provides us with a further glimpse of the unpopularity of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* in the Tibetan Buddhist tradition, prompts us to consider credibility of Bu ston's works that are extant and available to us, and points to the multiple circulations or transmissions of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*.

Notes

- * I have discussed the same topic in Kishino (2017). In that paper, however, I had to limit myself to a partial discussion and refrained from including extensive notes and references due to space limitations. The present paper enables me to engage in a full discussion and provide more detailed information. I wish to thank Emeritus Professor Mimaki Katsumi 御牧克己 for giving me a chance to submit this paper to this prestigious journal. I am also indebted to Mr. Dylan Luers Toda, Dr. Shayne Clarke, and Mr. Warren Kadoya for their careful checks of the English and useful comments, all of which improve this paper. This acknowledgement, however, does not imply their entire approval or agreement. I alone remain responsible for any and all errors, inaccuracies, and inconsistencies. I would also like to express my gratitude to JSPS for providing financial support (Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows 18K12204).
- 1) van der Kuijp (2016: 281, n. 189): “Bu ston completed this work [= *'Dul ba spyi'i rnam par gzhang pa*] on the tenth day of *'gro zhun* month of a *gser 'phyang* year, that is, on July 27, 1357.”
 - 2) The text numbers of Derge edition that I provide in this paper are based on *Chibetto Daizōkyō sōmoku roku* 西藏大藏經總目錄. Edited by Tōhoku Teikoku Daigaku Hōbungakubu 東北帝国大学法文学部. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan 名著出版, 1970.
 - 3) Mimaki (1987: 281–282). Mimaki (2000: 1155) notes that Bu ston was the first to designate the two large groups of the translated Indian Buddhist texts as *bKa' 'gyur* (The Buddha Words in Translation) and *bsTan 'gyur* (Scholarly Works in Translation).
 - 4) Hadano (1987: 115–116).
 - 5) These six *vinaya* texts are as follows: the *Shisong lü* 十誦律 (a *vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins; T. 1435 [23]), the *Sifen lü* 四分律 (a *vinaya* of the Dharmaguptakas; T. 1428 [22]), the *Wufen lü* 五分律 (a *vinaya* of the Mahāsāsakas; T. 1421 [22]), the *Mohesengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (a *vinaya* of the Mahāsāṃghikas; T. 1425 [22]), the *vinaya* of those who call themselves “Theravādins” extant in Pāli (the so-called “*Pāli Vinaya*”; regarding the problem with referring to them as “Theravādins,” see S. Sasaki [2000: 386, n. 1]), and a series of *vinaya* texts that modern scholars collectively refer to as the “Mūlasarvāstivāda-*vinaya*” (a *vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, or rather another *vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins; regarding the well-known discussion about the precise meaning of the term “*mūlasarvāstivāda*,” see, for convenience, Kishino [2013: 6–9]).
 - 6) The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is partially but relatively well preserved in Sanskrit. The Sanskrit manuscripts identified as the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* are mostly from Gilgit. For detailed information about them, see, for convenience, Clarke (2014: 1–17).
 - 7) Hirakawa (1982: 11), for example, calculates that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is “about four times longer than other *vinayas*.” Most recently, Clarke (2016–2017 [2018]: 203–204) more precisely compares the length of the *vinaya* with that of the other four Chinese *vinaya* texts, saying: “the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* would have been approximately seven times longer than the *Mahāsāka-*vinaya** (the *Wufen lü* 五分律), six times the length of the *Mahāsāṃghika-*vinaya** (the *Mohesengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律), and four times that of the *Dharmaguptaka-* and *Sarvāstivāda-*vinayas** (the *Sifen lü* 四分律 and the *Shisong lü* 十誦律).”
 - 8) Luo Hong repeatedly refers to the *'Dul ba spyi'i rnam par gzhang pa* in his discussions

about the *Vinaya-sūtra*; Luo (2011a; 2011b). In these papers, however, he does not explain the relationship between the two texts. As we will see below, Maeda (2001) is one of the few studies that even mention the *'Dul ba spyi'i nram par gzhang pa*. In that paper, Maeda explicitly states that the text is “a commentary on the Indian Guṇapraha's *Vinaya-sūtra* (インドの Yon tan 'od, *Vīnayasūtra* の解説書)”; Maeda (2001: 1). He does not provide, however, any evidence that supports his statement. He is probably just basing it on the explanation attached to the Tohoku Catalogue. The relationship between the *'Dul ba spyi'i nram par gzhang pa* and the *Vinaya-sūtra* remains to be examined.

- 9) There is also a brief reference to the *Las brgya rtsa gcig gi nram par bshad pa cho ga'i gsal la byed ba* (5187) in Kishino (2015: 180, n. 69; 183–184, n. 78).
- 10) For Schopen's other references to the *'Dul ba pha'i gleng 'bum chen mo* in his works, see, among others, Schopen (2001: esp. 103–104); cf. Ende (2016: 85–87). Note also that Hadano (1987: 105) states that Bu ston made the *'Dul ba pha'i gleng 'bum chen mo* and the *'Dul ba dge slong ma'i gleng 'bum* after he learned the *vinaya* from Shangs pa Jo ston, who composed a commentary on the *Vinaya-kārikā*. (“Śākyaśrī が..... ≪Hdul-ba Me-tog-phreñ-rgyud) を釈説し、それを Señ-ge zil-gnon と Śaṅs-pa Jo-ston が聴聞し、各自注釈を作ったが、前者 Señ-ge zil-gnon に Tshad-mhi skyes-bu, 後者にプトン が聴聞して ≪Gleñ-ḥbum ṭikā-chen-po) (東北大・西藏撰述仏典目録, Nos. 5192, 5193) を著作した.....”) This explanation of Hadano might suggest that the *'Dul ba pha'i gleng 'bum chen mo* (and the *'Dul ba dge slong ma'i gleng 'bum*) is connected to the *Vinaya-kārikā*.
- 11) Bu ston again alludes to his suspicion that the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* belongs to a non-Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition in his *'Dul ba dge slong ma'i gleng 'bum*; Schopen (1998: 178, n. 67); most recently and in more detail, Clarke (2016–2017 [2018]: 209–210, n. 26).
- 12) Schopen (2004a: 180–181; 2008: 230–232); Clarke (2012; 2016–2017: esp. 209–211).
- 13) Recently, van der Kuijp (2016: 281, n. 189) has also noted the importance of Bu ston's brief overviews of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and related Indian texts in his *'Dul spyi*, saying “it contains some precious information on the early Tibetan *vinaya* literature.”
- 14) Maeda (2001: 5) provided a partial translation of Bu ston's overview of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* in question. His translation, however, leaves some room for improvement. See n. 26 (esp. underlined parts) below.
- 15) See, for example, K. Sasaki (1985 [1977]: 168). Sakaino (1932: 2) suggests that the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* is a commentary on the *Vinaya-vibhaṅga*: “『薩婆多律攝』の内容は、比丘の『毘奈耶』の逐条的の要領を説いたものである...” Note, however, there seems to be little, if any, decisive evidence for the claim that the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* is a commentary on the *Prātimokṣa* rules or the *Vinaya-vibhaṅga*. See the discussion below (4. 1.).
- 16) There is one more text related to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and attributed to a medieval Indian monk that was transmitted and preserved in both Chinese and Tibetan translations: Viśakha(deva)'s (Chin. Pisheqia 毘舍佉; Tib. Sa ga[ʼi lha]) verse summary of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* entitled *Vinaya-kārikā* (Chin. *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye song* 根本説一切有部毘奈耶頌 [T. 1459]; Tib. *'Dul ba tshig le'ur byas pa* [Der. 4123]). Sanskrit fragments (14 folios) of the *Vinaya-kārikā* have come down to us, though they have yet to be published; Liu & Andrews (2017: 13, n. 17). For a preliminary

- report of the Sanskrit fragments, see Clarke's forthcoming work on the *Vinaya-kārikā*: "A Preliminary Survey of Viśākha(deva)'s *Bhikṣu-vinayakārikā-kusuma-sraḥ*."
- 17) Several fragments of the Tibetan *Vinaya-saṃgraha* are preserved in the Pelliot collection of Tibetan manuscripts from Dunhuang, and have been studied by Yang (2012).
- 18) Sakaino (1932: 2).
- 19) K. Sasaki (1985 [1977]: 175–176). Note, however, that Yijing 義淨 started to translate the *Vinaya-kārikā* during his stay in Nālandā in India, though he did not revise and complete it until he returned to China; Sakaino (1932: 2).
- 20) For Gakunyo's 學如 edition of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, see Clarke (2006: 26–27); Baba (2016: 269–271).
- 21) It is well known that the *Vinaya-sūtra* has been held in high esteem as the fundamental text for the study of *vinaya* by the dGe-lugs-pa school; Nagao (1954: 16); Onoda (1982: 196–197). Also, the *Vinaya-kārikā*, which is commonly called *Me tog gi phreng rgyud* in the Tibetan Buddhist traditions, was intensively taught and studied at Snar thang monastery especially from the 13th to 15th century; Liu (2014). See also n. 10 above.
- 22) cf. Otani Tanjur Catalogue (5606): "Ind. の師匠 Çilendrabodhi と Ind. の師匠 Çākyaṃprabha と大校修譯官 Vairocanarakṣita 譯. 再び, Kaçmīr の師匠 Jñānaçrībhadrā と譯官・釋迦比丘 Rgyal ba çes rab と譯官釋迦比丘 Çākya bçes gñen とが改訂, 検閲, 刊定."
- 23) The view that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* comprises four major parts (the *Vinaya-vibhaṅga*, the so-called Seventeen *Vastus*, the *Kṣudraka-vastu*, and the *Uttaragrantha*) seems to be popular in Tibetan Buddhist traditions; cf. *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* (s.v. 'dul ba lung sde bzhi). Given that several Indic commentaries on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* refer to this fourfold structure, the tradition without a doubt originated in India. For details, see Kishino (2013: 32, n. 29).
- 24) cf. *Samghabheda-vastu* (Tib. Der. 1 *Nga* 92b1 ≈ Skt. Gnoli I, 185): **Tib.** *mkhan po dang / slob dpon dang / bla ma dang / bla ma'i gnas lta bu rnams kyi* ≈ **Skt.** *ācāryopādhyāyānām gurūnām gurusthānīyānām*
- 25) cf. Yamagiwa (2001: 321): **Tib.** *rung ba'i gnas* ≈ **Skt.** *kalpika-sālā*; the *Vinaya-sūtra* (Tib. Der. 4117, 72a2 ≈ Skt. R. Sāṅkrtyāyana, 89, no. 301): **Tib.** *rung ba'i khang pa* ≈ **Skt.** *kalpika-sālā*. A *kalpika-sālā* is a special place where several behaviors regarding food, such as cooking and storing, that are forbidden by the *vinaya* are exceptionally permitted. Yamagiwa (2001) notes that the *Pāli Vinaya*, the *Sifen lü* 四分律, and the *Wufen lü* 五分律 refer to four types of *kalpika-sālas*, while the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* refers to five. We will see the details of the five below; cf. *CPD* (s.v. *kappiya-kuṭī*): "house for (items, i.e., food that) is permitted (for storing and cooking): kitchen; corresponds to rasavati (q.v.) in a non-ecclesiastical context; built on a compound called *kappiyabhūmī* (q.v.)."
- 26) cf. Maeda (2001: 5): "プトンはこの書を根本説一切有部の律と異なっていることを主張している. すなわち, 「この書は學を与え終わった段階で制戒 (sdom pa) を与えていないこと, 北俱盧洲のものより偷盜し波羅夷罪になることと, 師の座となる諸々の比丘に女子をあてがい手伝い (phyag gi go chod) をすることと, また受持の厨房に入る, (身体の) 弱い者の受持とか, 知の少ないものの受持をはじめとする四部門にわたり, *Vinayasūtra* と多く矛盾することがあるため, 他の部派の極上説を誤ったのか, 根本説一切有部の律を知らないものが著したことが明らかであり, 信託できない」(57b4–6) と述べている."
- 27) Watanabe (1977).

- 28) Kishino (2009).
- 29) Kishino (2013: 25, n. 1).
- 30) cf. Fujita (2004: 201): “..... これをシャル本テンギユルともいう..... プトンはこれに対する目録『テンギユル目録』(Toh. 5205)を作成した(1335年完成, プトンは45歳).”
- 31) For more details on the textual characteristics of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*, see Kishino (2018).
- 32) Kun mkhyen mtsho sna ba shes rab bzang po (12th–13th century CE; cf. Tsedroen 1992: 76–77) also refers to the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* as a commentary on the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* in his commentary on the *Vinaya-sūtra*, ‘*Dul ba mdo rtsa’i rnam bshad nyi ma’i ’od zer legs bshad lung gi rgya mtsho: gghan yang so sor thar pa’i ’grel pa ’Dul ba bdsud pa slob dpon Khyad par bshes gnyen gyis mdzad pa ste ’gyur snga phyi gnyis dang / (’Dul ti ka nyi ma’i ’od zer legs bshad lung rigs kyi rgya mtsho, Vol. II, 370, 16–17). The identification of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* as a *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* commentary might not have been peculiar to Bu ston; it was widely found in Tibetan Buddhist traditions at the latest in the 13th century.*
- 33) Der. 4105, 127b4–128b3.
- 34) Yijing’s version of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* also refers to the necessity of establishing a *kalpika-sālā* (*jingchu* 淨厨) within the *vihāra* and to the five *kalpika-sālās*. It does not mention, however, a monk of silly disposition or of little intelligence; T. 1458 [24] 545b2–: 次明作淨厨法。凡是寺内，應作淨厨。此類不同。有其五種：一生心作，二共印持，三如牛臥，四故廢處，五衆結作。言“生心”者.....
- 35) Edgerton (s.v. *kalpika-sālā*): “five are listed all are ‘explained’ in 6ff but the glosses are not all very clear.”; Yamagiwa (2001: 320–322, esp. n. 14): “それぞれに簡潔な説明が付されているが、チベット訳が難解であるため明確に意味を把握できない部分がある”; cf. *Bhaiṣajya-vastu* (Tib. Der. 1 Ga 24b2– ≈ Skt. Dutt, 235 [mostly reconstruction]): **Tib.** *bcom ldan ’das kyis rung ba’i gnas bsko bar bya’o zhes bka’ stsal pa dang / dge slong rnam kyis ci ’dra ba dang ji tsam pa ma shes nas / bcom ldan ’das kyis bka’ stsal pa / rung ba’i gnas lnga ste / rtsom pa’i mtha’ can dang / sems gtod pa’i mtha’ can dang / ba nyal ba lta bu dang / stong pa’i gnas dang / bskos pa’o // (cf. Yao, 2013: 542: “世尊が「浄地を劃定してよい」とおおせられたところ，諸比丘はどのような，またどれだけの大きさのものかを知らなかったので，世尊はおおせられた。「浄地は五種である。すなわち【1】建設に関するものと，【2】注意を向けることに関するものと，【3】牛舎のようなものと，【4】空の場所と，【5】劃定されたものである。」”) ≈ **Skt.** [..... *bhagavān āha / pañca kalpikasālā bhavanti / ārabhyamāṇāntikā ucchrīyamāṇāntikā goniṣādikā udbhūtava] stukā sammatikā ca /* (cf. Yamagiwa, 2001: 321, n. 14: “更に「五種の浄地」をDuttは，① *ārabhyamāṇāntikā*，② *ucchrīyamāṇāntikā*，③ *goniṣādikā*，④ *udbhūtavastukā*，⑤ *sammatikā*，に対応させているが，松田和信氏が所蔵するギルギット写本マイクロフィルム中の当該部分 (Folio No. 266) で確認した所，写本で単語を確定出来るのは，① *ucchrīyamāṇāntikā*，③ *goniṣādikā*，④ *udbhūtavastukā*，⑤ *sammatikā*，の四種であり②を示す部分は欠損していて判明しない。”)。The *Muktaka* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* also includes a reference to the procedures for establishing a *kalpika-sālā* (**Tib.** *rung ba’i khang pa* ≈ **Chin.** *jingchu* 淨厨); Kishino (2016: 243, § 1.9.4).*
- 36) The *Vinaya-sūtra* (Tib. Der. 4117, 78a5 ≈ Skt. R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana, 95, nos. 179–192). There seems to be no doubt that the series of *sūtras* deal with four *kalpika-sālās*, since it begins with the **Tib.** ‘*di la dus bzi yod do* / ≈ **Skt.** *catvārātra kālāḥ* / (“There are four occasions”),

which the *Vinayasūtra-vṛtty-abhidhānasvavyākhyana* comments on, saying: **Tib.** 'di la dus bzhi yod do zhes bya ba ni 'dir rung ba'i khang pa byin gyis brlab pa 'di la dus bzhi yod pa'o // ("Regarding [the *sūtra*] 'there are four occasions,' [it means that] there are four occasions on which the *kalpika-sālā* is formally recognized"). It is not completely clear, however, what the following *sūtras* (and also the comments on them in the *Vinayasūtra-vṛtty-abhidhānasvavyākhyana*) exactly mean. As a result, I am uncertain which four of the five *kalpika-sālās* are being mentioned in the *Vinaya-sūtra*.

- 37) The *Vinayasūtra-vṛtty-abhidhānasvavyākhyana* also does not mention a monk of silly disposition or of little intelligence in the comments on the *sūtras* concerning the *kalpika-sālās*; Derge Der. 4119 Zu 163a5–b3.
- 38) Der. 4105, 243b2–3; cf. Chin. T. 1458 [24] 599a26–27: 若尊及尊類, 應*手膝至地, 或時曲躬, 低頭合掌, 或捉臚, 或蹲踞合掌. *雙=宮內省圖書寮本 (旧宋本), 正倉院聖語藏本 (天平写經).
- 39) *Pravrajyā-vastu* (Tib. Der. 1 Ka 52a3; Eimer 136): *phyag ni gnyis te / yan lag lngas phyag 'tshal ba dang / sgyid pa nas 'khyud pa ste 'dir gan yañ ruñ ño //*; *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Tib. Der. 6 Tha 194a5–6 ≈ Chin. T. 1451 [24] 273a26–27): **Tib.** "nye bar 'khor 'on kyang 'phags pa'i chos 'dul ba la ni phyag gnyis te / yan lag lnga dang / byin pa la 'khyud pa'o //" ≈ **Chin.** "然鄔波離, 於我法律, 有二種敬禮. 云何為二. 一者, 五輪著地. 二者, 兩手捉臚."
- 40) The *Vinaya-sūtra* (Tib. Der. 4117, 93b4): *phyag ni nram par gnyis te / yan lag lngas phyag 'tshal ba dang / sgyid pa la 'khyud pas 'tshal ba'o //*. The Sanskrit text published by R. Sāṅkrtyāyana seems to be incorrect. Therein, there is no phrase equivalent to the Tibetan *nram par gnyis te* (R. Sāṅkrtyāyana, 111 no. 92): *cade (? ceda)-vandane pañcamandalakena jaṃghaprapī[da]nikayā ca /*. The *Vinaya-kārikā* (Tib. Der. 4123, 47b3 ≈ Chin. T. 1459 [24] 647c14) also refers to the two postures: **Tib.** *gcig ni dkyil 'khor lnga pa ste // gzhan gyi sgyid pa nas 'khyud yin //* ≈ **Chin.** 一謂以五輪 二乃擗其臚.
- 41) Der. 4105, 243b2–3. Yijing's version also refers to the way of showing reverence by kneeling as one of the others' views (T. 1458 [24] 599a25–28): 有說: 禮大師時, 五輪至地. 若尊及尊類, 應手膝至地, 或時曲躬低頭合掌, 或捉臚, 或蹲踞合掌. 若對所餘, 同梵行者, 若但合掌, 或復低頭, 或口云畔睇.
- 42) Kishino (2009: 187–188).
- 43) *Pravrajyā-vastu* (Tib. Der. 1 Ka 52a7–53a7, 53b3–5; Eimer 136–139; 139–140): *de'i 'og tu mkhan po rang gis de la chos gos gsum byin gyis brlab par bya'o //*; *de'i 'og tu mkhan po rang gis de la lung bzed byin gyis brlab par bya'o //*
- 44) cf. *Vinaya-sūtra* (Tib. Der. 4117, 2b3–4; 2b4 ≈ Skt. R. Sāṅkrtyāyana 2, no. 40; nos. 41–42; cf. *Vinayasūtra-vṛtty-abhidhānasvavyākhyana* [Bapat & Gokhale, 1982: 10–11; Ritsukyō shukkeji kenkyūkai, 2005: 57 [text]; 62–63 [Jp. translation]]): **Tib.** *de rang gis de la chos gos gsum byin gyis brlab par bya'o //*; *lung bzed kyang mi chung ngam mi che 'am mi skya ba'am zhes dge 'dun la bstan nas so // thams cad kyis de lta bu nyid ma yin na lung bzed bzang ngo zhes brjod par bya'o //* ≈ **Skt.** *sa svayam enam. tricivaram adhiṣṭhāpayet /; pātram copadarsya monam adhikam pāṇḍaram veti samghe / supātram ity anevamte brūyuh sarve /*.
- 45) Peking 5606, 315a7. cf. Der. 4105, 241b5–6: *chos gos rnam dang lung bzed ni dge 'dun la brten te byin gyis brlab par bya'o //*. Yijing's version also seems to support Peking's reading (T. 1458 [24] 598c3–5): 次令捧鉢巡行. 呈現大衆, 一一已, 咸云: "好鉢," 不道者, 得惡作罪. 即對衆前本師為, 守持衣鉢.
- 46) cf. *Vinaya-sūtra* (Tib. Der. 4117, 2a3 ≈ Skt. R. Sāṅkrtyāyana 1 no. 16; cf. *Vinayasūtra-vṛtty-abhidhānasvavyākhyana* [Bapat & Gokhale, 1982: 7; Ritsukyō shukkeji kenkyūkai, 2003:

- 71 [text]; 88 [Jp. translation]]): **Tib.** *mkhan pos gos ngur smrig dag sbyin par bya'o* // ≈ **Skt.** *upādhyā yaḥ kāṣāyāni vastrāni dadyāt* /.
- 47) cf. *Vinaya-saṃgraha* (Tib. Der. 4105, 241b6 ≈ Chin. T. 1458 [24] 598b27–28): *lung bzed med par dge tshul du mi bya'o* // ≈ 應畜鉢盂。若無鉢者，不應出家。
- 48) Yamagiwa (1987: 84); cf. *Pravrajyā-vastu* (Der. no. 1 *Ka* 50b2; Eimer, 132): *de'i 'og tu mkhan pos lung bzed dang gos ngur smrig dag sbyin par bya zhing des kyang rkang pa gnyis la gtugs nas blang bar bya'o* //; the *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Tib. Der. 6 *Tha* 228a1–2 ≈ Chin. T. 1451 [24] 284a4–5): *bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / dge slong gis lung bzed med pa rab tu dbyung bar mi bya ste / rab tu 'byin na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro* // ≈ 佛言：“不應無鉢，與他出家。作者，得越法罪。”
- 49) Note, however, that though Yamagiwa does not refer to it, the *Vinaya-sūtra* also includes a *sūtra* that may be taken as suggesting that a bowl must be given to the candidate (Tib. Der. 4117, 7a3 ≈ Skt. R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana 7, no. 279): **Tib.** *lhuñ bzed med par rab tu dbyuñ ba dañ bñen par rdzogs par mi bya'o* // “Do not have one enter the religious life and be fully ordained without a bowl.” ≈ **Skt.** *nāpātrakam pravrajayeyur upasampādayeyur vā* /.
- 50) Note, however, that it would not be uncommon in Tibetan Buddhist traditions for the *Vinaya-sūtra* to be prioritized more than the canonical *vinaya*. In the dGe-lugs-pa school, for example, the *Vinaya-sūtra*, rather than the canonical *vinaya*, has been held in high esteem. See n. 21 above.
- 51) Der. 4105, 108b7; cf. Yang, 2012: 124; cf. Chin. T. 1458 [24] 536b23–24: 北俱盧洲物，非己想，無不與取故，無盜罪。
- 52) For details on the characteristics of Uttarakuru, see Honjō (1999).
- 53) The *Upāli-pariṣecchā* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (Der. 7 *Na* 6a4–5; cf. Kishino, 2006a: § 1.2.2 no. 31c): *btsun pa byang gi sgra mi snyan gyi gling du ma stsal bar brkus na cir 'gyur lags / nye ba 'khor de na ni ma byin par len pa med de / gal te brku sems bskyed na ni nyes pa sbom por 'gyur ro* // ; the *Vinaya-sūtra* (Tib. D. 4117, 15b4–5 ≈ Skt. R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana 17 no. 200): *byang gi sgra mi snyan na ni yongs su 'dzin pa med pa nyid do* // ≈ *aparigrahatvam uttarakuru* /; cf. *Vinayasūtra-ṛty-abhidhānasavyākhyāna* (Der. 4119, 69b6): *byang gi sgra mi snyan pa rnams kyi rdzas rkus pa bzhin du de la ma byin par len pa med de / bdag tu ma byas pa nyid kyi phyir ro* //.
- 54) cf. *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* (Tib. Der. 2 *Ca* 3b1–4 ≈ Skt. [reconstruction] Banerjee, 1977: 14 ≈ Chin. T. 1454 [24] 501a8–10): **Tib.** *yang dge slong gang dge slong rnams dang lhan cig bslab pa mtshungs par gyur pas bslab pa ma phul bslab pa nyams par ma byas par mi tshangs par spyod pa 'khrig pa'i chos bsten na / tha na dud 'gro'i skye gnas su skyes pa dang lhan cig kyang rung ste / dge slong de pham par gyur pa yin gyis gnas par mi bya'o* // (cf. Vidyabhusana, 1915: 12: “Whatsoever monk, who has received the monk’s system of training and has not abandoned or injured it, indulges himself in impure intercourse down even with a brute beast, incurs Defeat and must not live in the community of monks.”) ≈ **Skt.** [*yaḥ punar bhikṣur bhikṣuṇām śikṣāsāṅgīvasamā pannaḥ śikṣām apratyākhyāya śikṣādaurbalyam anāviśkrtyābrahmacaryaṃ maithuṇaṃ dharmam pratisevate antatas tiryagyonigatayāpi sārḍham, ayam api bhikṣuḥ pārājiko bhavaty asaṃvāsayā* /] (cf. Prebish, 1975: 51: “Whatever monk, having undertaken the proper course and training of the monks, should, not having rejected the training and not having revealed his weakness in the training, indulge in sexual intercourse, an unchaste thing, even so much as with an animal, this monk is pārājika, expelled.” This translation is based on Banerjee’s reconstructed text. Relatedly, it might be noted that a collection of Sanskrit manuscripts found in

- Tibet and preserved in the “Palace of Culture of the Nationalities” in Peking includes a complete Sanskrit manuscript of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, as well as that Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber has been working on it; cf. Emms, 2012: 19.) ≈ **Chin.** 若復苾芻，與諸苾芻，同得學處，不捨學處，學羸不自說，作不淨行，兩交會法，乃至共傍生，此苾芻亦得波羅市迦。不應共住。
- 55) Hirakawa (1993: 182): “「捨戒」とは、比丘が「私は戒を捨てる」と言えば、その比丘の比丘性 (bhikkhu-bhāva) が無くなることである。すなわち比丘ではなくなることを言うのである。”
- 56) Kishino (2015: esp. 182–183, n. 76): “Although it may be expected that *saṃvara* would also be discussed in detail in canonical *vinaya* texts, such discussion—or even the term *saṃvara* itself or its Tibetan/Chinese equivalent (*sdom pa* / 律儀)—is uncommon. In the *Pravrajā-vastu* ‘Chapter on entering the religious life’ of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* extant in Tibetan, for example, only two *saṃvara* compounds appear merely four times in total.”
- 57) Hirakawa (1964: 117–120); Nakagawa (2009: 206).
- 58) Nakagawa (1987: 56): *punar asya sūtrasya na śikṣām pratyācaksā ity evaṃvidhād eva āhatyavacanāt saṃvaradhvaṃsasya saṃpattiḥ, anāhatyavacanād apy asya yena kenacit prakāreṇa tyāgollīṅgakād bhavaty eva saṃpattiḥ*. cf. Nakagawa (1988: 35): “徳光は……これらの捨戒の言葉を動作をともなって強く述べる場合 (āhatyavacana) と、動作をともならず普通の調子で述べる場合 (anāhatyavacana) の二つの形を示し、そのいずれもが捨戒は成立すると理解すべきだという見解を述べている。そして、動作をともなって述べる場合も、ともなわずに述べる場合にも律儀 (saṃvara) の滅 (dhvaṃsa) がもたらされることを示し、そのことを捨戒成立の根拠と見なしている。” There is no equivalent to the Skt. *saṃvara-dhvaṃsa* in the corresponding passage in the Tibetan version of the *Vinayasūtra-vṛtty-abhidhānasavyākhyana* (Der. 4119 *Shu* 57b3–4): *slar mdo 'di la de ltar na bslab pa 'bul ba ni tshig tu smra ba de kho na las bslab pa 'bul bar ma zad kyi / tshig tu ma smras par rnam pa gang yang rung bas gtong ba'i mtshan ma las kyang phul bar 'gyur te /*.
- 59) Peking 5606, 139a5–6; Der. 4105, 101b5–6; cf. Chin. T. 1458 [24] 533a21–23: 言“不捨學處”者，謂無捨緣故，言“不捨。”捨緣有四。謂，捨，二形，生命終，并斷善；cf. *AKBh* Ch. IV 38 (Pradhan, 222): *prātimokṣadamatyāgaḥ śikṣānikṣepañāc cyuteḥ / ubhayavyañjanotpatter mūlacchedān niśātyayāt //38//*.
- 60) There seems to be little, if any, chance that the Tibetan text of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* was revised and consequently the problematic statements that Bu ston had found were deleted or amended before it came down to us. This is because the Chinese version also suggests that Bu ston's doubt is not always tenable. See, for example, n. 38, 41, and 47.
- 61) Hirakawa (1960: 150); “同様に [『開元録』『貞元録』の「入藏録」は] 律攝についても、二十卷本のほかに十四卷本のあったことを、異本として挙げている。したがって、この両者は、異本が現在用いられているものと見るべきであろう。”; K. Sasaki (1985 [1976]: 166, n. 1): “『開元録』，『貞元録』には二〇卷本のほかに異本としてこの十四巻本があげられているが二〇巻本は伝えられていない。”
- 62) The *Lhan kar ma* (*Ldan dkar ma*) and the *'Phangs thang ma* catalogues refer to the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* as 15 and 13 *bam po* respectively (Yoshimura, 162, no. 493; Kawagoe, 24, no. 458). It seems that Bu ston also knew both 13 and 15 *bam po* versions of the *Vinaya-*

- saṃgraha*. He refers to it as 15 *bam po* in his *Chos 'byung* (Nishioka, 47, no. 443) but as 13 *bam po* in *Zhwa lu* Tanjur catalogue (105b4–5).
- 63) Park (2017), for example, in his study of the Bathang manuscript of the Tibetan translation of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, refers to five manuscripts and three xylograph editions of the *sūtra* and notes that all the eight versions have the same number of chapters (45 chapters) but the *bam po* numbers found in them are not always the same.
- 64) Photographs of them are fully preserved in the library of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies (Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Daigakuin Daigaku 国際仏教学大学院大学) in Tokyo: <https://koshakyo-database.icabs.ac.jp/canons>. For details of old manuscripts of Chinese Buddhist texts that have been preserved in Japan, see, most recently, Miyazaki (2019: 153–232; esp. 177–189).
- 65) It should also be noted that the Taisho edition of the 14 *juan* 卷 version refers to the large number of variant readings found in the Sung 宋, Yuan 元, and Ming 明 editions. It adopts a unique method to show them, presenting two versions of the text: one based primarily on the Second Koryo edition (再雕高麗版) (604b–610b), and another based on the Sung, Yuan, and Ming editions (610b–617a). In his excellent study of the *Adhikaraṇa-vastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, Borgland (2014: esp. 33–34) refers to this Taishō *Vinaya-saṃgraha* and wonders why it contains two explanations of the *Adhikaraṇa-vastu* in succession. This is simply because it includes these two versions, and each of them contain these explanations. A comparative study of the Taisho edition's two versions might also be a clue to the multiple circulation of the Chinese *Vinaya-saṃgraha*.

References

- AKBh* (Pradhan): P. Pradhan ed., *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Center, 1967.
- Baba (Hisayuki) 馬場久幸, 2016: *Nikkan kōryū to Kōraiban Daizōkyō* 日韓交流と高麗版大藏經. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館.
- Banerjee (Anukul Chandra), 1977: *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit: Prātimokṣa Sūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākya*. Calcutta: The World Press Private Limited.
- Bhaiṣajya-vastu* (Dutt): Nalinaksha Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III, Pt. 1. Srinagar: Government of Jammu and Kashmir, 1947.
- Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo: Zhang Yisun 蔘張怡 *et al.*, *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* (*Zang-han dacidian* 藏漢大辭典). Beijing: *Minzu chubanshe* 民族出版社, 1985.
- Borgland (Jens W), 2014: “A Study of the Adhikaraṇavastu: Legal Settlement Procedures of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oslo.
- Chos 'byung* (Nishioka): Nishioka Soshū 西岡祖秀, “‘Puton Bukkyōshi’ mokurokubu sakuin II 『プトン仏教史』目録部索引 II.” *Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu Bunka Kōryū Kenkyū Shisetsu kenkyū kiyō* 東京大学文学部文化交流研究施設研究紀要 5, 43–94, 1981.
- Clarke (Shayne), 2006: “Miscellaneous Musings on Mūlasarvāstivāda Monks: The Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Revival in Tokugawa Japan.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 33 (1), 1–49.
- , 2012: “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms: On the Affiliation of the Tibetan Nuns’ Lineages and Beyond.” Paper delivered at Oslo Buddhist Studies Forum, June

- 12, 2012.
- , 2014: *Vinaya Texts*. Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India: Facsimile Edition, 1. New Delhi and Tokyo: The National Archives of India and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- , 2016–2017: “Lost in Tibet, Found in Bhutan: The Unique Nature of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Law Code for Nuns.” *Buddhism, Law & Society* 2, 199–292.
- The Collected Works of Bu ston*: L. Chandra ed., *The Collected Works of Bu ston*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971.
- CPD: A Critical Pāli Dictionary*. Begun by V. Trenckner, continued by Dines Andersen *et al.* Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy, 1924–2011.
- Der.: *Bka' 'gyur sde dge'i par ma*. *Derge Kanjur: Bka' 'gyur (sde dge) (post par phud print)* (CD-ROM edition. 103 vols). New York: Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center, 2003–2004.
- 'Dul ti ka nyi ma'i 'od zer legs bshad lung rigs kyi rga mtsho: Kun mkhyen mtsho sna ba shes rab bzang po. *'Dul ti ka nyi ma'i 'od zer legs bshad lung rigs kyi rga mtsho*. 2 vols. (Pañchen Bsod-nams-grags-pa Literature Series; Vols. 80, 81). Delhi: Drepung Loseling Library Society, 1994.
- Edgerton: Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953 (Reprint, Kyoto: Rinsen shoten 臨川書店, 1985).
- Emms (Christopher), 2012: “Evidence for Two Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya Traditions in the Gilgit Prātimokṣa-Sūtras.” Master thesis, McMaster University.
- Ende (Rein), 2016: “The Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya: An Attempt at an *Index Locorum*.” Master thesis, McMaster University.
- Fujita (Kōkan) 藤田光寛, 2004: “Chibetto Daizōkyō shoshū no yuishikibu no tekisuto ni tsuite (1) チベット大蔵経所収の唯識部のテキストについて (1).” *Kōyasan Daigaku Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 高野山大学密教文化研究所紀要 17, 204–183.
- Hadano (Hakuyū) 羽田野伯猷, 1987: *Chibetto Indogaku shūsei* チベット・インド学集成, Vol. 2: *Chibetto hen* チベット篇 II. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館, 239–258.
- Hirakawa (Akira) 平川彰, 1960: *Ritsuzō no kenkyū* 律蔵の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- , 1964: *Genshibukkyō no kenkyū: kyōdan soshiki no genkei* 原始仏教の研究: 教団組織の原型. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- , 1982: *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns: An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṅghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, 21). Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- , 1993: *Nihyaku gojukkai no kenkyū I* 二百五十戒の研究 I (*Hirakwa Akira Chosakushū* 平川彰著作集, 14). Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- Honjō (Yoshifumi) 本庄良文, 1999: “‘Kusharon’ kankei shiryō ni mieru kitakurushū 『俱舍論』 関係資料に見える北俱盧洲.” *Bukkyō Daigaku Sōgō Kenkyūjo kiyō: Jōdokyō no sōgōteki kenkyū* 佛教大学総合研究所紀要: 浄土教の総合的研究. 79–86.
- Kishino (Ryōji) 岸野亮示, 2006: “Futatsu no ‘Uttaraguranta’ (‘Upāri mondō’ no kōsatsu) 二つの『ウッタラグラント』(「ウパーリ問答」の考察).” Master thesis, Kyōto Daigaku 京都大学.
- , 2009: “Koromo ya hachi no adhi-| sthā- 衣や鉢の adhi-| sthā-.” *Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai nenpō* 日本仏教学会年報 74, 181–204.
- , 2013: “A Study of the *Nidāna*: An Underrated Canonical Text of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya.” Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- , 2015: “The Concept of *sdom pa* in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya: On Possible

- Misunderstandings of the *Brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*.” *Bukkyō Daigaku Bukkyō Gakkai kiyō* 佛教大学仏教学会紀要 20, 147–192.
- , 2016: “A Further Study of the *Muktaka* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: A Table of Contents and Parallels.” *Bukkyō Daigaku Bukkyō Gakkai kiyō* 21, 227–283.
- , 2017: “Bu ston’s Doubts about the Authenticity of the *Vinaya-saṃgraha*.” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 65 (3), 239–245.
- , 2018: “‘*Vinaya-saṃgraha*’ kenkyū josetsu 『*Vinaya-saṃgraha*』 研究序説.” Paper delivered at Ōtani Daigaku Bukkyō Gakkai kenkyū happyō reikai 大谷大学仏教学会研究発表例会, November 22, 2018.
- van der Kuijp (Leonard W.J.), 2016: “The Lives of Bu ston Rin chen grub and the Date and Sources of His *Chos ’byung*, a Chronicle of Buddhism in India and Tibet.” *Revue d’Etudes Tibétaines* 35, 203–308.
- Lhan kar ma/ Ldan dkar ma* catalogue (Yoshimura): Yoshimura Shūki 吉村修基, “The Denkar-ma, an Oldest Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons.” In: *Indo daijō bukkyō shisō kenkyū: Kamarashira no shisō* インド大乘仏教思想研究: カマラシーラ の思想. Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑, 1974, 99–199.
- Liu (Cuilan), 2014: “Flower Garland: The Transmission of a Vinaya Commentary in Tibet.” <https://iabs2014.univie.ac.at/academic-program/list-of-panels/15-new-findings-vinaya/>
- Liu (Cuilan) and Andrews (Susan), 2017: “Introduction.” In: Susan Andrews, Jinhua Chen, and Cuilan Liu eds., *Rules of Engagement: Medieval Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Regulation* (Hamburg Buddhist Studies 9). Bochum: Projek Verlag, 9–24.
- Luo (Hong), 2011a: “The Recensions of Guṇaprabha’s *Vinayasūtra*: Towards an Editorial Policy for the Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text.” *Annali dell’Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”* 67 (1–4), 171–186.
- , 2011b: “The Explanatory Devices of the *Vinayasūtra*: Based upon an Investigation of the *Pravrajyāvastu*.” *Journal of Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka*, Vol. VIII, 50–60.
- Maeda (Takashi) 前田崇, 2001: “Chibetto ni okeru kairitsu kan (1) チベットにおける戒律観 (1).” *Tendai gakuho* 天台学報 43, 1–8.
- Mimaki (Katsumi) 御牧克己, 1987: “Chibetto-go butten gaikan チベット語仏典概観.” In: Nagano Yasuhiko 長野泰彦 and Tachikawa Musashi 立川武蔵 eds., *Chibetto no gengo to bunka: Kitamura Hajime kyōju taikan kinen ronbunshū* チベットの言語と文化: 北村甫教授退官記念論文集. Tokyo: Tojusha 冬樹社, 277–314.
- , 2000: “Chibetto-go no genten チベット語の原典.” *Gakujutsu geppō* 学術月報 53 (11), 36–39.
- Miyazaki (Tenshō) 宮崎展昌, 2019: *Daizōkyō no rekishi: naritachi to denshō* 大藏經の歴史: 成り立ちと伝承. Kyoto: Hōjōdō shuppan 方丈堂出版.
- Nagao (Gajin) 長尾雅人, 1954: *Chibetto bukkyō kenkyū* 西藏仏教研究. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店.
- Nakagawa (Masanori) 中川正法, 1987: “*Vinayasūtravṛtti* of Guṇaprabha: Pārājikam (1).” *Nanto bukkyō* 南都仏教 58, 50–69.
- , 1988: “Shakai no seiritsu to ritsugi (I): *Vinayasūtravṛtti* wo megutte 捨戒の成立と律儀 (I): *Vinayasūtravṛtti* をめぐって.” *Nishinihon shūkyōgaku zasshi* 西日本宗教学雑誌 10, 34–40.
- , 2009: “Kai no bōgo to shakai: Ritsugi (saṃvara) no seiki wo megutte 戒の防護と捨戒: 律儀 (saṃvara) の生起をめぐって.” *Kairitsu to rinri* 戒律と倫理. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店, 205–215.

- Nishimoto (Ryūzan) 西本龍山, 1933: “Konpon satsubatabu ritsushō 根本薩婆多部律攝.” In: Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙 ed., *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典, Vol. 3. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha 大東出版社, 532.
- Onoda (Shunzō) 小野田俊蔵, 1982: “Chibetto ni okeru ronrigaku kenkyū no mondai: Gakumonji no kiso kenkyū katei チベットにおける論理学研究の問題: 学問寺の基礎研究課程.” *Tōyō gakujutsu kenkyū* 東洋学術研究 103 (21-2), 193–205.
- Otani Tanjur Catalogue: *Chibetto Daizōkyō Tanjuru kandō mokuroku II: Ōtani Daigaku Toshokanzō* 西藏大藏經丹殊爾勘同目錄 II: 大谷大学図書館蔵. Edited by Ōtani Daigaku Shinshū Sōgō Kenkyūjo Chibetto Bunken Kenkyūhan 大谷大学真宗総合研究所西藏文献研究班. Kyoto: Ōtani Daigaku Shinshū Sōgō Kenkyūjo 大谷大学真宗総合研究所, 1985.
- Park (Hunjin), 2017: “The Bathang Manuscript of the *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra*.” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 65 (3), 246–250.
- Peking: *Eiin Peking ban Chibetto Daizōkyō: Ōtani Daigaku Toshokanzō* 影印北京版西藏大藏經: 大谷大学図書館蔵. Edited by Chibetto Daizōkyō Kenkyūkai 西藏大藏經研究会. Tokyo: Chibetto Daizōkyō Kenkyūkai 西藏大藏經研究会, 1955–1961.
- Phang thang ma* catalogue (Kawagoe): Kawagoe Eishin 川越英真, *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma*. Sendai: Tōhoku Indo-Chibetto Kenkyūkai 東北インド・チベット研究会, 2005.
- Pravrajā-vastu* (Eimer): Helmut Eimer, *Rab tu 'byung ba'i gzi. Die tibetische Übersetzung des Pravrajā vastu im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*, 2. Teil: Text. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.
- Prebish (Charles S.), 1975: *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: The Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtra of the Mahāsāṃghikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins*. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Sakaino (Kōyō) 境野黄洋, 1932: “Konpon satsubata-bu ritsushō 根本薩婆多部律攝.” Ritsu-bu 律部, 17 of *Kokuyaku issaikyō* 國譯一切經. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha 大東出版社.
- Samghabhedavastu* (Gnoli): Raniero Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu: Being the 17th and Last Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*, Part I (Serie Orientale Roma, 50). Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1978.
- Sasaki (Kyōgo) 佐々木教悟, 1976: “Ritsushō no kyōjo ni tsuite 律撰の経序について.” In: *Okuda Jiō sensei kiju kinen: Bukkyō shisō ronshū* 奥田慈應先生喜寿記念: 仏教思想論集. Edited by Okuda Jiō Sensei Kiju Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 奥田慈應先生喜寿記念論文集刊行会. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平樂寺書店, 987–1000.
- , 1977: “Konponsatsubatabu ritsushō ni tsuite 根本薩婆多部律撰について.” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 25 (2), 63–70.
- , 1985: *Kairitsu to sōgya: Indo, Tōnan Ajia bukkyō kenkyū* 戒律と僧伽: インド・東南アジア仏教研究, Vol. I. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平樂寺書店.
- Sasaki (Shizuka) 佐々木閑, 2000: *Indo bukkyō hen'i ron: naze bukkyō wa tayōka shitonoka* インド仏教変移論: なぜ仏教は多様化したのか. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版.
- Schopen (Gregory), 1998: “Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries: On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices.” In: P. Harrison and G. Schopen eds., *Sūryacandrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Indica et Tibetica, 35). Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica, 157–179 (Reprinted in Schopen, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 2004, 260–284).
- , 2001: “Dead Monks and Bad Debts.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44, 99–148 (Reprinted in

- Schopen, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*. Honolulu: Hawai‘i U.P., 2004, 122–169).
- , 2004a: “On Buddhist Monks and Dreadful Deities: Some Monastic Devices for Updating the Dharma.” In: H.W. Bodewitz and M. Hara eds., *Gedenkschrift J.W. de Jong*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies, 161–184 (Reprinted in Schopen, *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Worldly Matters*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2014, 333–357).
- , 2004b: “Making Men into Monks.” In: Donald S. Lopez Jr. ed., *Buddhist Scriptures* (Penguin Classics). London: Penguin Books, 231–251 (Reprinted in Schopen 2014, 175–193).
- , 2008: “Separate but Equal: Property Rights and the Legal Independence of Buddhist Nuns and Monks in Early North India.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 128 (4), 625–640 (Reprinted in Schopen 2014, 73–94).
- T.: *Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡邊海旭. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai 大正新脩大藏經刊行会, Popular Edition, 1988–1992 (First Edition published in 1924–1935).
- Tohoku Catalogue: Kanakura Yenshu *et al.* eds., *A Catalogue of the Tohoku University Collection of Tibetan Works on Buddhism*. Sendai: The Seminary of Indology, Tohoku University, 1953.
- Tsedroen (Jampa), 1992: *A Brief Survey of the Vinaya: Its Origin, Transmission and Arrangement from the Tibetan Point of View with Comparisons to the Theravāda and Dharmagupta Traditions*. Hamburg: Foundation for Tibetan Buddhist Studies.
- Vidyabhusana (Satis Chandra), 1915: *So-sor-thar-pa (khrims): Vol. 5 of the Dukwa portion of the Kangyur, leaves 1–29 and top line of leaf 30*. Calcutta: Asiatic Society.
- Vinaya-sūtra* (R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana): Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, *Vinayasūtra of Bhadanta Guṇaprabha* (Singhi Jain Śāstra Śikṣāpīṭha. Singhi Jain Series 74). Bombay: Kulpati Munshi Marg, 1981.
- Vinayasūtra-vṛtty-abhidhānasavyākhyāna* (Bapat & Gokhale, 1982): P.V. Bapat and V.V. Gokhale, *Vinaya-Sūtra and Auto-Commentary on the Same by Guṇaprabha* (Chapter I-Pravrajyāvastu). Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1982.
- Vinayasūtra-vṛtty-abhidhānasavyākhyāna* (Ritsukyō shukkeji kenkyūkai, 2003): “Ritsukyō ‘Shukkeji’ no kenkyū (1) 『律經』 「出家事」の研究 (1).” *Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo nenpō* 総合佛教研究所年報 25, 44–93.
- Vinayasūtra-vṛtty-abhidhānasavyākhyāna* (Ritsukyō shukkeji kenkyūkai, 2005): “Ritsukyō ‘Shukkeji’ no kenkyū (3) 『律經』 「出家事」の研究 (3).” *Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo nenpō* 総合佛教研究所年報 27, 50–76.
- Vogel (Claus), 1985: “Bu-ston on the Schism of the Buddhist Church and on the Doctrinal Tendencies of Buddhist Scriptures.” In: *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*. Erster Teil (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung III, 1). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 104–110.
- Watanabe (Shōkō) 渡辺照宏, 1977: “Adhiṣṭhāna (kaji) no bunkengakuteki shiron Adhiṣṭhāna (加持) の文献学的試論.” *Naritan Bukkyō Kenkyūjo kiyō* 成田山仏教研究所紀要 2, 1–91.
- Yamagiwa (Nobuyuki) 山極伸之, 1987: “Konponsetsuissaiubu no shukkesahō ni okeru mondaiten 根本説一切有部の出家作法における問題点.” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku*

kenkyū 印度學佛教學研究 36 (1), 84–86.

- , 2001: “Shoki bukkuyō kyōdan ni okeru shoku no juyō: jōchi wo meguru shomondai 初期仏教教団における食の受容: 浄地をめぐる諸問題.” In: *Ishigami Zen'ō kyōju koki kinen ronbunshū: Bukkyō bunka no kichō to tenkai* 石上善應教授古稀記念論文集: 仏教文化の基調と展開. Edited by Ishigami Zen'ō Kyōju Koki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 石上善應教授古稀記念論文集刊行会. Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 307–322.
- Yang (Bejia) 楊本加, 2012: “*Genben sapoduo-bu lüshe*” *yanjiu* 《根本薩婆多部律攝》研究. Beijing: *Minzu chubanshe* 民族出版社.
- Yao (Fumi) 八尾史, 2013: *Konponsetsuissaiuburitsu yakuji* 根本説一切有部律彙事. Tokyo: Rengō shuppan 連合出版.
- Zhwa lu* Tanjur catalogue: *Bstan 'gyur gyi dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu dbang gi rgyal po'i phreng ba*. In: *The Collected Works of Bu ston*, part 26 La.